

LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, ~~738~~ Division F
No. Shelf, Section 3
No. Book, No. 2

The John M. Krebs Donation.

BV 665 .S5

Smyth, Thomas, 1808-1873.
The prelatival doctrine of
apostolical succession

THE
PRELITICAL DOCTRINE
OF
APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION EXAMINED,
AND THE
PROTESTANT MINISTRY DEFENDED
AGAINST THE
ASSUMPTIONS OF POPERY AND HIGH-CHURCHISM,
IN A SERIES OF LECTURES.

BY THOMAS SMYTH,
PASTOR OF THE SECOND PRESEBYTERIAN CHURCH, CHARLESTON, S. C.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CROCKER & BREWSTER.
NEW YORK: DAYTON & SAXTON. PHILADELPHIA: HOOKER & AGNEW, AND HENRY
PERKINS. CHARLESTON, S. C.: S. HART, SEN. CINCINNATI: WEED & WILSON.

1841.

CAN ANY REASONABLE RULE OF CONSTRUCTION MAKE THIS (I. E. THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION) AMOUNT TO MORE THAN ANCIENT AND APOSTOLICAL PRACTICE? THAT THE APOSTLES ADOPTED ANY PARTICULAR FORM, AFFORDS A PRESUMPTION OF ITS BEING THE BEST, ALL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THAT TIME CONSIDERED; BUT TO MAKE IT UNALTERABLY BINDING, IT MUST BE SHOWN ENJOINED IN POSITIVE PRECEPT. [BISHOP WHITE IN 'THE CASE OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.'

I AM, — SAYS THE REVEREND THOMAS SCOTT, — AN EPISCOPALIAN, BUT NOT A PRELATIST.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-one, by
CROCKER AND BREWSTER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

S. N. DICKINSON, PRINTER,
52 Washington Street.

THESE LECTURES

ARE DEDICATED, BY THEIR AUTHOR,

FIRST,

TO ALL EVANGELICAL, OR LOW-CHURCH EPISCOPALIANS, AND TO ALL NON-EPISCOPAL, AND EVANGELICAL COMMUNIONS, WHOSE COMMON INTEREST AND DUTY IT IS TO OPPOSE THE EXCLUSIVE ASSUMPTIONS OF

POPERY AND HIGH-CHURCHISM.

SECONDLY,

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, CHARLESTON, S. C. FOR WHOSE IMMEDIATE BENEFIT THEY WERE ORIGINALLY PREPARED ; BY WHOSE COUNSEL THEY WERE PUBLICLY DELIVERED ; AND BY WHOSE SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE, THEY ARE NOW PUBLISHED TO THE WORLD :

AND, THIRDLY,

TO THE REV. SAMUEL MILLER, D. D. AND REV. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D. THE LONG-TRIED AND FAITHFUL ADVOCATES AND FRIENDS

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ;

TO WHOSE LABORS ITS BISHOPS, ELDERS, AND CHURCH MEMBERS, ARE UNDER DEEP AND LASTING OBLIGATION.

FROM the unprecedented haste with which the Volume has been carried through the press, many mistakes in names and references, both in the body of the work and the Index, may have escaped the notice of the Author, who has done all he possibly could to avoid them.



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present Volume, while complete in itself, and therefore published under its distinctive title, formed only the First Part of a Course of LECTURES ON PRELACY AND PRESBYTERY. The Second Part, which will constitute a second Volume, and which is in a state of preparation, will embrace discussions, more or less full, of the following topics:—

I. The True Apostolical or Ministerial Succession claimed by Presbyterians—in which it will be shown that this claim has been always urged, and the ignorance of some Prelatists on this point exposed.

II. This claim of Presbyters justified by Scripture—in which the condition of the church during our Lord's Ministry will be considered, and some general topics debated.

III. This claim of Presbyters sustained by Scripture, continued—in which the arguments from the Apostolic Church will be entered upon.

IV. This claim of Presbyters sustained by Scripture, in which the argument from the Apostolic Church will be continued.

V. This claim of Presbyters sustained by Scripture, and objections answered, in which the argument will be concluded.

VI. This claim of Presbyters sustained by the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers.

VII. This claim of Presbyters sustained by the testimony of the Primitive Fathers.

VIII. This claim of Presbyters sustained by the testimony of later Fathers.

IX. This claim of Presbyters sustained by the testimony of later Fathers and Divines—of the most eminent Reformers—and of many of the most eminent of the English divines.

X. The Antiquity of Presbyterianism, including an account of the Culdees.

XI. The true Liberty, Catholicity and Security of Presbyterianism.

XII. The Republicanism of Presbyterianism.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

AN ECCLESIASTICAL CATECHISM OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, for the use of families, Bible Classes, and private families. Second edition—much improved.

TRACTS ON PRESBYTERIANISM; 1 vol. 12mo.

SOLACE FOR BEREAVED PARENTS: Or, INFANTS DIE TO LIVE. With an historical account of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation, and Select Thoughts in Poetry and Prose.

A FORM FOR THE SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY, according to the order of the Presbyterian Church.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

THE NECESSITY FOR THIS DISCUSSION — IN WHICH THE QUESTION IS STATED — THE NECESSITY FOR ITS DISCUSSION ILLUSTRATED — AND THE PLAN OF THE ARGUMENT DEVELOPED.

It is the object of this Lecture to explain the nature of those claims assumed by Prelatists; and by which the right of other communions to a fellowship in the privileges of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolical church is denied, 2.— The bigotry of Prelatists towards all other denominations, and their demand for the investigation of their claims, 3.— Some of the reasons which have led to this discussion, 5—: First, This discussion of these high and exclusive claims, we owe to their authors and abettors; secondly, we are under obligation to institute this investigation, by a due regard to our character and just claims, which are both— this doctrine being true—entirely overthrown, 9;— thirdly, such an examination is demanded by the cause of truth and liberty, 13;— as a fourth reason, we are summoned to this enterprise by the claims of charity and peace, 18;— fifthly, to this defensive warfare for the maintenance and preservation of our spiritual rights, we are imperatively summoned by the memory of our fathers, 20.— NOTE A. The bigotry of Prelatists further illustrated, by a reference to their opinions of the different christian denominations, 23.— NOTE B. On High-churchism, 29.— NOTE C. Dr. Rice on the necessity of this controversy, 29; the call of charity, 30.— NOTE D. Our Scottish fathers, 30.

LECTURE II.

THE TRIBUNAL: BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION MUST BE ADJUDICATED.

This necessary to be decided, 34.— This tribunal is the written word of God, 34-35.— The question at issue fully stated, 37 and 44: 1. Many churches make these same claims, and therefore we must try them all by the written word, 45; 2. If these church principles are essential, they must be found in scripture, 48-51. NOTE A.— The doctrine further illustrated from prelatist writers, 52.— NOTE B. Further authorities in support of our first position, 53-54.— NOTE C. Further authorities for demanding clear scripture evidence, 54.

LECTURE III.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONTINUED.

3. We demand clear scripture proof, because these principles constitute new terms of communion with the church universal, which Christ alone is competent to prescribe, 56-60; 4. This demand is in accordance with the doctrine and the spirit of Protestantism, 60-67; 5. This demand is further made, because it is a right admitted and acted upon, whenever needed, by our opponents themselves, 67-74.

LECTURE IV.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONCLUDED.

Recapitulation, 75-76; 6. Before allowing to fathers, councils, or the practice of the church, an authority, coördinate with, or interpretative of, the Bible, evidence of not less weight than that given for the Word of God, must be produced, 76-82; 7. We demand this unquestionable evidence, because of the unreasonableness of the whole scheme, in itself considered, 82-87.— The conclusion from the whole argument drawn, namely: that this clear evidence must be given— that Prelacy, however, as is admitted, is not thus revealed in the scriptures, 87-92.— Prelacy, therefore, is untrue, and to urge it as fundamental is wrong, 93-94.— Two inferences drawn: 1. Presbytery, as contrasted with Prelacy, is characterized by a fearlessness of scripture, 94-96; 2. Also by its reverence for the Word of God, 96-98.— NOTE A. The authority of the fathers, 100-101.— NOTE B. Testimony of fathers.— NOTE C. Prelacy not in scripture, 103.

LECTURE V.

THE TESTS BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION MUST BE TRIED.

This unbroken succession to be proved, not one of ministers, but of prelates, 106. — This succession must be shown to have originated with Christ, 107. — This order, supposing it to have been thus originated, must be shown to have been designed as perpetual and unalterable, 107-108. also, to have been instituted by all the apostles, under the guidance of inspiration, 108-109. also, that it was made of fundamental importance, 109-110. — We must have equally satisfactory proof for the validity of every subsequent link, 110. — It must be shown that no link is wanting, 112. — Also, that the ordination of every prelate in this entire succession, was valid; first, as to the form of ordination, 113-114; secondly, as to the subjects of ordination, 114-118; thirdly, as to the ministers of ordination, or the ordainers, 110-120. — The utter impossibility of doing this shown, 121. — The absurdity of the whole scheme shown, and our safety argued, 122. — NOTE A. *Episcopus* and *Hoadly* on the succession, 124-126. — NOTE B. Another ground of uncertainty, 126.

LECTURE VI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION TESTED BY SCRIPTURE.

The doctrine again stated, 127-129. — Disagreement of Prelatists, 131. — Our present object, 132. — What has been proved by Mr. Taylor, 133-134. — Promises claimed, 134. — Universal consent for presbytery, 135-136. — Prelacy denounced by Christ, 137-138. — Opposed to scripture declarations, 138. — warnings and precepts, 139. — and to scripture prophecy, 140-141. — Also, in opposition to the ministerial commission, 142-144. — and to the promises, 144-148. NOTE A. Variations of Prelacy, or episcopal doctors *versus jure divino* Prelatists. — NOTE B. — Mr. Noel on the promises. — NOTE C. Presbyterian succession the only safe one. — NOTE D. Mathew Henry on the case of Eldad and Medad.

LECTURE VII.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONTINUED.

Recapitulation, 155. — This doctrine equally contrary to the facts of scripture, 156. — Of ordination and its alleged essentiality, 156-157. — Bishop and presbyter identical, 158-161. — Contrary, also, to the decisions of scripture, 161-164. — Contrary, also, to scripture manifestations, 164-173. — The variations of prelacy, and the demonstration of presbytery, 173-179.

LECTURE VIII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BROUGHT TO THE TEST OF HISTORY.

Question again stated, 181-182. — Recapitulation, 182. — The issue staked upon the historical proof, 183. — No proof for the very beginning of this chain, 185. — Peter never at Rome, 185-186. — Peter never Bishop of Rome, 187. — Peter never appointed any successors, nor can any order of succession be determined, 187-194.

LECTURE IX.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONCLUDED.

The doctrine again stated, 195. — Recapitulation, 196-197. — Our confusion thickens as we advance, 197-198. — The succession evidently invalid, 198-199. — Character of the popes, 199-200. — The Anglican succession defective in various respects, 200-202. — So, also, the Irish, 202. — Further illustrations of the English succession, 203. — The papal and, of course, the Anglican succession antichristian, 204-208. — The Anglican succession invalid since the reformation, 208; — Derived from the crown, 209-210. — On Archbishop Parker's ordination, 210-213. — Other flaws in the Anglican succession, 213. — On the Scottish succession, 214-216. — This succession confessedly broken, by the undeniable separation of the English church from the Roman church, 216-218. — The American succession also doubtful, 218-221. — The succession can only be of the strength of its weakest link, 221. — Objections answered, 221-223. — The succession, therefore, assuredly destroyed, 223-224. — NOTE A. The character of the popish successors, 225-227.

LECTURE X.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BROUGHT TO THE TEST OF FACTS.

Doctrine stated, by Bishop Seabury, 230; — and by Romanists, 231. — Recapitulation, 232. — Prelates not, in fact, successors of the apostles, 233. — Not to their name or title, 233-235. — Different meanings of the word apostle, 236-238. — Prelates not apostles in their call, 239; — nor in the insignia of their office, 239-242; — nor in their office itself, 242-246; nor in their laborious duties, 246-250. — Oppose preaching, 248-250. — The parable of the apostles, 253-254. — NOTE A. On the meaning of the term apostle, 255. — NOTE B. Prelatical opposition to preaching, 255-256.

LECTURE XI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ESSENTIALLY POPISH IN ITS TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

This charge disavowed, 257-258. — Necessity for discussing this topic, 258. — This popish tendency shown, first, by the analogy between this doctrine, as embraced and followed out by the Romish and the Anglican churches, 259-262; secondly, from the fact that this doctrine and the system of the Oxford divinity are essentially connected, 262-267; thirdly, from the undeniably popish character of this system, and to which it leads, 267-268. — This proved by abundant testimony, 265-274. — NOTE A. The character of the Oxford divinity, 275-276.

LECTURE XII.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONCLUDED.

The tendency of what is called Oxford divinity to popery, proved by numerous facts and conversions, both in England and this country, 279-285. — This system prevailing in the episcopal church in this country, 285-286. — Our conclusion inevitable, and our discussion justifiable, 287-288. — On the ground of this doctrine, consistency requires an apostacy to the church of Rome, 288-292. — The doctrines of prelacy and popery different, but not distinct, 289-292. — The doctrine of prelatial succession leads therefore to popery, 293-294. — NOTE A. Roman Catholic Letter to the prelatists, proposing union, 295. — NOTE B. Peculiar attachment of prelatists to the Romish church, 296. — On the value of tradition, 297.

LECTURE XIII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION INTOLERANT IN ITS TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

This arises from the powers implied in this claim, 299-300. — This shown from a historical review of the prelatial character, and of this doctrine, 301-305. — The spirit of intolerance not abandoned when the Church of England separated from Rome, 305-307. — Nor is it now abandoned, 307-309. — The laity to be excluded in America from all conventions, 309-312. — Prelatists, even now, advocate compulsion and implicit obedience to canonical authority, 312. — Justify absolute anathemas from the articles and canons, 313, 314. — Bishops to punish the disobedient, 314, — and to do so by an inquisition, 315. — They teach that civil magistrates have plenary power in ecclesiastical matters, 315-317. — Glory in intolerant laws, 317. — Require implicit subjection, whether right or wrong, 317. — Exult in being reproached for this intolerance, 318. — This intolerance exemplified, 318, 319. — Prelacy entirely opposed to civil and religious liberty, 320, 321. — Subjects her members to a foreign influence, 322. — This spirit cannot, at this time, be carried out, 323. — That it would be, if it could, shown by the introduction of intolerant epithets, 323-326. — Necessity of opposing it, 327. — Why they brand us as schismatics, 327, 318. — They teach that no human legislature has any liberty to tolerate schismatics, 329. — Presbyterians not open to the same charge, 330, 331. — NOTE A. Dr. Bangs on prelacy as an usurpation, 332. — NOTE B. This intolerance historically illustrated, 332-334. — NOTE C. This intolerance illustrated in the conduct of Bishop Hobart, 334, 335. — NOTE D. Extracts from Dr. Rice's Letter, (from the National Intelligencer,) on High-church principles opposed to the genius of our republican institutions, 335-342. — NOTE E. Tendencies of prelacy illustrated, 342-344. — NOTE F. The true character of Archbishop Laud, 345-346.

LECTURE XIV.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION UNREASONABLE.

The three prelatial castes, 347, 348. — Review of the intolerant principles of the system, 349, 350. — The province of reason, 351, 352. — This doctrine to be adjudged by reason, 352. — It substitutes the means for the end, 353. — Prelatic and scripture reasoning contrasted, 354, 355. — This theory sustained by false and sophistical reasoning, 355-357. — Prelatists differ from each other more than from us, 357, 358. — This absurdity episcopally described, 358-360. — No prelatial distinctions known in heaven or hell, 361, 362.

LECTURE XV.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SUICIDAL.

The Anglican and Romish succession stand or fall together, 365, 366. — The Romish church can on this theory recall as well as give the succession, 366. — The invalidity of both successions shown by examples, 366, 367. — Bishops limited by the power of the Pope, 367, 368. — This doctrine would make true the most opposite and evident errors, 369, 370. — May be claimed by one church as well as another, 370. — Its claimants are mutually excommunicated, 370, 371. — The prelacy cannot defend herself without defending us, 371. — How can the HOLY Spirit pass through an unholy succession, 371, 372. — Destroys all christian hope, 373. — Repudiated, and why, 374.

LECTURE XVI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION CONTRARY TO THE MORE APPROVED AND CHARITABLE JUDGMENT OF THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

This declared to be a falsehood, 377. — Proved by the London Christian Observer and Bishop Burnet, 378-280. — Also, from the articles, canons and practice of the English church, 381-384-386. — And from its reformers and laws, 384, 385. — Also, from the testimony of English divines, 387-391, — and bishops, 391-396, — and archbishops, 396-403, — and from Bishop White, 403-405. — NOTE A. Additional testimonies, 406-410. — NOTE B. The sentiments of Bishop White, continued, 410-412.

LECTURE XVII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SCHISMATICAL IN ITS TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

Meaning of the term schism in the Bible, 413; — in the fathers, 414; — among prelatists, 414-417. — The Anglican church schismatic, 417, 418. — The Romish church schismatic, 418-420. — The different parties in the Anglican church also schismatical, 420, 421. — The Oxford divines and their sect schismatical, 421-423. — The evangelical party also schismatical, 423. — The prelatist party also schismatical, 423, &c. — Christian unity, 425-431. — Scriptural and primitive meaning of schism, 431-434. — Ecclesiastical meaning of schism and its consequences, 435, 436. — The true doctrine of, 436-438. — NOTE A. The necessary tendency of prelaty to unity, both of spirit and of ecclesiastical association, 439-441. — NOTE B. The nature of schism, 442-444.

LECTURE XVIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED, AND THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.

Recapitulated view of unity and schism, 445, 446. — We are branded as schismatics, 447, 448. — We are not schismatics, because so called, 449; — nor because in a minority, 449, 450; — nor because ecclesiastically independent, 450; — nor on the ground of heresy, or of improper terms of communion, 451, 452-454. — Presbyterian liberality and prelatist exclusiveness contrasted, 452-454. — We are not separated from the Catholic church, by separation from the prelaty, 454-457. — We were never rightfully subject to it, 458, 459. — The ancient schismatics identified with prelatists, 459-464.

LECTURE XIX.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SCHISMATICAL. — SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

What is implied in this charge explained, 465, 466. — This tendency exemplified, 467. — Proved from their definitions of schism 467-470. — The Puritans did not willingly separate, but were driven out, 470-472. — Their exclusive bigotry is schismatical, as prelatists show, 472, 474. — Their intrusion of their churches and doctrines within other bounds is by their teaching schism, 474-476; — and so is their separation from Rome, 477, 478. — The prelaty evidently schismatical, 478, — and divided, 479. — Why it is schismatical shown, 480-482.

LECTURE XX.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ASSERTED.

To find this, must be guided solely by the Word of God, 483. — Question again stated, 484-486. — The several meanings of the word church, 486-488. — Divided into several denominations, 488, 489. — I. What is essential to a true visible church, our belief, 489, 490; — and 1. What is thus essential to the being of a church generally, 491-496; — 2. What is essential to the being of a church as it regards its ministers, 497-501: — II. What is not essential to the being of a church, 502-509. — NOTE A. The nature of ordination, 510-512. — NOTE B. On Separation, 513, 514.

LECTURE XXI.

THE SAME SUBJECT — CONCLUDED.

Recapitulation, 515. — Uniformity in rites, ceremonies or policy not essential, 516-530. — Of other alleged marks, 530. — When and how the church is to be sought, 530-532. — True doctrine is the all-essential mark of a true church, 532-547, and NOTE A.

CONCLUSION.

Recapitulation and Summary of the arguments, and closing appeal, 551-558.

INDEX.

INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I. *The Object of this Discussion.*

THE subject-matter of the following Volume is, the prelatical doctrine of apostolical succession, or the exclusive claim of high-churchmen and Romanists, to be the ONLY true church of Jesus Christ; his ONLY true and valid ministers; and the only sources of efficacious ordinances and covenanted salvation. This doctrine, and not episcopacy, is the subject of our animadversion. The principles involved in this assumption — and not the character or standing of the protestant episcopal church — we condemn. The tendencies of this doctrine, as exhibited in its past history, and in its necessary influence — these, and not the persons of its abettors, who may utterly repudiate and deny many of these consequences, we reprobate as anti-protestant and dangerous. Our warfare is against principles and not men — in defence of truth, against the aggression of this opposing system.

High-churchism, therefore, in contradistinction to low-churchism; prelacy, considered as being the ultraism of episcopacy; the exclusive, bigoted and intolerant assumptions of the hierarchy, in their wide separation from the peaceful and equal claims of the episcopal denomination; this, we wish it to be distinctly understood, is the only object of our reprobation. Whether the arguments by which the episcopal form of church government is sustained, are valid, or of greater strength than those produced for presbytery, is another question, which we may have occasion to consider. This, however, is not our present inquiry. That inquiry is simply and in substance, this:—IS THE PRELACY THE ONLY CHURCH OF CHRIST, IN THIS OR IN ANY OTHER COUNTRY, AND THE ONLY SOURCE OF COVENANTED MERCY AND EFFICACIOUS GRACE? AND ARE PRESBYTERIAN, AND ALL OTHER DENOMINATIONS, WHICH CLAIM TO BE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, HAVING MINISTERS AND ORDINANCES ACCORDING TO HIS APPOINTMENT, — ARE THEY IMPOSTORS, WHO ONLY DECEIVE IGNORANT PEOPLE, TO THEIR GREAT, AND SERI-

OUS, IF NOT FATAL, INJURY? This is the question to be answered, — plainly — candidly — either in the affirmative or in the negative.

SECTION II. *Origin and Design of this Discussion.*

NOTHING could have been more unexpected by the Author, than an engagement in this discussion. The whole subject was foreign to his tastes and pursuits. In common with his brethren, he was accustomed to hold it in abeyance, as unworthy and undeserving of any mature deliberation. It was better, he thought, to occupy his own mind, and the minds of his people, with the practical and saving truths of the gospel, and leave ecclesiastical polemics to ecclesiastical agitators. Circumstances, however, led him to discover his own ignorance of the grounds of our denominational views — his inability to grapple with the arguments of our opponents — and his incapacity to satisfy the minds of those who sought for ministerial guidance and direction. The manifestation of alienation of feeling; of haughty reserve; of high-toned exclusiveness; of reluctance to associate with him, or in any way to acknowledge him as a minister; and the open declaration of sentiments at war with all charity, and which threw him out of the pale of christianity — at various times and by various persons; — were still further inducements to examine into the foundation upon which our church professed to build her claims. This desire was strengthened, by observing, that by our total silence on these subjects, not only our members, but also our ministers, were generally unacquainted with them, in any thing beyond a mere general and superficial knowledge, and that many of the laity were perfectly ignorant of the first principles of our ecclesiastical polity. Hence he discovered, they were open to the artful and insidious efforts of proselyters, and were easily made a prey by the cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive and to insnare the unwatchful. For many years, too, there has been a growing interest in these subjects, gradually extending itself through the community. This interest has been excited to tenfold strength, and universally diffused, by the origination and efforts of that association known as the Oxford Divines, and by the circulation of the Oxford Tracts, and various other volumes of a similar character and tendency.* The introduction of these writings into this country; the terms of praise and exultation with which they were noticed; their re-adoption by many individuals, religious newspapers and periodicals, as containing in the main their own cherished sentiments; the republication of these tracts, and of many of the separate volumes; the adoption of many of them by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, among their issues; and the zeal with

* See a very satisfactory account of the origin of this system, in Note A., at the end of the Introduction.

which they were put into circulation, not only among episcopals, but through the community generally, and within the author's own congregation;—all seemed most loudly to demand investigation. This conclusion was rendered evidently proper by the additional fact, that these exclusive assumptions were made the topics of pulpit discussion, and, in some cases, to the disturbance of many minds. These, among other reasons, urged the author to an examination of the subject.

On entering upon this examination, some three or four years since, it was the object of the writer to procure, and to read, the writings above alluded to, and whatever else was most important on the prelatist side of the question. This, as the work will show, he has, to some considerable extent, been enabled to do. In doing so, he was astounded at the confidence with which our error and their truth, was proclaimed by our opponents; at the triumphant air with which we were called upon to gainsay or resist; and at the unblushing effrontery with which we were excommunicated from the church of Christ, and consigned to uncovenanted mercies. These assumptions he found to be all built upon the doctrine of the apostolical succession, as the only charter of the church, and as the exclusive right of prelates.

But while it was easy enough to procure works, in abundance, in defence of this prelatist theory, the Author was amazed to find so little, even of an indirect kind, in exposure of this fundamental principle, from which prelatists have deduced their entire scheme. While their views are before the public in every form, from the child's catechism to the full-sized volume; and are teeming daily from the press, in every possible variety of shape; and are held forth as essential to the very existence of the ministry, and the church; there is not, so far as the author has ever yet discovered, one *distinct treatise* on our side of the question, and upon this branch of the argument, in print, in America; and but one, recently issued by a methodist clergyman, (and only seen when these Lectures were far advanced,) in England.* The Author, therefore, found himself subjected to great expense and trouble, in procuring rare works on the general controversy, and in discovering their incidental, or partial, discussions of this topic. While there are many valuable works, both English and American, on the general argument, this particular part of it appears to have been considered as underserving of a full investigation; or as in itself unreasonable and absurd. The Author was, therefore, led to think, that a distinct examination of this prelatist theory—which is now put forth with more confidence than ever, and made the foundation of the whole prelatist superstructure—would be equally advantageous to himself, and to his own people; and serviceable, also, to his brethren in the ministry, who might not have an opportunity of

* An 'Essay on Apostolical Succession,' &c., by Thomas Powell, Wesleyan minister.

examining works, which are now with great difficulty procured.* In order to secure this end, the Author has added (very many of them since the composition of the Lectures) authorities, and further illustrations of the points in hand, from works in his own possession, or in the libraries referred to. By this means, at a cost of time and self-denial, of which he had no anticipation, he hoped to make the work valuable not only to general readers, who might pass by the Notes and illustrations, but especially to such as were disposed to examine the subject for themselves, and with a closer attention.

The Author has spoken, in these lectures, as the defender of an assailed citadel, on whose walls he has been set as a watchman. He has used the language of defence, and written in the spirit — not of aggression,—but of justification. Still, however, he does not rest the merits of the discussion, or its necessity and importance, upon the correctness of this position. To his mind, the evidence of its truth and propriety, is clear and certain. Every just provocative to examine this subject has been given. The assault upon our principles has been beyond all precedent, open and avowed; and in an air of resolute determination to circumvent and destroy us. We have said, and we repeat it — that nothing else than the firm belief of this necessity could have induced us to enter upon this uninviting — toilsome — thankless task.

If we were mistaken, be it so. We have no controversy to wage on this subject. We give our views, and speak as impelled by our convictions. Let this be as it may, the subject itself is none the less important, nor its investigation unnecessary. Certain it is, that the claims involved in the prelatric doctrine of the apostolic succession — referring, as they do, to other denominations also, which are all characterized as sects, dissenters, and schismatics — are now promulgated from the pulpit and the press, with a boldness never before exhibited.

This doctrine, then, we should understand. Of these claims we should be fully apprized; and the grounds upon which they are based, and upon which they are altogether rejected, should be well ascertained. And although, to many, these claims appear to be absurd, and unworthy of consideration, yet they are now advanced as unquestionably of divine origin; as sanctioned by express divine authority; and as demanding implicit and universal acquiescence.

SECTION III. *Importance of the Subject. This Doctrine cuts off all other Denominations from Salvation.*

THE supreme importance of this subject at once appears, when it is affirmed that this doctrine being true, then, among all de-

* Having matured his preparations, the expediency of either delivering or of printing these Lectures, was submitted to the determination of a number of the members of the author's congregation. It was in accordance with their unanimous desire, they were first delivered to audiences composed of different denominations; and it is by their cordial and substantial co-operation they are now published to the world.

nominations of christians not prelati, there is no true church, no valid ministry, no efficacious ordinances, no authorized ministrations of any kind whatsoever, not even in the solemnization of matrimony; AND NO COVENANTED SALVATION. Now, as we can imagine THE POSSIBILITY of no other salvation than such as flows through the channel opened BY THE COVENANT OF GRACE, this conclusion is, to our minds, identically the same with the declaration that FOR US THERE IS, WHILE OUT OF THE PRELATIC CHURCH, NO POSSIBLE SALVATION. We are without God — without hope — beyond the means of grace — and the covenant of mercy. This is the practical bearing, and the plain, logical, and unavoidable, inference from this doctrine — A QUESTION OF INFINITE MOMENT TO EVERY MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD, WHO IS NOT A PROFESSED MEMBER OF THE PRELACY. This doctrine being true, then are the millions of protestants of all denominations now alive, and the million millions that are dead, consigned to the blackness of darkness and despair.¹

This conclusion, the Romish church, with characteristic cruelty, openly affirms to be unalterably and infallibly the truth in the case. *Extra ecclesiam salus non esse potest.*²

This orthodox sentiment, as has been said,³ was beautifully expressed by Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope Pius II. of blessed memory, (Epist. lib. i. ep. 369,) viz: "That none who had disregarded the authority of the Roman pontiff, could at any time enter the kingdom of heaven; and that those who had spurned the commands of the apostolical see, should not have any occasion for exultation. *Hos enim catholica veritas nisi resipuerint ante obitum, ignis aeterni mancipio sine intermissione deputat.*" So that there is no redemption from eternal fire for those who do not repent before their death of their disregard of the pope's authority. Pope John XXII., in his Bull of 1317, says, on his infallible authority, that "God has confided the empire of the earth, as well as that of heaven, to the sovereign pontiff."

A labored defence of this exclusive characteristic of this anathematizing communion — whose public creed, to which every convert has most solemnly to swear, is little more than a vow to curse and hold accursed all heretics, however good or dear — may be found in the recently published manual for the benefit of young ladies.⁴

This conclusion, however, we must explicitly say, though in itself, as we think, inevitably consequent upon this doctrine, as is allowed by the Romish church, is not generally admitted by prelati writers. Many of them, as, for instance, Dr. How and Dr.

1) See this view of the subject fully presented in 'Three Lectures on the Supposed Apost. Succ. and Auth. of a Christ. Priesthood,' by the Rev. Henry Acton, Exeter, 1840, pp. 4, 5, and 72, 79, and which I have seen since this Preface was written.

2) See 'Cramp's Text-Book of Popery,' pp. 46, 47, and 395.

3) Charleston Observer.

4) See 'The Ursuline Manual,' N. York, 1840; the whole appendix, and especially at p. 513.

Bowden, indignantly repel the imputation as outrageously slanderous.¹ Bishop Onderdonk, also, disavows this inference.² We are not, therefore, to charge this opinion personally upon any individuals, except upon their personal avowal of it. But our present business is not with persons, but opinions. We have nothing to do with Dr. Bowden, Dr. How, or Bishop Onderdonk, but only with this prelatical doctrine of succession—to which, as it happens, they have severally given their advocacy. Our inquiry, therefore, is, what is the nature, the tendency, and the necessary results, of this doctrine?³ Now to this inquiry we can give but one answer, and that is — that it is a sentence of excommunication and reprobation passed, not by God, and guided, therefore, by infinite wisdom and mercy, but by weak and passionate men, upon nine tenths of the protestant world, living and dead. This is our opinion of it. This is the only and the certain inference to which it leads. And yet these are the men who cannot name Calvin, or think of the doctrine of election,—which leaves the fate of every man, not in the hands of either priest or prelate, but of a just, wise and merciful God,—“without the strongest feelings of indignation,” and “their blood running cold,”⁴ while they coolly consign millions to a fate beyond the reach of mercy; — just as the king of France expressed his tender sympathy for the Admiral de Coligny, after having himself procured his assassination.⁵

1) The amount of the reserve imposed upon the full application of their principles may be stated in the words of Dr. How, (Vind. p. 44:) “We are very far from saying that there is no possibility of salvation out of the visible church. God forbid! It is, indeed, in the visible church alone that God has deposited his covenant; such as fail to enter that church, therefore, cannot be considered as in a *covenanted* state. Still they are in the hands of a merciful Being, who makes due allowance for the errors of his frail creatures; — pardoning and receiving all who sincerely desire and endeavor to know and to do his will.”

2) ‘Works on Episcopacy,’ vol. ii. p. 131.

3) But then, to use the language of Bishop McIlvaine, (pp. 173, 306, 348, and see pp. 452, and 527:) “Their doctrine is now public property, doing its good or evil, independently of its authors; just as a poison or a medicine works its health or death in those who take it, independently of the apothecary who compounded it. The public must judge of the compound, as to its nature and consequences, without being bound by the opinion of the apothecary. And so the public will and can make the true inference as to whether Oxford divinity is essentially as much a system of human merits as that of Rome, without being governed by the deductions of Oxford divines.”

“Many a man professes entire renunciation of doctrines, to which his system directly tends; and of practices of which his principles and frame of mind contain already the swelling germ and essence.”

“It will be remembered, that this external instrument (baptism,) is made absolutely necessary to salvation, by Oxford divines. There is no regeneration, no justification, and therefore no entrance to Heaven without it; before it is applied, faith is dead, and incapable of any instrumentality, except as it prepares for, or leads to baptism, or except as ‘restitution’ of stolen goods on the part of a thief, would be instrumental in justification.”

4) “The absurdities of calvinism, like those of popery, if left unopposed, would have produced universal infidelity.” (Dr How’s Vind. of Ep. Ch. p. 12.) So also the episcopal church is represented as “affording an asylum to those whom the absurdity of calvinism would otherwise lead first to socinianism and then to open infidelity.” (Ibid. p. 19.)

“Now, it is a fundamental rule with respect to a dilemma,” says Dr. Bowden, “that when it can be retorted, it is good for nothing.” (Works on Episco. vol. i. p. 109.)

5) See Dr. How’s Vind. pp. 364, 372. But, after all, we must say, with Dr. How, when he will insist upon the uncharitableness of our presbyterian standards, in

The ground upon which this conclusion is denied by prelatists, is the unscriptural and baseless dogma of uncovenanted mercy. "But how," asks Counsellor Bristed,¹—himself an episcopalian,— "do our deep divines establish their position, that non-episcopalians have *no* covenant claim to salvation, seeing that they do *not* pretend to adduce one syllable from the scriptures in support of their theory? If it appear from the Bible, that God *has* promised eternal life to those who believe in Christ, without putting in any clause of exception against non-episcopalians, then they *have* a claim upon covenant mercy. And if the Bible contains such a clogged promise, confining salvation exclusively to the episcopal channel, by *what* authority do our theologues undertake to assert, that *any* non-episcopalian *can* escape damnation, since the scriptures say nothing about uncovenanted mercy? and they both assert, that communion with the episcopal priesthood is an indispensable condition of salvation."

"One of the theologians iterates, and reiterates, his candid conviction, that all in communion with the episcopal church are in covenant with God; and that *all others* are *aliens* from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenant of promise, and have no hope but in the *uncovenanted* mercy of God. He then proceeds to charge the presbyterians with entertaining a similar opinion, with excluding from the christian covenant all, save presbyterians; and pronouncing all, who do not embrace the rigid peculiarities of Calvinism, to be in an unregenerate state, and left to uncovenanted mercy."

"I believe it would not be easy to find any Calvinistic presbyterian *so very* ignorant of the Bible, as ever to speak about uncovenanted mercy; so entirely unacquainted with the gospel plan of redemption, as to dream of any mercy, *other* than what is promised by the covenant of grace in the Lord Jesus Christ."

"The truth is, Calvinistic presbyterians profess to believe that, by the covenant of grace, salvation is promised to *all* who really repent of sin, and sincerely believe in Christ as the great propitiation for sin, to *whatever* church they may belong; nay, although they bear *no* relation to *any* visible church."

spite of all evidence,— "Here is a great display of candor, (charity;) but I am sorry to be obliged to add, it is nothing more than a display." (p. 373.) "The whole is a mere evasion, founded on the vague meaning of a phrase." (p. 382.)

"And it will not be denied," says Dr. Mitchell, (Presb. Letters, p. 285,) "that if piety consist in confining the favor of God and the benefits of Christ's manifestation in the flesh, to *themselves* and their little party, and in shutting the gates of heaven against all protestants who differed from them; in inventing and embracing, with enthusiasm, a *new* doctrine, never heard of before their time; I mean, that *their* baptism, and no other baptism, confers immortality on the souls of men, and (lest their adversaries should get off with annihilation, and thus escape the damnation of hell.) that God, by an act of omnipotence, confers immortality on all English, Irish and Scottish protestants, who are not non-jurors, that they may be damned to eternity;—if, I say, piety consist in broaching, publishing and defending such doctrines as these, which are enough to make 'the ears of him that heareth them to tingle,' and his hair to stand on end; then it will be universally allowed, that those learned and conscientious divines were the most pious men, that ever lived in England, or any where else."

1) 'Thoughts on the Anglican and Anglo-American Churches,' New York, 1822, p. 433.

“Are such men,” asks Mr. Bristed, after enumerating Luther and Calvin, and a number of others,¹ “of whom the world was not worthy, to be excluded from Christian fellowship; to be shut out from the communion of the saints; to be consigned over to the uncovenanted mercy of God? Is not the covenant of grace made with all true believers? with all those who, feeling themselves to be sinners, fly unto God for mercy, through Christ; and to whom God gives the Holy Spirit, which first regenerates, and then progressively sanctifies them both in heart and in life? with all those who find peace from the Son of God, and from the Spirit of God; from the Lord Jesus Christ, forgiveness; from the Holy Ghost, sanctification; with all those, who, under the sanctifying influences of the Spirit, are assured, that although sin still remains lurking in the deeper folds, and buried in the inmost recesses of the heart, it shall not regain dominion, nor shall they come into condemnation; but, being accepted in the beloved, shall give evidence of what manner of spirit is in them, by wishing what the Father wishes, and hating what the Father hates? with all those who study the holy scriptures, with prayer for forgiveness through the Lord Jesus Christ, for assurance of pardon through the Holy Spirit, and for grace to obey the commandments of God; seeing, that the gift of the Holy Ghost is promised to *all* those, who, despairing of themselves, rest for righteousness on the Son of God?”

“Is not salvation altogether individual? Can one man be saved by another’s faith, or damned by another’s works? The declaration of Jehovah himself is, ‘he that believeth, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned.’”

“Erasmus, when he became acquainted with the persecuted Puritans in England, exclaimed, ‘May I live their life, and die their death!’”

On this subject, Mr. Bristed,² after quoting from two American divines, further says: “The same doctrine is repeated again and again, by another distinguished divine of the same school, in his ‘Vindication’ of the American Anglo-church; and if these two theologians be right, that God has made *no* covenant with any people in the United States, except the two hundred and fifty thousand bishops, priests, deacons, and laics, so thinly scattered over their surface, wo betide the ten millions of all the other American denominations! For the scheme of *uncovenanted* mercy cannot help the poor presbyterians, congregationalists, baptists, methodists, or any other non-episcopalians, simply because *no* such scheme is to be found in the Bible, which uniformly represents God as, *out* of Christ, a consuming fire, and *in* Christ, as reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to them their trespasses and sins.”

“In reference to this doctrine, one of the greatest divines of the

1) ‘Thoughts,’ &c. p. 415.

2) Ibid, pp. 419, 420, 421.

present, or of any former age, observes: "Warrant for this sweeping sentence of proscription, from the word of God, none has or can be produced. To unchurch with a dash of the pen, all the non-episcopal denominations under heaven, and cast their members indiscriminately into a condition *worse* than that of the very heathen, is, to say the least of it, a most dreadful excommunication; and, if not clearly enjoined by the authority of God, as criminal as it is dreadful.

"That all those glorious churches, which have flourished in Geneva, Holland, France, Scotland, England, Ireland, since the Reformation; and all which have spread, and are spreading throughout this vast Continent; that those heroes of the truth, who, though they bowed not to the mitre, rescued millions from the man of sin, lighted up the lamp of genuine religion, and left it burning with a pure and steady flame, to the generation following; that all those faithful ministers, and all those private christians, who, though not of the hierarchy, adorned the doctrine of God, their Saviour, living in faith, dying in faith, scores, hundreds, thousands of them, going away to their Father's house, under the strong consolations of the Holy Ghost, with anticipated heaven in their hearts, and its hallelujahs on their lips; that all, all were without the pale of the visible church, were destitute of covenanted grace, and left the world, without any chance for eternal life, but that unpledged, unpromised mercy, which their accusers charitably hope, may be extended to such as labor under involuntary, or unavoidable error, and this merely because they renounced episcopacy; are positions of such deep-toned horror, as may well make our hair stand up like quills upon the fretful porcupine, and freeze the warm blood at its fountain."

Hear also, on this subject, Archbishop Whateley.¹ "To decide what persons can or cannot be members of the same religious community on earth, uniting in public worship and other observances, is no more than it is possible, and allowable, and requisite, for uninspired man to undertake; and this is implied, and is all that is necessarily implied, in the ordinances and formularies of every church: but to decide who are or are not partakers of the benefits of the christian covenant, and to prescribe to one's fellow-mortals, as the terms of salvation, the implicit adoption of our own interpretations, is a most fearful presumption in men not producing miraculous proofs of an immediate divine mission."

There being, therefore, no foundation for this figment — this covering of fig-leaves — the naked deformity of this cruel doctrine must stand forth to view.

This consequence is equally certain, not only as deduced from this doctrine generally, but also as inferred from the prelatie theory of schism, which follows from it. Schism, say they, is a voluntary separation from the holy catholic church, which church

1) 'Essays on Dangers to the Christian Faith,' p. 233.

they are. Such a separation is, according to Austin and other fathers, and to Thomas Aquinas and other schoolmen, a damnable sin; and as effectually excludes from the means of salvation, as did the shutting of the doors of the ark, close upon all without the only way of escape from the deluge. (See Pet. 20—21.) From this, therefore, it follows, as the Romanists plainly teach, and as the premises necessarily conclude, that all who are guilty of schism, as all non-episcopalians are, are certainly beyond the reach of any possible salvation.

That this conclusion is the certain and necessary result of this doctrine, will further appear from the testimony of episcopalians themselves.

“The doctrine of these high-churchmen, then,” says Mr. Bristed, after quoting two divines, “is, that all non-episcopalians are in the broad road to perdition; their watchword being ‘episcopacy or damnation,’ as if multitudes do not obtain *both* these benefits; and as if such a dogma were not of the very essence of popery!”

“They, indeed, only follow in the foot-tracks of another reverend gentleman, who, some years since, when preaching an ordination sermon at St. Paul’s church, in the city of New York, declared that all ministers, not episcopally ordained, are impostors; their commissions, forgeries; and their sacraments, blasphemy.”

That this is the necessary conclusion from their principles, is urged, explicitly, by the London Christian Observer.² “But the declaration,” says this work, in allusion to the dicta of a Mr. Knollis, ‘that those who are saved must be saved through Christ,’ “does not touch the question. It was the very point of his argument, (let our readers re-peruse the extract,) that no dissenter can be in covenant with God, or have any title to the promises of salvation. A dissenter, he urged, ‘is not a member of Christ’s church; and Christ has no where said that he will save out of his church;’ assuredly, then, a dissenter, if saved, must be saved by unpromised, uncovenanted mercy. Again, ‘Christ *may* save’ a dissenter; ‘but he does not positively say he will.’ Is not this consigning all dissenters to uncovenanted mercy? And we may add, that it is presumptuous not only in the way of binding, but also of loosing; for if God has not given any promise, what right has Mr. Knollis to hold out any possibility, however feeble, that a dissenter may be saved? He should say more or less. The error arises from an unscriptural and anti-Anglican notion of ‘the church,’ from which, and the blessed promises made to it, Mr. Knollis’s argument excludes many who will not be found excluded at the last day. We believe that Christ’s holy catholic church includes all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; though they do not all form one visible communion upon earth.”

The same interpretation was put upon the high-church doc-

1) ‘Thoughts,’ &c. vol. i. p. 420.

2) Nov. 1840, pp. 703 and 704.

trines, by the learned and able author of 'The Rights of the Christian Church,' who was himself a member of that church, and a professed defender of it, against the non-jurors. "But," says he,¹ "are the highflyers, who confine the church of Christ to a smaller number, (than the papists,) and who are so far from communicating with other reformed churches, either at home or abroad, that they damn those who do so, as schismatics and hypocrites, more charitable?"

But as this is a point of such evident importance, I would invite attention to a few quotations from prelatial writers, in addition to the many that may be found in different parts of the work itself.

"The immediate purpose of the church is to convey from God to man, those heaven-descending influences of the Holy Ghost, whereby his salvation is to be wrought. That preternatural operation, that subtle but powerful touch, whereby the will is renovated, requires a distinct vehicle, a mode of conveyance which both befits and witnesses a direct derivation from God."²

Is not this prelatially-ordained ministry laid down as one of the essential marks of the church, and "the means through which the divine presence is graciously represented in the church?"³ "I conscientiously believe the church of Christ (that is, in her three orders) to be an institution equally sacred as the divine laws themselves."⁴

Hear Bishop Ravenscroft, of North Carolina :⁵ "What presbyterian or other dissenter, will risk the purchase of property from a distant owner, by power of attorney, upon the mere assertion of the agent, that he is empowered to convey the title? Know you of any, who would not require to see the power of attorney, that it was in due form of law, and such as would bind the principal, before he paid the price, or even became bound for it? And know you not of thousands, who bargain for the rich inheritance of the gospel, for themselves and their families, without the slightest security, beyond the mere say-so of the agent? Alas! how very true are our Saviour's words, 'that the children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light.' Episcopalians present these doctrines to their hearers, in the full persuasion, that the church, the ministry, and the sacraments, are as distinctly and truly appointments of God, *in order to the salvation of sinners, as the faith of the gospel; and that only as these are united in the profession of religion, can the hope thereby given to man, be worthy of the name of assurance.*"

Says Dr. How,⁶ "Of this church, (i. e. 'the true church,' as instituted by Christ and his apostles,) "of this church, all men

1) Lond. 1707, ed. 3d, p. 364.

2) Gladstone's Church, in its Relations to the State.

3) The Old Paths, by the Rev. J. B. Pratt, 3d ed. Oxford, 1840, p. 41.

4) Ibid, pp. 109 and 256.

5) Vind. and Def. in Evang. and Lit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 549.

6) Vind. p. 73; and also p. 81.

are commanded to become members. In refusing to become members of it, therefore, they violate the law of God. So far as their conduct is to be traced to unavoidable ignorance, or involuntary error, it will be excused; so far as it is the result of *pride, passion, negligence, or any other culpable cause*, it will be *ground of condemnation*. God only can tell when error proceeds from a criminal, when from a pardonable, source: He only can tell, in each individual case, how far the heart is sincere, and how far allowance is to be made for the ignorance, the mistakes, and the prejudices, of his frail creatures." " *Wilful opposition to episcopacy is certainly rebellion against God, and must, therefore, exclude from his presence.*" " *In short, your opponents say that wilful rejection of episcopacy will exclude from the kingdom of heaven.*"

The Rev. Andrew Fowler, Rector in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in S. C., in his Catechism, defines the "church of Christ," as that in which "the sacraments are duly administered by persons rightly ordained," that is, by "the bishops who were commissioned by the apostles."² And he concludes,³ "that, as there is but one holy, catholic, or universal church, for which Christ died, we, who are called, *have no hope of salvation, but as being faithful members of it.*"

Not less explicit are the words of the 'Charleston Gospel Messenger,' in a recent article on "Schism."⁴ Speaking of the "very great misfortune" "of those who are dissenters," it is said, "whatsoever blessing God gives through his regularly ordained ministry — whatever benefit is attached to their ministrations of the sacraments of baptism and the holy eucharist — whatever advantage belongs to hearing the word preached by lawful, spiritual authority — *all these the dissenter, (that is, every non-episcopalian in Charleston and elsewhere,) loses, whether it be through his sin, OR HIS MISFORTUNE.* Thus, in a remarkable manner, the sin of the parents cleaves to the children until the third and fourth generation." Again, "it may be thought very liberal to say that separation from *the church is not sinful*, (that is, in Charleston, from St. Michael's, St. Philip's, or St. Paul's,) *when scripture declares it to be so, but I deny that it is charitable.*" It is then shown to be charitable to unchurch them all, that they may "see their error, and join themselves to the apostolic church."⁵

"Firmly persuaded, with Hooker, that episcopacy is the primitive apostolical institution, I *must consider obedience to it to be a matter of christian obligation.*"⁶

Bishop Hobart, in his 'Companion to the Altar,' puts these words

1) Charleston, 1840, p. 6, § ii. and p. 13, § ix.

2) Pages 10, 12, 13.

3) On p. 24.

4) For May, 1841, see p. 52.

5) P. 50, 51. The reader should know that this Magazine professes to be "*didactic*" in its character, and a "*lover of peace.*" We might fill our volume with similar exemplifications of its pacific, liberal and didactic character.

6) Daubeny's Appendix to his Guide, quoted with approbation, in 'A Collection of the Essays on the subject of Episcopacy,' N. York, 1806, p. 152.

into the mouth of a communicant: "Let it be, therefore, *thy supreme care*, O my soul, to receive the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of the Saviour, only from the hands of those who derive their authority by regular transmission from Christ." Again he says, "where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with *the church*, by the participation of its ordinances at the hands of *the duly authorized priesthood*, is *the indispensable condition of salvation*," except in cases of "ignorance, invincible prejudice, imperfect reasoning, and mistaken judgment."¹

Dr. Hide, after laying down their premises of no ministry, and no worship, &c., goes on to say: "Here seems yet a very bad certainty of their religion; and how can there be a better certainty of their salvation? unless (that we may gratify their singularity more than our veracity) we will say, there may be a company of good christians out of the communion of saints, or a commonwealth of saints, out of Christ's catholic church."²

What are we to understand by the declaration of the Tracts, that "episcopal authority is the very bond which unites christians to each other, and to Christ" — or of the British Critic, that "the effect of separating from the bishop is a separating from Christ." In Nos. 51 and 52 of the Oxford Tracts we have these strong expressions: "Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution to save other men. There is no other name given under heaven, among men, whereby we may be saved, but the name of Jesus, and that is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church."³

From the 'New York Churchman,' which quotes from the Oxford Tractists, we learn: "1. That the only way of salvation is the partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer. 2. That the mean expressly authorized by Him, for that purpose, is the holy sacrament of His supper. 3. That the security, by Him no less expressly authorized, for the continuance and due application of that sacrament, is the apostolical commission of the bishops, and under them the presbyters of the church." "That is, episcopacy or perdition."⁴

The Rev. William Jones, one of the fathers of the English church, quoted by the Oxford Tractators, in their *Catenæ*, has two discourses on the same perverted and unmeaning words, (i. e. in their isolation,) which have, as if original, gained such notoriety to Dr. Hook. In these he exposes "two great errors" — the first supposes that the church will save men without godliness;⁵ and the second, that godliness will save men without the church,⁶ which "is the error of those that leave the church to follow some private way of worship." "We must," he says, "be of the

1) Ibid, p. 149.

2) See quoted in Baxter's 'Five Disc. on Ch. Govt.' Lond. 1659, p. 343.

3) See quoted with more, in Bishop Meade's Sermon for Bishop Elliott, p. 95.

4) The Presbyterian.

5) "Godliness is the sense and spirit of all the forms and services of the church."

Ibid, p. 411.

6) Wks. vol. v. pp. 393, &c. 411, &c.

church outwardly, in order to be of the church inwardly."¹ And as baptism can only be administered by them, so he teaches that "as the church could never find any where a new birth, independent of baptism, we never shall."² Of course, therefore, we are excluded from its possible enjoyment. Our condition and that of such as are within the church, is likened by him to the waters of the flood, and the ark of Noah;³ the city of Sodom devoted to destruction, and Zoar, the city of refuge; Egypt, the house of slavery, and Canaan, the land of liberty."⁴

And thus again:⁴ "What further danger is there in schism? The obvious danger of losing the benefit of God's ordinances for our salvation; as a limb severed from the body loses the life of the body. Why so? Because, if we have no true church, we have no true sacraments, to which the promises of life are annexed."⁵

The facts in the case, then, are these. Prelatists do not undertake (for how indeed can they?) to deny *the eminent piety, as christians*, of many non-episcopalians — but they do positively deny that they can possibly receive or enjoy any mercy flowing through the evangelical covenant, while as to their future state and condition, "they obstinately refuse to pronounce any judgment," one way or the other.⁶ Now, surely, here is a most extraordinary case. We have in the premises "eminently pious christians" — we have, as propositions, an utter rejection, as infamous, of the tenet that none but prelatists can be saved — and the equally positive affirmation, that for all such individuals, covenanted mercy there is none — and as a conclusion, a dogged silence, which will give no response to the most earnest inquiry, — what will be the future condition of such rejectors of prelacy?⁷

There is, on this theory, mercy for the heathen, vile, wicked and idolatrous, though they be⁸ — and for the Jews, though in "great and lamentable error"⁹ — but all who "wilfully reject episcopacy," must be forever excluded from the kingdom of heaven,¹⁰ for their "certain rebellion against God." We can only

1) Ibid, p. 412.

2) P. 425.

3) Ibid, vol. xi. pp. 410, and 411.

4) See the first Collect in the office for public baptism.

5) Ibid, p. 428.

See also similar quotations from the Bishop of Exeter's Second Triennial Charge, 1836, p. 44; and from Precentor Lowe's Sermon, in Mr. Acton's Lect. as above. Mr. Lowe says, of these prelatical successors, that Christ "delegated these powers to *them alone*, and ABSOLUTELY EXCLUDED ALL OTHERS from acting with effect as ambassadors and stewards of the mysteries of God." So the Bishop says, "He who wilfully and in despite of due warning, or through recklessness and worldly-mindedness, sets at naught its ordinances, and despises its ministers, HAS NO RIGHT TO PROMISE TO HIMSELF ANY SHARE IN THE GRACE WHICH THEY ARE APPOINTED TO CONVEY."

6) Daubeny's Guide, App p. 259.

7) Ibid, App. p. 275, and Lond. Chr. Obs. 1805, p. 162.

8) Dr. How's Vind. p. 106, et preced.

9) Ibid, p. 109.

10) Ibid, pp. 81, 73, &c.

say — happy are the heathen — happy are the Jews — but of all men, most miserable are non-episcopalians, — that is, nineteen twentieths of all the reformed churches !

SECTION IV. *The imperative Duty of controverting this Doctrine.*

INASMUCH, therefore, as this doctrine so plainly and unequivocally involves — as has been shown by the confession and the teaching of prelatists themselves — the utter exclusion from all hope and mercy of all non-episcopalians, the duty of controverting it is very apparent.

We concur fully with Dr. How, in the reasons he has so ably presented in his ‘Preliminary Remarks’ in favor of the necessity and importance of controversy. Where important truths are denied, or unimportant truths are held forth as essential to the faith of every true christian, we are called upon to controvert. Scripture — the tenure upon which we hold the blessing of sound doctrine — the lessons taught us on every page of ecclesiastical history — the experience of the church in this country — the intrinsic value, and the exposed and dangerous position, of truth — all call upon us to contend earnestly for the faith and liberty of the gospel. “No body of men,” says this writer, “will grow without contending for their principles ; nor will any attachment be preserved for principles, which it is made an object to keep systematically out of sight. Under such circumstances, the laity would soon become entirely ignorant of the peculiar doctrines of the church ; the clergy would, in time, become ignorant of them also.” “They who so decidedly condemn all defence of the principles which discriminate our church from other christian societies, must be reduced to the dilemma of saying either that the peculiar principles of our church are unscriptural, or that the injunction of the apostle is not to be obeyed.” “We are to display the meekness and affectionateness of the christian temper in our intercourse with our brethren of other denominations ; but we are not to sacrifice our principles to theirs : — nay, *we are not to be afraid to contend firmly against what we conceive to be error, even at the hazard of deeply offending those by whom it is embraced.* The apostles were surely animated by the true spirit of the gospel. They resisted error with a firmness which nothing could shake ; and propagated truth with an unwearied and inextinguishable zeal. It is a false charity that places all opinions and all communions upon a level — a charity which religion, reason, and common sense, equally disclaim.”

Dr. How, indeed, is not ashamed to boast that “the church” — we suppose he means the prelatial church — “of Connecticut has grown up in the midst of perpetual discussion. She is literally the child of controversy.”² Again, “a large proportion of the

1) Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch.

2) Pages 15, 21, 27.

clergymen of our church now settled in the diocese of New York are converts from other denominations." "Deprive our church in this diocese of the clergymen who have joined her from other denominations, and she would be left, indeed, in a very desolate condition."²

How clearly, then, is it our duty, as presbyterians, to stand forward in defence of our character and claims. "Matters have come to a fine pass, indeed," says Dr. Rice, in his able review of Bishop Ravenscroft,³ "if, when a presbyterian maintains that he is a member of the church of Christ, he is to be represented as thereby making an attack on episcopacy! It is often made a subject of private talk, 'this presbyterian is not one of us; he is an alien from the family, and has no right to any of its privileges, nor to any part of the inheritance.' The presbyterian, on hearing this, comes out openly, and says, 'We are brethren; here is the proof of my birth, my baptism, my education under the care of a common father; let us, then, live in peace, and cherish brotherly love.' 'See,' cries the other, 'how this man is picking a quarrel with me, and even attacking me without provocation! This was the only sort of attack ever made by the Reviewer, until Bishop R. preached and PUBLISHED his famous sermons.'⁴

This necessity for discussion is also apparent from the prevailing ignorance upon the subject. Dr. Rice, in introducing some considerations on this point, remarks: "In our southern country, subjects of this kind have been so little discussed, that the great body of the people have no ideas of their true bearing, or of the manner in which they affect their true interests."⁵ Bishop Ravenscroft, adopting the sentiment, presents it as a reason why he "should stand justified for discarding that false tenderness to the feelings of others, which had been instrumental in keeping back these fundamental doctrines from the edification of the pulpit."⁶

One design of the Hon. Judge Dudley, in establishing his Lecture at Harvard College about a century ago, — as Dr. Chauncy informs us, in his lecture on 'The Validity of Presbyterian Ordination Asserted and Maintained' — was, "that our sons who are sent here, from all parts of the land, to be trained up for public service, might be under advantage to hear and know the reasons, upon which they may with all good conscience join in communion with these churches, and officiate as pastors in them, should they, when fitted for it, be called thereto." "It took rise in the honorable founder's mind, from the narrow principles of those

1) Vind. p. 17.

2) Ibid, p. 19.

3) P. 20.

4) Evangelical and Literary Magazine, p. 634.

5) Evang. and Rel. Mag. vol. ix. p. 458.

6) "Men should never be considered as guilty of attack upon their fellow-christians, simply for bearing testimony against what they conceive to be pernicious error." (Dr. How's Vind. p. 145.) "If you think our church corrupt, you have a right to say so. Without a privilege of this kind, free discussion would be impossible." (Ibid, p. 142.)

7) Boston, 1762, p. 6; in Athenæum, b. li. p. 118.

anathematizing zealots, who would confine salvation to their own church, by confining the validity of gospel ordinances to the administration of them, by persons upon whom the hands of a bishop, in their sense of the word, have been imposed."

"I therefore earnestly wish," says the Rev. William Jameson, in his 'Sum of the Episcopal Controversy,' "that the pastors of the Kirk of Scotland would spend more time in explaining this controversy, especially in their catechetical discourses, and confirm from scripture the presbyterian principles, and confute their adversaries. This, I earnestly wish were done in a grave way and clear style, for it certainly would be of great use, especially to the common people. It would also be of great use to give from the pulpit, now and then, calmly and plainly, a deduction of God's mercies unto this land by delivering us from spiritual Babylon, Rome; and again, from the false doctrine and tyranny of her kinsmen, the prelates." "Some may say, the question is of no great moment—I affirm the contrary, were it but on this account only, that all the bloodshed, rapine, confiscation, banishment, imprisonment, fining and confining, that miserable Scotland has been harassed with above a hundred years, were occasioned by this controversy." But on this subject we refer our readers to our first Lecture, where it is fully considered.

Should it be thought that our language is, in many cases, too strong, let it be borne in mind, that most frequently we have used the language of our opponents themselves; and that blame is, therefore, imputable to them and not to us, where it may be justly merited.² Let it also be remembered, that in all cases, we speak only "of the *tendency* of the doctrine, and not the *actual feeling* of any particular persons,"³—and that the further we may be from questioning any individual's devotion and reverence, the more necessary is it that we should be on our guard against their erroneous principles; since their acceptance by such persons is an alarming symptom, and a proof of their very probable diffusion.⁴

SECTION V. *What we Challenge and Assert.*

First—The production of any one scriptural record, of any one ordination, where only a single individual officiated.

Secondly—The production of one single case, where any individual was ordained a second or third time, and where there is thus afforded even a pretext for the three ordinations of prelacy.

Thirdly—The production of any proof for the necessary employment, in ordination, as essential to a valid ministry, of impo-

1) Glasgow, 1713, Preface.

2) Thus speaks Dr. Cook, (Wks. on Episcop. vol. ii. p. 200 :) "If there is any thing offensive to any one, in the book, it is a quotation; and quotations a man is bound to state as they are stated by the author from whom they are taken."

3) Keble on Primit. Trad. p. 106.

4) Ibid; and also Saravia's Priesthood, p. 29.

sition of hands,—if the cases of Paul and Timothy are not allowed to be cases of ordination, and therefore proofs of presbyterian, in direct opposition to prelatic, ordinations.

Fourthly — The exhibition of any authority whereby prelates usurp the title of bishop; a title which was given by the Holy Ghost to presbyters, and which is given to no other officers in the New Testament.

Fifthly — we challenge those who assert the necessity of prelates, priests and deacons, as three distinct orders of the christian ministry, and essential to the being of the church, to prove that these orders were originally given, and do belong to the catholic church, as such; and not to particular churches; so as that separation from them comes to be separation from the church catholic.¹

Sixthly — Supposing that there were persons called bishops or apostles, from the very beginning; or even diocesan bishops; still we challenge some proof of a triple consecration, and of the possession of a right to ordination in the order of prelates exclusive of presbyters. Let some instance in the first two centuries be produced, or let these prelatic assumptions be forever abandoned.

Seventhly — Further, we ask prelaticists to show, from any record of the church, for two hundred and fifty years, any trace whatever of a *second ordination*, which yet we might expect to be most frequently alluded to, on the supposition of the existence of three orders with their three separate ordinations.²

Eighthly — We challenge the production of a case in the earliest ages, where any ordinary minister held the oversight of more than one particular charge; having, as his specific duty, the oversight of ministers and churches, and not the pastoral care of some particular congregation.

What is Asserted.

First — Mr. Noyes, in his 'Claims of Episcopacy Examined,'³ gives it as the result of his examination, 1. That "it cannot be shown that the order of diocesan bishops existed during the first two centuries of the christian era. If, during that period, bishops are mentioned, it is in such a connexion as to show that they were only overseers of single churches, or moderators amongst presbyters equal to themselves in authority, having no connexion with more than one church, and no exclusive right to ordain christian ministers. 2. It can be shown that diocesan episcopacy had human origin, and a gradual progress. It can be shown that it naturally arose from the circumstances of the early churches,

1) The *καταρχια* of the Nicene Synod, says Dr. Owen, (Works, vol. xix. p. 173,) intends no more than the old usage, nor is any thing of institution, nor so much as of apostolical tradition, pleaded therein.

2) See Dr. Rice in *Evang. and Lit. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 617. "But to put the matter beyond controversy, we will undertake to show, that there was no ordination performed in the church at all, from the days of the apostles, until at least two hundred and fifty years after Christ, by any but presbyters." (pp. 618 and 629.)

3) *Dudleian Lect.* for 1838, in *Christ. Examiner*, for Nov. 1838, p. 212.

from certain tendencies in human nature, on the part of ministers and people, and from the influence of Jewish and heathen institutions." "From prime-presbyters arose city-bishops; from city-bishops, diocesan ones; from diocesan bishops, metropolitans; from metropolitans, patriarchs; and, finally, at the top of all, his holiness the pope, claiming the character of universal head of the church."

Secondly — "The testimony of early writers," says the author of the 'Sketch of the History of Presbyterianism in England,'² "shows that presbyterian order, as then followed, was derived from scripture, and is a confirmation of its statements. The name of bishop or overseer was given to all presbyters or elders till the year 106; and down to the beginning of the third century, bishops were at least parochial or congregational; — that is, the pastor, administering the word and sacraments in each congregation, was styled bishop, which was the first stage in the change of the use of the word, applied originally to both classes of elders, — those who only rule, and those who both rule and teach. Afterwards it was appropriated to one in each presbytery; and thus prelacy was gradually introduced, by men, who, like 'Diotrephes, loved to have the pre-eminence.'"

Thirdly — For the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, we have most express scripture; whereas, on the other hand, for the laying on of the hands of the diocesan bishop, we have no express scripture.³ (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

Fourthly — No instance is to be met with of an ordination by a person under the name of a bishop, in scripture; neither have I been able to find an instance of ordination under the like name, and meaning by it a bishop, as distinct from a presbyter, in any writer, till we come to the times when it is owned a distinction obtained between these officers of the church.⁴

Fifthly — Nor is that mode of diction, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, to be met with, in any writer, before Clement of Alexandria, who did not flourish until the latter end of the second century, unless we except Ignatius, in whose corrupted and interpolated epistles this manner of speaking is common.⁵

Sixthly — There *never* was any general council — never any number of accredited fathers; never any modern church, since the time of our Lord and Saviour, who maintained that bishops were, *by divine right*, an order superior to, and distinct from, and possessing powers and authority incompatible with, presbyters, as presbyters. He that affirms there was, let him prove it.⁶

In conclusion, we have only to say, that we have not been led

1) Chauncy's Dudleian Lecture. See also his Views of Episcopacy; Geiseler's Ecclesiastical History, § xxix. lii. liii.; Christian Examiner for Nov. 1834, p. 180, &c.

2) Pp. 33, 39, and 40.

3) See Jameson's Sum of the Episcopal Controversy, p. 9.

4) Dr. Chauncy's Dudleian Lect. 1762, p. 70.

5) Dr. Chauncy's Appeal to the Public Answered, Boston, 1768.

6) Powell on Ap. Succ. ed. 2d, p. 78.

to this discussion through any desire of controversy, or any personal or denominational animosity. Our object is not the exclusive aggrandizement of any one church, but the assertion of the equal rights of all who hold the truth in sincerity. We speak in the language of christianity, and not of a sect or party. We defend protestantism against popery — apostolical, against ancient christianity — spiritual freedom, against the assaults of hierarchical despotism. That the principles we condemn are attributable, not to the episcopal church, but to a party in that church, we have affirmed, and until we are otherwise convinced, it is against the principles of that party, we are at war.

Neither do we desire to be led into controversy. We have given our views candidly, and our authorities explicitly. Let the reader examine for himself, and weigh the evidence advanced, seriously and impartially. Meantime, should any one feel inclined to notice this argument, we would remind him, in the language of the London Christian Observer, in a late review of the work of Bishop McIlvaine,¹ “that no question is satisfied, unless it is presented in particular detail, and in its broad principles and general relations. No writer is fully answered, unless you not only disprove his stated arguments, but his very thoughts.”

Should any of the author's facts or references be found incorrect, he would say that such incorrectness has arisen not from any intention to mislead. And if any such mistakes are pointed out, it will give him pleasure, should he have the opportunity, to correct them. In the mean time, he is willing they should be withdrawn, and the argument adjudged by the strength of the remaining evidence.

1) March, 1841, p. 167.

Charleston, S. C. July, 1841.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO INTRODUCTION.

NOTE A.

ORIGIN OF THE OXFORD TRACTS AND THE OXFORD DIVINITY.

THE best account of the origin of the present Oxford party, who, with such learning and diligence, have re-published and propagated these sentiments, is given by Mr. Beverly, in his recent work on the 'Heresy of Human Priesthood,' (Lond. 1839, ed. 2d, pp. 72, 73, 74:)

"To Dr. Pusey, the regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, is generally attributed the origination of that sect or party, which is now called after his name; but if honor were given to whom honor is due, the more appropriate name of the sect would be Hamites,* from Dr. Hook, the teacher to whom even Dr. Pusey has attributed his knowledge of those precious truths, which characterize the Oxford Tracts.

"Dr. Pusey returned from the continent, in the year 1828, and then published an apologetic inquiry into the charge brought against the theologians of Germany, by Mr. Rose, the christian advocate, of Cambridge. Mr. Rose, the late principal of King's College, London, was certainly deeply imbued with those opinions, which are now known by the name of Puseyism, as early as the year 1824: for, at that time, I conversed with him on these questions, at Cambridge; and such were the sentiments which I used to hear him express, that they led me to suppose he was aiming at the revival of the Laudean school, which seemed, in those days, to exist only in history. Puseyism had not yet been mentioned; and the Laudean views, now in a fair way to influence the whole body of the clergy, were not openly entertained by any writer in the church, as far as I am acquainted with clerical proceedings.

"Dr. Pusey's opinions are supposed to have been not unfavorable to rationalism, when he took up the pen in defence of the German theology; and on that ground, most probably, the *Edinburgh Review* defended Pusey, most warmly, *versus* Rose. An entire change, however, must subsequently have taken place in the sentiments of this gentleman, who, together with his coadjutor, Mr. Newman,† and all the leading tractators of Oxford, came to consider Mr. Rose a sort of patriarch in their cause.

"In the year 1830, the Rev. J. H. Newman, and the Rev. R. H. Froude, fellows of Oriel College, Oxford, disagreed with the provost of their college and some of the tutors, on the subject of their exercising another prerogative, besides the usual offices of tuition and literary superintendence; and upon the provost's refusing to allow their claims, resigned the offices they held as college tutors. What Mr. Newman's opinions may have been, at that time, I know not; but in the year 1828, Mr. Froude, the now all-but-canonized saint of the party, thus wrote of Mr. Newman, in a letter to a friend: 'Sept. 7, 1828; I heard from N. the other day, with the testimonials..... He is a fellow that I like more and more, the more I think of him; only I would give a few odd pence if he were not a *heretic*;' a heretic, in Mr. Froude's phraseology, means a protestant, and N. is an abbreviation for Newman; at that time, therefore, 'the Vicar of Saint Mary the Virgin' was not indoctrinated in the theology of the Oxford Tracts; indeed his opinions were bordering on low-church views.

"About midsummer of 1833, the party began publishing THE OXFORD TRACTS, having first organized themselves in a regular association, as is apparent

* From *hamus*, a hook.

† Mr. Newman has lately published a volume of Sermons, with the following dedication: "To the Rev. Hugh James Rose, Principal of King's College, London, and domestic chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, when hearts were falling, bade us stir up the gilt that was in us, and betake ourselves to our true mother, this volume is inscribed by his obliged and faithful friend, the author."

by a sentence in Mr. Froude's 'Remains,' 'Sept. 16, 1833, has sent me your resolutions for our association, which I think excellent;' and it is to the operations of this association, that we must now for a few moments turn our attention.

"The system of the party seems to be this: to take advantage of the obviously incomplete and unfinished state of the Church of England; and knowing well that it is a mixed system, which, in the act of emerging from popery, was suddenly arrested by the death of Edward VI., to collect carefully all that it has of its ancient popish form, and to reject, as far as may be, without absolute infraction of ecclesiastical law, every thing that savors of its protestant regeneration. The Church of England is indeed an image of iron and clay, a fabric of ill-assorted and incongruous materials; but such as it is, Elizabeth, who came to the throne as a heroine of the protestant cause, after the Marian persecution, would not allow any change to take place in this her brother's unfinished plan; and indeed it seems certain, that she wished rather to recede to some more papal form of religion, till she was stimulated by the unceasing intrigues and treasons of the papists, to appear, to the world at least, a protectress of the protestant religion. The discrepancies and contradictions of sentiment in the authorized standards of the Anglican faith, have been frequently exposed; in the prayer-book, the homilies, the articles and the canons, are a quarry from which a Laudean, a Puritan, a Calvinist, and an Arminian, may each hew out his own religion, and plausibly argue that his is the orthodox selection: but besides this, the very omissions of the established church, the many questions which it has left open and undecided, allow a Laudean to argue, that if the established church, which was once avowedly popish, has not, in emerging from popery, denounced or rejected such or such 'usages,' it is fair to suppose that she does not oppose their retention; and, therefore, it is right and proper to revive any 'ancient usage' not absolutely prohibited. Amongst these omissions, for sake of example, I mention 'prayers for the dead,' which, it is now decided in the courts of law, the Church of England *does not forbid*; and if she does not forbid, then the next step is to revive the custom; and so of divers other 'usages.'"

"In the reign of Charles I., Archbishop Laud, with rapid strides, took the Church of England into Puseyism, or popery faintly concealed; the executioner's axe stopped his project, which revived again, however, in the reign of Queen Anne, but was foiled with a great overthrow by the revolution of 1688. It was the evident policy of the Brunswick dynasty, to discourage the high-church party, and to promote clergymen, with opposite views, to the bench; hence, the two first Georges steadily repressed the old Laudean school. Puseyism was consequently to be found chiefly, if not altogether, amongst the non-juring clergy, the jacobites, and all the other pious malecontents of that æra. Bishop Ken,* and Hicks, and Collier, and others of that grade, kept up the consecrated flame of Puseyism and 'privy conspiracy,' till the flame seemed to die out altogether with the death of the non-jurors. During the reign of George III., and his successor, the clergy seemed perfectly contented with their secular emoluments, and were little disposed to trouble themselves with any questions of an exciting nature: *Religious feeling, for sixty years at least, was not in action*; and therefore, they were neither Puritans nor Papists, neither evangelical nor Puseyistic, but simply consumers of tithes, or, if need be, persecutors of methodism, when methodism arose to disturb their golden slumbers. At last, however, the old Laudean fever has revived, and has spread its contagion through all ranks of the clergy; a swarm of unknown and inferior priests may now justify the adoption of Puseyistic opinions, by reference to the prelates of Oxford and Lincoln, and, it is believed, to the Archbishop of Canterbury also.

"But now to the Oxford Tracts. The managers of 'the association' seem to have laid down three principles in the course they are pursuing. 1. To restore every thing practised or believed in the papal communion, not expressly forbidden and plainly prohibited by some decision of the established church: this they call, 'inquiring after ancient usages of the holy catholic church,' 'cherishing a transmissive religion,' and 'listening to the venerable voice of the fathers, councils,' &c. 2. To enjoin silence on all the protestant tenets of the church, such as the atonement, justification by faith. 3. To make a liberal use of phrases expressive of their abhorrence of popery; which, however, has not succeeded in deceiving the Roman catholics, who perfectly understand this politic language of their best friends and most useful allies."

The true character of the leader of this heresy may be learned from the following notice, which we copy from the London Record:

"Some surprise has been expressed by the *Times* newspaper, that Dr. Pusey was

* Ken, Kettlewell, Hicks, Collier, are now favorite saints of the Oxford school. It is rumored, that, by some solemn process, they have canonized Bishop Ken, *more Romano*, so that now he is Saint Ken.

The extent to which the non-juring attachments of the Oxford party are carried, is strikingly displayed by Dr. Pusey's sermon on the 5th of November. The reverend gentleman seems anxious to revive, if possible, the Jacobinical agitation; so great is his love for the Stewarts and the non-jurors.

not present at the meeting held at the late Mr. Rose's house, in the summer of 1833, at which, according to Mr. Arthur Percival, the Oxford Tract 'conspiracy' was hatched. We believe the explanation is to be found in the coolness which then subsisted between Mr. Rose and Dr. Pusey, arising out of their controversy about German Neology. Mr. Rose had exposed the awful state of the German universities and churches. Dr. Pusey had defended them, and questioned Mr. Rose's facts and conclusions. Dr. Pusey, also, then avowed his low notions of the value of the Bible, by declaring, that it was too much to contend for the divine authority of the historical books. Thus it appears, that a denial of the inspiration of scripture was one of Dr. Pusey's first steps towards that heresy of which he has become a leader. Denying that 'all scripture is given by inspiration of God,' and consequently being led to undervalue the authority of the whole of the book of God, he was naturally led to look for some other court of ultimate appeal in matters of religion. Having rejected the Bible, he resorted to antiquity and tradition. It was but very lately, as we are informed, that Mr. Dodsworth preached, that to give the Bible to a poor man without having *first* given him the Prayer-Book, was little better than an insult."

NOTE.—As proof that this doctrine excludes others from salvation, the Author would add the following, which he has just met with.

Bishop Jebb teaches, that "the Sacred Scriptures, taken by themselves, are NOT THE WHOLE OF REVEALED RELIGION," and that "AN HIERARCHICAL CHURCH, DAYS OF COMMEMORATIVE OBSERVANCE, &c. are all ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS of the great body of THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION." See *Life*, vol. ii. p. 340, Eng. ed. He also deprecates on behalf of a large portion of his church the universal dissemination of the Scriptures, and is sustained in doing so by Mr. Miller—(see Miller's *Bampton Lectures*, Third ed. 1833, p. 10, 14, &c.)—who speaks of the "quicksands! of dissent." p. 21.

The Author would, in conclusion, commend to his readers the perusal of two small and very interesting volumes, recently issued by the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian church, 'The History of the Covenanters,' where they will find a practical commentary taken from the facts of history, upon the spirit and bearing of this prelatial theory.

LECTURE I.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN EXAMINATION INTO THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

WHEN the prophet Jeremiah was commissioned, by Jehovah, to stand in the gate of the Lord's house, and there call upon all who entered in to worship the Lord, to amend their ways and their doings, he was especially enjoined, to admonish them not to trust in lying words.¹ And what were those "lying words," in which they were not to trust? The people had been led, by their false teachers, to believe, that because the temple, with all its services, its ritual, its forms and ceremonies, and its gorgeous rites, were theirs; and because these had been originally ordained by the express appointment of God; they were, therefore, so unalterably the favorites of heaven, as to be assured of God's presence and favor, however perverse and disobedient they might be. Thus were they deluded with the cry, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these;" not remembering that He, who ordained the temple, was a holy God—that the temple itself was a holy place—that the end, for which it, and all its services, were instituted, was to promote the holiness of its worshippers; and that, therefore, the further removed they were from holiness of heart and life, the greater was that condemnation in which they were involved by these distinguishing privileges.

And yet, as the same principles of human nature still remain, these ancient Israelites have found imitators in every age and country. So that there are, and ever have been, those who cling the more tenaciously to the form of godliness, by how

1) Jer. vii. 1—4.

much the more they are strangers to its power; and who are therefore “haughty, because of the holy mountains,” just because they have no other holiness in which to trust. Forms and ceremonies man loveth, and can, by his natural powers, appreciate and enjoy. These, too, nourish and sustain the righteousness of the self-approving heart; while “the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Christ Jesus,” as it excludes all boasting, has ever been a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence.

Hence do we find multitudes, even now, not only within the pale of the Romish church, but also within the limits of the prelacy,² and even elsewhere, who look round upon their fellow christians, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise—as lying beyond the precincts of the holy city, in the open field of uncovenanted mercy, in all the shame of their natural pollution, unwashed and unsanctified—and as thus debarred from all rightful participation in the blessings of God’s sanctuary. Confident in their own claim to the peculiar favor and promises of heaven, they are found boasting, that they can call Abraham *their* father, and that theirs are the oracles of God, with the urim and thummim of sacred ordinances. On these do they build their assured reliance, and while they say to us, who by their decision are “afar off,”—stand by, for we are holier than ye,—in all the sanctimoniousness of these ancient pharisees, do they exclaim, with endless repetition, “the temple of the Lord—the temple of the Lord—the temple of the Lord are we.”³

Do we allege these things without foundation, or on insufficient grounds? “We trow not.”

There is a time to speak, and a time to be silent. There is a time, when to be silent is treachery; and to speak, fidelity. Such a time to speak is come, when charity is violated, and the law of brotherly kindness set at naught; when character is blackened and rightful claims are denied; when truth itself is enslaved to the exclusive interests of a party; and when not only we, but all who may look to us for guidance and direction, are blotted from the book of life, expunged from the roll of christian churches, and positively declared to be “as the heathen.”

The doctrine now inculcated, and to which we object, is summarily this: That there is an order of ministers in the christian church distinct from, and superior to presbyters; and who are exclusively entitled to be called bishops. That these, are

1) Zeph. iii. 11.

2) See Note A.

3) See a very valuable illustration

of this tendency to trust in names and privileges in Archbishop Whateley’s *Origin of Romish Errors*, ch. 6. § 3.

by divine right, and not merely by human appointment; — that they possess prerogatives, by pre-eminence, their own—that they, alone, are empowered to ordain, — that their ordination is essential to the validity of a true gospel ministry—that they possess, and can alone bestow, the gifts of the Holy Spirit — and that, without them, all preaching, and all ordinances, administered by such as were ordained in other denominations, are “vain,” and “without the promise of Christ,” and of course delusive, not only as it regards us who minister, but those also to whom we minister in holy things.

Presbyterian ministers are therefore branded as “pretended ministers”¹¹ — as guilty of “presumption and daring imposture,”¹² as no “ministry,” and their churches “no churches”¹³ but “withered branches”¹⁴ — as “unauthorized sects.”¹⁵

We are “protestant sectaries”¹⁶ — “sectarians”¹⁷ — “the meetings”¹⁸ — “schismatics”¹⁹ — “guilty of a most grievous sin” and of “wicked errors” — “self-appointed teachers”²⁰ “dissenting mountebanks” — and “those beings who pretend — to be ministers of the gospel and really are ministers of hell.”²¹

“It is utterly unlawful to attend our ministry,” and to hear us “is rebellion against God.”²²

“Our Baptism is a mockery, which may sprinkle with water on earth, but cannot admit souls to the kingdom of heaven.”²³

We are declared to be as totally different from the true church and the true ministry, “as a mouse is from a bat,”²⁴ or as “one kind of flesh is from another”²⁵ — “they are in the church, we are out of it.”²⁶

We are therefore (and if all this is true, we are justly) “excommunicated,” as being guilty of “a sin against our brethren, against ourselves, against God — a sin which, if not repented of, is eternally destructive to the soul,”²⁷ since “all our acts of separate worship” are to be ranked among the works of darkness.²⁸

Our church “sessions are meddling, inquisitorial courts.”²⁹

1) High-churchism, No. 3, § 31, as published by the Author. See Note A.

2) Ibid. § 52.
3) Ibid. 41.
4) Ibid. 46.
5) Ibid. 48.
6) Ibid. 52.
7) Ibid. 54.
8) Ibid. 45.
9) Ibid. 31.
10) Ibid. § 47.

11) High-churchism, No. 3, § 52.

12) The Rev. T. S. Escott in plea for Presbytery, Glasg. 1840. p. v.

13) British Critic, Oct. 1839, p. 337.

14) Ibid. p. 338.

15) Ibid. p. 341.

16) Palmer on the Church, vol. 1. p. 54 and 59 and 70, and vol. 2, p. 323. English Ed.

17) Ibid. p. 70, 71.

18) Soames' Elorabethian Relig. Hist. p. 587, 592, et passim.

“ Our whole system involves errors in fundamental doctrines,”¹ while presbytery and episcopacy are declared to be two opposites.²

“ Whereas,” says Bishop Beveridge, “ in the private meetings, where their teachers have no apostolical or episcopal imposition of hands, they have no ground to succeed the apostles, nor by consequence any right to the spirit which our Lord hath ; without which, although they preach their hearts out, I do not see what spiritual advantage can accrue to their hearers by it.”³

This is no more than a fractional illustration of that language and sentiment which are now prevalent in reference to Presbyterianism. It may be thought, however, that this is the language of only some few, illiberal, bigoted and extravagant writers. But this is not the case.

This system is not only found in the writings of many old and standard divines of the Church of England,⁴ of whom forty-three are quoted in No. 74 of the Oxford Tracts ; it is not only receiving extensive currency, by the able and zealous advocacy of certain eminent divines of Oxford ; it has not only been avowed by some of the English prelates, and by two thousand of the English clergy ; but it is now extending itself widely through the

1) Oxford Tr., vol. J, Am. Ed.

2) Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 100. Am. Ed.

3) Sermon on Christ's presence with his ministers ; in Works, vol. 2.

4) See the list of them in the Oxford Tracts, vol. 3, Tract 74.

5) Very erroneous conceptions prevail of the extent to which these high-church principles, as developed by their recent advocates, have been diffused.

These doctrines, says an English episcopal press, “ are every where creeping into houses and into churches too.” “ Puseyism,” which is scarcely a modification of popery, is increasing most fearfully ; its votaries boast that two thousand clergymen of the established church have publicly or privately announced themselves converts to its erroneous doctrines.” Plea for Presb. p. 522.

A Roman catholic priest, in Great Britain, in a public meeting recently stated, that out of fifteen thousand clergymen of the Episcopal church, eleven thousand have embraced these sentiments. The proportion is by no means so large in this country, and the statements respecting the church of England may be exaggerated.

As to the extent of the influence of these views, see also Professor Powell, of Oxford, in his recent work, “ Tradition Unveiled, or An Exposure of the Pretensions and Tendency of Authoritative Teaching in the Church.” Lond. 1839, p. 1, 2. “ It is clear,” he says (p. 4) of these opinions of church authority, and others dependent on it, that they “ have been extensively adopted and are strenuously upheld, and are daily gaining ground among a considerable and influential portion of the members as well as ministers of the established church.”

Dr. Pusey boasts of “ the almost electric rapidity with which these principles are confessedly passing from one breast to another, from one end of England to another.” Letter, page 230, 231, Edn 2.—and also of “ the sympathy which they found in the sister and daughter churches of Scotland and America.” The testimony of R. M. Beverly Esq., who was himself educated at one of the universities, is of weight. In his “ Heresy of Human Priesthood,” he says, “ At last, however, the old Landean fever has revived, and has spread its contagion through all ranks of the clergy ; a swarm of unknown and inferior priests

protestant episcopal churches in this country; has been avowed by some American prelates; by some leading journals—by some of their periodicals—and by some of their ministers, in this very city.¹

Acting on these principles, the episcopal church, by her Canons, prohibits her ministers from allowing a minister of any other denomination to preach in any of her pulpits—while they, who fully adopt these principles of high-churchism, most carefully avoid any possible occasion—as for instance co-operating in the advancement of any work of common charity or benevolence—by which they might “even seem” to acknowledge our claim to the character of christian ministers. The most zealous efforts are also made to put into the widest possible circulation, those works, pamphlets and tracts in which these views are most boldly and pertinaciously advanced. By these, and other means, the minds of many in our communion have been already excited to inquiry on these great questions—while the minds of all must, sooner or later, be turned anxiously to the settlement of the fundamental principles which they involve. From these causes, in different parts of this country, as well as in England and Ireland, ministers of our own, and other protestant denominations, have felt called upon to appear in vindication of their claim to membership in the holy, catholic, and apostolic church of Christ.

Urged by a strong conviction of duty, we have also determined to examine those assumptions, whereby we are to be despoiled of all right and title to the character of a church of Christ—the possession of christian ordinances—and a christian ministry. The reasons—or some of them—why this course appears plainly and imperatively demanded of us, we will at this time present.

This open discussion of these high and exclusive claims, we owe to their authors and abettors.

However desirable and proper it is for christians to live in

may now justify the adoption of Puseyistic opinions, by reference to the prelates of Oxford and Lincoln, and it is believed, to the Archbishop of Canterbury also.” Ed. 2d. pub. in 1839, pp. xi. 74. See also p. 81. See further the Review of Tracts for the Times, Number Ninety, in Edinb. Rev., April 1841, p. 146.

The recent restriction put upon the publication of what are termed “The Oxford Tracts,” will in no degree retard, but rather advance the pro-

gress of those sentiments to the support of which those tracts were mainly devoted.

1) For proof of this see the Charleston Gospel Messenger for July, 1840, pp. 103, 118, et passim, and also the quotations which shall be subsequently introduced. See also British Critic, Oct. 1837, 343, pp. 285, 305, 308, 309, and 324, 326, 327.

See also Presb. Defd. p. 27, and p. 130.

peace and brotherhood — yet, when that peace is broken by the incessant shouts of war, and this brotherhood is scornfully rejected as “impious opposition to the divine will” — it is time to proclaim — “amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.”²² And however we might feel justified in bearing patiently personal contumely or wrong — yet, when it is the character and claims of the church that are in question, we are surely required, by an imperious call of duty, “to vindicate the perverted truth and abused ordinances of our blessed Master.”²³

In accepting, therefore, the call to this discussion, we make no assault upon the christian character and standing of those churches denominated episcopal. The question is not, “is episcopacy right, or is it wrong — of scriptural or of human origin?” That episcopacy does not destroy the being of a true church of Christ is cheerfully granted; for we ourselves claim the possession of primitive and apostolical episcopacy. Our ministers are styled *episcopoi* (Επισκοποι) or bishops, — and our polity is the scriptural episcopacy.

1) Palmer, on the Church, vol. ii. page 323.

2) “Plato is my friend, so is Socrates; but truth is a friend I prize above both.”

3) This challenge is given by Mr. Keble, in his work on primitive tradition, in the very fulness of confident victory. He complains bitterly of that “light, extemporal way in which many reject it,” and calls upon its rejectors in the language applied of old to an impatient controversialist, “strike, but hear me.” “Do your best in argument, if you can any how refute the claim of the succession; but do not dismiss it unexamined, in any kind of hasty feeling. Do not set it aside,” &c. Edition, 4th, p. 95, 96.

These doctrines are most fully avowed by the Rev. Mr. Odenheimer, of Philadelphia, in his *Origin and Compilation of the Prayer Book*. Phil. 1841, see *passim*. He even ventures so far as to denominate all non-episcopalians as dissenters, (e. g. pp. 33, 46) and the Episcopalian as the only legitimate branch of the church catholic in America. See p. 106, 113.

The notorious sermon of Dr. Hook, “Hear the Church,” has been also republished by the Bishop of New Jersey, “whose untiring efforts for the dissemination of *Catholic truth and practice*, claim the gratitude and love

of American churchmen!” See *do.* do. p. 53; Note.

So also in the Preface to No. 74, of the Oxford Tracts. “Persons who object to our preaching distinctly and unhesitatingly the doctrine of the apostolic succession, must be asked to explain, why we may not do what our fathers in the church have done before us, or whether they too, as well as we, are mistaken, or injudicious theorists, or papists, in so doing? This question is here plainly put to them; and at the same time the attention of inquirers who have not made up their minds on the subject, is invited to the answer, if any is forthcoming, from the parties addressed.” *Oxf. Tr. No. 74, vol. 3, p. 129.*

This doctrine will be found contained in the most elementary catechisms of our opponents. See, for instance, the catechism prepared by Bishop England (Roman catholic) “for young children, servants, &c.” p. 27, 28, and his larger catechism, p. 23.

See also the church primer of the protestant episcopal church, *passim* and p. 12 — and Hobart’s Catechism, (number three) at p. 46, &c. and the short catechism at the end of Bayard’s Anniversary Sermon to the Prot. Ep. Sund. Sch. Un., from Cat. No. iii.

That this discussion does not turn upon the mere question of episcopacy, and that therefore, in pursuing it, we are not to be regarded as either opposing or denouncing episcopacy, as such—this, I say, is granted even by our opponents. “We are,” say they, “of **THE CHURCH**, not of the episcopal church—our bishops are not merely an order in her organization, **BUT THE PRINCIPLE OF HER CONTINUANCE**; and to call ourselves Episcopalians, is to imply, that we differ from the mass of dissenters *mainly* in church government and form; whereas the difference is, that we are here, and *they* are *there*: **WE IN THE CHURCH, AND THEY OUT OF IT.**” “It may seem harsh,” they add “to speak thus of episcopacy and episcopalian, yet we hope it will not shock any one, if we say, that we wish the words—as denoting an opinion and its maintainers—never had been invented. They have done great mischief to our own cause.” “Apostolic order,” and not “the episcopate, or the liturgy” form the corona, or crown, which adorns their kingly head. “**OUR ALL,**” say they, “as we cannot but know, depends upon that holy succession.”³ The argument, therefore, now entered upon, is not about episcopacy, which is thus repudiated as containing (as indeed it does) nothing peculiar to themselves,⁴ nor is it about liturgical services,⁵ which do not constitute their distinctive characteristic—but it is about the all-important and essential question—which is, confessedly, fundamental to all well-grounded hopes of eternal life—where is, and where is not, the church of Christ, and the way of salvation?

This church, and this way of salvation, are limited by these prelatists, or high-churchmen, to those only, who either are members of, or who fraternize with, the anglican church. All others are guilty, they say, of “renouncing the church of Christ—a renouncing of her ministers, and through them of Christ himself.” They “cannot, therefore,” it is said, “expect to be considered as christians, but, according to the command of Christ, as heathens and publicans.”⁶

1) “The American Church.” See in *British Critic*, Oct. 1839, p. 341.

2) See ditto, p. 341. See, also, p. 340, and p. 337, 338.

3) *Oxf. Tr.* vol. i. p. 376. *Am. Edit.* and p. 555.

4) But we may give up “*gowns, robes, surplices, christmas festivals*, and even a *liturgy* and still be as distinctly as we are now an *episcopal church*. These are not essentials to an Episcopal organization.” *Dr. Clark’s Letters on the Ch. Phil.* 1839, p. 29.

5) “He,” Archbishop Usher, as is declared by Dr. Bernard, “was for the minister’s improving of their gifts and abilities in prayer before sermon and after, according to his own practice.” *The Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, &c.* Lond. 1657, p. 149, 150.

6) See *Letters to a Dissenting Minister*, by L. S. E. recommended by the Bishop of London in “*Schism*,” p. 351.

To characterize this system, we use the terms prelaty, or high-churchism — terms which they themselves adopt, which are currently applied in a good sense, and which cannot therefore be offensive.¹

In rejecting their claim to supremacy, and to a fallible infallibility, we are accused of abetting heresy and socinianism,² and thus branded with names of the greatest possible opprobrium.

Seeing, therefore, that prelatists are thus bold and uncompromising in hurling their dread anathemas against us — while “to seek controversy is hateful,” “to shrink from it” in such circumstances, “were indeed pusillanimous.” The examination of this subject is a debt we owe to them, that wherein they are wrong, as we believe them to be far wrong, we may correct their errors, as God shall give us opportunity — and that whereas they are straining every nerve to diffuse their erroneous principles, we may, if possible, counteract their injurious influence, and arrest their desolating progress.

1) The currency of this distinction between high and low church as early even as the 17th century, will strikingly appear from a treatise entitled “The Distinction of High-church and Low-church distinctly considered and fairly stated,” published in London in the year 1705, and “humbly offered to the consideration of the ensuing parliament and convocation.” p. 56.

The work was written by a high churchman who endeavors, by defining his terms so as to suit his own purposes, to prove that low churchmen were not churchmen at all. On page 7 he says, “I know no odious or specious characters that have made more noise, nor passed through the world with so much license and authority as the distinction of high-church and low-church with the fair spoken plea of moderation.” On page 24 he speaks of the term High Church “as generally used and applied;” — on p. 25, of “the odious character of a high churchman;” — on page 35 he speaks of the “*qui unmodicum* as an imperate and undue affection, as something in the extreme, as the term *high* slyly indicates.”

He shews on p. 34, that “it is not open and professed enemies that do us the mischief, but they that walk in the house of God as friends, and are doing the work of the dissenters in the shop of the church.

“—— Hunc tu Romane caveto,”

thus showing how tenderly these parties at that day regarded one another in the bonds of their professed union and fraternity.

On the use of the term high-church, See Charleston Gospel Messenger, Feb. 1840, p. 368; Dr. Hook in Lond. Christ. Observer, 1839, p. 657, and defined in do. p. 658; Dr Hook’s call to Union, (Am. Ed.) p. 84, 86, 88, 90, 131, 44, 45, 57, 59, 65; Palmer on the Church, vol. 1, p. 259; Soames’ Rel. Hist. of the Elizab’n Age, p. 150, 366, 462, 583; Burnet’s Hist. of the Reformation, vol. 1, p. xvi, xvii. and xviii; see also a full account of the difference between the high and low churchmen in Burnet’s Pastoral Care, preface.

For further remarks see Note B, also Archbishop Seeker in his letter to Mr. Walpole in Crit. Comment. on p. 26; Bishop Fleetwood in Lond. Chr. Obs. 1841, p. 12; see also the tract of the Protestant’s Episcopal Tract Society; “The High churchman vindicated,” N. Y. 1837. Warburton’s Works, vol. 7, p. 83. “The Church of England and in America Compared.” N. Y. 1841, p. 6.

2) See Oxf. Tr. vol. 1, p. 383; also, p. 320: also, N. York Review, Jan. 1840 p. 320, 321.

Our apology, therefore, were any due, for attempting such an arduous undertaking, must rest upon the infinite importance of the subject, our extreme solicitude to impress what appears to us right sentiments respecting it, together with the consideration that the confidence which ill becomes the innovators "upon christian truth and charity, however able and learned, may be pardoned in the defenders, however weak, of a system, which" rests upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.¹

But in the second place, we would remark, that we are under obligations to institute this investigation, by a due regard to our own character and our just claims.

The church of the living God, we believe to be the pillar and ground of the truth—the repository of "the oracles of God"—the source of heavenly wisdom—the fountain of life—the centre of divine influences—the birthplace of souls—the celestial ladder—the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ—the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.²

We also further believe, that unto this catholic, visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God,

1.) In order to appreciate the call made upon us to defend our assailed bulwarks, let us imagine ourselves to be Episcopalians, and that declarations similar to those now fulminated against Presbyterians, were addressed to Episcopalians by Presbyterians. Let the Rev. John A. Clark, Rector of St Andrew's church, Philadelphia, and who is himself a most worthy and esteemed minister in the episcopal church, let him describe what would, in such circumstances, be our necessary conclusions. "How would it strike us," asks this writer, "if another denomination were to assert, to preach from the pulpit, and publish through religious papers, that the episcopal church was no church at all—a mere unauthorized human institution—that it had no valid or authorized ministry—that its preachers were nothing more than laymen—that it had no sacraments—that baptism and the holy supper, being administered by unauthorized hands, were of no efficacy, and that if any belonging to this body were saved, it would not be because they had been brought within the covenant promises, but because

God in his sovereignty "will have mercy on whom he will have mercy." Were a large and influential denomination of christians to assume this stand, and proclaim these views, would not our prejudices be aroused? Would you not then say with some reason, "Shall we sit still, and see ourselves swept off the face of Christendom by the restless spirits of the age?" Letters on the Church, Phila. 1830, p. 23.

The same writer gives the following illustration of the zeal with which episcopacy is advanced. "I have heard a minister occupy his audience with this topic exclusively upon a communion Sunday, without a word about the spiritual qualifications we ought to possess in coming to the Lord's supper, with no reference to Christ, or the emblems that represented his dying love, save the remark, that this ordinance would be valid only when administered by properly authorized hands. I have even heard this made the topic of discourse at a funeral." Do. do. p. 24.

2. See Conf. of Faith, chap. XIV.

for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world, and doth by his own presence and spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereto.¹

And still further, we believe, that as "all saints are united to sus Christ, their Head, by his spirit and faith," and they have "ALL fellowship with him;" so are "ALL saints bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, to their mutual edification,"² by a public profession of their common faith, and their consequent union with the church of Christ. He who wilfully fails thus to confess Christ before men, and to show forth his death, in the appointed ordinance of the Lord's supper, — him will Christ deny before his Father and his angels.

Hence, it is manifest, that the question, whether we are or are not, as a presbyterian church, a living branch of the good olive tree, a truly scriptural and apostolic church of Jesus Christ — is not a question of small or trifling import, but of the most grave and serious moment. Are our claims to such a character invalid? Are our marks, wherein we show the impress of a divine commission, a forgery? Are our ministers intruders, deceivers, hypocrites, unsent, uncalled, and unauthorized? Are our ordinances mere human ceremonies, unaccompanied by any virtue or grace from on high? Then surely it is all important that we should make a timely discovery of the rottenness of that foundation on which we have builded our house, before the floods rise and the winds beat upon it, and we are overwhelmed in the dreadful ruin.

Are prelatis in exclusive possession of the keys of the kingdom of heaven? so that whomsoever they admit on earth, shall be welcomed in heaven; and whomsoever they exclude on earth, shall be refused admission there? Then, who will deny that the voluntary neglect of principles which would, in this case, become divine, and separation from a church so constituted, or union with any other — is schism, and a sin of no ordinary magnitude?

We owe it, then, to ourselves, in view of our best interests — even our everlasting welfare — to examine well into the grounds of our confidence; that, if deceived by others, or if deceiving our own selves, we may, while there is opportunity, fly from the impending danger. We owe it to our children, and to all over whom our example may have any influence, to ascertain

1. See Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXV. §3. 2. See Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXV.

the perfect soundness of that vessel wherein they are to venture the perilous voyage of eternity.

On the other hand, are we right in our views, and are prelatists mistaken, when they represent our denominational character as “resistance to the love, power and wisdom of God, and the punishment—the wrath of God?”¹—then are we as truly called upon to justify our character and claims, in order that the “schismatical distance and alienation between religious denominations,” originated by these exclusive pretensions to divine right, may attach in all its certain criminality to its true authors.

Since it is publicly taught, that “but for the episcopal church in this country, there would be nothing but the extremes of infidelity or fanaticism”²—since in every way, in every place, and by every means—prelatists are endeavoring to undermine, by misrepresentation, the doctrines and order of presbyterianism—since the cry is now raised against our church in particular, “raze it—raze it to the foundation”³—shall we not stand on the defensive; and, as far as the “panoply of God,” “the armor of righteousness,” and the weapons which are “spiritual and not carnal,” shall enable us, repel the fiery assault, and preserve the endangered walls of our Zion—that “city set on a hill, whose builder and maker is God?”

This we do in self-defence—in the spirit of repellency, and not of attack—of bold and uncompromising adherence to what we confidently believe to be the truth and order of God. We have no wish to depreciate the character of episcopacy, as the form of a sister denomination of christians, and a branch of the true vine—the church. We question not their rights, as churchmen. We impugn not their claims as christians. We reject not their evidences of heaven-taught piety, though they repudiate the truth and genuineness of ours. We scruple not to enter their temples, or to unite in their worship; though they think it scorn to participate with us in our worship of God. In short, for ourselves, we deprecate exclusiveness; to them we deny nothing but monopoly; and for both we supplicate peace, purity, and charity from God, who is “the Author of peace,” and from Christ, who is “the Prince of peace.”

“To the law and to the testimony” is our appeal against the unjust judgment of those, who “say that, since prelacy (episcopacy, in original) is an ordinance of God, to abandon it is sin,”⁴—who thus presume to declare essential, what God has not

1) See quoted in Schism, p. 352.

2) See Powell on Ap. Suc. p. 170.

3) See the Report of Edinb. Celebration, p. 63, 64. Dr. Pusey's Letter

to the Bp. of Oxford, p. 148, Note, and 104, Note. Oxf. Tr., vol. i, Tract 4.

4) Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 101, 104.

made necessary—who thus command with absolute authority what inspired apostles never ventured to require—who thus rush in where angels would fear to tread; and assuming the prerogatives of Him, who alone is Judge, consign to “uncovenanted mercies” or to “eternal wrath,” those who boldly “stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.”

Receiving our commission from these heavenly oracles—resting our credentials on their divine requirements—submitting our souls to every ordinance of heaven—obeying all divine prescriptions—and rejoicing in the manifestations of God’s favorable mercy towards us—we glory in the hope, that, however men may reject, “God hath received us.” We are satisfied with a commission given in the courts above—a validity to our claims, sealed with the witnessing of the Spirit of the Most High God, even though it should not be countersigned by popes or prelates.

We can thus fearlessly ask, “Who shall curse whom God has not cursed?”—drying up the fountain of our baptism; tainting the manna of our eucharist; making our ministers speechless; and breaking the sceptre of divine authority held by those who are over us in the Lord? Who shall excommunicate those, who have held to that creed, to that succession, to those ordinances, to those orders, **AND ONLY THOSE**, which Christ bequeathed to them, in that last divine testament which reveals the whole will and council of God?¹ Who shall interpose between our souls and salvation—close upon us the gates of mercy—and cut off from all, beside themselves, those streams of salvation, which make glad the city of our God.

You, my brethren, we would have well instructed in the whole counsel of God, so that ye may be able to give a reason of the hope that is in you to every man that asketh it. Why should you stand in jeopardy through doubt or ignorance? Be ye not children in understanding, but be men; so that ye may be blown about by no winds of doctrine, or sleight of men, whereby in cunning craftiness they would beguile your souls.

Be ye therefore fully established in your own minds; knowing whereof ye affirm, and having the profession of your faith grounded in principles well established. And thus, in that hastening time, when the endangered rights of christian men must be abandoned or maintained, ye may be “able to withstand in the evil day,” as were the Presbyterians of Scotland in one of her seasons of peril and distress.²

1) Adopted in part from Newman on Romanism, p. 414.

2) See Burnet’s Hist. of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 160. Similar, also,

We proceed to show, that such an examination into "the first principles" whereon this prelatical usurpation rests, is demanded by a regard to the cause of truth and liberty.

The truth is a sacred deposit, which we are to "buy" at any cost, and "to sell" at no price whatever. It is a treasure committed to us, for which we are "to contend earnestly," and to which we are to "hold fast, without wavering."

The truth is the centre—the source—the foundation—the citadel, of our liberties. It is "the truth, which makes us free indeed;" delivering us from the bondage of "will worship," and "man worship," of formality and superstition, and every "corruption," whereby "the word of God is made of none effect through the traditions of men." Now, in this liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, we are "to stand fast." All aggressions upon it we are to resist. "To those false brethren," and their doctrines, "unawares brought in, who come privily to spy out the liberty we have in Christ Jesus, that they may bring us into bondage—we are to give place by subjection," to their unscriptural demands, "no," says the apostle, "not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel may continue with us." (Gal. ii. 4, 5.) Well might it be declared of us, that we "are not worthy" of this heavenly birthright, could any thing "bewitch us to be again brought in bondage of the beggarly elements" of carnal policy and earthly wisdom. We might receive admonition, were any such spirit ours, from the ancient synod of Nice, in which it was decreed, that "ancient customs should be retained," and "the privileges of churches be preserved." Or from the ancient council of Ephesus, which decreed, that "every church should preserve the rights which it possessed from the beginning, lest the pride of worldly domination should come in under the guise of the sacred ministry: and lest we should imperceptibly lose the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ purchased for us

was the familiarity of our New-England fathers with the principles of their ecclesiastical polity.

Dr. Chauncy, in his letter to the Bishop of Landaff, could claim for the clergy and people of that day, that "they know the errand of their forefathers into this country, and have been well indoctrinated in the PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY. We prefer our own mode of worship and discipline to that of the English Church; and we do it upon principle, as really believing that it comes nearer to the purity and simplicity of

gospel direction." Boston, 1767, p. 53. So, also, could Dr. Livingston, in his letter to the same prelate, declare "that the non-episcopalians in this country had conscientiously abandoned a religion which taught submission to that prelatical oppression whereby those venerable persons were expelled their native soil," and "superstitious attachment to rites and ceremonies of human invention," "and 'tis devoutly to be wished their posterity may be never so infatuated as to resume it." New York, 1768, p. 12.

with his own blood.”¹ Or from Cyprian, who teaches us, “we must let no man corrupt the truth through faithless concessions.”

While, therefore, we take heed, that we build our doctrines and order on the alone foundation land in Zion, let us not be ashamed to own, avow, and proclaim them; but rather let us “glory in them,” and “magnify,” and make them honorable. In opposing the exclusive claims of prelacy, and in asserting those of presbytery to an equal share in the inheritance of our common Head—we are pleading not our own cause merely, but the cause, also, of all other protestant denominations;² for they are equally placed under the ban of this dread anathema,³ and as far as the essential principles of ecclesiastical polity are concerned, must stand or fall with presbyterianism. We are thus encouraged to stand fast in this our liberty, whether we examine well our foundations, and look round upon our impregnable bulwarks; or whether we consider the number and character of our allied forces. “This is the doctrine and practice,” says Mr. Percival, speaking of presbyterianism, “on this point, to wit, ordination by presbyters, now received by the Lutherans in Denmark and Germany; by the Calvinists in France, Switzerland, Germany and Holland; by the Presbyterians in England, Scotland, Ireland and North America; and by the Wesleyan Methodists.⁴ These all claim,” says he, “to have received their orders from some episcopally ordained presbyter.” The Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, a minister of the English church, in a tract on Unity published by him, in which he speaks of an individual who had lately become a presbyterian, says: “His conclusions were supported by several of the reformed churches. The Lutheran, Swiss, French, Dutch, and Scotch churches, the church of the Vandois, and a large and pious section of the American church, were all on his side. While in favor of episcopacy,” he adds, “besides the church of Rome, ‘the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;’ and the eastern churches, which are nearly as corrupt, he found ONLY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND THREE OR FOUR small sections of the church of Christ elsewhere, who had retained diocesan episcopacy.”⁵

1) See in Palmer, vol. ii. p. 272, 273.

2) See Oxf. Tr. vol i. p. 400.

3) See Palmer, vol. i. p. 230, where all beside episcopalians are anathematized; and Schism, p. 290.

4) On Ap. Succ. p. 9.

5) Among the countries embracing presbyterianism, in one or other of its forms, the London Christian Observer for February, 1841, p. 73, 74, enumerates Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, Prussia, Holland, the Lutheran church in Germany, and France.

Such, therefore, being the facts of the case, when the church-standing of almost the entire protestant world, and the christian character of the purest churches under heaven, are assailed and utterly denied; may we not say, in the language of one of these assailants, that the presbyterian church "has fairly been put on her defence, and been called upon to allege grounds on which she receives and maintains her doctrines. Under such circumstances, no man can be blamed who desires, after the apostle's instruction, to give an answer to them that ask a reason of the hope that is in him, with meekness and fear."¹ "And if there is, as I think, every reason from Scripture and tradition, for believing that it" — i. e. this prelati- c doctrine of apostolic succession — "did" NOT "form part of that faith, (which was once delivered to the saints,) then who shall blame us for obeying the Spirit's injunction by the mouth of the apostle, that we should earnestly contend against it," "and for that faith?"² And this the more especially, as "there is a consequence springing from these premises," to continue the words of Mr. Percival, "if established; in respect, namely, of the paramount and EXCLUSIVE claim upon the obedience of all christians within the British (or prelati- c) dioceses, which belongs to the bishops of those dioceses; and which well deserves the consideration of all who refuse that obedience, whether they are members of non-episcopal communities, or profess to have an episcopacy of their own."³

It is thus made further apparent, that we are challenged to the consideration of this subject, — as indeed we are distinctly, in the last words of this same writer's work, which is now issued by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society of this coun-

"That the presbyterian reformed churches are more numerous and potent than the episcopal reformed churches, will appear from this short list of those countries that were reformed from popery to presbyterianism.

I. The kingdoms of Denmark and Norway.

II. The King of Prussia's dominions.

III. There's the branching of Sweden's extensive dominions.

IV. Several provinces of the empire.

V. The United Provinces.

VI. The Republic of Geneva.

VII. The Protestant Swiss Cantons.

Not to mention the once famous churches of Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, Transylvania, and France, who now by popish cruelty are in a manner reduced.

The whole mass of the reformation is at this day presbyterian, except England, Ireland, some of our plantations, and the bishopric of Lubeck, in Germany."

See "Rebaptization Condemned, by the author of Plain Dealing, or Separation without Schism." Lond. 1716, p. 25.

1) Percival on Ap. Succ. p. 10.

2) Percival on Ap. Succ. p. 142.

3) Do. do. p. 142.

try — which is in extensive circulation — and a copy of which, with some similar publications, was very recently sent to one of the families in my own congregation. We are therefore called upon, in all plainness and boldness, to show cause why we altogether repudiate the asserted authority of any prelatie church whatever.

If the fact of the re-publication of these Oxford writings in this country, and their “beguiling many unwary and unstable souls,”¹ was deemed by Bishop McIlvaine a sufficient reason for his defence of those doctrines controverted by them, much more is this—together with the repeated boast that numerous converts had been made from among our clergy—an amply sufficient warrant for our vindication of the liberty of Christ against the unjustifiable pretensions embodied in this widely-diffused doctrine of apostolical succession.²

The authority of the church, which prelatists make an article of fundamental importance,³ — in other words, the authority of prelates, — this we believe to be one of the main pillars of the gorgeous structure of popery ; the broad base, upon which has been erected that huge colossal fabric of superstition and spiritual despotism, around which such floods of human tears and blood have been made to flow. “Antichrist,” say the Waldenses, in a treatise written A. D. 1200, “covers his iniquity by the length or succession of time — by the spiritual authority of the apostles — by the writings of the ancients, and by councils.”

Nor does this system symbolize less with popery in “enforcing as necessary points of faith” what are not contained in the creed⁴ — nay, in resting these exorbitant claims not on the Bible, but upon “oral tradition,”⁵ and the perverted dogmas of the ancient church. On such grounds as these do prelatists proclaim that the name of catholic is appropriated to their churches, to the utter exclusion of all the various denominations of christians separated from them.⁶ On these grounds do they throw off all fellowship with protestants, and openly avow their friendship for Rome. “We are unwilling to speak harshly of the Romanists,” say these divines. “Whatever be our private differences with the Roman Catholics, we may join with them in condemning Socinians, Baptists, Independents, and the

1) Lond. Chr. Obs.

2) See Note C.

3) See Brit. Critic, Oct., 1839, p. 337, 338.

4) See Newman on Romanism, p. 288.

5) Oxf. Tr., vol. iv, p. 1, Eng. ed., and Tr. No. 80, p. 62, &c., and Anc't Christianity, vol. i, p. 465.

6) Palmer on the Church, vol. i, p. 237, 238.

like. But God forbid that we should ally ourselves with the offspring of heresy and schism, in our contest with any of the branches of the holy church which maintain the foundation, whatever may be their incidental corruptions."¹

Again we hear them say, "If no western church now-a-days is quite what its mother, the church of Rome, used to be, the catholic church in England, Scotland, and America, (that is, says the Tract, the protestant episcopal churches of those countries,) surely comes nearest to her, nay, so near, that they who have well scanned the mother's lineaments, can be at no loss to trace her features in her child," &c.²

Thus do they cast out the reformed churches as reprobate, as having committed "grievous sin"³ — as "inexcusable"⁴ — and as having forsaken Christ.⁵ Thus do they boldly advance sentiments which, on their own principles, must be pronounced illiberal — uncatholic — and dyed in the gall of party spirit.⁶ And, while they are torn with intestine divisions, and pitted against each other, in the most resolute and determined antagonism; and split up into countless and sectarian clans; — they assail the rights of all other churches, and proclaim war against all Christendom beside.⁷ For to use the language of their great Coryphæus, "in the English church may be found differences as great as those which separate it from Greece or Rome — calvinism and arminianism, latitudinarianism and orthodoxy, all these, sometimes simply such, and sometimes compounded together into numberless varieties of school, * * * each denouncing all the rest as perilous, if not fatal errors."⁸

Now this arrogant claim to the prerogatives, and this assumption of the exclusive character, of the true church, Mr. Palmer (in his great work on the church) charges on the papists as "impudent pertinacity." But is this assumption less "impudent pertinacity," when made by prelatists, as it is by this writer himself, on their behalf, against us? Is it less "a monstrous fabrication," "founded on false premises," and "sustained by ignorance and bigotry," when uttered by the voice of prelacy, than when it comes forth in some Romish bull? Most assuredly not.

These church principles must terminate in the same results

1) Oxf. Tr., No. 25, p. 6, 8, 9.

2) Tract No. 153 of the Am. Prot. Episcopal Tract Soc., on The Ancient Things of the Catholic Church. p. 6.

3) Palmer on the Church, vol. ii. p. 368.

4) Do. vol. ii. p. 366.

5) See Newman on Rom., p. 418. Also the Bp. of Norwich in Schism, p. 508.

6) See Oxf. Tr., vol. i. p. 427, 428 and 429.

7) Newman as above.

8) See vol. i. p. 238.

in England and America, which have ever followed them in Italy and Spain, in Asia and in Africa. And if we will not sacrifice every thing that is pure in the truth — precious in the promises — spiritual in the ordinances — ennobling in the precepts — and free, elevating, and refining in the spirit — of the gospel; we must stand fast in the liberty of apostolic christianity against all the innovations and the self-originated policy of ancient and modern church principles.¹ Their views, these writers inform us, and those understood by the term evangelical, are as wide apart as socinianism and popery.²

Further, we remark, that we are summoned to this enterprise by the claims of charity and peace.³

To oppose prelacy is not, we again repeat, to oppose episcopacy; neither is it to impugn the character, standing, or piety of evangelical episcopal churches. In entering our protest against the anathematizing, excommunicating spirit of high-church principles, we consider prelatists as they present themselves, in their self-chosen garb, “stripped of those better parts of their system” — those common principles of christianity, “which are our inheritance as well as theirs;” and so contemplating them, in that aspect by which they are distinguished, as prelatists, it is surely for the interests of peace and charity, that their unscriptural and unchristian dogmas should be exposed.

A defensive war, when made necessary by the aggression of others, can never be wrong in principle, however it may be tarnished by the spirit in which it is conducted. On the contrary, it is only by such a war, vigorously and successfully prosecuted, that peace can ever be restored, and prosperity enjoyed. There is, in such circumstances, no alternative between war and liberty; or submission and enslavement. The question before us is, conformity to prelacy, or the justification of our claims to that inheritance in which we glory. To this image we must bow down and worship; or boldly avouch the Lord to be our God, and Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. While prelacy goes forth in her present crusade against the immunities and privileges of all other denominations, there is, and there can be, neither peace nor charity. By demanding uniformity, prelacy destroys and prevents unity. By branding as aliens from the christian commonwealth, all who worship God in a manner different from her — prelacy opposes what she miscalls schism, by what the Bible pronounces to be truly schism; for illiberality, bigotry, intole-

1) See *Anc't Christ'y*, passim.

2) *Hook's Call to Union*, p. 44.

3) See note D.

rance ; what are these but the very essence of schism ? The rebuke given by Campbell to the fanaticism of Dadwell, who makes the very existence of christianity to depend on prelacy, is surely not too strong.

“ Arrogant and vain man ! what are you, who so boldly and avowedly presume to foist into God’s covenant, articles of your own devising, neither expressed nor implied in his words ? Do you venture, a worm of the earth ? Can you think yourself warranted to stint what God hath not stinted, and, following the dictates of your own contracted spirit, enviously to limit the bounty of the Universal Parent, that you may confine to a party what Christ hath freely published for the benefit of all ? Is your eye evil because he is good ? Shall I then believe that God, like deceitful man, speaketh equivocally, and with mental reservations ? Shall I take his declaration in the extent wherein he hath expressly given it ; or as you, for your own purpose, have new vamped, and corrected it ? ‘ Let God be true, and every man a liar.’ You would pervert the plainest declarations of the oracles of truth, and, instead of representing Christ as the author of a divine and spiritual religion, as the great benefactor of human kind, exhibit him as the head of a faction—your party.”¹

“ Who, then, is the true sectarian ? but he who thus denounces all, as sectaries, who are not of his sect ? Who is the fanatic ? if not he, who sees fanaticism every where, but in his own party spirit ? Who is the enthusiast ? but the man who makes a God of externals and non-essentials—while he finds enthusiasm in those only, who are in earnest respecting the grand objects of religion ? Where is the schismatic ? if not among those who term every thing schism, which does not accord with their own opinions ?”²

How, then, can there prevail peace and charity, while it is still a question whether God or man is to be the Lord of conscience—and the principle is still undetermined, whether man can impose as a fundamental doctrine of christianity, what Christ has not instituted or revealed as such ? How can christians walk together in unity of heart, or of profession, while differing on these first elements of all church principles ?

There must be controversy, so long as these primal and momentous questions are matters of dispute. They affect the very being, and much more, the well-being, of the church. They involve, in their decision, the whole doctrine of charity. Their determination makes peace a duty, which must be ful-

1) Lect. on Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 90, 91.

2) See Schism, p. 341.

filled, "as far as lieth in us,"—or separation and withdrawal, and avowed opposition, as imperative on all who would faithfully contend for Christ's kingly prerogative and crown. NEVER, while these church principles of prelatical usurpation are current, can the prayer of Christ be visibly fulfilled, when all his churches and people shall be seen and known to be ONE, being of one mind and of one heart, and preserving amid their differences of views, the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. Such claims were rejected by the English reformers—by all the reformed churches—and by the greatest divines of all ages. They are in violent opposition to the spirit and principles of the gospel. "Let us," then, as said the Bishop of Norwich, in his late charge to his clergy, "let us abide by the faith of our protestant ancestors, whose object it was to proclaim that there was a deeper and more scriptural unity, than the unity of ecclesiastical organization, or of ecclesiastical detail,—I mean the unity of christian principle, the unity of the Spirit."¹

Then would the church of God have rest and be edified; displaying on the banners of the various divisions of her one sacramental host, the glorious motto of her own glorious Augustine, "In things essential, unity—in things not essential, liberty—and in all things, charity."²

Till that happy period arrive, which may God in his mercy hasten, forget not the admonition of the apostle—and stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ has made you free.

Finally, brethren, we would remark, that to this defensive warfare for the maintenance and preservation of our spiritual rights, we are imperatively summoned by the memory of our fathers. "It is no new thing, brethren, that has happened unto us," as wrote the imprisoned martyr Ridley to his brother Bradford; "for this was always the clamor of the wicked bishops and priests, against God's true prophets; the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord."³

There has thus, as it plainly appears, ever been a spiritual aristocracy, which would make a monopoly of salvation, confining it to its own orders, succession and gifts, as the only and exclusive fountain whence it might be obtained.

Now, to that form of government, in which this spirit inheres, we may be said to possess a hereditary antipathy. The history of presbyterianism, whether we look to its ancient defenders,

1) Charge of 1838, p. 22, &c.

2) In necessariis unitas, in dubiis

libertas, in omnibus caritas.

3) Letters of the Martyrs, p. 48.

the Culdees, or the Waldenses;—or to the churches of the reformation, which, with the single exception of the English, re-adopted these primitive and apostolical principles;—or to its more modern defenders in Ireland and in Scotland, yea, and in this country prior to the revolution;—presents a series of struggles, of unexampled severity and suffering, to preserve the church, on the one hand, from the grasp of Erastianism, and on the other, from the domineering rule of spiritual tyranny. To surrender the church to the one, or to the other, and to give it up a prey either to the civil, or to the ecclesiastical powers, was regarded by them as nothing short of treason to their Head and King. Acknowledging no man, as master on earth, and recognizing no temporal head or fountain of supremacy,—they placed the crown upon the brow of Him who is alone worthy to wear it.

“For Christ’s crown and covenants,”—for his word and worship,—for his ordinances in their entirety and in their purity;—these were the stirring watchwords by which they were rallied around the standard of the truth;—by which they were bound together in one heart and in one mind—and by which they were sustained in the loss of property, of liberty, and of life itself. The headship of Christ, and the liberty and spiritual independence of the church of Christ, these were the high principles, for the maintenance of which they endured a great fight of afflictions; counted not their lives dear unto them; and poured out their blood like water.

And having, at a cost so priceless — even ages of endurance, ignominy, oppression, penury and danger — secured to us the enjoyment of this great inheritance — are we not called upon, against all who would attempt to bring us into bondage, to contend earnestly for that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and wherein we stand and rejoice. “And because the world, as I perceive, brethren,” again to use the words of Ridley, “ceaseth not to play his pageant, and to conspire against Christ our Saviour with all possible force,” eloquence, learning and power, “exalting high things against this knowledge of God and this liberty of Christ, let us join hands together in Christ; and if we cannot overthrow, yet, to our power, and as much as in us lieth, let us shake those high things, not with carnal, but with spiritual weapons.”¹

And now to conclude.—We find ourselves, providentially, by birth, education, or from conviction, in the bosom of the pres-

1 Letters of Martyrs, p. 33.

byterian communion — a body identified with civil and religious freedom. Many of us hope that we have been here spiritually born — that from this alma mater we have drawn spiritual nourishment, and on her lap been nurtured in piety. With her, too, are associated all our hopes for the everlasting happiness of the loved and the gone. Under the shadow of her sanctuaries lie the buried forms of our venerated sires, and our beloved offspring, whose resurrection to glory and honor must stand or fall with the standing or falling of presbyterianism. It is no slight or trivial interest, therefore, which demands our contemplation. And what we say to you is, Abide where you are, neither be ye moved or shaken, until our opponents have shown cause why we should escape for our lives, as from a tottering building whose foundation is on the sand. Till then, we would desire to help you to a more perfect understanding of the sure foundation upon which our church is built, as on a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; and to show you its immovable strength by an exhibition of the utter weakness of the forces with which her overthrow is attempted. By so doing, we expect to brighten hope, and to gild the pages of memory; — to inspirit the heart of the onward pilgrim — and to hallow the memories of the departed spirits of the sainted dead. You will be emboldened, we trust, to venture more largely for a church so adorned with all the graces of heaven; and so capable of enriching you with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus. You will bless God for having led you into her sacred temple, and to tread her heavenly courts. You will hold more assured communion with the church of the first-born — the spirits of just men made perfect, as knowing, that among that bright and shining throng, there are many who here mingled their voices in our earthly worship. And you will more tranquilly approach the hour when, leaving all you love below, you will know that you are not therefore hurrying to the doom of the schismatic, or to the purgatorial limbo which may be provided by God's uncovenanted mercy, but are hastening to join the ransomed throng of the church triumphant, in that temple not made with hands, whose Builder and Maker is God.¹

1) See Note E.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE FIRST.

NOTE A.

As it may still be thought by many, that we have very laboriously collected a few extravagant expressions, it may be well to bring together in a note some additional illustrations of the spirit and language of high-churchism. Of such specimens we have a large collection at hand. Let us first take a few extracts, showing the sentiments of prelatists regarding the churches of the

DUTCH REFORMED, PRESBYTERIANS, AND INDEPENDENTS, CONJOINTLY.

“Either church organization is far more than a form, or it does not call for a great deal of lamentation. There are no forms under the gospel. Apostolical order is an ethical principle, or it is not worth much. These worthy Independents were deficient in an inward element of truth, in a something mental, moral, spiritual, mystical — or they had no great loss, considering they were in unavoidable ignorance. They were not altogether right, up to a certain point, and only wanted finishing. They were not dressed, all but hat and shoes. Mr. Ceswall seems to consider that the episcopal form is the *last* thing in the idea of a church—and therefore a presbyterian or independent body may be considered an imperfect sort of episcopacy. Imperfect! Is a mouse an imperfect kind of bat? Is it a bat, all but the wings? Could we sew wings on it, and make it a bat? Did all the swellings of an ambitious heart develop the frog into the bull? Could it ‘perfect its defective organization?’ So it is with independency or presbyterianism, viewed in themselves; as forms, they are as distinct from the church as one kind of flesh from another.” See the *British Critic* for October, 1839, page 337.

“Now, taking the thirty-nine articles as the exactest form of apostolic truth, still we must consider that the quakers and Dutch reformed deviate from them as far as the Roman catholics.” See do. p. 339.

“It may seem harsh thus to speak of ‘episcopacy,’ and ‘episcopalians,’ yet we hope it will not shock any one if we say, that we wish the words, as denoting an opinion and its maintainer, never had been invented. They have done great mischief to their own cause. We are ‘of the church,’ not ‘of the episcopal church;’ our own bishops are not merely an order in her organization, *but the principle of her continuance*; and to call ourselves episcopalians is to imply that we differ from the mass of the dissenters mainly in church government and form, in a matter of doctrine merely, not of fact; whereas the difference is, that we are *here* and they *there*; we in the church, and they out of it.” See do. p. 341.

Let us now present their views of

THE INDEPENDENT, OR CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

In special reference to these, it may be sufficient to quote, besides what is applicable to dissenters generally, as intended to bear particularly on them, the following quotation from a letter addressed to the Rev. William H. Cooper,

of Dublin, Ireland, by the Rev. T. D. Gregg, dated Dublin, 28th November, 1839, and printed in the newspapers generally.*

He addresses him in ridicule, "my lord," because he claimed to be a christian bishop.

"If, like the excellent primitive Methodists, you acted as a lay-helper of the church, renounced all titles but that of 'Mr. W. H. Cooper, preacher of the gospel,' 'expounder of gospel truths,' or 'evangelist,' it would be quite a different matter. Even though you were irregular, I should consider that then there was no place for ridicule—nay, I should respect your humble zeal. But to announce yourself as 'reverend,' to talk of your 'ordination,' 'of your administering of sacraments,' and of your 'not denying the right hand of fellowship to your dear episcopal brethren'—this, believe me, is ridiculous. I assure you, my lord, you have no more right to perform pastoral functions—no more rightful pastoral authority—no more faculty to administer sacraments, than one of your own 'clergy'—the Rev. Miss Blank, an excellent relation of mine; or than my other excellent friend, who was lately one of your sect, but who having, through my arguments, abandoned dissent, is now an attached member of the holy catholic and apostolic church—the one fold of the one shepherd, Jesus Christ—Mr. John Hanley."

In reference to speaking severely of the Romish church, he says: "I am consistent—I should not be esteemed offensive. It is at once insult and injury that you, supported by the Rev. Miss Dobbs, and the Rev. Mrs. Snobbs, your 'clergy,' take the liberty of using such language as you have used.

"Forgive me if I have spoken harshly—I have heard some say that you and I are embarked in the same cause. I can scarcely think so; I know the mind of the Roman catholics, and I know this, that if there be one offence in the way greater than another, it is the offence that arises from protestant sectarianism, while it is with the very arguments of independence that popery is at present assailing the church. You say that Christ has made your communities churches; I deny it. You are they who 'separate themselves,' (Jude 19,) and what Christ makes you is 'sensual'—'not having the spirit.'"

He then concludes thus: "With respect for you as a man, love as a christian, but with thorough contempt for your Fungus Episcopate—I remain, my lord, very seriously, yours in Christ,

"T. D. GREGG.

"Dublin, 28th November, 1839."

Let us now hear their opinion, more especially of

PRESBYTERIANS.

In a Treatise on the Church, by Edward Barrick, of Trinity College, Dublin, published in Belfast, in 1813, and for years past offered for sale in Londonderry, it is said: "We must recollect, that these *pretended ministers* who officiate in the meetings of *Presbyterians*, &c., have not been ordained by the bishops. And consequently, as I have already demonstrated, these men have not been sent by God; and therefore, *it must be utterly unlawful to attend their ministry*. For how can we hear without a preacher, and how can they preach unless they be sent? The Lord forbids us to hear them, because 'he hath not sent them, and therefore they shall not profit this people.' To hear, then, in such a case, is *rebellion against God and utterly unlawful*, and is countenancing them, and hardening *their presumption and daring imposture*." p. 146.

He quotes the following sentence, with approbation, from Dr. S. Butt's Discourse on Church Government: "That episcopacy is of divine right; that to separate from the orthodox bishops is schismatical; that schism is a damnable sin." p. 327.

In another passage he says: "The case being thus, the *nonentity* of these *unhappy peoples'* church appears upon a double account; first, as wanting a *ministry*, and second, as wanting the due preaching of the pure Word, and

* Quoted from the Belfast Christian Patriot, of December 6, 1839.

right administration of the sacraments. So that the difference between us and this people, as already considered, is a *ministry and no ministry, a church and no church.*"*

In the Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 264, No. 36, under the head of "Account of Religious Sects," &c., the second division includes, "Those who receive and teach a part, but not the whole of the truth, erring in respect to ONE OR MORE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES. Under this head are included most of what are called 'Protestant dissenters.' The chief of these are—

1. Presbyterians, so called, from maintaining the validity of ordination by *Presbyters* or elders only; in other words, by the second order of the clergy, dispensing with and superseding the first." "We need not deny to the church the abstract right, (however we may question the propriety,) of altering its own constitution. It is not merely *because* episcopacy is a *better or more scriptural form* than presbyterianism, (true as this may be in itself,) that Episcopalians are right and Presbyterians are wrong, but because the presbyterian ministers have assumed a power which was never intrusted to them. They have presumed to exercise the power of ordination, and to perpetuate a succession of ministers without having received a commission to do so." Oxf. Tr. Vol. i. No. 13.

It will only further be necessary to quote the recent and very explicit views drawn up for the guidance of theological students, of Mr. Palmer, in his Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 574—577, in which, with the most cool and consummate arrogance of bigotry, there is the most daring assertion of what the true facts of the case will by no means warrant.

"I am now to speak of the presbyterian societies in Scotland, and examine their claim to be considered a part of the christian church.

"These proceedings being annulled on the restoration of Charles II., the Church of Scotland continued till 1690, to be subject to its bishops, like all other churches, though many adherents of the covenant formed conventicles, and separated themselves from the church. In 1690 this party of dissenters obtained the support of the civil power, (in consequence of the refusal of the bishops to acknowledge King William II.) and under their influence the Scottish parliament consummated a most woful schism, abolishing episcopacy, and establishing the presbyterian separatists as the church of Scotland. Thus the bishops and clergy were deprived of their estates and all their legal rights, and their place and authority was usurped by others, while a portion of the nation fell from their obedience, and united themselves to the new establishment, which afterwards obtained many converts by the same persecution which it directed against the church.

"Hence it would be a great mistake to suppose that the question between the Presbyterians and the church was merely a dispute on church government—it was concerning the most vital principles of the church's unity and authority. The Presbyterians were innovators who *separated* themselves from the church, because they judged episcopacy anti-christian, and thus condemned the church universal, in all past ages. Their *opinion* was erroneous; but had it merely extended to a preference of the presbyterian form, it might have been in some degree tolerated—it would not have cut them off from the church of Christ. But it was the exaggeration of their opinion, their *separation* for the sake of their opinion, their actual rejection of the authority and communion of the existing successors of the apostles in Scotland, and therefore of the universal church in all ages, that marks them out as SCHISMATICAL; and all the temporal enactments and powers of the whole world could not cure this fault, NOR RENDER THEM A PORTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. If a party of schismatics should separate themselves from the church of England, and should, by a fortunate combination of events, be able to effect the temporal overthrow of the church, and their own establishment by the civil powers, this would surely not deprive the church of her claim to the adherence of christians, nor cover the sins of those who assailed and despoiled her.

"This appears really to have been the case of the Scottish church and the

* See Presbyterianism Defended, Glasgow, 1839, pages 197, 198.

Presbyterians; and therefore, while we must ever deplore the condition of Scotland, and most earnestly desire that the people may be re-united in religious harmony, it is impossible for us to close our eyes on the origin of the presbyterian establishment in that country.

“With regard to all the other sects in Scotland, which have seceded from the presbyterian communities, such as Glassite, Sandemanians, Seceders, Burghers, Anti-Burghers, Constitutional Associate Presbytery, Relief Kirk, Scottish Baptists, Bereans, Independents, &c.; the same observations apply to them all. Their predecessors, the Presbyterians, voluntarily separated themselves from the catholic church of Christ, and they, in departing from the presbyterian communion, have not yet returned to that of the true church. CONSEQUENTLY, THEY FORM NO PART OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.”

Similar are the sentiments expressed towards

BAPTISTS.

The Baptists, under the general head of dissenters, have already been dealt with according to the tender mercies of these high-church expounders of the will of God. It will not be necessary therefore to enlarge.

Mr. Palmer, on the Church, vol. i. p. 266, in replying to the objection that the Church of England is in error on the subject of baptism, says: “A difficulty of this kind, raised by a mere handful of professing christians, in opposition to the judgment and practice of the church, and of all sects, in all ages, from the beginning, is not worthy of attention. We may refuse all controversy on the subject, for, as St. Augustine says, ‘Si quid horum tota per orbem frequentat ecclesia—quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissimæ insanix est.’ In fact, there cannot be a more certain mark of heresy and apostacy from Christ, than such a condemnation of what the church in all ages has received and approved. If infant baptism renders our churches apostate, all churches must have been so for many ages, and therefore the church of Christ must have entirely perished, contrary to the promises of holy scripture.”

In the Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 265, Baptists are ranked among those who err in respect to “FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES,” and are further declared to have “departed from the truth, not only as concerns the doctrine of the laying on of hands, but also as concerns the doctrine of baptism, AND OTHER OF THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES, according to St. Paul.”

Nor are they at all more lenient toward the

METHODISTS.

This large body of Christians have lately received very rough handling in the British Magazine, and other high-church courts of ecclesiastical law. In the Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 265, they are also dignified with a place among those who “err in one or more fundamentals,” and are thus described:

“Methodists are subdivided into an immense variety of sects—the chief are, Wesleyans, Whitefieldians, or Lady Huntington’s Ranters, or Primitive Methodists, Briantes, or Bible Christians, Protestant Methodists, Tent Methodists, Independent Methodists, and Kilhamites.

“These do not receive or teach the truth respecting the doctrine of ‘laying on of hands,’ which St. Paul classes among the fundamental doctrines of christianity, and by which the christian ministry receives its commission and authority to administer the word and sacraments. For they, one and all, reject the first, (i. e. the apostolical, or as we now call it, episcopal,) order of clergy, who exercised the rite according to the New Testament, and without whom there is no warrant from scripture for believing that the clergy can be appointed or the sacraments be duly administered.”

Mr. Palmer, on the church, vol. i. p. 247, says: “The METHODISTS DO NOT PRETEND TO BE A CHURCH AT ALL; but call themselves a society or association, which they would represent to be united to the Church of England, and subsidiary to its ministrations.”

So also at page 237, honorable mention is made of Methodists. "In fine, we use the name of catholic as appropriate to our churches, while we give other titles to the various denominations which have separated from us; as Independents, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Baptists, Romanists or Papists, Huntingdonians, Methodists, Socinians, Unitarians, &c. None of these communities dispute with us the possession of this name except the Romanists; and their impudent pertinacity, in the assumption of it, induces sometimes the ignorant or the indifferent to countenance their claim in some degree."

So, also, as it regards the

LUTHERANS AND REFORMED CHURCHES.

Of these it is declared by Palmer on the Church, vol. i. p. 157, "The societies were not properly churches.

"That the lutheran and calvinistic were not properly churches of Christ, I argue thus," &c. See do. p. 383. "Several theologians, it is objected, even of the British churches, have acknowledged the lutheran and reformed to be churches of Christ.

"Answer. I admit that this opinion has been held by some writers; but they seem to have been influenced by the notion, that it was necessary for the justification of both the protestant and British churches. However, scarcely any theologian affirmed these foreign communities were perfect in all respects, according to the institution of Christ; and most of those who give them the title of churches, do so in a general sense, not meaning that they are churches in the strict sense of the term." See do. p. 397.

"Of these communities, whether collectively or individually considered, I affirm, THAT THEY ARE NO PART OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. This question has been recently so well treated by many able writers, that very little need be said on the subject." See do. p. 399.

And as regards the

DISSENTERS GENERALLY.

In regard to all other denominations who, living in the same country with Episcopalians, are on that account arrogantly styled dissenters, though they have no relation whatever to the episcopal church, other than as churches of Christ, much is said. This term, as we shall show, is one applied even in America.

"They are *human* societies. The will of man makes them, regulates them, unmakes them. They are, in a word, purely voluntary associations, and therefore cannot be any part of that church which is formed by the divine command, and by means instituted by God, and from which man cannot separate without most grievous sin." See do. p. 407.

"It is clear, then, that the principle of division is a principle of dissent, and therefore their community cannot form any portion of the church of Christ." See do. p. 407.

"And as every officer of a voluntary association or club, derives his commission entirely from those who create him, so the dissenting minister is commissioned to preach the gospel, not by God, but by man. He is the minister of man only, and therefore the dissenting communities being destitute of a true ministry, which is essential to the church, are not churches of Christ. I shall add nothing in a case so easy and clear." See do. p. 414.

"Therefore, their separation from the Church of England was founded, not only in schism, but in heresy, and this being the case, they could not have been any part of the church of Christ, nor were they capable of forming christian churches." p. 403. See also page 402.

"THEY AND THEIR GENERATIONS ARE AS THE HEATHEN; and though we may have reason to believe that many of their descendants are not obstinate in their errors, still it seems to me that WE ARE NOT WARRANTED IN AFFIRMING ABSOLUTELY THAT THEY CAN BE SAVED." See do. p. 110.

The present feeling of liberality towards Presbyterians and others, is thus

rebuked in the Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 599: "Do not hover about our ancient home, the home of Cyprian and Athanasius, without the heart to take up our abode in it, yet afraid to quit the sight of it; boasting of our episcopacy, yet unwilling to condemn separation; claiming a descent from the apostles, yet doubting of the gifts attending it, and trying to extend the limits of the church for the admission of Wesleyans and Presbyterians, while we profess to be exclusively primitive. Alas, is not this to witness against ourselves, like coward sinners who hope to save the world, without giving up God's service!"

"When I say that dissent is a *sin*, I by no means thereby imply, that for that reason every dissenter is at once and necessarily a sinner. To say that a particular thing is a *sin*, is very different from saying that every one who does it is a sinner." See do. p. 355.

"I must observe, then," says Mr. Dodsworth on Romanism and Dissent, p. 14, "that there is often a kind of levity indulged in, when speaking on the subject of dissent, which conveys the idea that it is a very light and trivial matter. If a man ventures to speak of it as an evil, he is met by a smile at his supposed bigotry or simplicity. Now, if dissent is indeed, as I think has been shown, a breach of unity in the church—if it be that which we are taught to pray against in the same sentence with 'false doctrine and heresy,' with 'hardness of heart, and contempt of God's word and commandments,'—then it is a *sin*; and then to make light of it, is to subject ourselves to a reproof which we should not willingly incur—for 'fools make a mock of sin.' And then we should feel bound in charity to others who have been drawn away from us, in meekness and gentleness to warn them of their danger, because we must not 'suffer sin upon a brother.'"

"So we do not exhort you to abstain from going to those assemblies because we attach any inherent virtue to our own ceremonies above theirs; but because, by so doing, you lend your countenance to that which the *Scriptures* pronounce to be sinful." See do. p. 15.

"I need scarcely add, therefore, that in order to obey the injunction in the text, you must refrain from ever sanctioning by your presence the assemblies of those whose standing is one of rebellion against the Lord and his church. If schism is *sin*, then to be present where it is practised cannot be without culpability." See do. p. 16.

"But we must judge of dissent, not in reference to individual teachers, but as a system; and we may easily see, *both from fact and reason, that its tendency is to infidelity.*" See do. p. 11.

Further, in the Oxford Tracts, vol. i. pp. 355, 356, it is said: "For when a man thinks the church unscriptural, he has good reason for leaving it, and is (what I have called above) a *conscientious* dissenter; though at the same time I am bound to say, I think his conscience a very erroneous one, which leads him to consider the church as unscriptural; and while I allow him to be *conscientious*, in one sense of the word, yet I also think him to be *heretical*—just as those who, (as our Lord foretold,) thought when they persecuted the Apostles 'they did God service,' were wrong, not in that they obeyed their conscience, but because they had not a more enlightened conscience. 'The light that is in' a merely *conscientious* dissenter, is what Christ has called 'darkness.'"

"Christ has appointed the church as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first that the Lord added daily to the church such as should be saved; and what was then done daily hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. 'There is no other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus,' and that is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church." See do. p. 361.

These extracts, in addition to many more which shall be introduced in the course of the work, and which we could most easily multiply, may suffice to lead all our readers to appreciate the urgency of that demand which calls upon us to examine these arrogant pretensions.

NOTE B.

The meaning of this term, high church, is given by Dr. Rice. "Somebody," says he,* "has put forth a long story about Bishop Horsley's notions on this subject. But all this is as far from the subject, as it is discussed in this country, as we are from being high churchmen ourselves. There are men in England, who maintain that the clergy are entirely dependent on the State, and derive all their clerical authority from the laws of the land—while others hold that, apart from the civil power, and all acts of the government in relation to the church, the ministers of religion have power and authority derived from the appointment of Christ. The latter of these, in Bishop Horsley's sense of the term, are *high*, and the former, *low* churchmen. But this has no connexion whatever with any controversy in this country. The church here derives nothing from the State; in all her branches she is entirely separate and independent. In Bishop H.'s sense, we are all high churchmen. But when we use the term, as expressive of the principles to which we never can be reconciled, we mean a man, who holds that all spiritual power is vested in him; that he is a substitute for Christ's person on earth; that he belongs to an *order*, whose official prerogative it is to come between God and man; to declare authoritatively the divine will to his fellow men, and to bind the source of all mercy and grace to the performance of his own covenant engagements, and thus give to man the assurance of salvation. And who adds to all these monstrous claims, the assumption, that all who differ from him in these particulars, and separate from his communion, are out of the pale of the church, and destitute of all warrant to hope for heaven. These are the principles against which we are pledged to wage war as long as we live. But at the same time, we delight to call every humble, pious episcopalian, brother, and to cherish towards him feelings of fraternal kindness."

We might make a further reference to a treatise written expressly in defence of moderate, or low church men, entitled, "A Vindication of the Principles and Practices of the Moderate Divines and Laity of the Church of England," by the Rev. Edward Pierce, Rector in Northampton. Lond., 1682, p. 410, p. 80. The author shows that they were distinguished from the high church by all their practices and opinions, which he fully justifies. At p. 52, he urges moderateism towards dissenters, "because we agree not only in fundamentals of religion and government, but in the necessary adjuncts of worship," &c. See in Philad. Lib. No. 937, Miscellanies, vol. xvii.

See this distinction used also by Prof. Powell, in his *Traditions Unveiled*, p. 5, in reference to that party in the church, "the well-known and old established section of the church commonly designated as the high-church party."

NOTE C.

In his Review of Bishop Ravenscroft's Vindication and Defence, Dr. Rice remarks: "It was indeed the opinion of some,† that we had undertaken a work of gratuitous labor and trouble; that the extravagant pretensions of Bishop R. might be left to sink at once into the oblivion to which, it was believed, they are destined. We thought differently. It has for some time appeared obvious to us, that there is growing up a spirit in this country, which seeks for marks of distinction between itself and the mass of the people. As infidelity is out of fashion, and unitarianism is not popular to the south, there is a great demand, among people of a certain sort, (to use a phrase current among all good cavaliers ever since the "merry days of King Charles,") for a "religion fit for a gentleman." There is, also, among many of our republicans, a passion for ceremony, for pomp and show in religious worship. Others, moreover, too indolent, too much devoted to the world to secure scrip-

* *Evang. and Lit. Magazine*, vol. ix. p. 635.

† *Evang. and Lit. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 368 and p. 436.

tural evidences of their being in a state of salvation, are willing enough to look to their priests for assurance. High-church notions, then, do not sink under the influence of public opinion. It is necessary to make efforts to pull them down. The interests of the church and of the country require it. Under this conviction, we acted according to our sense of duty, and endeavored to show that the claims of this bishop could not be sustained either by reason or scripture." "But we will say, that when high-church principles were first broached among us, we thought that it was perfectly a work of supererogation to undertake to oppose them; that in *this country* their very extravagance, their opposition to the genius of all our political institutions, their obvious tendencies, would at once put them down. But they are growing. Their influence is felt even by *evangelical men*. Young preachers, who turned out warm hearted and liberal, are gradually screwed up to notions and feelings high enough to please a diocesan bishop. We see these things and lament them. It is our duty to expose the error, and give the warning. And as God may give us grace to be faithful, none within the sphere of our labors shall go unwarned."

NOTE D.

That we are thus required by the call of charity to examine and discuss this subject, is taught us by one of its most recent advocates. "The only question," says Mr. Percival, "then is, whether the episcopal (i. e. prelatical) scheme is *true*; if so, charity requires that we should teach it, and forbids our keeping it back." "The exclusiveness of that which professes to be an article of this one faith, affords a *prima facie* probability* of its being a genuine article of that one faith." "Believing," he adds, "the doctrine of the apostolical succession to be catholic and scriptural, I will never so far betray the cause of truth as to surrender it to the sole use of the erroneous papists."† "They who believe this doctrine to be true, are only acting faithfully to God and to his people, when they calmly vindicate and bear witness to the truth."‡

And, once more, in the very spirit of fabulous invention, this writer adds to the assertion, that all the churches during the apostles' time were episcopalian; "that, until the presbyterian scheme was invented in the sixteenth century, it had always been understood to be our Lord's intention that the church should continue episcopalian (i. e. prelatic) until his return." §

"Now when," as one of their own selves has said, "when a religious system condemns us by name, and pronounces sentence concerning our eternal state in so decided a tone, and that simply because we dissent from some of its tenets, we not only think we have a right to defend ourselves and our religion, but consider it our bounden duty to examine the grounds on which a system of such pretension rests, and honestly, though quietly, to avow our reasons for rejecting it." ||

NOTE E.

The Rev. Dr. Muir, in his Sermon in Commemoration of the General Assembly of 1638, (Glasgow, 1838, p. 18—20,) thus eloquently alludes to the fathers of the church of Scotland: "That for exciting our gratitude, as on such a day as this, we may well cherish the remembrance of the men who were instrumental in procuring, and then transmitting the privileges of our protestantism. The zeal of David, the man after God's own heart, was truly exemplified in their piety, and wisdom, and sufferings, and constancy. Their strength of character and decision was great. Their devotion to the cause of Christ was greater. Persecuted in their adherence to that cause, they still

* On Ap. Succ. p. 38.

† P. 40.

‡ P. 52.

§ P. 61.

|| The Old Paths, by the Rev. Alexander McCaul, D. D., of Trinity College, Dublin. London, 1837, p. 3, No. 1.

endured. Thwarted in their measures, at once religious and patriotic, they planned anew. Withstood in their most reasonable demands, they held fast by their claims, and persevered.

“And while, on reviewing the glorious deliverance achieved from anti-christ, from the monstrous evils of the mercenary and superstitious priesthood of Roine, of an interdicted reason, and a banished Bible,—while, on reviewing *that* struggle with ‘the man of sin,’ which broke the chain of the papacy in Scotland, we trace the might of the contest and the victory to the Lord of Hosts, and give him the honor and the praise, yet ought we not to remember ‘the noble army of the martyrs?’—with grateful sentiments ought we not to think and speak of ‘the cloud of witnesses’ that endured, and labored, and died, in the cause of truth; and to hold up their memories, embalmed in sacred gratitude, before ourselves and our children? There was Hamilton, distinguished by learning as well as high birth, devoted from his youth to God, and whose zeal for the pure faith, which he drank at the feet of Luther and Melancthon, was not quenched on earth but with his blood. There was Wishart, skilled almost equally in divine and human sciences, whose sermons penetrated the most hardened, and melted them into tears,—who braved the pestilence to carry the message of divine grace to his ignorant and perishing countrymen,—whose devout wrestlings for sinners had somewhat of angelic fervors in them, and whose martyr’s crown shone amid the flame of persecution as gloriously as *that* of any of the early christians themselves. There was Knox, the apostolic messenger of the reformation, peculiarly fitted, by the spirit of wisdom and power, for his extraordinary work; and whose devotedness to the cause of Christ, and eloquence, and compassion for the souls of men, and warmth of affection, were not less memorable than the boldness of character which earned for him the well-known encomium at his grave: “There lies a man who never feared the face of man.” Names these are, not often rehearsed from the pulpit; and, doubtless, having scripture names, examples of piety and zeal so numerous, how seldom need we go from the Bible record to seek the pattern and incentive to righteousness! But, on *this* day, and valuing the privileges of our church, and desirous to see them perpetuated and extended, shall we not recall the memory of the great men who planted and watered the tree of our privileges with their very blood? and shall we not consider that those now named, were followed by a multitude of other religious patriots, in having whom any country might deem itself honored? And surely we cannot read of such men as the Melvilles, and Bruce, and Welch, and Henderson, and Gillespie, and Rutherford, and more of the like sainted character, without blessing God for his goodness, in having raised up those who were so fully qualified, both for establishing and adorning our Zion. They who thus wrought at the second reformation (as it is called) were indued, even as they needed, with qualities both of mind and heart, similar to what had been requisite at the first. The work of the first had been marred and shaken by the renewed attempts of popery to gain, under the disguise of improving and beautifying the services of the church, a lodgment once more in Scotland. Who shall doubt this who have traced the painful steps of our history, from the opening of the seventeenth century, onwards to its thirty-eighth year?

“In Scotland, these persecutions were peculiarly severe* and aggravated. From the opening of the tragedy with the scarcely legalized murder of the Marquis of Argyll, to the closing of it in the death of the zealous Renwick, an innumerable host sealed with their blood, their testimony to the truth of presbyterian reformation principles. Their sufferings and privations were of the severest kind, and of every possible form which the cruelty of man could invent. Neither were the martyrs confined to the man of robust constitution and masculine mind; but delicate and helpless females were found fear-facings their blood-thirsty persecutors, preferring to die with their children in lessly their arms, rather than sacrifice their religious liberty. ‘God and our country’ was the watchword,—the governing sentiment which filled the hearts of these patriotic sufferers. But, though driven from their homes, and forced to seek a hiding-place in the lone glen or rocky cavern, the presence of

* Sketch of Hist. and Princ. of the Presb. Ch. in England. London, 1840, p. 17 and p. 26.

the covenant sustained and cheered their souls ; and it was then they found the vision of Moses in Mount Horeb, affectingly applicable to their circumstances, and adopted the burning bush in the wilderness, as a fit emblem of the state of the church—enveloped in the flames of a fiery persecution, yet not consumed, for the Lord was in the midst of her.

“ Yes—though the sceptic’s tongue deride
Those martyrs who for conscience died ;
Though modish history slight their fame,
And sneering courtiers hoot the name
Of men, who dared alone be free
Amidst a nation’s slavery :
Yet long for them the poet’s lyre
Shall wake its notes of heavenly fire.

“ Their names shall nerve the patriot’s hand,
Upraised to save a sinking land ;
And piety shall learn to burn
With holier transports o’er their urn.”

LECTURE II.

THE TRIBUNAL, BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION MUST BE ADJUDICATED.

WHILE the nature of man is so constituted, as to dispose him to submit to that authority which is true and valid, it also compels him to resist that which is unlawful. Thus, when our Saviour had entered upon his public ministry, and had manifested his design to interfere with the established usages and opinions of the Jews, they came unto him, as he was teaching in the temple, and said, "by what authority doest thou these things?—who gave thee this authority?" (Math. 21, 23.) The propriety and reasonableness of such an inquiry, (while, in view of the captious manner in which it was, *at this time*, proposed, Christ gave only an indirect and parabolic answer,)—our Saviour has fully allowed, by the frequent appeals which he, at other times, makes to the evidences of his divine mission.

When, therefore, any body of men assume to themselves the exclusive possession of the gifts and calling of God;—declare themselves to be the one and only true church of Christ, out of which there is no covenanted salvation; and pronounce a sentence of excommunication, and of withering anathema, upon all other denominations, who call themselves christian;—un-churching their churches; deposing their ministers; confounding their orders; protesting, as forgeries, their commissions; despoiling of all virtue their most solemn ordinances; and thus casting them out of the temple, as intruders;—we *seriously* put to them the question, which was *arrogantly* addressed to Christ, and ask, "by what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" And, since these claims are either founded on assured divine sanctions, and are,

therefore, to be most humbly and implicitly allowed; or are based upon the prescriptions of uninspired and fallible men, and are, in this case, mere assumptions, involving the deepest criminality; it will not do for their abettors, to draw themselves up in lordly dignity, and with the declaration that the ground of such authority is too notorious to be denied,¹ violate the spirit while adopting the language of our Saviour, when he said, "neither tell I you by what authority I do these things."

To this question, therefore, which we propound in all sincerity and honesty of purpose, and with an unfeigned desire to know and obey the truth as it is in Jesus, that in all things by His grace given unto us, we may please God, and walk obediently in his statutes and ordinances, — we must demand a reply. And as we are not willing to abandon that position which we have taken, and as we believe, by the guidance of holy Scripture, — we cannot bow down to these masters, or serve them, until they have duly authenticated the divine warrant of their supremacy.

The first point, therefore, to be decided, and which is of vital importance to the determination of the whole scheme of church policy, is the rule by which the claims of prelacy, or of popery, or of presbytery, are to be measured. — What is the tribunal to which their claims are to be brought for adjudication? Who is the judge, by whom our appeal is to be finally issued? For until these preliminaries are decided, "we will but be led," as Alexander Henderson told King Charles, "into a labyrinth, and want a thread to wind us out again."²

Now this inquiry is, we humbly think, most plainly decided for us in a celebrated passage in the book of Isaiah. The Jews were prone to seek counsel and direction in their perplexities from diviners, wizards, and enchantments. The prophet is, therefore, instructed to rebuke them for this heaven-daring course, which was as foolish as it was impious. "Should not a people," he asks, "seek unto their God? — to the law and to the testimony?" "The law of God is the standard of duty; his sure testimony the fountain of truth; his promise the firm ground of hope." All principles, practices and characters, are to be tried by this criterion. All doctrines, counsels, or claims, by whatever advisers or priestly instructors they are offered, must be brought to this unerring touchstone. All asserted privileges, and pretended endowments, must be submitted to the arbitrament of the law and the testimony; so that, if not found

1) See Oxford Tr. No. vii. p. 2, and Dr. Hook's Two Sermons, p. 7.

2) See Life of Alexander Henderson, p. 655.

warranted and authorized by the word of God, then is there not even the shadow of a foundation upon which they can be made to rest. They are manifestly without authority. "Here," says the learned, and more pious, episcopal commentator, Mr. Scott, "here, in this passage, we have a solemn, decisive, and scriptural appeal, applicable in all ages and cases."

This appeal we now make, and the answer to our inquiry — "who gave thee this authority?" — we require shall be adduced from the law and the testimony, and not from antiquity, perpetual succession, universal consent of the fathers, or the universal practice of the primitive church. To these inferior sources of evidence we will freely allow weight and value, as historians of facts or of opinions, so far at least as they are borne out by the positive and authoritative warrant of the divine word; but when considered in themselves, and as measured by their own intrinsic importance, we at once reject them as of no authoritative value whatever. Apart from scripture, and from a reasonable support in scripture, we give place, by subjection, no, not for an hour, were it even to the whole church, in all its priests, prelates and councils, from the year of A. D. 100, when the last inspired apostle had died, to the present hour. We utterly repudiate all antiquarian servility, and spiritual prostration to the ghostly rule of church guides and church principles.

Our first beginning in this discussion must be, the principle of the supreme authority of scripture, as arbiter and judge. And this first principle we regard as most reasonable, in a controversy between two parties, both of whom professedly receive the Bible as the only, or at least as an infallible, rule of faith and practice. Both parties mutually acknowledge the divine origin and authority of the Bible, while one party most peremptorily rejects any other rule, except as "unauthoritative tradition." We cannot, therefore, allow prelatists to found their argument for their exclusive claims upon the acknowledged existence of prelacy in an advanced age of the church; and thence to argue backward to the apostolic age; for we yield no submission whatever to the opinions of the church, *as such, and this too, at a time, when she had corrupted the plain doctrines and ordinances of God, and had almost suffocated christianity by a superincumbent load of vain and foolish ceremonies.* We protest against the judgment of the Nicene, or even of the earlier church, because they had both, in many and grievous respects, made the word of God of none effect, by their traditions receiv-

1) See Hawkins Dissert. on Unauthoritative Tradition, Oxford, 1819.

ed from the fathers. We make our appeal from ancient, to apostolic christianity; and, from all will-worship of men, to the pure word and worship of God. "The church," when the argument suits a prelatist purpose, "is not built upon individuals — nor knows individuals."¹ Neither does it rest, do we affirm, upon "catholic teaching, expressing and representing that more ancient religion which of old time found voice, and attained consistency in Athanasius, Basil, Augustine, Chrysostom and other primitive doctors."² Our church, and the true catholic church, rests upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. This rule of scripture, then, being a first principle among those concerned in this discussion, while the authority of the fathers is a question of most serious dispute;³ and since the authority of the church depends, at best, only upon human testimony,⁴ we cast our anchor in the haven of divine truth, fearless of whatever storms, from the turbulent ocean of ecclesiastical antiquity, may burst upon us.⁵ Let those who will, venture on it, and make shipwreck of their faith.

Now, since Christ has positively declared that in his church there should be — as we understand him to affirm — no such distinctions and no such arrogant claims to superiority, as are presented by prelatists, (Mark iv. 42,) — since the Bible was adapted to the necessities of the present, as much as of the ancient church; since it expressly forewarns us against false teachers and false doctrines which should prevail even "in the temple of God;" and since, on the other hand, the system of prelacy is declared by its advocates to be one of "the fundamental" and "great doctrines of religion,"⁶ so that to "regard it as no doctrine but only alterable discipline, is not to keep the SUBSTANCE of the FAITH entire,"⁷ and to oppose it is to "violate not a small, but a great duty of the christian religion,"⁸ and to become "schismatics, if not heretics;"⁹ — seeing that these things are so, we demand before God and the world, that they, who thus sit in judgment upon us, and peril by their decision, our everlasting interests — shall produce divine authority for the rendition of such a judgment. On them,

1) Newman on Romanism, p. 288.

2) Ibid, p. 289.

3) See Chillingworth, vol. iii. p. 237, 238.

4) See Palmer on the Ch., vol. ii. p. 86.

5) This description of ecclesiastical antiquity is given by the fathers of the Council of Trent, in their fifth session, where they speak of "entering

the ocean of councils, the decretals, and the papal constitutions." Mendham's Councils of Trent. p. 63.

6) See the Charleston Gospel Messenger, July 1840, p. 103.

7) Ibid, p. 118.

8) Ibid,

9) Palmer, on the Church, vol. ii. p. 392.

and not on us, rests the whole burden of proof. We hold firmly to the Bible — to the law and the testimony. And by that sacred institute they must disprove our claim, and bring us in guilty before God. Till then — we charge them with “sitting in the temple of God as God, and defying those whom the Lord has not defied.”

Addressing them in the adapted language of Dryden, we may say,

Despair at our foundations, then to strike,
Till you can PROVE YOUR FAITH, apostolic;
A limpid stream drawn from the native source,
Succession lawful, in a lineal course.
“For” such high claims “traditions must not fight,
But you must prove that prelacy is right.”¹

Before proceeding to the discussion of this point, it will, however, be important to present a full view of the doctrine in question. We will, therefore, endeavor to state what is the faith on this subject of the presbyterian church—wherein that church harmonizes with the prelatical—wherein they differ from each other—and what is precisely that doctrine against which we contend.

The presbyterian church teaches, that besides the catholic or universal church, which is invisible, and consists of the whole number of the elect, there is “the visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (that is, not confined to one nation, as before, under the law,) and consists of all those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God; out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.”²

As “holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him; as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word,” which “with a precept authorizing their use, contain a promise of benefit to worthy receivers;”³ “there be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, baptism and the Lord’s supper, neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word lawfully ordained.”⁴

1) See the “Hind and Panther,” in Poetical Works, vol. 2. p. 61 and 67.

2) Conf. of Faith, chap. xxv. § 2.

3) Conf. of Faith, chap. xxvii. § 1 and 3.

4) Ibid, § 4.

She further teaches, that "the ordinary and perpetual officers in the church are — BISHOPS OR PASTORS ; and the representatives of the people usually styled RULING ELDERS and DEACONS."¹

Further still, it is declared that "it is absolutely necessary that the government of the church be exercised under *some* certain and definite form. And *we* hold it to be expedient and agreeable to scripture and the practice of the primitive christians, that the church be governed by congregational, presbyterial and synodical assemblies. In full consistency with this belief, we embrace in the spirit of charity, those christians who differ with us in opinion or in practice on these subjects."²

In accordance with these catholic sentiments, we are taught that "the purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no churches, but synagogues of satan. Nevertheless, there shall always be a church on earth to worship God according to his will." Now with this doctrine, substantially, all denominations of christians not prelatical, agree ; and wherein they differ on these points, which regard the polity of the church, they nevertheless agree in believing that their difference is not — as far as relates to this question — a matter so absolutely essential or fundamental as to endanger the substance of the faith, or the salvation of souls. These things our church maintains. She holds them forth in her standards for the instruction of her own members ; and *requires* full compliance therewith from her own officers, as being "in her judgment agreeable to scripture and the practice of the primitive churches." But she leaves all other denominations free to act, as they may think most accordant to the will of Christ — by whom and through whom and with whom, as their common lord and master, she desires to hold "the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace, with all that in every place call on the name of the Lord Jesus, both theirs and ours."

Far different from this, however, are the claims of prelacy, as laid down in the doctrine of apostolical succession. In order that you may understand fully and clearly what is implied in this doctrine, we will exhibit, at some length, those points in which we agree.

It is then, we remark, mutually allowed, that the Lord Jesus Christ has established a church on earth, which is his kingdom — house — or family. That into this church the Lord, as his ordinary method, gathers such as shall be saved by the ministration of his word and spirit. That all are under obligation to be-

1) Form of Gov't. chap. iii.

2) Form of Gov't. chap. viii. § 1.

lieve on him, and to confess him before men, by a union, where this is possible, with his visible church. That, for the edification of this body and the perfecting of the saints, Christ has ordained two sacraments, of baptism and the Lord's supper, in connexion with the preaching of the gospel. That these are to be administered by those whom he has called into this ministry. We are also agreed in believing that this church is holy, catholic, and apostolic — visible and perpetual — one and unchangeable — and that she is the nursery of heaven.

Thus far our views are concurrent and harmonious, and we may say that we have one God and Father — one Lord and Saviour — one Spirit and Sanctifier, — one faith, one baptism, and one sacramental communion.

The claims of prelacy to which we object are, in addition to all that has been now stated — separable from it — and super-added to it. According to this system, the church of Christ is identified with the prelacy; to which, as such, is given by our Lord Jesus Christ, an exclusive supremacy and divine right, in perpetual possession. The holy, catholic, and apostolic church is, therefore, limited by the very necessity of the case — the terms of its original institution — to those churches which are prelatical in their form. To these are committed all the authority, in any way delegated by Christ to his church on earth. To this church alone is given, as an hereditary trust, "the grace of the episcopal order"¹ — that "sacred gift" whereby alone "any real vocation can be conferred to the ministry" — or any efficacy imparted to the administration of the word and sacraments. Now "this supreme authority" — we are further taught — having been given by Christ to his apostles, was, by them, committed to an order of men called "the episcopate," prelates, or bishops, who are alone empowered, to use the words of Epiphanius, "to beget fathers of the church by ordination," while presbyters, in virtue of the imposition of the bishop's hands, having *thereby* received "the inward grace of the divine commission with which the church has power to animate" their previously lifeless spirits² — are enabled "to beget sons by baptism," and to minister at the altar. "Episcopacy," (prelacy,) in short, as defined by Bishop Onderdonk, "declares that the christian ministry was *established in THREE orders*, called EVER SINCE the apostolic age, bishops, presby-

1) See all these expressions in Palmer, vol. ii. part 6.

2) "The church declares her full persuasion that the person set

apart has not before received the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the church of God." Bp Onderdonk.

ters or elders, and deacons; of which the highest only has the right to ordain and confirm — that of general supervision in a diocese — that of the chief administration of spiritual discipline — besides enjoying all the rights of the other grades," and "having the power of supreme discipline over the clergy."¹ All this "the church declares to have been established BY DIVINE INSPIRATION,"² and to be by divine right.³

This original grant, thus bestowed on the episcopate by the apostles, has been, we are also assured, transmitted by the church, and is to be traced through "an unbroken line" of prelates, in personal succession, from its first communication, until this hour; and the authenticity of any claim to this sacred and apostolic gift must be attested by the manifestation of this uninterrupted and unquestionable lineal descent.⁴ Every link in the chain by which the existing prelacy is united to the apostolate is, we are assured, in preservation — while any such succession is positively denied to any other church or denomination whatever.

"The real ground of our authority," say these divines, "is our apostolical descent."⁵ "The Spirit, the sacred gift, has been handed down to our present Bishops."⁶ "An uninterrupted series of valid ordinations has carried down the apostolical succession in our churches to the present day."⁷ "We must necessarily consider none ordained who have not been thus ordained,"⁸ "appealing to that warrant which makes us exclusively God's ambassadors."⁹ "Now every one of us believes this."¹⁰

From this view of the doctrine of apostolical succession, which is a fundamental article of the Romish church, and "which has been inherited and embodied by the Church of England, and other episcopal communions,"¹¹ the points of our difference may be as clearly developed as are the points of our agreement.

In opposition to this theory, (for we deny that it has any foundation in the word of God, or in reason,) we maintain, there-

1) See Wks. on Episcopacy, p. 419 and 436.

2) See do. Charge, 1831, p. 16, immediately applied to the deaconate.

3) "From its establishment to the present day, there have been three distinct orders in the priesthood." Pratt's Old Paths, p. 53.

4) See Palmer, vol. ii, p. 453. "There is not a bishop, priest or deacon among us, who cannot, if he please, trace his own spiritual descent

from St. Peter or St. Paul." Dr. Hook's Two Sermons, p. 7, 8.

5) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 6.

6) Do. do.

7) Dr. Hook do. do., and see Note A to Lecture 1.

8) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 11.

9) Do. p. 23 and 131.

10) Do. do. p. 10, and see Note A.

11) So speaks Mr. Isaac Taylor, an episcopalian, in his Spiritual Despotism, p. 145. Eng. Ed.

fore, that bishops are not, by divine right, an order superior to presbyters; or possessed of any one of their asserted prerogatives, in any higher degree than what is common to presbyters; or than has been voluntarily delegated to them by presbyters. We maintain that the ordinations of presbyters alone, are quite as valid as those by prelates and presbyters conjointly; and more regular than those performed by a single prelate; and that the ministry in the different reformed churches is equally valid and efficacious, to say the very least — whether examined as to its authority, or as to its results — with that of the prelatical communion.

You thus perceive that, in utterly repudiating and rejecting this sacerdotal authority — which is claimed by the privileged order of prelates, as their exclusive inheritance — as an arrogant usurpation, in part, of the rights of the other clergy; and in part, also, of a power and dominion never given by Christ to any officers whatever in his church; and as being thus an encroachment upon the authority of our only King and Law-giver, and upon the liberties of his people — we do not, in any degree, attach to ourselves the criminality of that heartless bigotry, which, because of such differences alone, would excommunicate from the kingdom of Christ, and consign to uncovenanted mercy, millions of professing christians.

We do not, therefore, reject ordination as a proper and necessary service. We set apart, by the public and solemn imposition of hands, such as give credible evidence that they have been already called of God to the work of the ministry. But we utterly deny that there is any mysterious efficacy in the hands of prelates, whereby that “*vis insita*,” which comes living along the line of their prelatical succession, can be imparted to their less privileged brethren. The source of all spiritual power and sacred gifts, we trace beyond any terrestrial springs, to the pure fountain of heavenly influence. We believe, therefore, that there have been many lord bishops who were not the Lord’s bishops, and many man-made ministers who were not called, or sent, or commissioned, by God, or acknowledged by him at all. “They are not all Israel that are of Israel.”

The question before us, then, is not whether a christian ministry is necessary to the christian church — or whether ordination is necessary to the *regular* induction of that ministry, within any particular denomination. Neither is it the question, whether episcopal ordination is valid — since ALL TRUE PRESBYTERS ARE BISHOPS, and bishops can be nothing more, even if true and valid,

than presbyters. We do not question whether one of these bishops or presbyters might be made a constant moderator of the presbytery, and thus become, officially, chief bishop or pastor, possessing delegated and exclusive powers.¹ The expediency of such a course we must strongly deny; but its legality we would not be hasty in rejecting.² Irenæus, we know, was thus moderator of the council in Gaul, for twenty-four years, while such a practice was customary, also, in the later Waldensian synods, and is still followed in the French presbyteries.³ We regard prelatial bishops as having originated in this very custom of the early church. But while we might thus allow to them this extrinsic and accidental authority, though not as by divine, but only by ecclesiastical right, we altogether deny that they possess any intrinsic or essential authority, with which presbyter bishops are not endowed. The original apostolic authority of both is, we contend, equal, supreme, and the same.

Neither would we dispute whether the concurrence of this chief bishop, or perpetual moderator, — where the custom of the church allows such a dangerous office to exist — just as in those churches, in which, (as in our own,) the office of moderator is temporary — is essential to a regular and valid ordination in that church. For this moderator is, by the very tenure of his office, the organ of the presbytery or council, and intrusted with its delegated authority — and in a proper sense, the minister of ordination; as being the mouth, the head, and the acting officer of the ordaining body. But that an exclusive, inherent, episcopal grace, is transmitted in an order of prelates, whose very office it is, by divine right, to govern and ordain other ministers; and this, too, so that no other ordination but theirs is allowable or proper; this is what we deny, and for which we demand sufficient proof.⁴ For this pre-eminence, we require the same positive and indubious testimony, which these very prelates demand of Romanists, when they assert the divine pre-eminence of Peter and of Rome.⁵ If even the admission that Peter was personally, on some accounts, foremost among the apostles, would not authorize the conclusion

1) On appointing moderators for life, see Hill's View of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, Edinb. 1803, p. 169, part 2, lect. 2.

2) On this danger, see Altare Damascenum, &c., Davidis Calderwood, Lugduni, 1708, 4to. p. 221.

3) Blair's Waldenses, vol. i. p. 36.

4) The artfulness of prelatists, in laying down their premises, is truly astonishing. Thus, in Chandler's Life

of Dr. Samuel Johnson, of King's College, New York, (New York, 1805, p. 25,) the question is thus stated: "No act of ordination and government, for several ages, was ever allowed to be lawful, without a bishop at the head of the presbytery." What does this make for diocesan prelacy?

5) See Palmer, vol. ii. part vii. chap. 1, et passim. See also Newman on Romanism.

that he had dominion over them ; neither would the supposition, that prelates are, by virtue of their office, foremost among presbyters, give them any supremacy over them.¹ And whatever we might be willing to grant as a privilege, we most resolutely deny, when it is required upon the ground of principle and of right. When these honorary officers would, therefore, boast themselves, over those who are the very founders of their office ; and assert a despotic and hereditary rule — then do we appeal to the word of God, and put in a demand for judgment, against this doctrine, as being, to use Mr. Newman's words, no less " gratuitous in proof than as it is in itself untrue."²

Neither, again, do we deny that there ever has been, and ever will be, a succession of ministers ; as there ever has been, and ever will be, a true and perpetuated church, whose ministers they are. To this church we belong, and to this succession we lay claim.³ But what we affirm to be a figment, and without any sufficient proof is, that Christ appointed three distinct orders in this ministry — bishops, priests, and deacons — that of these three essentially distinct orders, there ever has been, and ever will be, an uninterrupted succession, and that to these the gifts of the Holy Spirit have been limited, and through them alone are enjoyed. Irenæus says, " et ubi spiritus Dei, illuc ecclesia et omnis gratia ;" that is, where the spirit of God is, there is the church, and all grace.⁴ The presence of God's spirit, therefore, is the sure index to this " legitimate ecclesiastical perpetuity." We learn from him, says Faber, " both where we are not to seek the true catholic church, and where we are to seek it."⁵ Now has this Spirit, we ask, been confined to pre-

1) See Palmer, vol. ii. p. 488, 492, and Oxford Tr. vol. i. p. 92.

2) Newinan on Romanism, p. 136.

3) " We rejoice in the fact of the succession, such as it was, and of the tradition of a *regula fidei* as the common law of christianity ; and here we find an evidence of the origin and divine authority of our religion and of its principal doctrines. We regard the succession and tradition, *not indeed as authority*, yet as a valuable auxiliary or collateral elucidation of our ONLY standard of faith and practice, the holy scripture. But let me remark, —

" 1. Our argument does not turn upon the *personal* succession, a thing, notwithstanding the boasting of Dr. Cave, Mr. Bingham, &c., impossible to be satisfactorily made out. It [*i. e.* the genuine christian idea of succession,] lies in the transmission of *facts*,

the foundation of christianity, and of primary *doctrines* ; and this transmission attested by a succession of authentic writings. Does the certainty of our knowledge of the common law depend on our being able to produce a perfect list of lords chief justice ?

" 2. If the catalogues were indubitably complete, nothing would follow to the detriment of our views, or to the advantage of the style of episcopacy against which scripture and antiquity compel us to protest. We look at those pleasant lists with a smile of doubt ; but we see in their early links nothing but the idea of a line of lowly pastors of congregational churches." — Dr. Pye Smith's First Letter to Dr. Lee, p. 26.

4) Adv. Hær. Lib. iii. c. 40.

5) See on the Anc't. Vallenses, &c. p. 27.

lates and refused to all other, the reformed protestant churches? God forbid. But if we possess the "omnis gratia," the "all grace" — we may well be satisfied, even if we are denied by prelates the title of "ecclesia," or church.

This subject, therefore, involves in it plainly these three questions :

First, who are the divinely appointed ministers of the christian church — presbyters or bishops, and these alone, as one order — or bishops, presbyters and deacons, as three essentially distinct orders, having essentially different offices and powers?

Secondly, by what authority are these men called into the ministry? By the authority of God, or of man?

And thirdly, is this divine authority of the ministry committed to the church as a sacred deposit, to be transmitted in unbroken succession; and to depend for its virtue upon this unbroken succession, from the apostles to the end of the world? Or is it so immediately derived from Christ, through the agency of his Spirit, and so dependent upon his divine gift, that whether ecclesiastical order is interrupted or not, this authority can be communicated and preserved to the church?

If it is the doctrine of the Bible, that presbyter-bishops have only in part the divine authority which is there given in perpetuity to the ministry; that prelates alone have the power of ordination and of government — that to these prelates is committed the Holy Ghost — and that this heavenly gift cometh upon the church, not immediately from God, but mediately through these prelates, by a line of uninterrupted succession, so that without and beyond them, these sacred gifts cannot be enjoyed — then does it follow, that nearly the whole of protestant christendom lies beyond the pale of the church; and that while saying "peace, peace to themselves," they are still in the shadow of death, without God, and without hope. But if, on the other hand, ordination is the scriptural and legitimate work of presbyter-bishops — if all that authority, power and grace, which render any ministry effectual to salvation, is derived immediately from Christ, and is not communicable by any man or body of men on earth — and if the only succession which is at all essential to the true being, or to the well being, of any church, is a succession in the pure doctrine of the word of God, and in the due administration of God's two, and only appointed, sacraments — then does it follow that this system of prelacy is not only baseless in itself; but, what is far worse, that it is positively unchristian.

For this system, therefore, as now portrayed, and which we pronounce a schism from the whole reformation — we demand

express and indubitable sanction from the word of God. We fall back upon this written testimony, as the only inspired law—the only code of Heaven's institutes—the only rule by which we are to be judged, either of men, or as it hath pleased Him, by God himself.¹ On no lower authority than this, is it possible to sustain such unbounded assumptions; and to no other power will we yield subjection, while this magna charta of our spiritual liberties is in preservation.

The grounds upon which we rest the justice of this demand, that, being christians, we shall be tried at the bar of Christ, and if worthy of death, receive it at his hands, rather than fall into the hands of men, are in part, these :

I. In the first place, these same exclusive claims were asserted by the ancient heretics, as is taught us by Tertullian,² who says they were on this account to “be detected by the diversity of their doctrine.” The Arian churches which once prevailed to such an extent, and through so many countries; the Nestorian, Eutychian, Jacobite, and other churches, which were all in their turn condemned as heretical; had undisputed claims to this apostolical succession. The Greek, Armenian, Syrian, Abyssinian, and other oriental bodies, all assert their rightful possession of this hereditary title to the charter of the true church.

The mere production, therefore, of a catalogue of bishops, in all apparent regularity, from the apostles down to the present time, is nothing to the purpose. The Greek church, the Ethiopic, and others, are equally willing to spread out their endless genealogies. Bellarmine says, “the church of Constantinople has one from the emperor Constantine in an uninterrupted series, and Nicephorus likewise deduces the names of all the bishops, even from the time when the apostle Andrew flourished.” And yet, notwithstanding all this, Bellarmine and his Romish coadjutors deny to the Greeks any true and valid apostolical succession. They require in order to the substantiation of such a claim, not only an uninterrupted lineal succession of prelates, but also, that no single heretic shall be found among them all.³ Such, also, are the boasted pretensions of the Romish church, which excommunicates and anathematizes the English, as schismatical

1) John viii. 50, and xii. 48.

2) And so Cyril Hieros. Catech. 18 in Cary's Testimonies, p. 249. See Oxford Tracts, vol. 1, p. 37, § 8, and Oxford Tracts, vol. 1, p. 556, 557.

3) Bishop Williams urges this very argument against the Romanists. Notes of the Ch. Examd. p. 100, 101. “Suppose that a person that has imbibed this principle is in quest of the

true church, and had been living when Luther appeared, and had before him the Nestorians and Eutychians, the Armenians, Egyptians and Ethiopians in the east, the numerous churches of Greece, &c., which pretend to a duration as good and sufficient as that of Rome, and the last of which is acknowledged by the Bishop of Bitonto, in the council of Trent, to be ‘the

in its character, invalid in its ministry, and inefficacious in its sacraments.¹

Now, since there are different and rival claimants to this same high prerogative and supremacy,² we require a judge who may arbitrate their respective pretensions, before we abandon "a good hope" and a "well-grounded assurance," and submit our souls, we cannot tell whether to heretics, Romanists, or to Anglican prelates. Such a judge is the more necessary, inasmuch as, when our ship is once loosened from the firm moorings of scripture, we know not whither we are to be driven, but must allow ourselves to be swept by every wind of doctrine, without any cheering light from sun, moon, or stars. There is evidently no security, no rest, for the sole of one's foot, except in the form of sound words;³ and of this much we are assured, that the true church of Christ "knows no master but Christ, as he enjoined;"⁴ since "Christ has taught his church, by his scriptures, in what he will be glorified; and it is not for us to tolerate other ways, however they may challenge our admiration, for their ingenuity; or our kindness, by the seeming sincerity of their inventors."⁵

Neither do we believe there is any "via media," or middle path, between this exclusive supremacy of Bible doctrine, order, and polity, and the full-grown enormities of the papal hierarchy. For, if the church has committed to it, under divine guidance and promise, an inherent power of gradual development and progressive alteration, — then, why this power should be limited to the age of the Nicene church, or why it should be even termi-

mother of the Latin, and to which the Latin owes what it hath; how shall he be able to determine where he shall fix?" So also Bishop Fowler. *Ibid.* pp. 124, 123, 130 See also Dr. Thorpe in *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 136, 138, 140. "To pass by the christians under the Patriarch of Mozale, of whom Postellus saith, "Though they are but few in comparison of what they have been, yet they are many more than us Latins." To say nothing neither of the Armenian christians, falsely called Nestorians, (whose Catholic, as they call their patriarch, "Otho Frisangensis," reports to have under his obedience above a thousand bishops, from the report of his legates sent to Rome,) both which vast bodies of christians acknowledge no subjection to the see of Rome: I say, to pass these by, we need not instance any besides the Greek church, for the aforesaid pur-

pose; which hath had an uninterrupted succession of bishops, from the apostles, and is of greater antiquity than the church of Rome, and which hath produced more fathers than that church." See note B.

1) See Palmer, on the Ch. vol. 2, part 6. chap. ii.

2) "It is not true," says Bishop Onderdonk, in his charge on the rule of faith, (p. 7, Tract form,) "that tradition is the same among churches of different countries. For example; the Greek, Armenian, Syriac and Coptic churches do not agree with the church of Rome in regard to the traditions before us — that the latter is the mistress of all churches."

3) Oxford Tr. vol. 2, p. 425, and also pp. 423, 424.

4) *Ibid.*, 427.

5) *Ibid.*, 423.

nated at the period of the Tridentine council — we cannot possibly divine. If the church was authorized to re-construct, alter, amend, or beautify the glorious fabric of the christian temple, as left by Christ and his apostles, then do these church principles equally sanction the continued adaptation of this building, in its internal arrangements, and in its outer appearance, to the altered spirit and temper of the times.¹ The theory of the papacy, assumes the continuance, with the church, of a divine prerogative and supremacy of legislative control, which the theory of the prelacy regards as having ceased somewhere — the precise time she has not yet determined — between the third and the eighth centuries, according to the opposing views of her contradictory theologians.² But it can be, and has been shown, that the ripened system of popery, as it now exists, is nothing more than the maturity of those principles and practices, which were in full blow, as early even as the fourth age. And there is, therefore, most plainly no alternative, nor resting place, between the undisputed sovereignty of scripture, and the infallibility of the Romish church. The single question is between the Bible and the church. “The popery which is even now gathering over our heavens from all quarters, is nothing but the digested superstition which the good Augustine (and the other divines of the Nicene age) set forward in their day.”³

To sustain the enormous structure of a hierarchical and prelatic church, any other foundation is altogether insufficient, and hence if this is “a building of God, and not made with hands,” it must be shown to rest upon that rock, against which the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail.

It has been made obvious that the fact of uninterrupted succession — much more, the mere claim to such succession — can prove nothing as to the identification of the true church. Time was, when such a claim constituted no distinction whatever, and that confessedly, between the orthodox and the heterodox, the true and the untrue churches of Christ. And even now do we find various bodies, with very varying forms, ordinances, rites, ceremonies and doctrines, who regard each other as heretical and schismatical, and many of whose views, we, in common with three-fourths of protestant christendom, must esteem erroneous

1) See Dr. Miller's letter to Dr. Pusey, Lond. 1840, p. 11 and 13, &c.

2) Mr. Palmer and Dr. Pusey would seem to extend this period as late as to the year 1054, when the eastern and western churches were

separated by mutual excommunications. Palmer, on the Ch., vol. 2, p. 189. Miller's Letter to Dr. Pusey, p. 12, 28.

3) See Ancient Christ'y, vol. 1, p. 445, et passim.

— all asseverating that they inherit this pure, unadulterated, uninterrupted, indefectible, or infallible succession. As plain, therefore, as any thing can be, this mark can never guide us to the true church, since it may just as readily guide us to the false. And therefore must it be made evident from holy writ, that Christ has left his promise and all his bequeathed inheritance of divine blessings, with the prelacy of England; or with any prelacy whatever; or that Christ — a fact we have never yet discovered — has instituted any such thing as a prelacy at all. For as Hooker remarks, “our conviction can only be of that strength which the evidence will warrant, and one scripture proof must outweigh even ten thousand general councils.”¹

“We allege, as a second reason for our demand of a full and explicit scriptural authority for these high-church principles, that were they — supposing them to be correct — of essential importance, they would have been plainly revealed in scripture, and be susceptible of plain scripture establishment.

Whether there is such an institution as the church of Christ at all, can be known surely only from the scriptures — now written and completed — but during the lives of our Lord and his apostles, delivered orally, and from time to time. This fact cannot be made certain to us by any uninspired men, for the church is an institution of God, for the accomplishment of his wise and gracious ends, and can be made known only by Him; either through a written revelation, or in some other mode. The church being thus divine in her origin, must receive her charter from heaven, and this must be contained in that revelation, which is now preserved in a written form, for our guidance. But it is equally plain that this charter alone, can declare what is the nature — what the constitution — what the faith, order, worship, laws and powers of this heavenly society. Being not a natural body, not originated or moulded by man’s wisdom or sagacity, but being altogether a mystical body, and removed from human comprehension or discovery, the entire platform, genius, and design of the church, must evidently depend upon her institution, her sacred charter, her heavenly commission, and that code of laws framed for her by her supreme and ever-living Head.²

1) See Wks., vol. 1, p. 181, 182, 183, and Chillingworth’s Wks. vol. 1, p. 316.

2) “Whether there can be any such thing as a church, or not, we can only know by the scriptures.” “For certainly the church has no charter but what is in the scripture.” “For the charter which founds the church, must

declare the nature and constitution of it, what its faith and worship, and laws and privileges, are.” Bp. Sherlock, in notes of the Church Examd. and Refuted, pp. 9 and 6.

Again, “the church is not a natural but a mystical body, and therefore its nature depends upon its institution.” Do. p. 23. “And therefore if

It is, then, incontrovertibly plain, either that there is no such thing as a church, or that every thing essential to the being of that church, which it is imperatively binding upon all her members to observe and follow, must be contained in that divine institution from which she derived her origin. Now prelacy asserts the absolute necessity, to the very being and continuance of the church, of a succession of prelates as one of three orders in the ministry; and therefore is it most manifest that such a doctrine, and such an order and orders, must all be made clear from this heavenly institute. Otherwise, though the whole world were against us, as it was against Athanasius, we abide by the charter, and in the name of its divine author, the omnipotent and all-wise God our Saviour, we hold in abeyance all the synods, convocations, and œcumenical councils which may attempt to wrest from us this title-deed, signed and sealed in the courts above.¹

If such a prelatical succession is essential to the true church, so that there cannot be a true, and pure, and safe church, without it; then would our Lord have necessarily "designated, in express terms, that could not be mistaken," the nature, order, and character of such succession, and by such specifications on his part, would have rendered any miraculous proofs needless for our full satisfaction. It is only by such a definitive specification of this doctrine, or by the continued presence of a miraculous agency bearing attestation to it, that christians in all future ages could have been assured of the truth of this fundamental article. Certainty on this point was most certainly to have been expected, since the very object of this doctrine is to exclude all rival or differing forms of polity, from having any

there be any, they must be instituted notes." Do. p. 24. "Whatever institution makes proper and necessary it makes essential." "And it is certain there can be no other rule or standard of the church, but its institution as to faith and worship and government."

"As no covenant can originally be made for God, but by God himself; it hence follows that God only can make or constitute a church." Danbury's Guide to the Ch. vol. 1, p. 44.

1) Thus speak the authors of the Notes of the Church Examined and Refuted. See p. 9, 6, 23, 24, &c. On p. 47, Bishop Sherlock says: "Should synods, and convocations, and œcumenical councils, determine that for an article of faith, which is not plain and intelligible in scripture, they were ridiculous indeed, and that were an

end of their authority." Archbishop Whateley holds this language, (Dangers to the Chr. Faith, Lond., 1839, p. 171): "If it were possible that all the christians now in existence — suppose 250 millions — could assemble, either in one person or by deputations of their respective clergy, in one place, to confer together; and that the votes, whether personal or by proxy, of 230 or 240 millions of these were to be at variance (as in many points they probably would be) with the decision and practices of our own church, we should be no more bound to acquiesce in and adopt the decision of that majority, even in matters which we do not regard as essential to the christian faith, than we should be, to pass a law for *this realm*, because it was approved by the majority of the *human race*."

participation in the benefits of Christ's kingdom, and all exercise of private judgment in otherwise interpreting the word of God.¹

That error cannot be fundamental, even "our enemies themselves being judges," which consists in the rejection of a doctrine that is only probably revealed by Christ, "while there is a probability that he did not reveal it." "In this case," we are instructed, "error is tolerable."² Now, in order to establish against us, the charge of wilful denial of a certain truth, — which conduct is, we are told, "heretical, anti-christian, and destructive of salvation,"³ — the certainty of the revelation of that truth must, of course, be made apparent.

When we consider, how these church principles are consonant to the pride, pomp, and circumstance, which are so dear to the natural heart, — how perfectly they are in unison with the strongest feelings and prejudices of the Jewish people — and how often the apostles manifested the outbreking of this self-same spirit — we may well feel assured, that had not these apostles been restrained from doing so, by a divine influence, they would have fully developed, and frequently asserted them.⁴ This argument becomes conclusive, when, in contrast with the course pursued by the apostles, we consider the bombastic and fulsome exaggeration with which many of the fathers, and later churchmen, expend all their force of energy and of eloquence, in the establishment of these — to them, all-important verities. But further: "no bishop — no church," is a current maxim in the system of prelacy. Now, it is on all hands allowed, that the writers of the New Testament employed the word bishop interchangeably, and as synonymous, with the word

1) See Whateley's Dangers to Chr. Faith, Essay iii. § 4. "Now," says Dr Howe, (Vind. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 361,) "nothing will serve as a basis for a divine institution but an *express warrant* of scripture; now, it is quite sufficient if the institution be capable of being fairly proved from scripture."

Bishop Onderdonk, in his charge on the rule of faith, remarks: "that in proportion to the magnitude of the structure should be the strength of the foundation," which is, says his Roman catholic reviewer, "true in logic as well as in architecture." See the Catholic Miscellany, March 6, 1841. He further adds, "that without a clear and explicit scriptural basis, the whole structure of infallibility can only rest on the foundation of human fallibility."

"But," to apply this bishop's words, "has this enormous structure a foundation of proportionate strength? No, it has not — none in scripture — none in common sense and sound reasoning." (See p. 33, in the Tract form.)

2) See Palmer, vol. i. p. 131.

3) Do. do.

4) "But a visible priesthood, with power and parade, officiating within the perimeter of holy rails, at altars of gold or marble, and mimicing meditation with divers well-contrived ceremonies and shows of intercession, is gross food for the natural man, and such as his coarse palate does exceedingly relish." (Beverley's Heresy of Human Priesthood, p. 7.)

5) See Hinds on Inspiration, p. 79 and 85.

presbyter. But since the apostles gave very full and explicit directions to the churches they addressed, on all points deemed important; and were led to do so by the teaching of the Holy Ghost;—it would have been the more necessary to guard their readers against the inference which must be otherwise drawn, as to the identity of these officers. Prelacy being true, and being of essential importance, we cannot imagine how the apostles should have said what they *have* spoken, and should have left unsaid what they might have so easily declared.

Christ commanded us to call no man master on earth, and before submitting, therefore, to this yoke of bondage, we must be certified of the authority by which it is imposed. Christ represented his kingdom as divided into different provinces, under the dominion of as many separate governors as he then had chosen ministers, and we ask where he has reduced it to one consolidated and absolute monarchy.¹ Christ is held forth to us, every where, as the only head of his church; and as carrying on all its operations by his own immediate and divine presidency; and we ask where he has consigned this sceptre, and intrusted this rule, to prelates—these *self-styled* successors of the apostles.² Christ commanded his ministers to go forth as heralds, not as legislators—as servants, not as masters—as teachers of what he commanded, and not as enforcers of what he commanded not. The Jewish Rabbis are condemned, for making the law of God,—which, like prelates, they professed fully to receive—of none effect by those traditions, with which they overlaid and obscured them. Now we must be certified that these prelatical church principles are not, likewise, traditions of the elders, and therefore to be condemned.

That which is essential to salvation, is held forth in scripture so plainly that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err. Such truths are as a city set on a hill, toward which we can hardly miss our way, if sincerely desirous to reach it. They are proclaimed so openly, so unreservedly, and so clearly, that whosoever believeth may be saved. But these writers would persuade us that the main difference between the Jewish and christian dispensations, lies in the *difficulty* of discovering the precise requirements of the christian ritual; and that instead of being a law of liberty, it is a law of severity, of constraint, of formality, and of external rites. But is this indeed so? “To the law and the testimony.”³

1) See Mark 29, 30.

2) See the Dudleian Lecture, by the Rev. John Tucker, A. M., Boston, 1778. “The validity of presbyterian ordination argued from Jesus

Christ being the sole legislator and supreme head and ruler of the christian church.”

3) See note C.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE SECOND.

NOTE A.

That we do not overcharge the picture, will appear from the statement of the question as given by its three ablest American advocates.

Dr. Bowden declares that he has proved "that *diocesan* (his own italics) episcopacy is of divine origin."* "I had proved," says he,† "that bishops in the third century were diocesan; that they were raised from the presbyterate to the episcopate by a new ordination; that they possessed the supreme power of the keys; that they were the sole ordainers; that they alone confirmed; that all orders in the church were subordinate to them, and that bishops of this kind were instituted by CHRIST."‡

The doctrine is thus laid down by Dr. Howe: † "Well, the supposition is, that Christ established distinct grades of ministers, and conferred upon the highest grade the exclusive power of ordaining. When a minister of the highest grade, then, ordains, Christ ordains; when a minister of the second grade ordains, it is not Christ that ordains, but man. Thus episcopal ordination confers the sacerdotal office; presbyterial ordination does not. If, therefore, the former ordination be laid aside, and the latter be substituted in its place, the sacerdotal office must cease to exist; and as there can be no church without a ministry, the church must cease to exist also.

"Man can no more make a minister of Christ than he can make a Bible. The sacerdotal power can come only from the great Head of the church; and it can come from him only in the way of his appointment."

Dr. Cooke thus presents the question: § "We have express warrant for saying, that there was an order of clergy superior to presbyters; that their superiority rests on the appointment of CHRIST, and that with this superior order alone were deposited all the treasures of ministerial order and succession. Moreover, that we have the positive testimony of those to whom this superior order committed the church, as their successors, that they, when the church was settled, dropped the name of APOSTLES, messengers, and, now that they were confined to the oversight of the church in one city and the district of country surrounding it, assumed to themselves the more appropriate name of OVERSEERS or bishops, and continued to exercise the powers of the superior order,"|| viz. the apostolic order.

Bishop Meade, in his sermon at the consecration of Bishop Elliott, with a particular reference to Archbishop Laud, gives the following outline of the high-church doctrines on this subject:

"1st. That before Jesus Christ left the world, he breathed the holy spirit into the apostles, giving them the power of transmitting this precious gift to others by prayer and the imposition of hands; that the apostles did so transmit it to others; and they again to others; and that in this way it has been preserved in the world to the present day.

* Letters, 2d series, Letter ii. p. 18.

† Do. Letter iii. p. 25. See also p. 26, 36. See also Works on Episcop. vol. ii. p. 63 and 73.

‡ Vind. of the Prot. Episc. Ch. p. 351.

§ Works on Episcop. vol. ii. p. 250.

|| Washington, 1841, p. 94.

"2d. That the gift thus transmitted empowers its possessors, 1st, to admit into, and exclude from, the mysterious communion called in scripture the kingdom of heaven, any one whom they judge deserving of it; and this, with the assurance that all whom they admit or exclude on earth and externally, are admitted or excluded in heaven and spiritually, in the sight of God and holy angels; that it empowers them to bless and intercede for, those who are within this kingdom, in a sense in which no other man can bless or intercede. 2d. To make the eucharistic bread and wine the body and blood of Christ in the sense in which our Lord made them so. 3d. To enable delegates to perform this great miracle by ordaining them with imposition of hands.

"According to this view of the subject, to dispense with episcopal ordination is to be regarded not as a breach of order merely, or a deviation from apostolical precedent, but as a surrender of the christian priesthood, a rejection of all the powers which Christ instituted episcopacy to perpetuate; and the attempt to institute any other form of ordination for it, or to seek communion with Christ through any non-episcopal association, is to be regarded not as schism merely, but as an impossibility."

In Nos. 51 and 52 of the Oxford Tracts we have these strong expressions: "Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution to save other men. There is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus, and that is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church."

NOTE B.

ON this point a few more references may be made.

This inatter, says Episcopus in his Labyrinth or Popish Circle, Arg. vi., is so clear, that even the learned Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine, acknowledges these two things: 1 That the argument concerning succession is not adduced by his party to prove that the church in which this succession may be found, is on this account to be considered the true church, but only to prove that that is not the true church in which such succession is wanting. 2. That antiquity and continued succession avail nothing to the Greek church, or at least to that of Constantinople, nor even to all the eastern patriarchates, for proving them to be the true church, because the thread of legitimate succession among them has been broken by some of their bishops having been heretical. From these remarks it clearly follows, that when the succession is made out, the principal question respecting truth remains still to be determined. For when an uninterrupted succession is proved, if it cannot be infallibly collected and concluded that the church which has such succession is the true church; and if it must be rendered apparent that no heresies or heretical bishops have interposed in the succession; reason itself dictates that succession is introduced to little or no purpose, unless we are fully informed respecting that which constitutes the truth in doctrine; for whilst truth is unknown, it is impossible to determine what is or what is not heresy.

Of this succession, Turretine says it cannot be a note of the church;* "quid competit etiam falsis Doctoribus. Annas et Cajaphas successerunt Aaroni in sacerdotio, Scribæ and Pharisæi succedebant Patribus et Legis interpretibus, Ariani succedebant orthodoxis, Ecclesia Græca, quam Pontificii habent pro schismatica et hæretica, successione non interrupta Episcoporum ab apostolis gloriatur. Bellarminus ipse de notis Eccles. lib. 4, cap. 8, sub finem, fatetur, non posse inferri necessario Ecclesiam esse, ubi est successio.

"Si successio localis est nota ecclesie, ergo multæ Ecclesie hæreticæ et schismaticæ sunt veræ ecclesie, quia possunt habere talem successionem, ubi falsi Doctores succedant in loca et in sedes verorum Pastorum."

So also in his treatise, "De Secessione Necessaria ab Ecclesia Romana," he says,† "Scribæ et Pharisæi succedebant versis doctoribus, qui tamen seductores evant, et veritatis hostes accerimi. Sic Ariani, succedebant orthodoxis; sec tenebræ luci; morbus sanitati; Tyrannus pio, principi succedit."

See also Stapferi Institutiones Theologia Tom. 1, p. 423, § MDXXVII.

* Opera Tom. iii. p. 121, twice.

† Op. Tom. iv. p. 216, 217.

That the Greek, Ethiopic, Syrian and other churches equally depend on an uninterrupted succession, see also Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. pp. 83, 84. Causa Episcop. Hier. Lucif. Edinburgh, 1706, 4to. pp. 181, 182. Dr. Fulke Conf. Rhem. N.T. on Eph. iv. 13.

On the claims of the Greek church and its condemnation of others, including the Romish, see Pinkerton's Transl. of Platon's Summ. of Chr. Div. Edinburgh, 1814, p. 162, 163. See also, Tracts by the ever-memorable John Hales, of Eaton. London, 1727, p. 210.

NOTE C.

When we demand express scripture authority for that which is to be maintained, as of divine right, we do not mean that the proposition is to be discovered there, in so many words; but that if not there in words, it will be found to follow from its words, as a clear and evident consequence. "It is quite sufficient," to use the words of Dr. Howe, "if the institution (to wit, prelacy) be capable of being *fairly proved* (his italics) from scripture."

Such a clear and evident proof for them as such, has been ever required by protestant writers. This rule of protestantism is thus expressed by Conder, in his Nonconformity, vol. ii. p. 317: "The sufficiency of the Bible, as a rule of faith and practice, is to be considered as exclusive, not of other means of rational guidance, but of all other sources of authority in matters of religious duty. It is not implied, that nothing but what scripture commands is lawful, but that nothing which scripture has not made to be duty, can, as respects the concerns of religion, be constituted our duty by the authority of man. The word of God is our only rule, in the sense both of a law and a standard; a rule sufficient, as opposed to all deficiency; exclusive, as relates to the divine authority from which it emanates; universal, as embracing all the principles of human actions; and ultimate, as admitting of no appeal. For all religious purposes, it is literally the only rule, because the divine command constitutes the only reason, as well as the only law of religious actions; and there can, therefore, be no scope for other rules, except with regard to the mere outward circumstantialities of religious duties, which do not come within the obligations of any law."

This demand is fully sanctioned by Dr. Bowden, in the following canon:* "But as there is no probability that we shall meet one another upon this point, the least I think you can do, as a reasonable and candid opponent, is to consider these texts as involved in some degree of obscurity; and, therefore, upon every fair principle of criticism, not affording sufficient ground for either your practice or ours. It is conceded by all men of sense, that no doctrine should be founded upon a single passage of scripture, when that passage is not perfectly clear in itself; and especially when there are strong objections upon other grounds to any particular sense given to it,"

That all things necessary to be believed, are to be found expressly in scripture, see taught by Hooker, Eccl. Pol. B. 3, § 2, vol. i. p. 208 and 210, Hanbury's Ed. and B. 3, § 18.

When Elizabeth required her chaplain to perform divine service before a crucifix which she kept in her chapel, Dr. Cox wrote to her as follows: "I ought to do nothing touching religion, which may appear doubtful whether it pleaseth God or not; for our religion ought to be certain, and grounded upon God's word and will."†

See also Jackson's Works, vol. iii. p. 890. Oxf. Tr. vol. i. 42, 46, 48. Whatcley on St. Paul, p. 366. Do. on Romanism, 173. Jeremy Taylor in Powell, p. 12. Dodsworth on Scripture, on p. 12. Potter on Ch. Govt. p. 119, and 278 and 281; see also p. 27. Stillingfleet, Iren, p. 118. Stillingfleet, Irenic, Pt. 2, ch. i. p. 151.

See also some good remarks in Dr. Mitchell's Letters to Bishop Skinner, London, 1809, Prel. Disc. p. 29, &c.

* Works on Episcop. vol. p. 153.

† McCrie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 156.

LECTURE III.

THE TRIBUNAL, BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION MUST BE ADJUDICATED.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

THE question before us, as fully stated in the preceding Lecture, is the prelati doctrine of apostolical succession.

“The doctrine in dispute is this : that Christ founded a visible church as an ordinance forever, and endowed it once for all with spiritual privileges, and set his apostles over it, as the first in a line of ministers and rulers, like themselves, *except in their miraculous gifts*, and to be continued from them by successive ordination ; in consequence, that to adhere to this church thus distinguished, is among the ordinary duties of a christian, and is the means of his appropriating the gospel blessings, with an evidence of his doing so not attainable elsewhere.”¹

For the truth of this theory, we demand express and indubitable sanction from the word of God, the only tribunal by which this question can be finally and authoritatively settled.

In support of the reasonableness and propriety of this demand, we offered two arguments :

I. Such plain and evident corroboration is made necessary by the fact, that the claims involved in this doctrine were urged by the ancient heretics, and are now preferred by various bodies differing very materially from each other. Of necessity, therefore, recourse must be had to some umpire who can decide upon their respective claims. This umpire is the written word of God.

II. Such proof is necessary and reasonable, because if this doctrine, as is alleged, is of essential importance, then would it have been, as all articles of fundamental importance are, dis-

1) Oxf. Tr. No. 74, vol. iii. p. 129.

tinctly revealed in God's written word, and thus be capable of clear and certain proof.

We will now proceed to our next position.

III. A third ground for demanding full and explicit scripture authority for these principles, is, that they constitute new terms of communion, and that not with any particular church, but with the church universal, which Christ alone is competent to institute and prescribe.¹

Upon these principles, prelates not only debar us from *their church*, which they may, but from the church of Christ, which they may not. They not only thus unchurch us, but they unchristianize us. They not only cut us off from the benefits of episcopalianism — whatever those may be — but they turn away from us every possible stream that flows from the fountain of salvation.² Now, for thus binding upon our shoulders a burden too heavy to be borne, and for thus shutting the kingdom of heaven, so as to leave us no covenanted possibility of entrance, we may fairly demand the witnessing impression of a heavenly warrant.

This conclusion follows also from the argument of Mr. Keble, one of the most able of the Oxford Tractators, in his truly Romish treatise, (I mean in the spirit and tendency of it,) “on Primitive Tradition.” He here argues that the deposit committed by the apostle to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 14) contained “a CERTAIN SYSTEM OF CHURCH PRACTICE, BOTH IN GOVERNMENT, DISCIPLINE, AND WORSHIP.”³ Of course, therefore, since this system was then certain and perfect, and as far as ascertainable, is to be by us “retained and revered,” we having now all that was by the Holy Ghost deemed necessary to convey this certain system down to the end of time, in the scriptures, which were afterwards written; and in the accounts there given of the actual order instituted by the apostles in their churches; must be able from them to learn this certain system of church practice, in government, discipline, and worship.” The apostle evidently claims, for what he had thus committed to Timothy, a divine right and title. But if this “certain system” was thus of such supreme importance, and “given by inspiration of God,” and, as such, committed to Timothy; when the apostle was led to write those epistles, which “are for our instruction, on whom the ends of the world have

1) See Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord. London, 1680, Part 1, ch. x. p. 100, &c.

2) See Palmer, vol. i. pp. 68, 71.

3) In the Smaller Catechism of (the Roman catholic) Bishop England,

is asked, (see pp. 29, 30,) “Is it not in the power of men to change the mode of governing the church? No; because no men have power to change the permanent regulations of God.”⁴

4) 4th Edn. 1839. Lond. p. 21.

come," he must have left on record, not only "the treasure of apostolical doctrines," but of "church rules," and "this certain form and system of church practice." And while we may allow, that during that period of the church, when these divine scriptures were as yet unwritten, and they existed only as communicated orally by the apostles, that oral teaching constituted a part of the rule of faith and practice; yet now, that the canon of inspiration is completed, and is left for our guidance, and as such is universally received, we argue—and we are sustained even by Mr. Keble—that these scriptures are not only "a test of positive truth, but may also be appealed to negatively: that is, their silence may be quoted, as excluding any point from the list of truths necessary to salvation."¹ So that now "every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned books of that canon."² It is, therefore, as this writer adds, "the golden rule not of the Anglican only, but of the catholic church, that nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith, necessary to salvation, but what is contained in, or may be proved by, canonical scripture."³

The authority of the church is derived exclusively from the Word of God. This is her charter and her rule. By this is she astricted and compassed in all her legislation and enactments, so that whatsoever is beyond, as well as contrary to this, cometh not of God. The church can institute no new office or order, as of divine authority.⁴ "The assumption of authority is lawful" only "in the sense of power conferred by Christ upon his church."⁵ "It would also be sinful and detestable to teach merely human theories and opinions, as equally obligatory on the conscience of Christians with the doctrines of revelation; for God himself has said, "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."⁶ All true power is from God; and God, who has declared to us his will in the revelation of truth, will not oblige us to receive as such, any the least deviation from this only fountain of truth.⁷

"We all grant," says Mr. Jones, of Nayland, himself a high-toned prelatist, "in common with Dr. Samuel Clarke, that the legislative power of the church cannot extend to matters of doctrine: for the power that can make a law can unmake it, and then it might follow that the church might dispense with any doctrine of scripture."⁸ Either, then, this whole subject of apostolical succession is a doctrine, and

1) Keble on Pimit. Tradit. p. 29.

2) Ibid, p. 30.

3) Ibid, pp. 30, 31.

4) See Burnet in Vindication of Ch. of Scotland, p. 355.

5) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 304.

6) Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 110, 111.

7) See Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 109.

8) Rem. on the Conf. Wks. vol. ii. p. 346 and vol. iv. p. 429.

therefore beyond the legislative authority of the church, and binding only so far as it can be proved by scripture; or it is not a doctrine, and therefore to be ranked under the head of things indifferent, and of consequence, not essential to salvation.

But since the church of Christ subsists perpetually by the same divine promises and charter; that which is foreign to the constitutional powers of the church now, was also unconstitutional in every preceding century, up to the very time when her high commission was first issued; and hence, at no period of her history, was it competent for the church to legislate authoritatively on matters of doctrine. Of necessity, therefore, it follows, that at no time past, present, or to come, can this theory of apostolical succession be a doctrine, unless made certain from the divine charter. Otherwise, to insist upon it as such, is a manifest assumption of despotic rule in the house of God.

Unless, therefore, it can be shown, that these high church principles, which have ever been "attended with asceticism and superstition,"¹ are so clearly borne out by scripture, that nothing may *probably* be alleged from the sacred oracles *against* them, they cannot be proved to be necessary doctrines; and may therefore be rejected, "without," as Chillingworth says, "any fault at all,"² or at least without endangering salvation;—since those points cannot be "fundamental which are deducible from scripture, but probably only, and not certainly."³ We are accused of heresy, because we deny that these church principles can be discovered among the divine institutes—the only canon of infallible laws—and heresy, we are at the same time informed, "excludes from salvation."⁴ Now heresy is defined by these same divines, to be "the *pertinacious*, or obstinate denial, of some truth *certainly* revealed,"⁵ (their own italics.) "It is agreed generally, that pertinacity or obstinacy is required to constitute formal heresy;" and "I add," says the learned Palmer, "*certainly* revealed, because if there be a legitimate doubt in a controversy, which of the two contrary doctrines was actually revealed, either may be held without heresy."⁶ These doctrines, consequently, must be shown to be so CERTAIN as to exclude any legitimate doubt; and further, to be rejected by us after having been thus demonstrated from scripture; before

1) Anct. Chr., vol. i p. 503.

2) This point is distinctly argued against the Romanists by Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 159, &c.

3) Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 161. See also p. 215, where this plain determination of scripture is demanded

of the Romanists on another question.

4) Palmer, vol. i. p. 91.

5) Ibid.

6) Palmer, vol. i. p. 92. This point is also urged by Mr. Newman against the Romanists, in his lectures. See p. 255.

this fearful charge, involving such awful consequences, can, on their own principles, be excused from "horrible audacity, in coolly consigning entire communities, including the most eminent individuals, to eternal perdition."¹

There is still another ground on which we may urge the necessity of this plain revelation, and expose the dilemma to which these principles conduct their abettors — if indeed, by this test, they are not "evaporated altogether."

In his great work prepared for the use of theological students, and designed to imbue their minds, not with doctrinal truth, but with these high-church principles, Mr. Palmer most unequivocally asserts, that "confirmation, ordination, episcopacy," &c., are rites and ceremonies, and come under "the discipline" of the church.² Now, "if any rite," as he further teaches, even though "mentioned in scripture," was not given by all the apostles, under the express sanction of the Holy Ghost; "or not delivered to *all the churches* by the apostles;" "then it must be regarded as designed only for temporary uses." Again, "if any rite, or discipline, be not traceable in scripture, it cannot be essential or invariable." "All rites which are supported by ancient tradition only, might be omitted by the church for special reasons." "All rites and discipline, whose early prevalence may be accounted for without apostolic institution, or which were only received by a portion of the church, may be omitted." And further, "those rites not mentioned in scripture, and which are found by experience to be injurious to christian piety, *in consequence of extreme abuses connected with them*, OUGHT TO BE REMOVED BY THE CHURCH."³

Now, on each and all of these grounds, do we object to prelacy, and to high-church principles, as being in direct antagonism, in their certain tendency, to the spirit and principles of the gospel.⁴ And to make these principles articles of faith, is to assume a greater power than that exercised by God himself,

1) This is the language of the episcopal author of Anct. Christ'y. See vol. i. p. 490, where he shows that "the frightful impiety of denying the possibility of salvation to dissidents" must follow from these principles. That it is not against faith to reject even points fundamental, unless sufficiently proposed as revealed by God is a position taken by Romanists, as in Chillingworth, vol. i. pp. 336, 338

2) See On the Ch. vol. ii. p. 71.

3) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 70, 74.

4) "The laws of attraction and repulsion are universal and invinci-

ble, as well in the spiritual as in the material world. A deep antipathy reciprocally repels THE GOSPEL, and a religion of asceticism, superstition, and sacramental efficiency. NEVER have the two systems been combined, although often they have been tightly bound together by stringent creeds, in the same church-bundle. The epistle to the Galatians turns entirely upon this irreconcilable contrariety between God's religion and man's religion. Whoever, therefore, adheres to the latter, finds himself, as if by an irresistible and invisible hand, drawn

since He makes essential, only such points as are really necessary to salvation.

This system, so far as it stands distinguished from evangelical episcopalianism, is in unquestionable opposition to the entire catena of the apostolic, and inspired authors — the true fathers, founders, and authorities of the christian church. For such a system, therefore, which is made to stride the entrance to the kingdom of heaven, like the cherubim with the flaming sword in the garden of Eden, to be a consuming fire to all presbyterian and other sectaries, who may venture to approach — for this system we must demand, before submitting to it, the most plain, palpable, and certain scripture evidence.¹

IV. A fourth ground upon which we stake the merits of this demand, for the most clear and unequivocal scripture authority, in support of these exclusive pretensions is, that it is in accordance with the doctrine, and the spirit of Protestantism.

The doctrine of protestantism cannot be more satisfactorily stated, than — in the language of an episcopal writer, Mr. Isaac Taylor, already quoted, and whose language we use rather than our own, because he is an episcopalian, — “That no article of worship, discipline, government, or opinion, which, however well attested as belonging even to the apostolic churches of the first century, is nowhere alluded to, or enjoined, in the inspired scriptures, can be binding upon the church in after-times; for we adhere to the belief, and on this very ground renounce Romanism, that, whatever our Lord intended to be of permanent observance in his church, he has caused to be included in the canonical writings; and secondly, that points so attested as ancient, and yet very slightly or ambiguously alluded to by the inspired writers, are not to be regarded as of prime necessity, or insisted upon as conditions of communion.

“Again, at the present moment, the christian community, and especially the clergy of the episcopal church, are called upon to make their choice between APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY, and ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY; and this weighty alternative must soon merge all other distinctions, leaving only the two parties — the adherents of the inspired, and those of the uninspired documents of our religion.”² “What we mean by protestantism,” says

away from the former: a dread fatality pursues him, from step to step, of his course; he himself struggles against what he feels to be an ominous tendency; — he wistfully returns twenty times to a point nearer to the foot of the cross, and as often is borne away, as on the bosom of a smooth

river toward a cataract.” Anct. Christ’y. vol. i. p. 503

1) See Rutherford’s *Due Right of Presbyteries*, Lond., 1644, 4to, pp. 224, 223, ch. iv. § 5.

2) Anct. Christ’y. vol. i. p. 510 and 110.

Mr. Taylor, in his preface to the Life of Luther, “can be nothing less than a renouncing the religion of man’s contrivance, and a returning to the religion which God has revealed; and to effect this return, we must recede, not toward the sixth century, not toward the fifth, nor toward the fourth, nor the third, nor the second: not to the times of Polycarp or Ignatius: not even to the age of the apostle John; but we must go where alone revealed religion is to be found — namely, to God’s Book.”¹

No mere human power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, has any right or authority whatever, to make essential to salvation, either the form of church government, or the manner of administering its discipline and rites; so far forth, as they are not so propounded in the Word of God. This is that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free — in which we stand — and for which we must contend earnestly, and if needs be, even unto blood. From those carnal ordinances, in which were prescribed the minutest detail of religious services and ecclesiastical offices, we have been delivered; and what should bewitch us, having been once freed from bondage, to be again enslaved to these weak and beggarly elements? Were the apostle alive, he might address the abettors of such a system, as he did the Galatians: “Ye observe days and months and time and years, I am afraid of you.” Let us here use the language of that eminent episcopalian, Dean Stillingfleet, in the preface to his *Irenicum*: “Will Christ ever thank men at the great day for keeping such out from communion with his church, to whom he will vouchsafe not only crowns of glory, but it may be *aureolæ* too, if there be such things there? The grand commission the apostles were sent out with, was only to *teach what Christ had commanded them*. Not the least intimation of any power given them, to impose or require any thing beyond what himself had spoken to them, or they were directed to, by the immediate guidance of the Spirit of God.

1) See the fundamental principles of the reformers well laid down in Dr. Owen’s answer to Dr. Stillingfleet, in *Wks.*, vol. 20, p. 232, &c. First. “The first was, that the scripture, the Word of God, is a perfect rule of faith and religious worship; so as that nothing ought to be admitted which is repugnant unto it in its general rule of especial prohibitions, nothing is imposed that is not prescribed therein, but that every one is at liberty to refuse and reject any thing of that kind.”

Secondly. “The second principle of the reformation whereon the reformers justified their separation from the

church of Rome was this, that christian people were not tied up unto blind obedience unto church guides, but were not only at liberty, but also obliged to judge for themselves, as unto all things that they were to believe and practise in religion and the worship of God.”

Thirdly. Another principle of the reformation is, “That there was not any catholic, visible, organical, governing church, traduced by succession into that of Rome, whence all church-power and order was to be derived.”

It is not whether the things required be lawful or no? which I now inquire after, (of those things in the treatise itself) but whether they do consult for the churches peace and unity, who suspend it upon such things? how far either the example of our Saviour, or his apostles, doth warrant such rigorous impositions? There were great diversities of practice and varieties of observance among christians, in the apostolic times, but the Holy Ghost never thought those things fit to be made matter of laws, to which all parties should conform. All that the apostles required as to these, was mutual forbearance and condescension towards each other in them. The apostles valued not *indifferences* at all, and those things it is evident they accounted such, which, whether men did them or not, was not of concernment to salvation. Without all controversies, the main inlet of all the distractions, confusions, and divisions of the christian world, hath been by adding other conditions of church communion than Christ hath done."

These fundamental principles of protestantism, that the church can never *make* any thing to be wrong, but can only declare or hold forth, that which is made wrong by the Word of God,¹— and that it has no authority to make *necessary* as articles of faith that which the Bible has not made certainly necessary, — these principles are held forth, as if engraven on their fore front, by all the reformed churches in christendom.²

Luther, in his preface to the Bohemic confession, says, "Let us remember that all the rites and observances of all churches never have been, or could be, uniform and alike; for the circumstances and varieties of men do not permit it. Only let the doctrine of faith and morals be preserved, for this ought to be the same."

Melancthon says, "As we agree respecting the chief articles of christian doctrine, let us embrace each other with mutual

1) See Palmer vol. ii. p. 262, and the Church Indep. of Civil Gov't. p. 62, by an Episcopalian.

2) The reformers and later divines rejected the claim of uninterrupted succession as a mark of the true church. See De Moor Comment. vol. 6, p. 54; Turretini Opera, tom. III. p. 121, de Notes Ecclesiæ; and tom. iv. De Seccessione, p. 216. For a full and elaborate collection of the testimonies of the reformers, the reader is referred to Blondel's "Actes Authentiques des Eglises Reformées de France, Germanie, Grande Bretagne, Pologne, Hongrie, Pais Bas, &c. Touchant la paix et charite frater-

nelle, que tons les serviteurs de Dieu doivent saintement entretenir avec les Protestants qui ont quelque diversité, soit d'expression, soit de methode, soit mesme de sentiment, rassemblis en un pour la consolation et confirmation des ames pieuses, et pour l'instruction de la posterité, à Amsterdam, 1655," 4to. The clergy of England receive even her creeds, as Bp. Bull testifies, "upon this ground, prinarily, — because she finds that the articles thereof may be proved by *most evident* testimonies of Scripture." Vind. Ch. Eng. § xxviii. p. 106. See also Voeuius Desperata Causa Papatus, Amst. 1635.

love. Nor ought dissimilitude and variety of rites and ceremonies to disunite our affections."

Calvin did not regard the peculiarities of the Lutheran church, as any just cause of disunion between it and the Reformed. He desired that the most catholic union should subsist among all the churches of the reformation, exclaiming, "I should not hesitate to cross ten seas, if by this means holy communion might prevail among the members of Christ." In his exhortation to the Lutheran churches, he says, "keep your smaller differences, let us have no discord on that account; but let us march in one solid column, under the banners of the Captain of our Salvation, and with undivided counsels pour the legions of the cross upon the territories of darkness, and of death."

Knox ministered to a church at Frankfort, in which a form of modified liturgical service was employed.

"We do not," says the Helvetic confession, "by a wicked schism separate and break fellowship with the holy churches of Christ in Germany, France, England, or other nations of the christian world."

"For it is of little moment," says the Polish agreement at the synod of Sendomir in 1570, "what rites and ceremonies are employed, provided the fundamental doctrine of our faith and salvation be preserved entire and incorrupt."

"In 1614, at the general synod held at Tonneins, a plan of union was proposed, which was to allow each of the churches to retain its independence, and its own order."

The sixth article of the Church of England, declares that "whatsoever is not read in scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is NOT to be required of any man, that it should be believed AS AN ARTICLE OF THE FAITH!" Again, in article 20th, after the interpolated passage, (as we must regard it,) it is said, "It is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written . . . and as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so, besides the same ought it NOT to enforce any thing to be believed for NECESSITY OF SALVATION." Again, in the canon of 1571, it is enjoined that "preachers shall be careful NOT to preach aught to be religiously held and believed by the people, *except* what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected from THAT NEW DOCTRINE, by the catholic fathers and ancient bishops."

Bishop Burnet, in his commentary on the thirty-nine articles, very strongly contrasts this characteristic of the Church of

1) See these quoted on Schism, p. 483, &c.

England, with "the tyranny of the church of Rome; which has imposed the belief of every one of her doctrines on the consciences of her votaries, under the highest pains of anathemas, and as articles of faith."¹ This he regards as "intolerable, because it pretends to make that a necessary condition of salvation, which God had not commanded."

That this was the doctrine of the English reformers, cannot be doubted. Thus Hooper tells us, that Christ left his will "unto the world in writing, by the hands of his holy apostles, unto which writing only he has bound and obligated his church, and not to the writings of men."² "It is mine opinion unto all the world," he adds, "that the scripture solely, and the apostles' church, is to be followed, and no man's authority, be he Augustine, Tertullian, or even cherubim or seraphim."³ "The church of God, therefore, must be bound to no other authority than unto the voice of the gospel and unto the ministry thereof, as Isaiah saith, 'seal the law among my disciples.'" Indeed, the very first article in the confession which this bishop and martyr drew up, as monitory articles for his clergy, in A. D. 1551, is "that none do teach any manner of thing, to be necessary for the salvation of men, other than what is contained in the books of God's holy word."⁴

That such also were the sentiments of the earliest puritans, is made manifest from the very first paragraph in the "Sacred Discipline," drawn up by Cartwright, the opponent of Archbishop Whitgift. "The discipline of Christ's church, that is necessary for all times, is delivered by Christ and set down in the holy scriptures; therefore, the true and lawful discipline must be fetched from thence and from thence alone, and that which resteth upon any other foundation ought to be esteemed unlawful and counterfeit."⁵

"We say," says Cartwright, "the word is above the church,

1) See *Intro.* p. 8.

2) See in the *Brit. Reformers*, vol. vii. p. 30.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 23 and p. 27, and again at p. 200 and 220.

4) "The cause why I die," said John Frith, who was offered up a sacrifice on the altar of British tyranny, by the bloody hands of Henry VIII., "is this: (Price's *Hist. of Nonconf.* vol. i. p. 48,) for that I cannot agree with the divines and other head prelates, that it should be necessarily determined to be an article of faith, and that we should believe, under pain of damnation, the substance of the bread and wine to be

changed into the body and blood of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, the form and shape only not being changed. Which thing, if it were most true, (as they shall never be able to prove it by any authority of the scripture or doctors,) yet shall they not so bring to pass, that that doctrine, were it never so true, should be holden for a necessary article of faith. For there are many things, both in the scriptures and other places, which we are not bound of necessity to believe as an article of faith."

5) In *Neal's Puritans*, vol. v. Appendix, p. xi

[Eph. ii. 20,] then, surely, it is above the English church, and above all these books before rehearsed." "The puritans contended for a rigid adherence to the letter of apostolic institutions and practice, while Whitgift maintained that a discretionary power was vested in the rulers of the church, to modify and regulate its ceremonies. The one appealed to the Word of God, the other to the writings of the fathers. The one required conformity to the example of the apostles; the other obedience to the mandate of the prince."—"Neither is the controversy betwixt them and us," say the writers of the *Admonition*, "as they would bear the world in hand, as for a cap, a tippet, or a surplice; but for greater matters, concerning a true ministry and regiment of the church according to the word, which things once established, the other melt away of themselves."¹

This fundamental principle of the sole and exclusive supremacy of scripture, as the arbiter and judge in all controversies, and the only fountain of authority and source of necessary doctrine; was the foundation upon which truly enlightened christians, in all ages, even the darkest, rested their confidence in bearing testimony against the growing corruptions of the church. Thus, for instance, that eminent man, Claude, metropolitan of Turin, in the ninth century, in his commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, "with an evident reference," says Faber, who quotes the original words, "to the state of religion in his own time, declares, that what constitutes heresy, is a departure from that interpretation of scripture which the sense of the Holy Spirit demands." He remarks, at the same time, "that real heretics, of this description, are to be found within, as well as without the pale of the church."²

"It is in vain, therefore," that I may employ against prelates what they address to Roman catholics, "to adduce passages from the fathers, where they speak of the catholic church as *one* communion, from which all heretics and schismatics are cut off." "These," says Mr. Palmer, "do not touch the question whether the catholic church itself may ever be divided in point of external communion." There is no "promise," he adds, "of its perpetual and perfect external union," and yet "this is what Romanists ought to produce before they affirm the impossibility of any division in the church, or the certainty that the catholic church can only exist in some one communion."

1) Second Admon. in Price Hist. Nonconf. i. 250, and pp. 236, 237, and 230.

2) See Faber's *Albigenses*, p. 313.

3) Palmer on the Church, vol. i. pp. 78, 77, 76.

Now claiming, as we do, but not in exclusion of others, to be one communion of the catholic church ; before we are cut off from this privilege, some promise or declaration of Christ, by which we are excommunicated, and by which the church of Christ is confined to the one communion of the prelacy, must assuredly be produced.

The assumption that they are the church, which prelatists so frequently make, we interpret as arrogance. Their retreat to the authority of the fathers, we regard as an avowal of the fact, that they have no sufficient evidence from scripture. These very pretensions, thus built upon the fathers, the best of those very fathers, as we have evidence to show, would most sternly rebuke.¹ And to such an outcry against this tyranny over Christ's free-born subjects, would be added the loud and unmingled reprobation pronounced upon it by the fathers of the English church, and the noble army of modern reformers. Their history informs us, that they perilled life, endured the loss of favor and of fortune, and suffered even unto death, that they might establish and perpetuate the sole supremacy of scripture, and the inalienable right of appealing from the decision of man to the judgment of God, as the only test of the purity and the perfection of our faith ; the only infallible rule

1) Upon the authority which is claimed for the early christian writers, Mr. Isaac Taylor remarks :

"It would be doing an injury to the reputation of the illustrious men whose writings are in question, if we were to speak as if they had claimed, in their own behalf, any such power to interpret scripture despotically ; or to legislate for the church in all following ages. They do no such thing. Whatever may have been their faults, *this impiety is not of the number.* It is altogether the product of the wicked despotism of a late age. None do the fathers so grievous a wrong as do those modern champions of church principles who are attributing to them an authority which they themselves religiously disclaim. Who are the enemies of the fathers ? the men who now are thrusting them, by violence, and against their solemn protest, into Christ's throne.

"The harsh treatment to which these good but greatly erring men must unavoidably be exposed, in the rude struggle which is yet before us, for rescuing apostolic christianity, cannot but do an injury to their just reputa-

tion. In proving them to have grossly perverted the gospel, and to be among the worst guides which the church can follow, we are driven to the necessity of producing evidence which no motive less imperative would have led us to bring forward. The same happens in every analogous instance ; to thrust a man into a position not due to him, is to expose him to the peril of being treated ignominiously.

"Let it then be clearly understood that, in vigorously contending, as we shall, for the paramount and *unshared* authority of the inspired writings, and in demonstrating that the strongest and most peremptory reasons of *fact* as well as *principle*, forbid the attempt to conjoin the records of the ancient church with them ; we are at war, NOT WITH THE MEN whose writings are in question, but with those ill-advised champions of church power, in modern times, who have put these writings in the room of God's word. It is the modern mystery of wickedness, not so much the ancient error, which we are laboring to overthrow." *Anct. Christ'y.* vol. ii. Eng. edit.

of faith and practice. "The Bible and the Bible alone, is the religion of protestants." "The religion of the protestants is the Bible. The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of protestants. Whatever else they may believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own ground believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it from others, without the most high and schismatical presumption."¹

V. We therefore make this appeal, fifthly, on the ground, that the right and privilege to demand it is not only recognized by the fathers of the reformation, and by all the reformed churches, but is, as has been already in part shown, a right admitted and acted upon whenever needed, by our opponents themselves.

However far high-church prelates may be disposed to carry their sacerdotal claims of exclusive prerogative and authority, against those whom they denominate dissenters; yet are they obliged, in coming into collision with the Romish church, to fall back for protection, into this fortress of scriptural supremacy. Nor do they even decline to make such a retreat, when hard pressed by the force of some one of those protestant arguments, which may be termed — to use a military phrase — invincibles.

If, therefore, we require the most clear, irrefragable, and indubious scripture proof, for this divine right of prelates, and for this passive obedience of all but the favored few; they will themselves teach us how to frame our apology. Thus, in arguing against the great protestant doctrine of private judgment, (which we had supposed was now a received, and not a disputed truth among protestants,) Mr. Newman asks: "Can any one text be produced, or any comparison of texts, to establish the very point in hand, that scripture is the sole, necessary instrument of the Holy Ghost in guiding the individual christian into saving truth."² Now, surely, to say the very least, it is as important to establish, by such positive scripture evidence, the divine right of prelacy, as the coördinate authority of tradition.

Take a second illustration, from another Coryphæus among modern high-church writers. Mr. Palmer, in arguing against popular election, as sufficient to constitute any man a minister, says: "But the grand, and unanswerable proof of its unscripturality," is the fact, confessed by the most ardent advocates for such election, that "no case occurs in the inspired history, where it is mentioned that a church elected its pastor. This

¹) Chillingworth's Wks. vol. i. ch. 7, § 56.

²) On Romanism. p. 199.

fact," says he, "is undeniable, and it is conclusive." Now, in the same way we argue, if there is any passage in scripture, by which prelates are empowered with all the prerogatives now claimed, — and this, too, as a hereditary right, to be carried down by personal descent, to perpetuity — let it be shown; or otherwise we must affirm that this very silence of scripture is a conclusive and unanswerable proof against them; "for it is not to be supposed," says this same writer, "that scripture would omit all notice of the very *essentials* of the christian ministry."¹

"How is it possible," asks Bishop Taylor, "that the scriptures should not contain all things necessary to salvation, when, of all the words of Christ, in which, certainly, all necessary things to salvation must needs be contained, — there is not any one saying preserved but in scripture alone."² "An opinion," says Mr. Newman, "which, in addition to the indirect evidence resulting from the foregoing remarks, seems to be sanctioned by the concluding words of St. John."³

But still further, when we demand, that the evidence thus to be produced from scripture, shall not be constructive, and inferential merely; we are sustained in this position, by Bp. Onderdonk himself, who in his tract on this subject affirms, that "against the taking for granted any mere hypothesis, all sound reasoning protests."⁴ He further says, "the right of these elders (or presbyters) to govern and ordain, cannot be claimed, as resulting from construction or implication," since "nothing of implication can be valid here."⁵ Now, if this is true of the claims instituted by presbyters; it must be equally true as applied to the assumptions of prelates, since their exclusive supremacy cannot be deduced from construction or implication.

If prelacy, therefore, as Mr. Palmer teaches, is to be ranked under the head of rites and ceremonies,⁶ then it cannot be made a fundamental doctrine; nor of the substance of the faith.

1) Palmer, on the Church, vol. i. p. 171.

2) Dissuasive, part 2. B. 1, § 2.

3) On Romanism, p. 365; see also pp. 366, 367.

4) Episcopacy tested by Scripture, in Works on Episcopacy, p. 424.

5) Ibid. p. 432. We cannot refer to a stronger exhibition of our position in all its fullness and in every particular, than to Bishop Onderdonk's charge on the Rule of Faith, forming Tract No. 67, of the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society. See especially pp. 38, 39, where he argues against infallibility — lays down the very

principle contended for — and urges the very demand we press. In his Vindication of the Church of England, Bishop Bull alleges it as one of the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome, that she maintains "that all things necessary to be known and believed unto salvation, are neither in express terms or by *necessary* consequence, delivered and contained in the holy scriptures; and that there is need of the tradition of the church, as a supply in this case." Oxf. ed., p. 10.

6) See Palmer on Ch., vol. 2, p. 71.

If, on the other hand, it is a necessary article of faith and of fundamental importance ; then it cannot be so regarded without explicit scripture warrant.¹ On the contrary, to make that a necessary doctrine, which scripture does not make necessary ; is, we are told, “sinful and detestable in the sight of God ;” for says Mr. Palmer, “the church of Christ would be apostate, if it taught positively what was false in faith, or contrary to the gospel of Christ.”² Those who reject such articles when made necessary, were those articles, in their proper degree of relative importance even scripturally true, “are neither heretics nor schismatics in the sight of God, and are therefore in a state of salvation.”³ Nay, we are still further taught, that many things may be “theologically and absolutely true,” and yet “not properly articles of faith, necessary to salvation, because they involve questions of fact and of human reasoning which are not self-evident, and on which men may be divided without doubting the doctrine of revelation itself.”⁴

“The pure word of God” in short, “means the doctrine CERTAINLY REVEALED by Jesus Christ, neither mutilated nor corrupted ;”⁵ and if any body of men, be they prelates of the English or of the Roman school, “should be guilty of such rejection or contradiction, and obstinately persist in them, it would,” says Mr. Palmer, “be *apostate* and cease, *ipso facto*, to be a church of Christ.”⁶ In arguing against the Romish doctrine of the unity of the church, as implying union under one spiritual jurisdiction or government of any kind, Dr. Barrow also says, “It is reasonable that whosoever claimeth such authority, should, for assuring his title, show patents of his commission, manifestly expressing it ; how otherwise can he justly demand obedience, or any with satisfaction yield thereto ?”⁷

“It was just that the institution of so great authority should be fortified with an undoubted charter, that its right might be apparent, and the duty of subjection might be certain.”

“If any such authority had been granted by God, in all likelihood it would have been clearly mentioned in scripture ; it being a matter of high importance among the establishments of christianity, conducing to great effects, and grounding much duty.”⁸

1) See in proof Newman on Rom. pp. 225 and 260. Palmer, vol. 2, p. 74, Obj. iv., and vol 1, p. 92, and vol. 2, p. 323, 362 ; Keble on Tradition, p. 30 and p. 74 and 77, 4th ed. Sententia Johanni. Davenantii Episcopi Sarisburiensem Cantab. 1640, pp. 9, 22, 30, 35, in the Old South Ch. Lib. Also his Ashortatio, &c., cap. ii. p. 49. In *ibid*, p. 45.

2) Palmer, vol. 2, p. 110, 111.

3) *Ibid*, vol. 1, p. 109, and see p. 86.

4) Palmer, vol. 2, p. 262.

5) *Ibid*, vol. 1, p. 45.

6) *Ibid*, vol. 1, p. 64. That the church has authority only in things indifferent, see also Jones (of Nayland) Works, vol 4, p. 429, and vol. 2, p. 346.

7) Works, vol. 1, fol. edit. p. 771, 2d and 5th.

8) See *ibid*, p. 551.

We are thus particular in illustrating the fact, that in arguing with Romanists, or upon any other important subject than the powers of the ministry, churchmen avouch to be true and valid, the doctrine we have laid down; because in reference to this subject of prelacy as being *jure divino*—such a demand for a distinct, certain, and clear revelation in the word of God, has been generally denied. The appeal to scripture, as the only standard by which the merits of this question can be tested, has been set aside for the decisions of councils, and of fathers. And as this is a point of great practical importance — and goes far to invalidate the theory in question, we will here present unanswerable evidence for its truth, reserving some further testimony, for the concluding argument under this branch of our subject.

Archbishop Whitgift explicitly avows it as his opinion, that the question was not whether “the platform of discipline” drawn up by the puritans “were fitly used in the apostles’ time — but may now well be used in sundry reformed churches. This,” says he, “is not denied.”¹ He maintained, that “though the holy scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church government and discipline; but that this was changeable and might be accommodated to the civil government we live under; that the apostolic government was adapted to the church in its infancy, and under persecution, but was to be enlarged and altered as the church grew to maturity and had the civil magistrate on its side.”² “The diversity of our times from the apostles, requires a diverse kind of government and of ordaining of ministers.”³

That this was the early judgment of the English church, Dr. Willet affirms.⁴ “The third opinion is between both; that although this distinction of bishops and priests, as it is now received, cannot be directly proved out of scripture, yet it is very necessary for the policy of the church, to avoid schisms, and to preserve it in unity. Of this judgment Bishop Jewel against Harding showeth both Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Hierome to have been.⁵ And among the rest, Hierome thus writeth, “Apostolum perspicue docere &c.” that the apostle teacheth evidently that bishops and priests were the same; yet he holdeth this distinction to be necessary for the government of the church. “Quod unus post electus est, qui coeteris prae-

1) See quoted in Neal’s Puritans, vol. 1, p. 240. Mr. Keble denominates Whitgift “the church’s defender,” see Primitive Tradition p.102. He is also called “the Church of England’s watchful patron.” Pref. to

Saravia’s Priesthood, Oxf. 1840, p. 5.

2) Ibid, p. 237, and p. 465.

3) Whitgift Def. of the answer to the Admon.

4) Syn. Pap. p. 273. fol.

5) Defens. Apolog. p. 242.

poneretur in schismatis factum est remedium. That one afterwards was chosen, to be set over the rest, it was done to be a remedy against schism.¹ To this opinion of S. Hierome, subscribeth Bishop Jewel in the place before quoted, and another most reverend prelate of our church in these words," &c.²

1) Ep. Ad Evag.

2) We will here add some other authorities. Dr. Willet, in his great work against "Papistrie," says, (Syn. Pap., p. 266.) "As for the names and offices of sub-deacons, readers, exorcists, acolythi, door-keepers, we have no such warrant out of the scripture, to make them orders of the church: and therefore we condemn them. All necessary orders for the edifying and building of the church the scripture hath prescribed. (Eph. iv. II.) There are all offices set down needful for the doctrine, instruction and edifying of the church. (Fulk. Eph. iv. § 4.) Wherefore away with these popish orders invented by men. But as for other offices and services, which shall be thought meet for the affairs and business of the church, they may be retained and kept, but not as new orders of the ministry."

Hooker* acknowledges that these controverted points, belong to the outward things of the church and not to its being. (Eccl. Pol. B. 3, § 1, vol. 1, p. 194.) That there were different forms in the apostle's days. (Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 36, 37.) And that the evidence of scripture on the subject of episcopacy is doubtful. (Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 30, 33.) And while it is asserted in the book of Common Prayer, that these orders are clear to all who diligently read holy scripture, Hooker shews that this whole subject is entirely beyond the reach of ordinary men. (Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 26, 27.) He makes it out that no form of church government is taught in scripture. (Eccl. Pol. B. 3, § 2, vol 1, pp. 207, 212, and B. 3, § 11.) That various forms may be equally consonant to it. (Eccl. Pol. B. 3, § 2, vol. 1, p. 208. And that this is not among the things essential at all. (Ibid. B. 3, § 2, vol. 1, pp. 208, 210, 211, 212.)

* "Perhaps there is no work," says Bishop White, in allusion to the Ecclesiastical Polity "which from the circumstances connected with it, has so good pretensions to be considered as evidence of the opinions of the leading churchmen of the period." Lect. on the Catechism, Philad. 1813, p. 426.

Bishop Warburton thus speaks of Hooker: (Controv. Tracts, p. 467, as quoted in Meth. Quart. Rev., 1841, p. 78:) "The great Hooker was not only against, but laid down principles that have entirely subverted all pretences to a divine unalterable right in any form of church government whatever. Yet strange to say, his work was so unavoidable a confutation of puritanical principles, which, by the way, claimed their presbytery as of divine right, that the churchmen took advantage of the success of their champion, and now began to claim a divine right for episcopacy on the strength of that very book that subverted all pretences to every species of divine right whatsoever."

Thus says Dr. Hammond:* (Pow. of Keys, in Pref. Oxford Tracts, vol. 3, p. 144;) "Who were the apostles' successors in that power, which concerned the governing their churches which they planted? and first, I answer, that it being a matter of fact, or story, later than the scripture can universally reach to, it cannot be fully satisfied or answered from thence; but will, in the full latitude, through the universal church in these times, be made clear from the recent evidences that we have, viz., from the consent of the Greek and Latin fathers, who generally resolve that bishops are those successors."

Bishop Heber also teaches, that Jeremy Taylor erred in this respect, and that the claims of prelacy are not to be based on the arguments from scripture, (see Taylor's Works, Heber's ed. and Life, vol. 1, pp. 181, 183, and 186.) but on "apostolical tradition" which is, says he, "the strong, and if I may be allowed the expression, the impregnable ground of the episcopal scheme." "It happens, however," he further says, (Serm. in Engl. No. 12, p. 250, Am. Ed.) "to be in our power to show, if not an explicit direction of Christ for the form of our church government and

* "Hammond's name alone, were there no other, binds us to the English church," &c. Oxf. Tr., vol. 3, p. 3.

Rushworth informs us, that in his days, (he wrote in the year 1618,) "prelacy was almost universally held, by the prelates themselves, to be a human ordinance, which may therefore be altered or abolished, in cases of necessity, without wronging any man's conscience."¹ Thus, in the famous debate with the parliament divines, in 1648, King Charles allowed, that bishops, as "successors of the apostles in all things not extraordinary, such as teaching, and governing, — are not mentioned, as a distinct order, in the New Testament;" while, on the other hand, these divines were of opinion, "that human testimony on both sides ought to be discharged, and the point in debate be determined only by scripture—and since your majesty," say they, "cannot produce any record from scripture, warranting the division of the office of teaching and governing into two hands, we must look upon it as an invention of men, to get power into their hands."² "His majesty in reply," relies, as he says, "on the numerous testimonies of ancient and modern writers, for the scripture original of bishops;" while he modestly insists, at the same time, that "testimonies from those fathers, even of an equal number, to the contrary, are of no value whatever."³

the manner of appointing our spiritual guides, yet a PRECEDENT so clear, and a pattern so definite, as can leave little doubt of the INTENTIONS of our divine master, or of the manner in which those intentions were fulfilled by his immediate and inspired disciples."

Bishop Tomline (see Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. pp. 376, 401, and 427., declares, that "as it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness, &c. The gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents. Faith and good works are the only things indispensably required for salvation." And again: "*Neither Christ nor his apostles prescribed any particular form of ordaining ministers, to be observed in succeeding ages; but they left this, with other things of a similar nature, to be regulated by the church.*" See also Paley's Works, vol. 6, p. 91.

1) So quoted in Neal, vol. 2, p. 496.

2) Neal's Puritans vol. 1, pp. 428.

3) Neal's Puritans, p. 431, and Life of Alexander Henderson. Dr. Pusey would not allow us any greater favor in our investigation of the fathers even could we feel at liberty to receive their testimony as authoritative. In his preface to the Library of the Fathers, and in treating upon their proper use, he says,—(Li. of Fath. vol. 1, p. xvii. xviii.) "The end then of this study is not discovery of new truth, for new truth there is none in the gospel; not any criticism of their own church, this were irreverent and ungrateful; not to see with their own eyes, for they will come to see with their own eyes, but not by making this their object; not to compare ancient and modern systems and adopt the one or the other, or amalgamate both, taking of each what seems to them truth; this were to subject the truth of God, and the authority which he has placed over them, to their own private judgment; it is not criticism of any sort, no abstract result of any sort, nor even knowledge in itself, but to understand and appreciate better and realize more thoroughly the estate to which God has called them, as members of that branch of the church catholic, into which they were baptized, and in which, perhaps, they have been or look to be, made his ministers."

In like manner, we find in a recent article on the "Use of the Fathers," in a standard high-church periodical, a re-assertion of this principle. "We wish," says the reviewer, "this humble effort might first of all direct the eyes of churchmen to see where the hidden power of the Church of England lies, that her defenders may not go forth to the contest, with armor that they have not proved, nor rob themselves of those essential graces, which are to them, not the works of comeliness, BUT THE SECRET of their strength."¹

That episcopacy cannot be substantiated from scripture alone, is also the general doctrine of the Oxford divines in their celebrated works.² "We do not find the origin of episcopacy exactly recorded," says Mr. Palmer,³ "but it is probable,"⁴ he adds. "Every one must allow," say the tractators themselves, that there is next to nothing on the surface of scripture about these (i. e. these church doctrines,) and very little even under the surface, of a satisfactory character."⁵

"If we were to take the several articles of what is called church doctrine," says the author of *Ancient Christianity*, himself an episcopalian, "in the order and under the perspective in which we find them, WHERE ONLY WE DO FIND THEM AT ALL,—namely, in the extant remains of the early church,—for if we give up these records, we have no other sufficient warrant for paying them any regard"⁶

"The claims of episcopacy (prelacy) to be of divine institution, and therefore obligatory on the church, must rest, however," as we have proved by the admissions of some of these writers themselves, and as Bishop Onderdonk expressly avows, "fundamentally on the one question—has it the authority of scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding. No argument is worth taking into the account that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic—the scriptural evidence of episcopacy," i. e. prelacy.

And so, in entering upon his treatise on the different degrees of the christian priesthood, Hadrian Saravia says,⁷ "I seek not to

"This indeed is the greatest practical end of the study of the fathers—not to prove any thing, not to satisfy ourselves of any thing, but to bring more vividly home to our own thoughts and consciousness the rich treasures of doctrine and decoration, which our church has from their days brought down for us."

1) See *British Critic*, Jan. 1838, p. 47. The writer then speaks of "the

concurrent voice of antiquity as the sure guide to all fundamental truth."

2) See *Oxford Tr.* vol. 4. Tr. 81, p. 1.

3) Vol. 2, p. 382.

4) *Ibid*, p. 383.

5) See also other quotations from them in *Ancient Christianity*, vol. i., p. 241.

6) *Ibid*, pp. 242, 243.

7) See p. 19, *Oxf. edit.* 1840.

be believed beyond what is EXPRESSLY declared in the word of God, or may be proved from it by the clear deduction of reason."¹

This, then, is the only demand which we prefer. Christianity, whatever it implies, is our choice. The scriptures, whatever they make necessary, are our rule, — the truth, as it is herein revealed; — the whole truth, as by these oracles it is proclaimed; — and nothing beside, beyond, or in superaddition to that truth. Episcopacy proved by scripture — to this we are ready humbly and implicitly to bow; — while any thing but this, we as resolutely disclaim. The system of the apostles — as distinct, and distinguishable, from the church principles of an after-age; — christianity as opposed to pharasaic religionism; — the gospel as contrasted with hierarchical traditions; — the decrees of God, in their wide separation from the impositions and burdensome canons of innumerable councils: this is the foundation, without any intervening stratum of human authority, upon which we build. All pharisaism, Judaism, Nicenism, and Romanism, kindred and identified as they are, in all essential principles, we disavow. All such "ecclesiastical pretensions," which lead their authors to the avowal, that "we know nothing from revelation of any grace, any christian ministry, any sacraments, or any salvation, beyond the church,"² (i. e. of the prelacy) — we must regard as "adding the guilt of outrageous impiety to the sin of schism."³

1) "No fact can be established by reasoning solely; whatever, then, hath been reasoned by the ingenuity and research of men contending for parity, is of no moment until the fact be previously established by proper evidence." Bish. Ravenscroft's Vind.

p. 38, in *Evang. Mag.* vol. 9, p. 562. See also p. 31, and pp. 40, 41, 42, to 57.

2) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 431, and 436.

3) *Ancient Christianity*, vol. i. p. 488.

LECTURE IV.

THE TRIBUNAL, BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION MUST BE ADJUDICATED.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

WE now resume the discussion of the prelitical doctrine of apostolical succession. This doctrine is thus defined by Bishop Beveridge:¹ "In the first place, I observe, how much we are all bound to acknowledge the goodness, to praise, magnify, and adore the name of the most high God, in that we were born and bred, and still live in a church, wherein the apostolical line hath, through all ages, been preserved entire, there having been a constant succession of such bishops in it, as were truly and properly successors to the apostles, by virtue of that apostolical imposition of hands, which, being begun by the apostles, hath been continued from one to another, ever since their time, down to ours. By which means, the same spirit which was breathed by our Lord into his apostles is, together with their office, transmitted to their lawful successors, the pastors and governors of our church at this time; and acts, moves, and assists at the administration of the several parts of the apostolical office in our days, as much as ever. From whence it follows, that the means of grace which we now enjoy are in themselves as powerful and effectual as they were in the apostles' days," &c.²

If this doctrine is essential, and the powers assumed by it are necessary to the origination and perpetuation of a true church on

1) Serm. on Christ's Presence with his Min. in Wks. vol. ii.

2) "That fountain of supernatural grace which was opened for you

when you were consecrated to be an apostle." Keble on Trad'n. p. 10, in ref. to Timothy.

earth, then must it be susceptible of proof from holy writ, as clear and undeniable as any other article of fundamental importance. That such clear and positive evidence must be given by the abettors of this system, we have shown, first, from the fact that various and opposing claimants set forth the same pretensions, and there must be some tribunal by which their claims may be determined. Secondly, if this doctrine is a fundamental one, then it must be found clearly laid down in the Word of God. Thirdly, as the doctrine is made to constitute a term of communion with the Catholic church, since Christ alone, as the head of the church, is competent to institute such terms, therefore must it be shown that Christ instituted this. Fourthly, we urged this demand for positive scripture proof, on the ground that such a claim is in perfect accordance with the doctrine and the spirit of protestantism. And, fifthly, we made this appeal, on the ground that the same requisition is urged whenever needed, by our opponents themselves.

VI. A sixth ground upon which we require this unquestionable scripture authentication of this doctrine is, that before allowing to the fathers — the decisions of councils — and the practice of the church, an authority co-ordinate with, or authoritatively interpretative of, the Bible; that authority must be substantiated by evidence of no less weight than that which is given for the Word of God.

If a secondary authority is to be admitted, by which the primary is to be directed how to speak, when to speak, and for whom to speak; and by which its plainest declarations are to be pronounced obscurest; and its obscurest hints proclaimed as the plainest and most binding edicts; and by which no meaning can be put upon any of its most evident relations, but what is sanctioned and allowed by this interpreter; then is it at once manifest, that what is thus nominally the secondary authority, is in reality the primary, the supreme, and the only authority; and that what is denominated the primary source of authority, is of no authority whatsoever. The scriptures, in this view of them, instead of being the source of authority, are subsidiary to no other purpose than the introduction, the exaltation, and the glorification of the church — that is, the prelates of the church; for, from the church, as thus considered, the unofficered laity are entirely excluded. They have neither voice, authority, or interference in the whole matter. Their duties and their privileges are summed up in the one word, OBEEDIENCE.

Now, if the universal consent and agreement of fathers, councils and churches, (if, indeed, such a pure fiction were even conceivable, much less ascertainable,) — if this is to be the rule

by which we are to ascertain the true meaning and intent of God's word; the true acts of the apostles; the real polity of the apostolic churches; the unquestionable prerogatives of the hierarchy; and the assured duty of implicit subjection to their sacerdotal sway;—then, most plainly, is the Bible set aside, as to any practical value it is of; so that it might as well be actually kept secreted, or altogether withheld. For, no possible information can be acquired from it, except through the interpretations of the church; and the adoption of any different interpretation incurs the fearful risk of schism, heresy, and apostasy from “the obedience of the faith.”

Romanists only claim for their church, an authority equally infallible, and co-ordinate or concurrent, with that of the Bible;—but prelatists demand for the church, an authority “indefectible” in itself;¹ by which alone, any meaning shall be attached to this revelation of God—and without which, any such explanation of it, is a breaking loose from the anchorage of sound catholicity, and a venturing forth upon the shoreless ocean of interminable error. The Bible is thus a revelation made for the special benefit of the clergy of the prelacy; and not a revelation made to man. It is a gift to the church, and not to the world. It is a code of laws, of which they, the clergy, are to be the sole judges, interpreters, and executors; and in which the laity have no interest, other than is made known to them by the clergy.

Now, if this is so, we may surely, without arrogance, demand, “by what authority” these prerogatives are sustained; and “what signs, and wonders, and mighty works,” carry to our minds the evident impress of divine sanction? Suppose these claims—involving, as it is avowed they do, fundamental doctrines, which are essential to salvation—to be established; as they are not, and cannot be; but suppose them to be established by patristical authority, and that, therefore, as is also affirmed, they must be apostolic. That doctrine, or article of faith, which is apostolic, is inspired; for, it is only what the apostles gave to the churches, under the guidance of inspiration, that is divine, and of binding force upon the conscience. These doctrines, therefore, are doctrines of inspiration, or else they are not of binding authority. If heaven's mercy is limited by the boundaries of the existing prelacy, then this fact can be made known to us only by revelation; for it cannot surely be ascertained by uninspired men. We conclude, therefore, that since

1) “He (i. e. Christ) as our Mediator, is God, AND SO HE HAS MADE HIS CHURCH INDEFECTIBLE.” Tr. 158, of

the Prot. Episcop. Tr. Soc. p. 9. See also Newman's Lecture on Romanism, p. 232, &c.

inspiration implies supernatural assistance, and nothing short of miracles or prophecy can constitute its supernatural proof—this evidence must be given before receiving as apostolic, the church polity and doctrines framed by councils, fathers, and the gradual, and altered practice of the early church.¹ If “the church,” as is asserted, “has a supernatural gift, for the purpose of transmitting the faith;” so that it is made true, “because she teaches it;”² then what we ask her to give us, is supernatural proof for these supernatural claims.

The propriety of this demand is admitted by the Roman (prelatical) church, “who are fond of arguing that the performance of miracles is a sign of the true church.”³ Such miracles are pretended to, not only by the Roman, but by the oriental church.⁵ This claim, Mr. Palmer also does not reject as unreasonable,⁶ — but allows that there is every “probability, nay certainty, that such signs have been wrought since the time of the apostles.”⁶ Now the line of demarcation between documents which are authoritative, and such as are unauthoritative, however otherwise valuable and instructive, is that drawn between those which are “attested by miracles, and all without exception not so attested.”⁷ Making appeals of the *same kind*, therefore, to the one, as to the other, — to man and to God — is giving the glory of Jehovah to another — canonizing the writings of fallible men — and thus making the word of God of none effect, through vain traditions.⁸ And to have recourse to such self-constituted prophets, is to provoke God to give us up to believe a lie.

If this principle was so acknowledged in the Nicene age, as that, in support of the church principles and practices then estab-

1) See Hinds (of Queen’s College, Oxford) on Inspiration.

Mr. Newman, in his argument for the “indefectibility (infallibility) of the church,” says, “we must have recourse to such sources as will enable us to agree, and such, I would contend, is ecclesiastical antiquity;” “and the evidence of its being apostolic is *in kind* the same as that on which we believe the apostles lived, labored, and suffered.” See on Romanism, p. 232 and p. 233.

2) Newman on Romanism, p. 233.

3) Palmer, vol. i. p. 499, says: “It is evident, then, that the authority of catholic tradition, and of the universal church, as opposed to the unlimited freedom of private inventions,

(judgment?) was continually recognized in the church of England during the whole reformation, and *always afterwards*.” Again, in vol. ii. p. xv. he shows their agreement with the synod of Trent, so that when it taught “the christian truth and discipline are contained in unwritten traditions, also,” he says, “WE ADMIT IT.”

4) Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 141, 142; also Dr. Rosbury in Notes of the Ch. Ex. and Ref. p. 279.

5) *Ibid*, p. 143.

6) *Ibid*, p. 145.

7) Hinds on Inspiration, p. 185. See from p. 174.

7) *Ibid*, p. 184.

8) See Ancient Christianity, vol. i. p. 347, &c. et passim.

lished — although these were in glaring contrariety to the word of God — such miraculous evidence was freely boasted;¹ — and if such gifts are proclaimed also by the existing hierarchy of the Romish church; then on what principle can it be denied by those other inheritors of apostolic powers and gifts, who assert their identity with the church of the Nicene age?

“For, moreover,” says Archbishop Whateley, “we must not (if we would profit by the examples of Christ and his apostles) refer the people, as a decisive authority, on the essential and immutable points of Christian faith and duty, to the declarations or decrees of any class or body of fallible men; of any who have not sensibly miraculous proofs of inspiration to appeal to. Whether it be to a council or to a church, that reference is made; whether to ancient or to later christian writers; whether to a great or to a small number of men, however learned, wise, and good, — in all cases the broad line of distinction between inspired and uninspired, must never be lost sight of; and (if we would profit by what Christ and his apostles have taught us) we must neither make, nor admit, *claims* to inspiration, unless supported (as theirs were) by miraculous proofs.”²

But even were this requisition set aside as extravagant, — though to those whose eternal destiny is to be decided by it as by the Lord, it must appear no more than what is reasonable — we are still called upon to heave off from us the imposed yoke of patristical authority,⁴ by the very fact that, once beyond the region of inspiration, we find “no end, in wandering mazes lost.” There is, confessedly, no *certainty* as to the practice of the universal church, after the time of the apostles. This is allowed by Eusebius, the primitive historian of all that can be known, and affirmed by Joseph Scaliger and other learned in-

1) See *Anc't Christianity*, vol. i. p. 347, &c. et passim.

2) Whateley's *Dan. to the Christ. Faith*, p. 130, and see the whole of the subsequent discussion.

That this system, requiring implicit faith in its teaching, as much as in the scriptures themselves, must therefore produce the same miraculous evidence, is also most ably argued by Professor Powell, in his *Tradition Unveiled*, pp. 29, 34, 36, 39, 40. Nay, this evidence is actually claimed, for it is said “the lives and deaths of the great framers of the articles attested a supernatural assistance.” Sewell on *Subscription*, in *Ibid.*, p. 31.

“Thus,” says Mr. Powell, on p. 38, “the manifest consequence of the sys-

tem of tradition and church authority, is to obliterate the boundary line of distinctive evidence between the New Testament and the fathers and councils; between the apostles and their successors to the present day. In this view, both are placed on the same footing; both must be equally inspired and divine; or (we have the alternative) both equally uninspired and human.”

3) See *Life of Henderson*, p. 638.

4) On the obscurity of ecclesiastical history, at the very period when most needed, i. e. the first ages, see Scaliger, Silenus, Potavius, and Stillingfleet, in *Ayton's Constit. of the Ch.* p. 450. *Hegesippus* in *Euseb.* l. 3, c. 29.

quirers. It is just as easy to quote these early writers on the one side of this question as on the other—against, as for the prelacy.¹ There is among them an endless diversity and confusion. And we believe this latter “confusion of tongues” has been as wisely ordered as was that of Babel. The descendants of Noah (as is supposed) proposed to themselves to make such a provision as should render them, in any future deluge, independent of divine assistance. Exactly similar is the attempt now making to raise such a pile of human authorities, as may enable its architects to dispense with the Word of God, as completely as they of old proposed to dispense with any future ark. The attempt is equally presumptuous, and its result will equally frustrate the expectations of its authors.²

1) “It has happened, that from the beginning of the second century, in which Ignatius wrote, until towards the end of it, the works of all the christian authors are lost, except a few fragments found in other authors of later dates, and except the apologies and decalogues of Justin Martyr, who has said nothing which makes for the one side or the other of the present question.” Bishop White’s Lect. on the Catech. Philadelphia, 1813, p. 453.

Between these two periods, who can prove that prelacy was not introduced?

That the testimony of fathers is of no possible value towards a final and authoritative determination of this question, is conclusively shown by the evidently contrary interpretations put upon them by opposing parties, and by the evident purpose of high-church never to permit the fathers to speak a word in contrariety to their views. “From all these circumstances,” says Dr. Bowden, (Letters, second series, Works on Episc. vol. ii. p. 49,) “it necessarily follows, that you have either mistaken the meaning of Jerome, or that he contradicts himself. If the *former*, you derive no aid from him, he is altogether on our side. If the *latter*, he is NOT WORTH A STRAW TO EITHER PARTY.”

“But,” says Dr. Bowden, (Works on Episc. vol. ii. p. 76.) “suppose the scriptures to be doubtful on this point, what will the weight of the fathers be then? I answer, absolutely decisive; their testimony removes the doubt at once, for they, and they only, are the persons to whom we can appeal.”

Of what use, then, can an appeal to the fathers be, if, as Dr. Bowden affirms, “I *have* maintained and do *now* maintain, that the scriptures alone *are* sufficient to prove the apostolic institution of episcopacy.”

“For,” says Dr. Rice, (Evang. Mag. vol. x. p. 358,) “on the supposition that we can search the records of the *primitive church*, how far do these terms reach? They include the first four general councils; that is, they reach 450 years. But in going through the records of this period, we find something to favor congregationalism; more to support presbyterianism; and in about 400 years, strong evidences for episcopacy, with now and then a little in favor of the papists. And in modern times, we do not see any thing *exactly*, in all respects, like the primitive church. What are we then to do? The primitive church itself presents us different aspects, and really we are unable to decide. Taking the first three centuries for our standard, we should, on the whole, be presbyterians. But, taking the next century and a half, we should in all probability be episcopalians. We *must* go to scripture, and find the *notes* of a true church there. And then, according to the rule, we must look to the church to expound the scripture. Drive this argument as we may, it will run round in a circle.”

2) See Essays on Romanism, by an Episcopalian, very highly spoken of and quoted in London Christian Observer, 1840, p. 48.

But there are other grounds on which we would protest against that most unfair use which is made by Romanists and prelatists, of these ancient records. They are perverted to their own purposes.¹ They are subjected to just the same treatment which the scriptures are wont to receive at their hands. For as these oracles of God are made to receive their meaning and interpretation, from the rites, forms, usages, and opinions of the Nicene and later ages, so that the canonical meaning of scripture can only be ascertained through the comments and explanations of the church; just in the same manner these ancient records of the Nicene and proximate ages are to be understood, and their terms explained, by the meaning attached to these terms, and by the principles adopted, in the church now. It is utterly forgotten, that “names, rites, and formularies may remain unchanged, when their spirit and meaning have been essentially altered; and that much of what the Romanists (or prelatists) confidently appeal to in the early ages of christianity, carried quite a different import to a cotemporary from that which it suggests under the dominancy and in the nomenclature of the hierarchy.”²

And, finally on this part of our subject, we remark, that it would be easy, with no other assistance than what is rendered by these writers themselves, to array the fathers in manifest support of this sole supremacy of scripture.

“The holy and divinely inspired scriptures, are sufficient of themselves to the discovery of truth,” says Athanasius.

“It is an instinct of the devil to think any thing divine without the authority of the scriptures,” says Theophilus of Alexandria.

“That which the holy scripture hath not said,—by what means should we receive and account it among these things that be true?” says Cyril of Alexandria.

Basil declares, “It is a manifest falling from the faith, and

1) To use the words of a member of the English church: (Dr. Payne in Notes of the Ch. pp. 163 and 164:) “Besides the correcting, or rather corrupting of so many fathers, which were genuine monuments of antiquity, the counterfeiting of so many false ones, and obtruding of so many spurious authors upon the world, is a plain evidence of the want of true antiquity.” “Thus the decretal epistles were counterfeited to prop up the pope’s spiritual power, and Constantine’s donation to establish his temporal.” “But there are

great numbers of forged and spurious authors, whose testimonies are still produced by these writers, for those doctrines and opinions which are destitute of true antiquity, a collection of which is given us by our King James, in his Bastardy of the False Fathers; and all those critics who have written censures upon the fathers’ works cannot but own it.”

2) We quote from the London Chr. Ob. 1840, p. 48, an evangelical episcopal periodical.

3) See also Note A.

an argument of arrogancy, either to reject any point of those things that are written, or to bring in any of those things that are not written."

"Forasmuch," says Gregory Nyssene, "as this is upholden with no testimony of scripture, we will reject it as false."

"Nothing at all ought to be delivered concerning the divine and holy mysteries of faith without the holy scriptures," saith Cyril of Jerusalem.

"If it be not written," saith Tertullian, "let them fear that woe which is allotted to such as add or take away."

"As we deny not," says Jerome, "these things that are written, so we refuse those things that are not written."

"Whatsoever ye hear," says Augustine, "(from the holy scriptures,) let that savour well unto you; whatsoever is without them refuse."

"It would be superfluous," says Mr. Palmer, from different portions of whose learned work these authorities are chiefly taken, "to cite additional testimonies to the same truth, from Clemens Alexandrinus, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Optatus, Hilary, Vincentius Lirinensis, Anastasius, Prosper, Theodoret, Antony, Benedict, Theophylact, which have been collected by our writers."¹

On the authority therefore of the fathers — that is, by all the weight and influence attached to tradition by prelatists themselves; we are required to receive or to reject this doctrine, as it shall, or shall not make good its title, from the clear and certain testimony of God's Holy Word. The apostolic writings are certainly not more obscure on this point than those of the early fathers; for the meaning of the one, is as much controverted, and their as authority variously claimed, as is the case with the Bible. And the whole obscurity on this subject, which is charged upon scripture, arises from the fact that the assumed practice of the early church, as prelatial and not presbyterian, is made to justify the most forced construction of certain passages of God's Holy Word. But let that word speak out in its plain unvarnished phrase, and this obscurity will in a great measure vanish.²

VII. A seventh ground on which we rest this claim to an unquestionable scripture authentication of these exclusive powers, is the unreasonableness of the whole scheme, in itself considered.

1) Lee on the Church, vol. ii. p. 13, and p. 74. See also Newman on Romanism, Lect. xiii. and also at pp. 274, 281. Also Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp.

556, 560, and 563. Faber's *Albigenses*, pp. 264, 491, 492; see also Note B.

2) See Henderson's *Rev. and Consid.*, Edinb. 1706, 4to. p. 53.

We are very far from saying of any doctrine, that, because mysterious, and removed from the region of common sense, it is therefore of necessity false — as a scheme pretending to divine authority. But what we do affirm, is, that being not only above, and beyond reason, and therefore beyond man's power of origination; but being also, as we hold, at the same time, unreasonable and very contrary to reason, such claims cannot receive the shadow of respect, as of divine authority, until their divine sanction is made irresistibly clear.

Indeed it is not pretended, that these prelatial claims are founded in reason, or are to be adjudicated upon at all by reason. Their abettors disclaim utterly any such foundation or standard.

Thus let us hear the Rev. William Dodsworth, in his recent Discourses on Romanism and Dissent: "If human reason," says he, "may safely reject every doctrine which is above its powers, then we at once admit that this doctrine must be rejected; for the conveyance of a blessing through the medium of some men, which is not, and cannot be conveyed through others, equal or superior to them in all respects of natural endowment, is a mystery of which human reason is not cognizant: all argument founded upon it, therefore, must go for absolutely nothing. Again, we admit that the blessing is the object of faith and not of sight, and hence the true foundation of our belief is not touched by any inference which is drawn from visible effects. Hence, then, the Church of England has no sympathy with those injudicious, and I may say unbelieving opponents of Romanism, who throw contempt on the doctrine of apostolical succession, deny the efficacy of the sacraments apostolically administered, and who oppose the pretensions of the Romish ministers on the ground that no visible effects follow from the exercise of those sacred functions, in behalf of which they advance such preposterous and impious claims. Here, again, we shall find that the Church of England is equally distant from Romish corruption and from sectarian latitudinarianism."²

So again in his discourse on the efficacy of baptism, he says: "Such baptism the church ever regards as efficacious to the cleansing away of sin, to justification, to the implanting of a new life, to the illumination of the spirit, to adoption into God's family, to heirship of the kingdom of heaven."³

So also in No. 80 of the Tracts for the Times, the Oxford tractators thus deliver themselves:

1) See Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 26.

3) See Dodsworth on Romanism

2) See Dodsworth on Romanism and Dissent, p. 19.
and Dissent, p. 6.

“The question therefore need never be, whether an ordinance such as that of episcopacy, can be proved to be of divine command, for it has been observed, that our Lord never said that he was the CHRIST. But he was not on that account the less so, nor was it the less necessary that he should be received as such. All the external evidence required would be, whether there are indications of a divine preference given to it, for if this can be proved, it is sufficient for a dutiful spirit. In such considerations, all that can be said is, “he that can receive it, let him receive it,” and that “the poor in spirit” occupy “the kingdom.”¹

Thus also Mr. Keble speaks, —

“The succession itself is — a mystery, and of course left as all mysteries are, in some respects dimly revealed, i. e. in the world’s language, vague and indistinct.”²

Now, inasmuch as for the full establishment of these claims, we are to be deprived of all use of our own understanding in the investigation of them; and of all exercise of the right of private judgment upon the reasonableness of them; — it is surely incumbent upon their abettors to put their divine origin beyond any reasonable doubt, cavil or objection. For, to use the language of their own approved commentator, Bishop Burnet —

“We, having naturally a faculty of judging for ourselves, and using it in all other things, this freedom, being the greatest of all our other rights, must be still asserted, unless it can be made to appear that God has in some things put a bar upon it by his supreme authority.

“That authority must be very express, if we are required to submit to it in a point of such vast importance to us. We do also see that men are apt to be mistaken, and are apt likewise willingly to mistake, and to mislead others; and that particularly in matters of religion the world has been so much imposed upon and abused, that we cannot be bound to submit to any sort of persons implicitly, without very good and clear grounds that do assure us of their infallibility: otherwise we have just reason to suspect that in matters of religion, chiefly in points in which human interests are concerned, men may either through ignorance and weakness, or corruption, and on design, abuse and mislead us. So that the authorities or proofs of this infallibility must be very express; since we are sure no man, nor body of men, can have it among them, but by a privilege from God; and a privilege of so extraordinary a nature must be given, if at all, in very plain and with very evident characters; since without these

1) Tracts for the Times, No. 80, vol. 4, p. 67.

2) Keble on Tradition, p. 96.

human nature cannot, and ought not be so tame as to receive it. We must not draw it from an inference because we think we need it, and cannot be safe without it, that therefore it must be so, because, if it were not so, great disorders would arise from the want of it."¹

"It is also certain, that if God has lodged such an infallibility on earth, it ought not to be in such hands as do naturally heighten our prejudices against it. It will go against the grain to believe it, though all outward appearances looked ever so fair for it; but it will be an inconceivable method of Providence, if God should lodge so wonderful an authority in hands that look so very unlike it, that of all others we should the least expect to find it with them.

"If they have been guilty of notorious impostures, to support their own authority, if they have committed great violences to extend it, and have been for some ages together engaged in as many false, unjust, and cruel practices, as are perhaps to be met with in any history; these are such prejudices, that at least they must be overcome by very clear and unquestionable proofs: and finally, if God has settled such a power in his church, we must be distinctly directed to those in whose hands it is put, so that we may fall into no mistake in so important a matter."²

This doctrine of the supernatural efficacy of sacerdotal ministrations, and the exclusive possession of this sacred gift by prelatial bishops, is either reasonable, or it is above reason, or it is unreasonable. If it is reasonable, then, according to an established maxim of modern science, we must neither know, believe, nor assert it, without having warrantable and conclusive evidence, wherewith to establish and make it good. Positive opinion must rest upon indisputable proof. Where such a measure of proof is wanting, that, which if supported by it, would constitute an opinion, can without it, be regarded as no more than a doubt, a conjecture, or a question. To speak confidently, therefore, in reference to this matter, which is at least only set forth as the more probable of two alternatives, is to "dogmatize with all the pride of a most intolerable assurance."

1) Burnet on the 39 Art. p. 234.

2) Ibid, p. 235. "With such proofs, (i.e. more than ordinary,) they must surely be prepared; for without them, a doctrine so questionable must fall by its own improbability," so says the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, in Romanism and Prot. p. 5.

"They bring proof from unwritten tradition. But the proof is as suspic-

ious as the claim, because they alone, had the custody of it." Ibid.

"Much less could they adduce the tradition which alone could establish the claim,—the written apostolic, universal tradition," "which is not the consent of two fathers or of ten, but of the universal church in all times and places." Ibid.

Is this succession, like its supposed communications, supernatural, and thus *beyond* the grasp of human reason, and secreted from human observation or discovery, both as to its means and its ends?—then do we demand for it an institution as clear and undeniable as that given for other revealed ordinances. Or, on the other hand, is this doctrine *unreasonable*, so as to be not only without scripture warrant, but also to be contrary to reason?—then is it at once, and without ceremony, to be cast out of the church, as evil. Now that this doctrine is unreasonable, would appear from this consideration. The sacraments are, on this theory, the appointed means of grace. The sacraments are efficacious only when validly administered. They are only thus administered by such as have received the sacred gift, and the mysterious power to conduct these “mysteries” by the imposition of prelatical hands. But it cannot be denied, that beyond the line of this demarcation, the heavenly influences of God’s saving and sanctifying grace do nevertheless descend and manifest themselves, in the christianization of thousands of souls. Here, then, is the evidence of undeniable and undenied facts, against a hypothetic system. There are, and ever have been, beyond the pale of the hierarchy, thousands who have given all the evidence, which the cases could possibly require, that they are made partakers of the grace of God which worketh salvation. It is, then, most unreasonable to say, that while God thus actually bestows his grace on thousands of thousands who do not receive it through this prelatic channel, He nevertheless cannot and will not, and is under promise and obligation that he will not, communicate these saving influences, except through this very channel of the “episcopal grace,” and by the hands of prelatical functionaries.

Considered, therefore, as being unreasonable, we reject this exorbitant demand upon our credulity. Considered as above reason, we repudiate it, because it is not and cannot be established by scripture. And considered as reasonable, we deny it, for the want of any thing like sufficient evidence.

The canon of modern science, which makes such undoubted evidence essential to the establishment of any opinion, is just as true of the word of God, as it is of the works of God; and in ascertaining what is, or is not, a doctrine of God’s word; as what is, or is not, a law in God’s works. And it would be just as reasonable to conclude, that the early philosophers, with the same works of Nature before them, could more accurately discover their laws and operations, than those of modern times; as that the earlier christians, though uninspired, and with no other Bible before them than what we possess, could discover

therein a system of such matured and consolidated polity, based upon principles of such plain and avowed prelacy — which is altogether undiscernable to the closest scrutiny of modern investigation. The admitted silence, therefore, of the Word of God, as to these church principles ; — the fact, that from Matthew to Revelation, we hear not a word about apostolical succession, and sacerdotal pre-eminence, and episcopal grace, and supernatural communications, by the laying on of prelatival hands ; and of the sin of dissent from this prescribed episcopate, as heresy, and schism, and destructive of salvation ; — this fact alone, is to our minds, conclusive evidence against them. It is not necessary, that the scriptures should be explicit in denunciation of them, in order to their condemnation. It is enough, that they are not to be found in scripture — that they are not, therefore, among the institutes of Christ, as recorded in this book of the law. This, we say, is enough to stamp upon them the mark of reprobation.¹ This alone, is amply sufficient to prove that they are not of “the substance of that faith” “which was ONCE delivered unto the saints ;” that, however ancient, they are not apostolical, — and that they who uphold them, “teach for doctrines, the commandments of men.”²

Even then, were this system not in direct antagonism, as it is, to the parabolical institutions and to the prophetic exhibitions of our Lord ;³ — were it not equally at variance with the book of Acts, the *first* and only inspired record of the primitive and apostolic church, as it most manifestly is ;⁴ — even did it

1) See this shown at length, in Ancient Christianity, vol. i.

2) See this well argued in Campbell's Lect. on Eccl. Hist., lect. iv. p. 58, &c. ed. 3d.

Hear Bishop Fowler : (Notes of the Church, p. iii.) “We could very willingly appeal to our adversaries themselves, were they unconcerned, whether a plainer proof can be given of a baffled cause in a controversy relating to any point of revealed religion, than for the asserters of it to decline maintaining it by those books, which alone can acquaint us with divine revelations. But it is notorious, that the Romanists are highly chargeable upon this account, in their endeavors to persuade the world that theirs is the only true church.”

As another illustration of the fact, that in argument with the Romanists, the *silence* of scripture has been pleaded as a full, sufficient confutation, see Dr. Claggett in Notes of the Ch. Ex. p. 171, and 172, 173, 174.

See also Bishop Williams on Notes of the Ch. p. 111, p. 117.

“Knowing of themselves, that if appeal be made to the sacred bench of prophets and apostles, they cannot stand, they carry the suit of religion *craftily* into the court of the fathers.” (Bishop Hall.)

Thus also Jeremy Taylor : “*Whatsoever* was the regimen of the church in the *apostles' times*, that *must be perpetual*, (not so as to have ALL that which was personal, and temporary, but so as to have NO OTHER,) for that, and that *ONLY* is of divine institution, which Christ committed to the apostles, and if the church be not now governed as THEN, we can show no *divine authority* for our government, which we *must* contend to *do*, and do it too, or be called *USURPERS*.” Epis. Asserted, Wks. vol. vii.

3) *Ibid*, vol. i.

4) See this shown at length in Ancient Christianity, vol. i.

not come under the anathema thundered against that predicted apostacy from the purity and simplicity of the gospel, which is foretold in the apostolic epistles;¹ — even were it not found in inseparable association with, or eagerly thirsting after, practices and principles, which reduce the difference between the prelacy and the papacy to a distinction in particulars, where there is no difference in essentials;² — were none of these things true, yet still this very silence of scripture, and the undoubted origination of the whole nomenclature by which it is described, with the ecclesiastics of an after-age, seals its condemnation. “For, surely,” says Mr. Palmer, “it is in the highest degree improbable, that doctrines equally necessary, should be left with totally unequal evidence — that some articles should be delivered by scripture, as well as tradition, and others by tradition only.”³ Or, to use the words of Mr. Newman, “Surely, we have more reason for thinking that these doctrines are false, than that their saying that they are apostolical, is true.”⁴

What we allege, then, is, that while it is admitted, even by prelates themselves, that in scripture, there is abundant testimony to the divine appointment of the ministerial order of presbyters — there is not, on the contrary, in the whole Word of God, a single text which *can be made* to prove, with any fairness, the existence, in the apostolic churches, of an order of ministers who were not pastors of churches, but pastors of pastors — bishops of bishops — governors both of bishops and their flocks, — and sole repositories of “that divine grace or commission, which may reasonably be considered a sacrament in the church.”⁵ There is not, we repeat, a single passage in the Word of God from which this doctrine can be, with any fairness, or certainty, deduced.⁶ This system, which, from the fundamental and necessary character attached to it, and the prominence with which it is held forth, we might expect to find glaring upon us from every page of the sacred volume, is not sustained by a single trace — not even the most attenuated shadow — of explicit and divine appointment. As well might we seek the living among the dead, as to seek for diocesan prelacy in the scriptures of truth.⁷

1) See Ancient Christianity, vol. i. p. 3.

2) Ibid, passim.

3) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 8, 9, and 86, and vol. i. p. 131, 171.

4) On Romanism, p. 324.

5) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 441.

6) See Presb. Def. p. 40, 41.

7) A man, it has been truly said,

may read all that the evangelists have recorded of the sayings of Jesus, and all that the humble, though inspired apostles did and wrote, till he wonders from what part of the christian revelation, these bold and lofty claims can possibly be drawn. He peruses and re-peruses the testimony, but in vain! — he finds no authority for this

That we may urge this point with some authority, and not as of ourselves merely, let us again employ the words of Bp. Burnet, as contained in his "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles." "The silence of scripture on this point," we use his reasoning against the claims of the Roman pontiff, "seems to be a full proof that no such thing was intended by God; otherwise, we have all reason to believe that it would have been clearly expressed." "Here the greatest of all privileges is pretended to be lodged in a succession of bishops without any one passage of scripture importing it." "We cannot suppose that God has granted any privileges, much less infallibility, (these claim indefectibility,) which is the greatest of all, to a body of men of whom or of whose constitution he has said nothing to us." "To enjoin it as necessary," therefore, "to obtain the pardon of sin, and to make it an indispensable condition, and indeed the most indispensable of all, — is beyond the power of the church; for since Christ is the mediator of this new covenant, he alone must fix the necessary conditions of it."

The abettors of prelacy aver, that while these doctrines are more fully developed in antiquity, yet are they drawn from the wells of sacred scripture, and derive their authority from thence. Let them then be proved by this sure word of prophecy, and all controversy is at an end. If found in God's word, we ask not, nor do we stand in need of antiquity, to avouch for the truth of God. And if not warranted by this standard, then must we reject them as of divine right, or essential to the faith, though ten thousand fathers, with ten thousand dubious pretended miracles, should attest their divine original; — unless, indeed, scripture predicts the coming of such brighter testimony to a doctrine which the sacred writers had overlooked, or of purpose had left unrecorded.

hierarchical christianity — this official and ceremonial sanctity — this sacramental and hereditary grace — this divine right to supreme rule in the church — this essential distinction of order, and function, and power, between bishops and presbyters; who, in the New Testament, are one and the same. He compares scripture with scripture; — he studies the *spirit* of the gospel — he finds it meek, lowly, gentle, self-denying, self-diffident — not wont to take its stand on mere authority even in an apostle — never solicitous for outward uniformity — ever rising superior to externals, and cleaving to spiritual realities —

never lordly, priestly, exclusive, demanding: — but affectionate, tender, conciliatory, beseeching, indulgent to prejudice and weakness — non-compliant and unyielding only in regard to sin: indeed, opposed throughout to the spirit which has ever been generated by the fond dream of 'apostolic succession,' and all its attendant visions; whether in the Romish or Protestant church." See Schism.

1) See on the xxxix. Art. p. 258, 259, and see also on Art. xx. p. 269, and again on Art. xxi, p. 275, and on Art. xxii, p. 296, and on Art. xxv. p. 349, 453, 355, and 365. Page's ed.

Having thus, we trust, satisfactorily proved, that the silence of scripture is conclusive evidence against any doctrines claiming to be fundamental or essential to the faith;—in order to demonstrate the falsity of these prelatical claims — it will be only necessary, further, to prove that their establishment is not sought for in scripture alone. Now that this is the truth in the case has been already, in part, shown. But it may be well to adduce still further, and most satisfactory testimony.

Mr. Palmer allows that “we do not find the origin of episcopacy *exactly* recorded.”¹

In tract No. 86, the Oxford tractators say of these doctrines, “they appear to be great secrets, notwithstanding whatever may be said of them, only revealed to the faithful.”² “If the episcopal and priestly succession have in them something divine, as channels which convey, as it were, such his presence, to us — we must expect to find in them something that hideth itself — surrounded with difficulties to the carnal mind, withdrawing itself;” &c.³ “These would lead us to expect that they should be left in so delicate a manner, that he who will not afford them such *affectionate* attention, will lose all those high privileges.”⁴ “The question, therefore, never need be whether an ordinance, such as that of episcopacy, can be *proved to be of divine command.*”⁵

The Oxford writers, in Tract No. 8, further acknowledge,

1) Palmer, vol. ii, p. 282. He, Mr. Palmer, says “there are manifest *traces* of this institution in scripture,” (vol. ii. p. 389.) He says, “Titus *may* have made a distinction among the presbyters in Crete, *or* was *probably* himself the chief pastor of those churches.” (Ibid, pp. 392 and 393.) “The consecration of bishops was derived from divine and apostolical *tradition*, (in opposition to the declaration of Hilary that bishops and presbyters were the same) is infinitely *more probable.*” (Ibid, p. 395.) “It is admitted,” says this learned author, “that bishops and presbyters were the same at first, and that the church was GOVERNED by a council of presbyters under the apostles,” (ibid, p. 394,) “and the full amount of their jurisdiction (as in Jerome’s time,) was not essential to the episcopal order,” (ibid, p. 394,) for says he, “if bishops were gradually intrusted with more exclusive power by the church than they possessed at first, this was by the act of the church herself, which had a per-

fect right to make any regulation in discipline not contrary to the word of God.” (Ibid, p. 391.) “Besides this, the universal church having approved and continued this discipline FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY, at latest, till the reformation, it cannot be sinful or contrary to the word of God.” (Ibid, p. 391.) When dioceses arose, which are essential to modern diocesan episcopacy, is, he grants, uncertain. (Ibid, p. 401.) And yet “general supervision in a diocese,” is one of the rights belonging only to the highest of the three orders,” according to Bishop Onderdonk. (See *Episcop. Tested by Script.* p. 419.) The authority for their existence, however, as late as the third century, is “rather doubtful.” (Palmer, p. 401.) Presbyters “were gradually divested of the cure of souls,” and “these alterations were introduced GRADUALLY,” &c. (Ibid, p. 402.)

2) In vol. 4, p. 49.

3) Ibid, p. 65.

4) Ibid, p. 65.

5) Ibid, p. 67.

“there is no part of the ecclesiastical system which is not faintly traced in scripture, and no part which is much more than faintly traced.”

In tract No. 85, “it is granted by the writer that the divine right of episcopacy, the apostolical succession, the power of the church, &c., are wanting in direct or satisfactory proof, and are to be established, if at all, only by the aid of very attenuated, and nicely managed inferential arguments.” “EVERY ONE MUST ALLOW,” says the writer, “that there is NEXT TO NOTHING ON THE SURFACE, OF SCRIPTURE ABOUT THEM, AND VERY LITTLE EVEN UNDER THE SURFACE, OF A SATISFACTORY CHARACTER; a few striking texts at most, scattered up and down the inspired volume, or one or two particular passages of one particular epistle, or a number of texts which *may* mean, *but need not mean*, what they are said by churchmen to mean, which say something looking like what is needed, but with very little point and strength, inadequately and unsatisfactorily.”¹

“Some doctrines, such, for instance, as the spiritual gifts in ordination, which are assumed to be great and real where these ordinances are duly and worthily received, “the church has retained by oral tradition, and maintained by her uniform spirit of deference to the early church, whose hallowed lamp she carries on, and whose handmaid she is.”²

Mr. Newman says of “the sects around the church,” that “they gain their opinions from a distinct source, their private examination of the scriptures, by which they conjecture the doctrine of Christ, with its traditionary delivery through its appointed stewards.”³

The famous Henry Dodwell also admits the same thing.⁴ “They (the sacred penmen) *no where*, with decided clearness, distinguish the EXTRAORDINARY OFFICERS, (i. e. the apostles,) WHO WERE NOT TO OUTLIVE THAT AGE, from the ordinary ministers who were not to cease till the second coming of Christ. They *no where* explain professedly the offices or ministries them-

1) See this and more, quoted in Ancient Christianity, vol. i. p. 241.

2) Tract 81, p. 1, vol. 4.

3) And that we do not misjudge these writers will appear from the following testimony from the Dublin Review of May, 1840, pages 345, 346, a Roman catholic publication. (See the Method. Quart. Rev. for Jan. 1841.) “Avowedly there is no direct mention of the bishop of Rome in the scripture, no specification of the spiritual authority given to St. Peter; no, nor even of the authority given to the

successors of the apostles in general. On these subjects, the scripture is silent. Not one of the sacred writers has thought of describing in detail the plan of church government, which the apostles established to be observed after their death. For that we must have recourse, as the Oxford teachers admit, to tradition.”

3) On Romanism, p. 322.

4) De Nupero Schismate, sect. 14, in Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 32 and 33.

selves, as to their nature and extent ; which surely they would have done, if any particular form had been prescribed for perpetual duration."

Admissions equally important are made by Bishop Onderdonk, and that too even in his Tract on Episcopacy tested by Scripture. There he teaches that "ALL that we read in the New Testament concerning bishops, (including, of course, the words overseers and oversight,) is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade of presbyters."¹ "It was AFTER the APOSTOLIC age, that the name bishop was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first — AS WE LEARN FROM THEODORET"²—a WRITER of the FIFTH CENTURY!—and this is the scripture by which episcopacy is tested!³

It is thus manifest, by the showing of prelatists themselves, that prelacy cannot—to say the very least—be so certainly revealed in the word of God, as to be a necessary doctrine—for such doctrines, says Palmer,⁴ "are known to be so by the clear words of scripture." These only are matters of faith.

1) See p. 420.

2) Ibid, p. 480.

3) He further says, "the original meaning of bishop was only a presbyter." "Was the laying on of hands on Timothy an ordination? It cannot at least be proved; and comparing scripture with scripture, are we not justified in regarding it," &c. "The ordination of Timothy may be alluded to by St. Paul in the second epistle, the gift of God," &c. "If not then, or in this view, both these passages are unconnected with the controversy before us." (Ibid, p. 427.) He then gives several meanings attachable to this decisive passage in 1 Tim. iv. 13, (ibid, pp. 427, 428,) the amount of which is to show that the application of the passage is very doubtful. "The mere expression, presbytery, therefore, (p. 429,) does not *explain itself* and cannot of itself be adduced in favor of parity," nor of imparity. (Ibid, p. 429, at bottom.) It "cannot explain itself in favor of our opponents. It can only be referred to a body of clergymen; and these clergymen *may have been* in part or entirely apostles, who were superior to presbyters." (p. 430.) "It is evident, therefore, if this passage refer to an ordination." (Ibid.) "On the whole, can it be denied, that a cautious and candid interpretation of the two passages *said* to relate to the ordination of Timothy," &c. (Ibid.) "And considering the above distinc-

tion of by and with, (see p. 430) our *theory* is obviously the better of the two." (431.)

Now as the author (p. 436) makes positive proof necessary for the presbyterian claim, *a fortiori* do we demand it for prelacy, and "a *hint*," therefore, is not to be made "imperative." The demonstrative plainness with which this author claims to have discovered his "theory" in the New Testament, reminds us of the Irishman's telescope, with which he could see far out of sight.

Bishop Onderdonk seems to have himself discovered, that it would hardly do to venture the claims of prelacy on scripture alone, since in his answer to Mr. Barnes, he says, (p. 92.) "And the 'press,' at the time it issued the tract, issued also with it, in the 'Works on Episcopacy,' those of Dr. Bowden and Dr. Cooke, which embrace the argument at large. There is no reason, therefore, for thinking that, however a single writer may use selected arguments in a single publication, either he or other episcopalians will (or SHOULD) narrow the ground they have usually occupied. The fathers are consulted on this subject, because the fabric of the ministry, which they describe, forms an historical basis for INTERPRETING SCRIPTURE!"

4) vol. ii. p. 104.

“ Other doctrines, which are deduced from passages of scripture, *which admit of a different interpretation*, are matters of opinion, and they may be received or not received, without heresy, because there is no *certainty* that they were revealed by Christ.”

“ In this, and in all similar cases, those who are in error are free from heresy, when they judge (on *probable* grounds) their opinion supported by a greater scriptural and ecclesiastical authority, than that of their opponents.”¹ “ These, however misled, are not schismatics in the sight of God, and are, therefore, in a state of salvation.”²

From all that has been said, we conclude that prelacy, when tested by scripture, cannot — our enemies themselves being judges — be *so* established, and as of such necessary importance, as to endanger either the church standing, or the personal salvation of those who reject it as unscriptural and unreasonable. And this conclusion, though plentifully obviated by *other statements*, is admitted by Bishop Onderdonk himself. “ An apparently formidable yet extraneous difficulty, often raised, is,” says he, this, “ that episcopal claims unchurch all non-episcopal denominations. By the present writer this consequence is not allowed.”³

When we come to the proof of our position, that presbyters are the true successors of the apostles, it will be time enough to authenticate our right positively; and to show, not only that presbyterianism “ has divine sanctions, and must stand with episcopacy,”⁴ but that it is the truly apostolic and christian polity, and that prelacy must stand, — as we freely grant it may, — as one, though but one, and that an altered and deteriorated, form of presbyterian episcopacy, — the truly primitive and apostolical polity.⁵

1) See Palmer vol. ii. p. 108.

2) Ibid, p. 109.

3) Wks. on Episc., p. 414; see, however, the startling peroration of his Tract, on p. 437, and his remarks in his charge, (pp. 9, 15, 16,) for 1831.

4) See Ibid, p. 1.

5) The gray friar who undertook to argue with Knox at the convention of learned men, held at the university of St. Andrews, (McCrie's life of Knox, vol. 1, p. 63,) “ rashly engaged to prove the divine institution of ceremonies; and, being pushed by his antagonist from the gospel and acts to the epistles, and from one epistle to another, he was driven at last to affirm, that the apostles had not received the Holy Ghost when they wrote

the epistles, but they afterwards received it, and ordained ceremonies.”

“ His opponent urging, (ibid, p. 64,) that the church could have no authority to act in opposition to the express directions of scripture, which enjoined an exact conformity to the divine laws respecting worship: “ If so,” said Azbugkill, “ you will leave us no church.” “ Yes,” rejoined Knox, sarcastically, “ in David I read of the church of malignants, *Odi ecclesiam malignantium*; this church you may have without the word, and fighting against it. Of this church if you will be, I cannot hinder you; but as for me, I will be of no other church but that which has Jesus Christ for pastor, hears his voice, and will not hear the voice of a stranger.”

But before concluding, we are led to observe two striking characteristics of our church in contrast with that of the prelacy. "THE GREAT CHARACTERISTIC" of that church, to use the language of one of the most recent tracts of the Episcopal Tract Society, "is a reverence for antiquity."¹ "We are to look," says Mr. Keble, "before all things, to the integrity of the good deposite," "the treasure of apostolical doctrines and church rules," ascertained by "apostolical tradition;" "a tradition so highly honored by the Almighty founder and guide of the church, as to be made the standard and rule of his own divine scriptures," so that "the scriptures themselves do homage to the tradition of the apostles." "Our clergy," he says again, "can be called upon to walk by the rule of primitive antiquity, rather than by their more private judgment." It is therefore truly affirmed in the tract, already quoted, and which has been largely circulated by episcopalians in this country, that, "if no western church now-a-days is quite what its mother (the church of Rome) used to be, (alluding to what had been lost by the evil change of the reformation,) the catholic church in England, Scotland and America, — that is, the protestant episcopal churches of those countries — surely comes nearest to her; nay, so near, that they, who have well scanned the mother's lineaments, can be at no loss to trace her features in her child."² Such, then, is the self-drawn portraiture of the prelacy.

What a contrast is presented, when we turn our gaze upon the presbyterian branch of the true, catholic, and apostolic church. Stripped of all the vestments of ancestral pride; disdainful to conceal, under the trappings of official dignity, her poverty and emptiness; assuming no forms of earthly splendor; and hiding not herself amid the dim, discolored light of darkening ages; she stands forth upon the pedestal of truth, in all the simplicity of her unadorned beauty, clothed only in those garments of righteousness which were aforetime prepared for her, by the ministry of her divine Master, and his inspired apostles. Neither fearing, nor courting observation, she is satisfied with the inward assurance, that with her, resides the treasure of sacred doctrine, the truth as it is in Jesus; that in her society there will be heard no other converse than that of Christ and his apostles; — that from her voice, there will go forth no other doctrines, than such as are of God; — and that all, therefore, who put themselves under her guidance, shall find her ways pleasantness, and all her paths, peace.

1) No. 153, Ancient Things of the Catholic Church, p. 7.

2) Primitive Tradition, pp. 44, 28.

3) Tract, 153, p. 6.

The great characteristic of our church is, therefore, her fearlessness of scripture. No merely human system dare trust itself to scripture, and to nothing but scripture. It is, it must be, afraid of it. Its coward heart trembles at the approach to such a fiery ordeal; and is already filled with a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and of condemnation. Therefore, does the papacy throw discredit, doubt, and foul reproach, upon the sacred scriptures, as a sure and infallible rule of faith; and upon the sacred right and duty of private judgment, as necessary in their investigation: and therefore does her child, the prelacy, imitate her kind mother, whose lineaments she so plainly bears, to mark her as her own. While she grudgingly holds forth the sacred volume with one arm; she stretches forth the interposing authority of the church, as its only authorized interpreter, in the other; and thus silences the inquiring mind, with the enforced necessity of cautious reserve, and reverential self-denial, in taking up opinions of its own. It is, therefore, to the holy and beautiful liturgy; — to the incomparable articles; — and to all other, her appointed means for communicating divine knowledge to the soul—she points the weary and heavy-laden traveller to Zion.¹

Not such, however, is the character of that church — composed of spiritual freemen — and to which we, by the great grace of God, are honored in belonging. She speaks “as unto wise

1) “And yet,” says the Rev. John A. Clark (*Letters on the Church*, Phil. 1839, p. 35,) it is undoubtedly true that in the face of all this, and in the face of the most positive declarations of God’s words to the contrary, there are some within our borders who point out no other method of salvation to dying sinners than the practice of a certain round of moral duties.”

“That high-church have a right divine from Jove,
By signs and wonders they pretend to prove.
They (i. e. Dodwell) can a mortal soul immortal make;
They can by prayers our constitution shake.”

See *High-church Miracles*, printed in 1710, in *Scott’s Coll. of Tracts*, vol. 12, p. 320.

Strange it is, that while these men make the sacraments the great end and glory of the church, there is not one word about sacraments, as Mr. Leslie admits, in the apostles’ creed. See *Short Method with Roman Catholics*: Edin. 1835, p. 21. And yet the church and the sacraments constitute the alpha and the omega of high-church divinity, and their only consolation for the

poor and perishing sinner.—“The sacraments, again, are a still higher way in which the church helps us against time—by bringing heaven forward upon earth, by fetching eternity out into time, by bringing great gifts from far, and by them, in the midst of time, substantially anticipating eternity.” *Tr. 160 of Prot. Episc. Tr. Soc.*, p. 10.

“The sacraments by which it (the incarnation) is conveyed to us and GIVEN to us.” *Tr. 158 of the Prot. Episcop. Tr. Soc.* p. 9. If this is not pure nonsense, it is rank popery, and to our minds impiously profane. Again, in *ibid.* p. 14, “You have the presence of God within you. Sacraments, providences, ordinances, discipline, ascetic habits, sometimes slowly, sometimes swiftly, all have been drawing your natural infirmities more and more within the power of this supernatural kingdom.” And on p. 15, “self-struggling is against the Spirit and the sacraments. Therefore deny that self, and the empire of Christ will stretch forth from the river even unto the green sea, from baptism until eternity begins.” Truly this is another gospel!

men." She addresses the understanding and the heart. She commends herself and her doctrines unto men, and not merely as unto babes and children in Christ. She speaks forth the truth, and the whole truth; and giving into their hands the heavenly oracles, she calls upon her members to judge her words, and to search the scriptures, whether these things are so. She looks scripture in the face, and holds with it direct, immediate, and constant communion. She does not build her faith upon shreds and patches; upon forced constructions, and hypercritical analogies; or upon illogical inferences; "picking and choosing" what suits with her established wishes. She renounces, and calls upon all her followers to abandon, this "popery of the heart," and to seek the solution of every doubt, and direction in every perplexity, in that sure word of prophecy, to which she gives earnest heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place.

But to proceed: Hadrian Saravia, in his *Treatise on the Priesthood*, published in the year 1591, says, in one place,¹ "THERE IS NO QUESTION but that the apostles held the first rank; evangelists the second; prophets the third; pastors and presbyters the fourth; teachers the last:" thus making five orders, besides deacons. These are "the different degrees of authority, appointed in the beginning by our Lord, and continued by the apostles." And yet does this writer take upon him to reverse this decision. "Although," says he, "St. Paul mentions prophets in the second place, I remove them into the third — following, not so much the order of dignity, as the time of institution of the offices of the New Testament:"² as if he knew the time of their institution.

What can exceed — in such bold and irreverent assumption of a power to interpret scripture, to the liking of their own priestly notions — the declaration of this same writer, "the happy author of many learned tracts" "concerning episcopacy;" — "that since the apostolical traditions concerning the government of the church, and its externals, were drawn FIRST by OUR SAVIOUR himself, and afterwards by his apostles, from the Old Testament; with such modifications as difference of time and place required; no fault can be found with the fathers, if they should appear to have taken certain regulations from the same source!"³ What is this, I ask, but to reduce our blessed and divine Saviour to a level, as an instituter of sacred laws, and as an interpreter of scripture, with the apostles and the fathers;

1) Oxf. ed. 1840, p. 57.

2) Ibid, p. 77.

3) Saravia on Priesthood, Pref.

and to exalt the fathers and apostles, to the same pre-eminence in authority and wisdom, with the Son of God himself.

Nor is there less presumptuous arrogance in the declaration of this same "happy author," — made after he had himself otherwise interpreted and applied these very passages — that the orders of patriarchs, archbishops and metropolitans, "are denoted by the titles of apostles and evangelists; — in the epistle to the Romans, by the words, 'he that ruleth,' (Rom. xii. 8,) and in the epistle to the Corinthians, by the term, 'governments.'" (1 Cor. xii. 28.)¹

We are thus led by these examples, to the notice of another striking feature of prelacy, as contrasted with presbyterianism, and that is, the spirit of lightness and irreverence with which it treats the word of God, and makes it subservient to its own purposes.² This it does by teaching, first, that a discretionary power is given to prelates, to decree rights and ceremonies which shall be enforced, as necessary terms of communion with the church of Christ. Secondly, by teaching that prelates are the authoritative interpreters of scripture, so that it must mean what they are pleased to say it does mean. Thirdly, by teaching that primitive tradition is parallel to the scriptures — and of an equally divine original — and binding necessity.³ And we have just seen how, acting upon these principles, the defenders

1) Ibid, p. 240.

2) "Therefore," says the Rev. Mr. Boyd, in favor of the prelatic theory, "for our nonconformity with the conduct of our Master, (which we deny was intended in this case to be a binding pattern,) we plead His nonconformity to the rule and ancient usage of Israel." That is, because Christ thought proper to abrogate a Jewish rite, both in its matter and manner of observance, — therefore, Episcopalians are at liberty to tamper with his holy institutions." (Presb. Def. p. 266.)

3) What can be more absolutely destructive to all inherent, original, and independent authority, in the written word of God, than the authority claimed by prelatists for tradition and the church. Thus Dr. Bowden delivers their views: (Works on Episcop. vol. i. p. 116.) "As episcopacy appears from a cloud of witnesses to be the government of the church, at the close of the apostolic age, it can never be admitted, that any thing in the New Testament militates against this fact."

Dr. Campbell, of Armagh, in his Vindication of the Principles and Character of the Presbyterians of Ireland, (London, 1787, 3d ed. p. 6,) alludes to "the famous debate between Hoadley and Sherlock, in which we find Parker, bishop of Oxford, asserting the king was superior to Christ."

Pope Innocent, of course guided by his infallibility, clearly discovered the divine origin of his office in the first chapter of Genesis. "For the firmament of heaven, (i. e.) of the universal church, God made two great lights, (i. e.) he ordained two dignities or powers, which are the pontifical authority, and the regal power; but that which rules the day, (i. e. spiritual matters,) is the greater, but that which governs carnal things, is the lesser."

Thus also, by the tops of the mountains, in the seventy-second Psalm, nothing can be more rightly designed than the prelates and priests of the church, as we are taught by Mr. Sclater, a Romanist. (See in Notes of the Church, p. 318.)

of prelacy can even boast that there is little or nothing about it in the Bible, nothing certainly of a clear or satisfactory nature; and how even an apostle can be set right, when, in prelatic judgment, he mistakes as to the relative dignity or order of these hierarchical rulers.

Not such, however, is the spirit of presbyterianism. It claims indeed the right of private judgment, in ascertaining what is the true word of God, and what that word truly says — but there it stops. It bows reason, private judgment, and all discretionary opinions, whether private or public, individual or synodical, to the supremacy of this divine and infallible standard. It assumes no power of binding any conscience, in any matter in which God has left it free. It boasts of no reserved treasury of primitive traditions, from whose dark recesses it may draw forth auxiliary troops, whenever it would assault some battery of opposing truth. It pleads no commission to interpose between God and his people; and to say unto them, thus only shalt thou understand — whatever else you may believe it means — the proclamation of Heaven's will. It reverently receives from God's hands his own divine and precious gift. It enthrones it in the sanctuary. It affixes it to every sacred desk. It admits of no appeal beyond it, or from it. This is with it, the alpha and the omega of all authority; the hearer of all questions; — the judge of all controversies; — the settler of all disputes, and the fountain of all antiquity. Whatever is in this, it receives. Whatever is beyond it, it rejects. It turns away from all the wisdom, and eloquence, and power of man, to listen to the still small voice of divine mercy, as it comes forth from this urim and thummim of the holy oracles. And to doubt — cavil at — wantonly tamper with — alter — amend, or add to, the words and ordinances of this book, it regards as a spirit, whose tendency is towards rationalism and infidelity, and that too of the worst and most fatal kind.

While, therefore, we have, and should have, no disposition to think less charitably as to our fellow-christians of other denominations, who may, as conscientiously as we, obey, as they think, the divine will; we may well think more honorably than we have done, of the claims of our own Zion. We may bless God, who has preserved our churches from the reception of doctrines which expose their adherents to such inevitable temptation to tamper with, or irreverently supersede, the teaching of God's holy word. Believing, as we do, that the church is "that true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man;" and that all her arrangements and essential forms, have been designed by this unerring Architect, we are reverently held back from the

indulgence of our own sense of architectural beauty, and the fitness of proportion, by the warning voice — “see that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount.”¹

1) “In an inquiry, what is sin,” says Matthew Henry, (A Brief Inquiry into the Nature of Schism, London, 1717, p. 5,) “let those books be opened which must be opened at the great day. If sinners must be judged by those books shortly, let sin be judged by them now, and let not any

man or company of men in the world assume a power to declare that to be sin, which the sovereign Rector of the world hath not declared to be so, lest in so doing, they be found stepping into the throne of God, who is a jealous God, and will not give this branch of his glory to another.”

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE FOURTH.

NOTE A.

ON this subject, Bishop Hurd,* in exposing the folly of the reformers, in allowing an appeal to the primitive fathers as interpreters of scripture, remarks: "When the state of the question was thus changed, it was easy to see what would be the issue of so much indiscretion. The dispute was not only carried on in a dark and remote scene, into which the people could not follow their learned champions, but was rendered infinitely tedious, and indeed interminable; for those early writings, now to be considered, as of the highest authority, were voluminous in themselves, and what was worse, were composed in so loose, so declamatory, and often in so hyperbolic a strain, that no certain sense could be affixed to their doctrines, and any thing or every thing might with some plausibility be proved from them.

"The inconvenience was sensibly felt by the protestant world; and after a prodigious waste of industry and erudition, a learned foreigner at length showed the inutility and the folly of pursuing the contest any further. In a well-considered discourse on the Use of the Fathers, he clearly evinced that their authority was much less than was generally supposed, in all points of religious controversy, and that their judgment was especially incompetent in those points which were agitated by the two parties. He evinced this conclusion by a variety of unanswerable arguments, and chiefly by showing that the matters in debate were for the most part such as had never entered into the heads of those old writers, being indeed of much later growth, and having first sprung up in the barbarous ages; they could not, therefore, decide on questions which they had no occasion to consider, and had in fact never considered, however their careless or figurative expression might be made to look that way, by the dexterous management of the controversialists. This discovery had great effect; it opened the eyes of the more candid and intelligent inquirers; and our incomparable Chillingworth, with some others, took the advantage of it, to set the controversy with the church of Rome once more on its proper foot, and to establish for ever the old principle, that the Bible, and that only, (interpreted by our best reason,) is the religion of protestants."

The inconsistency of the reformers, in appealing to the fathers, is also exposed by Herbert Croft, bishop of Hereford, in his *Naked Truth*, or the *True State of the Primitive Church*: † "The evangelical doctors, so called because they chiefly urged evangelium, the gospel, for the defence of their doctrine, were most of them bred up from their infancy in the popish church, and therein taught, even to adore all councils and fathers, and (education being of great force to command and awe both the wills and judgments of men) made them very shy and timorous to reject that authority which they had long revered; in modesty, therefore, some of the evangelical doctors were content to admit the authority of fathers for three or four of the first centuries; some admitted five or six, whereby they were reduced sometimes to great straits in their disputations; for though neither all nor half the popish errors

* Introduction to the Study of Proph. Sermon. xii. ed. 1839. London, p. 241.

† Published in 1675, and to be found in Scott's Coll. of Tracts, vol. vii. pp. 279 and 280.

can be found in the councils and fathers of these centuries, yet some of them were crept very early into the church. Thus superstition of the cross and chrysm were in use in the second century; the millenary error got footing about that time; and the necessity of infants receiving the blessed sacrament of the Lord's supper came in soon after. About the fourth century, there were some touches in oratory sermons, by way of theoretical ejaculations, like praying to saints, but long after came to be formally used as now in churches; and so superstitions came in, some at one time and some at another. The papists themselves do not receive all these errors, but reject some, as that of the millenaries and the necessity of infants receiving the Lord's supper. Now I ask, first, the papists, by what rule they retain some of these things and reject others? Secondly, I ask the evangelical by what rule they submit to the authority of some centuries and refuse others? Both will answer me, because they believe some to be erroneous, some to be orthodox. Whereby it is evident, that neither submit to the fathers' authority as commanding their judgments, but receive their opinions as agreeing with their judgments."

"And will you," says Bishop Croft,* "be bound up to all the decrees of councils, without scripture or any reason for them? If once we leave scripture, and hearken to the doctrine of men, ever so holy, ever so learned, ever so primitive, we shall soon be wheedled into the papist's religion, and many other errors which the papists themselves now reject, as I have declared at large before."

"By the way," says the ever-memorable Hales, in his Tract on Schism, "by this you may plainly see the danger of our appeal to antiquity for resolution in controversial points of faith, (he was speaking of the dispute about Easter,) and how small relief we are to expect from thence; for if the discretion of the chiefest guides and directors of the church did, in a point so trivial, so inconsiderable, so mainly fail them, as not to see the truth in a subject wherein it is the greatest marvel how they could avoid the sight of it, can we, without imputation of extreme grossness and folly, think so poor-spirited persons competent judges of the questions now on foot betwixt the churches?"

That in this controversy we must not be tempted to give any heed to primitive teachers, further than as sanctioned by the word of God, see also London Christian Observer, 1837, p. 145. De Moor, in his Commentary on Marckii Medulla, volume vi. p. 54, thus succinctly gives the reasons then deemed sufficient for rejecting this authority of the fathers: "Patres omnes fuere fallibiles, nævis et erroribus pluribus laborarunt, sæpe dissident, dubia non raro est genuinitas scripturum quæ sub nomine eorum venditantur, monumenta ipsorum plurima perierunt, controversias recentiores ignorarunt, de argumentis variis ante ortam de illis controversiam securius locuti sunt." Vide supra Cap. ii. § 46, 47, et Turretine in loc. cit. § 32—33. Derhard Confess. Cathol. lib. i. part ii. cap. xiii. Tom. i. p. 549—730.

"The writing of the fathers," says the Rev. Mr. Pratt,† "may contain many opinions which have no reference to apostolical doctrine or fellowship; but such opinions are held to have no more weight than the opinions of individuals; they are not the voice of the church, declaring the everlasting truths of the gospel; or, it may be, that the writings of some of the fathers contain opinions calculated rather to abrogate than to establish the doctrines of our Lord and his apostles, and to encourage new and strange practices rather than to guard the primitive ordinances and institutions of the gospel. In such cases, the episcopalian rejects the authority of the fathers, and looks on their opinions as vain or heretical. Independent of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the writings of the fathers can have neither weight nor authority in matters of faith."

That the Church of England herself has not perfect confidence in the fathers, see Calamy's Def. of Nonconf. vol. i. p. 134. London, 1703. See a good disquisition on this subject, in the "History of Popery," by the authors of the Universal History. London, 1735, 4to, vol. i. Packet, xxxi. p. 128, &c.

No human authority can ever settle this question. "You shelter yourself,"

* Naked Truth, in Scott's Coll. of Tr. vol. vii. p. 311.

† The Old Paths, p. 160.

says Dr. Bowden to Dr. Miller,* “under Bishop Taylor, who, from the quotations you give, seems to think that they have been corrupted. If Taylor really thought so, he is certainly very inconsistent, for he quotes them as freely as any man, in his *Tract on Episcopacy*, and without uttering the least expression of disapprobation. If, then, you can quote him as condemning them in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, I can quote him as approving them in his *Tract on Episcopacy*, and thus his testimony either way becomes perfectly nugatory.”

The testimony of Jerome is treated in exactly the same manner at p. 49 of *ibid.* So also of Bishop Forbes and others, he says, (p. 73,) “Let this be exactly as you say, to what does it amount? Just this much: *they* thought so. But I might oppose to them full as eminent episcopal divines. And what would the conclusion be? Precisely nothing.”

“There are so many passages in their (the reformers, Luther, Calvin, and some others) writings, which stand in direct opposition to one another, that I am totally at a loss what to think.† Hence it is, that they sometimes appear to be perfect equality men; at other times, to assert as strongly as possible inequality. But this is easily explained. They did not hold an inequality of *order*, but an inequality of *degree*. This opinion, the offspring of the ‘dregs of popery,’ preserves them from self-contradiction, and in no other way can it be done.”

“Neither your testimonies nor mine, have the weight of a feather in the scale of evidence; for, on both sides, they are nothing but *opinion*, and our opinion can never determine a matter of fact.”

NOTE B.

The following additional testimonies are given in a German review of Mr. Manning’s work on the Rule of Faith.‡

“A mind which is sound,” says Irenaus, “and trustworthy, and God-fearing, and truth-loving, will, with a ready devotion, occupy itself in such things as God has put in our power, and subjected to our knowledge. These are the things that strike our very eyes, and are set down in so many words in scripture, *plainly and without any ambiguity.*” — (Lib. ii. c. 46, ed. Ferard.)

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, proves the greatest mysteries of our faith, by scripture testimonies, which, as he says, *are so plain as to need no explanation.*

Clement of Alexandria — “The supreme *demonstration* produces a scientific faith from the citation and opening up of scriptures.” — (Strom. ii. p. 381.)

The canon of interpretation according to him is, “The harmony and concord of the law and the prophets with the New Testament.” — (Strom. vi.)

Origen thinks that even “the difficult scriptures are ONLY to be explained by a comparison with other scriptures.” — (Philocal. c. ii. p. 22.)

Athanasius assures Jovian that “The true faith is *manifest to all*, being known and read in the sacred scriptures.” — (Ep. ad. Jov. t. i. p. 246.)

Chrysostom tells us that “all things are plain and straight in scripture; yea, all necessary things manifest. (In 2 Ep. and Thessal.) And again, “The apostles, taking quite a different method from the philosophers, made their doctrine *clear and plain to all*, that such, *by merely reading their writings*, might understand their meaning.” — (Hom. 3, in Lazar.)

And S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in a passage quoted by Dr. Manning himself, tells the catechumens not to receive the creed itself, unless he could prove it to them by scripture. Is the scripture then to be explained by the creed, and yet the creed proved by scripture?

As collated by Dr. Barrow, Augustine and Lactantius, thus clearly affirm our position: § “I do believe,” says Augustine, “that also on this side there would be most clear authority of the divine oracles, if a man could not be

* Letters, Second Series, vol. ii. Works on Episcopacy, p. 56.

† Works on Episcopacy, vol. ii. pp. 173, and 178, and 179.

‡ Lond. Chr. Obs. 1841. p. 173.

§ See Wks. vol. i. p. 562. Fol. and p. 769.

ignorant of it, without damage of his salvation ;” and Lactantius thus, “ Those things can have no foundation, or firmness, which are not sustained by any oracle of God’s word.” Again, “ I will not that the holy church be demonstrated from human reasonings, but the divine oracles.”

See the quotation from Eleutherius, bishop of Tyana, A. D., 431, “ against those who declare that we ought neither to search into, nor speak from scripture, being content with the faith they possess,” in Clarke’s *Succ. of Sac. Lit.* vol. ii. p. 197. See similar sentiments from Theodoret, Cyril and Basil, in Usher’s *Answ. to the Jesuit*, p. 35. See also Cyprian, *Epist.* 63 and 64. Tertullian, *lib. de Veland. Virg. cap. 1.* And *lib. de Amma, cap. 23.*

NOTE C.

We will here add some additional testimonies and remarks.

Mr. Keble, in his *Primitive Tradition*, says, “ he does not see how without its aid,” (“ the chain of primitive tradition ”) “ the very outward face of God’s church and kingdom among * us could now be retained,” and he enumerates as among “ the points of catholic consent known by tradition,” and which “ constitute the ties and knots of the whole system,” “ the apostolical succession.”†

So on p. 76 he expects from this tradition “ the proving the existing church system divine in many points where they ignorantly supposed it human.” ‡

Nevertheless, this same writer has this declaration : “ It is among the privileges reserved for serious inquiring piety, to discern an express will of God, as well in these ecclesiastical laws, as in others more immediately.”§

The following is the confession of bishop Croft in his *Naked Truth or the True State of the Primitive Church* :|| “ And I hope my readers will see what weak proofs are brought for this distinction and superiority of order — no scripture, no primitive general council, no general consent of primitive doctors and fathers, no, not one primitive father of note speaking particularly and home to our purpose ; only a touch of Epiphanius and St. Austin upon Aerius, the Arian heretic, but not declared, no, not by them, an heretic in this particular of episcopacy.”

Professor Powell, of Oxford, in his *Tradition Unveiled*, says of the high-church party, that “ the traditionists readily allow (which *must appear* to a strict inquirer) that all such appeal to *written evidence alone* is utterly insufficient to establish the point. No such institution, complete and distinct, is to be found in the New Testament, positively *delivered*, or strictly deducible ; no code of its constitution laid down like the Levitical in the Old. *Tradition*, however, supplies the deficiency.”

This silence of scripture is admitted by bishop Skinner, who offers some vindication of the fact. See his *Vindication*, p. 134, and Dr. Mitchell’s *Letters*, p. 59, &c.

The same thing is admitted by Dr. Cooke. “ How,” he asks, ¶ “ can the scripture assert beforehand that a thing *is done*? (that *they succeed*, in the present tense) What Episcopalians, therefore, would be simple enough to expect to find a passage in scripture, asserting that the *bishops do succeed* the apostles in their apostolic office?” However this be, it might reasonably have been expected that the scriptures would have made it plain that it was the purpose of God that prelates alone *should succeed* the apostles.

That the claims of prelacy rest, after all, upon patristic tradition, is evident from the whole tenor of Dr. Bowden’s *Letters*. See *Wks. on Episcop.* vol. i. pp. 106, 115, 116.

It is here, therefore, to be observed, that even were this doctrine embodied in the present standards of the English church,* “ she did not take her direction from the scriptures only, but also from the councils and examples of the four or five first centuries, to which she labored to conform her reformation.

* 4th edn. p. 33.

† See also p. 78.

‡ See do. pp. 39, 40.

§ Scott’s *Coll. of Tr.* vol. vii. p. 306.

|| See p. 19. See also pp. 22, 23, 59.

¶ *Wks. on Episcop.* Vol. ii. p. 211.

** Dr. Owen, vol. 17, p. 235.

Let the question now be, whether there be no corruptions in this Church of England, supposing such a natural state to be instituted. What I beseech you, shall bind my conscience to acquiesce in what is pleaded from the four or five first centuries, consisting of men that could and did err, more than that did her's, which was pleaded from the nine or ten centuries following."

Now if this doctrine of succession is by tradition, then it cannot — as prelatists make it — be of the substance of doctrine, or among things necessary to salvation; for this kind of tradition is that which the church rejects, which Taylor repudiates, and in whose disparagement Mr. Keble himself inconsistently joins. "In practical matters," it is said, "tradition may be received, but in doctrinal (with the exception of the creed) it cannot." — (Keble, on Prim. Trad. p. 71.) Again, "all necessary *credenda*, all truths essential to salvation, are contained in scripture itself." — (Keble, p. 74.)

It follows, therefore, that either this whole doctrine is not fundamental, or necessary, and therefore prelacy is self-condemned; or if it is fundamental, it cannot be *proved*, or verified by tradition, but must be contained in scripture. But this, it is granted it is not, in any certain and palpable form; and therefore, to affirm, as do these writers, that its rejection unchurches and unchristianizes other communions, is as grossly absurd in reason, as it is heretical in doctrine, and uncharitable in spirit.

LECTURE V.

THE TESTS BY WHICH THIS PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL
SUCCESSION MUST BE TRIED.

THAT we may once more illustrate the nature of the doctrine of apostolical succession, we ask a candid examination of the following passages, which are all extracted from "The Churchman," published in New York, under the sanction of Bishop Onderdonk: the first is from Dodwell, an English writer quoted in the Oxford tracts—the second from Dr. Hook, an English divine of the Oxford tract stamp—the third from an Address on Unity by Dr. Onderdonk, Bishop of New York—the fourth from a correspondent.

1. "None but the bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow, that whosoever is disunited from the visible communion of the church on earth, and particularly from the visible communion of the bishops, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible catholic church on earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and what is yet more, from *Christ and God himself*. It is one of the *most dreadful aggravations* of the condition of the damned, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. The *SAME* is their condition, also, who are *disunited* from Christ by being disunited from *his visible representative*."

2. "Unless Christ be spiritually present with the ministers of religion in their services, those services will be vain; but the only ministrations to which he has promised his presence, are those of bishops, who are successors to the first commissioned apostles, and to the other clergy acting under their sanction and by their authority."

3. "None but the bishops can unite us to the Father, in the

way of Christ's appointment, and these bishops must be such as receive their mission from the first commissioned apostles. Wherever such bishops are found dispensing the faith and sacrament of Christ, *there is a true church*; UNSOUND IT MAY BE, like the church of Rome, but still a *true or real church*,—as a sick or diseased man, though unsound, is still a real or true man."

4. "By being duly admitted members of the church of Christ, men are placed in a covenant relation to God, in which he gives them, on certain conditions, a title to the benefits of Christ's mediation. The means and pledges of this title's being made effectual, are the sacraments, services, and ordinances of this church."

Now, as prelatists have "suspended the validity of their own ministry and ordinances, and the whole christianity of all their people," and their claim to be regarded as a church of Christ at all, upon this doctrine of an unbroken line of valid and successive prelatical ordinations, from the existing incumbents up to the apostles themselves, into whom, as into a fountain of episcopal grace, they all empty themselves—we will proceed to expose the utter groundlessness and absurdity of this vaunted prerogative. *Res est ridicula et nimis jocosa.*¹

Having disposed of this subject, we shall then proceed to show what is the true doctrine of apostolic succession; and that presbyterianism, both as it regards its doctrines and its order, is accordant to the apostolic platform.

This exclusive claim to be **THE CHURCH**, and the only true church, and the only conveyancer of heavenly grace, we may consider as a fact to be proved, and as a right to be established. Now, in making good these pretensions, there are certain acknowledged principles or canons which have been ratified by prelatical adoption, and by which they may be tested.

The succession which is thus claimed by prelates, is not a succession of christians, nor of ministers, but of prelates; for episcopal ordination does not, we are told, confer any right or power whatever to transmit the sacred gift and grace, except in the one order of prelates. It is, therefore, a personal and exclusive succession of prelates which is to be made manifest. It must then be shown not only that the church has ever existed—not only that officiating ministers have ever been found in that church—not only that there have ever been an order of men calling themselves prelates—but it must be shown, that there has been an unbroken succession of true prelates—from

1) Catullus.

the apostles' days down to the present time. For, if there is any reasonable doubt, as to any one link in this lengthened chain, then is their proud boast made vain.

But, should prelatists even succeed in carrying their chain, in its unbroken continuity, up to the apostles, and thus bridge over the dark chaos of intervening time—they will be required to fasten it surely and strongly to the rock of ages. They must point out and make manifest where and how, it has entered, as an anchor sure and steadfast, and is infixed in the good foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

It will not do for prelatists to deal with this doctrine of apostolical succession, as the Romanists do with that of infallibility. This they assume, as the basis of their system, and as in itself necessary, as the ground and security of the entire building. But, as Mr. Newman in reasoning with the Romanists remarks, this “cannot be taken for granted as a first principle in the controversy, for if so, nothing remains to be proved, and the controversy is at an end.” In like manner do we say, in arguing with prelatists: That principle, on which the excommunication of all the protestant churches in the world is to be based, must be shown to rest upon no dubious interpretation—upon no questionable meanings,—no interpolated opinions of uninspired and unauthoritative men—no figment of the universal consent of the early church, founded upon the doubtful remains of comparatively a few, self-contradictory fathers.

But, as Mr. Newman says of the Romish doctrine referred to, that Romanists are obliged to maintain it by their very pretensions to be considered the one, true, catholic, and apostolic church,¹—so also do we affirm of prelatists, that they also are obliged to maintain this unauthenticated and equally preposterous dogma, by their very pretensions to be considered the one, true, catholic, and apostolic, church. The absurdity, however, with which such a course is chargeable, is in both cases, equally apparent; and the reasonableness of our rejection of both, until proved by a divine warrant, and fully established in all their parts, equally obvious.

Nor is this all. For, even could we suppose that it had been discovered in the apostolic writings, that such an order of ministers as prelates had been ordained in the churches established by the apostles,—as, for instance, Timothy and Titus;—it would be still further necessary to prove, that this order was instituted by the apostles as a perpetual and unalterable

1) See Lectures on Romanism, p. 68, &c.

order of the church. Reason would demand, that "we should hesitate awhile, before we regard the institutors of a NEW RELIGION, in appointing its ministers, or even their method of proceeding in naming their successors, as absolutely conclusive in favor of the same method in after times; inasmuch as no other plan may be supposable as proper or practicable at the commencement of a new order of things; and yet, some other plan be both possible and more eligible, when this same economy has run on through a tract of time."¹ Apostolic precedent is only binding where it is of the nature of an apostolic precept, where it is given in the exercise of apostolic inspiration, and with the forethought of apostolic prescience. The apostles themselves distinguish between what is essential as a necessary principle, and what is expedient for the present necessity; between what, in certain circumstances, may be a duty, while, in other circumstances, it may be a matter of perfect liberty and indifference.² That this rule is necessary, appears from the admission made by these divines, that "ordination, episcopacy, &c. come under the category of rites and discipline," and yet, that "rites are found in scripture, which every one admits to be changeable."³

But, what is still more to the point, in order to establish the designed perpetuity of such an institution, it must be shown, as Mr. Palmer testifies, that it was "enacted by the authority," not of "some of the apostles" merely; but "by all the apostles, under the express direction of the Holy Ghost."⁴ "It may be affirmed," to apply the conclusion of this writer, "that unless there is evidence that this system was instituted for a *permanent* object, or was to be transmitted to others, it cannot by any means be proved a matter of faith; and therefore, even if we were to concede, that "this system was, in fact, followed

1) Spiritual Despotism, p. 149.

2) See Calvin's Institut. B. iv. ch. x. § xx. and ch. xix. § xxx. "We do not," says Dr. Howe, (Vind. p. 354,) "rest the obligation of episcopacy on the ground of its existence in the primitive church, but on the ground that the apostles, acting under the commission, and in conformity to the will of Christ, established it as the regular and *permanent* method of conferring the sacerdotal power." This principle is also admitted by Dr. Bowden, in arguing on the subject of the synagogues. (Works on Episcop. vol. ii. p. 145.) "Ezra's being an inspired man, is no proof that he established them; but if he did, it is no proof

that he was directed to do so, for inspired men did many things, merely on the ground of human expediency."

"What if baptism was administered to heathen converts? It was not done, so far as we know, by divine appointment." See also Dr. Mitchell's Letters to Bishop Skinner, p. 69.

3) See illustrated by examples, Palmer, vol. ii. p. 70. "It universally acknowledged," says Dr. Bowden, "that several apostolic usages are not binding, because the apostles, in such cases, did not act on the ground of divine authority." (Letters, 2d series, iii. p. 21.)

4) See illustrated by examples, Palmer, vol. ii. p. 71.

by the apostles, as is pretended," "its *divine* right would not be established."¹ For, unless it can be thus "proved from scripture, it is no article of faith, notwithstanding the rash assertions of some modern theologians to the contrary."²

But again, that we may advance to another point. Were we required by proof, plain and sufficient, to admit that the system of diocesan prelacy was instituted by apostolic authority, as a permanent ordinance in the church; a further requisition must be met, before its *exclusive* title to the prerogatives of the church of Christ can be admitted. Many of the most important and learned writers, — and among them not a few who have adhered most conscientiously to the prelati form of church government, — have been of the opinion, that, on scripture evidence alone, an assent could never be demanded for this, or any existing and completed form of church polity; but that, with the approbation or permission of the apostles, the particular nature and order of the ecclesiastical constitution of any particular church, was made to accord with the national sentiments and civil usages of christians, in the different countries and provinces where christianity was established. Many variations and anomalies in the distribution of offices, the order of procedure, and the mode of government, were, it is by these parties believed, actually found in the apostolic churches; and that it was only in the course of centuries, the churches became so fused and melted, as to form but one homogeneous mass. In the affirmation, that prelacy, as now modelled, was matured in the first age of the church, it is believed by such writers, that "common sense is insulted and historic evidence outraged, by affirming it to have been a fact."³

But, in order to authenticate the divine right of prelacy to the monopoly of grace, it is obviously necessary, that it should be made manifest by the clear declarations of the lawgiver, that such was his predetermined purpose and decree. This, then, is a fourth condition in the argument for the exclusive assumptions of prelacy. It would not suffice, for this end, to show from undoubted scripture authority, that prelati orders are valid and allowable, but that they are necessary, and, therefore, binding. It must be "*proved*," that these prelati dogmas are "articles of faith," and that they are so taught in the Bible.⁴ And this proof must be perfectly sufficient, for it is enough to destroy the claim of any such rites or discipline to be considered as

1) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 496, in arguing against the supremacy of Peter. See also pp. 494 and 493.

2) *Ibid*, p. 505 on do.

3) See *Spiritual Despotism*, pp. 160, 163, 166, and pp. 118 and 119.

4) Palmer, ii. p. 465.

articles of faith, that their definite and exclusive appointment as the only allowable forms of christian polity, is doubtful.¹ Facts obscurely revealed, and practices inferentially deduced from incidental allusions, can never be made authoritative and binding on the conscience. "It is not in any such form, that law has ever been promulgated. No legislator has so tortured the ingenuity of any people." And since christianity is distinguished from Judaism by being a system of principles, instead of forms; a code of doctrines, rather than a ritual; a digest of essential elements, and not a huge collection of minute circumstances; — we require nothing more to disprove the asserted obligatory character of any imposition which is forced upon us, than that "the primitive practice in such a matter is clearly not clear." The only council which assembled under the guidance of inspired men, has emblazoned, in the forefront of christianity, its distinctive character, when they left on record this decree — "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these NECESSARY THINGS."² "Nevertheless, and with this very proclamation before our eyes, we may make the apostles despots, if we will thrust them into the iron chair of tyranny, and extort law from their lips, where in fact they have uttered no decree."³ We acknowledge, therefore, no right of legislation where Christ has left us at liberty, nor will we be bound by the commandments or traditions of any men, however loudly they may trumpet their own praises, and herald their empty denunciations.

These four canons being observed, in discovering to us the undoubted commencement of this chain of the apostolical succession of prelatical bishops; we shall be canonically equipped for an entrance upon the investigation of its more lengthened continuance. Here also, however, there are certain rules by which, in this all-important inquiry, we must be most cautiously guided. For, as we have already shown, prelates themselves, both Romanists and protestants, have staked their present claims to the character of THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, upon the FACT, as they state it, that "the succession of prelates (bishops) from the apostles has preserved and transmitted from one generation to another, THE IDENTITY of the church."⁴ This is "shown," say they "to be the unanswerable argument for the truth of christianity"⁵ — "was maintained as the great pillar of the church by the men on whom

1) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 453, 467, 472, 473, 474.

2) Acts, xv. 28.

3) Spiritual Despotism, p. 121. See also p. 163.

4) British Critic, 1839, No. 52, p. 257.

5) Leslie's Short and Easy Method, vol. iii. p. 2.

the Anglican theology rests and is founded,"—and is "the only ground" on which is based that claim of respect and attention, which they make² and upon which they can boldly meet Romanism and dissent.³ The whole fabric of christianity is, we are assured, virtually connected with it.⁴ So that, where it is lost, "the overthrow of the church, and the gospel of Christ, has followed also."⁵ Its rejection is the source of all errors and heresies,⁶ while it is made the fountain of all those other opinions and practices, to which we object in the system of high-church pre-lacy; and by which we believe it to be, so far forth, identified first with the Nicene, and afterwards with the Romish church, in the corruptions and errors which characterized their apostacy from the simplicity and purity of the gospel. Hear what is said on this point: "This," that is, the apostolical succession, "is the rudimental truth on which all the churches rest. They have gone forward from one truth to another; from the apostolical commission to the succession; from the succession to the office; in the office they have discerned the perpetual priesthood, the perpetual sacrifice; in the sacrifice the glory of the christian church, its power as a fount of grace, and its blessedness as a gate to heaven."⁷ "There is no conceivable point of opinion, or practice, or ritual, or usage, in the church system, ever so minute—no detail of faith or conduct ever so extreme, but what might be a legitimate and necessary result of that one idea, or formula."⁷

1) See *Catena Patrum*, on the *Apost. Success.* in *Oxf. Tr.* No. 74; where are named Hooker, Andrews, Hall, Bramhall, Mede, Sanderson, Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Heylin, Pearson, Bull, Stillingfleet, Ken, Beveridge, Wake, Potter, Nelson, Law, Johnson, Dodwell, Collier, Leslie, Wilson, Bingham, Samuel Johnson, Horne, Jones of Nayland, Horsley, Heber, Jebb, Van Mildert, and Mant.

2) *Oxf. Tr.* No. 1, vol. i.

3) *Ibid*, Tract 74.

4) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 49

5) Mr. Manning's *Append.* p. 113.

6) See *Oxf. Tr.* vol. i. p. 383.

7) See a very elaborate article on "the American Church," in whose praise this is spoken, in the *British Critic*, Oct. 1839, pp. 308, 309, where reference is given to, and quotations made from American bishops. See also Palmer, vol. ii. p. 529, 530. Thus Dr. Pusey speaks of "rites, practices and observances, (such as fasting, ember days,) which she (the church by virtue of this authority) has ever observed, and which are essential to

her well-being." *Letter*, p. 183, *Eng. ed.*

The supreme importance to be attached to this investigation into the tests by which the validity of this succession must be approved, is manifest. "If the succession," says Dr. Chandler, (*Appeal in Behalf of the Ch. of Eng. in America*, N. Y. 1767, p. 4,) "be ONCE broken, and the power of ordination, ONCE lost," as it is on their theory by invalidity, "not all the men on earth, not all the angels in heaven, without an immediate commission from Christ, can restore it." "Admit," says Dr. Howe, (*Vindication of the Prot. Episcopal Church*, p. 347,) "for the sake of testing a principle, that the succession should be interrupted, how would the priestly office be conferred? There would be no person on earth, according to the supposition, possessed of the ordaining power. It follows, that the sacerdotal office would perish, unless God should be pleased again miraculously to interpose." "There is a perfect analogy in this particular between the Bible

Such, then, being the issues dependent upon the determination of this question, it is all-important that it should be most accurately weighed.

It must first, therefore, be shown, that no link is wanting in this chain of personal succession, from the first successor of the apostles down to the present time. In demanding the most perfect proof of the purity and perfection of every link, in the several chains, that bind each church to the apostles, and by which they are invested with that "plenitude of sacerdotal power which constitutes episcopacy"¹ — we only ask what they

and the priesthood. An uninterrupted succession of true copies is necessary to the former; an uninterrupted succession of true ordainers is necessary to the latter. If either succession be *really* interrupted, the interruption must be fatal, until God shall be pleased to interpose." (Ibid. See also Percival on the Apost. Succ. pp. 51, 53, Am. ed.)

Bishop Ravenscroft thus lays down the law: "As the ministerial character is a divine right to transact the affairs of Christ's kingdom, ORDINATION must consequently be the only evidence (miracles excepted) of divine right — the substitute to us for miraculous attestation to the ministerial communion." (Vind. and Def. in Evang. and Lit. Magazine, vol. ix. p. 539.)

The wily Romanist, the author of the "Nullity," a paper answered by Burnet, thus argues: "They are no bishops, (Lond. Chr. Obs. 1838, p. 825, and Ed. obs. p. 826,) because their form of ordination is essentially invalid and null, seeing it cannot be valid, (no more than that of priesthood,) unless it be in fit words, which signifies the order given; as Mr. Mason says, in his *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, lib. i. c. 16, n. 6, in these terms: Not any words can serve for this institution, but such as are fit to express the power of the order given. And the reason is evident, because ordination, being a sacrament, (as the same author says, lib. i. n. 8, and Doctor Bramhall, p. 96, of the consecration of protestant bishops,) that is, a visible sign of invisible grace given by it, there must be some visible sign or words in the form of it, to signify the power given, and to determine the matter (which is the imposition of hands, of itself a dumb sign, and common to priests and dea-

cons, confirming, curing, &c.) to the grace of episcopal order." "We sincerely believe," they add, "that upon the non-spiritual principles assumed by the objector, the orders of the Church of England would be invalid."

But there are many questions we, in our turn, might put both to Anglican and Roman prelatists. As for instance, "Was Ignatius, (Dr. Mitchell's Pres. Letters, p. 219,) the bishop of Antioch, ordained by the laying on of hands? Dr. Wake seems to doubt of it much. We have seen that Gregory Thaumaturgus was not ordained to the charge of the *seventeen* by imposition of hands, no more than by two or three bishops, and consequently never was ordained. Frumentius was the apostle of the Indians; and it was not till after he had been employed in converting them, that Athanasius ordained him. The king of the Iberians was employed, with success, in the conversion of his subjects, before he was so much as baptized, and his history does not say, that he ever was ordained. Olaus Fringesson, king of Norway, first converted his own subjects, and then fitted out ships, and went on board, with a sufficient number of learned men and disciplined troops, and in his apostolic circumnavigation, converted a great number of his pagan allies and dependents, without ever thinking of being ordained."

We find, by a very recent possession of "Dr. Mitchell's Presbyterian Letters, addressed to Bishop Skinner," (London, 1869,) that this very argument is pursued at great length. See part ii. of that work, p. 194—262.

1) British Critic, 1839, No. 52, p. 257. *Plenitudo sacerdotii*, is a designation used for episcopacy in ancient writers.

vauntingly declare to be in preservation and in actual possession.¹

A single breach, in any part, of any one course, of this mysterious chain — by which a nervous spiritual energy is communicated to the entire body — will at once destroy its vitality, and reduce its ministers to laymen, and its ordinances to mere nullities.

A second test, which is also self-imposed, and which will be necessary for the further trial of the genuineness of each link in this golden chain, is this : it must be made manifest, in regard to all the individuals in this long line of personal succession, that their ordination as prelates was valid ; first, as to its form ; secondly, as to the subject of it ; and thirdly, as to its ministers.²

This validity must be ascertained, first, as to the form of their ordination. For, “any episcopal ordination”³ will by no means be a sufficient guaranty, when, by a mistake, the souls which Christ redeemed may, through hesitation “or mistake, perish.”⁴ Numerous have been the cases in which individuals have been forthwith and unconditionally re-ordained, when any doubt has affected the “ministration of the sacrament,” — to use prelatial language — in its own original form ; and this, “whether the doubt affected the whole sacrament, or related only to a circumstance of the sacrament already administered.” “For sacraments are of such great moment ; especially those which are conferred but once, that when there is any probable doubt that they have not been validly received or delivered, they ought certainly to be conferred again.”⁵ This custom continues even now, as may be seen from many striking illustrations of it, as given by themselves.⁶ The “divine grace or commission is believed,” we are informed, “to be only given perfectly, to those lawfully ordained.”⁷ Now Bingham teaches us, that “no bishop was to be elected or ordained without their (metropolitans’) consent and approbation ; otherwise, the canons pronounce both the election and the ordination null.”⁸ No bishop was to be ordained, until the canons of the church were read in his hearing. All the ancient rituals, and pontificals, and canons, “require the imposition of hands to be given by the consecrating bishops, *while* the prayer of consecration is repeated. “It might be

1) See Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 377, 378. and see references in Lecture i. “This authority is traceable in our church to the apostles, and through the apostles to Christ.” Dr. Boyton’s Sermon, p. 14.

2) Palmer on the Ch. vol. ii. 436.

3) Ibid, p. 434.

4) Morinus de Ordin, in Palmer, ii. p. 434.

5) See Palmer, *ibid*, p. 435.

6) Palmer, ii. p. 441.

7) Bingham, B. ii. ch. xvi. § 12.

8) Ibid, B. iv. ch. vi. § 1.

argued," says Mr. Palmer, "that this is necessary, in order to determine the other to the grace of the episcopal order."¹ It must also be determined beyond doubt, what form is necessary to a valid ordination; for, if the essence of "this sacrament" consists in the matter and form now assigned by the Romish church,² then it follows that, "since all the rituals of the Latin church — for the first ten centuries — had no such form, . . . the church had, in the course of so many ages, no true orders."³ These, and all other considerations, of whatever nature they may be, touching the form in which a valid ordination may be conferred, — must be shown to be all fulfilled in reference to each individual prelate, in the endless chain of apostolical succession.

But, *secondly*, this validity must be further manifested, as it regards the subjects of such ordinations. And first, we demand that above, and in precedence to, all other requirements on this head, those laid down in the apostolic canons be fully and answerably met.

The qualifications of a bishop are unequivocally expressed by the apostle Paul, as in other places, so very fully in 1 Tim. iii. 1—7, and Titus, iv. 5—9. Personal piety; holiness of character; a thorough and correct knowledge of the truths of the gospel; and ability to communicate that knowledge to others — these, among other specifications, are made essential to him who would fitly enter upon the high and holy office of a christian bishop. These qualifications are what God himself has made necessary, and which cannot, therefore, be dispensed with by man. They are not such as are desirable merely, but such as are required — not such as are variable, but what are permanently necessary. Without these, no ecclesiastical authority under heaven, could induct a man into the character, however it might into the office, of a minister of the New Testament.⁴ Such an individual might be officially, externally, and nominally, a bishop, but he would not be a teacher sent of God, or called by him. It were blasphemous presumption to challenge the power of gifting such an one, by the mere imposition of a prelate's hands, and the utterance of a prelate's prayer, (and yet this, we are told, is the essence of ordination, though it is no where so taught in the word of God,) with the plenitude of sacerdotal power and episcopal grace. A bench composed of such bishops, were a most graceless episcopate — having power to sit as God in his temple — to subvert his counsels, and to set

1) Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 467, 468.

3) Ibid, do.

2) See Bishop Burnet on Art.

4) See Palmer, vol. ii. p. 446,

25th, pp. 373 and 374.

and p. 510.

at naught his plainest requirements. They who knowingly ordain such characters; and they who are, in such unfitness, knowingly ordained — are traitors to God, to his church, and to his sacred cause.

In their declaration of the functions of bishops and priests, the English reformers declare, in full conformity with these views, that “this office, &c. is subject, determined and restrained unto those certain limits and ends, for the which the same was appointed by God’s ordinance,” &c. Again: “by which words, (of the apostle, in the passage quoted above,) it appeareth evidently, not only that St. Paul accounted and numbered this said power and office of the pastors and doctors, among the proper and special gifts of the Holy Ghost; but it also appeareth that the same was a limited power and office, ordained especially, and only, for the causes and purposes before rehearsed.”¹ If, then, it should be found historically true, that such graceless and unqualified subjects have been thrust into the office, or rather, into the benefice and emoluments of the office of bishop — then are we assured, that God never sent them, and that, however *called* bishops, they were yet *no* bishops — and consequently, were absolutely unfit either to receive, or to impart, or to transmit, this spiritual or heavenly gift.²

But when we pass from the consideration of the qualifications of the proper subjects of episcopal ordination, as they are laid down in the canon of inspiration, to these same qualifications, as laid down in the canons of councils, and in the common law of ecclesiastical bodies; we shall find that the tests of such validity are multiplied and not decreased, and that the impossibility of authenticating the genuineness of every link, in this interminable chain, is as far removed from practicability as infinite is from finite.

Bishops, as we thus learn, were not to be ordained under thirty years of age,³ and yet we know they were often ordained even in infancy.⁴ They only were proper subjects for ordina-

1) See also Art. xxvi. See this in Burnet’s Hist. of Reform. Coll. of Records, B. iii. Art. v.

2) We do not say that God cannot, or that he has not blessed the ministration of unworthy prelates and teachers, but only that such *individuals* are *themselves* unworthy, and as ministers, invalid in the sight of God, and that they are incapable, by any personal merit or influence, of communicating any spiritual grace. If by the episcopal grace, we understand

the office of the episcopate, then is the word altogether misapplied, being withdrawn from its spiritual and internal reference, and applied to that which is only external. And if, on the other hand, it is intended to refer to an internal spiritual efficacy, this plainly is neither possessed nor communicable by such unholy prelates.

3) Bingham, vol. i. pp. 103, 104.

4) Ibid, p. 106, and Calvin, B. iv. ch. v. § 1.

tion, who had gone through the inferior orders; and yet nothing was more common than for individuals to be thrust into the episcopate at once.² The book of the gospels was to be laid upon the head of bishops at their ordination,³ and yet have there been times, when such a book could not be obtained. No one was to be ordained a bishop while under sentence of deposition.⁴ Inquiry was to be made into the faith and morals of such as were ordained;⁵ ordination was not to be given to strangers,⁶ — nor to persons who had done public penance⁷ — nor to energumens or demoniacs⁸ — nor to murderers, or adulterers, nor to any that had lapsed in time of persecution⁹ — nor to usurers or seditious persons¹⁰ — nor to such as had dismembered their own body, (as Origen did,)¹¹ — nor to such as were baptized with clinic

1) "When Constantine, (Presb. Letters, pp. 233, 234,) the antipope, was compelled to yield the apostolic chair to Stephen III., in 768, and was dragged before a council in the lateran, (his eyes having been mercifully torn out, that he might be exempted from the pain of seeing his successful competitor,) he was sternly asked, why he, a layman, had dared, in defiance of the *laws of the church*, to accept ordination as a bishop. Constantine answered, that of such ordinations there were many examples in the church; of which he mentioned, particularly, the cases of Sergius of Ravenna, and Stephen of Naples, who of laymen were ordained metropolitans, in the late pontificate. If pain and fear had not confounded his recollection, he might have mentioned many more instances of the same gross irregularity, and produced a multiplicity of examples of men who were consecrated *high* priests, without being priests. He might have named Cyprian, 'the apostle of high-church,' who, according to Pontius, his biographer, was only what was called a nephite, or one newly converted and baptized, when he was elected and ordained bishop of Carthage; and Nectarius, whom the second general council appointed to succeed Gregory Nazianzen, in the see of Constantinople; and Philogonius, who was, without ceremony, taken from the bench, on which he sat as a lay-judge, and placed on the episcopal throne of Antioch; nay, and as great a saint as any of them, Ambrose of Milan, who was elected bishop before he was baptized, and ordained a few days after.

No person who is conversant with ecclesiastical history, needs to be informed, that *after* the time of Constantine (the antipope) such transgressions of the canons occurred frequently. Some of them were shockingly flagrant."

"Pope Alexander II. condemns ordination *per saltum*, that is, leaping to a superior order without passing through the inferior." Art. Ordination, Rees' Cyclop.

Mr. Percival himself allows that there "are *many* instances to be found in church history, of persons consecrated to the *episcopate* from the *laity*." (On Apost. Suc. Ap. p. 110, Eng. ed.) Now, Dr. Field, who is at least as good authority as Mr. Percival, says: "A bishop ordained *per saltum*, (i. e. that never had the ordination of a presbyter,) can neither consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's body, nor *ORDAIN* a PRESBYTER." Of the Church, B. 3, ch. 39, p. 157, fol. ed. 1635, in Powell, p. 310.

See instances of those introduced to the episcopate immediately, in Plea for Presb. p. 19.

2) See further, Palmer, vol. ii. p. 432, and Bingham, vol. vi. pp. 108 and 109.

3) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 121.

4) Bingham, vol. vi. p. 492.

5) *Ibid*, vol. i. 358.

6) *Ibid*, vol. i. p. 360.

7) Bingham, vol. i. 361, and vol. vi. p. 495.

8) *Ibid*, vol. vi. p. 493, and vol. i. p. 331.

9) *Ibid*, vol. i. p. 363.

10) *Ibid*, p. 365.

11) *Ibid*, vol. i. p. 366.

baptism¹—nor to any one unbaptized, or not baptized in due form²—nor to any baptized, or even re-baptized by heretics or laymen³—nor to any who had not first made all their family catholics⁴—nor to soldiers, actors, and numberless other descript and nondescript characters.⁵

1) Bingham, vol. i. p. 369, and Blair's Waldenses, vol. i. p. 40.

2) Bingham, vol. vi. p. 493.

3) Ibid, vol. i. p. 370, &c Further, in the reign of James I. the words "lawful minister were inserted in the rubric for private baptism, to prevent laymen from presuming to baptize." Rymer, vol. xvi. p. 575, in Origin of the Prayer Book, p. 100.

See also Lond. Chr. Obs. for 1811, App. p. 832.

"Baptism (Presb. Letters, pp. 297, 298) ought unquestionably to precede consecration. So thought Cyprian, and that 'great and respectable council,' the first council of Nice, and the composers of the apostolical constitutions; in a word, all that you account respectable in christian antiquity."

"But the most terrible consequence of all is, that, when the present episcopal clergy of Scotland look back to their spiritual progenitors of the seventeenth century, they can discern nothing but a number of pagans dressed in canonicals. If their ancestors, after the flesh, were unbaptized persons, as all presbyterians are; (and I am much misinformed, if several of them have not this dreadful retrospect,) then they have nothing hereditary to depend on for their admission into heaven; but must be obliged, like those who call themselves 'clergy' of the establishment, to trust to 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.'"

"Unless," says Dr. Mitchell, addressing the non-furing successor, Bishop Skinner, (Presb. Letters, p. 223,) "you have sacrificed some of your distinguishing principles to the treaty of friendship, into which you have lately entered with that church, you must maintain that baptism by midwives, or any of the laity, male or female, is *not valid*, and that it leaves the person to whom it is administered, as much a Jew or pagan as it finds him."

4) Bingham, vol. i. p. 371.

5) See in *ibid*, vol. i. pp. 370, 392.

But further, (Presbyterian Letters, pp. 227, 228:) "One may be incapacitated by one's sex as well as by one's age, for ordination to a baptism; and it is not beyond the bounds of rational belief, that you have some female 'authors and predecessors' between you and the apostles. It is a canon of the New Testament, that women shall not be ordained ecclesiastics of such an order, as entitles them to speak in the churches. Yet there are at least fifty Latin authors, including Platina and some Greeks, who relate that a lady, most of them say of English extraction, of the name of Jollana, or Joan, did slip, somehow, into the chair of St. Peter, and occupied it till she was brought to bed. What effect this remarkable event had, during the two years five months and four days that Joan filled the papal see, on the *stream of succession*, in so far as the validity of your orders is concerned, I do not know, and I presume you are alike ignorant. For aught any body now alive can tell, the crosier may have descended to our Scottish primers, from a hand, which Nature and the New Testament appointed to hold no staff but the distaff.

"I am perfectly aware of the fact, (that Joan succeeded St. Peter) being disputed. It would be strange if it were not, in the church of Rome, which conceals, or denies, or expunges from all records, under her control, what she does not choose to acknowledge.

"I am aware, also, that some protestants have submitted to the labor of investigating the evidence, on which the truth of this curious fact rests, and have expressed themselves dissatisfied with it. Yet Fra Paolo, one of the most learned and intelligent Roman catholic writers of his own or any other age, acknowledges that it has never been disproved, and says, that though he is disposed to believe it false, it is not on account of its absurdity, — that age, (the middle of the

Those, says Palmer, "are manifestly devoid of the qualifications required by the apostles and the church," who have been guilty of crime, (see specifications,) who are illiterate, who are neophytes—that is, ordained immediately after their baptism, or before the canonical age,¹ or without examination—who are heretics, excommunicate and schismatics—those deficient in mind or body—those under the command of others—those ordained by a bishop who had no right, or whose ordination was in any degree doubtful,² or who had been

ninth century) producing things as extraordinary as a lady being pope."

See the truth of this history of the popess Joan proved by sixty-five popish authors, several Greek authors, and by other evidence,—and all objections answered—in "The History of Popery," &c. by the authors of the Universal History, 4to. Lond. 1735, vol. i. pp. 299—303.

1) "How old," asks Dr. Mitchell (Pres. Lett. pp. 224, 225,) "was Hugh, the son of Count Herbert, when his father procured his exaltation to the archiepiscopal see of Rheims? Just five years of age; and yet his election was confirmed by the *infallible* Pope John. If Hugh was an apostolic bishop, I suppose no body will dispute the legality and propriety of Caligula's appointment of his favorite horse to the consulship at Rome. Whether the venerable Archbishop Hugh was ordained, and began to perform his archiepiscopal functions, 'or administer the blessings of the holy and venerable sacraments,' before his grace was thought by *madame la countesse*, his mamma, to be quite fit for quitting the nursery; or whether the pope, *de plenitudine potestatis*, permitted his grace to enjoy the revenues of his see in the nursery, and allowed another, such as the arch-priest of the church of Rheims, to perform the functions, in quality of his grace's lieutenant; and among other things to ordain, I will not positively say." "John XI. the bastard of a former pope, was placed in the chair of St. Peter, before he was *twenty* years of age. Benedict IX. was made pope at the age of *eleven*, according to some, and of *eighteen* according to others."

"It were endless to mention, by name, all the striplings, *the adolescentuli*, as Baronius indignantly calls them, who were, at different periods of the Romish hierarchy, and in all

the western nations of Europe, thrust into the highest seats of the church. I cannot, however, pass over two instances, which occurred in our own country, and so lately as the beginning of the sixteenth century. The duke of Ross, a younger brother of king James IV., and Alexander Stuart, James' natural son, were successively nominated to the archbishopric of St. Andrews, the former before he was twenty, the latter when he was fourteen years of age."

2) The author of the Rights of the Chr. Church, (London, 1702, edit. 3d., p. 327,) in controverting Mr. Dodwell's arguments, remarks, "whether the papists have or have not done this, (neglected to continue their succession) the *English* church, by his own reasoning, must be without bishops, because they who were ordained to sees already full, are, as he asserts in at least forty places, no bishops, and their consecrations null and void: and 'it was,' as he saith, 'a principle universally received in the catholic church, as ancient as the practice of two pretending to the same bishoprick, that the *secundus* was always looked on as *nullus foras alienus*, so far from being a bishop of the church, that the attempt divided him from it. And this he saith is as evident from reason as from authority, because no man can convey the same thing twice; and therefore, in all monarchical districts, none can suppose an anti-monarch's title good, till he has shown the first monarch's title is not so.' And consequently, the attempt to make protestant bishops of those sees which were full of others, must be null and void; and if they were no bishops of those places to which they were ordained, they were bishops of no others, and therefore no bishops at all; since none, as he owns, can be a bishop of the catholic church otherwise than by

deprived, and finally, those whose wives are of an evil character."¹

Such are *some* of the tests, by which each link in this "unbroken line from Peter to the present day"² is to be approved.

But, in the *third* place, we must consider the qualifications which must be shown to have existed in each case of ordination, in the ministers or ordainers.

These also are required, by the canons of inspiration, to be faithful men, who shall be able to teach others, also, (2 Tim. ii. 2; and see all of chap. 2nd and 3d.) Faithfulness to God, to Christ, "to the truth and trust of the gospel,"—to the glory of God and the salvation of men,—such only as have these gifts are scripturally empowered to ordain others.

All the canons required that ordination, to be valid, must be performed "by a bishop, whose own ordination is in no degree doubtful."³ Now, according to these canons, all bishops should be consecrated by their metropolitan, and the synod of provincial bishops,⁴ and yet by this single test, the entire succession, both in the English and Romish churches, is completely vitiated.⁵

The canons are equally pointed in requiring, in order to any valid ordination, the presence of at least three prelates.⁶ All ordinations, by less than three prelates, are, by what may be termed, in church phrase, the universal consent of the catholic church—for this *always* supposes a *difference* of more or less extent—and sometimes an opposition on the part even of the majority—invalid.⁷ Now, by this canon, also, the succession,

being a bishop of some particular district. Nor could the death of the popish bishops make those who were not so much as members of the catholic church, to become bishops of it."

1) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 437, 438, and pp. 436, and 434, and 429, &c.

2) Dr. Hook.

3) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 436.

4) Ibid, vol. i. p. 487. The Nicene council enacted that "it is very evident and certain, that if any one be made a bishop without the concurrence of the metropolitan, this great council has decided that such an one ought not to be a bishop." Cap. 7, in Saravia, p. 187.

5) See Palmer, vol. i. pp. 437, 438.

6) Bellarmine allows that a lawful bishop must be (Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 80) ordained of three bishops which were ordained of others, and they of

others before them, till they come to the apostles.

"If we may believe Gregory of Nyssa, (Dr. Mitchell's Presb. Letters, p. 209,) it is a fact, that Gregory Thaumaturgus was ordained, not by two or three bishops laying their hands on him, but by Phedimus, a neighboring bishop, who, at the time of the ordination, happened to be at the distance of three days' journey from the person ordained. The truth is, Phedimus dedicated Gregory to the service of God at Neocesarea, by his own solitary prayers, in the absence of Gregory, and without his consent either asked, or given freely, or extorted; and yet Gregory undertook the charge assigned him, without further ceremony, and performed all the parts of the episcopal function."

7) See this fully argued in Palmer, vol. ii. p. 422, &c., and Bingham, vol. i. p. 117, and Dr. Mason, vol. iii. p. 68

in the Romish and the English church, and in the Romish church in this country also, has been most certainly and palpably destroyed,¹ and clouded with “a very serious doubt on their ordinations generally;”² “a doubt, too, which no after measures could possibly remove or efface,” “since a true and valid episcopal vocation is not merely probable, but CERTAIN and UNDOUBTED.”³

All the bishops present at an ordination are also required to “lay on their hands in the ordination of a bishop.”⁴ Bishops were not to ordain their own successors.⁵ They were to read the canons of the church to every one at his ordination.⁶ They were not to ordain in another’s diocese without consent.⁷ And the hands of the consecrating bishops were to be imposed *while* the prayer of consecration was repeated.⁸

A wrong baptism, also, is sufficient to vitiate the whole future orders received subsequently to it, so that the whole ordination of a church, and its succession, may be broken by one single case of invalid baptism, since it is plain, that “*nihil dat, quod non habet.*” Now, it is a fact, that notwithstanding these canons, no one has ever been refused orders because not prelatially baptized.⁹

We have thus, with as much brevity as possible, laid down the admitted canons or rules of common law, by which judgment must be rendered in this matter. The foundation of prelacy in “the sure word of prophecy,” from which we are admonished to let “no man move us,” “must be tried so as by fire,” by each of the canons we have drawn forth. The actual existence, and the genuine and unadulterated character of each separate link in the chain of personal succession from Christ, through his apostles, to the present time, must next be ascertained as by an *experimentum crucis*, by the application of all those numerous canons we have adduced, touching the form, the subject, and the ministers of ordination as to each individual. It must be known, that he was himself duly qualified for ordination,—that he was duly invested with the sacerdotal power in all its plenitude of grace, and that he received his investiture from the hands of those who were each of them, in like manner, and in all respects, in a condition of “certain and undoubted” fitness to communicate “a valid episcopal vocation.”¹⁰ This task must be undertaken and gone through with, and the result

1) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 469, 470, 471, 472.

2) Palmer, ii. p. 473.

3) *Ibid.*, ii. p. 474.

4) Bingham, vol. i. p. 121.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 135.

6) *Ibid.*, pp. 391, 392.

7) Bingham, vol. i. pp. 83, and 395.

8) Palmer, ii. p. 467.

9) See affirmed in Burnet on the 39th art. in art. xxvi. p. 388, 389.

10) See Lond. Chr. Obs. 1840, p. 222.

brought clearly to light, by a direct or reverse progress, through every link in the catalogue of christian bishops, amounting, as has been stated, to some one hundred thousand.¹ "The unsuppliable defect of any necessary antecedent, must needs," as Chillingworth remarks, "cause a nullity of all those consequences which depend upon it. In fine, to know any one thing, you must first know ten thousand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known. But then, that of ten thousand probables, no one should be false; that of ten thousand requisites, whereof any one may fail, not one should be wanting; this to me is extremely improbable, even cousin-german to impossible. It is," therefore, "not a thing very improbable, that amongst those many millions, which make up the Roman" (and, we may add, the English) "hierarchy, there are not twenty true."²

1) Since, *a priori*, we do not know but what this succession has been broken, by one or many invalid links, it is no more than reasonable to require, as has been said by a very able writer, "that there should be very strong evidence indeed that the strictest regularity was observed in every generation; and that episcopal functions were exercised by none but bishops by succession from the apostles."^{*}

That the ordination in the Romish church has not been validly perpetuated, see shown in Dr. Willet's Syn. Pap. pp. 81, 82.

"Whereas," says Dr. Field, (lib. 3, cap. 39, in Div. Right of the Min. Part ii. p. 143.) "the fathers make all such ordinations void as are made by presbyters, it is to be understood according to the strictness of the canon in use in their times, and not absolutely in the nature of the thing; which appears, in that they likewise make all ordinations *sine titulo* to be void; all ordinations of bishops ordained by fewer than three bishops with the metropolitan; all ordinations of presbyters by bishops out of their own churches without leave. Whereas I am well assured, the Romanists will not pronounce any of these to be void, though the parties so doing are not excusable from all fault." Thus far Dr. Field.

2) See his entire and most con-

clusive *argumentum ad hominem*, and *reductio ad absurdum*, in Works, vol. i. pp. 245—247, and again at p. 281. "To ascertain," says Archbishop Whateley, (Dang. to Christ. Faith, p. 180.) "their apostolical succession for eighteen centuries, you must examine all the decisions of general councils, having first settled the claims of each to divine authority; you must consult the works of all the ancient fathers, observing what are the points wherein they agree, and which of these are essential points; and this, after having first ascertained the orthodoxy of each, and decided on the degree of weight due to his opinion; and for this purpose, you must ascertain also the characters and qualifications of those modern divines who have undertaken to select, translate, and comment upon, some thirty or forty, of those voluminous writers. To require all this, of the great body of plain, ordinary christians, who, by supposition, have not sufficient learning, or ability to judge for themselves of the true sense of scripture, would be an absurdity too gross to be seriously intended by any one. If we were to tell a plain, unscientific man, ignorant of astronomy, and destitute of telescopes, that he must regulate his hours, not by *the town-clock*, but by the satellites of Jupiter, from observations and calculations of their eclipses, no one could be made to believe that we were speaking seriously."

See the nature of our demands and

* Review in the Edinb. Rev. for April, 1839, supposed to be written by Mr. Macauley, who is himself an episcopalian.

Now, if these things be so — and these requisites are indeed necessary — and this personal succession, of validly ordained prelates, is needful to the certain present enjoyment of those heavenly gifts on which salvation depends, — then most truly are we thrown upon a contingency, as hopeless as absolute impossibility can make it; since it is very sure that there is not, on these principles, and when brought to these tests, a single prelate in existence, either according to divine or ecclesiastical right.¹

The jeoparding of the present character and vitality of the church upon these conditions, is nothing less than to evacuate the very being of a church at all.² There is not the shadow of a shade, upon which its fabric can be thus made to rest. This whole boasted claim “is a mere assumption, a baseless theory”³ — and only involves in its own ruin its presumptuous authors.⁴ We bless God, that this wild hypothesis rests not upon a single text in his entire word, — that he never staked the salvation of millions of unborn souls upon a contingency like this,⁵ — and that even were this chain of personal ministerial succession shivered into atoms; we can still rejoice in the succession of God’s word in its purity — of his ordinances in their sanctity — of his gifts in their plenitude — of his graces in all their fulness — of his church in all its glory — and of his Spirit in all the blessings of his divine and enriching presence.

We may be anathematized and stand excommunicate from the Roman or the Anglican churches, but we are not thereby, God be thanked, aliens from the body of Christ, which is His church. We may not belong to the church prelatical, but we may nevertheless — and oh, this is far better! — we may be living members of the church spiritual. We say, with the ancient Albigenses, when thus treated by the Romish hierarchy, “we are christians, you are episcopalians.”⁶ We, my brethren, are not Anglican, not Roman, not protestant episcopalian, — we take “christian for our name,” and presbyterian “for our surname.” We belong to no sect or party, — we tie our faith to no fathers, councils, or authorities. We hazard our salva-

the impossibility of their fulfilment, laid down by Dr. Rice in his Review of Bishop Ravenscroft, in the *Evang. and Lit. Mag.* vol. ix. pp. 550, 451. See also Note B.

1) See Calvin *Instit.* B. iv. ch. v. § 3.

2) See Burnet on the 39th art. p. 338. See also Bishop Hoadley in *Presb. Def.* p. 40.

3) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 518, and see p. 526.

4) See this proved by Dr. Barrow on *Supremacy of the Pope*, *Suppos.* 7th.

5) If this apostolic succession is the only ground of true and heavenly grace, then must every believer, in order to have true peace of mind, ascertain for himself the validity of the claims of their respective ministers.

6) See Faber, on pp. 89, 92, 101, 93.

tion, and the salvation of our children, upon no “fabulous and endless genealogies and questions, which are not of goodly edifying. We have too much to do with realities, to be drawn aside by shadows.”¹ We rest our claim to the attention and regard we expect from our people, not upon our proving that all other denominations are churchless, Christless, and graceless — nor upon long-drawn catena of misquoted and misrepresented fathers — but, upon our manifestation to the consciences of them that hear us, of the truth as it is in Jesus — upon our exhibition of apostolic doctrine and apostolic practice — and upon our zealous efforts to impart to them, as instruments in God’s hands, all spiritual gifts. These are the seals of our ministry, and these the evidences of our divine mission. God has not left us, brethren in the Lord, without authority, nor can any human anathema silence his voice, or prevent the outgoings of his gracious Spirit, in raising up, qualifying, and sending forth many laborers into the harvest of the ministry.

1) This is the language of the bishop of Chester, as applicable to this theory. Charge, edition 1838, see page 3.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE FIFTH.

NOTE A.

The following able remarks are from the *Labyrinth, or Popish Circle*, by Episcopus. (Taken from the *Southern Christ. Advocate*, March, 1841.)

The controversy respecting the succession is useless and endless.

ANTIQUITY and SUCCESSION is the endless burden of the papal song, and yet this is worthy of the highest admiration, that the principal declaimers on this topic are those who, perchance, never thoroughly examined the books and histories of the men from whom that antiquity and continued succession must be drawn and supported:—Or, if they have examined them, they are by no means fit persons to investigate them without affection or prejudice, since they are accustomed either foolishly to believe by means of some proxy, who in their estimation is most intimately acquainted with the matter, although such person is not unfrequently destitute of all correct knowledge of things:—or, without sense or judgment they eagerly catch at every word or syllable which they imagine may be rendered at all subservient to their purpose.

How irksome it must be to descend into the arena of disputation with such persons, every one will perceive. For who does not see the great labor that is required to determine questions which are to be demonstrated from the memory of past ages, from various books and histories, and which, even when established by solid reasons, so as to close the door to all future exceptions, shall still fail to produce any good effect in the minds of the opposite party!

Wherefore they who inculcate upon the body of the people, such matters as these, do nothing but involve them in an inextricable maze, out of which the unskilful multitude either despair of a happy exit, or, if they have any hope, remain still in the same uncertainty, being fatigued and confused by the too difficult labor of investigation. It is impossible for any other result to follow: and this, indeed, is the most ready and effectual way of acquiring power to lord it over the consciences of simple people, and having bound them in a gordian knot, to persuade them to the belief of any thing. But let us put both these things in a little clearer light. I establish the first by the following arguments:—

No man is able to deny that for the asserting of the antiquity not only of the church, but likewise of a continued and uninterrupted succession of bishops in the church, it is necessarily required (1.) a certain, undoubted, and accurate knowledge both of Latin and Greek authors, and of all the histories which have been written on the subject; and (2.) that to this knowledge ought to be added a sound and acute judgment, by which the examiner may discern with exactness, in their pages, the genuine from the spurious and adulterated books, true histories from interpolated ones, and those which have been fabricated by party feelings, passion, and preconceived opinions, from those which have been composed by persons who had no such undue bias or prejudice: so that he may reconcile contrary statements, and faithfully supply defects. Every one must at once perceive what labor, time, and anxiety this would require. Even among the most learned, during the entire space of 1800 years, not one has hitherto been found, who was adequate to this weighty performance. Are the uneducated and unskilful common people, then, who are considered by the papists to be unqualified for the examination of any one of the books of the holy scriptures, sufficient to undertake and go through this great work;—accurately to search all those volumes of ecclesiastical history with which whole barns might be filled and whole ships laden? The laity therefore in the Romish church, who, laying aside the holy scriptures, never cease to prattle

about antiquity, and continued succession, betray a mind sufficiently stupid and foolish because they know nothing more, perhaps much less, about true antiquity and succession, than about the holy scriptures; or rather they are alike ignorant of both.

It is true, indeed, that a catalogue and index of bishops may be easily composed, in which the series and order in which they succeeded each other may be exhibited. But that is nothing to the purpose; for the Greek church, the Ethiopic, and others, have composed such catalogues in favor of their several pretensions. — “The church of Constantinople has one,” says Bellarmine, “from the time of the emperor Constantine, in an uninterrupted series, and Nicephorus likewise deduces the names of all the bishops, even from the time when the apostle Andrew flourished.” Yet Bellarmine, and with him all papists, deny that the Greeks can of right claim to themselves a proper succession. A succession of persons, therefore, is not deemed to be sufficient; but an additional requisite is, that it should be a legitimate succession, and such a one, that there shall not be found, in the line of the successive bishops, a single heretic, atheist, or apostate.

1. It is required, that it be legitimate; for, as the papal decree has it, (Dist. 79.) “if any one shall be enthroned in the apostolic see, by bribes, by human favor, or by popular or military tumult, without the unanimous and canonical election both of the cardinals and of the inferior clergy, let him not be accounted a successor of the apostles, but of the apostates.” 2. It is required that there shall be no heretic in the succession of bishops; for it is on this account, as cardinal Bellarmine, and other popish doctors affirm, that the succession of the Constantinopolitan bishops (those of the Greek church) is not to be esteemed legitimate, because there have been heretics in the number. (Liv. iv. De notis Ecclesie, chap. 8.) If therefore any one wishes to form a correct judgment of the succession of the bishops of Rome, according to the canons of the Papists themselves, he must ascertain both these points with the greatest certainty.

But how is this possible? Who can know, without a shadow of doubt, whether all her bishops obtained the episcopate lawfully? Did those of them who gained their dignity in the succession by simony, that is by money and gifts, (as Simon Magus wished to do,) or by force, intrigues, factions and bribery? But further, if any person desirous of becoming acquainted with their history, shall discover that even the writers most devoted to the claims of the church of Rome frankly confess, not only that one or two, but that many different bishops of Rome attained to the pontifical dignity, who were convicted of open heresy, and accounted (by these chief writers of their own church) impious scoundrels, atheists, schismatics, ruffians, and debauchees, who by gifts and bribes, by force and factious, without any previous choice, or subsequent approbation on the part of the clergy, intruded themselves into the succession by foul machinations and dishonest stratagems, by deceit, and by the influence of their harlots, and kept mistresses, — what diligent inquirer, I ask, can extricate himself from that maze of perplexities in which a knowledge of these circumstances will have involved him? If you say, “Credence in this matter is to be given to the best and to the most faithful historians,” you fall into a new labyrinth: for I ask, who are those historians, and by what are they to be distinguished? Why should any one, by such a remark, derogate from the credit of the popish writers? For they cannot be deemed heretics, or hostile to the church of Rome, who were most subservient to it; and some of these writers were the greatest flatterers of the popes, and the most zealous abettors of the papal dignity. The papist must therefore allow, that writers of this character must have been constrained by the undoubted and known truth of the thing itself, to admit these facts into their writings. And suppose, for the sake of argument, that they who have recorded these corruptions had not been writers devoted to the papacy, what just reason can be given, why they should not be entitled, as faithful writers, to equal credit with the advocates of the pope, and of his assumptions? Friendship is as powerful as enmity, to prevent an author from recording the truth. He who would write a faithful history for future ages, ought to be free from all bias; but by what reason can we persuade ourselves, and convince our own mind, that there has ever been any such writer, especially if we live not in the same age with him? In this

case, however, the testimony against the integrity of the succession of the Roman bishops, is given by writers whose prejudices were all in favor of the papacy.

He who divests himself of preconceived opinions, and who considers these things without prejudice, will clearly see that those who endeavor to shelter themselves under the plea of antiquity and succession, involve themselves in a labyrinth in which they are easily entangled, from which it is scarcely possible for them to be freed."

Very pertinent also are the remarks of Bishop Hoadley. (Preservative, p. 75, &c.) "I do not love, I confess, so much as to repeat the principal branches of their beloved scheme; they are so different, whencesoever they come, from the voice of the gospel. When they would claim you, as their fellow-laborers the papists do, by telling you that you cannot hope for the favor of God, but in the strictest communion with their church, (which is the true Church of England, governed by bishops in a regular succession,) — that God hath himself hung your salvation upon this nicety; — that he dispenses none of his favors or graces, but by the hands of them and their subordinate priests; — that you cannot be authoritatively blessed or released from your sins, but by them who are the regular priests; — that churches under other bishops, (i. e. other than in a regular succession,) are schismatical conventicles, made up of excommunicated persons, both clergy and laity; out of God's church, as well as out of his favor: — I say, when such arguments as these are urged; you need only have recourse to a general answer, to this whole heap of scandal and defamation, upon the will of God, the gospel of Christ, and the Church of England in particular: — that you have not so learned Christ, or the design of his gospel, or even the foundation of this particular part of his church, reformed and established in England. The following arguments will justify you, which therefore ought to be frequently in the thoughts of all, who have any value for the most important points. God is just, and equal, and good: and as sure as he is so, he cannot put the salvation and happiness of any man, upon what he himself has put it out of the power of any man upon earth, to be entirely satisfied in. — It hath not pleased God, in his providence, to keep up any proof of the least probability, or moral possibility, of a regular uninterrupted succession. But there is a great appearance, and, humanly speaking, a certainty of the contrary, that this succession hath been interrupted."

NOTE B.

There is still another source of uncertainty, to which we may here allude. According to Maimbourg, the Jesuit, (*Hist. du Grand Schisme, D'Occident, in Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag. Ap. 1840, p. 146.*) there have been about thirty-one established methods by which to make the popes the visible heads of the church. It appears that the election was made for the first five centuries by the clergy and the consent of the people — that the Arian King, Theodoric, usurped the right to create the pope himself, which example was imitated by the Gothic kings who followed him, — that this right was retained by Justinian, and afterwards regained by the tyranny of the marquis of Etruria and the counts of Tuscany, who created and deposed popes at their pleasure, instruments of their passions — and that for some centuries this power having been obtained by the cardinals, is still retained by them. Most certain it is, then, that either this office is of divine right, and then the mode of its transmitted inheritance must be equally of divine appointment, in which case it cannot be pretended that any valid or proper succession has been preserved, unless there are some thirty-one modes of such succession laid down in the word of God; for Maimbourg himself asserts that in the great Schism whose history he writes, "it was morally impossible to decide who were true popes, and who anti-popes;" — or this office is not divine, but an usurpation and a despotism, and in this case it is equally a matter of indifference whether there have been thirty, or thirty thousand ways by which its retainers have gained possession of the papal chair. Most true it is, that if its present incumbents are validly elected and introduced, and therefore true successors for eleven centuries after Christ, no true pope could have occupied the see of Rome. See also Father Paul's *Treatise on Benefices and Revenues. Westminster. 1727, p. 26.*

LECTURE VI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION TESTED BY SCRIPTURE.

THE claims which are involved in the doctrine of the apostolical descent, as maintained by *many* of its advocates, are not less arbitrary and despotic; not less exclusive of the just rights and privileges of other sovereignties; nor less regardless of their interest and happiness; than were those of the Babylonian despot. This doctrine being supposed true, there is but one church on earth, and that is the prelatiC — there is but one order of ministry, and that is the succession of prelates — there is but one channel of efficacious grace, and that flows between the high embankments of prelacy — and there is but one covenanted gift of plenary mercy, and that is deposited in the hands of prelates.

This doctrine, in all its nakedness, and boldness, is proclaimed, as the fundamental principle of all church claims whatsoever, by the doctors of the Vatican and the Sorbonne; by the doctors of Maynooth, and the doctors of Oxford; by the Roman and the Anglican church. “It is the mystic pæan of sacerdotal power and glory.”

Nor is this doctrine, at least in those essential elements, which drag with them, by necessary consequence, the whole train of awful and soul-shuddering consequences, received merely by those who are denominated high-churchmen, and who love and admire the church with an almost idolatrous attachment; but it is also, as would appear, avowed by many of those who are distinguished as evangelical, or low-church episcopalians.

“Few episcopal readers of the tracts,” (I quote from the Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, May 9, 1840, the organ of the low-church, or evangelic episcopalians)¹ can hesitate to approve

1) The Rev. John A. Clark, one of the editors of this paper, in his “Letters on the Church,” and which are generally very unexceptionable in their spirit and language, nevertheless declares, “To my mind, this question assumes a vast importance from a deep-rooted conviction, not only that ours is VERILY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, but,” &c.

“That the evangelical clergy,” says R. M. Beverley, Esq., (Heresy of Human Priesthood, London, 1839, p. 81, Note,) “are by their position continually in danger of lapsing into the vortex of Puseyism, is apparent in their writings. ‘I wrote to remind you, good protestants,’ says the author of the Velvet Cushion, ‘that you owe to popery almost every thing that deserves to be called by the name of a church.’ (p. 17.) And of the Oxford Tracts, Mr. Bickersteth says, ‘It is true I strongly deprecate many of their statements and views as erroneous in themselves, and leading to still more dangerous errors. But there is too much seriousness, conscientiousness and impartial truth mingled with those views, for me ever to have expressed the utmost abhorrence against them.’ (Letter in the Record, April 4, 1839.)

“That against this abomination of desolation, set up in the holy place, scarcely an evangelical voice, ministering at the altar, has been heard long and loudly to protest,” says the London Evangelical Magazine, “that the press has not teemed with the exposure and reprobation of this old heresy of Rome, so daringly paraded in the halls and the sanctuaries of the protestant reformation, has been to us a matter of astonishment. Has apostolical succession so blinded their understanding, that the successors of the Venns, the Cecils, and the Newtons, can thus suffer the glory of their ministry to depart without warning or remonstrance? Have the senseless pride and folly of sacerdotal power, by which babes are converted into believers, and scoffers and infidels are sent straight to heaven, taken such possession of their hearts, that for the sake of being Anglican priests, they can cease to be evangelical divines?

Be it so; while we deeply lament it, we fear not for the ark of God. There are other churches in which the sacred light of truth shines with undimmed, if not with perfect lustre.”

“I have just seen,” says a correspondent of the same Magazine, “a publication entitled, ‘A Doctrinal Catechism of the Church of England,’ &c., said to be the production of a highly Calvinistic divine, who officiates in an episcopal chapel, in the west end of the town, not a hundred miles from Tavistock place, in which occur the following questions and answers:

‘1. Who are your lawful and spiritual pastors? The ministers of the Church of England in these realms.

‘2. What are they called? Bishops, priests, and deacons.

‘3. Are not dissenting teachers ministers of the gospel? No; they have never been called after the manner of Aaron.

‘4. But do they not say, that God has called them inwardly? Yes; but if he had, he would have called them according to the order of his word outwardly.

‘5. What do you mean by the order of his word? They should have been appointed by “those who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard,” and who are also the apostles’ successors.

‘6. Who are they? The bishops of the Church of England, in the English church.

‘7. Who consecrated the bishops? Their spiritual predecessors, and they theirs, and so on, until you come to apostolical times and apostolical men, and so to Christ, the founder of our religion.

‘8. Who ordains priests and deacons? The bishops, with the help of their presbyters.

‘9. Is it not very wicked to assume this sacred office? It is; as is evident from the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, mentioned in the xvth chapter of Numbers.

‘10. Who appoints dissenting teachers? They either wickedly appoint each other, or are not appointed at all;

the avowed design of the writers at the commencement of the series, or to acknowledge that there are many things in them deserving of the warmest commendation. There are certain fundamental principles recognized, precious in themselves and highly valuable and conservative when carried only to their legitimate results, which, however they may be presented as novelties, or as old truths long buried and forgotten, the churchman will recognize as familiar elements of his creed, which have always formed essential parts of the constitution of his faith. If the writers had confined their discussions to the divine institution of the ministry — the apostolical succession — the defence of liturgical services — an exposure of the evils of schism, and the modern rationalistic theology; if they had displayed far more zeal than they have, to revive the wholesome administration of discipline in the church, and a more reverent observance of the festivals and fasts — my thorough church principles would have prompted me to bid them God-speed, and be a zealous co-operator with them in their good work. If they had not gone beyond these points, though some might have questioned the validity of some of the arguments employed, and others have been dissatisfied with the results at which they arrived; yet none, I believe, would have complained of their well-intended efforts to fortify the church in these times of peril, by grounding her more thoroughly in the intelligent attachment of her members. The peace of the church would have been undisturbed, her landmarks unremoved, her foundation untouched. When we speak, therefore, of the Oxford tracts, we speak not of the truths they contain or advocate, which are received and acknowledged by all sound churchmen, but of those things which constitute their *peculiarity*, their *characteristic traits* — distinguishing them from the wellknown and long-received theology of our church."

It is thus more and more apparent, as we advance, that it is

and so, in either case, their assuming the office is very wicked.

'11. But are not dissenting teachers thought to be very good men? They are often thought to be such, and so were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, till God showed them to be very wicked.

'12. But may we not hear them preach? No; for God says, "Depart from the tents of these wicked men."

Again: "It is mentioned in the London Patriot, a paper not friendly to the English established church, that the evangelical party in that church is rapidly diminishing, and that they who formerly professed low-church

views, are now becoming the most rampant advocates of the Oxford heresy. It is said that with very few exceptions, such as Baptist Noel, there are no representatives in the establishment, of the Scotts, Newtons, Venns, and Cecils of the last age. Two sons of the estimable Wilberforce, both ministers of that church, are said to be among the most zealous defenders of Puseyism. This is a statement for which we were not prepared, although we have seen in our own country, some singular instances of low-church episcopacy suddenly veering to the opposite extreme." (The Presbyterian.)

all important, necessary, and advisable, that these claims, by which we are to be annihilated in our standing, character, and hopes, as a christian church, should be brought to the balances of the sanctuary, of history, and of sound reason, and there tested. For upon this issue depend the everlasting destinies of millions in past, present, and long-coming ages.

In our former discourse we made an entrance into the courts of the temple, and there, with the aid and assistance of these very men by whom we are to be adjudged, brought forth those balances or tests, by which the real merits of such claims are to be tried. We now proceed to an actual experiment of the question, and to make it manifest that, when weighed in these balances, they are found, like the doomed Belshazzar, Tekel—Tekel.

We affirm, then, that these claims are found radically defective when brought to the balances of scripture. Scripture knows them not. They are neither in it, nor of it, nor accordant with it. They can only be imputed to that sacred volume, when it is opened amid the gloomy shadows of darkening ages, and when its meaning is eked out by the torturing crucible of ecclesiastical comments, groundless analogies, and the most inconclusive and illegitimate inferences. It is only when thus seen through the stained light, which streams upon the sacred pages from the cloistered windows of cathedrals, abbeys, and monkish cells, that the scriptures can be made to speak in the tones, and in the language, of prelacy. For this doctrine of apostolic succession, and for its distinctions of orders and functions, as of divine right and *de fide*, and therefore essential; we dare boldly challenge the production of any thing like a warranty, from the only infallible rule of faith and practice. These distinctions, we aver, are the offspring of time and custom, and the progressive advancement of spiritual despotism in the church. They are not, therefore, "*de fide*," but are "*de jure ecclesiastico*;" and their authority can rise no higher than its source, and must sink with the depression of that source to its just subordination to the higher authority of God's only and true record. Such prelatie distinctions and deductions, with all their attendant claims, are on the evidence of a firm defender of episcopacy, "glaringly at variance with the usage of the apostolic church,"¹ and could only have arisen when "churchmen had renounced all respect for the example and injunctions of the inspired founders of christianity." These "divine episcopal prerogatives," this "consummation of church

1) Isaac Taylor in *Spiritual Despotism*, p. 208.

power," irresponsible and uncontrollable, is not apostolic, — however it may be ancient christianity. There is not, we repeat, a single text in the Bible, from which they are fairly deducible.

Indeed, we have already shown, that but few of the advocates of this system have been hardy enough to bring prelacy to the test of scripture at all. It is allowed by most, that the doctrine is not there, in any degree of plainness; by many more, that it is the result of a legitimate legislative power possessed by the church, and that it is, therefore, binding; by others, that the polity of the apostolic ages was of necessity immature and unfitted for the perfect condition of the church; and by still others, that no form of polity is, in itself, enjoined, required, or essential. Nor have those, who venture to test episcopacy by scripture, been able to agree among themselves on the first principles of their sacred institutes. Some base their theory on the extinct Jewish sacerdotal orders; some make Christ the first link in the chain of prelates, and the first of the order; some trace their high pedigree to the apostles; some transform the humble presbyters, as referred to in the epistles, into prelates. All are obliged to dress up the missionaries of the cross, who went forth as evangelists to preach the gospel, and to set in order what was wanting in the incipient and chaotic mass which formed the crude materials of the early church; in the pontifical robes of gowned and mitred prelates.¹ Nor is there *one* advocate, who can stand firm on the foundation of scripture, and build from *its materials* ALONE, the fabric of prelacy. We find even the crowned champion, who has lately carried off the laurels, (episcopalians being judges,) in his battle for the scriptural authority of episcopacy, actually substantiating, as we have seen, an arch stone of the whole building, on the authority of a father, who lived in the fifth century! According to some, the essence of episcopacy consists in three orders, essentially distinct, and ordained *de jure divino*, and by inspiration of the Holy Ghost; so that the one cannot perform the functions of the other with any propriety, nor with any efficacy whatever. But it is now granted, by Mr. Palmer, that the orders of bishops and presbyters are identical, differing not in essence or nature, but only in degree and in a very few functionary offices.² The order of deacon, he says, is not a spiritual order at all, but only a temporal order, and not formally pos-

1) See Wks. on Episcopacy, p. 420. See Episcopacy Tested by Scripture. by Bishop Onderdonk, and generally.

2) Palmer on Church, vol. ii. pp. 375, 400, 398, 403, 439.

sessed, either by their ordination or by the ritual, with any cure of souls, or jurisdiction, or power of celebrating divine service, or any duties, other than of a "temporal, or at least a very inferior character."¹

In short, there is no unison whatever among prelati divines, except in the opinion, that prelacy must be upheld and maintained.²

"My antiquity is Christ Jesus," said Ignatius; and we deny the authority of this true and only valuable antiquity, for this system of prelacy; as it assumes to be the only efficacious fountain of that plenitude of episcopal grace, which is to flow, in augmenting power, along the growing lines of apostolical descent.

It is not our purpose here to enter into the argument from the identity of bishops and presbyters, as the one order of the christian ministry. This position, as we have shown, is now in some measure granted by one of the ablest advocates of the prelati system, and will come under review at another stage of our discussion.³ Nor is this question essential to the present inquiry, which is — supposing this distinction to be allowed — Do the scriptures teach, that the order of prelates is essential to the continuance of the church, so that without it, the church is deprived of its vital organ, — its brain, — the very source of all its living energies? Do they teach, and where do they teach, that this order, by divine appointment, is the sole and exclusive fountain and depository of heavenly influences; and that through it, as such, these influences would be continued, in an unbroken personal succession, along which this electric power might invisibly and potently communicate itself, to the end of time? This is the fact to be made plain from scripture; and that, too, not by strained analogies, or far-fetched inferences, or fanciful and gratuitous interpretations, between which and those adopted, as the basis of the papacy, there is no essential distinction; so that, if prelacy be true, and on these grounds; the papacy cannot be proved untrue.⁴

When we come to substantiate, as we hope to do, the scriptural claims of presbyters to the true apostolical succession, we shall feel called upon to advance those scriptural grounds, upon

1) Palmer, pp. 403, 375, 404, 405.

2) See Note A.

3) For this discussion see our subsequent volume.

4) "Even allowing the truth and necessity of the doctrine of apostolical succession, there is still a most important question, viz. in what line of church polity was it to run? Was it to be prelati or presbyterian? Now

that this succession, as far as it was transmitted at all, was handed over to presbyters or bishops the Word of God makes certain — but that it was given to any order of diocesan prelates, is what never can be shown, even were Timothy and Titus both supposed to be (incredible supposition) apostles." See Archer's *Six Lect. on Puseyism*, Lect. v.

which such claims are based. But in canvassing the scriptural title of this doctrine of prelatic succession, which is made to supersede and to overthrow every other, we cannot be expected to discover any such scripture proofs for its support, when even our opponents have failed to produce them from the divine record.¹ On the contrary, as has been already seen, but little pretension has been made, by the ablest defenders of this system, to any thing like an express divine warrant.

As, therefore, those particular passages which are adduced in refutation of the claims of presbyters, and in substantiation of those of prelates, will be more fitly considered when we are prepared to advance our own demands, we will in this lecture present some general considerations, by which we would hope to show, that this entire scheme is most gratuitously ascribed to God's holy word.

Now, that we may not unnecessarily prolong this discussion, we would remark, that it has been fully and elaborately shown, by a recent and very learned episcopal writer of the evangelical school, that this whole system of high-church prelacy, and this exclusive claim to apostolical descent in particular, is in direct

1) That prelatists can make some *show* of scripture proof, and appear to rest upon it as authority, is nothing to the point, since, as Dr. Bowden allows, (Wks. on Epis. vol. i. p. 109.) "it is scarcely possible to produce texts of scripture for any point whatever, that may not be obscured by plausible objections. Ingenuity is never at a loss; and when it is excited to exertion by prejudice, and by an attachment to a particular hypothesis, it is extremely difficult to diminish its vigor, and to divest it of all its subterfuges."

"They cannot, however, prove," says Dr. Mitchell, in his Letters to Bishop Skinner, (p. 85.) "that any subordination, implying authority on the one hand and subjection on the other, existed among christian ministers in the apostolic church; nor can they find their three orders among the offices instituted by the apostles. Hence, lest the exhibition of the three orders, consisting of our Lord himself, his apostles, and the *seventy*, should not put to silence all gainsayers, they have recourse to the following curious stratagem. They fix upon a passage, in which Paul enumerates eight different orders of ecclesiastical officers, who were all supernaturally endowed and

set in the church, not by the apostles, who were themselves one of the eight orders, but by Jesus Christ. Without deigning to give a reason for their rejection of five of those orders, as not making part of the *apostolic* model, they do, without any ceremony, seize upon three, and then hollow in the ears of presbyterians, "these *SEEM* to be all the standing orders established in the church. Behold the divine model of the 'sacred hierarchy.'— Adopt it and be saved, or 'reject it, and go to perdition, as you please!'"

"I have looked over my Bible with some attention," (says Sir Michael Foster, Knt. in his Examination of the Scheme of Church Power, 1736, p. 8.) "and do not find any of the powers his lordship speaks of vested in the episcopal order, exclusive of the church, or body of believers. I have likewise consulted some learned men who have made these matters their study, and they tell me, that none of the bishops of the first three hundred years after Christ claimed any separate exclusive powers for the exercise of church discipline, but left those matters to the provincial and diocesan consistories, which, in the purer ages of the church, were composed of bishops, clergy, and laity."

antagonism to the whole spirit and genius of our Lord's *teaching*. This heavy charge he substantiates by an examination of several of the most prominent of our Lord's parables and predictions.¹ The same conclusion he has also drawn from an extensive induction of particulars in the Book of Acts, the first and the only inspired record of the early church; and in which, if any where in scripture, these doctrines must have been fully brought out.

It is unnecessary for us, as this work has been republished, and is in circulation among us, to enter at length into this same argument. We would, however, call attention to a few remarks. When prelatric writers quote in proof of their exclusive powers such passages of scripture as these, — “as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you” — “I am with you always, even unto the end of the world” — “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed me,”² — it is sufficient to reply, that their applicability depends on the assumption as true, of the very question in dispute; and that they can have no pertinency whatever, as an argument in favor of prelates, until the appointment of such an order of ministers, as of permanent and necessary standing in the church, has been otherwise made plain.³ Until this is done, we claim all such passages, in all the fulness of their meaning, for the ministry of the church in

1) See Ancient Christianity, vol. i. See also Potter on Ch. Govt., pp. 124, 125, who explains the parables as referring to church offices while there, is manifestly no allusion to different orders, but to one only.

2) See Percival on the Apost. Succ. p. 61.

3) Paley, after quoting these very passages, (as my Father hath sent, &c.,) adds: (Works, vol. vi. p. 91,) “These are all general directions, supposing, indeed, the existence of a regular ministry in the church, but describing no specific order of pre-eminence or distribution of office and authority. If any other instances can be adduced more circumstantial than these, they will be found, like the appointment of the seven deacons, the collections for the saints, the laying by in store upon the first day of the week, to be rules of the society, rather than laws of the religion — recommendations and expedients fitted to the state of the several churches by those who then administered the affairs of them, rather than precepts

delivered with a solemn design of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages.”

“I have been sometimes disposed to think,” says Dr. Mitchell in his Letters to Bishop Skinner, (p. 87,) “that ‘Lo, I am with you always unto the end of the world,’ means, ‘I will never cease to support the religion which I have commissioned you to publish;’ and that it is parallel to the promise which follows: ‘On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;’ and that both promises refer rather to the stability and duration of the religion itself, than to those of the highest order of its ministers. I was the more confirmed in this opinion, by having read that christianity has subsisted in some places, and even flourished, independently of diocesan bishops. But it seems I have been in a mistake. Both the passages referred to, *must* relate to the duration of episcopacy, till the heavens and earth fly away: so that ‘On this rock will I build my church’ *must* signify, ‘On

general. And since it is not disputed that presbyters were divinely instituted as a perpetual order in the christian ministry; while for the order of prelates, we boldly deny that there is any warrant from God; therefore do we appropriate these glorious declarations — until wrested from them by well-grounded assurance — to the order of presbyters.

It is “indeed,” says Dr. Mitchell, in his *Letters* to Bishop Skinner, “an apostolic precept, which our vindicator does not suffer us to forget — ‘obey them that have rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account.’ But the obedience and submission here enjoined, of whatever nature they may be, are exacted from the people to their pastors, not from one order of ecclesiastics to another. Nay, I can produce some passages in which all christians, both pastors and people, are commanded to ‘be subject to one another, and to submit themselves one to another, in the fear of God.’ But I have not met with a passage, which says either explicitly, or by implication, ‘presbyters and deacons, obey them that have the rule over you, for they watch for your souls.’ When high-church shall show me a passage to this purpose, I shall acknowledge that her divine model, like the image of the great goddess Diana, and the Paladium of Troy, undoubtedly fell down from Jupiter.”¹

It is certainly very remarkable, that we may apply to presbyters the words of Jablonski, as quoted by Mr. Percival, and which he applies to prelates,² “that there is no doctrine or tenet of the christian religion, in which all christians in general have, for the space of eighteen hundred years, so unanimously agreed, as in this of ‘presbytery, as being a certain and necessary order of the christian ministry.’” “In all ages and times down from the apostles, and in all places through Europe, Asia, and Africa, wheresoever there were christians, there were also presbyters; and even where christians differed in other points of doctrine

this rock will I build the episcopate, and presbyterians and independents shall not prevail against it.”

We will here present also the judgment of Archbishop Usher, as given by Dr. Bernard, (*Certain Discourses* by the late Archbishop of Armagh, Lond. 1657, p. 157.) “That last speech of our Saviour, (Matt. xxviii., Lo I am with you, &c.) cannot be limited to the persons of the apostles, (with whose deaths these administrations did not expire,) but must be understood collectively of the whole body of the ministry, then, as it were, in their

loins who should SUCCEED in PREACHING and BAPTISM, and through whom a successive powerful assertance of the spirit is to be transferred in and through those to the end of the world.”

This very promise, (John xx. 21 – 23.) was embodied by the English reformers in their office for the ordination of presbyters, and was continued in its application to them until the year 1661. See also Note B.

1) *Letters*, p. 84.

2) See Percival on *Apos. Succ.* p. 53.

or custom, and made schisms and divisions in the church, yet did they all remain unanimous in retaining their presbyters."¹

As there is this universal consent as it regards the order of presbyters, while for the order of prelates, as held forth in this doctrine of prelatical succession, there can be given no proof either from holy writ, or the earliest ages,² — then surely these and

1) Dr. Edwards, a very learned divine of the reign of Queen Anne, (Theolog. Reformat. vol. i. p. 523,) after a careful examination of the several texts bearing on the subject, draws the following conclusion: "Thus we can show the time when WE ARE SURE THERE WAS A PRESBYTERY; but we CAN'T SAY THERE WAS EPISCOPACY AT THAT time in the CHURCH. This is owned by some of the most celebrated writers of our church; and even Mr. Dodwell, who was thought by his friends to be as able a defender of episcopacy as any they had, confesses there were no such fixed rulers as bishops in the church at first. (De Jure Leic. cap. 3, § 14.) Dr. Whitby shows the same, and is large in the proof of it, (Ann. on 1 Thess. ch. 5.)" Dr. Edwards then goes on to chastise a confident braggadocio, the author of the "Rehearsal," and asks, "Where, then, is our great boaster, who challenges all mankind to prove that presbyters were before bishops? Is it not plain, from all the afore cited scriptures, viz., Acts xi. 29, 30; Acts xiv. 23; Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; Acts xvi. 4; Acts xx. 17, 28, and Titus, i. 5; James, v. 4; 1 Pet. v. 1; and the suffrage of episcopal writers themselves, that presbyters had the start of bishops, whatever this pretender makes a show of, and notwithstanding his telling us, that this is the single point, on which the whole controversy depends? If it be so, he must own himself baffled, and all his pretensions are empty and insignificant." See also note C.

2) "As for those proofs," says Mr. Baynes, in his Diocesan's Tryall, Lond. 1621 p. 45.) "that bishops have been, throughout all churches from the beginning, they are weak. For first, the council of Nice useth *αρχησ*, not *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, in order happily to that time wherein the custom began, which was better known to them than to us; the phrase is so used, Acts xv. 8, in respect to some

things which had not continued many years. They cannot mean the apostles' times, for then metropolitans should have actually been from the apostles' time. Secondly, the phrase of the council of Ephesus is likewise equivocal; for they have reference to the fathers of Nice, or at least the decrees of the fathers, who went before the council of Nice. For, those words being added *definitiones Nicenæ fidei*, seem to explain the former, *canones apostolorum*. It is plain, the decree of the council doth ascribe this thing only to ancient custom no less than that of Nice, Constantinople, and Chalcedon; and, therefore, cannot rise to the authority of sacred scriptures. Let him show, in all antiquity, where sacred scriptures are called canons of the apostles. Finally, if this phrase note rules given by the apostles, then the apostles themselves did set out the bounds of Cyprus and Antioch. As for the authority of *Cyprian*, he doth testify what was *communicated* in his time, bishops ordained in cities; not *universally*, as if there were no city but had some. Secondly, he speaketh of bishops who had their churches included in cities, not more than they might meet together in one, to any common deliberations. They had no diocesan churches, nor were bishops who had majority of rule over their presbyters, nor sole power of ordination. As for the catalogue of succession, it is *pompæ aptior quam pugnæ*; Rome can recite their successors. But because it hath no bishops, ergo, œcumenical bishops, is no consequence. All who are named bishops in the catalogue were not of one cut, and in that sense we controvert."

"Now as to the business in hand," says Bishop Croft, in his Naked Truth, or the True State of the Primitive Church, (Scott's Coll. of Tr. vol. vii. p. 302.) "I cannot yield, that the scripture is very doubtful in it, or scarce doubtful at all; for, though in scripture it is not *in terminis* said, pres-

all similar passages, must be understood of presbyters, and must be considered as conclusive warrant for their divine prerogatives.

According to the plain and evident meaning of his words, our Lord Jesus Christ expressly denounces this system of prelatical supremacy, in its embryo spirit, when he told his disciples — “ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, *exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you.*” (Mark x. 42, 43.) For, in making their ambitious request, the sons of Zebedee desired not merely an elevated post of honor, but such an one as would exalt them above their brethren. It was the desire of official pre-eminence, and a higher rank and order in the arrangements of their fondly imagined hierarchy, which our Saviour so severely rebuked, when he told them, that among the rulers of his spiritual kingdom — the ministers of his church, — there should be no such distinctions of rank, all being of one order, and equal in power.¹ To strengthen this conviction in their minds, our Lord presented to them his own example, saying, “For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.”²

So, also, when the disciples had contended among themselves who should be greatest, (see Mark ix. 33 – 37,) that is, who should be first amongst the apostles, in their expectation of the speedy establishment of his kingdom, our Lord “checked their ambitious designs,” by the declaration, “He that is greatest among you,” in his own ambitious aspirations, “let him be as the younger.”³

bytery and episcopacy are both one and the same order, yet the same circumstantial expressions are (as I have showed) so strong and many, that they are equivalent to a clear expression *in terminis*. Secondly. This is not a matter of any indifference, but of vast and dangerous consequence, if mistaken. That a church without such bishops as you require, cannot be truly called a church, and so we shall exclude many godly reformed churches; for if bishops be of such a superior, distinct order as you pretend, if the power of ordination be inherent in them only; then, where no bishop, no true priests ordained; where no priests, no sacraments; where no sacraments, no church. Wherefore I humbly beseech you, be not too positive in this point, lest thereby you do not only condemn all the reformed churches, but the scripture and St. Paul also.” See their

alleged distinctions between bishops and presbyters, largely confuted in the *Altare Damascenum Davidis* Calderwood, p. 149 – 190, &c., and cap. 4, p. 86 – 143.

1) The Rev. T. H. Horne, prebendary of St. Paul's, says: “Jesus Christ prohibited all disputes concerning rank and pre-eminency in his kingdom.” “Ye know,” says he, “that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But *it shall not be so among you*; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.” Matt. xx. 25 – 27.

2) Hinds' Family Lecturer, Oxford, 1829, p. 127.

3) See *ibid*, p. 123.

All spiritual jurisdiction, therefore, claimed by any one portion of Christ's ministers over others, as a supreme order; and as such, as necessary or of divine right, is a plain and palpable violation of this enactment of the divine author of Christianity. Nor will it avail any thing to say, that Christ made to his apostles, on another occasion, a special promise of such distinction, when he said, "Ye shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" for, in these words, our Lord had evident reference to the future retributions of the eternal world, when, as he declares, "the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory." Thus plainly does it appear that the church of Christ, as designed by our "Saviour," was to be moulded in direct contrariety to prelacy, and upon the very principles of presbyterian parity.

And whereas this doctrine teaches, that the blessing of the covenant, and the favor of Christ, can only be found within the limits of this sacerdotal line of prelates; it is to be observed, that we have declarations in scripture, which prove that the grace of God is not limited, in its bestowal, to such arbitrary boundaries as prelatic formalists would prescribe.² When the disciples saw one who followed not with them casting out devils in Christ's name, they were anxious to prohibit, and to depose him from his unauthorized ministry. But Jesus, we are told, not only sanctioned his ministry, and continued his favor towards him, as he did afterwards to Apollos, (Acts xviii. 24,) but proceeded to chide his blinded and erring disciples, and to lay down this universal rule for the future guidance of his church; "for there is no man who shall do a miracle"—or give manifestation of any spiritual power, in the preaching of the gospel—"in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me; for he that is not against us

1) See Matthew Henry's sermon "On Disputes Reviewed." Wks. Lond. 1830, p. 781, § iv. on "Disputes about Precedence and Superiority."

2) On this point, the language of the Rev. Mr. Leslie, (who, in arguing with dissenters, is most severe and illiberal,) in his Short Method with the Romanists, is very strong. (Edinb. 1835, p. 50. "But that state of the church is better represented by the seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal, but of whom Elijah knew none, but thought he was 'left alone,' (Rom. xi. 3, 4.) This was a state of segregation; there were particular persons who kept the faith, but invisible to the world or to one another, without any

public worship, or so much as private meetings; for Elijah would surely have known of these, and been the principal among them: far less could they have had organized churches with pastors and rulers over them, without being known to Elijah and to many more, even to their persecutors, who found out the most private recesses of the primitive Christians, and their meetings, though in the most secret manner, for divine worship; and their bishops, too, whom they seized and dragged to prisons and to martyrdom, for they could not lie hid, and the faith was then visible, though under persecution." See also Baxter's Five Disputations of Church Government, Lond. 1650, p. 242. See also Note D.

is on our part," (Mark ix. 38-40.) So also that other declaration, which is agreeable to the promise made in the ministerial commission, "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

We have also passages which give fearful warning of the guilt which is incurred by those, who arrogate to themselves offices and powers unauthorized by God's word. The fate of Dathan and Abiram, of Korah and his company, of Jeroboam also, (see Numb. ch. xvi. and 1 Kings, xiii. 34,) and of the seven sons of Sceva the Jew, as recorded in the New Testament,¹ (Acts xix. 13-15,) should admonish all who would usurp a power and dignity which Christ never gave to them, but contrariwise forbade, that they shall not escape the indignation of God.

Not less plain are those express precepts, in which we are called upon to beware of such daring presumption, on the part of all who should be found treading in the steps of the ancient rabbis, and, like them, extorting from their followers a homage to which they have no title. "Be ye not called rabbi," says Christ to his disciples, and through them to all his future ministers; "for ONE is your master, even Christ, and ALL YE ARE BRETHREN; and call no man your father," (or right reverend father in God,) "upon earth; for ONE is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters," (*καθηγυται* leaders or guides, the very idea conveyed by the term prelate,) "for ONE is your master, even Christ." (Matt. xxiii. 8-11. See also Mark x. 42-45; Mark xx. 25-28; Luke xxii. 25-27.

Now, the very head and front of the offending of these ancient rabbis was, their ostentatious assumption of such prelatic titles; their bold pretensions to such prelatic deference and regard, and

1) "The rebellion of Korah and his company," says Mr. Percival and the whole high-church party, (see Powell on Ap. Succ. p. 301,) "is analogous to the rebellion of presbyters against bishops. Indeed! Now who were Korah and his company? Who? Who? Yes, Mr. Percival, were THEY PRIESTS or laymen? What does this mean—'Seek ye the priesthood also?' If they were *priests*, how could they seek the priesthood? Dathan and Abiram were Reubenites, and could not be priests. *They none of them were priests at all!* Fie! fie! ye queen's chaplains and Oxford tractmen, to trifle thus with the public mind! But your violation of truth will return upon your own

heads. The case is plain enough, it was the Levites and the people rebelling against the priests; and not the priests against the high priest."

"Mr. Percival is certainly outwitted in attempting to make friends for the high-church in the cases of Jeroboam and the seven sons of Sceva. Where can the parallel for the former be found but in heresy, the head and fountain of whatever prelatical succession high-church has? And who can avoid likening the latter, who were sons of a chief of the priests, and who seem to have resented the interference of the heretic and schismatic Paul with their peculiar commission, to Mr. Percival *et id omne genus*." (See Powell, p. 300.)

their authoritative requisitions, to be followed in these traditions of the elders, (i. e. fathers,) which they taught.¹ Nor were the apostles themselves inattentive to these divine injunctions? Instead of claiming a prelatie authority to interpret the word of God, and thus to dictate our faith, they were careful to declare that, although employed by God as his inspired agents to communicate his will, yet, *personally*, they were themselves equally bound to receive it with the very humblest of their followers. "Not," says Paul to the Corinthians, "that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your faith, for by faith" — as wrought by the convincing power of God's spirit in your own minds — "ye stand." (2 Cor. i. 24.) "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus's sake." (2 Cor. iv. 5.) Therefore does the apostle Peter solemnly call upon the ministers of Christ, with whom he identifies himself, saying, "I, who am also a presbyter" — to "feed the flock of God, taking the oversight (or episcopate) of it, "not," says he, "as being lords," (or rulers, or claiming the exercise of superior and lordly functions) "over God's heritage; but" contrariwise, by your equality and brotherhood, as ministers, "being ensamples to the flock." 1 Pet. v. 1-3.²

But still further, it is clearly foretold that such arrogant pretensions to higher seats in the house of the Lord, and to superior eminency, would be made in the coming ages of the church; and that they must be earnestly contended against. For instance, there are some spoken of (in 2 Cor. xi. 12,) who "transformed themselves into apostles of Christ" — by actually assuming the title, and claiming a succession to the powers and functions, of the apostles — against whom the apostle denounces "sharpness according to the power which the Lord had given him." (2 Cor. xiii. 10.) Thus also does Paul, in his last solemn interview with the Ephesian ministers, forewarn them, that "OF THEIR OWNSSELVES" — even among those who were ministers of Christ — "SHALL MEN ARISE, speaking perverse things to draw disciples after them." These prelatie and ambitious aspirants after power and official pre-eminence, he calls "grievous wolves" who should "not spare the flock," but make it subservient to their own aggrandizement. (Acts xx. 29-31. So also, we are taught, in connexion with the mention of Diotrophes, whom Oe-

1) See marginal note in Bagster's Comprehensive Bible in Matt. 23.

2) If we understand this passage of the apostle as prelatists would have us, and as the Vulgate renders it, "neither as being lords over God's olergy;" (see Saravia on Priesthood,

p. 151 and note,) then how very pointedly does it prohibit this lord-bishoping over the clergy, by these self-styled successors of the apostles, who thus contradict the precept of their exemplars in the plainest possible manner.

cumenius, Bede, and some others, think to have been in the ministry. Whatever he was, his course is plainly stated, and its reprobation as plainly expressed. He “loved to have the pre-eminence.” The original word is *Φιλοπρωτευων* that is, one “who loveth the presidency or chief place, and who therefore magnified himself in his office, and behaved haughtily in it”¹—just like these prelates who “prate against us,” their ministerial brethren, “with malicious words:” and not content therewith, neither do themselves “receive” us as “the brethren,” but “forbid them”—that is, their more evangelic brethren—“that would; and cast them out of the church”—calling them Socinians, and rationalists, and venturing to make terms of communion for the church of God which he never framed. Surely to such, the language of our Saviour is as applicable, as to the more ancient—and therefore, in their view, more catholic—fathers; “woe unto you scribes and pharisees,” prelates, “for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men”—by these unauthorized doctrines and terms of communion—“neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.” (Matt. xxiii. 13.)

The apostle Jude, also, tells us of some in his time, whose “mouth spoke great swelling words, having men’s persons in admiration, because of advantage”—men who “despised the dominion”—and supreme authority of God’s holy word—“and spoke evil of dignities”—by denying to other ministers the equal prerogatives assigned to them “by heaven.” “These be they,” says the apostle “who separate themselves”—from their brethren and claim to be the only true church and the only true ministers, and to have the only true ordinances of Christ, (Jude v. 8, 16, 19,)—and who “murmur and complain” that any others should be received and acknowledged as such; and that God should so abundantly bless their labors.

Indeed, the very last book in the Bible is chiefly occupied, in depicting the misery and ruin, the spiritual tyranny and wickedness, and the abominations, which should be foisted into God’s worship and held forth as his doctrines, by those wearing the garb of the ministry. Of these persons it is in so many words revealed, that they should lay claim to this very character of being successors of the apostles and invested with their personal and spiritual authority. And it is here made our imperative duty to “try them who” thus arrogantly “**SAY THEY ARE APOSTLES AND ARE NOT;**” in the certain assurance that we shall find their credentials utterly vain and false. (Rev. ii. 2.) “One would have thought,” to appropriate the language of Mr. Percival—“that the sentence concerning certain false teachers “whom I have

1) See Bagster’s *Comprehensive Bible*, marginal note.

delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme," — (1 Tim. i. 20,) had been sufficient to appal these prelatist successionists when they venture actually to deny the Holy One and the Just, the privilege or the right of having any other church than among themselves. "But thus it is that one evil step draws another; they who began by carping at the authority of" presbyters, "presently proceeded further to carp at that of the apostles," and to frame apostolical canons, rites, ceremonies, orders, and traditions of their own devising, "and who will not probably be deterred from carping at that of our Lord himself."¹

For what else is it, after such solemn rebukes of the very spirit of prelacy by our Lord himself — after finding that the same names, qualifications and duties are given, in his word, to all his ministers; and that, in all the apostolic churches, instead of prelacy, there was to be found presbytery; and instead of different orders, ministerial equality — what else, I say, is it than carping at the Lord himself — to set at defiance his teaching, and the example of all the apostolic churches — by the obstinate intrusion, as of divine right, of this system of prelacy?

This doctrine will be found unsupported by the word of God, if we proceed to consider the nature of that ministerial commission, under which all who labor in word and doctrine, must claim their authority.

There is but one commission given by Christ, and by virtue of which, ministers claim authority to teach, and are impelled to undertake the difficult and laborious office of the minister. For, however Christ may have commissioned the twelve and the seventy also, for a temporary agency, in delivering a definite, and limited, and preparatory message; it was only when he had actually founded the christian church, and was about to ascend, as its head, to the supremacy of his mediatorial throne, that he gave that perpetual commission, which was to remain in force to the end of the world.² This is the well-head of all ministerial order, power, and dignity. Here the Divine Legislator of his church, looking from the heights of his ascending glory, upon its coming fortunes, has expressed his will, as to the character

1) See Ancient Christ'y. vol. i. pp. 405, 407, 420, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 435, 436, 455, 457.

That these principles are contrary to the spirit of the New Testament, see shown in Unity and Schism, pp. 121, 122, and Presb. Def., pp. 40, 41.

2) See Rise and Progress of Christianity, by the Rev. S. Hinds of Ox-

ford, vol. i. pp. 120 and 153, where these views are fully avowed.

"The third ordination," says the Rev. Mr. Pratt, (Old Paths, p. 59,) "of the apostles, when they were invested with all power and authority to act in Christ's stead, and to bind and loose in his church, took place after our blessed Lord's resurrection, and immediately before his ascension."

and functions of its officers. And will it be pretended that, in this only formal enunciation of the ministerial commission, there is either an allusion to three orders, or to prelates, or to the separate functions of ordaining, governing, and teaching? Or is the commission limited by its own express terms, to prelates and their successors, to the end of time? There is but one commission; and this commission addresses itself, in broad terms, to all the ministers of Christ; lays down for all, one and the same functions; and makes to them all, one and the same promise. There is, therefore, and there can be, but one order of christian ministers, by whatever name they may be called, or in whatever way their functions may be systematized by ecclesiastical appointment, or their talents and services appropriated by ecclesiastical authority. Let then prelates show some divine commission by which their order is separately instituted. Let them, who claim the exclusive enjoyment of Christ's gifts, show the testament that disinherits their brethren, and in which the common Saviour of all has disowned a portion of his own commissioned servants.¹ For it is not to be imagined that any act emanating

1) See this subject more fully considered in the proposed volume.

That this commission was really intended to authorize and apply to presbyters, we are most certainly assured by the reformers of the English church, who actually embodied it in the form of ordination for presbyters. It was thus appropriated to presbyters alone, and by the English church herself, which continued that form until the year 1661, when distinct forms for the ordination of presbyters and bishops were first introduced.

"It is admitted on all hands," says Dr. Bowden, (Works on Epis. vol. ii. p. 142,) "that this promise implies a continuation of the gospel ministry to the end of time, and that the commission empowered the apostles to preach, to administer the sacraments, to govern the church, and to ordain others to the same holy office."

"The truth of the proposition," says Dr. Cooke in his Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination, (Works on Epis. vol. ii. p. 202,) "is granted. It is true that CHRIST gave but one commission for the office of the gospel ministry: *but the inference is denied*; it is *not* true that the office of course is one."

"It may be as well proved from

thence," says Dr. Bowden, (Works on Epis. vol. i. p. 173,) "that all ecclesiastical teachers had, in the first age, the powers of the apostles, as they have since, the powers of bishops, properly so called. For THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE AT ALL MADE IN THE COMMISSION."

Now this conclusion we think inevitable and fair, on the principle that "ubi lex non distinguit non est distinguendum." And that we are not bad reasoners, let an English prelate testify. "Truly," says B.ishop Croft in his True State of the Church, (Scott's Coll. of Tr. vol. vii p. 300,) "I must commend Petavius, if he will thus ingeniously confess the truth, for I shall by and by fully declare that 'tis the diversity of commission, and not of order, that enables men to act diversely, and that a bishop without commission can do no more than a presbyter without commission; and therefore I further beg of Petavius, that, till he can prove the contrary, he would confess them also to be of one single order, called only by divers names, priest, or bishop, and one chosen out of the number, not the rest abased, but he exalted, with authority to govern. This is the rational and common practice of all societies, corporations, colleges, monasteries, conclave

from men, from sinful creatures like ourselves, should be of force to convey such an awful power,¹ wrapped up, as it is, in such terrible mystery. "Clearly not—no command of an earthly king, nor ordinance of an earthly legislature, nor decrees of counsels, nor authority of fathers," could invest an order of men with power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost.² "He alone," it is confessed, "is evidently entitled to confer this power, who himself gave, in the first instance, that Spirit to his church. It is to him such commission must be traced, in the case of every individual who would establish his right to this" dread supremacy.³

Nor is this doctrine less opposed to the PROMISES of scripture. Christ promised to be himself always with his ministers to the end of the world. All power is his, and with him, and by him, and through him; so that, without him there is neither power nor gifts in his church. Now where, in all the Bible, does Christ say he will be only with prelates? Where does he say he will impart these sacred gifts only by and through prelates, and by the imposition of their talismanic hands? And where does he say that he has left these gifts, in some way of unintelligible and inscrutable mystery, to be carried down, upon the equally undiscoverable, indescribable stream of apostolic succession? We ask where? That this promise of Christ, which is bound up with the ministerial commission, in particular—and that his promises to his church generally,—are not so limited, but are made in their fulness to all his ministers, and to all the members of his body, the church—whether admitted through the door of prelacy or of presbytery—is in itself clear to every candid ex-

of cardinals, and what not; there is no new order supposed in any of these, but only a new election, and a new authority given according to the fundamental constitution of each society. The pope himself, with his triple crown and triple dominion over all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, pretends to have no new order of popeship, but only the new authority conferred by his election: why then, may not presbyters, chosen to preside over the rest, without any new order, do the like? And for this very reason I conceive Justin Martyr uses the name of president always for bishop; and St. Cyprian, also a bishop himself, and most glorious martyr, he calls himself and other bishops generally by the name of *præpositus*, as if this were the main distinction betwixt himself and his presbyters, that he

was *præpositus* only, one of them placed with authority over them, no more; nor doth the name of bishop, in the original Greek, signify any more than the overseer of the rest."

1) See Oxf. Tracts, vol. i. p. 30. "The awfulness of the priestly office." Tr. 160 of the Prot. Episc. Tr. Soc. p. 12.

2) "Again," says Mr. Baynes, (Diocesan's Tryall, pp. 71, 72,) "God hath described the presbyter's office, as amply as any other. A legate dependeth on none for instructions, but on him that sendeth him; now every minister is an ambassador of Christ. By their reason a minister should be accountant to man for what he did in his ministry, if his exercising of it did depend on man."

3) See also Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 30.

aminer; and may be abundantly established by the authority of episcopalians themselves. These promises build the church on the truth as it is in Jesus; and not on apostolic succession.¹ They refer all spiritual and saving gifts to Christ, as their only and immediate source; and not to the mysterious agency of an intermediate apostolical descent. The apostle, therefore, disclaimed all authority over the faith of the churches; while these boasting successors base all their pretensions on their *authority*²—and yet call themselves successors of the apostles. These promises being left to the church, and to all believers³—by what logic is it proved that prelates are, and, of right constitute, the church? And if they are to be limited to the clergy, or even to prelates, then in what sense are they true of those—and they are not a few—who have been, to use the words of one of their own-selves,⁴ “drunkards, whoremongers, adulterers, dogs, enchanters, and the many who died, such as God’s word hath excluded from the kingdom of heaven, and whom hell must swallow up with open mouth?” “Are they?”—we ask with this most vaunted divine, “THE CHURCH, and may hell gates prevail against them and not prevail against the church?”⁵ Does the Holy Spirit pass in succession, in the plenitude of episcopal grace, through those who resembled the archbishop mentioned by this writer, who gave evidence that he was passing straight to hell as duke, while he was most canonical in his archiepiscopal descent?⁶ And if so, then what kind of grace is that which can thus transmit itself unpol-luted through the foulest channels? It is, as the apostle says, (1 Cor. viii. 4) “nihil in mundo.”⁷

Besides, when they thus limit the promises of God to the church, as ONE; and in her prelatial form; seeing that the church is, in fact, not now one, even in her prelatial phase, but

1) See Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 159.

2) Ibid, p. 160.

3) See Jackson’s Wks fol. vol. p. 437.

4) Jackson’s Wks. vol. i. p. 425.

5) Jackson’s Wks. vol. i. p. 425.

6) See Ibid, pp. 426, 427. That is “nothing in the world.”

To appropriate these promises of God—the rich treasures of heavenly grace and the glorious inheritance of his spiritual commonwealth, wherever found, in any of its members,—to prelates “you must prove,” says Dr. Jackson, whom they themselves denominate one of the greatest divines, and who was a president in Oxford, “that the best gifts of God, the peculiar attribute of whose glory it is to be

no respecter of persons, are infallibly entailed to a certain succession of men, without all respect of learning, wit, or honesty. You must prove that the Holy Spirit is a private spirit, and might err when he said ‘the Lord giveth grace to the humble;’ and that our Saviour’s words ‘ventus spirat ubi vult,’ did not import (as he meant) that his Spirit might enlighten whom he pleased. For if all these and that other ‘Deus cuius vult miseretur,’ then who can hinder God,” &c. “That men should learn to rely on his mercy and providence and not on the authority and skill of men.”

7) See Jackson’s Wks. fol. vol. i. p. 302.

is divided into parties, who mutually excommunicate one the other, and demonstrate the invalidity of each others' claims; they therefore cut off all possible communication with heaven, since this condition of the promise has, of a long period, yea, even for ages past, been notoriously broken and set at naught.¹

And further, on this part of our subject;—to appropriate these promises to the prelates or bishops of the church; as the source of all spiritual gifts, to the clergy; and thence to the laity; is to render the spiritual presence of Christ with the clergy essential to the perpetuity of the church. Without this presence with each and every one of the successors, in the line of apostolical descent, the promises are falsified, the succession interrupted, and the current of vital influences impeded. Now will any sane-minded christian man unblushingly affirm, that Christ has been so present with all, who must be enrolled in the black list of vile apostate successors of apostles? And, if any are bold enough to make such an affirmation, are they ready to give the proof of it? For surely they will not first demand infallibility in giving us a correct interpretation of the promise, and then make the promise guarantee the certainty of that which is most uncertain, and palpably impossible.²

We are aware that it is urged, that this uninterrupted succession is made certain by the immutable promises of Christ, and therefore, whatever obscurity may attend its progress, we are required to believe implicitly in its certain and valid continuance. This argument might have some force, were it only proved that there is in the word of God any such promise, securing any such result. This, however, we deny. And therefore, to insist upon this argument is only another application by “the daughter,” of a course of reasoning very agreeable to “her mother.” The prelatial Church of England is the true church, because she alone retains the apostolical succession, and that she does retain this succession is undeniable, because she is the true church, and must therefore have it.

We are not by any means to imagine, that the promises of Christ secure to the church an unfailling possession of pure and incorrupt doctrine. On the contrary, the most grievous errors in doctrine and practice have been, as is allowed, permitted to corrupt the church.³ Are we, then, to seek the fulfilment of these promises, in the preservation of an unbroken succession

1) See Newman on Romanism, p. 246.

2) See this granted by Faber in his *Albigenses* p. 27.

See on this subject generally, Cal-

vin *Instit.* vol. ii. pp. 313, 317, 321, London ed. Also, Faber's *Albigenses*, p. 15, and Hooker in *ibid.*

3) See *Oxf. Tr.* No. 30, 35, &c.

of prelatically ordained ministers? But this can be no mark by which to discover the real nature and intention of that commission, under which the christian church holds its being. The very question at issue is, whether Christ or his apostles have chartered such a prelatical corporation, for until this is proved, it is in vain to appeal to promises which have reference to the church universal, and not to an order of self-constituted dignitaries. The mere fact of a succession of such men, can never give them a divine right to the privileges they claim. Until such a charter is produced, from Him whose sole prerogative it is to grant it, all such assumed powers must be regarded as self-originated and usurped.

Besides, if these promises of Christ are to be so interpreted as that the only true church, is *THAT*, which continues to preserve this uninterrupted succession; then, as these promises run on to the very end of time, it cannot be certainly determined, until the end comes, to which, of all the churches who have claimed them, these promises really belong. For many churches, which were certainly of apostolic origin, and which prelatists assert, were prelatically organized, (as, for instance, some of the seven churches of Asia,) have now ceased to exist. They have not continued in any form whatever. Either, therefore, these promises do not necessarily imply that every true church, when once constituted, would continue to enjoy this prelatical succession, or the promises have failed in their accomplishment; and it is now an impossibility to find any true church by this mark, until the consummation of all things. Then, and not till then, can this interpretation of the promises be urged as the ground of their claims, by any of the churches that may have existed in the course of time. It is, therefore, very reasonable to conclude, that such never was the intention of their divine Author in giving these promises to his church and people.

Will it be urged upon us impatiently, that the prelati- cal interpretation of these promises is sustained by the authority of the church in all ages, and must, therefore, be received, whatever seeming difficulties may attend it, in the opinion of self-constituted judges? We must be permitted to reply, that it is utterly in vain to tell us that the prelates themselves — for, after all, this is what is meant in this question by the church — have affixed such an interpretation to these promises of the word of God, (supposing now that the assertion is true,) — since the very question in debate is, whether they interpret rightly. Their right of interpretation must not surely be assumed, when the very thing which they iuvite us to discuss is, whether they

possess any such power." That they have any such power, we deny, and we will hardly be convinced by their assertion, that they have; and much less by their accompaniments of anathemas and excommunications. "Never cease," says the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Noel, "to ask for plain and positive scripture proof, from scripture, that a Roman catholic council," (we say, that a number of prelates, called the church,) "composed of a small part of the clergy, themselves a small part of the whole body, the pious persons, among whom are a small part of Christ's universal church; that this small fraction of fractions in the church, distinguished neither for piety nor learning, is thus gifted" by the Lord, with such an absolute supremacy over his own inspired word.¹

Even, however, were this exclusive power admitted, our right to investigate its extent, and to test its claims, as these are presented by Christ in his word, must still remain; and our right also to weigh the grounds of their interpretations, and to question their interpretations themselves. For any body of men "to decide who are, or are not, partakers of the benefits of the christian covenant, and to prescribe to one's fellow-mortals, as the terms of salvation, the implicit adoption of their own interpretations, is a most fearful presumption in men not producing miraculous proofs of an immediate divine mission."³

1) See the Hon and Rev. B. W. Noel, in *Romanists and Protestants*, p. 10.

See also Bishop Hoadly's celebrated sermon before George I., on the nature of the kingdom of Christ.

2) Archbp. Whateley's *Dangers*

to the Christian Faith, Lond. 1839, p. 239.

See this also fully argued by Bishop Davenant in his *Letter to Duræus* "De pace inter Evangelicos Eccl. restaurandam adhortatio," Lond. 1640, pp. 10-15, 30, 35, et passim.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE SIXTH.

VARIATIONS OF PRELACY, OR, LEARNED EPISCOPAL DOCTORS VERSUS JURE DIVINO PRELATISTS.

WE shall here illustrate this disunion in the unity of this prelati- c body, by a reference to a few particulars.

I. On the office of the apostles, and whether they had any successors.

Until Christ's death, the apostles were presbyters, and Christ alone was bishop.

1. This is affirmed by Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, Part 2, p. 218. Spanheim *Op. Theol.* Part 1, p. 436, in Ayton's *Constit. of the Ch.* p. 18. Dr. Hammond's *Wks.* vol. 4, p. 781, who makes them deacons. Mr. Brett, *Divine Right Episcop.* Lect. 8, p. 17.

2. This is contradicted, and the apostles made bishops during the same time, by Bishop Jer. Taylor, *Episcop.* Asserted; Dr. Scott, in *Christian Life*, vol. 3, p. 338; Dr. Monro's *Inq. into the New Opinions*, p. 96; Mr Rhind, *Apol.* p. 50 &c.; Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 236; Archbishop of Spalato, in Ayton's *Constit. of the Ch.* Append. p. 7; Jeremy Taylor, (bishop,) *Wks.* vol. 7, p. 7, &c. who contradicts himself in *Wks.* vol. 13, p. 19, et. seq.

Archbishop Laud is very positive in affirming that Christ chose the twelve, and made them bishops over the presbyters, (Laud on the *Lit and Episcop.* p. 195,) and Bishop Beveridge is as confident that Christ chose these same twelve as presbyters and not bishops. (*Wks.* vol. 2, p. 112.) Again Laud asserts very positively, that Christ ordained them, since the word used by St. Mark is *επιτιθησεν*. He made them. (*Ibid.* p. 196.) Beveridge on the contrary declares that Christ did not ordain any of them during his life, and adduces in proof, the use of this very term *επιτιθησεν* *δεδεικναι*. (*Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 112.)

3. Others, again, affirm that the apostles were not commissioned till after Christ's resurrection. Mr. Sage, quoted in Ayton's *Constit. of Ch.* App p 5, 6; Saravia's *Priesthood*, Spanheim *Op. Theol.* Par. 1, 436. Stillingfleet *Irenic.* p. 117, 118, and Par. 2, 218; Whitby *Annot.* Luke 10, 1; Dr. Hammond in *ibid.*; Bellarmine *de Pontif. lib.* 4, cap. 25; Bishop Heber in *Life of Jeremy Taylor*, *Wks.* vol. 1, p. 185.

II. The apostles were extraordinary officers, and could have no successors.

1. This is affirmed by Pearson on the Creed, p. 16, "who are continued to us only in their writings;" Whitby in *Comment. Pref. to Titus*; Bishop Hoadly, see *Wks.* fol. vol. 2, p. 827; Dr. Barrow in *Wks.* fol. vol. 1, p. 598; Dr. Willet in *Synopsis Papismi.* fol. p. 164, 165; Bishop Fell on *Ephes.* 5, 9; Hooker *Eccl. Pol.* B. vii. § 4, vol. 3, p. 187, Keble's edition; Sadeel; Chillingworth; Hinds' *Hist. of Rise and Progress of Christ.* vol. 2, p. 70—87; Hinds on *Inspiration*, p. 117; Lightfoot's *Wks.* vol. 13, pp. 26, 27, 30, 70, 98, &c. and in other works; Palmer on *Ch.* vol. 1, p. 169, 170; Bowers' *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. i. 5, 6; Potter on *Ch. Govt.* pp. 121, 117, Am. ed.; Steele's *Phil. of the Evid. of Christ*, pp. 102, 105, 106, 107; Dodwell *Parcnes*, ad. ext. p. 68, comp. 11, 54, 55, 62, apud Ayton; Bishop Davenant on *Col.* vol. i.

Ch. 1; Mr. Brett, *Div. Right of Episcop.* Lect. xii. p. 26, apud Ayton; *Stillingfleet*, (the dean and not the bishop,) *Irenic*. Par. ii. pp. 299—301; *Spanheim Fil. Dissert.* 3 numb. 25, 37, 34; *Archbishop Tillotson*, see quoted in *Presbyterianism Defd.* pp. 117, 118.

2. This is most resolutely disproved by *Laud*. See his *Three Speeches on the Liturgy Episcop.* &c. in *Oxf. edit.* 1840, passim; *Dr. William Nichols* in his *Defence of the Ch. of England*; "Bishops are successors to the Apostles, both in name and thing," says *Leslie* in *Letter on Episcopacy*, in *The Scholar Armed*, vol. i. 64, et alibi; *Beveridge* in *Wks.* vol. ii. pp. 88, 93, 120, 147, 149, 167, 278; *Law* in his *Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor See*, in *Oxf. Tr.* vol. iii. p. 156; *Stillingfleet*, (the bishop, not the dean,) in *Wks.* vol. i. p. 371, in *Art. Bishop. Rees' Cycloped.*; *Bishop Hicks*, *Mr. Rlind*, *Dr. Scott*, *Dr. Munroe*, see *Ayton's Orig. Constit. of the Ch.* App. p. 8, *Lect. ii.*; *Bishop Honie-man*, *Survey of Naphthali*, Par. ii. 191, &c. in *Ayton*; *Bishop Hall*; *Episc. by Div. Rights*, Par. 2.

III. The divine and exclusive right of three essentially distinct orders is clearly established in scripture. This is affirmed by prelatists generally.

That there were only two distinct orders, is affirmed by *Bishop White*. In closing his dissertation of episcopacy, (*Lect. on the Catech. &c.* *Philad.* 1813, p. 463,) he says, "In the discussion of this subject, the author has confined himself to the single point of establishing two distinct orders of the ministry: resolved into one order by many bodies of professing christians." In the episcopal charge delivered by this same writer in 1834, when urging the duty of sustaining the episcopacy, he says the reformers "found that in the origin of the ministry," (*The Past and the Future*, *Philad.* 1834, p. 13.) "it comprehended THREE orders."

As to this third order, *Bishop White*, in a letter to *Bishop Hobart*, thus expresses himself: (see in *Memoir by Dr. Wilson*, p. 365 :) "But can it be imagined that an order instituted for the purpose of 'serving tables,' should in the very infancy of its existence have the office of the higher order of the ministry committed to them? I do not deny either the right or the prudence of allowing what has been subsequently allowed to this lowest order of the clergy. All I contend for is, that at the first institution of the order, there could have been no difference between them and laymen, in regard to the preaching of the word and the administering of the sacraments."

As to deacons, *Bishop Croft*, in his *Naked Truth*, thus delivers himself. (*Scott's Coll. of Tr.* vol. vii. pp. 307 and 308.) "Having thus stated and united the two pretended and distinct orders of episcopacy and presbytery, I now proceed to the third pretended spiritual order, that of deaconship. Whether this of deaconship be properly to be called an order or an office, I will not dispute; but certainly no spiritual order, for their office was to serve tables, as the scripture phrases it, which in plain English, is nothing else but overseers of the poor, to distribute justly and discreetly the alms of the faithful: which the apostles would not trouble themselves withal, lest it should hinder them in the ministration of the word and prayer. But as most matters of this world, in process of time, deflect much from the original constitution, so it fell out in this business; for the bishops who pretended to be successors to the apostles, by little and little took to themselves the dispensation of alms, first by way of inspection over the deacons, but at length the total management, and the deacons who were mere lay-officers, by degrees crept into the church ministration, and became a reputed spiritual order, and a necessary degree and step to the priesthood, of which I can find nothing in scripture, and the original institution, not a word relating to any thing but the ordering of alms for the poor. And the first I find of their officiating in spiritual matters, is in *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the second century."

That there was only one essential order in the christian ministry, is also affirmed.

Jeremy Taylor says there is "only one order," and that bishops are the "only order," See in *Powell* on *Ap. Succ.* p. 17; *Palmer* on the *Church*, vol. ii.

And while it is asserted in the *Book of Common Prayer*, that three orders are clear, &c., *Hooker* shows that this whole subject is entirely beyond the reach of ordinary men. See as quoted in *Lecture iii.* p. 71.

That this was also the opinion of a large portion of the early English church was made apparent. See Lecture iii. p. 71.

It was our design to have pursued the illustration of this subject to a much greater length, and as it regards various other points of disagreement. We will however desist, and refer the reader to the following sources of information on this subject.

Dr. Mason's *Wks.* vol. iii. pp. 71, 143, 144, 150; Anderson's *Defence of Presbyterian Church Government*, pp. 30, 31, 110; *Plea for Presbytery*, Glasgow, 1840, p. 290; Dr. Mitchell's *Letters to Bishop Skinner*, p. 36, &c.; Dr. Ayton's *Constitution of the Primitive Church*, Appendix; Well's *Vindication of Presb. Ordin.* p. 35; also *The Sum of the Episcopal Controversy, &c.* by William Jameson; *Lect. of History in the University of Glasgow*, Glasgow, 1713, pp. 78, 126, in the Old South Church Library

And now we may fairly say, as Dr. Bowden has taught us to say, — "This makes the notion ridiculous. Pray sirs agree among yourselves, and then you may with more decency contradict us." *Wks. on Episc.* vol. ii. p. 127.

NOTE B.

Thus also speaks the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel: "This" (Matt. xvi.) we are told, (see Romanists and Protestants, p. 8,) gives to the church its authority, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it;' and limits this authority to the successors of Peter in the Roman church. 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church.' To the second of these conclusions that the Roman church is intended, a man of plain sense might demur on these considerations:

"First, That the rock may not be Peter, but that doctrine which Peter had just before professed, — the divinity of the Lord Jesus, on which the universal church is unquestionably built.

"Secondly, That if the church is built on Peter, it is equally built on the other inspired writers. 'Ye are built,' says Paul, 'on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets.' (Eph. ii. 20.)

"Thirdly, That, in point of fact, several churches, as those of Greece and Macedonia, were built on Paul; having no more connexion (that we know of) with Peter than with any other of the twelve apostles.

"Fourthly, That it is very improbable that Peter was ever bishop of Rome, the prevalent tradition being that he was bishop of Antioch.

"Fifthly, That though Peter be allowed (which he cannot) to have been the great founder of the universal church, there is no mention here of his successors at Rome; and the promise, therefore, if it belong to any particular visible church, may belong to his Greek successors, rather than to the church of Rome.

"And now, what is the promise itself, whether it belong to the Greek or Roman catholic church? Where is a word of infallibility? If any visible christian church, with a pure faith and wholesome discipline, with faithful pastors and pious congregations, maintains its ground against the devil and the world; even though it does not grow in numbers, or send the gospel to the heathen; though it want infallibility, and err in matters of subordinate importance; yet surely it has not yielded to the gates of hell.

"But, lastly, Though the Greek and Roman churches, and all the visible churches of nominal christians, with the greater number of ecclesiastics who preside over them, should degenerate into a corrupt practice and a false belief, still, if there be found amongst them some faithful pastors, through whose ministry a few real christians are preserved unharmed by the plague of superstition, to maintain the doctrines of the gospel and exhibit its morality, then is there the church of Christ still subsisting; and the promise still holds good; for the gates of hell have not prevailed against it; and this is the real meaning of the promise."

NOTE C.

"It is certain," says one, "that those who ordained others in the primitive church were presbyters, but it is doubtful whether they were bishops. I suppose every one will grant, that it was the practice from the times of the apostles for ministers to ordain ministers: but all who have read any thing of this controversy, know that it is disputed whether there were, in the first ages of the church, any such thing as bishops in the modern sense of the word. Now this dispute very much weakens the evidence of a succession in a line of bishops, but does not at all affect the evidence of a presbyterian succession; for these persons certainly were presbyters, or ordinary ministers of the gospel, whether they had any higher character or no.

"There is no accounting for the succession, in the catalogue, which prelatists present, without supposing that some of the first persons named in it were presbyters, or such officers whereof there were a number in the same church, who governed it jointly. Here I shall use the words of the author of *An Historical and Rational Inquiry into the Necessity of an Uninterrupted Succession of Diocesan Bishops*, page 31. 'Supposing there should have been such a succession of persons from St. Peter as are mentioned, yet those that are mentioned as his next successors might not be a succession of diocesan bishops superior in office to presbyters, but rather a number of presbyters that governed the church in common. Presbyters they are called by Irenæus, (Fragment of the Epistle to Victor, about the Easter Controversies,) who having occasion to mention the practice of the church of Rome before Soter, he calls them the presbyters that governed the church, which he now presided over. And when we consider the uncertainty of the accounts, concerning the order in which they succeeded, sometimes one, sometimes another being mentioned as the immediate successor of St. Peter and Paul, and so the like variation in the account of the second and third successors; it is not improbable, that they might govern the church together in common as presbyters, (for such Irenæus calls them,) and that their governing the church in common, is no improbable conjecture. I find it espoused by the learned Vossius, and maintained by him, (vols 2, Ep. and fin. *Cl. Cotellerii*.) where he lays down this as the form of government in the Roman church: 1. Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, 2. Cletus, Anacletus, and Clemens. 3. Cletus, Anacletus. 4. Anacletus, Solus. 5. Evaristus, who began a succession of single persons, whereas before there used to be two or three. The reasons by which he enforceth this order, are the acts of Pope Damasus, who saith expressly, that Peter ordained two bishops, Linus and Cletus, to govern the people, while he gave himself to prayer and preaching. And he observes, this passage is not in the printed books, but in the written copy, and so quoted by Marianus Scotus. Linus being taken away by martyrdom, Clemens is put in his place with Cletus. And this he proves thus: Cletus is said to sit from anno 76, to 83. Clemens is said to sit from 68 to 79. Therefore these two persons coincide; but the former quotation from Damasus shows that Cletus was made pastor before 76, yea, by the apostle himself; and then he shows, that though Clement was sent into banishment about 79, yet Cletus was not alone, but Anacletus with him, who survived all these, and suffered martyrdom about 95. He observes, that Eusebius was the first who assigned to the distinct persons certain years, one succeeding another, who did very ill, because, according to him, Clement succeeded Anacletus, anno 93, whereas the epistle written in his name was writ during the standing of the temple, that is, before the year 71. But see the epistle itself. By all this it appears that these several persons, Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, were not so many diocesan bishops that governed the church of Rome, one succeeding another; but so many presbyters (as Irenæus calls them) that governed that church, sometimes two, and sometimes three together.' Thus far this author: to which I shall only add, that I know of no other scheme on which the difficulties that occur in the succession of these persons can be solved; and if this be admitted, it destroys the succession in a line of bishops, and establishes that in the line of presbyters.

"The objections made against particular persons, through whom the line

must run, do generally, if not universally, relate to their character as bishops, and not as presbyters. Thus, for instance, none dispute Dr. Parker's ordination as a presbyter: but many question, for the reasons that have been mentioned, whether his consecration as a bishop was regular or even valid. Now, though our ordinations are derived from him, as well as your's; yet they are not at all affected, according to our principles, by the dispute about his consecration; for we believe that he had power to ordain as a presbyter: whereas, according to your own principles all your ordinations do absolutely depend on the validity of his disputed consecration. If his consecration was invalid, all your ordinations are likewise invalid: and as his consecration is, at best, much disputed, and very doubtful, 't is impossible that your ordinations, which depend upon it, should be clear and indisputable.

"Upon the whole, if I was now to be ordained, and thought it my duty to seek ordination where there was the fairest probability of being within the uninterrupted succession, I should think myself much safer in taking presbyterian ordination, than episcopal orders. But, after all, as the gospel has not by express and positive prescription, made an uninterrupted succession of regular ordinations, in any line whatever, absolutely essential to the ministerial character, I conceive we have no right to make it so; and since God has not in his providence kept up clear and certain evidence of the fact, I can't but think it is very dangerous for us to pretend to it; and that it is in effect giving up the cause of christianity to make the lawfulness of the ministry, and the validity and effect of gospel ordinances, absolutely to depend upon it."

So in the Sketch of Hist. and Princ. of Presb. in Eng. p. 38: "And no scripture can be adduced to prove that the twelve *apostles*, either received a commission to ordain, or did ordain, or gave authority to ordain; while it is quite clear that others ordained who were not apostles, (Acts xiii. 1, 3) or, if the apostles ordained successors, it was simply successors in the *ministry of the gospel*, not in the apostleship. Indeed, not one single passage of scripture can be adduced to show that consecration and ordination are two distinct things,—that there is one way of appointing prelates, and another way of appointing priests or presbyters, the former of which is transmissible, and the latter not transmissible."

Baxter uses another argument to show the unscripturality of prelacy. "I prove," says he, (Five Disputations on Chr. Gov. 1658, Disp. 1, Arg. 10. p. 51; see also p. 67.) "the minor according to their own interpretation of Titus i. 5, and other texts. Every city should have a bishop and it may be a presbytery, (and so, many councils have determined; only, when they grew greater, they except cities that were too small; but so did not Paul.) But the episcopacy of England is contrary to this; for one bishop only is over many cities. If therefore they will needs have episcopacy, they should at least have had a bishop in every city. Now, when the apostle formed new churches with officers over them, he gave them no authority to institute any different kind of churches, or any different order of ministers, but only such as he had appointed to succeed them in the same office."

"Now, if the apostles," says Mr. Baynes, (Diocesan's Tryall, p. 66,) "had done this with reference to a further and more eminent pastor and governor, they would have intimated somewhere this their intention: but this they do not; yea, the contrary purpose is by them declared. For Peter so biddeth his presbyters feed their flocks, as that he doth insinuate them subject to no other but Christ, the arch-shepherd of them all. Again, the apostles could not make the presbyters pastors without power of government. There may be governors without pastoral power; but not a pastor without power of governing. For the power of the *pedum*, or shepherd's staff, doth intrinsically follow the pastoral office."

NOTE D.

I WILL here give another illustration from the Old Testament, taken from a very rare treatise of Matthew Henry, not found among his published works, and preserved by the Rev. Shepard Kollock. It is "A Brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism." (Lond. 1717, pp. 5, 6, 7.) "Only one scripture occurs in

the Old Testament, which perhaps will help to rectify some mistake about schism. It is the instance of Eldad and Medad, who prophesied in the camp. The case, in short, is this; Eldad and Medad were persons upon whom the spirit rested, i. e. who were by the extraordinary working of the spirit endued with gifts equal to the rest of the seventy elders, and were written, i. e. had a call to the work, but they went not out unto the tabernacle as the rest did, though God himself had appointed that they should, v. 16. And they prophesied in the camp, i. e. exercised their gifts in private among their neighbors, in some common tent. Upon what inducements they did this, doth not appear; but it is evident that it was their weakness and infirmity thus to separate from the rest of their brethren. If any think they prophesied by a necessitating and irresistible impulse, they may remember, that the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets.

“Now, if some of the schismaticating doctors that the church has known had but had the censuring of Eldad and Medad, we should soon have had a judgment given against them much more severe, than would have been awarded to him that gathered sticks on the sabbath day.

“And ’t is confessed, all the circumstances considered, it looks like a very great irregularity, especially as an infringement of the authority of Moses, which they who prophesied in the tabernacle under his presidency manifestly owned and submitted to.

“Well, an information was presently brought in against them, v. 27. Eldad and Medad prophesy in the camp, that is, to speak in the invidious language of the times, there’s a conventicle at such a place, and Eldad and Medad are holding forth at it.

“Joshua, in his zeal for that which he fancied to be the church’s unity, and out of a concern for the authority of Moses, brings in a bill to silence them; for as hot as he was, he would not have them fined and laid in the jail for this disorder neither; only, my lord Moses, forbid them: not compel them to come to the tabernacle, if they be not satisfied to come, only for the future prohibit their schismatical preaching in the camp. This seemed a very good motion.

“But hold, Joshua, thou knowest not what manner of spirit thou art of. Discerning Moses sees him acted by a spirit of envy, and doth not only deny, but severely reprove, the motion. v. 29. Enviest thou for my sake? Would to God that all the Lord’s people were prophets, provided the Lord will but put his spirit upon them. He is so far from looking upon it as schism, that he doth not only tolerate but encourage it. And O that all those who sit in Moses’ chair, were but clothed with this spirit of Moses.”

LECTURE VII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION TESTED BY
SCRIPTURE.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

WE have already brought this prelatial doctrine of apostolical succession to the balances of the sanctuary. We have shown, first, that when thus tested, it is found to be contrary to the spirit and teaching of the scriptures — secondly, to that one ministerial commission upon which the christian ministry rests its entire authority, and which recognizes only one order: — and thirdly, to the divine promises, as contained in scripture, and which cannot, without the greatest violence and arrogance, be exclusively appropriated by the clergy of any denomination, or by any particular or self-styled Catholic church.¹

1) As a further exhibition of the importance attached by its advocates to this doctrine, take the following: "Such, therefore, as have laid aside ordination by the highest grade of the ministry, and substituted in its place ordination by the second grade, have lost the sacerdotal office; and this office being essential to the very existence of the church, they can no longer be regarded as in a church state." Dr. How's Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 123.

Baxter, in his True and Only Way of Concord, (Lond. 1680, Pt. iii. p. 90, 91,) gives the following abstract of Dodwell's doctrine on this subject, whose book he professes to answer:

"1. That the ordinary means of salvation, are, in respect of every particular person, confined to the episcopal communion to the place he lives in, as long as he believes in it.

"2. That we cannot be assured that God will do for us what is necessary for salvation on his part, otherwise than by his express promises that he will do it.

"3. Therefore we must have interest in his covenant.

"4. Therefore we must have the sacrament, by which the covenant is transacted.

"5. These, as legally valid, are to be had only in the external communion of the visible church.

"6. This is only the episcopal communion of the place we live in.

"7. The validity of the sacraments depends on the authority of the persons, by whom they are administered.

"8. No ministers have authority of administering sacraments, but only they that have their orders in the episcopal communion.

"9. This cannot be from God, but

We will now endeavor to show that this doctrine of prelatical succession (for we ourselves claim a ministerial, — though not a lineal and personal, succession,) is equally as contrary to the facts of scripture, as it is to its spirit, its principles, its teachings, its promises, and its predictions.

Ordination, we are told, by the imposition of the hands of a prelate, is essential to the validity of the ministry,¹ to the efficacy of ordinances — and to the visibility and perpetuity of the church of Christ.² And this succession is mediately derived from the apostles, the first duly commissioned prelates of the church.

Now, is it not a most wonderful thing, that ordination should make individuals now, what it did not make them in the days of the apostles?³ For the apostles were not made bishops by ordination; neither were they ever ordained at all, as preliminary to their ministry.⁴ And when they, in joint conclave, filled up the vacant see, which had been voided by the death of the apostate metropolitan Judas; it is further true, that even when thus left to themselves, our Lord having gone to heaven, “they did not ordain in *the manner afterwards adopted*, by the

by a continued succession of persons orderly receiving authority from those who had authority to give it them, (viz. bishops,) from those first times of the apostles, to ours at present.

“10. That the Holy Ghost is the instituter of this order, and to violate it, by administering without such ordination, is to sin against the HOLY GHOST, THE SIN THAT HATH NO OTHER SACRIFICE AND PROMISE OF PARDON.

“11. That the ordained have no more or other power than the ordainers intend or profess to give them

“12. That it is certain, that the bishops of all former ages intended not to give presbyters power of ordaining or administering out of their subjection; ergo, they have it not.”

1) Mr. Keble labors to prove, that it is the doctrine of the Church of England, that the Holy Ghost is really communicated by a supernatural gift, with the imposition of the prelate's hands, and that thus “the episcopal succession is a channel of special graces.” He shows, that the words in the ordination service are to be taken literally, not as a prayer, but as expressive of an actual bestowment; for which, he says, “the language of which the, (viz. Mr. Whitgift,) was so unrivalled a master, fails him, as it were,

in his endeavor to find words to express the greatness of the gift which he there apprehended.” According to Whitgift, “*the same power is now given*, (Mr. Keble's italics.) as was originally given to the apostles. So that “he which receiveth the burden is thereby forever warranted to have the spirit with him and in him, for his assistance, countenance and support.” “Whether, therefore, we preach or pray, baptize, &c., our words, judgments, acts, and deeds, are not ours, but the Holy Ghost's.” “The power of the ministry giveth daily the Holy Ghost.” For all this, he adduces also the authority of Hooker, (Primit. Trad. p. 102-104.) as he might also that of Bishop Beveridge. See Wks. vol. ii. passim.

2) See Palmer, i. p. 161, &c. and vol. ii. p. 440, 443.

3) Baxter, in his True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1681, p. 212, largely proves, that in cases of necessity there may be a true bishop or presbyter, without any ordination. So also in Part iii. p. 79.

4) Bishop Beveridge affirms, that Christ, during his personal ministry, did not ordain the apostles. Wks. vol. ii. p. 116.

laying on of hands.”¹ Such, then, was the case as it regards Matthias.² Ordination, therefore, can never continue in successive impartations, what it never originated. Nor can it be either a necessary and inseparable sign or seal of that grace and authority, with which it never was connected by divine appointment,—or under divine teaching and example;—since without it, those very gifts were bestowed on the very persons, who are made the patterns of all their successors.

So utterly unknown was this theory of sacramental ordination, as the great means of all clerical grace, to the sacred writers,—that when Paul the apostle, who had already approved his apostleship, by many a hard encounter, and by numerous seals of his ministry;—when this same Paul was to be sent forth on a mission to the heathen—he was, by the express dictation of the Holy Spirit, ordained with the imposition of the hands of three brethren belonging to the church at Antioch, called teachers and prophets, and of whom therefore it were an absurdity too gross for the most credulous to believe, that they were prelates and not rather simple presbyter-bishops.³

Timothy, in like manner, was set apart by the laying on of the hands of a presbytery or company of presbyters. And who can imagine, that, at this period, there were prelates numerous enough to have canonically consecrated Timothy? And who can believe these prelates would be denominated by the name of that very order which it is now “a fundamental article” “of the very substance of the faith,” and “essential to salvation,”—to believe to be excluded, by divine appointment, from such a blasphemous presumption as the attempt to ordain, and above all, to ordain a prelate? But let us imagine Timothy to be, for a moment, duly consecrated a prelate. In the very fact, that the Holy Ghost, in recording his ordination, uses words which, by the universal suffrage of the Latin, and many of the Greek fathers,⁴ and by the interpretation of common sense, refers to presbyters,⁵—there is demonstrative evidence, that no such

1) So say the Oxford tractators, vol. i. p. 33.

2) See *ibid.*

3) Acts xiii. 1–3. See this case more fully considered afterwards, when it will be shown that the passage refers to ordination, and that this ordination was certainly presbyterian. See the forthcoming volume.

4) See Palmer, vol. ii.

5) “By the presbytery,” says Archbishop Usher, in his “Reduction of Episcopacy into the Form of Synodical Government received in the An-

cient Church, proposed in the year 1641,” (London, printed 1656, p. 3.) “Ignatius understood the community of the rest of the presbyters or elders who then had a hand, not only in the delivery of the doctrine and sacraments, but also in the administration of the discipline of Christ, for further proof of which we have that known testimony of Tertullian, in his general apology for Christians. “The presidents who bear rule therein are certain approved elders, who have obtained this honor, not by reward, but by good report.”

distinction, as is contended for, was, at that time, or by the inspired penmen, ever dreamed of. A steady and exactly-defined constitution of officers, never fails to be quickly followed by a well-marked usage, assigning certain designations to certain functionaries; to disturb which, becomes an affront to dignities, and is instantly resisted.

“On this rule we conclude, with some degree of assurance, that, during the apostolic age, forms of government and the distribution of public services were still open to many variations and anomalies. No writer of the age of Cyprian uses the words bishop, presbyter, and deacon, so indeterminately, or so abstractedly, as do the apostles.”¹

It is granted, however, that “the same appellations are indiscriminately given to ministers in the New Testament,”² so that from the use of the separate titles, it is impossible to argue to any separate order or function, as belonging to those upon whom these titles are conferred. Now, in our judgment, no other admission is necessary in order to establish the certain fact, that this doctrine, which lodges in prelates the sole origi-

Apologet. cap. 39. “With the bishop, who was the chief president, (i. p. 4.) . . . the rest of the dispensers of the word and sacraments joined in the common government of the church.” This he goes on to prove from antiquity, and then adds, “True it is, that in our church this kind of presbyterial government hath been long disused; yet, seeing it still professeth that every pastor hath a right to rule the church, (from whence the name, rector, also was at first given unto him,) and to administer the discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the doctrine and sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth truly from the custom now received in this realm, “no man could doubt,” &c. (p. 6.) Again, in 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6, it is said: “St. Paul was the principal and the presbyters were his assistants, according to the constitution and custom of our church in ordination. The bishop is not to do it alone, but with the assistance of at least three or four of the ministers, which was after the pattern of primitive times.” (Certain Discourses by the late Archbishop of Armagh, Lond. 1659, p. 183.)

Jeremy Taylor says, the presbytery that ordained Timothy was a company of bishops, and yet, that all antiquity declare it was a company of presby-

ters. See *Episc. Asserted*, p. 191, in Powell, p. 21.

1) *Spiritual Despotism*, p. 166. See also 164, 165.

2) Boyd on *Epis. 1839*, p. 42. Bishop Seabury allows, that Paul, in Acts xxviii., calls “presbyters overseers, in Greek, bishops of the church of God, and says they were made so by the Holy Ghost.” “They had, therefore, received some part, at least, of the apostolical commission;” by what process of division we are not well able to divine! “But,” he adds, “whatever share of apostolical authority these bishops held, whether the whole or only a part; or, however they came by it, (strange doubts for a *jure divino* prelatist, the compunctious visitings, no doubt, of conscience and common sense.) they were manifestly subject to St. Paul’s authority.” How this was, the doubting bishop seems to leave uncertain, since, as he further adds, (p. 183.) “it does not appear that St. Paul had any further personal intercourse with the church or clergy of Ephesus.” He further allows, (p. 86,) that “it is true, that in most of St. Paul’s epistles, the apostles of the churches to whom he writes are not mentioned; and probably, at the time of writing those epistles, THERE WERE NONE APPOINTED.”

nal, and exclusive power of the sacred ministry, to be derived from them to presbyters and deacons, is unsupported by scripture.

Bishop Croft, in his "True State of the Primitive Church," has this language: ¹ "And I desire you to observe, that of those two names, presbyter and bishop, if there be any dignity and eminency expressed in one more than the other, sure it is in the name of presbyter, not bishop; because the apostles themselves, and the chief of the apostles, (as some would have it who stand highest on their pantables,) are in scripture styled presbyters or elders, as the word in our English translation signifies, but never bishops, as I remember. And, therefore, I cannot but wonder why that haughty head of the papists should not assume to himself the title of his pretended predecessor, St. Peter, presbyter rather than bishop, unless it be by God's providential disposure, to show his blindness in this as well as in other things, and make him confute himself by this name of bishop, which was never given to St. Peter, no more than St. Peter gave unto him the headship of the church." "The word bishop, *ἐπισκοπος*, indeed, is *never used* in the New Testament to signify the office of **OVERSIGHT OVER MINISTERS**, but only over the flock of Christ."²

Not only does this conclusion follow, for the reasons already given; it will also follow from another view of the matter: for, if prelatists "admit, and always have admitted,"³ that "the same appellations are indiscriminately given to ministers in the New Testament," then is it assuredly impossible to confine to any one order, what may be alleged as belonging to individuals whom prelatists would rank in the order of prelates; since, in every such case, the term employed has, as they say, no peculiar meaning, and may be as well applied to presbyters as to prelates. An order of prelates, as distinct from that of presbyters, can never be proved from scripture, since, on these principles there are no terms by which any distinctive order may be pointed out, and all powers exercised by any functionaries, may, by the very admission of our opponents, be regarded as exercised by presbyters under the names of apostles, or evangelists, or prophets; to whom were granted, by our Lord, to meet the exigencies of the church, in her incipient state, extraordinary powers. It will also appear, to every unprejudiced mind, that there is, in this admitted fact, that "the same appellations are indiscriminately given to ministers in the

1) See Scott's Coll. vol. 7, p. 298.

2) Powell on Ap. Succ. p. 78.

3) Boyd on Episcopacy, p. 42.

New Testament," a very strong presumption in favor of the presbyterian doctrine, that there is but one order of teaching, or ministerial officers in the church, of equal official power and dignity. There are, however, various designations by which these officers are entitled; while it is also true that they were originally distinguished by their spiritual gifts and powers, and are now made to differ, even as one star differeth from another in glory, by their mental endowments, or their ministerial attainments.

In perfect harmony with this conclusion, is the fact, that not one single example of prelatical ordination can be produced from the word of God. There is not a single instance in which any individual was set apart to the sacred ministry, by the instrumentality of only one ordainer. In every case, in which we have any intelligible record of the fact of an ordination, we find that it was accomplished by a plurality of ordainers. So it was in the cases already mentioned, and so was it also in the ordinations spoken of in Acts xiv. 23, and which were solemnized by Paul and Barnabas, who, as we have just seen, and shall see more fully afterwards, had received only presbyterian ordination. For this purpose do we find a plurality of presbyters in many or all of the churches planted by the apostles; as at Ephesus; at Antioch; and at Philippi; and with whom doubtless both Timothy and Titus co-operated in carrying out the injunctions of the apostle; Timothy and the apostles having been themselves thus set apart to the work of the ministry, and the apostles having sanctioned it by their own practice.

It is indeed said, that Paul instructed Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man." But surely this does not necessarily teach that he was to do so ALONE, when he did deliberately enter upon that important duty; no more than the injunction given to this same individual, by this same apostle, "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine," implies, that no other minister at Ephesus was at liberty to attempt the same duties. And, besides, it was customary in the later church, in the imposition of hands, for each ordainer to place only his right hand upon the head of the consecrated person; the very mention of *hands* in this direction *may*, therefore, impliedly refer to the co-operation of other presbyters in the act of ordination.¹

But, however this may be, no record can be shown of any ordination, where there were not present at least a plurality of persons. Nor is the declaration of Paul to Timothy, to "stir up the gift of God which was in him, by the putting on of his hands," in any thing contrary to this conclusion. This passage

1) See Bini Concilia, vol. 2, p. 932, and Plea for Presbytery, p. 27.

cannot, to say the least, be ever shown to refer to ordination at all. On the contrary, there are, we think, good reasons for interpreting it as having reference to the communication of some spiritual gift.¹ Such gifts, we know, were very commonly imparted by individuals singly; and since they were extraordinary, and temporary, there was no necessity for that security which is required in the consecration of ministers. Ordination, too, as has been shown, was never, so far as is recorded, performed by one individual alone. This view is, we think, forced upon us by the language. For if the word "gift" is made to refer to the office of the ministry, it were nothing short of absurdity to ask any minister to "stir up the sacred office of God, which sacred office is in him, by the putting on of hands;" whereas it would be perfectly correct to exhort such an one, to whom had been imparted some spiritual and internal gift, to "stir up this gift of God that was thus in him." And when we look to the whole passage, we find that the apostle speaks to Timothy of the "unfeigned faith that was in him," and "*wherefore*," adds the apostle, "stir up the gift of God which is in thee;" "for God hath not given us the spirit of fear," "be not thou, therefore, ashamed of the testimony of the Lord," &c. We are, therefore, led to conclude that the allusion of the apostle here, was to the bestowment of an abundant measure of faith, in the way of supernatural gift, by his hands to his son Timothy, and not to ordination at all.²

But to proceed, we further remark, that the opposition of this doctrine of apostolical succession — by the personal and hereditary transmission of heavenly gifts — to many of the DECISIONS of scripture, is not less palpable.

The truth — the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of God, as it is cemented together in the writings of the apostles and prophets, — this is the foundation, and the only sure foundation, on which the church can rest. That is the church, which has this truth for its ground, and which, as a pillar of testimony, publishes it to the world. That is not the church of God, which is not found holding forth the truth; for it is against this truth, as a rock immovable as the everlasting hills, that the gates of hell shall never prevail.³ Such is the judgment of God's word. And we are here required to keep aloof from all

1) Bishop Hoadly says, as indeed any one would judge, "that this word rather imports the *extraordinary qualifications* given to Timothy from above, for the better execution of his office, than the office itself." (See in

Works on Episcopacy, vol. i. p. 146.)

2) See this meaning developed in Plea for Presbytery, p. 26, 28.

3) See this fully shown when we come to discuss what is the true apostolical succession.

pretended ministers who are not men of God, and who do not preach the glorious gospel of the blessed God.¹ They who "handle the word of God deceitfully," (2 Cor. iv. 2;) who "have corrupted the word of God," (2 Cor. ii. 17;) "denied the resurrection," (Cor. xv;) — such teachers "are to be held accursed by us," (Gal. v. 12, and 1 Tim. vi. 3—5; 2 Thess. v. 15; Rom. xvi. 17, 18; 1 John iv. 1; Acts xx. 29, 30; Rev. ii. 16; Rev. xviii. 1—4.)

Of all the qualifications laid down any where in scripture for the office of a christian bishop, never is it prescribed as necessary, that he should be able to authenticate his lineal descent, through a personal succession, from the apostles. And yet, by the theory in question, this is made to be the first and most necessary mark of a true christian bishop.²

How are christians directed in scripture to try the character of their teachers?³ "Beware of false prophets," said our Lord, "who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." But how shall we beware of them, or by what criterion shall we distinguish the false from the true? Shall we critically examine their spiritual pedigree, and see whether, by an uninterrupted succession of regular baptisms and ordinations, they be regularly descended from the apostles? Impossible. A method, this, which would involve every thing in impenetrable darkness, and plunge all the hopes and prospects of the christian into a scepticism, from which there could be no recovery. On the contrary, the test he gives is plain and familiar. Mark his words: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them." And the apostle John says, "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God." And how are we to try them? The sequel plainly shows, that it is by the coincidence of their doctrine with that of the gospel. The like was also the method prescribed, under the former dispensation, by the prophet. "To the law and to the testimony," says he, "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." A very different mode of trial would now be

1) Math. vii. 15–20, and xv. 14.
John, x. 5. 2nd Cor. ii. 13, with
23.

Lect. on Popery, Puseyism and Protestantism. Lect. v. § 2.

2) See Rev. T. Archer's sixth

3) Campbell's Lect. on Eccl. His. Lect. iv. p. 60, ed. third.

assigned by a zealous patronizer of the hierarchy, popish or protestant.

“Who are false prophets?” asks Tertullian, “but false teachers—who are false apostles? but they who preach an adulterated gospel.” “The church is not bound, therefore, to an ordinary succession, as they call it, of bishops; but to the gospel. When bishops do not teach the truth, an ordinary succession avails nothing to the church: they ought, of necessity, to be forsaken.” So speaks Melancthon.²

Now, by this decision, the fair fabric of apostolical succession is scattered to the four winds, and blasted for ever. In Jackson’s Works, there is a chapter in which he professes to show that “the Romish church hath defiled the catholic faith, and by defiling it, hath lost true union with the primitive and apostolic church.”³ Hear also the great and good Bishop Jewell: “The grace of God is promised to pious souls, and to those who fear God, and is *not* affixed to *bishop’s chairs*, and personal succession. For that ye tell so many fair tales about Peter’s succession, we demand of you wherein the pope succeedeth Peter? You answer, he succeeded him in his chair; as if Peter had been some time installed in Rome, and had solemnly sat all day with his triple crown, in his *pontificalibus*, and in a chair of gold. And thus, *having lost* both religion and doctrine, ye think it sufficient, at last, to hold by the chair, as if a soldier that had lost his sword would play the man with his *scabbard*. But so Caiaphas succeeded Aaron; so wicked Manassas succeeded David; so *may* antichrist easily sit in *Peter’s chair*.”⁴

But, as the present succession of the Anglican church must stand or fall with this corrupt and faulty source, therefore is it associated with it in its merited condemnation.

It has been already shown, on the testimony of a learned episcopal writer, who has lately investigated the subject, that this system stands inseparably connected with that apostacy predicted by the apostles; (see 2 Thess. ch. ii., 2 Pet. ch. ii., 1 Tim. ch. iv., &c.) and is, therefore, involved in the condemnatory sentence passed upon it.⁵ And we are afraid we shall make it

1) De Præscript. c. 4.

2) In Powell on Ap. Suc. p. 151, where are similar statements from Ambrose, Peter Martyr, Bishop Jewell, &c.

3) See vol. iii. p. 870.

4) Def. of Apology, p. 634, Edin. 1609.

5) That the mystery of iniquity, spoken of by the apostles, refers, in its consummation, to the papal primacy, and in its progress to that prelacy on which it was based, has been shown by presbyterian writers in former times as it has recently by Mr. Taylor. Thus it is largely handled by the

too plainly evident, when we come to investigate the decisions of scripture respecting schism, that it must be also reprobated as schismatical by the just judgment of Heaven.

We allow these arguments at present to pass with this mere allusion to them, and would bring this question finally, as it regards the tests of scripture, to what we would term scripture MANIFESTATIONS, or the testimony of God's word, as it is interpreted by the workings of God's grace, in the dispensations of his mercy.¹

Do other denominations, beside those which are prelatical, claim to be, in truth, churches of Christ? Then, what is easier than to bring them to the test of experiment, and prove them in this same confident boasting? If churches of Christ, then it is but fair that they should be required to show the signs of a church. If good and not wild olive trees, then should they be found, not merely garnished with leaves, or even fair seeming blossoms, but laden also with fruit, fit for the master's use, and worthy of the care bestowed upon them by the husbandman. "By their fruits ye shall know them." This is a rule given to us by the Lord himself; and in no case could it be applied more safely than in the present. For, assuredly, if we are not churches of Christ, but mere human conventicles, and voluntary societies;—if we are not true worshippers of God, but mere "meetings," who rather offend and provoke him by our unauthorized forms;—if the promises of grace apply not to us, and are, therefore, unfulfilled in us—if our ministry and our sacraments are no better than mere mockeries—then it is most truly an easy thing to make evident the fact, that, like the fleece of Gideon, we remain *dry*, while they enjoy the refreshing dews of divine grace. God is not a man, that he should lie; neither hath he said what he will not accomplish, whether it be in giving or in withholding. For he is faithful who hath promised, and he cannot deny himself; and surely no second Prometheus can steal down grace from heaven, and thus vivify, with divine energy, the lifeless carcass of a mere self-willed ceremonial.

author of *Causa Episcopatus Hierarhici Lucifuga*, Edinburg, 1706, ch. iv. lect. 2. p. 123-162, and 410.

It is there shown that this was the opinion of Beza, (p. 126,) and other protestant divines.

The powers assumed by the prelacy are also particularly shown to be condemned in such passages, and to be in principle identical with the papacy.

"That the state of churches in after

ages," says Dr. Owen. (Works, vol. 19, p. 132.) "was moulded and framed after the pattern of the civil government of the Roman empire, is granted; and that conformity (without offence to any be it spoken) we take to be a fruit of the working of the mystery of iniquity."

1) See some remarks on this point in Dr. Mitchell's *Letters to Bishop Skinner*, p. 45.

As a criterion of the true church, nothing can be fairer than to take the evidence of facts, in proof of the withholdment, or bestowment of the promised blessings of Heaven; seeing that to the true church it is secured as a divine gift, that whatsoever she binds on earth shall be bound in Heaven. This canon of judgment is allowed even by Dr. Wiseman, the learned advocate of Romanism, and by Dr. Hough, the able episcopal reviewer of his disingenuous and jesuitical work against protestant missions. "It must be," says Dr. Wiseman, "an important criterion of the true rule of faith, delivered by our blessed Redeemer to his church, whether the preaching according to any given rule has received the success promised in this engagement on his part; or whether its total failure proves it not to have satisfied the conditions which he required."¹

Consonant to these views, are those of Mr. Bristed, himself an episcopalian, as contained in his thoughts on the American-Anglo churches. "However this may be, one thing is certain, that there is *no* exclusive church, to the professing members of which eternal salvation is exclusively confined. For it is manifest, that divine Providence blesses *every* sect and denomination of christians among whom the doctrines of the cross are faithfully preached; whether they be episcopalian, or presbyterian, or congregational. All these religious bodies have been blessed, as instruments in the hand of God, and under the quickening, sanctifying influences of the Spirit, to the conversion of sinners, the purifying of the life and conduct, and the salvation of souls; as is evident, by a cloud of witnesses, in different ages, and in every clime."²

"Now, if *any one* church, whether Greek, or Latin, or protestant; either as a whole, or in any of its various parts, subdivisions, or sects, were an exclusive church: the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the head of the church, would *not* bless the ministers of any other denomination with his presence, nor aid them with the illuminations of his spirit. It behooves us, therefore, to extend a catholic spirit of love, esteem, and reverence,

1) Lectures on the Romish church during the Lent of 1836, p. 109, 110, and p. 27, lect. 7, and Hough's Vindic. of Prot. Missions, p. 104, so also by Bishop Davenant. "At quot spectat ecclesias integras utrum fundamento suo salutariter maneant conjunctæ neene, ex operationibus quæ ab eisdem exerceri indies possunt et solent est statuendum. In quibus enim ecclesiis illi actus omnes exercentur per

quos homines christo uniri, in christo manere et per christum ad vitam eternam perducì possunt, eos ab hoc viniulo salutis humanæ, fundamento alienatos et divulsos nemo affirmare aut cogitare potest." Bishop Davenant ad Pacem Eccl. Adhortatio Cant. 1640, p. 59, and p. 101, chap. 8.

2) The same rule is adopted by Mr. Newman (on Romanism, p. 53,) in reference to the Romish church.

towards all, of whatsoever denomination or persuasion, who preach Jesus Christ, and him crucified, in purity of doctrine, in singleness of heart, in simplicity and in truth.”

“A good old divine says: ‘I have seen a field here, and another there, stand thick with corn. An hedge or two has parted them. At the proper season, the reapers entered. Soon the earth was disburdened, and the grain was conveyed to its destined place; where, blended together in the barn, or in the stack, it could not be known that a hedge once separated this corn from that. Thus it is with the church. Here it grows, as it were, in different fields, severed, it may be, by various hedges. By and by, when the harvest is come, all God’s wheat shall be gathered into the garner, without one single mark to distinguish that once they differed in the outward circumstantial of modes and forms.’

“If there were an exclusive church, membership in which is essential to salvation, and all out of its pale were consigned to perdition, or left to an uncovenanted contingency, it is fair to infer, that the Holy Spirit would have revealed it in the word of God, as plainly as he has revealed any other truth, belief in which is necessary to salvation; as for example: ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength:’ or, ‘He that believeth (in Christ Jesus) shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned.’ But, as this is not done, does it become christians, who profess to serve one and the same Master, to love one common Lord to condemn those who differ from them in opinion about church order, and church government, about external ceremonies, rites, and discipline?”

The Rev. Charles Leslie, who in his reasoning with non-episcopalians, is most unsparing and relentless, yet, in arguing with the Romanists, urges this very point with great force. “For what,” says he,¹ “have we to do to judge them that are without? — Them that are without, God judgeth.”² And God did judge one who was without, that is, out of the pale of the church, to be the most beloved of God, and that ‘there was none like him in the earth.’³ And he is put upon the level with the greatest in the church, ‘though Noah, Daniel and Job, were in it,’ &c.⁴ And as God chose a Gentile to be the great example of patience to all ages;⁵ and of another Gentile it was said by Christ, ‘I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.’⁶ And He who said often to his disciples, ‘O ye of little

1) Short Method with the Romanists, Edinb. 1835, p. 46-48.

2) 1 Cor. v. 12.

3) Job i. 8.

4) Ezek. xiv. 14.

5) James v. 11.

6) Luke vii. 9.

faith!’ and upbraided his apostles with their unbelief;¹ yet said to a woman of Canaan, (who would not be discouraged for the objection he put against her, of her not being within the pale of the church, but without, among the dogs,) ‘O woman, great is thy faith!’² And of the ten healed, there was but one thankful, ‘and he was a Samaritan,’³ that is, a schismatic, a stranger, as Christ here calls him, and said to him, ‘thy faith hath made thee whole.’⁴ And the pattern of charity is placed in the person of a Samaritan, in opposition to both a priest and a Levite:⁴ which makes good what St. Peter said of Cornelius a Gentile,⁵ ‘Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.’ This is the doctrine which Christ taught,⁶ when he reminded the Jews that a widow of Sarepta, a city of Sidon, and Naaman the Syrian, were preferred to all the widows and lepers in Israel; which so enraged the Jews, tenacious of the privilege of the church, that they ‘thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill, (whereon their city was built,) that they might cast him down headlong.’ And it is said, that they were ‘filled with wrath.’ The like fury they showed when St. Paul told them that the gospel was to be extended beyond the pale of their church, and that God had sent him to the Gentiles: ‘And they gave him audience unto that word, and then lift up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live. And they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air.’⁷ And the like rage is seen among the zealots of your church, when they hear of the gospel being extended out of the pale of their communion; though to christians, who hold the three ancient creeds, and have every thing essential to a church, except what Rome has made so, viz. the universal and unlimited sovereignty of her bishop: which is the great bone of contention, wherein Rome stands single by herself, thrusting all other christian churches from her; like a man in a boat who thinks he thrusts the shore from him, whereas he only thrusts himself from the shore; as Firmilian said to Stephen, bishop of Rome—‘Do not deceive yourself—you have cut yourself off from the church; for he is truly a schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity; for, while you think

1) Mark xvi. 14.

2) Matt. xv. 26, 28.

3) Luke xvii. 16.

4) Luke xvii. 18.

5) Luke x. 30, &c.

6) Acts x. 34.

7) Luke iv. 25, &c.

8) Acts xxii. 22

you can excommunicate all other churches from you, you have only excommunicated yourself from them.'"¹

Now, on this ground, we challenge inquiry, and are willing to abide the issue. What, then, is the conclusion, as to the divine purpose towards the presbyterian denominations generally, and our own specially?

The fact must be, either that there is, or that there is not, among them any real christians and heirs of heaven, or if any, so few as to come under the denomination, if we may so speak, of sporadic or miraculous cases, and which do not, therefore, conflict with the general rule, that upon us and upon our children, no dew from heaven, nor any spiritual gift, grace, or blessing, ever descends.

Now, although it is unquestionably true, that the prelatist theory does necessarily exclude from all the means of salvation, and therefore, from their result — that is, salvation; — all who are out of the pale of the church; although many of its advocates insist on this conclusion, and boldly avow it — yet as men's hearts are not, after all, so callous as are oftentimes their abstract conclusions, we do find some relentings in the bosoms of even high-churchmen. Many, therefore, are found willing to admit the claims, personally considered, to a high order of christian character and piety, of numbers "among presbyterians at least, (I use the language of the Oxford tractators,) whose piety, resignation, cheerfulness and affection, have been such, under trying circumstances, as to make them say to themselves, on the thoughts of their own higher privileges, 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida.'"² Their sympathies thus rise, "against their abstract positions," and forbid that they "should be so hard-hearted, as to condemn, by wholesale, the multitudes in various sects and parties whom they never saw."³ This conclusion is most cordially adopted in reference to multitudes among us, and on principle and conviction too, by all that portion of the episcopal denomination who are usually termed evangelical or low-churchmen, and with whom we can most cordially fraternize. Such episcopalians feel called upon to indulge these views, because, as they themselves say, to use the words of one of the most gifted and eloquent of their divines, "the gospel teaches us to regard all who give proof of having received favor of the Lord, as his true followers — as children of the same father — members of the same family — clinging to

1) Cyprian, Ep. 75, p. 228. Edit. Oxon.

2) Oxf. Tr. vol. 1, p. 334.

3) Ibid, and also Potter on Church

Government, p. 12, 13, 28, 29, where it is distinctly shown that persons may be true christians, and yet out of the church.

one cross — actuated by one aim — animated by one hope — and travelling to the one home.”¹

What we therefore demand is, that the piety of those who really act up to their profession in the judgment of even their fellow-members, in the presbyterian church, should be brought to all the tests of true and unfeigned religion, before God and our Father; and that like the gold of the furnace, it should be therein tried so as by fire. We challenge the proof of our christian character as a whole—for we claim no perfection, but eschew all such claims, as coming from a deceived heart — whether that character be according to godliness, and whether we be in the faith. We are willing to give a reason of the hope that is in us, to any man who will ask us; and to square our experience of the inward power and working of christianity, with that of any to whom God has made known the communication of his grace. To God’s word we implicitly and reverently bow. To God’s will we would in all patience, and resigned humility, constantly submit. To God’s sovereign mercy in Christ Jesus, who is the Lord our righteousness, we would refer all our hopes and all our desires of salvation. And, by the grace of God, and not by any thing in us, or done by us, would we most thankfully confess we have attained, to whatever measure of the stature of Christ, we have attained. We thus offer to their examination, the criteria of our individual membership in the kingdom of grace, whatever may be the criteria of the true visible church. This latter point we know, involves many intricate questions of dark and ambiguous meaning — involved in labyrinthine and misty speculations, which have been spun out into webs lighter than the gossamer’s, and almost invisible to the most microscopic examiner.

We, therefore, come boldly forward into open daylight, unfold our credentials and our experience — and call upon them to decide, not whether we are true, visible churches, but whether we are, in fact, true christians. Now we rejoice, that charity has here triumphed over bigotry and intolerance, and that our manifestation of the truth is allowed by many to give “such proofs of personal discipleship, as are not to be questioned without impiety as well as uncharitableness.”²

This, then, being the unvarying rule of practical judgment laid down in scripture, by which all men shall know the disciples of Christ; let us inquire, is the presbyterian church — our enemies themselves being judges — a safe church in which, as a vessel destined to the port of heaven, men may adventure the salvation of their immortal souls? Now, a whole cannot be

1) Sermons of the Rev. Hugh White, of Dublin, vol. i, p. 243. See also Heber’s Sermons in England, p. 217, 223, et passim.

2) Anc’t. Christ. vol. i. p. 489.

different from its parts; so that, what certainly belongs to each of its parts, and is inseparable from them, does not belong to the whole which is made up of those parts, and constituted by their union. This being granted, as a plain axiomatic proposition, we then proceed to its application, which is this. The individual members of this church, as far as they act out their profession, and thus give evidence of

“ Their heaven-wrought birth,
Meekness, love, patience, faith’s serene repose,”¹—

these all, either are, or at least *may* be, true christians, and in the way of salvation, and destined to “fill the thrones of heaven.” For if, as is allowed — fully allowed — many are thus found, giving incontestable proofs, that

“ They are of the chosen few,
The remnant fruit of largely-scattered grace,
God sows in waste, to reap whom he foreknew
Of man’s old race ;”²

then, as far as salvation is dependent on human instrumentality, or divine sovereignty — such might, in possibility, be the happy experience of all. It follows, as a necessary consequence, that the church, which these individuals compose, and of which they are the members, cannot be out of the way of salvation, or situated beyond the limits of divine grace and heavenly promise. It may not be, THE CHURCH — or the only church — or the exclusively true church of Jesus Christ — and such we never wish, nor desire that it should be; but blessed be God, it may be, A CHURCH OF CHRIST, a true, and pure, and faithful branch of that one, universal, holy, and apostolic church, of which Christ is head, and all we are members.

To deny this conclusion, from such premises, is not any better than to argue that a province or state is in rebellion, and its inhabitants, as a body, justly and deservedly held and treated as traitors; while at the same time, each single inhabitant is, in his own person, a faithful and loyal subject, although indeed, some may decline wearing a particular badge which some dominant party would enforce as a necessary sign of loyalty.³ To claim such universal, and exclusive dominion, in such a spirit of dictation, is to impress schism upon the forefront of the claimant body. It is spiritual despotism, founded on a baseless assumption of authority never given, and rights never vested.⁴ “ Out of

1) *Lyra Apostolica*, p. 67, by the Oxford divines, or their coadjutors.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 68.

3) That in this figure I do not lower our denominational distinctions, see Heber’s *Sermons on Eng.*, p. 223,

who resembles it to “the fashion of their arms.”

4) See it denounced as antichristian, and antisocial, by a Romanist quoted in Hough’s *Reply* as above, p. 111.

the church, there is no ordinary salvation"—grant it. But who — what — where is the church? and who is entitled to set up the boundary lines, and to say to the insulted Spirit of God — thus far mayest thou go but no further? "Out of the church" — and who are thus out? "Is it," it has been asked, "those whom Hildebrand may have excommunicated, or whom Gregory the Great may have cursed, or whom Syricus may have condemned, or whom Liricus, or Stephen, or Sextus may have denounced as heretics and schismatics?" — or is it those, whom Romanists and Anglicans consign to the hopelessness of that forged figment of the schools, God's uncovenanted mercies? Nay, we are taught, even by Archbishop Potter¹ that we may be unjustly excommunicated, and still be in communion with Christ the head, and of course, with all his living members. And it is by claiming the benefit of this very principle — just, and merciful, and true — that the Church of England herself confidently hopes to bear unscathed the anathemas of "her dear sister Rome."²

These prelatial, and exclusive, claims to the possession of the plenitude of grace; and of sacraments exclusively efficacious; are shivered and broken, by the admission, that without and beyond the church, and within the pale of other communions, the gifts and calling of God are freely and fully bestowed. Grant but this, — as reason, charity, and the most plain, palpable, and undeniable facts require, — and such views are self-contradictory, and in plain opposition to the evident manifestations of the divine presence. They are sheer absurdities, as well as gross impieties. It is as if a company of men, for the purpose of building up some village or town in an opposite location, should asseverate of an existing town, that its situation was essentially and necessarily fatal, and must prove destructive to the lives of all who venture to reside within its limits; while, at the same time, the most general health prevails through the community, and every inhabitant speaks in praise of the salubrity of the atmosphere, and the delightfulness of the climate.

There is, then, no alternative. Consistency demands the sacrifice, and it must be made. THE CHURCH — THE CHURCH is to be preserved, and for her a stern denial must be given to all love, charity, sympathy, and kindness.

There is no way left, therefore, but to stand firm and immovable in the assumption — the temple of the Lord — the temple of the Lord, are we, — to deny the operations of the Holy Spirit, wherever else they may be witnessed; — to reject as spurious, fanatical, and unsound, all extraneous evidences of

1) On Ch. Gov. p. 23, 29.

2) See e. g. Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 136.

piety and grace; — and to consign to deserved perdition, the millions of schismatic and rebellious outcasts, who will not go to heaven under prelatie orders.

“ Oh fools, to dream of showing mercy, —
Arm earth, hell, heaven, 'gainst their ungodly cause,
And sweep them to the appointed pit of hell.”¹¹

But in either case — take which alternative they may — the advocates of this doctrine of prelatie apostolical succession, as the conveyancer of heavenly grace — are involved in inextricable perplexity and absurdity.

Do they admit, as many do, and as Archbishop Potter teaches, that it is not easy to give a distinct and certain account what were the particular offices of these persons, (the orders of the church;) and which of them were extraordinary and temporary, and which designed for the constant and lasting use of the church; since the scriptures do not speak clearly, and learned men have differed in their judgments about them;¹² — then is it assuredly certain, that scripture does not authenticate the prelatie claims to a transcendency of power and privilege.

Do they, on the other hand, admit that the fact of our personal christianity, as exhibited in the lives and character of multitudes among us, is manifest, with a clearness not to be gainsayed; and stands, therefore, upon evidence incomparably stronger than can be given for their exclusive pretensions to be the only true church? — then do they, equally, overthrow their own position, since it is by the combination of such christians, our churches are made up; and since there is in their christianity a demonstration of the presence and power of Christ within them, to save, to sanctify, and bless.

Or will our opponents break away from every restraint of charity, and sear, as with a hot iron, the bowels of compassion, that stir and agitate their hearts with compunctious visitings of kindness; and will they boldly pronounce the doom of the vast and growing majority of protestant christendom? — then must we leave them, like Acetius, “to climb alone into heaven by their own ladder,” to sit down upon its thrones, and wield its sceptres. — We may, however, still be permitted, and thanks be to God, by whose gracious providence we are — to throw ourselves into his hands, and, as we desire to know and to do only his will, so to hope that every door is not shut against us, and that

1) Milman's *Anne Boleyn*, vol. iii. p. 28.

That this consequence is inevitable, see urged in *Anc't. Christ'y.* vol. i. p. 490.

2) Potter on *Ch. Gov.* p. 93, See also pp. 97, 91, 92, also, pp. 85, 86, 88.

this merciful and holy God hath not so stated our case, as to reduce us to the necessity of sinning against conscience, enlightened by his word, in order to escape from a state of damnation; or that our crime, if it is a crime, is so inexpiable, that nothing less than our eternal ruin can satisfy for it.¹ Truly we may say, with St. Augustine, although he himself assisted powerfully in forging fetters for the future officers of the Inquisition — “*Misericordia Dei liberam esse voluit, servilibus oneribus pre-munt, ut tolerabilior sit conditio Judæorum, qui etiamsi tempus libertatis non agnoverint, legalibus tamen sarcinis, non humanis presumptionibus subjiuntur.*”² “For one institution of God’s,” says he, “there are ten of men’s; and their presumptuous devices are more vigorously pressed than the divine precepts — whereby the state of christians was rendered far more intolerable than theirs under the law; their impositions being from the pleasure of God, but these from the will of presumptuous men, enthraling that religion which God, in mercy, would have had free.”

After all, then, supposing this whole doctrine to be true in theory, of what value is it? — since it is not found true in actuality. God is not more their God than our God — nor Christ their Saviour more than ours — nor the Spirit more their sanctifier than our sanctifier — nor the promises more richly fulfilled in their experience than in ours — nor does salvation come of their church more than it cometh of our own³ — and it is, says Wickliffe, “a thousandfold more grace to be a minister as Christ has ordained, and by grace that God himself giveth, than to be a pope or other prelate.”⁴

But little as the doctrine may be worth, even for the purpose of aggrandizing one denomination, and of humbling others; the guilt which is involved in this appropriation to one particular and visible church, of those privileges and rights, which are the patrimony of the church universal — this guilt is not light, nor will its authors be held excusable by Him, who is the common Father of us all. “I know not,” says Bishop Heber, “any superiority, except that of truth, which one religious sect has a right, as such, to demand over another, and I am confident that truth, wherever that is found, cannot be more effectually forwarded, than by the friendly intercourse, in good works, of those who conscientiously differ.”⁵

1) See Howe’s Reply to Stillingfleet’s Sermon on the Mischief of Separation, in Wks. vol. iv. pp. 422, 440.

2) See the whole passage in Epist. 119, Januarii, cap. 19.

3) See Anc’t. Christianity, vol. i. p. 486, 492.

4) See in Brit. Ref. vol. i. p. 221.

5) Sermons in England, p. 217 and p. 223. “Who,” asks Dr. Rice, in his

To substantiate any other claims than these, whose validity depends on the manifestation of an unbroken line of personal successors from the apostles, we require to have exhibited to us, not the last footsteps in this march of onward progression—but their continuance through the recesses of that unfathomed darkness which lies in the remote ages of the past; and their sure termination in the person of the Son of God. The rigid uniformity of every movement must be ascertained and made clear by observation. It must be demonstrated that no break, or informality, nor the absence of any necessary element, in the working out of the countless experiments, by which this mysterious agency has been elicited and transmitted; has ever occurred, to mar its progress, in any portion of its traceable course. And when this has been made apparent, of every step in the ascending or descending series; we then demand, that the establishment of this divine right, by the appointment of the only King in Zion, shall be made equally sure. Nothing short of this will satisfy us. For, it is not a question of mere ancestral pedigree, whereby the pride and vanity of some antiquated family are to be gratified; and when we are fully satisfied to look upon their genealogical tree, with all its well-marked limbs and branches. But that, surely, must be a chain of adamant, and safe anchored within the veil,—on which is to be made dependent the destinies of millions. And that pedigree

Review of Bishop Ravenscroft, (Evan. and Lit. Mag., vol. ix. p. 547,) “can perceive any difference in the ministrations of religious teachers, arising from a *difference in their ordination?* What visible difference in the effect of their labors? A pious, zealous episcopalian preaches the gospel; sinners are converted; the faithful are edified; the afflicted are comforted. A presbyterian preaches the same truths, and the same effects follow. No man in the world can point out the smallest difference between the penitence, the faith, the love, the hope, the comfort, produced by the instrumentality of these different preachers. The character of holiness formed by the truth in each case is, as far as it goes, precisely the same character. Yet Bishop R. and his brethren of the high-church, would wish us to believe that there is a most material difference in these two cases, arising solely from this fact, that one preacher was ordained by a diocesan bishop, and the other by a presbytery.

The converts made by the instrumentality of the presbyterian, believe the doctrine, because it is Christ's doctrine; rely on the promises, because they were *made by Christ*; receive the sacraments, because they were *instituted by Christ*; cherish the hope of salvation, because it is warranted by the truth which *Christ* has revealed, and the work which *Christ* has wrought by his spirit; yet this hope is unscriptural, because, forsooth, his religious teacher has not received a *character of authority* transmitted through bishops and popes for 1800 years. Whereas the episcopalian, who exercises the same repentance, the same faith, the same love, and no more; who receives the sacraments as signs and seals of the same covenant of grace, and cherishes precisely the same hope of salvation, has the warrant of heaven for all, because his religious instructor has the *character of authority!* Pretensions like these stumble belief—create offence—and awaken suspicion.”

must surely be legally attested, which is to wrest, from its present claimants, a long-possessed, and dearly-bought inheritance, secured to them by blood.

You, (we address this prelatie church,) you arrest the angel having the everlasting gospel to preach unto all nations, and charge him to proclaim it to those only, who will receive it, as interpreted by your decisions. You hush the sounds which warble from the angelic choir, who announce, in rapturous exultation, a Saviour who is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and you require that they shall celebrate a Saviour whose blood is efficacious only for all prelatists. You imprison that light of heaven which was designed, in the overflowing munificence of its bounty, to enlighten all men; and would thicken into deeper gloom that darkness, which already enshrouds man's rugged and hopeless path. Now, surely, in so doing, you can direct us to that voice from heaven, by which such supernatural authority has been committed into your irresponsible hands? Why, then, is it, that, as we urge on our way through the pages of the New Testament, we find, as we close book after book, that, whatever else it may contain, and whatever other information it may convey, it contains not, and conveys not, this grant, so unspeakably important, desirable, and necessary, your doctrine being true? And why is it, that, in support of these claims, as we have already seen by the testimony, even of their defenders, there is not a word of clear and distinct revelation, so that they are inferrible at all, only by them, in whose favor they are boldly set forth?

“Whether these *episcopoi*,” says the author of what has been termed, by the Edinburgh Review, “the most original, comprehensive, and profound contribution, which any living writer, in our own country, has made to the science of ecclesiastical polity”—after going through an analysis of the New Testament¹—“whether they all ruled with equal power, or submitted to the guidance of a senior, or president; we are not told.” “The present constitution of the church, although it emanated from the apostles, is,” says Mr. Dodwell, one of the most renowned champions of prelacy, “more recent than all the writings of the New Testament, and is not to be expected to be found there.”² This writer also denies that any of the apostles had a successor but Judas the traitor.³ Bishop Davenant, also, and multitudes more in the Church of England, deny that the

1) Isaac Taylor on Spiritual Despotism, p. 444.

2) Parœnes, Lecture xiii. p. 54
See in Anderson's Defence of Pres.

Ch. Gov. p. 98. See also Mr. Rhind, on *ibid*.

3) Parœnes, Lec. vi. p. 2. Lec. xv. p. 62. See xvi. p. 68.

apostles, as such, had any successors.¹ The Romish church, also, expressly contradicts this theory, and affirms, as a doctrine fundamental to the salvation even of Anglican prelates, and of the substance of the faith, that of all the apostles, not one had a lineal successor, save and except only Peter, and that in the papal chair. "The apostles" says Mr. Dodwell "ordained no bishops but presbyters only." Nay, says Dr. Hammond, an authority equally strong, "the apostles at first ordained no mere presbyters, but bishops only."² Thus is it certain, as Archbishop Potter declares, that "the scriptures do not speak clearly, and learned men have differed in their judgments about" the whole matter.³

But how is this, when the principles of church government came directly within the sphere of the apostolic writers, and when, if there is any thing, (prelacy being true,) on which we should have expected full and accurate and indubious legislation, this is that very subject? For the apostles being inspired by Christ, to write what would be necessary, not only for the churches as then existing, but as they were designed ever to remain; and thus prospectively to instruct us on whom the ends of the world have come; it is impossible to believe they could have left this whole doctrine, essential as it is declared to be, in such confessed ambiguity and silence. Since, then, this doctrine of apostolic succession is not found drawn out in the ecclesiastical records, canons, or decretals of the inspired writers; the only legislators of Christ's church — it is not — it cannot be — and it is sinful to make it appear to be — a doctrine of God's word, or essential to the salvation of men.

Mr. Leslie, indeed, has ventured to declare that by the application of his four celebrated rules, there is given an infallible demonstration of prelacy.⁴ But if his infallible demonstration proves any thing, it proves its utter unscripturality. For that the system of prelacy was publicly instituted in the face of the world, which is one of these rules, either by Christ or his apostles, is a *petitio principii*, assuming as undeniable what we most confidently dispute; since for any thing like satisfactory evidence of this fact, the world has yet to wait. Neither can it be shown that during the first ages of the church, the system of diocesan prelacy was attested by public monuments, or by outward and unquestionable acts. None such are to be found in the apostolic or primitive age of the church. And, although we

1) See Lecture x.

2) See Diss. Cap. 19, 20, 21, 22. Vind. of chap. ii. Annot. on Acts 11 b, and 14 a. See Anderson, Def. of Presb. p. 112.

3) The Oxford tractators, we showed, give up scripture as to any clear evidence. See Potter; also at pp. 107, 109, 110.

4) Letter on Epis. in Scholar Armed, vol. i. p. 56.

must allow that such a system has existed from a later period in the greatest portion of christendom, yet do we deny that it can be shown to have commenced from the time of Christ, which is yet made essentially necessary by Mr. Leslie's fourth rule.¹

But on the other hand, that an order of ministers have existed in the church, from the very time of Christ, is plain and undeniable. And that presbyters, as an order of christian ministers, have thus existed, and have been perpetuated in the church, is also allowed; for, as most prelatists teach, the apostles were certainly of this order during our Lord's ministry — and others expressly so denominated were afterwards appointed to succeed them in the christian ministry. By these famous rules, therefore, of Mr. Leslie's, we have an infallible disproof of the exclusive claims of prelacy, and an infallible demonstration of the truth of a presbyterian ministry.

Our conclusion, therefore, is, that prelacy has no foundation in the word of God. It has never been mentioned, or alluded to, by Christ, except it be in those passages where its essential spirit is most pointedly condemned. Nor has he left a commission for any but one order of christian ministers, to the end of time. And as he employed only one order of ministers, under the same commission, with the same powers, and for the same objects, during his life; so must we certainly conclude that the church, under Christ, was presbyterian, and not prelatial; Christ still being regarded by presbyterians as presiding over his church and ministers, with the same authority as when visibly manifest in the flesh. Neither is prelacy laid down by the apostles, the next master-builders of the christian church. They never mention three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons. They always interchange the titles and offices of bishops and presbyters. They ascribe to presbyters all the powers now properly claimed by prelates. These powers were exercised by presbyters, and with their sanction, even during the life-time of the apostles. The churches established by them, were placed under the superintendence and government of a council of presbyters. They, themselves, received ordination at the hands of presbyters. And while they are *never* called

1) The scriptures, says Mr. (afterwards bishop) Lowth, furnish us with two remarkable periods of time, from whence we may date the institution of the episcopal government. The first commences from St. Paul's release from his imprisonment at Rome, when Timothy was made bishop of Ephesus, &c., i. e. about 63, and yet James, the pretended bishop

of Rome, was there in the year 34. See Defence of Remarks on a Sermon by William Lowth, B. D., by John Norman, of Portsmouth. London, 1724, p. 25; in Boston Athenæum, B. 121. While the original of presbyters is therefore clear and certain, even the warmest advocates of prelacy cannot agree upon any time when its first introduction took place.

bishops, they are identified with presbyters, in their ordinary and perpetual ministerial character, with whom they sat, as co-members, in the same synodical assembly. The church, therefore, as it existed under apostolic regimen, was presbyterian, and not prelatic.

Nothing like a definite and express testimony, in favor of these prelatic claims, can be produced from any portion of the New Testament; nor any other evidence, unless it be of that analogical and inferential kind, which prelatists themselves teach us to reject; while we are, every where, in this word of God, warned against the encroachments of this very system, as it should, "by degrees," (*paulatim*) make its way to its present established claims, prerogatives, and powers. But, on the other hand, we have clear and evident testimony from scripture, for every essential feature of the presbyterian system.

That presbyters are a divinely appointed order of christian ministers, who ever have continued, and will continue to the end of time, never has been questioned. That these presbyters have ascribed to them, in the word of God, all the rights and powers included under ordination and jurisdiction, cannot be reasonably doubted. (See 1 Thess. v. 12 with 17; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Cor. v. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 3 John ix.; Titus iii. 10.) These powers were not only exercised upon the apostles by presbyters, and by presbyters during the lives of the apostles, but were also committed to them by the apostles in their last farewells, as to the highest officers in the church; and as their proper successors in the government of the church. (See Acts xx. 25, 27, 28, 29; 1 Pet. v. 1—4, with 2 Pet. i. 13, 14.)

That the ministers of the churches should be elected to their office in those churches, by the suffrages of the members, and not by any prelatic, or close corporation of vestry-men; is another title-deed which the ministers of the presbyterian church can produce—which scripture makes necessary—and which prelatical ministers have not. (See Acts i. 15, 16, 21—23; Acts vi. 3; Acts xiv. 23; and 2 Cor. viii. 19, 16.)

And thus might we proceed to show our divine warrant, for presbyterial and synodical assemblies, and for other features of our scriptural system. But enough has been said to make it clear, how indubitably certain it is, that the church of Christ, when tested by scripture, and fashioned after the pattern of God, is presbyterian, and not prelatic; and that this doctrine of prelatical apostolical succession, when tested by scripture, must be condemned.

In fine, therefore, we may say of the attempts to rest this

prelatic doctrine upon the basis of God's word, what Hooker says of the tenets he controverts. "Howbeit, examine, sift, and resolve their alleged proofs, till you come to the very root from whence they spring, the heart, wherein their strength lieth; and it shall clearly appear unto any man of judgment, that the most, which can be inferred upon such plenty of divine testimonies, is only this, — that *some things* which they maintain, as far as *some men* can *probably conjecture*, do seem to have been out of scripture *not absurdly* gathered. Is this a warrant sufficient for any man's conscience, to build such proceedings upon, as have been, and are, put in use for the establishment of that cause?"

1) Works, vol. i. p. 187, Hanbury's ed.

LECTURE VIII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BROUGHT TO THE TEST OF HISTORY.

WE have been engaged in an examination of the prelatie doctrine of apostolical succession. We say, the prelatie doctrine of apostolic succession, because, as we hope to show, there is a view of this doctrine which is scriptural, reasonable, and of great moment. There is no other foundation on which true christianity can rest, than the doctrine of apostles and prophets; and only they who remain steadfast in holding THE TRUTH can be regarded as the legitimate successors of these founders of the christian church. This scriptural view of the doctrine of succession, breaks down all middle walls of partition — rejects as Judaical, the separation of the christian temple into outer and inner courts, of greater and less privilege and sacredness — merges all distinctions, except such as are necessary to the government of the church, into the brotherhood of one heavenly family — and allows no other differences than such as arise from the manifestations of the truth, and the zealous discharge of christian obligation. There is thus conferred precedence upon none. None are by birth, inheritance, or the monopoly of some exclusive charter, invested with the privileges of the christian church. The church is a house of prayer for ALL nations. The promise is to believers, and to their children — to them that are near, and to them that are afar off; so that should any particular church become apostate — deny the truth — and yet say, “we have Abraham for our father,” — ours are the promises and the oracles of God, and the priesthood and the succession — God is still able of those who are esteemed, by such pharisees, graceless as the stones of the

valley, to raise up children unto Abraham, and to send them ministers after his own heart.

The prelatie doctrine of apostolic succession represents the spiritual interests of the whole human family, as intrusted by God, to one visible corporation — the church ; to which, for this end, is committed a plenary authority, to draw at will upon the divine treasury. — This power or gift is a personal right, vested in each successor of the apostles, by the imposition of prelatie hands ; and has been transmitted — as it could not otherwise have been transmitted at all — in an unbroken line of prelates from Christ to this present hour. Beyond the jurisdiction of this body, in which Christ resides, there can be no spiritual safety or happiness.

We have exhibited this doctrine in the language of its advocates. We have also, by their assistance, laid down the canons, by which the evidence presented must be tried. And we have brought the whole question to the test of scripture. The position has, we trust, been abundantly established, that a doctrine which is made essential, and of the substance of the faith, must appear to have been clearly and certainly revealed in scripture.¹ Now, by the confession even of its advocates, this doctrine is not thus to be found — if found at all — in the word of God. It was also shown, that in order to give validity to these high claims, it is needful, not only to make manifest the fact, that such a system was acted upon by the apostles, in their administration of the affairs of the first churches, but that they instituted such a system as the perpetual *and unalterable* order of the church. Of this we have discovered no evidence whatever, nor can such evidence be produced.

Further: it was made to appear, that even had this system been thus instituted by the apostles, it would still be necessary, in order to brand any deviation from it — not in a spirit of self-willed resistance, but of a godly desire to carry out the teaching of our Lord, — with a measure of guilt so foul, as to be atoned for only, by exclusion from the favor of God, and from the enjoyment of his grace ; — to prove that the system was made essential, and held forth as among the articles of faith. But for this, no such proof can be advanced from the word of God.

Weighed in the balances of truth, this prelatie doctrine of apostolic succession is therefore found wanting. It is clearly adulterate, and is not the pure fine gold of the sanctuary. It may be *jure ecclesiasio*, but it cannot be *jure divino*. It may be *de canonico*, but it cannot be *de fide*. It may be *de jure*

1) See in Lect. ii. iii. and iv.

regum, but it cannot be pretended to be *de jure regis regum*. It may be delivered *ex cathedra*, but it cannot be proclaimed "as by commandment of the Lord." To impose it as a heavy burden upon the consciences of all men, is wantonly to usurp the throne of judgment — for all judgment is committed unto the Son. — It is to affront the supremacy of Him, who has not vacated his throne, but ever lives as head over all things to his church. As a question of conscience, the matter is thus clearly decided. No possible doubts or fears can have place respecting it. We may sit unmoved and unharmed, whatever fiery assaults may be made upon us, and their comminations, anathemas, and badly mimicked fears, we may treat as the idle wind, which we regard not; "for where there is no law, there is no transgression."

But satisfactory as is the conclusion to which we are thus led, it may be well, for our full confirmation, to bring this doctrine to the tests of some other principles; and first let us try it by the standard of history.

To this investigation we are indeed challenged in a voice not less bold and confident of victory, than that of the giant Philistine, when he scowled defiance upon the army of the Israelites. Peradventure, if God shall give his assistance, this boasting may be found as vain and profitless, even though a David may be wanting to fight the battles of the Lord. The cause is safe, whatever may be the portion of its advocates, since victory is already sure.—"These," we are told, are "mainly matters of fact, resting upon history, and not on preconceived opinions, and controversialists must be reminded that they are to be dealt with as facts, and can be met only by *historical* contradictions."¹ So says Bishop Seabury: "there is no other way left to obtain a valid commission to act as Christ's ministers in his church, but by an *uninterrupted succession of ordinations from the apostles*. Where this is wanting, all spiritual power in Christ's church is wanting also."²

The fact, then, to be proved, is, as the same writer states it, the derivation of their power from the apostles, through episcopal (prelatical) ordination, — in other words, the apostolical succession. "This succession has been handed down," it is said, "with scrupulous care from the earliest times, and at the reformation, was rigidly preserved in the Church of England."³ In

1) Oxford Theology in the Lond. Quarterly Review, April, 1840, p. 294. This is an elaborate defence of the Oxford Theology, perhaps by Southey.

2) Sermons, vol. i. p. 12. Brit. Crit. Oct. 1839, p. 309.

"We must be as sure," they say, "that the bishop is Christ's appointed representative as if we actually saw him work miracles as St. Peter and St Paul did." Oxf. Tr. No. 10, p. 4.

3) Brit. Crit. Oct. 1839, p. 309.

other words, the whole power of the ministry is derived from the apostles through a line of prelates personally succeeding them, every link of which is unbroken and perfect, and which line can be still made clear by every prelate.

It must then, as we have already shown, be made manifest that not a single link is wanting in this entire chain.¹ It must be proved that each individual in this succession had received an ordination, which in its form was perfectly valid and beyond doubt.² It must be further proved of each individual, that as a subject for that ordination, he was in all respects duly qualified, both as required by scripture and the canons.³ And further still, it must be proved in regard to each individual, singly and separately considered, not only that he was a fit subject for ordination — not only that he was ordained in due and regular form — but also that all this was true of each of his ordainers. They also, it must be shown, were in number, in character, in standing, and in qualifications, such as to give validity to their act, and thus efficaciously to communicate the *plenitudo sacerdotii*; the plenitude of sacerdotal grace.

A failure of “*proof for the historic fact*,” in any one particular, regarding any one individual, in this apostolical succession, throws doubt upon the whole; and the certainty of an unbroken line being thus destroyed, the whole pompous fabric crumbles into dust. When a perpetual succession of prelates who have been found duly authenticated in each of these particulars, and wanting in none, is established, then, and not till then, may our faith be challenged.⁴ Till then, we will continue to rejoice that the reformers wrenched this chain from the hands of apostate Rome, and fastened it afresh to the rock of scriptural truth.⁵

Let us first inquire, therefore, whether these conditions can be met in any fairness, as it regards the period immediately subsequent to the establishment of christianity. Supposing the foundation to have been as securely laid, as we have found it utterly insecure, the next most important step would be to approve as sound and good the first links, by which the whole succession is attached to this adamantine rock. — Thus only can it be demonstrably transmitted, in uninterrupted succession, to the present time.

Now here we boldly deny, that there does exist any such historical evidence in the first age of the church, as to stamp any traditive doctrine on this point, with a clear and full apos-

1) See Brit. Crit. Oct. 1839, p. 309.

2) See *ibid.*

3) See Lect. V.

4) See Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 106.

5) See Voetius *Desperata Causa Papatus*, Amsterdam, 1535, p. 268, Lib. 11, Lect. 11. Cap. xix.

tological character. There is no such thing as an universal agreement either as to the facts, or as to the doctrine founded upon them, and therefore no title of undoubted authority.

As the Anglican church traces up her succession through the Romish church, so that its validity depends upon the validity of that church,¹ what is the proof, we ask, for the succession, as commencing with Peter, and descending to the present occupant of the Roman papal throne? This chain, on which is suspended the whole character and hopes of the British hierarchy, is, we aver, defective at the very point where the firmest coherence is needed. "It is indistinct and attenuated, and open to valid objections, *at its commencement*, where it should have been clear and uncontroverted."

The very basis on which the whole succession is founded, is still open to serious disputation, as untenable and groundless. For that Peter ever was at Rome at all, is a question on which learned men have given very different views.²

On what authority is it asserted, that Peter ever was at Rome at all? Besides one or two other fabulous legends about the aeronautic flight of Simon Magus, and the personal encounter with our Saviour, when the apostle was again denying Christ by a base and unmanly flight — it is alleged that the sepulchre of St. Peter is to be seen at Rome at this day. But even were the real body of the apostle enshrined at Rome, we know that the translation of the bones and bodies of martyrs from one place to another, is no unusual thing in the history of Rome. But again, how are we to believe that the body of St. Peter is actually at Rome, when, as Dr. Fulke says,³ "half his body is at Peter's in Rome, the other half at Paul's; and yet he hath another head at John *Lateran*; and his nether jaw, with the beard upon it, is in France, at *Poictiers*; at Triers, many of his bones; at Geneva was part of his brain, which was found to be a pumice stone: like as Anthony's arm was found to be a hart's pissel."

1) "From the church of Rome," says Dr. Geo. Miller in his recent Letter to Dr. Pusey, (Lond. 1840, p 6,) "corrupted though it was, we profess to have received the sacred orders of our priesthood, and the commissioned authority of our episcopacy; and we are accordingly ever ready to acknowledge, as already invested with the holy orders of our church, and therefore requiring no new ordination for admission among our clergy, those of the clergy of that church, who have, from time to time, connected themselves with ours."

Laud confesses that this succession

stands or falls, with the opinion that the church of Rome "never erred in fundamentals." See Neal's Puritans, vol. iii. p. 189. See p. 193.

"I agree with the Romanists in resolutely maintaining the doctrine of the apostolical succession." Pratt's Old Paths, p. 221.

2) Spiritual Despotism, p. 303.

3) See this question discussed in Bowers' Hist. of the Popes, vol. i. ch. i.

4) Conf. of Rhem. Test. on Rom. 16, p. 185, Am. ed. and Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 160.

There is no agreement as to the time, when the apostle should have visited Rome.¹ The time specified is absolutely contradictory to scripture history.² There are several considerations grounded upon scripture statements, which involve this assumption in impenetrable obscurity, and make it more difficult to believe than to reject the story, as "but a fable."³ It is also not improbable, that Peter died at Antioch, and not at Rome.⁴

The arguments against the supposition by many learned men, have never been satisfactorily answered,⁵ while they have been considered irrefragable even by Romanists themselves.⁶

Thus much may suffice, as to the uncertainty which surrounds the question, whether Peter ever was at Rome at all. But that Peter was the fixed and resident bishop of Rome, is a most untenable position, and contrary to all reason.⁷

1) Orosius, Jerome, and Damasus differ. See Willet, Syn. Pap. 161.

2) Ibid.

3) See Bradford, Let. to Lady Vane, in Brit. Ref. vol. ii. p. 101, and in Fathers of the Engl. Ch. vol. vi. p. 130. This martyr-bishop there promises more fully to establish this point in a Treatise on Antichrist. See also Fulke, as above, and Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 161, 162. Dr. Barrow in Wks. fol. vol. i. p. 599.

4) See Auth. in Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 162.

5) See Illyricus, lib. contr. primat. pap. Uldaricus Velenus; Calvin, Inst. lib. 4, c. 6, § 16; Magdeb Cent. Cent. 1, lib. 2, c. 10, col. 561, in Dr. Willet. Cranmer denies that Peter was at Rome. See in Burnet's Hist. of Reform. vol. iv. pref. B. 2, A. D. 1534. See others in Powell on Ap. Succ. p. 107; Zanchius de Eccl. cap. 9; Ep. Bull's Vind. of the Ch. of Engl. p. 73, 75, 78; Oxf edit. Owen's Wks. vol. xix. p. 202. "As to what is recorded in story; the order and series of things, with the discovery afforded us of Peter's course and place of abode in scripture do prevail with me to think steadfastly he was never there."

See also Frid. Spanheim, filio in quat. dissert. T. 2, Opp. p. 333, seq; Spanheim, Hist. Christ. § 1, p. 569; Ayton's Orig. Const. of the Ch. p. 453, where Scaliger in Euseb. p. 189, and Wales. in Euseb. p. 2, 10. See also Spanheim, Miscell. Sac. Antiq. l. 3, dissert. 3; Bishop Reynolds against Hart, cap. ii, in Div. Right of Min. Pt. 2, p. 115; Dr. Whittaker, lib. de Pontif. qu. 2, cap. 15, in ibid,

p. 117; Junius, Contro. lib. 2, cap. 5, not. 18; and ibid, p. 124.

On the whole subject, see a full and learned reference to various authorities in Fabricii Lux Evang. under the head of "traditiones minus certæ." p. 95 - 98.

6) Lyranus, in Dr. Willet.

7) See this matter discussed with full authorities, in Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 163, 164, and again at p. 168. See also fully argued by Dr. Barrow on the Pope's supremacy, in Wks. fol. vol. i. p. 599 - 602; Spanheim's Eccl. Hist. Wright's Transl. p. 146, n. 3. See also Bishop White's Lectures on the Catechism, Dissert. i. § 2, p. 411 - 417, Philad. 1813; Dr. Rice in Lit. and Evang. Mag. vol. ix. pp. 72, 73; Campbell's Lect. on Eccl. Hist. Lect. xii. p. 215; Bayne's Diocesan's Tryall, Lond. 1621, p. 31.

See also Tracts, by the ever-memorable John Hales, Lond. 1721, p. 206; "Yea, says he, that he was bishop at all, (as now the name of bishop is taken,) may be very questionable; for the ancients, that reckon up the bishops of Rome until their times, as Eusebius, and before him Tertullian, and before them both Irenæus, never account Peter as bishop of that see; and Epiphanius tells us that Peter and Paul were both bishops of Rome at once; by which it is plain, he took the title of bishop in another sense than now it is used; for now, and so for a long time upward, two bishops can no more possess one see, than two hedge-sparrows dwell in one bush. St. Peter's time was a little too early for bishops to rise."

That Peter occupied that chair as the head of the papal succession — as the exclusive source of transmitted grace to the church ; is a gross and palpable fabrication, destitute of all scriptural basis, or historic verity, and the pregnant source of innumerable crimes, and the blackest enormities that have stained the bloody page of ecclesiastical history.

“ All unavoids is this doom of destiny.” The very core of the papacy is rottenness. The corner-stone is wanting, and its airy castle topples to the ground. There is uncertainty, to say the least, around the very charter from which this whole succession dates its lineage. God in his merciful providence has thus baffled the devices of Satan, and wrested from him this prime principle of intolerance and heresy — the very pillar and ground of the unity and infallibility of Rome.

But let this pass, and supposing Peter to have been bishop of Rome. Whom, we inquire, did this imaginary pope — or these popes? — choose and ordain to be his successor? No one could have dared to assume the apostolate of Peter and the primacy of Rome, the destined mistress of the world, unless called as was Aaron — unless called, chosen, and invested with the keys of earth, hell, and heaven, by the divine apostle. Who was thus chosen, called, and ordained? We ask and demand an answer — Who?

“ These great apostles,” answers Dr. Hook, “ successively ordained Linus, Cletus, and Clement, bishops of Rome,” from whom “ the prelates in these realms derive their mission by an unbroken, spiritual descent.”¹ And “ this continued descent is evident to every one who chooses to investigate it.” Most boldly spoken. And now, surely, we will have the *proof*; “ for these are matters of fact resting on history, and not on preconceived opinions, and controversialists must be reminded ”² of this. Unlock, then, your doors, ye guardian prelates ; summon to your aid the whole orders of “ bishops, priests, and deacons, who can, if they please, trace their spiritual descent from St. Peter or St. Paul.”³ Let it please you to bring forth the priceless Sybil leaves, on which are charactered, in burning proof, strong as of Holy Writ, the insignia of this early royalty. Oh, why so tantalizing to a world ready to pay all due homage to your just honors? or so modest, as to conceal from view the evidences of your unpretending greatness?

To be most serious, (where gravity itself might be overcome, to see this mountainous fabric in laborious agony) here, again,

1) Dr. Hook's Two Sermons, 3d ed. Lond. 1837, pp. 7, 8.

2) Edinb. Rev. Oxf. Theol. Ap. 1839, p. 294.

3) Dr. Hook, as above.

confusion becomes worse confounded. There is no proof whatever, either in the New Testament, or in any authentic document of the apostolic remains; or in any veritable authors; that the apostles called and invested any single individual named or nameless, with the prelacy of Rome.

Irenæus is the first writer they produce. He testifies that Linus was the first occupant of the see of Rome, though how he came there, or when, or by whom; or whether validly ordained, or himself a valid subject for ordination, he does not tell.¹ He does not even say which of the apostles delivered the episcopate to Linus; nor that he was ever ordained by the imposition of hands at all, and thus received the communication of the plenitude of episcopal grace. And, more than this, what Irenæus does say, he does not pretend to authenticate by testimony, but gives it as "that which is held as a tradition from the apostles," — if, indeed, as Grabe argues, this does not refer exclusively to the fides, or faith, of which he speaks, and not to the successiones or succession.² To Linus, Irenæus says, succeeded Anacletus,³ to him Clemens, and to him Evaristus, and Alexander. Now Irenæus wrote the treatise from which this testimony is derived, about the year A. D. 176, or 192.⁴

The next witness is Eusebius, who was consecrated bishop about the year A. D. 320.⁵ He says that "after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome;"⁶ and that after holding it twelve years, he "transferred it to Anacletus,"⁷ who was "succeeded by Clemens."⁸ Now let us be permitted to cross-examine this witness. We would then inquire what Eusebius *knows* about this matter, from actual documentary or other sufficient data, especially as it is pretended by some that he had by him such existent records?⁹ Eusebius answers in this same work, (chapter iv.) "but how many, and which of these, actuated by a genuine zeal, were judged suitable to feed the churches, established by these apostles, IT IS NOT EASY to show, further than may be gathered from the writings of Paul." On what, then, we would ask, did this writer rely, as the source of his information? He frankly declares, "that he was obliged to rely much on tradition, and that he could trace no footsteps of other historians going before him only in a few narratives."¹⁰ Let us further inquire, then, if

1) Adv. Haer. iii. 3.

2) Irenæus, cap. iii. § 2, p. 175;

Grabe in Dissert. iii. § 4.

3) Ibid, § iii. p. 174.

4) Lardner, vol. ii. p. 166.

5) Ibid, vol. iv. p. 72.

6) Eccl. Hist. iii. § 2.

7) Lib. iii. § 13.

8) Ibid, § 14.

9) See Eccl. Hist. Leipsic edition, vol. i. p. 187, Notes.

10) See his introductory chapter, and Dr. Miller on the Min. p. 129.

Eusebius knows whether any individual apostle did really designate Linus to the episcopate at Rome? Eusebius gives no answer to that question. Let us again ask, whether Linus was actually ordained by imposition of hands? Eusebius does not say. Was it during the life of the apostles Paul and Peter, that this Linus received the episcopate? "No" says Eusebius, "it was after their martyrdom." But pray, inform us, what was the nature of that episcopate which Linus thus received after the death of the apostles? This, Eusebius does not determine, so that whether he was a presbyter-bishop, or a diocesan-bishop; whether a governor of presbyters, or himself a presbyter, or presiding moderator, president, or senior among other presbyters; whether he was a bishop of the church at Rome, or of the whole region around Rome; whether he had under him the orders of presbyters and deacons, who were excluded from all right to ordain; and whether his office was considered as of divine right, in its superiority; all this, which is of the very essence of the prelatic doctrine of apostolical succession, is left entirely undetermined — nay, rather determined against its claims, since we are referred, by Eusebius, to the Acts of the Apostles, and to the Epistles, where, as we have already seen, prelacy is not to be found.

Linus, then, not receiving his office till after the death of the apostles, could not receive it from them: and could not, of course, transmit, in succession, any gifts, graces, or powers, which he never received. He was never invested with this office by the apostles, for he received it after their death, and, of course, whatever virtue there is in Romish succession, must originate with, and terminate in Linus, and not in the apostles. Neither do Irenæus nor Eusebius give any proof, but only a tradition, in the one case a hundred years old, and in the other, more than two hundred, and in both cases delivered after the hierarchy had entered on its progress, and the prelatic spirit had wormed itself into the bosom of the church, and corroded that vital energy which lay in its purity and simplicity. We know not, and it is impossible that we now should know, who was the first stationed minister or pastor at Rome. We know not who succeeded him, nor how this successor was appointed, nor when, nor how ordained; and that he was a diocesan prelate of the first order, having under him two other orders, essentially distinct; and that he was the first link in the electric chain of celestial grace — these are figments which break in the rough and uncivil hands of stubborn historical verity, like a rope of sand.

1) *μετα την Παυλος και Πιτερσ μαρτυριαν*, ch. 11, § 1, vol. i. p. 187.

A poor foundation this, whereon to build the destiny of millions !¹

But, perhaps, what is wanting in the testimony of these two early traditionists, (and to whom, although they do not verify this baseless theory, we yet owe much,) may be made up by the clear, full, universal, and unvarying testimony of other writers. Nothing of the kind is, however, true. The case of this tottering erection is made infinitely worse, by the very attempt to renew or strengthen its frail foundations. Irenæus and Eusebius, we have seen, place Anacletus next to Linus, as having received the episcopate from him. Now Tertullian, and several others assure us, that this is an entire mistake, for that Clemens was first of all, and the next lineal descendent of Peter, or whosoever it might be. Epiphanius and Optatus again seriously affirm, that Anacletus and Cletus were before Clemens. Jerome, Augustine, Damasus, and others, differ from them all, and assert that Anacletus, Cletus, and Linus, were all anterior to Clemens, and the first links in this chain of living energy. Damasus is of opinion that Peter ordained two successors, and not one merely. Vossius declares, that before the time of Evaristus, two or three successors sat together on this episcopal throne.²

1) Thus it is shown, that the whole of this stupendous pantheon rests upon the two pillars of Irenæus and Eusebius. But Irenæus, besides that he gives no positive testimony as to what is of importance in the case, does actually, in other parts of his writings, show that by bishops he meant presbyters, and that he had no conception whatever of modern bishops or prelates, (as in Lib. 4 cap. 43, and Lib. 5, cap. 23; and see Div. Right of the Min. Pt. 2, p. 115 - 117.) If Irenæus, therefore, proves any thing in the case, it is that presbyters are the only true successors of the apostles.

As to Eusebius, being more in the dark, and less liable to detection, he is rather more bold. But as Scaliger, with the approbation of Bishop Reynolds, affirms, Eusebius read ancient history *parum attente* as they show by many proofs. All he declares is only on the authority, that *sic scribitur*, so it is reported, and his only references are to unexisting records. (See Div. Right of Min. p. 64.)

On the doubtful credit to be attached to Eusebius in this matter, see also Henderson's Review and Con-

sid. Edinb. 4to. 1706, p. 331, 371 - 373, where he quotes Scaliger, Dido-clave, Stillingfleet, &c.; Mosheim's Commentaries, vol. i. pp. 135, 297, 294; Stillingfleet, Irenicum, p. 341; Plea for Presbytery, Glasg. 1840, p. 248.

We may here apply the rule laid down by Bishop Lloyd. "But for the number of witnesses, I think that is not much to be considered when they come, (as these do,) all in file, one after another, so that all their strength is resolved into the credit of one author." Hist. Acct. of Ch. Gov. in Great Brit. and Irel. Lond. 1684, Pref.

Again, he makes it a chief argument against the Scottish claims "by showing the distance of time at which the first author of them lived, from the persons and things of which he writ." Ibid. "It is a shrewd presumption against the truth of any matter delivered in history, when it is said to have been many ages before the time of him that was the first author that mentioned it." Ibid.

2) See Dr. Miller on the Ministry, p. 327.

Irenæus and Eusebius then declare, that they knew no more about this whole matter than we ourselves are still able to discover, from the apostolic records; while that which they did know, most effectually cuts up by the roots, this goodly tree of prelatical succession. And all the fathers and writers after them affirm, and deny, and contradict, and make doubly uncertain, this first stage in the progress of a succession, which is, nevertheless, as these modern divines teach, "evident to every one who chooses to investigate it; and an unbroken line from Peter to the present day, which every bishop, priest, and deacon, can trace!"

This may be true, however doctors may differ; for we are required, on this system, to believe what is plainly contrary to fact and evidence, with an implicit faith.¹ But sure we are, that every ecclesiastical writer, of any name or honesty, will assert the fact, that the order of this primitive succession cannot be determined.² The facts in the case are irrecoverably lost, and are buried, by a gracious Providence, at the very bottom of that fathomless gulf of oblivion, into which the memory of man pierceth not.

Nay, this order of primogeniture is a subject of controversy even within the bosom of the Romish church itself. Tertullian, we have seen, makes Clement the immediate successor of the apostle Peter.³ In this he was followed by Rufinus, and by the Latins generally, among whom, in the fourth century, this opinion universally prevailed. But Jerome rejected this opinion, and placed Linus first, who was, of course, ordained by St. Peter. Tertullian, however, assures us that Clement was thus ordained; while the apostolical constitutions, which place Linus first, tell us, in the most express terms, that he was ordained, not by St. Peter, but by St. Paul.⁴ Now, however, it is believed, as a matter of faith, in spite of all contradictory evidence, both from the Greek and Latin church, that Linus was the first bishop of Rome.⁵

In the English church, the same controversy has prevailed. Dr. Hammond will have it that Clement, Linus, and Anacletus all succeeded Peter, and held co-ordinate jurisdiction; the first over the Jews, and the others over the Gentiles.⁶ This theory Cotelerius rejects as without any support, while Dr. Pearson

1) See Dodsworth on Dissent. and Ref. in Lect. 4, p. 83.

2) See Hind's Rise and Progress of Christ. vol. ii. p. 165, who thinks there were two churches at Rome; Gieseler's Ecl. Hist. vol. 1, p. 66; Stillingfleet, Iren.

3) De Præscript. heret. c. 32.

4) See B. vii. ch. 46.

5) See Bower's Hist. of Popes, vol. i. p. 9.

6) Hammond l. 5, c. 1.

insists that it is, as Cyprian says, contrary to the evangelic law, and to the rules of the catholic institution, for two bishops to preside together in one city.¹ This, also, was determined on in the council of Nice,² and became a settled proverb, "one God, one Christ, one bishop,"—two prelates being regarded, as Theodoret testifies, infamous.³ So that "whoever is made bishop after the first, is, says Cyprian, not a second bishop, but no bishop."⁴ Archbishop Potter again asserts, that "Clemens not only conversed with the apostles, but was ordained bishop of Rome by St. Peter."⁵ Bishop Pearson proves that Linus died before Peter, and how could he succeed him?

Thus is it made apparent, in what palpable and gross darkness, in what impenetrable obscurity, the prime question, on which this whole cause rests—the corner-stone and foundation on which the stately structure of the prelacy, Romish and Anglican is built—is involved. Irenæus positively declares that the church, at Rome, was only founded by the apostles Peter and Paul, who left Linus in charge, while they pursued their course. Of necessity, there was no succession in the case whatever, and their authority, the apostles still held in possession. Eusebius, and Epiphanius both affirm that Peter and Paul were, at the same time, both bishops and apostles.⁶ Both, therefore, were bishops, or neither, and if both, then is the origin of this succession, according to Cyprian, the council of Nice, Theodoret, and Dr. Pearson, infamous, uncanonical, and invalid.

Ruffinus again affirms that Linus, Cletus, and Clemens all held the see of Rome, during the life-time of St. Peter,⁷ and thus is it trebly sure that Peter never transmitted his apostleship, in the plenitude of episcopal grace, through the Romish succession.

"It may now be inquired," to use the words of Mr. Bower, in his History of the Popes, and who gives abundant evidence to show that there is every doubt, whether Peter ever was at Rome, and that it is certain he never was the bishop of that place, as that word is now understood,— "if St. Peter," says he, "was bishop of Rome, who placed him in that see? Did our Lord appoint him? Did the apostles name him? Did the people choose him? To these queries no answers have been yet given, but such as are so ridiculously weak, that it is not worth my while to relate them, nor the readers to hear them."

1) See Cyprian, as quoted in full, in Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 161, 162.

2) Bower, *ibid* p. 10.

3) *Ibid* p. 8.

4) See Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 123.

5) Epiph. *hær.* 7. Bower, *ibid*, p. 6.

6) Ruff. in *Præf.* and *Clem. Recogn.* in *ibid* p. 5.

7) See *ibid*, p. 6, et *preced.*

St. Peter, either alone, or jointly with St. Paul, appointed the other bishops of Rome. Now, when he appointed others, did he resign his episcopacy or retain it? If he resigned it, he did not die bishop of Rome, which shakes the very foundation of the pope's claim to supremacy. If he retained it, then there were two bishops, "or three, or even four," as some would make it, "on the same see at one time,"¹ which, according to the canons, would, of itself, blast all claim to validity of succession.²

"Upon the whole matter," says the very learned Dr. Cumber,³ "there is no certainty who was bishop of Rome next the apostles, and therefore the Romanists (and the prelatists) build upon an ill bottom, when they lay so great weight on their personal succession." Cabassute, the learned popish historiau of the councils, says of the whole matter, "it is a very doubtful question."⁴ Prideaux assures us "no certainty is to be had." Howell, another thorough churchman, after fully exposing what he calls the stupidity and fables of the Romanists on this point, adds, "hence it is evident, how very doubtful and uncertain is the personal succession of the Roman bishops." Platina acknowledges that the authorities on the succession of the popes are full of confusion.⁵ Of this and the whole series of successions, Bishop Hoadly remarks, "the learned must have the least assurance, and the unlearned can have no notion" whatever, "but through ignorance and credulity."⁶

It is scarce possible, in the nature of things, that such facts could come down to us fully authenticated, through three centuries of

1) Bower, vol. i. p. 8.

2) This uncertainty will be apparent from the following table, which will at once show how the fathers differ and contradict one the other. It is taken from Hanbury's edition of Hooker, (Lond. 1830, vol. iii. p. 100.)

Authorities.—Irenæus, century II.

1. Linus made bishop by Peter and Paul; 2. Anacletus; 3. Clement.

Tertullian, century II. Clement first after Peter.

Eusebius, century IV. Linus first after martyrdom of Peter.

Origen, century III, *ibid.*

Epiphanius, century IV. Peter and Paul.

Damasus, century IV. Peter 25 years; came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's reign. (N. B. Nero reigned but 14 years.)

Jerome, century V. Peter 25 years; till *last* year of Nero's reign.

On the uncertainty of these first links in the succession, see also Dr.

Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 67, and Fulke's Conf. Rhem. Test. Rom. 16, § 4.

Also Riddle's Ecclesiastical Chronology, p. 60. Calamy's Def. of Non-conformity, vol. i. p. 163, Lond. 1703.

"Would it not," says Calamy, "tempt a man to wonder, after all this, to find such a stir made about the tables of succession in the several churches from the time of the apostles, as a proof that diocesan episcopacy had its rise from them? Alas, the head of the Nile is not more obscure than the first part of these tables." Vol. i. p. 162. See this further illustrated by Mr. Drew, in Dr. Bangs's Original Church of Christ, p. 216.

3) Roman Forgeries in Councils Part I. c. 1. in Powell p. 107, where, see the testimony of Cabassute.

4) See quoted in Powell on Apostolical Succ. p. 107.

5) See *Ibid*, pp. 108, 109.

6) See also Calvin Instit. B. iv. ch. 6, § 15, vol. ii. p. 275.

almost uninterrupted persecution, during which records were not regularly kept, if kept at all — for they would only be sources of evidence against christians — and when, if attempted, they were so likely to be destroyed.¹ The whole question, therefore, as to the origination, and the first successions in the church at Rome, as was the case with hard questions in the court of the Areopagites, may be postponed *ad diem longissimam*. It is a gordian knot, which all the ingenuity of man can never untie.

But, nevertheless, upon its resolution depends the whole order of the Romish prelatical succession; and upon this depends the succession of the prelatie Church of England; and upon this depends the succession of the protestant episcopal church in this country — and upon this, the whole system of the prelacy, with all its claims to exclusive prerogative and divine right. The whole christianity of these churches is, by their high-church defenders, interwoven with the unbroken order of a lineal episcopal succession, from the apostles to the very individuals by whom they are now governed, and in whom the mysterious gift resides, to be in like manner transmitted, by their manipulations, to all succeeding prelates, to the end of time. The foundation of this stupendous system, on which our destiny as a church, as they would teach, hangs trembling, we have now examined, and the first and most essential link in this chain we have brought to the test of historical fact, and they have been found, tekell. They are unsound. They are brittle. They are worse, for they are mere fables, and a huge mass of endless genealogies. This boasted foundation is infinitely too small for such an immense structure. That “huge and hoary castellated edifice,” to which these rulers of a subjugated world would betake themselves, “closely tenanted” as it is, “even to the very attics,” with mitred heads and robed dignitaries, is leaning toward its fall; the washing tide, at every flow, wastes more and more its insecure foundation; and while it overhangs the fearful gulf below, the touch of history is alone sufficient to make this stately church a heap of ruins.

1) See Hill's Lect. vol. iii. p. 432, 8vo ed.

LECTURE IX.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BROUGHT TO
THE TEST OF HISTORY.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

THE question involved in this prelatiic doctrine is, we are told, one of facts. Such is the representation given of it by its advocates, and we are reminded, that by its accordance with the facts of history must it stand or fall. On this subject, we have already given the opinion of several writers.

But the same ground is as confidently assumed by prelatists in this country, as will appear from the following statement given by the Rev. William Staunton, in his Dictionary of the Church.¹ In explaining this doctrine of “uninterrupted succession,”² this writer traces, as he supposes, the regular “links of the chain,” in historical progression from Christ downwards. He defines the doctrine thus: It is “a perfect and unbroken transmission of the original ministerial commission from the apostles to their successors, by the progressive and perpetual conveyance of their powers from one race of bishops (i. e. prelates) to another.”

“The validity of the ministry,” as he allows, “depended altogether on the legitimacy of its derivation from the apostles, — and therefore, “infinite care was taken, in the consecration of bishops, to see that the ecclesiastical pedigree of their consecrators was REGULAR and INDISPUTABLE.” “And I suppose,” he quotes with approbation, “it cannot bear any dispute, but that it is now more easily to be proved that the archbishop of Canterbury was CANONICALLY ordained, than that any person now

1) N. York, 1830, 2nd. ed.

2) See p. 458, &c.

living is the son of him who is called his father; and that the same might have been said of any archbishop or bishop, that ever sat in that or any other episcopal see, during the time of his being bishop." "Such, then, is the uninterrupted succession; a FACT to which every bishop, priest, and deacon, in the wide world, looks AS THE GROUND OF VALIDITY IN HIS ORDERS. Without this, all distinction between a clergyman and a layman, is utterly vain, for no security exists that heaven will ratify the acts of an ILLEGALLY CONSTITUTED minister on earth. Without it, ordination confers none but humanly derived powers; and what those are worth, the reader may estimate, when we tell him, that on proof of a real fracture in the line of transmission between the first bishops of the American church and the inspired apostles, the present bishops will freely acknowledge themselves to be mere laymen, and humbly retire from their posts."¹

Now, if this line of succession is firm any where, it must surely be so at its commencement. We have therefore entered at some length upon an examination of the first links of this boasted hierarchy.

It may, we suppose, be safely assumed as an axiom, that what has no beginning can have no continuance and no end. And yet here, at the very outset of this gorgeous procession of popes and prelates, with their two attendant orders of priests and deacons, and after the most diligent search, we can discover no head — since that Peter ever was at Rome, is a matter of great uncertainty, — that he was ever bishop of Rome utterly incredible — and that he was the first of an order of popes or diocesan prelates, an assumption without any manner of proof, human or divine.

And while we are taught to believe that "order is heaven's first law," this august pageantry is led on by a host of crowded candidates for primacy and succession, who can be reduced to no terms; and between whose rival claims the universal church has, as yet, been unable to decide. Where, with "peremptory expectation," we look for assured certainty; all is doubt, ambiguity, and confusion. Not one single canon we have laid down, has been met in the attempted substantiation of the very first links in the chain. The facts themselves, and every thing about the facts of any importance, are equally covered with mysterious darkness. Taking, therefore, the Bible as our guide, and appealing to historic fact as our evidence, "we spurn with-

1) So under "Schism," p. 418, he speaks of that "succession of ministerial authority without which there can be no church."

out a doubt," the long train of pernicious absurdities, which are involved in this dogma of an unbroken prelati- cal succession.¹

"If," says the author of "The Rights of the Christian Church,"² himself an episcopalian, "there is a line of succession on which the very being of the church depends, happy they who lived in the earliest, when the line was entire; while we, at so great a distance, can meet with nothing except uncertainty, perplexity, and despair. How can the majority of the christian world, the simple and unlearned, judge when this line is broke, and when not? What can be more absurd, than to send them to fathers, councils, and church history, for their information? If there was a particular set of men who, under a certain form, were to govern the church, and this was necessary to its being, Infinite Goodness would no doubt have made it most conspicuous to the bulk of mankind who they are. But what other judgment, upon this hypothesis, can the most knowing make, than that 't is placing the government of the church on such a foot as must destroy the church itself."

"It is probable," says Dr. Claggett,³ "that the Roman church wants the first, — and that there is now no true pope, or has been for many ages, for that church to be united to. For by their own confession, a pope simoniacally chosen, a pope intruded by violence, a heretic, nay, more, an atheist or an infidel, is no true pope. And many such there have been, of one sort or other, whose acts, therefore, in creating cardinals, &c., being invalid, it is exceedingly probable that the whole succession has upon this account failed long ago." For, as he adds, "while there was no certain pope, there could be no certainty of the validity of any acts necessary to continue a succession of true popes."

Passing now from this threshold of the temple, and entering within the wide portals, which, like those of Egyptian Thebes, bespeak for the divinity worshipped there, a power and glory coextensive with our spiritual nature; we find ourselves mournfully impressed with the striking analogy in the fate of both. All is "ruin wild and waste." The mighty fabric of ages has fallen. Its colossal pillars are in the dust. Its glory and its garniture are no more. The sands of the desert have overwhelmed, even the dilapidated relics which lie far buried beneath their increasing mass. Such is the prospect which opens before the inquirer, who undertakes to trace out the relics of this apostolic succession, amid the desert wastes of church

1) See Spiritual Desp. p. 327.

2) P. 359, Lond. 1707, ed. third.

3) Notes of the Church, p. 181.

history. Confusion thickens upon him at every step, while his covetous guides become the more vainly confident and garrulous, just in proportion as the absence of all marks of truth leave room for imagination to weave its fictions, and superstition to enforce its dreams.

“The religious system professed in the christian church had, in the course of two hundred years, reckoning from the death of the last of the apostles, BECOME CAPITALLY DISTINGUISHED from the christianity of the apostles.”¹ Already had the prelate erected itself into an established system, and triumphed over the lower orders, now reduced to comparative vassalage; and over the laity, now excluded from their rightful participation in the administration of the affairs of the church. Of course, every thing was made to conspire to the glorification of this first order of the ministry — the prelates — who were in the third century formally inducted into the office and undisputed title of successors of the apostles.²

Very little credence can therefore be given to the tales recorded of their own greatness and inherent dignity, by those who persecuted, even to banishment or death, such refractory sons of the church as dared to question their title-deeds of official sanctity and supremacy.

Of all authorities drawn from the fathers in support of this system, we may say, many are to no purpose — many are ambiguous — many refer simply to authority and office, without determining the meaning of the words, and are irrelevant — many are spurious and forged — and all are the declarations of men, taught to believe that the advantage of the church was to be sought as paramount to all other claims whatever.³

The line of prelatic succession, therefore, which wants coherence at its very starting point, becomes more and more attenuated, until we find it broken by a thousand intersecting claims, decrees, anathemas, canons, and usurpations. By making diocesan prelates the only representatives and successors of the apostles, the standing of all the churches in the first and purest ages is for ever blasted; since there was no such official personage as a prelate, to be found in all their catalogues — no dioceses having been erected until the fourth century.⁴ The same conclusion may be drawn from innumerable other

1) Spirit. Desp. p. 326, and Anct. Christ. part 5th.

2) See Bingham, b. 2, ch. 2, and Cyprian in Schism, p. 124.

3) See Palmer on the Church, vol. ii. part 7, ch. 3.

4) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 544, and full on in Clarkson's Primitive Episcop. p. 226 and 230; Baynes' Diocesan's Try-all, Lond. 1621, where this subject is fully argued. Baxter's Treatise on Episcopacy, Lond. 1681, part i.

facts, having reference to the subject, the form, and the ministers, in the case of each separate consecration. But it is altogether unnecessary to go into this investigation at any length. Contested elections,—the decrees of councils—the rivalry of opposing claimants—excommunications, anathemas, and depositions, which affected all the acts of the individuals to whom they applied—the intrigue, violence, and bloodshed, with which such contests for office were carried on,—the undenied, because undeniable atrocity, atheism, infidelity, licentiousness, heresy, and murder, which characterized many in this “unbroken succession,”—these facts, which even Baronius could not deny, who confesses that, in a succession of fifty popes, there was not a pious man—that there were no popes at all for years together—and other times two or three at once—and between twenty and thirty schisms, one of which lasted for thirty years¹—these plain and incontestable facts render all such investigations supererogatory to the clear decision of this question. It never yet has been determined what popes have been true popes—which of the rival claimants are to be received—nor what councils are to be our guide in coming to a conclusion.²

But, again, we are taught, as by Bellarmine, that heresy, when held by any church, and persisted in by that church, is sufficient to destroy its claim to be a true church.³ Now, that which is of sufficient potency to overthrow the pretensions of any body to the character of a church, must necessarily be destructive, also, of the claims of such a body to an apostolical succession, since this is, itself, one of the assigned marks of a true church. And will any man venture to deny, that among those whose names are necessary to make up the line of this prelatical succession, there have been many who have been avowed heretics, and who have employed all their influence for the promotion of heresy? Was not this the case with Zephyrinus, Marcellinus, Liberius, Felix, Anastasius, Honorius, and, not to enlarge, with John the XXIII., who denied a future life?⁴

1) See in Neal's Puritans, vol. iv. p. 211, and Edgar's Variations of Popery, and Newman on Romanism, lect. xiv.

2) See this strongly urged against Romanists, (though the author was committing suicide,) by Mr. Newman on Romanism, pp. 151, 152, and see Palmer, vol. ii. part 6, ch. vi. p. 432, &c. And against prelatists generally, in Plea for Presb. 1840, p. 84, &c.

3) De Not. lib. iv. cap. 8. Palmer on the Church.

4) See Bishop Williams in Notes of the Ch. p. 102. Also, Dr. Thorpe in *ibid*, pp. 131, 132, § 7.

“*Infallible Heads of the Infallible Church.*” — “John XXII. was a heretic, and denied the immortality of the soul. John XXIII. Gregory XII., and Benedict XIII., were all popes and infallible heads of the church at the same time, and the council of Constance cashiered the whole of them as illegitimate. The council of Basil

Without attempting to go into any consecutive or elaborate examination of the history of this succession, some general remarks may be satisfactory to those who have not access to other sources of information. Not to speak further of the asserted unchristian character of the Romish prelatical succession, it can, we think, be clearly shown, that many links are defective and invalid, even in the chain of the Anglican succession, and that it can be made to rest upon no tenable or sufficient ground.

It can be clearly shown, we say, that many links are defective and invalid, even in the chain of the Anglican succession.

At a certain period, the see of Armagh was occupied for eight generations by individuals who had never received *any ordination whatever*. Hooker admits that ordinations had *oftentimes* been effected without a bishop to ordain, "and therefore," he says, "we are not simply, without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles, by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination." Stillingfleet declares, that "by the loss of records of the British churches, we cannot draw down the succession of bishops from the apostles' times."² There is, in fact, no reckoning for the first five hundred and ninety-six years, until the time when Augustine was sent from Rome to re-establish christianity in Britain.³ Nor is the record

convicted Pope Eugenius of schism and heresy. Pope Marcellinus actually sacrificed to idols. Pope Liberius was an Arian, and subscribed to that creed. Anastatius was excommunicated as a heretic by his own clergy. Silvester II. sacrificed to the devil. Formosus was promoted to the chair through perjury. Sergius III. caused his predecessor's body to be dug out of the grave, its head cut off, and then flung into the Tiber. Boniface deposed, imprisoned, and then plucked out the eyes of his predecessor. In a word, many of the popes have been atheists, rebels, murderers, conjurers, adulterers and sodomites. Papal Rome has far exceeded in crime her pagan predecessor. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the popes, though always assuming a new name, yet never take the name of Peter. It is a curious fact that they always shun it. Those who have received that name at the font have always changed it when they reached the chair. Petrus de Tarantasis changed his name to Innocent IV. Petrus Caraf became Paul V. Sergius III's christian name was Peter. This practice looks like conscious guilt. They fear the name

of Peter would but too plainly show their apostacy from the apostle Peter's virtues; and men would be apt to exclaim, "how unlike is Peter the pope to Peter the apostle." Stevens' Spirit of the Church of Rome. See Note A.

1) Eccl. Polity, b. 111.

2) Origines Britannicæ, Lond., 1685, pp 81, 83.

3) "Thus far, indeed, we have no mention of bishops in the British church, nor do we find ANY FURTHER information on the subject AT ALL, until the year 314." Rev. Henry Cary on "the Apostolical succession in the Church of England," p. 8.

According to Mr. Jones, of Oswestree, in his Historical Treatise "of the Heart and its True Sovereign," there was left in England in 663, but one remaining successor of Augustine and his monks, and that was Winet, a Simonist. All the rest of the bishops were of British ordination, who, as this same divine of the English church testifies, all denied their ordination from Scotch byteters. See Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1680. Premonition, II.

"A long interval of heathen dark-

of these five hundred and ninety-six years, any better kept at Rome than in Britain; for if we come to Rome, says Stillingfleet, "here the succession is as muddy as the Tiber itself," and "what shall we say to extricate ourselves out of this labyrinth?"¹ Who can tell the date of the consecration of Augustine, about which a late prelatie advocate differs from himself in the small amount of fifty-four years, and in reference to which we find Baronius contradicting Bede, and Dr. Inett making confusion worse confounded?² The archbishopric of Canterbury, says Dr. Inett, in his *Origines Anglicanæ*, had been void from the year 1089, in all, about four years, and the bishopric of Lincoln about a year. Towards the end of the eighth century, this same see was *divided* into two parts for several years. Dr. Inett himself affirms, that "the difficulties in that see betwixt the year 768 and the year 800, were *invincible*."³ Speaking of the death of Dunstan, this writer further states, that Elthelgar "succeeded to the chair of Canterbury the year following, but dying the same year, our historians are not agreed who succeeded, some confidently pronouncing in favor of Siricius, and others of Elfricus."⁴

It is also known that in the dark ages, there were many Scotchmen calling themselves bishops, who travelled over England, and of whom it is believed that some at least were settled in bishoprics, who ordained many; and yet they are represented in the public acts made against them, to be of very "uncertain ordination."⁵

It must be further stated that, as the whole virtue of Augustine's ministrations depends on the pre-established validity of the Romish succession, so also, as Fox relates, the first seven of the prelates of Canterbury "were Italians or foreigners."⁶ The pope has also frequently consecrated archbishops of Canterbury, as appears from Godwin's lives of the English bishops.⁷

But it has been already made to appear, that no dependence whatever can be placed upon the Romish succession, either as

ness now followed, (i. e. the death of Germanus in 448,) to wit, until the arrival of Augustin from Rome, A. D. 596," that is, "a century and a half." Rev. Henry Cary on the Apostolical Succ. in the Brit. Ch. p. 12. "When, however, the re-introduction of christianity was resolved on by Oswald, who recovered his kingdom of Northumberland, that prince, who had lived many years among the Scots, obtained a bishop from that country who brought with him the usages of the Scottish church," that is, presbyterianism. Ibid in *ibid*, p. 17.

1) *Irenicum*, part 2, ch. vi.

2) See *Plea for Presbytery*, Glasgow, 1840, p. 77.

3) See quoted in *Plea for Presbytery*, p. 78, from the original.

4) *Ibid*, p. 79.

5) See specimens in Selden, as quoted in *ibid*, p. 79.

6) *Book of Martyrs* quoted in *ibid*, p. 80.

7) See in *Plea for Presbytery* p. 80, and in Powell on Ap. Succession. "Is it not true, (Archer's Six Lect. on Puseyism, lect. v.) that twenty-nine archbishops of the Church of England,

to its christianity, or its continuity, or its validity, and hence all claims deriving their authority from it, must be rejected.

The same remarks are applicable to the Irish sees, in some of which, even the names of many of the incumbents are unknown.¹ From Patricius upwards, for a space of four hundred years, there is no record or certainty. That he had no connexion whatever with Rome, is affirmed by many of the ablest antiquarians.² According to the very best authorities, *eight* prelates in succession from Patrick *were without orders.*³

Notwithstanding the undeniable certainty of many such facts as these now produced, we are actually challenged to exhibit

between the seventh and the fifteenth centuries, were ordained directly by the pope, or by the pope's legate? What do you make of *their* 'apostolical succession?' Nay more, the archbishop of York, Chichely, was ordained by Gregory the Twelfth, one of the three popes who were at that time contending for the tiara, and who were all of them deposed. What do you make of all those whom he ordained? What do you make of their 'apostolical succession?' Was it valid or not?"

"Out of 36 archbishops of Canterbury prior to Cranmer, 12 have been consecrated by the popes, so that through this source the Romish succession has been introduced twelve times." Rev. Henry Cary on the Apostolical Succession in the Church of England, p. 18.

1) See in Plea for Presb. pp. 81, 82.

2) As Dr. Monck Mason, &c. see *ibid.* p. 82.

Indeed, the very existence of such a character as St. Patrick is denied, and the whole legend regarded as a fabulous story. Such was the opinion of Ledwich in his *Antiquities of Ireland*; Gordon in his *History of Ireland*, &c. See Stuart's *History of Armagh*, 1819, Introductory Dissertation.

3) *Ibid.*

As to the succession in Ireland, Mr. Stuart in his *Dissertation on the State of the Ancient Irish Church*, (*Hist. of Armagh*, p. 622, app. xiii. and 623, 624.) says, "after the decease of the Irish apostle, ecclesiastical dignities were soon monopolized by certain princely families, and transmitted in the same sept from generation to generation. Even in Armagh, the primal right seems to have been convert-

ed into a kind of property, by a particular branch of the Hi Nial race, which was probably sprung from Daire the donor of Druimsailech, to the founder of the see. St. Bernard reprobates this practice in very vehement terms. He styles it "an execrable succession," and affirms, that prior to the primacy of Celsus, the see had been thus held by fifteen successive generations. "Verum," says he, "mos pessimus inoleverat quorundam diabolica ambitione potentum sedem sanctum obtentum iri hereditaria successione. Nec enim patiebantur episcopari, nisi qui essent de tribu et familia sua. Nec parum processerat EXECRANDA SUCCESSIO decursis jam hac malitia quasi generationibus quindecim et eo usque firmaverat sibi jus pravum imo omni morte puniendam injuriam generatio mala et adultera, ut etsi interdum defecissent clerici de sanguine illo sed episcopi nunquam." (*Sanct. Berni. Vita Mal. apud Mess. c. vii. p. 358. Vita Mal. ut supra, p. 359.*)

"In the twelfth century, Pope Innocent III. directed John Salemitan, his legate in Ireland, to have the practice abolished by which sons and grandsons were accustomed to succeed their fathers and grandfathers in ecclesiastical benefices. (*Alph. Ciac. Vit. Pont.*)

"Lanfranc, in an epistle written about the year 1074, to Terdelvach, king of Ireland, complains that in the Hibernian church, as constituted at that period, bishops were often consecrated by a single bishop — that Irish children were baptized without the chrism — and that holy orders were granted by the prelates for money." (*Nazaren. Litt. II. p. 22. Vet. Epist. Syll. p. 72.*)

“ a *flaw* in the long line of descent” of the English church; and it is confidently averred, “ we can give you the lists of our bishops from the earliest to the present times.”¹

The bold hardihood with which such assertions are made, is truly astonishing, when it is a wellknown fact, that some of the very pontiffs who consecrated, as we have seen, archbishops of Canterbury, were afterwards deposed, and all their former ecclesiastical acts pronounced invalid. Now, since the English prelates who were consecrated by these archbishops, never received any posterior ordination, all their acts must be in like manner, null and void. Thus, for instance, Henry Chicheley, or Chichesley, was consecrated by Gregory XII., who had been previously condemned in council, and all whose acts and proceedings were formally annulled by another council at Constance, held in A. D., 1415.² Chichesley, however, though himself a grievous persecutor of the true church of Christ, nevertheless continued for *thirty* years to confer orders on the bishops and other clergy of the Church of England. Was this not a flaw in the line of English descent? Or can any prelate in existence attempt to prove that his succession, when traced up through past ages, will not be found to lose itself in some such bottomless abyss?

As prelatists rest their claims upon an unbroken line of valid prelatical succession, it is incumbent upon them to make manifest the certain existence of such a line; and failing to do this, they must abandon their vain assumptions. It is, therefore, unnecessary for us to give any proof of an actual disruption of this chain. Its existence may be fairly denied, until this is produced; and its continuity challenged, until positively ascertained by competent judges.

We have, however, done more than could be required of us. We have given reasons sufficient to invalidate this line, both as it regards its commencement and its continuance. Now, even could our opponents remove these apparent difficulties in every case but one, and there should remain evidence sufficient to destroy the valid connexion of the parts of this line in any single case, enough is left to invalidate the whole.

But there is still remaining one general view of the subject, which is of itself sufficient to overthrow all claims resting upon the assumed validity, as a medium for communicating spiritual graces, of the Romish succession. That church, considered as the papacy, is, and has been, for a thousand, or perhaps sixteen

1) Letters on Episcopacy, by the Rev. A. Boyd, p 163.

2) See Fox in Plea for Presb. p. 92.

hundred years, an apostate system. There has ever been, we believe, within it, a true church, composed of many thousands or millions now in glory. But the ecclesiastical church system, known and recognized as the papacy, has been, and is now, antichristian.¹

We do not say that the Romish hierarchy has been, or that it is, exclusively antichrist; but that those principles, practices, and doctrines, by which that apostacy is characterized in the word of God, are found embodied in the system of the papacy. These principles, however, we believe to have been inherited by the present hierarchy from that of an age anterior to the time of Constantine; and that they were the result of that evil and bitter leaven which had begun to diffuse its venomous influence even when the apostles still presided over the infant church. There is the popery of Cyprian and of Dionysius, of Chrysostom and Augustine, of Ambrose and of Basil, as well as of Gregory IX.; and there is, in the one as in the other—differing only in degree—the same corrupting superstition, and the same grasping despotism.

Now, what we affirm is, that the Romish church regarded as the embodiment, and visible exemplar of those principles and practices which we denominate—to abstract them from their accidental connexion with Rome—the prelacy—was and is esteemed, and upon grounds sufficient for every man who would listen to the warning voice of reason and of prudence, as antichristian, and apostate. Whatever of truth she may retain, it is hidden, darkened, and withdrawn from common view, by the power of these ensnaring principles.

As antichristian, was this system testified against by the most ancient Waldenses, one of whose oldest treatises is on anti-

1) "This conclusion," says Bishop Hurd, (Inrod. to Study of the Proph. Serm. xii. Lond. 1839, p. 239,) "that *the pope is antichrist*, and the other, that *THE SCRIPTURE IS THE SOLE RULE OF CHRISTIAN FAITH*, were the two great principles, on which the reformation was originally founded." That this was the opinion of the reformers, is, says Bishop Van Mildert, certain, as also of modern divines.

See Boyle, Lect. vol. i pp. 312, 313. "Or rather," he says, "it appears to be a system of paganism grafted on christianity." Ibid, p. 314. When Knox first undertook to show the Romish church to be "the synagogue of Satan," from Dan. vii. 24, 25, "he compared," says

Dr. McCrie, (Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 66,) "the parallel passages in the New Testament, and showed that the king mentioned in his text was the same elsewhere called the man of sin, the antichrist, the Babylonian harlot; and that, in prophetic style, these expressions did not describe a single person, but a body or multitude of people under a wicked head, including a succession of persons occupying the same place." That the reformers and their successors freely, without hesitation, declared popery to be a damnable religion, see testified by Scott in Hooker's Wks. vol. i. p. 91, note, Hanbury's edit.

christ.¹ As such, was it denounced by the Albigenses, who never ceased to cry aloud and bear testimony against it, even when that witness insured to them a merciless and inhuman slaughter.² As such, in every age, was it held up to view by some warning voice, although too generally that voice was hushed in death, ere it had alarmed the slumbering conscience of the thoughtless.³ From the fourth century downwards to the period of the reformation, this system of church principles has been branded as antichristian, and the papacy as an apostacy.⁴ As such, was it reprobated, as with one voice, by all the reformed churches — by all the leaders of the reformation, — and by the greatest divines from that period until the present hour.⁵

Now, when any visible corporation or association, calling itself a church, or church of Christ, or *the* one catholic church, rejects Christ's commanded doctrine, and teaches for doctrines the commandments of men, it thereby becomes, *ipso facto*, apostate.⁶ The English divines unanimously agree that now the Romish hierarchy is thus apostate.⁷ The errors of that church are shown to be even damnable to those who might know them to be such, and yet obstinately persist in their avowal.⁸

1) See largely quoted in Faber's Albigenses, pp. 301, 370 - 373. Also, pp. 421, 426, 489. See the treatise itself, given in Blair's History of the Waldenses, vol. i. appendix.

2) See Faber's Albigenses, pp. 89, 92, 93, 159, 161, 162, 248, 252. The Pateirnes, also, accused the church of Rome of being the seat of Satan. (See Blair's Waldenses, vol. i. p. 193.) Nine bishops in Lombardy and the Grisons rejected the pope as a heretic in the sixth century. Blair's Waldenses, vol. i. p. 80.

3) See the testimony of Vigilantius in the fourth age in Faber.

4) See *ibid*, pp. 294, 295, 298, 393. That it was so in the eighth century, as proved by scripture, and the testimony even of Romish writers, see shown in Nolan on the Millennium, pp. 76 - 89, *et passim*.

5) See Powell on App. Succ. pp. 113 &c. 134 &c. 140; Letters of the Martyrs, (Cranmer,) pp. 19, 20, 9, and Ridley, pp. 45, 49, 52, 74 - 77, &c. As taught in the homilies, see Palmer, vol. i. pp. 306, 307. See also pp. 317, 316, and Powell, p. 113; Faber on Albigenses, pp. 25 - 27, 194, 273, 534 - 540; and as to all the reformed churches, see *ibid*, p. 160, and Brit. Ref. vol. i. p. 133, &c.; (Cobham) p.

127, (The Lollards) pp. 129, 143, &c.; Burnet on 39 Art. p. 243, where see Davenant. Bishop Hall's Wks.

"At the late anniversary of the British Reformation Society, the Rev. E. Bickersteth expressed his perfect conviction, that popery was the predicted apostacy, and that the pope was the man of sin, and that he was no churchman, who denied that the pope was the antichrist of scripture." N. Y. Obs.

6) So teaches even Palmer, vol. i. p. 64. So also Dr. Barrow on the Unity of the Church, Wks. vol. ii. p. 762.

7) See Palmer, vol. i. pp. 253, 282, 298, 304.

8) Chillingworth, Wks. vol. i. pp. 124, 137, 146. During the prevalence of Arianism in the church, as Hilary and Basil say, "the orthodox were hatched under the wings of the Arian priests."

The church of Rome herself argues, that idolatry unchurches any body guilty of it. Now, according to the belief of all protestant christendom, the church of Rome, so far forth as she has acted upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, praying to angels and saints, &c. has been guilty of idolatry. And so also will the church

But transubstantiation, which is one of the worst of those errors, was established by the fourth lateran synod, in 1215, was believed generally by the scholastic divines — and enforced in the council of Constance.¹ Purgatory, and the infallibility of the pope, were also enjoined by the council of Florence, and were, long before the council of Trent, held generally as received doctrines within the Romish church.²

It is thus made clear, that the Romish hierarchy has been regarded as apostate by all the reformed churches; as it was also by the Syrian church in Malabar.³ Of course, the prelatic succession, being exclusively managed, guided, and controlled, and made to subserve the purposes, and to meet the wishes, of the apostacy; and not of Christ's true church, which lay enfolded within that apostacy, must partake of the character of its source, and is, therefore, an antichristian and apostate succession.⁴

Let it also be here brought to view, that Christ's true flock, even while hunted as wild beasts, "protested (let us mark it) not so much against the papal tyranny as against the very practices and opinions which the Romish church had inherited entire from the Nicene church."⁵ It was the prelacy, including the usurped dominion of the prelates, and all those superstitious doctrines whereby they exalted their supremacy over the hearts of men — as, for instance, the efficacious virtue of the sacraments when episcopally administered, prayers for the dead, absolution, penance, asceticism, virginity, &c. — against which this loud remonstrance has been borne.

Even, then, could we not make manifest in particulars, as might, nevertheless, most easily be done, that by every rule and canon of judgment, the succession from the apostles' times to the reformation, has been, in numberless ways, rendered invalid, in-

of Rome insist, that during the prevalence of the heresy of Arius, the church was idolatrous. (See Leslie's Letter on Episcop. in Scholar Armed, vol. i. p. 72.) It follows, therefore, that the line of the prelatical succession, which depends for its personal continuity upon the continuance of the Romish church, as a true and sure church, must necessarily be invalidated.

1) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 222, 224, 230.

2) See Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 235, 244, 245.

3) See Hough's Vind. of Protest. Missions, p. 70.

4) Dr. Milner, in his End of Controversy, (letter xxix. p. 184, Philad.

ed.) admits this consequence. For after quoting the strong expressions of the Homily, (Perils of Idol. p. 111,) he adds, "How could she (i. e. the Romish church,) retain this divine mission and jurisdiction all this time, and employ them in commissioning her clergy all this time, (eight hundred years,) to preach up this detestable idolatry?" He argues that on this ground she could give no orders in succession at all.

5) See Anc't. Christ. vol. i. p. 453, and Hough's Vind. as above, p. 70, where, among other things in which the Syrian church differed from the Roman church, is the fact that "she holds two orders, the priesthood and diaconate."

formal, uncanonical, and that it has been unchristian, and actually voided and broken; there is more than enough in this general and admitted charge, to bring into utter condemnation the “fundamental axiom” of prelacy,—her message and commission from heaven, countersigned and attested by an unbroken succession of lineal and true descendants of the apostles, with gifts and graces from on high.¹

It is granted, that the prelatie Church of England cannot prove this succession without going back to the church of Rome, and connecting her present succession with that of the Romish hierarchy.² Indeed, it is shown by Bishop Godwin, in his lives of English bishops, that a large proportion of them were ordained at Rome, and by Romish prelates.³

It is also granted by our opponents, that a church might become so plainly apostate, as to lose its power of ordination.⁴ Further, it is allowed that Rome is heretical now and has hereby forfeited her orders⁵—having bound the whole Roman communion in the council of Trent, by a perpetual bond and covenant, to the cause of antichrist.⁶

But on the ground assumed by the strongest advocates of these prelatie claims, to wit, that the Church of England is identical with the church as it existed in England before the reformation—she being unchanged in every thing except her civil relations and some *circumstantials*—on this ground, we say, the Romish church is no more apostate now than it was before the reformation.⁷ For at that time the Romish and the Anglican churches, as far as England was concerned, were one and the same. If, then, the Romish church in England was not apostate then, neither is that church apostate now—but if the Romish church is apostate now, then was the Anglican church before the reformation also apostate. Whatever is true of the Romish church, anterior to the reformation, is also true of the Anglican church, which was one of its branches.

But the Romish church inculcates now only what led the

1) See Lond. Quarterly Review, March, 1840, pp. 272, 274.

2) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 83. Burnet on the 39th Art. p. 245.

3) See this shown at large in Powell on Ap. Succ. sec. xii. p. 123. “Is it not a matter of indubitable certainty that, from the seventh to the fifteenth century, the archbishops of Canterbury and York, as well as several of the bishops, were in general consecrated by the pope or his legates? From 668 to 1414, I find no fewer than seventeen archbishops of Canterbury

thus consecrated; and from 1119 to 1342, I find twelve archbishops of York indebted solely to Rome for all the gifts they conferred on others.”

4) Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 95.

5) Ibid.

6) Ibid, p. 96, and Wordsworth’s Eccl. Biog., vol. iv. p. 94.

7) Dr. Hook’s Call to Union. Dr. Pusey’s Letter. Dodsworth on Romanism and Dissent. Lond. Quart Rev. Ap. 1839. Oxf. Theol. Palmer on Ch. &c.

English reformers, with all the reformed churches, and the true church of Jesus Christ in every past age, to brand her as anti-christian, heretical, and idolatrous. The Romish hierarchy had, therefore, lost the privilege of ordination as well before, as she has since the reformation. Her orders, as these very writers insist, when arguing with her, were then just as much as now, to say the very least, of a doubtful character.¹ When brought to the test, either of scripture, of reason, or of the canon law, they are and were most demonstrably unsound, and a perfect nullity.² The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable. The orders of the English prelatial church, being derived from Rome, are less than nothing and vanity. Her whole unbroken line of prelatial succession, idolized as it is, is what the apostle defines other idols, quite as rationally worshipped by their blinded devotees, a mere nothing in the world. Even in the fulness of its boasted sufficiency, it is in straits; and when brought to the test of historical investigation, it perishes in the fire of probation, and is thus shown to be the hay, wood, and stubble, which cannot endure the breath of this fiery furnace.

Seeing, then, that this prelatial succession is identified with that of the papacy, which has been pronounced apostate and antichristian by the universal judgment of all true christians, of every age and of every country, it is unnecessary to pursue its investigation with any minuteness beyond the period of the reformation. Being, as we have seen, united up to that time with the stream of the papacy, it must with it be condemned. And as by the decision of the true catholic and universal church, this Romish hierarchy — and of course the prelatial or papistical succession — has been declared antichristian, so has this very hierarchy utterly repudiated the present claims of the Anglican prelaty to a true and valid succession. The existing orders of the English church are declared to be null and void, and without any foundation whatever, by that very power to whom she has subjected her character and claims, as a true church of Jesus Christ — and whom her divines are now courting as their dear sister, and reverencing as their honored mother.³

But even should we assume, as authenticated and genuine, the uninterrupted line of the Anglican succession, from the time of the apostles to the period of the reformation — and commence our examination of it with the reformed dynasty — there is as little ground for any rational faith in its unfounded assumptions.

1) Palmer on Ch., vol. ii. part vi.
and vii.

2) See Powell, sect. xi.

3) See Palmer on the Ch., vol. ii.
part ii.

The present succession of the Anglican church was vitiated at its very fountain. Like that of Rome, it wants a beginning, or one duly and properly substantiated. Unless there has been imparted to this hierarchy a new implantation of the *plenitudo summi sacerdotii*, by which “supreme power she can supply the deficiencies of dubious ordinations,”¹ and can “animate a dead form with the inward grace of the divine commission;”² and “remove all the impediments which prevent that grace from descending:”³ unless she can give miraculous evidence of such an immediate, and divine appointment and investiture — then is she assuredly despoiled of her principality and power, and her all-necessary succession hopelessly destroyed. For a valid consecration can be conferred only by those whose capacity to administer it is “IN NO DEGREE DOUBTFUL”⁴ — “and since this divine grace or commission is only given to those who are THUS lawfully ordained, and when (thus) actually ordained;”⁵ and “no such doubtful ordinations could be cured by their now combining, in numbers, to remedy the defect, so that ten or twenty bishops, themselves invalidly ordained, could not confer a valid ordination”⁶ — the prelatial Church of England has not now, and never can restore within herself, a true and valid succession.

The history of the present Church of England, as established at the reformation, renders all pretensions to a divine right, or an apostolical descent for the order of her prelates, supremely ridiculous.

“I allude,” to use the words of Dr. Mitchell,⁷ “to the king’s compelling all the bishops within his realm, to take out commissions from him, by which they acknowledged, that all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, flowed from the king, and that they exercised it, only at the king’s courtesy; and that as they had it of his bounty, so they would be ready to deliver it up at his pleasure; and therefore the king did empower them to ordain, give institution, and do all the other parts of the episcopal function.” “Thus,” as our author remarks, “were they made,” not Christ’s bishops, but “the king’s ministers” or lieutenants. Does not this proceeding of Henry, taken in connexion with your scheme, present to us a curious contemplation? — a divine right established by human laws; and successors of the apostles, not merely nominated by a lay sovereign, but commissioned to act in his stead, as his deputies or delegates, and removable from

1) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 474.

2) Ibid, p. 431.

3) Ibid.

4) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 426.

5) Ibid, p. 441.

6) Ibid, p. 473.

7) Presb. Letters, pp. 274, 275, 276, 279, 280. See also pp. 286, 286.

their office, as deputies ordinarily are, at his pleasure? 'But Henry had no right to the authority he assumed.' No matter, he exercised it; and you derive your orders from bishops, whom he empowered to ordain, give institution, and do all the other parts of the episcopal function, in his name, and in his stead; from bishops, who had no authority, temporal or spiritual, but what King Henry gave them." "Thus it happens, for the everlasting honor and consolation of all high-churchmen in this island, that Henry VIII. and his delegates or lieutenants in the episcopal office, stand in the line of succession between you and the apostles; and then unless you will all be re-ordained by the pope, or some patriarch of a Greek, Asiatic, or African church, or by the moderator of our general assembly, who would do it as well as any of them, Henry VIII. and his ecclesiastical lieutenants will stand to the end of the world, though your flocks should all go to perdition, because their bishops and priests are 'intruders and usurpers;' — a mortifying truth to men, whose pretensions are so high. But who can make that straight, which has, in the course of providence, been long crooked?"

"On this footing," says Mr. Anderson, "was prelacy settled, even in England, at the reformation; and I challenge any man to produce documents, where, even to this day, they have bettered its foundation, or settled it upon scripture authority, or divine institution." I am not aware, that any person has accepted this challenge.¹

The ordination of Archbishop Parker, the trunk of their present succession, was confessedly "disorderly,"² and "a violent proceeding;"³ and "carried on amid human sin," and a "scandal," and an "error." — It was, as many insist, and as the Romish church affirms, altogether a nullity, and in contradiction to all law. Now it is a poor excuse for this grievous sin to inform us, as Mr. Newman does, that "similar scandals" mark the entire chain of this prelatical succession up to the earliest age, so that "in truth the whole course of christianity from the first, when we come to examine it, is but one series," as he allows, of such "troubles and DISORDERS."⁴ All the waters of a flood will not wash out "this especial stain, which is imputed to the Anglican

1) "The regal supremacy was the leading principle of the reformation, and hath been lately styled (by the bishop of L. and C., Charge, p. 41.) the groundwork of it." Sir Michael Foster, Knt. Exam. of the Scheme of Church Power. This fact Sir Michael Foster, in the above work, demonstrates by a multitude of facts, whose force cannot be resisted. See *passim*.

2) Lect. on Romanism, pp. 424 and 429.

3) *Ibid*, p. 417.

4) See Newman on Romanism, pp. 417 and 424, who breaks the force of the Romish objection by showing that "similar scandals" were common in the Romish succession, up to the earliest ages. See pp. 418, 430.

church" when "a new succession was introduced"¹ — not by the authority of Heaven, but by the plenipotentiary authority of a woman, (Queen Elizabeth,) who, although forbidden by express writ of Heaven to rule in the church at all, but rather commanded to be in subjection, was made by the traitorous conduct of these same prelates, arbitress of the truth, and sovereign lord, as well of the souls and consciences, as of the lives and goods of the people.² Then it was that Christendom beheld the spectacle, never before witnessed in the darkest times of Romish despotism, "the cruel and ridiculous usurpation of purely spiritual authority by the kings and queens of England."³

The facts relating to the consecration of Archbishop Parker, demand our special consideration. These show incontrovertibly, that the very fountain of that modern succession, from which the Anglican church derives all its pretended virtue, is fatally poisoned. The existing succession of that church can rise no higher than its source, either as to antiquity or validity; and is therefore recent in its origin, and doubtful in its character. For when Elizabeth came to the throne, and the reformation of the church was again commenced, all the bishops in the kingdom, except Kitchen of Landaff, refused to comply.⁴ It was therefore impossible to derive any canonical or valid succession from the ancient British line, since three are necessary to convey such succession.

The whole chain of the present Anglican succession hangs, then, upon the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration. Now he was ordained by not a single prelate of the ancient British line; but by four English bishops, who had been consecrated in the reign of Edward, and who were afterwards deposed in the reign of Queen Mary, by that very church, on whose authority the succession depends,—and had never been restored;—that is to say, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. Kitchen, the only remnant of the ancient British line, though appointed to do so, yet did not in fact, assist at the consecration of Parker.

On this subject Mr. Jared Sparks thus writes:⁵

"Again, the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, is well known to be, at least, very questionable; yet this is the origin of the present English succession. Edward the Sixth abolished the Romish form of ordination, and substituted a new one in its place, which is still retained in the church. The old form was restored by Queen Mary, but rejected again by Elizabeth, and that of Edward adopted. When

1) Lect. on Romanism, p. 417.

2) Spiritual Despotism, p. 357.

3) Ibid. See all sec. viii.

4) Burnet Hist. of Ref.

5) See Letters on Min. Rit. and Doct. of Prot. Epis. Ch. Balt. 1820, p. 37.

Parker was nominated to be archbishop of Canterbury, in 1559, she issued a commission to certain bishops to perform the ceremony of consecration, according to the prescribed form. Some of them refused to comply, alleging that such a consecration would not be valid. She issued another commission to such persons, as she knew would not refuse, but whose episcopal authority was much to be doubted. The catholics immediately disputed this consecration, and have almost universally denied its validity. They profess to have proved, that Barlow, the consecrating bishop, was never himself consecrated. They say, that no record of this transaction was found or cited, till more than fifty years afterward, when the Lambeth Register was first quoted. And even this register entirely destroys the validity of the consecration, by showing it to have been performed according to King Edward's ordinal, which was not consistent with any former usage of the church.

"I shall not pretend to decide on these objections of the catholics; but if well founded, they must prove the invalidity of Parker's consecration, and the weakness of all pretensions in the Church of England to a divine succession.

"To my mind these objections, and others, briefly and clearly stated in the memoir of the Abbé Renandot, are convincing. Some of them are partially removed in Courayer's elaborate answer, but he has by no means cleared the subject of difficulties."

1) "The persons who consecrated Parker," says Dr. Rice, (*Evangel. Mag.* vol. x. pp. 38,39.) "were not bishops at the time of performing the service. The persons who performed this office, were *Barlow and Scory, bishops elect of Chichester and Hereford, Coverdale, a deprived bishop of Exeter, and Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford.* On this subject it has been remarked, that 'Elizabeth deprived the bishops whom she found in the church, and the episcopal character ceased.' In like manner had the episcopal character departed from the bishops whom Mary deposed. For if it was right in Elizabeth to put down bishops, and take from them their episcopal character and rights, it would not be wrong in Mary to do precisely the same thing. Was not Mary as much the sovereign of England as Elizabeth? If the latter could deprive bishops, so could the former; and if Mary could deprive, what becomes of Parker's consecration, the root of all episcopacy in England?"

"Parker being in this way raised to the see of Canterbury, proceeded to consecrate fourteen bishops in place of those who had been deprived by Queen Elizabeth, as supreme head of the church. Here, then, we see that almost all the bishops of England, though canonically consecrated, were displaced by the civil power, and others put in their stead, by a single bishop, whose consecration is seriously questioned." . . . "That difficulties were felt in relation to Archbishop Parker, is evident from this fact; that seven or eight years after his consecration, this whole matter was brought before parliament, and an act was passed confirming its validity, and that of the consecrations performed by him. There must have been important reasons for this, or such a body as the British parliament would hardly have adopted this measure. This was done about 1566 or 1567."

"Again," (*Pres Letters*, p. 317) "it is well known that Parker, the first protestant archbishop of Canterbury,

There are various other grounds on which, arguing on prelatial principles, this succession can be shown to be at least probably invalid and defunct. Thus in the period between 1553—1558, the visible church in England was destroyed, because it was again united to the Romish church, then under the control of the tridentine council, which was organized in 1545, when it began to promulge its sentiments until, in 1563, they were finally settled and formally decreed. At this time, therefore, the Romish church, as is allowed on all hands, had become utterly apostate from Christ. Was not, then, the REGULAR succession of the external visible church, at this time, interrupted? By what authority, did the clergy, after Mary's death, "assume and invent an ordination,"² and organize the church? Here, then, is an evident flaw in this prelatial chain.

Again, if only prelatial ordination can validly consecrate any individual to the office of a presbyter,³ then, of course, he who is not thus consecrated a presbyter, cannot be qualified for receiving prelatial orders.⁴ Now, although Mr. Keble affirms that it

in the reign of Elizabeth, whether he was consecrated in the Nag's Head tavern or not, was consecrated some where by four bishops who had no dioceses at the time.

"This also is a case in point; for Parker, like your college bishops, was ordained to no particular or local charge, and his ordainers had not only been deprived, but were designated to no dioceses."

In a work printed at Oxford in the year 1687, entitled "Church Government, part v. a Relation of the English Reformation," chapter xii. &c. are devoted to an illustration of the canonical defects of King Edward's and Queen Elizabeth's new bishops."

"Instead of the catholic bishops expelled, being all that then sate, save only Anthony, bishop of Landaff, (whom Camden calls the calamity of his see, &c) the queen had only six others surviving since King Edward's time, out of whom to raise her new ecclesiastical hierarchy. Scory, bishop of Chichester, Coverdale of Exeter, Barlow of Bath, two suffragan bishops of Bedford and Thetford, and one bishop of Ossory in Ireland; and of whom but one was consecrated in Henry VIII's days; the other five in King Edward's, whose times were full of uncanonical proceedings, and liable to several exceptions. Again, two of

which bishops. Scory and Coverdale, in King Edward's time, came (as is said) into bishoprics not void. Besides that they, as also Barlow, were lawfully ejected in Queen Mary's days." (p. 218.)

"The queen in her mandate to Coverdale, Scory, &c., for the ordination of her new archbishop, Parker, &c. was glad, out of her spiritual supremacy and universal jurisdiction, to dispense and give them leave to dispense to themselves with all former church laws which should be transgressed, in electing, consecrating, and investing the bishop." (He then quotes the words of her letters-patent.)

"To meet the continued scruples on this score, an act was passed, (8 Eliz. 1. c.) and the answer here given to such scrupulous minds, seems in effect this; "that though these bishops were ordained contrary to the laws of the church, yet they were ordained according to the laws of the land, and that this was sufficient to warrant the ordination, because these laws had given authority to the queen to dispense with any repugnant laws of the church." (pp. 226, 227)

1) Spiritual Despot. p. 357.

2) See all sect. 3.

3) See also in *ibid.* at p. 211, and Oxf. Tr. vol i pp 95, 96, 91, 136.

4) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 90.

will "not be averred, by any one, that ever the office of bishop was allowed to be exercised on such an ordination,"¹ we can only wonder, with what presumption he does so. For it is notorious, that Hume and Baxter were both solicited to fill sees.

"Since the reformation, the English bishops have consecrated not a few, who before had received only presbyterian ordination. Such was the case with the Scottish bishops in 1610."²

"One will, perhaps, be surprised to hear," says Dr. Campbell,³ "that our Scotch episcopal party, who have long affected to value themselves on the regular transmission of their orders, have none but what they derive from bishops, merely nominal."

"Even their own writers acknowledge that, immediately after the death of Dr. Ross, bishop of Edinburgh, the last of those ordained before the revolution, there were no local bishops in Scotland, not one appointed to any diocese, or having the inspection of any people, or spiritual jurisdiction over any district. But there were bishops who had been ordained at large; some by Bishop Ross, others by some of the Scotch bishops, who, after the revolution, had retired to England. The warmest partisans of that sect have not scrupled to own, that, at that gentleman's decease, all the dioceses in Scotland were become vacant, and even to denominate those who had been ordained in the manner above mentioned, utopian bishops: — a title not differing materially from that I have given them, *merely nominal* bishops. For, as far as I can learn, they were not titular, even in the lowest sense. No axiom in philosophy is more indisputable, than that *quod nullibi est, non est*. The ordination, therefore, of our present Scotch episcopal clergy, is solely *from presbyters*; for it is allowed, that those men, who came under the hands of Bishop Ross, had been regularly admitted ministers or presbyters, in particular congregations, before the revolution. And, to that first ordination, I maintain that their farcical consecration by Dr. Ross, and others, when they were solemnly made the depositaries of no deposit, commanded to be diligent in doing no work, vigilant in the oversight of no flock, assiduous in teaching and governing no people, and presiding in no church, added nothing at all. Let no true son of our church

1) Primit. Trad. p. 162. Dr. How also asserts that the Church of England "has never suffered any persons without such ordination to officiate as clergymen within her limits, (Vind.

p. 127.) See this assertion further disproved in lect. xvi.

2) Presb. Def. p. 69.

3) Lect. on Eccl. Hist. lect. xi. p. 202.

be offended, that I acknowledge our non-jurors to have a *sort* of presbyterian ordination; for I would by no means be understood as equalizing theirs, to that which obtains with us. Whoever is ordained amongst us, is ordained a bishop by a class of bishops. It is true, we neither assume the titles, nor enjoy the revenues, of the dignified clergy, so denominated in other countries; but we are not the less bishops, in every thing essential, for being more conformable to the apostolical and primitive model, when every bishop had but one parish, one congregation, one church or place of common worship, one altar or communion table, and was, perhaps, as poor as any of us. Whereas the ordination of our non-jurors proceeds from presbyters in their own (that is, in the worst) sense of the word; men, to whom a part only of the ministerial powers was committed, and from whom, particularly, was withheld the right of transmitting orders to others."

"It signifies little," adds Dr. Mitchell,¹ "that Spotiswood, Hamilton, and Lamb, were not episcopally ordained deacons and presbyters before their consecration. As they were not christians, it would have been of no consequence, although they had been re-ordained presbyters and deacons a thousand times." . . . "In consequence of the king's senseless delicacy, and the 'modern liberality' of his English bishops, you must either be silent, or acknowledge that your own professed principles are utterly subversive of the lofty claims which you advance, when we tell you, that you derive your orders from men, to the validity of whose baptism you yourselves object; and who arrived at the episcopate *per saltum*, leaping all at once, without baptism, and without ordination, from paganism into episcopal thrones." "The breach in your succession, occasioned by the consecration of three presbyterian ministers, who had been neither episcopally baptized, nor episcopally ordained, is too manifest to be concealed or disguised, and too well authenticated to be called in question. And here, let me ask, by the way, whether all the episcopals in Scotland, for half a century, were sent to perdition, merely because James VI. and his bishops, with the exception of the excellent Bishop Andrews, were ignorant of the necessity of re-baptizing and re-ordaining Spotiswood, Hamilton, and Lamb, or had too much idle delicacy, or 'modern liberality' to insist upon it?" "Of all the bishops in Scotland, who were consecrated before the civil wars, and the triumph of the covenant, there was only Syderf to be found in 1661, when the restoration of episcopacy was resolved

1) Presb. Letters, addressed to Bishop Skinner, pp. 299, 300, 302, 306.

on." "When the new-made bishops came down to this country, they consecrated six covenanters, without subjecting them to the new birth, which Leighton and Sharp had been obliged to submit to. As for re-baptizing those covenanters, the necessity of that operation to the salvation of the clergy, and all under their charge, was not known in Scotland till after the revolution: at any rate, nobody chose to incur the nickname of the Deucalion of the world, by re-baptizing heretics and schismatics. Hence Sharp and Leighton, as well as the six bishops, whom they and their colleagues consecrated, soon after their return from London, were nothing but presbyterian christians, otherwise pagans, as your ecclesiastical dictionary has it, to the day of their death."

But there is another test, by which the rottenness of the present succession of the English hierarchy may be exposed. It is laid down by Mr. Palmer, as an undoubted judgment of the church universal, that separation from the one, catholic, and apostolic church, to which belongs the succession of episcopal grace, is incapable of justification;¹ — and that any society of men, calling themselves christians, which have thus voluntarily separated, can form no part of the church of Christ. With such a body it is unlawful to hold communion.² Such separation is a sin of the deepest dye³ — and entirely "cuts off from christian unity, and from the true church of Christ,"⁴ those guilty of it.

Therefore do we find these men repudiating the name of protestant, as an unholy and an odious thing,⁵ lamenting it, as their "infelicity, that they are compelled to be protestant"⁶ — and glorying in the fact, that ever since the period of the reformation, these prelatie pretensions, assumptions, and supersti-

1) Palmer, vol. i. part 1, ch. iv. sect. ii.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 69.

3) *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 129.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 402.

5) Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 322.

6) Dodsworth on Diss. Preface. The following is from Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Faussett, p. 28. "If persons," says he, "aware that names are things, conscientiously think that the name of protestantism is productive of serious mischief, — if it be the property of heresy and schism, as much as of orthodoxy, — if it be but a negative word, such as almost forces on its professors the idea of vague indefinite creeds, makes them turn their thoughts to how much they may doubt, deny, ridicule, or resist, rather

than what they believe, — if the religion it generates mainly consists in a mere attack upon Rome, and tends to be a mere instrument of state purposes. — if it tends to swallow up devotion in worldliness, and the church in the executive, — if it damps, discourages, stifles that ancient catholic system, which, if true in the beginning, is true at all times, — and if, on the other hand, there be nothing in our formularies obliging us to profess it, — and if external circumstances have so changed, that what it was inexpedient or impossible to do formerly is both possible and most expedient now, — these considerations, I conceive, may form a reason for abandoning the word." Letter to Dr. Faussett, p. 28.

tions, have been branded as popish, and as the unwashed mark of the beast.¹

Now, when we turn from this canon, as thus laid down by prelatists themselves, to the historical facts in the case, and which are not to be squared down to any preconceived opinions or theories — we find nothing more plain, than the certain separation of the English from the Romish church. The changes to which the reformation led; — the new powers assumed by the Anglican church; — and its entire re-organization, as effected by the royal supremacy, and parliamentary legislation; — and the abundant confessions of the most competent and impartial witnesses; all demonstrate the fact that the Anglican church did separate from the Romish, and did thus, on prelatist principles, cut herself off from christian unity, from the church of Christ, and from all pretensions to an unbroken succession of lineal descendants from the apostles.² “Mr. Gilpin,” says Dr. Wordsworth, in his life of that divine, “would often say, that the churches of the protestants were not able to give any firm and solid reason for their SEPARATION, besides this, to wit: that the pope is antichrist.”³

The fact of such a separation is notorious. It constituted the boast and glory of the reformers, and it is the acknowledged characteristic of that spiritual revolution.⁴ If, therefore, this doctrine of succession is true, then does it inevitably follow that the Church of England — having voluntarily severed her former connexion with the catholic church — has forever abandoned all rightful claim to the character and privileges of that heavenly body.

1) “This calumny,” (of popery,) says Nelson, in his *Life of Bishop Bull*, (Burton’s edit. vol. i. p. 311,) “hath been thrown upon the greatest lights of our church, and will be the fate of many more, who shall zealously contend for the primitive doctrines and discipline of christianity. But yet, in the day of any trial, the men of this character will be found the best defenders of the Church of England, and the boldest champions against the corruptions of the church of Rome.”

“Our reformation was called popish by Geneva, (Lond. Quart. Rev. Oxf. Theol. Ap. 1840;) our church popish by Calvin and Beza, and the puritans in our own country. Popery was the charge against all the bishops in the reigns of Elizabeth, of Charles I. and of James II. It has ever been the cry

of both parties against the greatest and best of our divines, as often as they have stood forward to maintain against Romanism on one hand, and puritanism on the other, the rights, ceremonies, or doctrines of the catholic church of England. It was the cry against Jewell, Whitgift, Hooker, Bramhall, Andrews, Hall, Laud, Montagu, Cosin, Wren, Taylor, Sherlock, Sancroft, Kettleworth, Hickes, Brett, Dodwell, Leslie, Ken, and Butler.”

2) The evidence on this subject we will throw into Note 4.

3) *Eccles. Biog.* vol. iv. p. 94.

4) That the Church of England did actually separate from the Romish church, at the period of the reformation, see declared, — or the very term employed, in Neal’s *Purit.* vol. ii. p. 45; and in Laud against Fisher, s. xii. n. vi. p. 9; Blunt on the 39th Art. p.

Neither are these doubts confined to the Anglican or Roman — they extend also to the American, prelacy.

It is well known that many episcopalians, both in England and in this country have, on just grounds, regarded the prelatial character of the nonjuring bishops of Scotland as of a very doubtful nature. Bishop White informs us, that this doubt as to the validity of Bishop Seabury's episcopacy, which was received from the non-juring succession, actuated some in directing the convention to England rather than to Scotland, as the source of the American episcopate.¹

Another ground of serious doubt as to the full validity of the American episcopate, arises from the fact, that two of its earli-

4; Hales and Dr. Barrow, in Harris's Union, p. 105, Am. ed.; Taylor and Chillingworth, in *ibid*, 106; Neal's Puritans, vol. iii. pp. 193, 366, &c.; Jackson's Works, fol. vol. iii. pp. 860, 861, 889, 884; Oxford Tracts, vol. i. pp. 96, 97, Am. ed.; Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 86, 415, 429, 297, 443, 446; James II. in Neal's Puritans, vol. v. p. 49; Perkin's Works, fol. vol. iii. p. 236; Cranmer in Letters of the Martyrs, p. 16; Bishop Smith, in Bib. Repertory, 1836, p. 29; Jewell in Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 248; Burnet on the 39 Art. p. 5, Page's ed. and pp. 100, 245; Ridley in Letters of the Martyrs, p. 41; Rose in Bib. Repertory, 1826, pp. 417, 418; Stillingfleet in Burnet on 39 Art. p. 100; Faber on the Albigenes, pp. 537, 570; Chillingworth's Works, vol. i. pp. 66, 108, 109, 372; Potter in *ibid*, p. 89; Ancient Christianity, vol. i. pp. 435, 436, 449, 545; Palmer on the Ch. vol. ii. p. 456; Dodsworth on Romanism and Dissent, in self-contradiction, on the Script. pp. 17, 5 and 3; State of the Dead, pp. 9 and 15, Apost. Min. pp. 8, 10 and 7; Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 96; Hooker's Works, Hanbury's ed. vol. i. pp. 12, 13, where see references to Ainsworth, and Stillingfleet; Bishop Hall's Works, vol. viii. pp. 52, 53 and 91, 393, 423, 457, 479, &c.; Bishops Jewell and Noel, in Hooker's Works, as above, vol. i. p. 201, note; see also, as evidence of the general admission of this fact at that time, Jus Divinum, Min. Evang. pp. 39, 40; Rutherford's Plea for Paul's Presbytery, p. 340; Rutherford's Due Right of Presbyteries, p. 340; Morning Exercises agt. Popery, p. 492, serm. xiv.; Salter's Hall Sermons, vol. ii. sermon by Mr. Lowman; Southwark Lect.

agt. Popery, vol. i. sermon on this very subject, by Mr. Vinck; Hooker in Works, vol. i. p. 270, Hanbury's ed. Eccl. Pol. B. iv. Sec. 4; Bishop Bull's Vind. of the Ch. of Eng. pp. 234, 236, Oxf. ed.; Bishop Sherlock in Notes of the Church exam. and refuted, new ed. p. 55; Bishop Van Mildert. Bampton Lect. vol. i. p. 285; Archbishop Whateley, Origin of Romish Errors, pp. 313, 317; Dr. Claggett in Notes of the Ch. &c. pp. 185, 186, 195; Overton's True Churchman, p. 18; Lond. Christian Observer, 1837, p. 184; Stillingfleet's Irenicum, 2d ed. 1662, pp. 115, 116, 117, 118, &c.; Archbishop Wake is very express in one of his discourses, as quoted by Mr. Bristed, in his Thoughts on the American-Anglo Churches, p. 429, N. Y. 1822; The Church Dictionary, by the Rev. Wm. Staunton, N. York, 1839, p. 419; The Apostolical Succession in the Church of England, by Rev. Henry Cary, Reading, 1836, p. 6; see Dr. Hammond, and Dr. Bramhall, also referred to in Troughton's Apology for Nonconf. Lond. 1681, p. 114.

Let any man that doubts the certainty of this separation, look into Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. part 2, where he states at length the changes that were introduced by regal supremacy, and attempts — but most feebly — to obviate their force; and he will at once perceive that if a change in every thing important and implying the highest exercise of authority, is sufficient to characterize a new church, then is the Church of England a new and a separated church.

1) Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch. pp. 13, 124 and 135.

est bishops never received baptism from episcopal hands,¹ and of course could never have received that grace which is transmitted by such a ministration, and which is afterwards more fully ratified and secured by confirmation. It is certainly a most reasonable fear, to be entertained by all who receive the prelatic doctrine of baptismal justification and regeneration, that he who is not justified or regenerated, and therefore not a christian at all, cannot possibly be a fit subject for episcopal consecration. Nor will the argument, by which such fears are to be removed, — namely, that if this application of the doctrine is allowed, then “there is no certainty of the existence of a bishop in christendom, — do any service to the hierarchy;”² — since this consequence is, as we contend, unavoidably necessary, and is, therefore, entirely subversive of this scheme of prelatical succession.

Neither is there any escape from this disastrous conclusion, in the determination given by the archbishop and bishops in London, who, “in order to prevent any advantages that might be taken by dissenters,” agreed, that while lay-baptism should be discouraged, yet “if the essentials had been preserved in a baptism by a lay-hand, it was not to be repeated,” or if done in cases of extremity.³ For it is, after all, essential to a valid prelatic baptism, that the grace of it should come from prelatical hands, which, in the cases before us, it did not; neither were these cases of extremity at all.

A still further source of anxiety for the entire validity of the American prelacy, and for all the consequent ordinations of the church, has arisen from the omission of what was, by some, regarded as a very essential part of the form, in the consecration, both of Bishop Hobart, and of Bishop Griswold. It was publicly declared, at the time, that the act “was essentially defective,” and that the episcopal succession, through future agés, was certainly invalidated. And how it can be otherwise, on a theory which attaches such importance to words and forms, may very well admit of a most serious question.⁴

1) *Ibid*, p. 283.

2) White's Mem. Prot. Ep. Ch p. 283.

3) *Ibid*, p. 284.

4) Bishop White, *ibid*, pp. 287 and 288. This controversy was carried on in the newspapers and in pamphlet form, and with the greatest ardor. In Dr. Sprague's collection of pamphlets in the library of Princeton seminary, (vol. ccccxxii.) may be seen an elaborate pamphlet, entitled,

“Serious Thoughts on a late administration of Episcopal Orders, submitted to the calm reflection of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a Postscript in answer to Dr. Bowden's *Essentials of Ordination Stated*.” (New York, March, 1812, p. 80.) In this work, the author shows, from numerous standard authorities, that by all the laws of the church, the exact form of prescribed words for ordination are essential, and that

On this doctrine, therefore, of the apostolical succession, the claim of the American episcopal church to an unbroken and uninvalidated succession, must be allowed to be very weak indeed. The chain, if ever it extended across the Atlantic before 1787, was assuredly broken when even the *semblance* of a previous union was shivered by the storm of the revolution, and, when the episcopal churches found themselves without union, without a head, and without any accessible source of episcopal grace.¹ And when to this fearful break in their boasted line, we add the other invalidating defects in the composition of the links themselves; there is surely enough to exclude all boasting on the part of the American prelacy, on the ground of any certain and unbroken succession of duly consecrated prelates.²

without them the alleged ordination is invalid. On p. 27, he says: "From the considerations which have been offered, serious *doubts* at least are entertained by many of its pious and of its intelligent members, of the validity of the consecration supposed to be administered, &c." . . . "Suppose these doubts be well-founded . . . Suppose that at some future period, when the heat of passion is allayed, when calm reflection is suffered to be called in exercise, that then it shall be found and acknowledged that the considerations here advanced have weight, and that the consecration is attended with an essential defect; what will then be the state of our church? OUR PRIESTHOOD INVALID, OUR SUCCESSION LOST; numbers, under a show of ordination, ministering without authority; the evil so extended as to be beyond the power of correction." (p. 27.) "For myself, I am seriously and conscientiously persuaded that the omission of the *solemn* words is material, that it is essential, that it renders the whole form besides an utter nullity." (pp. 28, 29.) See his quotations from the Rubrics, &c., on pp. 24, 25.

"On this subject," says Dr. Milner, "our controversialists urge not only the authority of all the Latin and Greek ordinals, but also the conference of the above-named protestant divine, Mason, who says, with evident truth, 'not every form of words will well serve; but such as are significant of the power conveyed by the order.'" End of Controv., letter xxix. p. 182. On this ground he urges

the invalidity of all consecrations during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, and of course ever after.

1) The connexion of the episcopal churches in this country with the bishop of London, was very partial. "His authority," says Bishop White, (The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States considered, 1782, p. 6,) "was derived under a commission from the crown; which, though destitute of legal operation, found a general acquiescence on the part of the churches, being exercised no further than to the necessary purposes of ordaining and licensing ministers." And therefore, by the revolution which threw off all allegiance to the crown, "all former jurisdiction over the churches being thus withdrawn, and the chain which held them together broken, it would seem," says the bishop, "that their future continuance can be provided for only by VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS FOR UNION AND GOOD GOVERNMENT."

"An episcopal church without bishops, is like a body without a head; and an episcopal church that has bishops only in a distant region of the earth, is nearly in the same situation." (Address to the Episcopalians of Virginia, by the Clergy of N. York and N. Jersey, 1771, p. 55.) "One writer against American bishops, in the papers of Virginia, speaks of the church of Virginia as an independent society, making no part of the Church of England." Ibid, p. 56.

2) See this subject further considered in a future Lecture, No. xvi.

Our opponents would feign persuade us to turn away our attention from the doubtful parts of this chain, to those links whose strength and brightness are most evident. But surely in so doing, they make a most unreasonable request on their part, and assume the absence of all reason on ours. For it must be with this unbroken chain of prelatie ordinations, as it is with any material chain; — its strength must be estimated not by its strongest, but by its weakest links. Let all the links but one be as massy as it is possible they can be, and only let one be weak, or badly united to the rest, and the whole chain will be as feeble as is that weakest link; since, by its destruction, every thing that is dependent on it, must be infallibly lost. If, therefore, there should be found but one isolated link in this entire chain of apostolical succession, that is invalid, doubtful, or false, — and who will deny that there are such? — then must the whole chain be invalid, doubtful, or false, and all the claims and prerogatives which issue from it, be assuredly destroyed.

It will answer, therefore, no purpose whatever, for prelatists to draw out, in long array, a catalogue of high and honored names, which have adorned this prelatieal succession; or to apologize for cases of apparent interruption; for, unless they can substantiate the soundness of every single link in the unbroken chain, their labor is worse than in vain.¹

Prelatists are very sensible of the weakness of their cause. They know well, that with all the confidence of their boasting, no sufficient historic evidence can be possibly produced in substantiation of their vain pretensions.²

They employ, therefore, every possible artifice to blind the eyes of men, and to lead our minds away from the true question at issue. It is, therefore, very plausibly urged, that if the evidence for this uninterrupted succession is rejected, then must that given for the scriptures themselves be also thrown aside; and that we are therefore called upon, by our reverence for the Bible, to reverence, also, this prelatie succession. But this argument is entirely fallacious, and its premises without foundation,

1) Mr. Keble, speaking of "the succession, and the grace conveyed by it," says that, "till disproved, they ought to be acted on." (Primitive Tradition, p. 105.) But this surely is a most unwarrantable assumption of the very point under discussion, and a plain reversion of what is the rule in the case. This doctrine, it is averred, is by divine right, and necessary. We deny that it can be sustained, either by scripture or *primitive*

tradition. We deny, therefore, that it has any claim to divine authority, and that to act upon it, is a presumptuous usurpation of the prerogative of Christ.

2) Mr. Percival, in his work on Apostolic Succession, seems to admit that a sufficient historic testimony cannot be given. "If," says he, "nothing will satisfy men but actual demonstration, (that is, historic,) I yield at once." P. 19, Eng. ed.

since it is utterly untrue, that there is as much proof for the uninterrupted line of prelatical succession, as there is for the genuineness and authenticity of the scriptures.

For, while both appeal, for authentication, to the evidence derived from human testimony; the tradition by which the authenticity of the scriptures is proved, connects itself, as has been observed, by an unbroken chain of direct testimony, with the matter to be proved. The documents themselves claim to be given by apostolical authority, and present sufficient internal evidence of the truth of this claim; and therefore, every testimony given to their general truth, directly substantiates their claim to such authority. But, on the other hand, the chain of evidence for this uninterrupted lineal succession, is not unbroken; and does not go up to the time of its alleged beginning. And, since this doctrine is in itself preposterous, and most unreasonable; and contains, therefore, no evidence of its own divine original; it is perfectly obvious, that while the authenticity of the scriptures may be proved by testimony, the truth of this pretended claim never can, and that there is no analogy between the two cases, either as it regards the object to be proved, or the evidence by which it is sustained.

It has been further urged, in opposition to our demand for the confirmation of the title of every link in this "unbroken line," — as has been recently done, by the present dean of the cathedral in Derry — that we cannot properly require more than probable evidence for the facts in question, and that on the principle of the statute of limitations, all such objections against events of such remote antiquity are precluded, by their own absurdity.¹

1) See Letters on Episcopacy, &c., by the Rev. A. Boyd, pp. 160, 161.

"It is an objection," says Dr. Bowden, (Letters, first series, xxi. vol. ii. pp. 272, N. Y. 1808,) "that sometimes meets us, that an uninterrupted succession cannot be proved by written records. This is really very weak. We do not want records to prove the succession of the ministry. Its divine institution, and the promise to be with it, to the end of the world, is a better proof of succession than a million of volumes would be. But, although I deem this a sufficient answer to the objection, yet I will meet it in another way: I say, then, that we have records, equal to those for a succession of the manuscripts of the Bible."

"But," says Dr. Mitchell, (Letters to Bishop Skinner, p. 192,) "do you rest the credit of your episcopal succession purely on your own assertion, that you are the lineal progeny of the apostles? Oh, no; you prove it by what you facetiously call 'a clear, satisfactory train of reasoning.' A clear, satisfactory train of reasoning! Can any train of reasoning supersede the necessity of proving facts in the history of man, by that which alone can prove them, credible testimony? You may demonstrate truths by reasoning, but I never heard that reasoning can prove historical facts; though I know, that in the course of human affairs, many facts occur that baffle all reasoning *a priori*, and set even the conjectures of the most profound wisdom at defiance. Surely, you mean

But to this, it must be replied, that there is no analogy in the case presented, in bar of our conclusion. For, in the first place, the very claim in question, is made to depend upon the unbroken line of this succession. In the second place, we remark, that the transmission of the sacred gift, is alleged to depend upon the personal validity of each descendant, in this hereditary line of apostolical succession. Thirdly, we would say, that, in the case before us, there is, as is confessed, no such statute of limitations. On the contrary, we are assured, that this lineal succession, and the claim resting upon it, is to continue to the end of time, as the peculiar mark of the true catholic church. And finally, we would say, that these breaks in the chain of this boasted descent, can be pointed out, at its very beginning, and from thence downwards, and that we defy all the industry of man to make good the soundness of any one pretended link in any part of this existing chain. The plea, therefore, is unavailing, and our demand for the perfect establishment of the purity of each separate link, remains in all its force.

Bring, then, these prelatial claims to the standard of historical verity, and they are found to be incapable of any satisfactory proof.¹ Tried by those tests which are approved as just and necessary, not one single link in the whole chain can be substantiated. We were, indeed, boldly told, that every individual in this Anglican hierarchy is able to bring out, from the sacred ark, this unbroken and uninterrupted chain, and exhibit it to the confusion of every doubting infidel.

Now we have, with some diligence, put ourselves to school to many masters in Israel, and faithfully scanned their manuals of instruction. And we have wondered with an increasing amazement, that, up to this moment, we have been able to find so little beyond the reiteration of this same confident boasting. We have yet to find the man who, with the rashness of Phæton, can cast himself upon the devious void of that bottomless abyss, by which we are dissevered from the birth-hour of christianity ;

to jest with us, when you speak of proving facts by 'a clear, satisfactory train of reasoning.'

1) That the succession tested by history cannot be sustained, see argued in Dr. Willet's Syn. Pap. pp. 82 83.

The Rev. J. E. Riddle, in his recent and very extensive work on "Christ. Antiquities," and under his "Plea for Episopacy," &c. (Lond. 1839, p. lxxii. Pref. 1.) says, "whatever may become of the apostolic succession as a theory

or an institute, it IS IMPOSSIBLE, at all events, to PROVE the FACT of SUCH SUCCESSION, or to trace it down the stream of time. In this case, the fact seems to involve the doctrine; and if the fact be HOPELESSLY obscure, THE DOCTRINE IS IRRECOVERABLY lost." "It is impossible to prove the personal succession of modern bishops, in an unbroken episcopal line, from the apostles or men of the apostolic age."

and who, having carried this golden chain safely and unharmed across that perilous way, can grasp, with firm hand, the throne of apostolic power, and fix it in that sure foundation. It is not the closing links in this progression, of which we stand most in jeopardy, and for which we demand far — far clearer evidence; though even these, as we have seen, are but of a very doubtful character, if not, indeed, hopelessly uncertain. We can, however, for argument's sake, suppose our skepticism silenced, though not satisfied, as far as regards the period of the reformation.

But how can any man attempt to sustain the validity and the certainty of this personal succession, during all previous ages? Who shall lift this ponderous chain, even at its connexion with the reformation, and carry it backwards, until it is appended to Christ Jesus, the rock of ages — the cause of causes? — so that from him may proceed that influence which may propagate downwards to the very last point, in the lengthening series. We again challenge the proof which has been so boldly offered. And, in default of this — and assuredly it is wanting at every stage — we fearlessly scout the whole hypothesis, as wild, chimerical, fictitious, and unsupported either by history or scripture.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO LECTURE NINTH.

NOTE A.

As to the character of the individuals who constitute this line, it is unnecessary to enlarge much. A few notices may be given of these infallible heads of the infallible church.

Episcopius, in his *Labyrinth, or Popish Circle*, Arg. vi. (republ. in *S. Chr. Advoc.* Ap. 2, 1841.) in refuting this claim of the succession, says :

“But who shall show us the truth, and give us the fullest assurance of it? Shall the true church? But where or which is that? This cannot be shown. For after the succession of persons has been proved, it is still neither certain nor indubitable, that the church which has the succession, has the truth on its side, or has always been exempt from heresy; and by consequence, whether it has the right and power of determining that it is the true church. What church then is it which will infallibly point out to us and say, “This is true;” and that, on the contrary, is heretical? For a church that is without the succession, cannot, according to the Jesuits, do this, nor can even that church which has the succession, as appears from the principles already laid down. What end is there then to all this? It is impossible for a papist to untie this knot. To this I also add, let it be granted that no heretical bishops have intervened in the line of succession, but only such as have by force, faction, popular tumult or bribes, intruded themselves into the apostolical see,—where then, I inquire, will be the succession? For must we believe that holy and saving truth can better consist with these nefarious practices, than with heresy or error? Nay, further,—if it is a matter of historical record, that for fifty or eighty years together, there have been two or three popes at the same time; one of them denying to another the very name of christian, reproaching each other with the appellations of heretic and antichrist, and each pronouncing the other an unlawful pope; that one cut off two of the fingers of his predecessor; dug up the bodies of others from their graves, and having insulted their ashes, ordered them to be cast into the Tiber;—that sometimes all the three popes together, were condemned and degraded by a general council, as false popes, heretics, and ungodly wretches, not even to be reckoned in the number of christians; and that nevertheless many bishops and clergy were ordained by these false popes,—in what manner is the broken thread of the succession to be united? For, if it be said, for example, ‘That the pope is to be accounted a true one, who, in the time of the council of Constance, was by common consent, put in the place of the three popes deposed by that council, and who succeeded to the last deceased legitimate pope, the apostolical see having in the mean time been vacant, and usurped by force;’ he will enter into a new labyrinth, because many of the popish doctors, Bellarmine in particular, and all the Jesuits, deliver and urge it as their opinion, that the council of Constance is, in this respect, to be regarded as unlawful, inasmuch as it decreed that a council is above the pope, and because it was not approved by that impious man, Pope John XXIII. or XXIV. who had convened it, and was by its sentence deposed, or by the pope whom the council appointed in his stead. For if this council is not in that respect to be considered a lawful one, how then shall a lawful succession be established? Would the approval of so infamous a man as Pope John, who was charged by the council itself with atheism, have rendered this assembly a lawful one? It is shameful to make such an assertion; and it would be much more shameful to assert, that

the council was unlawful, solely because it was not approved by him. Or would it have been a lawful council, if it had received the approbation of the succeeding pope? But it will then indeed appear to be unlawful; because the man who was constituted pope by this council did not say that he and others in similar circumstances with himself were subject to a council; but on the contrary, in imitation of Lucifer, son of the morning, strenuously asserted that he was superior to any council, — though it is highly credible, that he approved of the decree of the council before he was chosen pope. Now who does not see in all this, a circle of absurdities? For whichever way you take it, the perplexity presents itself. If the authority of the council of Constance was not higher than that of the pope, it could not have deposed the pope; in this case, therefore, those infamous popes are to be reckoned among the legitimately succeeding bishops, in a continued succession, which was not interrupted by reason of their heresy, atheism, simony, violence, and other abominable wickedness. On the other hand, if an interruption through these crimes and heresies be granted, then the succession is at once vitiated and destroyed, for the same reason as that which Bellarmine gives, to prove that the succession in the Greek church ought not to be accounted a legitimate one."

Pope John XII. in a synod held at Rome, was (Bishop Fowler in Notes of the Ch. p. 255, from Luitprand Hist. lib. n. cap. 6 — 10, pp. 153 — 158,) formally accused before Otho the Great, viz: "The ordaining a deacon in a stable; the committing of adultery and incest; the putting out the eyes of a holy man; the drinking a health to the god of this world; the invoking of Jupiter and Venus when he was at dice, in favor of his cast. The synod sat, the witnesses were ready, his presence was urged by the emperor and by the synod. He refused to appear; and instead of purging himself, he sent this menace to the synod, 'That if the fathers deposed him, he would excommunicate all of them, and make them incapable of ordaining and celebrating mass.'"

The following is the confession of Father Paul of the order of the Servites, and consulor of state of the republic of Venice, in his Treatise of Benefices and Revenues. (Westminster, 1727, pp. 60 — 63, without the notes, and p. 64.)

"From this time until the year 963, during the space of 80 years, wherein Italy labored under the extremest confusions, as well in the civil government as ecclesiastical, especially in the papacy, we must not expect to find any traces or form of good government in the church, but a mere chaos of impieties, and a general preparative and forerunner of the miserable revolutions and disorders which followed.

"Popes were then excommunicated by their successors, and their acts cursed and annulled: not excepting the very administration of the sacraments. Six popes were driven out and dethroned by those who aspired to their places; two popes put to death, and Pope Stephen VIII. wounded in the face, with so much deformity, that he never appeared in public. Theodora, a famous courtesan, by the interest and faction she had then in Rome, got her professed lover chosen pope, who was called John X. And John XI. was chosen pope at the age of 20 years, the bastard of another pope, dead 18 years before. And in short, such a series of wild disorders gave occasion to historians to say, that those times produced not popes, but monsters.

"Cardinal Baronius, being under some difficulty how to treat these corruptions, saith, that in those days the church indeed was for the most part without a pope, but not without a head; its spiritual head CHRIST being in heaven, who never abandons it. In effect it is certain, that CHRIST hath never yet forsook his church; neither can his divine promise which he hath made us fail, that he will be with it even to the end of the world. And on this occasion it is the duty of every christian to believe with Baronius, that the same calamities which happened in the world at that time, hath happened also at another.

"So that a pope was not necessary to the existence of a church, even though there should never more have been a pope.

"But the general state of the church was then in truth every where else as deplorable. Princes gave bishoprics to their soldiers, and even to little children. Count Herebert, uncle to Hugh Capet, made his son archbishop of Rheims; and Pope John X. confirmed it."

“How hideous,” exclaims Baronius, (ad. ann. 900 in Presb. Let. pp. 251, 252,) “was the face of the Roman church, when filthy and impudent whores governed all at Rome, changed sees at pleasure, *disposed of bishoprics*, and intruded their gallants and their bullies into the see of St. Peter! The canons were trodden under foot,” &c.

“He acknowledges with a candor that is highly honorable to him, that the episcopal succession did actually fail in the ninth and tenth centuries; for he calls the popes of those times *usurpers* (*invasores apostolica sedis*), and not *apostolic* bishops, but *apostates*. Nay, he confesses explicitly, that the church was *then*, for the most part, without a pope, though not without a head, Jesus Christ being in heaven. Platina joins the cardinal, and says, that, when almost all the popes were raised to the throne by simony, by violence and outrage, or by the intrigues of vile courtesans, the see of St. Peter was *seized*, not *possessed*, and *seized by monsters*, not popes. And yet those holy *usurpers*, *apostates*, and *monsters*, and the apostates and monsters whom they *set* in every part of the western church, are your spiritual progenitors! I congratulate you on your descent from ancestors so illustrious. They seem to me to connect you rather with Herod and Pontius Pilate, Nero and Caligula, than with Christ and his apostles.”

Hear Bishop Burnet. In his *Work on the Articles*, (p. 438 on Art. 28,) he thus speaks: “The writers of the fourth and fifth centuries give us dismal representations of the corruptions of their times; and the scandalous inconstancy of the councils of those ages, is too evident a proof of what we find said by the good men of those days: but things fell lower and lower in the succeeding ages. It is an amazing thing, that in the very office of consecrating bishops, examinations are ordered concerning those crimes, the very mention of which give horror. *De Coitu cum Masculo et cum Quadrupedibus*.”

See on this subject, “*The History of Popery*,” Lond. 1735, vol. i. pp. 9, 22, 45, &c. See also, “*The Rights of the Christian Church*,” Lond. 1707, ed. 3d. p. 354, &c.

And now, in conclusion, we may say with Chillingworth — “It cannot be believed that the spirit of God descended through that succession of prelates, who were so many of them so notoriously and confessedly wicked, because he is the spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him.” See Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 400.

Hear also Isaac Taylor: (Pref. to *Life of Luther*, in *Lond. Chr. Obs.* Aug. 1840, p. 508:) “Then again the historical proof, touching the church of Rome, is complete, showing first, and by the testimony of his adherents, so extreme a profligacy and ferocity to have ordinarily belonged to the papal court and hierarchy, as utterly to exclude the belief of a divine presence, favor, and superintendence, connected with persons and with bodies of men thus flagrantly wicked and cruel. And secondly, the historical proof of palpable contrarieties and variations in doctrine and practice, is such as can never be made to consist with the theory of a divinely sustained infallibility.”

See also Voetius *Desperata Causa Papatu*, lib. iii. sect. ii. cap. i. Also Rutherford’s *Due Right of Presb.* p. 235, &c.

LECTURE X.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION BROUGHT TO THE TEST OF FACTS.

IT is of God's infinite and free mercy, there is such an institution as the christian church. The church is the concentration — and, in its visible form, the outward manifestation, — of all God's most gracious and innumerable benefits, conferred upon our fallen and apostate world. It is the ark prepared against that last and awful deluge, which is to overwhelm, in remediless perdition, the whole race of ungodly men, — into which we are now invited to enter; — and by which all who do thus truly enter, and abide within it, shall be delivered in the great day of wrath. Not that there is any thing either in the forms, polity, or even in the doctrine and sacraments of the church, which, in themselves considered, are any the more available to salvation, except as they are quickened by divine influence, than there was any power inherent in the boards with which the ancient ark was constructed, apart from the upholding and directing care of the Almighty, to save and to deliver them that entered it. But God, in the one case absolutely, and in the other ordinarily, has chosen to bestow his mercy through the instrumentality of his own appointment; and so, by the church, is made known the wisdom and mercy of God, faith coming by hearing, and hearing by the preaching of the word.

It is, therefore, all-important, to be well assured that we have committed our souls to a vessel, which will not founder in the dark night of coming tempest, when there will be no eye to pity, and no hand to save.

Now prelatists, both Romish and Anglican — to speak of prelaty as distinct from popery — affirm that there is but one church, and that is theirs — but one vessel of mercy aforesaid prepared,

and that they are entrusted with her exclusive management and control. There is, therefore, no getting on board but by their express permission, and assistance; and whatever other craft we may temerarily construct in the form and figure of a church, will avail us nothing in the hour of peril. Thus we are informed, "the church has within her power, a fountain of spiritual blessings, which she can open and shut — having authority, which all other denominations want."¹

"The short of the matter is this" to use the words of Bishop Seabury: "In the church of CHRIST, we have the government, faith, sacraments, worship, and ministry or priesthood, which are by divine authority: In the use of them, we can assuredly depend on the blessings which God hath annexed to them. To this church the Holy Spirit is given. As members of it, we receive his heavenly graces and influences, to conduct us to the hope of our calling — eternal life through JESUS the Redeemer. Out of the church, we are sure of none of these things; because, out of the church, GOD hath not promised them."²

"If then," he continues, "we receive the HOLY GHOST, in virtue of our being made members of CHRIST's church, it will follow, that if we renounce his church, we renounce that Spirit which we received by coming into his church; and, consequently, we renounce all that GOD can do for us; for all that GOD can do for us must be done by and through his Spirit."

"Hence appears the absurdity of the right so generally claimed by christian professors, of forming their own church, or of joining any party of people whom they shall please to call a church. CHRIST has but *one* church; and if we be not in his church, we are out of it; and, let our religion be ever so right and good in our estimation, it can have no warranted title to those privileges and blessings which are, by divine authority, annexed to the church of CHRIST."

"If we set up a ministry by our own authority, and call *our* ministers CHRIST's ministers, it will confer no power from him upon them; and the sacraments they shall administer can be only *our* sacraments, and not CHRIST's. Should they preach, and what they preach be true, they have no commission from CHRIST, and preach not by his appointment. If we wish to receive the full benefit of the government, ministry, sacraments, and faith, which CHRIST hath appointed for us, we must have them according to his institution, or we have no right to apply

1) Lond. Quart. Rev. March, 1840. See p. 285.

2) Sermon on Christian Unity, Episcopal Tracts, No. xlv. p. 7.

to ourselves the gracious promises he hath made to his church — that is, we must have them according to his own commission and authority exercised in his church.”

So, also, in the Pastoral Letter of the recent provincial council of Roman catholic prelates, held in Baltimore, “united for the purpose of consulting how to discharge the weighty obligations of their APOSTLESHIP;”¹ after a similar exhibition of the doctrine of the one church, which is, of course, that of which they are in possession; and of the doctrine of the apostolical succession; we are informed,² that “it is plain, that as the commission of the ministry was lodged with the whole body, (i. e. the Roman catholic church,) united to its head, (i. e. the pope,) no minority (i. e. the episcopal, presbyterian, or other churches,) however respectable, especially when opposed to the majority, and separated from the head, could lawfully claim to act under that commission; nor could any individual, (as Luther, or Calvin,) or voluntary association (e. g. the English church, or our own,) reasonably arrogate to itself the power of performing the functions of that commissioned tribunal,” — which is “regularly commissioned, (in St. Peter,) and also regularly perpetuated,”³ (in the Romish hierarchical succession.) That we are bound to worship God in this special manner, is, we are told, one of the first principles of the church,⁴ of which church, “the innumerable separatists that have gone out from the great body,” can be no part.⁵

You thus perceive, my brethren, by another illustration, the great practical importance which attaches to a proper understanding of the subject in whose investigation we are engaged. These claims to universal spiritual “dominion over our faith,” and of “lordship over God’s heritage,” and “to be called masters on earth” — and to hold the keys of death, hell, and heaven, — are rested upon the doctrine of a lineal succession of

1) Pastoral Letter, &c. p. 5, Balt. 1840.

2) Ibid, p. 11.

3) See p. 12.

4) P. 21.

5) Dr Milner thus states the doctrine, (End of Controv. Letter xxix. p 177, Philad. Ed.) “In viewing the apostolical tree, you are to consider it as representing an uninterrupted succession of pontiffs and prelates, who derive not barely their doctrine, but also in a special manner, their ministry, namely, their holy orders, and the right or jurisdiction to exercise those orders in a right line, from the apos-

ties of Jesus Christ. In fact, the catholic church in all past ages, has not been more jealous of the sacred deposit of orthodox doctrine, than of the equally sacred deposits of legitimate ordination, by bishops who themselves had been rightly ordained and consecrated, and of valid jurisdiction, or divine mission, by which she authorizes her ministers to exercise their respective functions in such and such places, with respect to such and such persons, and under such and such conditions, as she by the depositaries of this jurisdiction is pleased to ordain.” See also Letter xxx. *ibid*.

prelates, terminating in Christ, and to whom are given in perpetuity, the promises and gifts of heaven. From this claim, the Romish hierarchy excludes the English; and the English, the Romish, both in England and in this country; as having forfeited by invalidity or separation, the privilege of ordination — while both agree in severing from all semblance of pretence to any right in this inheritance, the remaining mass of protestant and reformed christendom.

Now this claim we have already largely considered. We have heard, from these prelates themselves, the rules by which, in forming a judgment on this subject, we should be guided, and the tests to which they would have it brought, and which, very plainly, never can be possibly met. We have also examined it by the test of scripture, and of historical fact, and are we not justified in saying, that it has been fairly pronounced, *Tekel*? This claim to supernatural and exclusive authority wants only one thing — (for there is no lack of bold and confident averment,) and that one thing is,—it is without any credentials whatever, either original or delegated, — either in the record of scripture, or in the record of history — either in the book of divine Providence, or of man's foresight and industry. Not that such credentials are unpretended. They are, on the contrary, loudly boasted as in the hands of all their clergy, and evident to every one who will duly examine. But then the volume which contains them, as well scripture as history, must, we are told, be “read, as it lies open in the hands of the church, under the guidance of her eye, and with the support of her testimony.”¹ She must be arbitress of her own claims; interpret for herself the laws; examine the witnesses; and pronounce the verdict, without a jury, by her own authority. For if, in the exercise of self-willed obstinacy, we will attempt to come to any decision for ourselves; and, instead of yielding to her authority,² “snatch the testimony out of her hands, *and run with it into a corner*,” these evidences, wisely withdrawn, in just judgment, from our perception, will “vanish from the word of God, and from the written page” of history.³

That, in fact, this is true, we have personal experience to attest. For, as we have profanely ventured on this investigation, not under the church's eye or rule, we have in vain searched for the evidences of a “regularly perpetuated tribunal” of prelatic functionaries “of the first order,” with exclusive possession of divine gifts, — in the word of God, or in the

1) Palmer, vol. ii. Oxford Tracts, vol. i.

2) Lond. Quart. Rev. March, 1840, p. 274.

3) *Ibid.*

page of history. We have sought for Peter at Rome, and we could not ascertain whether he was ever in Rome at all. We have diligently inquired after his episcopal residence, and were thoroughly satisfied that Peter never was bishop of Rome. We then sought for his successor in office, but could not be even satisfied as to the fact, whether he ever ordained a successor at all, or, if he did, who that successor was. And when we attempted to trace this line through its successive links, we were plunged into unfathomable darkness, and while depending on its assistance, found it broken and disrupted at every turn. There is no such thing to be found or proved. It is a nonentity, or existent only in the implicit faith, or the imagination, of its vain pretenders.¹

“ He must have optics sharp, I ween,
Who sees what is not to be seen.”

This conclusion will be strengthened, if we bring this doctrine, in the next place, to the test of facts.

Since, as these writers teach, it should be our “chief care and study to maintain the unity which was delivered by our Lord and his apostles to (the prelates) his successors,”¹ is it, we ask, a fact, that these prelates are the successors of the apostles, not in the sense of succeeding them in time, but of inheriting their office, their jurisdiction, and their plenitude of grace and gifts? This, Cyprian² and Firmilian, we believe, first distinctly affirmed.³ This title the hierarchy has ever since monopolized, like the Roman patricians, who, by the establishment of hereditary names, devised an easy and certain distinction, and thus secured to themselves the idea of a hereditary nobility. But is there, in all this confident assumption, any thing more than the name? We answer — it is *vox et præterea nihil*.

Prelates are not, as we affirm, successors even to the name of apostles. Its adoption by them, is an usurpation. It is the hollow pretext of an upstart family, who would conceal their own novelty, in the mystery or antiquity of some more noble name. “We will approve our claim,” says Bishop Onderdonk, “by the test of scripture.” And how does he prove it? “It was,” says he, “AFTER THE APOSTOLIC AGE, that the name bishop was TAKEN FROM the second order, and appropriated to the first, as we learn from Theodoret, one of the fathers,”⁴—who wrote in the fifth cen-

1) See Letters of the Martyrs, p. 93.

“The Pope of Rome,” says Bishop Hooper, “is neither head nor member of the church, but a very enemy, as the word of God, and all ancient writers do record.”

2) Cyprian, principio Epist.

xxxiii.

3) Though not to the exclusion of presbyters. See Augusti's Antiq. of the Ch. by Coleman, p. 100, et alique, and Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. pp. 274, 275.

4) Wks. on Episcop. p. 42.

ture!! "They thought it not decent," says Ambrose, "to assume to themselves the name of apostles."¹

Now from this very evidence, thus adduced by our opponents, it is, we think, clearly manifest, in the first place, that this name was not given to bishops, either by Christ or by his apostles; for Ambrose distinctly says, "the holy apostles being dead, they that were ordained after them," were thus denominated. "Those now called bishops (i. e. in the fifth century) were then (i. e. anciently) called apostles." So teaches Theodoret. This title of apostles, as applied to bishops, is of ancient, but it is not of apostolic origin. It was given, not while the apostles lived, but after they were dead. It is, therefore, human, and not divine. Secondly, it is apparent, from these very writers, that anciently, presbyters were called bishops, and that they were, in truth, bishops; for thus Theodoret says expressly, that "the same persons were anciently called promiscuously both bishops and presbyters." Even in ancient times, which were, of course, subsequent to apostolic times, the titles of bishop and presbyter were promiscuously applied "TO THE SAME PERSONS."

1) See in Bingham's Works, vol. i.

The following is the testimony of Theodoret and Ambrose, as it is presented by Mr. Bingham, (Ecl. Antiq. vol. i. p. 50, Lond., 1834.) "The same persons were anciently called promiscuously, (Theodoret, Comment. in Phil. i. 1,) BOTH BISHOPS and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops, were called apostles. But shortly after, the name of apostles was appropriated to such only as were apostles indeed; and then the name, bishop, was given to those, who were before called apostles."

"The author asserts the same thing," (Ambrose, Comm. in Eph. iv. Amalarius, de Offic. Ecl. lib. ii. c. 13,) "that ALL BISHOPS were called apostles at first. They who are now called bishops were originally called apostles; but the holy apostles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the churches, could not arrive to the excellency of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in MANY OTHER respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of apostles; but dividing the names, they left to presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they themselves were called bishops."

"Theodoret observes, they (the bishops) were called apostles, till in process of time, for distinction's sake, the name of apostle came only to be given to the apostles, especially so called." (Daubeny's Guide to the Ch. app. vol. ii. p. 63, Lond. 1804.) This writer also speaks of "the reservation of the apostolic title, by the general consent of the primitive church, to the blessed twelve." Ibid, p. 64.

Hear also Dr. Hook: "The officer whom we now call a bishop, was at first called an apostle, though afterwards it was thought BETTER to confine the title of apostle to THOSE WHO HAD SEEN THE LORD JESUS, while their successors, exercising the same rights and authority, though unendowed with miraculous powers, CONTENTED THEMSELVES WITH THE DESIGNATION OF BISHOPS." Two Sermons on the Church.

Now if we altogether reject the authority of Theodoret in a matter of such importance as the present, will not Dr. Bowden himself sanction its repudiation, since "it rests the point contended for upon incompetent evidence, — upon a single evidence?" Wks. on Episcop. vol. i. p. 154.

Thirdly, it appears from these writers, that the persons called bishops in the fifth century, differed essentially from those called bishops "anciently," or "after the apostles were dead." "Those now called bishops, (in the fifth century,) were (anciently) called apostles." Either, therefore, presbyters, bishops, and apostles, were titles which, in ancient times, were promiscuously given "to the same persons," or otherwise, the ancient order of apostles was distinct and different from the order of bishops in the fifth century.

And lastly, it is most clear, from these writers, that the prelates of the fifth century were a new order of ministers — for they were not "truly apostles." "Shortly *after*, the name of apostles was appropriated," says Theodoret, "to such only as were APOSTLES INDEED, and *then* the name bishop was given to those who were (*then*) CALLED apostles," (but were not apostles indeed.) That is, the prelates usurped to themselves the exclusive use of the title of bishop, until "in process of time," under the lordly Cyprian and his baronial successors, the name, style, authority, prerogatives, and powers, of the "true apostles" were arrogantly assumed by those who "say they are apostles and are not." For any order of men now to appropriate to themselves such a title, and thus lord it over the true bishops of Christ's church, is, to use the language of Ambrose, and to speak of it in the very mildest terms, "not decent." It was deemed immodest in ancient times, and it is certainly not warranted by God's word.

On this subject prelatists are completely posed. Their mouths are shut, by their own rule of the previous question, with which they are ever attempting to silence the arguments of presbyterians. We now demand, who withdrew the title of apostles from the order of bishops — supposing it to have been continued? By whose authority was the title of bishop — which was given to presbyters by the Holy Ghost and divine scripture, — taken from them and appropriated to prelates? Name the time — the causes — the authors — within the first three centuries, or on their own principles, let prelatists ever after hold their peace. Alas! alas! all that can be said is, "it (i. e. the title, bishop) PROBABLY continued to be given to the immediate successors of the apostles, till about the close of the first century, when the appellative bishop was appropriated to them."¹

Bishops are not, then, the successors of the apostles in the titular use of that phrase. There is not a particle of authority, either from scripture or ecclesiastical antiquity, to prove that

1) Wks. on Episcop. vol. ii. p. 123.

modern bishops are really apostles, or exclusively their successors. In its strict and appropriate meaning, the term apostle is confined to the chosen twelve. They are called "THE TWELVE," and "THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST," (1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, and 11, 13, &c. That such was the proper meaning of the term, as used in scripture, is the opinion of Eusebius. "The Lord Jesus Christ called twelve apostles," says he,¹ "whom alone, amongst the rest of his disciples, he denominated with peculiar honor, his apostles." When not used in this appropriated sense, as applicable only to "THE TWELVE," this title was given to ministers generally, including presbyters.

"Many were called apostles by way of imitation."² Such are the words of Eusebius; an earlier and better authority on such subjects than Theodoret or Ambrose. So he calls "Thaddeus, one of the seventy," an apostle.³ The learned Valesius's note on the place is as follows: — "Apostle here is to be taken in a large sense. After the same manner every nation and city termed them apostles, from whom they first received the truth of the gospel. This name was not only given to the twelve, but ALL their DISCIPLES, COMPANIONS and ASSISTANTS, were GENERALLY called APOSTLES." They all acted as missionaries in spreading the gospel. The word apostle means a missionary. See, then, the goodly company of apostles! Indeed, Suicer shows that WOMEN, as well as men, were sometimes called apostles by ecclesiastical writers; and that the Emperor Constantine, and Helen, were both frequently called, by ecclesiastical writers, *ισαποστολοι*, apostolic compeers."⁴ So St. Augustin says, "that, generally," in his time, "it was applied to such as were introduced into the ministry." He divides apostles into four classes, and says the third sort who were called apostles in his day, were such as were smuggled into the priesthood by popular favor, — "*favore vulgi in sacerdotium subrogati*."⁵ Jerome is plainer still. He makes the same division of apostles into four classes. In the first, he places Isaiah, the other prophets, and St. Paul: in the second, Joshua the son of Nun; the third he states to be, "when any one is ordained by the favor and request of men; as we now," says he, "see many, NOT according to the will of God, but by bribing the favor of the multitude, become smuggled into the priesthood."⁶ Here it is plain, from the testimony of these great men, earlier and better authorities than Theodoret,

1) Eccl. Hist. lib. i. cap. 10.

2) Eccl. Hist. lib. i. c. xii. In Powell, pp. 44, 45.

3) Euseb. E. Hist. l. L. c. 12.

4) Suiceri Thesaur. i. 477, 1459.

5) August. Opp. tom. iv. app. p. 9, ed. Sugd. 1664.

6) Hieronymi. Comment. in Ep. ad Galat. lib. i. cap. 1.

that, in their days, any priest, all priests, even the worst of priests or presbyters, were commonly denominated *apostles*. Grotius shows, that the emperors Honorius and Arcadius, in their laws, called the Jewish presbyters, apostles.¹ Tertullian expressly calls the seventy disciples, apostles;² though Bishop Taylor declares that they were only presbyters. Chrysostom and Theophylact, also, are mentioned by Estius, (on 1 Cor. xv. 7.) as applying the term apostle to the seventy; so also Erasmus and Calvin, on the same place.

Ignatius, also, expressly applies the term apostle to presbyters.

“Presbyters preside in the place of the council of the apostles:”—“Be ye subject to your presbyters as to the apostles of Jesus Christ:”—“Let all reverence the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and as the COLLEGE OF APOSTLES:”—“See that ye follow the presbyters as the apostles.”³

Ignatius calls this council of the presbyters “the Sanhedrim of God—the council of the apostles—the college of the apostles.”

On this subject we will add the following remarks from a standard work:

“It is well known, that the term apostle,⁴ has, in the New Testament, a *peculiar* or *appropriated*, and a *common* signification; and that its peculiar application is to that chosen band of men, who were endowed and sent, in an extraordinary manner, by Christ himself. Of the peculiar or restricted application of this title, we need not select specific examples. They are numerous, and well known. In this high and exclusive sense, we are expressly told, it was confined to those who had ‘seen the Lord,’ and who were ‘witnesses of his sufferings and his resurrection.’ In this sense it was applied to the twelve, and afterwards to *Matthias*, who was chosen to take the place of Judas, ‘who, by transgression, fell.’ And in the same specific meaning of the title, *Paul* was an apostle, who was made to ‘see the Lord’ in a miraculous manner, and who was chosen to be a *witness* unto all men, of what he had seen and heard.” Let any impartial man, who doubts whether this is the meaning of the title *apostle*, in its primary and pre-eminent sense, as applied to those on whom our Lord himself bestowed it, let him read the following scriptures, and he will no longer doubt. Matth. x. 1—6; Luke vi. 12—17; Acts i. 21, 22; Luke

1) Grotii Annot. in Poli. Syn. iv. 1. 230.

2) Tertull. adversus Marcion, 532. 1. iv. cap. 24.

3) Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 44-46.

4) Bib. Repertory, 1835, pp. 252.

xxiv. 48; Acts xxii. 14, 15; Acts xxiii. 11; Acts xvi. 16; together with many other parallel passages, which will readily occur to all who are familiar with the Bible. But the term apostle, *αποστολος*, is also sometimes applied, in the New Testament, to men who were not thus immediately commissioned, by Christ, in an extraordinary manner, to be “witnesses of his sufferings and his resurrection,” but who were simply messengers, sent on particular occasions to perform a certain service. This distinction between the *official*, and the *lax* or *general* sense of this term, the learned translators of our English Bible, though themselves zealous episcopalians, seldom fail to recognize. Thus Paul, in writing to the Phillippians, (ii. 25,) says,—“I suppose it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labor, but your messenger, *υμων δε αποστολου*, and he that ministered to my wants.” Epaphroditus had been *sent*, by the Phillippians, as a *messenger*, or bearer of their bounty to Paul. This we learn, not only from the passage just quoted, but also from chapter iv. 18, of the same epistle. Accordingly, he is styled “*their messenger*.” Surely, it would be preposterous to consider the original word as importing that he was an apostle in the official sense of that term. Again, the same apostle, in designating certain brethren, sent with Titus to bear the church’s bounty to Jerusalem, speaks of them thus:—“Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers, *αποστολοι*, of the churches, and the glory of Christ.” Here the very same rule of interpretation applies, and accordingly so judged the pious translators of our Bible; and, therefore, they rendered the word *messengers*, not “apostles.”¹

1) With this representation of the apostolic office, Dr. Barrow, of famous memory in the English church, entirely agrees. (See Wks. vol. i. p. 598. fol. ed.)

Similar, also, is the judgment of Dr. Willet, a very eminent episcopal divine, in a work of extraordinary learning and research. He here shows that this was the opinion of Cyprian and Ignatius, two of the fathers, who are most highly regarded by these prelatial divines. “While the apostles remained,” (Dr. Willet, Syn. Pap. pp. 274, 275,) “the calling of bishops is not thought then to have been so necessary as afterwards; but yet, after the apostles were departed, the ancient bishops refused to be call-

ed apostles, as before I showed in Ignatius. And St. Cyprian thus writeth; ‘Me nullius suadela potest, inclinare;’ that is, no man can persuade me that there are now other apostles,” &c.

“The term apostle,” says Mr. Powell, (Ap. Succ. p. 37,) “is also applied in the New Testament to several other individuals in a more general and less dignified sense. It is, in this sense, applied to designate all who were sent to preach the gospel; the twelve apostles, and all other preachers. This is proved by the following passages: Matt. xxiii. 34, compared with Luke xi. 49. For the apostles, as mentioned in Luke, are explained in Matthew by being called ‘wise men

As prelates are thus shown not to be successors to the apostles in *name*, we proceed to show that they are not their successors in their *call*. The apostles were summoned to their work by an immediate divine call, received from Christ and God. They were neither called of men, nor by men; (Gal. i. 12;) and they were inducted into their office without any imposition of hands, and without passing through any subordinate grades or orders in the ministry. This is true of every one of the apostles, and was essential to their character, and an integral and important part of that evidence by which they displayed the signs of an apostle. This call the apostles are most careful to assert and maintain as the alone ground of their assumed power and authority in the churches.

“To the office of an apostle,” says Dr. Barrow, “it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; such as St. Paul so often doth insist upon for asserting his title to this office,—Paul an apostle, not from men or by man.” “Not by men,” saith St. Chrysostom, “this is the property of the apostles.”

Now it is one of those points on which we and our opponents are agreed, that no such immediate and extraordinary call to the ministry is to be expected in this age of the church, and is only pretended to, by vain, enthusiastic, and fanatical visionaries.² Most evident it is, therefore, that prelates are not successors of the apostles in their calling, as they are not successors to their title.

Neither are prelates successors of the apostles, in the possession of those insignia by which their high calling was exhibited to the world. An extraordinary call from heaven has ever been accompanied by some extraordinary sign;—some gift, power, or supernatural influence,—by which, as a seal, heaven’s sanction was impressed upon its possessor. Thus it was with Moses; with the prophets; with John the Baptist; with the

and scribes; that is, all teachers or preachers of the gospel. So Dr. Hammond, in Matt. xxiii. 34: ‘Prophets and others learned in your religion, which, receiving the faith, (Matt. xiii. 52,) shall preach it to you;’ and, therefore, (in Luke xi. 49,) he translates the word ‘apostle’ by the word ‘messenger;’ and so Tremellius translates the Syriac there. Dr. Whitby, in Matt. xxiii. 34, explains ‘wise men and scribes,’ by ‘true interpreters of the law and the prophets,’ and instances Stephen the deacon as one of them. Thus Calvin, Mr. S. Clark, and Dr. A. Clark, interpret these pas-

sages to mean all preachers of the gospel; and, indeed, they do not seem capable of any other interpretation. In this sense, several of the fathers call the seventy disciples, sent forth by our Lord to preach the gospel, apostles. Apollos, who was nothing more than a lay preacher, is also in this sense called an ‘apostle.’ Compare 1 Cor. iv. 9, with v. 6; so is Barnabas, Acts xiv. 14; and see 2 Cor. xi. 13, with v. 15. Rom. xvi. 7; Rev. ii. 2.” See also Note A.

1) See ut supra.

2) See the Divine Right of the Ministry, pp. 115, 119, 4to. 1654.

seventy disciples, and with the twelve apostles. "Truly," says Paul, "the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds," (2 Cor. xii. 12, Acts viii. 14—19, and xix. 6, and 1 Tim. i. 6.) By this test do we put to silence the boasting pride of all impostors, whether fanatical or prelatical, whether Anabaptist, Romish, or Anglican. Show us the signs of an apostle, ye that claim the honor; or else let it be known of all men, that the Lord sent you not as apostles, neither has he commanded you, nor has he spoken unto you.

Now that we reasonably demand apostolic evidence, where there is claimed apostolic power and office; and the supernatural gifts, where the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in apostolic measure is assumed, has been already proved; and the pretensions and lying wonders of the Romish hierarchy in all ages, will alone demonstrably testify.¹ "That this office," says Archbishop Whateley, "the binding and loosing in respect of things essential," (e.g. prelatical ordination for efficacious administration of the sacraments) "can be left in the hands of none but inspired men, all must allow; and *we* should add, in the hands of men, who, like the apostles, give *proof* of their inspiration and prudence, the credentials of their divine commission, by working sensible miracles."²

The authority of the apostles can only co-exist with those supernatural endowments by which it was supported: and when those extraordinary evidences were no longer necessary for the establishment of the christian church, that extraordinary authority terminated; and the apostolic office ceased with its apostolic functionaries, who were the only "true apostles."³

It is most foolishly pretended, by way of objection to this conclusion, that the apostolic authority was separate from those apostolic endowments, whereby it was sealed and evidenced; because, it is said, the apostles received their commission first, and these gifts afterwards, at the day of Pentecost.⁴ But, be-

1) See Lect. iv. p. 76, and Hough's Reply to Dr. Wiseman, pp. 53, 54.

2) Whateley on Origin of Romish Errors, p. 173. See also Professor Powell's Tradition Unveiled.

3) See Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 234.

4) See *ibid.*, p. 232.

"It was the commission," says Dr. Bowden, (Wks. on Episcop. vol. i. p. 142.) "that gave the apostles their *primacy* in the church, and not their qualifications." But that commission manifestly gives no primacy whatever, but was given to the church, and

is the authority by which alone any true minister of Jesus Christ can act. We hold, then, that the commission continues as the charter of the church, but that the extraordinary gifts and qualifications of the apostles, having terminated upon themselves, the authority consequent upon them, has also ceased with the necessity, for which alone they were given. (See *ibid.*, p. 144, and the author's amazing confusion of ideas.)

Besides, Dr. Bowden himself allows, that the extraordinary authority

sides the glaring contradiction here given to the vaunted claims of these prelates, founded on their previous commission, as given to the twelve, during our Lord's ministry; at which time they were certainly endowed with these very miraculous gifts; our Lord, when he, as we affirm, for the first time truly commissioned the apostles, and pledged such supernatural gifts, restricted them from exercising their function — and charged them to wait at Jerusalem until these gifts were actually bestowed. They were, therefore, practically and fully commissioned as apostles, only when internally gifted with these heavenly inspirations, and preternatural endowments. Then, alone, could they feel assured of their divine call themselves — and then only, could they attest their divine mission unto others.

This objection leads, then, to a double absurdity. It involves its authors in self-contradiction. It denies a main pillar in their hierarchal argument, and practically refutes all claims to the existence of prelates during our Lord's ministry. It also separates and disjoins what the Lord made inseparable, the commission and the endowments of the apostles. The commission was indeed given separately and apart from any miraculous effusion; because it is the permanent basis upon which the ministerial office was to rest in every age, whereas miraculous powers were soon to be withdrawn. But as the apostles were selected for the special and glorious work of being master-builders in laying the foundation of the christian church, an additional promise of the bestowment of corresponding endowments to them was annexed to the commission, and for these they were required to wait, before venturing to undertake their all-important work. These gifts, therefore, were the necessary evidences to themselves and to others, of their actual investment with this apostolical office. Already, it is allowed, they had received a commission as ministers, just as all ministers have, who act under the same authority. But then only were they inaugurated into the office and duties of the apostleship, when empowered for its discharge by these heavenly and divine gifts.

and calling of the apostles was in superaddition to this commission. "Still further," (Wks on Episcop vol. i. p. 174.) says he, "I do not see how this commission could have been that, by virtue of which Matthias acted as an apostle. He was called to the apostolate in a different manner from the other apostles. To be sure, he was called to the exercise of equal power

with them; but it was not by virtue of this *commission*. In like manner, I do not see how it could have been that St. Paul acted in consequence of this commission, when he was called to the apostolate in a wonderful manner; and some time after this commission was given to the other apostles."

Now are modern prelates prepared to exhibit these royal insignia of their exalted office? Claiming the authority, can they show the signs of true apostles? Besides that commission, which vests authority to preach in all who are truly called of God to minister in his name, can they point to any other investment with any supernatural gifts, and by which they are instated in the office of the apostolate? To these they must either pretend, as do Romanists, and thus expose themselves, as they have done, to the derision of the wise; or to these they must offer no pretensions, as indeed they do not, and thus vacate their "episcopal thrones," and acknowledge the imposition of their assumed order.

Prelates, therefore, are not successors of the apostles in their name, in their call, or in their gifts. We further affirm, that they are not their successors in *office*. The apostles, in the office to which they were extraordinarily called, and by virtue of which, they were denominated, THE APOSTLES OF THE LORD, could not have, and never did have, any successors.¹

The apostolic office not being instituted by the apostles, but received by them immediately from Christ, could not be transmitted by them, without a continued, immediate, and supernatural influence, exercised by Christ, upon each incumbent of it. Their office, therefore, could form no part of the apostolic model of church government.

The extraordinary powers exercised by the apostles over the bishops, or presbyters of the churches, is no warrant for a continued order of apostles. "The circumstance, then," says Dr. Bowden,² "of bishops being obliged to submit to the instructions and directions of the apostles, was of an extraordinary nature, springing out of the state of things, and, therefore, ceasing with that state."³

1) See this reasoning fully sustained by Palmer on the Church, vol. i. pp. 160, 170.

2) Wks. on Episcop. vol. ii. pp. 131, 137.

3) Thus Bp. Beveridge teaches, that whatever in the apostles was extraordinary was by way of favor and privilege conferred on the persons of the apostles, (Wks. vol. ii. p. 88) "But the office properly apostolical, consisted only in such things as had an immediate reference to the propagating, edifying, and governing of the church in all ages. Indeed, our Saviour himself gives the apostle a particular description of their office, in the very commission he here grants them for

the execution of it; commanding them to convert all nations to his religion, to administer the sacraments to them, and to teach them all things that he had commanded them. Under which is contained whatsoever is necessary to the instruction and government of his church in all ages; as the ordaining persons to do it, censuring those who refuse instruction, comforting and encouraging those who receive it, and the like. This was properly the office apostolical, which, therefore, was not to die with the persons of the apostles, but was to be transmitted by them to all after ages, as our Lord himself intimates in the very description of it."

That the apostles did not feel competent to appoint successors to themselves in their apostolic office, is evident from the manner in which they proceeded to fill the vacated apostolate of Judas. "When Judas," says the Rev. Mr. Gordon,¹ "who had been numbered among the *twelve*, and had obtained a part of their ministry, had gone to his place, they do not, in virtue of any powers they had received, presume to fill up this vacancy; but nominate two of those men, 'that had conspired with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went out and in among them, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the same day that Jesus was taken up from them, to be ordained witnesses with them of his resurrection,' and appeal to heaven for a decision; 'and they prayed and said, Thou Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these men thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas, by transgression, fell; and they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the apostles.' In further proof and illustration of this, we find, that Barnabas and Saul being marked out for this office, they receive their appointment by immediate nomination from heaven. 'Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work unto which I have designed them.' Thus it is evident, that the work of apostleship was not to be the effect of the most perfect human wisdom or determination. The apostles, therefore, neither had, nor could have had, any successors, by a designation of their own. They attempt no such thing, nor is any succession, in this channel, to be looked for."²

1) Inquiry into Powers of Ecclesiastics. Edinb. 1807, p. 12.

2) See the argument forcibly presented in Campbell's Lect. on Eccl. Hist. lect. v. p. 83, ed. 3d. "Fourthly and lastly," says he, (pp. 84, 85, 88,) "as a full proof that the matter was thus universally understood, both in their own age, and in the times immediately succeeding, no one, on the death of an apostle, was ever substituted in his room, and when that original sacred college was extinct, the title became extinct with it. The election of Matthias by the apostles, in the room of Judas, is no exception, as it was previous to their entering on their charge."

"Thirdly, I say, (Bayne's Diocesan Tryall, p. 52,) that Christ never did ordain that any should succeed the apostles or the seventy-two, in regard of their order. There is a double

succession, *in gradum* or *in caput*, as the jurists distinguish. *In gradum eundem*, as when one brother dying, another brother doth succeed him in the inheritance. *In caput*, as when one not of the same degree and line doth come after another, as when a brother dying another doth inherit after him, not a brother but a cousin to him. Thus the apostles have no successors succeeding them *in gradum*, but such only as follow them, being of other degrees, and in another line, as it were, in which sort every pastor doth succeed them. But, then, they are said to succeed them, because they follow them, and after a sort resemble them, not because they hold the places which the apostles did properly. *Apostolo in quantum est Apostolus non succeditur, Legato quantum est Legatus non succeditur.*"

But, further, "if the apostles did commit some ordinary power of government to some men, above others, in which regard they should be their successors, then the apostles did not only enjoy, as *legates*, power over the churches, but as ordinary ministers. For what power they enjoyed as *legates*, this they could not *aliis legare*. Power, as ordinary pastors, in any nations or churches, they never reserved, and, therefore, did never substitute others to themselves, in that which they never exercised nor enjoyed. And it is to be noted, that this opinion of episcopal succession, from the apostles, is grounded on this, that the apostles were not only apostles, but bishops in provinces and particular churches. For the papists themselves urged with this, that the apostles have none succeeding them, they do consider a double respect in the apostles, the one of *legates*. So *Peter*, nor any other could have a successor, the other of bishops *oecumenical* in *Peter*, of bishops national or diocesan, as in some other. Thus only considered, they grant them to have other bishops succeeding them: for the apostolic power, precisely considered, was *privilegium personale simul cum persona extinctum*. Now we have proved that this ground is false, and, therefore, that succeeding the apostles, more appropriate to bishops, than other ministers grounded upon it, is false also."¹

In their ordinary character, what were the apostles, but ministers of Christ — stewards of the mysteries of God — presbyters of the flock? — And, as such, all true, and faithful ministers of Christ's word, are, as St. Jerome asserts, apostles, and successors of the apostles.² It is remarkable that the apostles are never once called, in the New Testament, bishops — while they are there denominated presbyters — as if for the very purpose of putting to shame this unblushing arrogance of men.

The office of an apostle was two-fold. He was a witness of Christ, and he was also a minister of the Holy Ghost. As a witness he was invested, by Christ himself, with the power of working miracles. As a minister of the Holy Ghost, he was endued with extraordinary spiritual endowments. In both capacities, the office was, in the very nature of things, inderivable, and terminable upon the persons of the original incumbents.³ This is not less true of Matthias and Paul, than of the other chosen apostles.⁴ The assertion that the apostles derived their authority from some mysterious "grace of the apostleship," and which was to be "transmitted along the line of those whom

1) Baynes' Diocesan Tryall, p. 52.

2) See also Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 117.

3) See Hind's Rise and Progress of Christ. vol. i. pp. 149, 154, 201.

4) See Hind's Rise and Progress, &c. vol. i. pp. 185, 187, 254, and Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 162.

they ordained, and so handed down to those who come after them," is in flat contradiction to the testimony of St. Paul, who ultimately tested his claims, and prevailed over his jealous rivals, by the assertion and the exercise of his superior miraculous powers.² And, while it is true, that these powers were possessed even by some not apostles, yet, in every such case, it was through the gift of the apostles, and in confirmation of their supreme apostolic power.³ Such then being the mode in which exclusively, miraculous powers were conveyed, the result must have been, that when all the apostles had terminated their course on earth, all the channels must have been stopped, through which this stream hitherto flowed; and as the last generation dropped off, one by one, of such as had been thus gifted, this extraordinary manifestation of the Spirit gradually became extinct.⁴

The only end for which the apostles were thus chosen as witnesses, and thus endowed as inspired teachers, and thus gifted with supernatural authority, legislative, executive, and judicial, was, that they might lay the foundation of the christian church. They, while living, were to the churches, what their inspired writings are to us, they being now dead. But, as there is but one foundation on which the church rests, so was it at once and but once, laid — and that is the doctrine taught by these apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. — And since there can be no other foundation laid, but that is laid, nor any reconstruction or alteration made therein; so is it certain that there can be no successors to the apostles in this, their high and holy office.⁵

To make, therefore, the church now rest its authority upon its being able to exhibit true successors of the apostles, is to shift it from the rock of ages, and to build it upon the sand. "The space between heaven and earth doth not more exceed the distance from the utmost ends of the world," than do such false apostles stand divided from the true.⁶

But we will not longer delay in arguing a point, which has been made to appear so incontrovertibly plain, by so many able

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 162, 164.

2) Hinds, as above. p. 254, note, and Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 164.

3) See this shown by Archbishop Whateley in his Essays on Diffic. in St. Paul's Writings, p. 306.

4) Ibid, p. 307.

5) See an argument on this point against the papists in Jackson's Wks.

fol. vol. i b. iii. ch. viii. p. 418, &c.

6) See Jackson, as above

Speaking of the most famous reformers and divines, Bishop Davenant, in his Adhortatia ad pacem ecclesie, p. 73, says, "eosque non suspiciamus TANQUAM prophetas et APOSTOLOS, θεοπνευστους, sed estimamus viros bonos," &c.

and impartial writers. "This office," says Dr. Barrow, "was not designed to continue by derivation; for it contained in it divers things, which, apparently, were not communicated, and which no man (or succession of men) could, without gross imposture and hypocrisy, challenge to himself."¹ The presumption of still claiming apostles, which the primitive church ventured not to indulge, it was left for their unapostolical successors, with all boldness and effrontery, to exhibit; and to require implicit faith in such an order, on pain of excommunication, deposition, and the brand of heresy.² "For these reasons," say the Westminster assembly of divines, after giving eight distinct arguments, with scripture proofs, in support of our position, "and because there is no office in the church that can resemble this, and because there is no promise in scripture for their continuance, we concluded that the apostleship was only for a time, and extraordinary."³

Bellarmino also, the great fountain authority of the Romish church, allows that these three things are necessary to constitute an apostle.⁴ "First, that he be immediately called of God, and inspired to write scripture: the second, to be a founder of the churches where none were before: thirdly, that he have authority over the whole church. The first (saith he) agreeth not with the pope, but the other two do: for by the pope many churches have been planted, and he hath authority over the whole church, as Peter's successor." &c.

Thus is it apparent, upon the showing of this cardinal, who was himself a candidate for the popedom, that the pope of Rome, the apostle of all apostles, is destitute of any thing like a clear and valid title to the true office of the apostleship. And if this is so evident as it regards the source of the entire prelatical succession of the English and American prelacy, how much more certainly evident is it, of those weak and diluted streams which have issued from it.

We proceed, however, to remark, that prelates are not *now*, and that they *cannot* be, successors of the apostles, as it regards their *laborious duties*.

The commission of the apostles extended to the whole

1) Similar is the judgment of Bishop Hoadley and Mr. Dodwell. See Dr. Miller on the Min. pp. 59, 60. See also Parry on Inspiration, p. 66. Hinds' Rise and Progress, vol. ii. pp. 70, 79, 80, 87; Hinds on Inspiration, p. 117; Lightfoot's Wks. vol. xiii. pp. 26, 27, 30, 70, 98, 99, 103, 105, 111; Calvin's Institutes, vol. ii. pp. 230, 236, 306, Lond. ed.; Biblical

Repertory, 1835, p. 253; Bowers's Popes, vol. i. pp. 5, 6.

2) See Potter on Ch. Gov. pp. 177, 165, 166.

3) See in Lightfoot's Wks. vol. xiii. p. 27.

4) Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 165. Bellarm. cap. 12, resp. ad object. 2 nili.

world. (Matt. xxviii 19; Mark xvi. 15.) They infallibly delivered to the churches the doctrines that are to be received, believed and taught. (John xvi. 13, and xiv. 26; 1 Cor. i. 18; Rev. xxii. 14; and Eph. ii. 20.) They had power to give the Holy Ghost. (Acts viii. 18, and xix. 6.) They were appointed to go through the world to settle churches, in that new form which was instituted by Christ. (1 Cor. xi. 23; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.)

“I must say,” says Dr. Owen, “if there be any who pretend to be the successors of the apostles, as to the extent of their office-power unto all nations; notwithstanding whatever they may pretend of such an agreement to take up with a portion, accommodated unto their case and interest, whilst so many nations of the earth lie unattempted as to the preaching of the gospel, they will, one day, be found transgressors of their own profession, and will be dealt with accordingly.”

“There were apostles,” says Dr. Pusey, “to whom Jesus Christ himself had given authority, and THE WHOLE WORLD as their diocese, and field of their labors.”¹

“An apostle,” says Chrysostom, “is charged with the instruction, not of any particular nation or city, but of the whole world; but a bishop (prelate) must reside and be employed in one place.”² The very reason which is assigned by Irenæus, and Ruffinus, for the appointment, at Rome, of a bishop, was, that the apostles might be at leisure to discharge the duties of the apostolical office.³ That the apostolic office was essentially missionary in its character, and in its labors, is very eloquently urged by a present American prelate.⁴

Now, even supposing (than which no supposition could be made more contrary to their whole history,) that these prelati- cal inheritors of the plenitude of episcopal authority,⁵ had any conception of such a work, or any disposition to attempt its fulfilment; the work itself is rendered plainly impossible by the very fact, that a large portion of the earth has been pre-occupied by prelati- cal claimants to priority of possession; and it is

1) The Church the Converter of the Heathen. Sermon second, page sixth, Oxford, 1839.

2) Bower's History of the Popes, page 6; Chrysostom's works, volume eighth, page 115, Benedictine edition.

3) Ruffinus in Præfatione ad Clement. Recognit. Irenæus in Eusebio, caput 5, 6; Bower's History of the Popes, volume first, page 5.

4) See “The Apostolical Commission, the Missionary Charter of the Church,” by Bishop Doane. pp. 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17. See also Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, book third, section 77.

5) See Archbishop Potter on the Government of the Church, American edition, page 163.

contrary to all ecclesiastical rule for one prelate to intrude within the diocese of another; or for one branch of the church to interfere with any other branch.¹ And thus it has come to pass, that opprobrium and disgrace, nay, open charges of criminality and wrong-doing, have been thundered forth from within this very church of the successionists, against all modern fanaticism, and schismatical unrighteousness, in the shape of missionary labors.

For the last thousand years at least, until of late, there have probably been very few prelates in the entire succession, who have, in any measure, manner, or spirit, thus proved themselves to be apostolical, or successors of the apostles. "In vain," therefore, to use the words of Bishop Doane, "ye trace the date of your commission back to Galilee. In vain ye prove, by warrant clear, and open, and enduring as the stars in heaven, the authority by which you act, as ministers of Christ. Only while you go and make disciples of all nations, does Jesus promise to be with his apostles and their successors unto the end of the world." "The promises made to the apostles were made to them as missionaries to all nations, as teachers every where, and the office cannot be held without the commission, nor the promise claimed without the work."²

Now, guided by these principles, where are we to find a succession of prelates who have truly filled the office, or really enjoyed the promise, made to the successors of the apostles? Stillingfleet incontrovertibly proves, in his *Antiquities of the British Churches*, from Sozomen³ and others, as it regards the church of Rome, that its prelates, so far from being missionaries, did not even preach at Rome. For when Sozomen wrote, "there was no preaching in that church; neither by the bishop nor by any one else."⁴ So it was also in the Armenian churches, which used their prelates for little else than to give orders, as the same author learnedly demonstrates.⁵ To how great an extent this was true of the prelates universally, during many ages, it is unnecessary in this place to show.⁶

"The bishops," says Dr. McCrie, in his review of the state

1) Potter, p. 182, 1839

2) Palmer on the Church, vol. i. et passim. Sermon, as above, pp. 12, 10, 6.

3) L. 7. c. 9.

4) Fol. ed. Lond. 1685, pp. 220, 230.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 231.

6) No bishop preached at Rome for five hundred years together. See

Bingham's *Antiq.* vol. i. p. 64, and vol. v. p. 86, &c.

In Ireland, prior to the reformation, "preaching constituted no part of the clerical office." Reid's *Hist. Presb. Church in Ireland*, vol. i. 18.

Another evidence of this popish tendency of the system is the fact, that while it was mainly established

of religion at the time of the reformation,¹ “never, on any occasion, condescended to preach; indeed, I scarcely recollect an instance of it, mentioned in history, from the erection of the regular Scottish episcopacy, down to the era of the reformation. The practice had even gone into desuetude among all the secular clergy, and was wholly devolved on the mendicant monks, who employed it for the most mercenary purposes.” Of the truth of this statement many ludicrous illustrations are given in the course of this author’s incomparable history of the Scottish reformer.

Such a state of things may appear to us incredible. But wherever this doctrine of prelatic apostolical succession has been established, such results have ensued.² In England it has been even argued that preaching was no necessary part of prelatical duty. And that the decline of preaching, and its subordination to forms, ceremonies, and order, will inevitably follow the extension of this system in this country, is certain from the following statement :

“The spirit which brings these (i. e. ceremonies) up, is at the same time disposed to muzzle the pulpit.³ We have it from

by Elizabeth, so were her tendencies and partialities strongly toward Romanism. “She was,” says Dr. Price, (Hist. Prot. Nonconf. vol. i. p. 441,) “strongly attached to some of the most obnoxious dogmas and rites of the Romish church, and on more than one occasion threatened her bishops with a reinstatement of the ancient faith. Warmly opposed to an increase of preaching ministers, she contended with singular inconsistency, that it was good for the church to have but few, and that three or four were enough for a county.”

On this tendency of this prelatic system, to undervalue and thus to destroy preaching, see Bp. Meade’s Sermon at the Consecration of Bp. Elliot, Washington, 1840, pp. 7, 8, &c.

1) Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 16, 5th ed.

2) It is one prominent object of the Oxford tractators to depreciate the importance of preaching in comparison with prayers and ceremonies.

The following is from the remains of the Rev. Richard Huzzel Froude, the great doctor of the Oxford holy catholic church: “If,” says he, to a correspondent, “you are determined to have a pulpit in your church, which

I would much rather be without, do put it at the west end of the church, or leave it where it is; every one can hear you perfectly, and what can they want more? But whatever you do, pray don’t let it stand in the light of the altar, which, if there is any truth in my notions of ordination, is more sacred than the Holy of Holies was in the Jewish temple.” This hatred of pulpits and preaching is characteristic of the party; the performance of ceremonies, and the reading of prayers at the altar, they would fain have to supersede the preaching of the word.

In a work recommended by the house of American bishops, (Daubeny’s Guide to the Ch. vol. i. p. 202,) it is declared, “To which we will add, that a man may hear sermons all his life-time, and yet be as far from heaven at the end of his stage, as when he set out; but let him pray the prayers of our church, and devoutly attend her sacraments, and we may venture to answer for his salvation, though he should have been so circumstanced as not to have heard a single sermon during his whole christian progress.”

3) Taken from the (Philadelphia) Episcopal Recorder, for February, 1841.

undoubted authority, that in one of our churches, not far distant, where there are generally *three* ministers present every Sunday, and where there is a peculiar love for the Oxford innovations, the people have assembled as much as two or three Sundays in succession, *without a sermon*; some remarks upon the collect of the day, or upon some ordinance or custom, taking the place. This is the high road to Rome. When ceremonies are lifted up and preaching is put down, we are not far from a condition which will ask for another reformation."

These prelates are not successors of the apostles, for they have voided the only commission under which the apostles acted, and have framed one of their own devising. The duty of ministers, as we are now taught, is to "preach the church"—to "preach the sacraments"—to administer the holy rite of baptism—and to offer up the sacrifice of the eucharist. But where in all the Bible, have high-churchmen discovered this commission of the christian ministry? "Apostles had it not, and Christ never gave it."

"He gave," to use the forcible words of the eloquent Caroline Fry, in her recent exposure of the popery of this system,¹ "an express commission to administer baptism, and an inferential one to administer as well as to receive, the Lord's supper. 'But go thou, and preach the kingdom of God.' 'Preach the word.' 'Preach the gospel.' 'Preach Jesus Christ—Christ crucified.' It is written of our Lord and his apostles, that they preached many things as pertaining to the gospel, righteousness, peace, repentance, remission of sins, resurrection from the dead:—of John the Baptist only it is written, that he *preached the baptism* of repentance. John was a minister of the law, not of the gospel. If this change of words in the ministerial commission means nothing, why not adhere to the language of Holy Writ? But it does mean something, and the words are better suited to the meaning than you perhaps are aware. It is intended in their preaching, to put the church and the sacraments in the place of Christ, and preach salvation by them, rather than by *him*; inviting us to worship them instead of himself. We cannot charge this language with disguise, but we may well say to them that use it, 'Thy speech bewrayeth thee.'"

The description given, by Bishop Doane, of the work and duties of an apostle, and of every true successor of the apostles, is a sentence of exclusion, by which invalidity and gracelessness are justly charged upon the whole line of the succession. Prelates may well doff their jewelled mitres; unrobe them of their

1) *The Listener at Oxford*, pp. 129, 130. See Note B.

sacerdotal ermine; and silence their loud and clamorous boasting; since it is thus evident, whether we test them by apostolic name, gifts, office, or labors, that their order is not derived from Christ, or from his apostles. It contains nothing resembling the apostolic institute, as such. They have no characteristic of the first apostles in their apostolic character. They have, on the contrary, full many of them been characterized by every thing that is in violent contrariety to that character. Which of the offices of the apostles do prelates perform, or even pretend to perform,¹ and on what principle can they affirm that “the office of an apostle was that which the Saviour instituted, and which it was his last act here on earth, to invest with authority, and shall never cease?”²

Now, whether the apostles, as such and in their proper character, had successors, and whether prelates are these successors, is, according to Dr. Chapman,³ “the very hinge on which turns the whole controversy between the dissenters and the church. If such an acknowledgment did actually exist, the sheet-anchor of episcopacy would be irretrievably lost, and the ship itself dashed into innumerable fragments.”

That modern prelates do, therefore, occupy the office — that they are clothed with the authority — and endowed with the character and grace of the apostles, is most unhesitatingly affirmed, as by others, so by Archbishop Laud, Bishops Stillington, Hicks, Honieman, Beveridge, and Hall, and by the Rev. Messrs. Nichols, Leslie, Law, and others.⁴

On the other hand, that the apostles had properly no successors in their appropriate and apostolic office, may be shown to have been the opinion of very eminent men.

The Romish church, of course, denies this succession to all the apostles except Peter, and to all others than the bishops of Rome, and such as have been ordained by them.

Espenceus shows, from Chrysostom, that there is a treble difference between an apostle and a bishop.⁵ “A bishop is called by man, is set over a certaine place, he is not always certaine that hee hath the spirit. But an apostle is immediately called of God, (Gal. i. 1,) he is sent to preach not to any one place, but to all churches, (as 1. Tim. ii. 7.) Saint *Paul* saith he was ordained an apostle, that is, a teacher of the Gentiles. Thirdly, he is sure he hath the spirit, not to erre: as in the same place, *I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not.* And (1 Cor. vii. 40.)

1) See Calvin, vol. ii. p. 295.

2) Bishop Doane, as above.

3) Serm. to Presb. p. 237.

4) See the Note on Variations of Prelacy, lect. vi. p. 149, 150.

5) See in Willet, Syn. Pap. p. 164, &c., Hom. 1, 9, in Matth.

I thinke that I have the spirit of God. WHEREFORE IT IS EVIDENT, THAT THE APOSTLES WERE NO BISHOPS, PROPERLY SO CALLED."

Such, also, is the doctrine of Stapleton,¹ of Turreine the Jesuit,² of Sutlivius,³ and of the great Romish authority, Bellarmine, who "denies that bishops do properly succeed the apostles."⁴

That the apostles, as such, were extraordinary officers, and could have no successors, is the opinion, also, of many standard divines, in the Church of England, as among others, so of Archbishops Whateley, and Potter; and of Bishops Pearson, Hoadly, Fell, and Davenant;—and of the Rev. Messrs. Barrow, Whitby, Willet, Hooker, Chillingworth, Hinds, Lightfoot, Brett, and Stillingfleet.⁵

To this host of authorities must be added the evidence of all other reformed churches, who all concur in this opinion. The proof, then, of their pretended succession to the true office of the apostles, rests with those who claim it. This proof they have not given, nor can they give it. Their boasted succession, as you have seen, is not sustained by scripture, nor borne out by history, nor by the application of their own instituted canons. Neither is it attested by an appeal to evident and plain facts. For to neither the name, the call, the endowments, the office, or the duties of an apostle, are they found succeeding. These points of dissimilarity between prelates and apostles, we might have easily increased. Dr. Ayton has drawn out twelve partic-

1) Doct. Prim. lib. vi. cap. 7: "Ipsius apostolatus nulla successio. Finitur enim legatio, nec ad successores ipsius transit."

2) See quoted in Welles' Vindication of Presb. Ordin. p. 83.

3) Sutlivius de Pontif. Rom. pp. 175, 176, apud Ayton.

4) "Bellarmine," says Dr. Willet, (de Pontif. lib. iv. 25,) "denieth that bishops do properly succeed the apostles." Syn. Pap. p. 269.

5) See Note on the Variations of Prelacy, lect. vi. p. 149.

"The office of the apostles perished with the apostles," says the learned Dodwell, (De Nupero Schism. pp. 55, 68, ed. Lond. 1704, in Powell on Ap Suc. p. 33,) "in which office there never was any succession to any of them, except to Judas the traitor."

So also Dr. Hammond, (in *ibid.*) declares, that the word presbyter was "*filly* made use of by the apostles

and writers of the New Testament, and affixed to the *governors* of the Christian church." And, although this title of presbyter had been also extended to a second order in the church, and is *now* only in use for them, under the name of *presbyter*, yet in the scripture times, it belonged PRINCIPALLY, if not alone, to bishops, there being *no evidence* that any of that *second order* were then instituted." In plain English, the Dr. fairly grants that presbyters, in scripture times, were bishops, and bishops were presbyters; i. e. they were *one and the same order and office.*"

Dr. Bentley also says that "the presbyters, WHILE THE APOSTLES LIVED, were *ἐπισκοποι*, bishops, overseers." (Randolph's Enchir. Theol. vol. v. p. 204.)

Spanheim Fil. Dissert. iii. num. 25, 37 34, though a friend to hier. govt., in Ayton. app. p. 10.

ulars, in which it is impossible that there should be any real successors to the office and character of the apostles.¹ But enough has been said to unbare the nakedness of this empty claim to an extinguished title, and an unexisting office.

We must come, therefore, to the conclusion of the learned Whitaker,² “munus episcopi nihil est ad munus apostolicum, that THE OFFICE OF A BISHOP HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE OFFICE OF AN APOSTLE;” and with Cardinal Bellarmine,³ that “episcopi nullum habent partem veræ apostolicæ auctoritatis. BISHOPS HAVE NO PART OF THE TRUE APOSTOLICAL AUTHORITY.”⁴

And since, as Dr. Chapman allows, this is the very hinge of our controversy — and it has been proved defective, and as such, to have been abandoned by men than whom none stand higher, either in the Romish or Anglican churches — we are brought safely to our conclusion, that when tested by facts, this prelatial doctrine of apostolical succession is found to be what it is when tested by scripture, history, or reason, utterly vain and groundless.

To what, then, shall we liken these prelates, and whereunto shall we compare these successors of the apostles, who think it no shame to obtrude upon the notice of the world titles which their ancestors were too modest to assume? and to glory in that to which they thought it not even “decent” to pretend? They appear unto our minds, reflecting upon these things, as would the self-proclaimed successors of the supreme functionaries whom we may imagine to have been appointed by some

1) Orig. Constit. of the Ch. ch. i. § ii. p. 20.

2) De Pontif. Quest. iii. cap. iii. p. 69, in Powell, p. 48.

3) De Romano Pont. lib. iv. cap. xxiv. in same.

4) “The ordination or consecration, whatever it might be, to that office of bishop, of itself conveyed neither inspiration nor the power of working miracles, *which, with the direct commission from our Lord himself, distinguished and set apart the primary apostles from the rest of mankind. It was only in a very limited and imperfect sense, that they could, even in the sees founded by the apostles, be called the successors of the apostles.*” Milman’s Hist. of Christ. vol. ii. pp. 70, 72.

Our blessed Lord is “the bishop (that is, overseer) of our souls, as the apostle calls him. It is a sacrilege, therefore, to take that regard which is due to him and place it upon others.”

Hoadly’s Works, fol. vol. ii. p. 827.

See a full argument to prove they had not and could not have, in Dr. Willett, Syn. Pap. p. 164, and again on p. 165.

This is admitted by Hooker, as it regards the special character of apostles, in Eccl. Pol. b. vii. § 4, vol. iii. p. 187, Keble’s ed.

Burton’s Hist. of the Ch. ch. viii. p. 177, Am. ed.

That the apostolic office and the prelatial are irreconcilably different, see shown by Dr. Barrow, Pope’s Sup. Supp. iii. Works, vol. i. fol. p. 598

See this subject well illustrated in Dr. Mitchell’s Letters to Bishop Skinner, p. 72.

See also full on in the Altare Damascennum Davidis Calderwood, p. 190, &c.

See also Colman’s Christian Antiq. p. 69; Peirce’s Vind. of Dissent. part iii. ch. i. p. 44, &c.

eastern monarch for some great and special ends. These we will suppose received their office by the special favor of their prince, were named after a peculiar title of royal bestowment, were enrolled in garments of official splendor and most marked distinction, were empowered to discharge functions of the most rarely delegated trust, and seated upon thrones of imperial grandeur around their favoring monarch.

And now, in a distant age, and a remote province; when direct exposure of their claims is deemed impossible, impostors are found boldly demanding from the over-awed multitude, that submissive reverence and obedience, which were due only to the true, and original, and exalted nobility. These individuals have no immediate appointment by their sovereign; no certified and honorary titles; no royal robes of office; no insignia of authority; nor any privileged admission to the royal presence; nor any confidential use of the royal signet. And yet, in conscious destitution of one and all of the essential and distinctive marks of this noble order, they erect themselves into an aristocracy; and, in the absence of the sovereign, subjugate the rightful officers of the kingdom, deprive them of all dignity, reduce them to the condition of servile obeisance to their command; and "load themselves to suffocation with unearned emoluments, and trail after them as they go, a long purse, crammed with the price of ruined subjects," "the victims of their aristocratic rapacity."¹ Oh, when their sovereign Lord returns in great power, and takes to himself the sword of vengeance, will he not speak forth in anger, and confound them and their abettors with perpetual shame?

He that hath ears to hear let him hear.

1) Spirit. Desp. pp. 395, 397.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE TENTH.

NOTE A.

So also Dr. Hammond in Luke vi. 13. "The name (apostle) hath no more in it than to signify messenger or legate." "Among the Jews *all sorts of messengers* are called apostles. So Abijah (1 Kings, xiv. 6.) is called *σκληρος αποστολος*, that is, a harsh apostle or messenger of ill news. And in the Old Testament the word is NO OTHERWISE USED. Among the Talmudists it is used of them that were, by the rulers of the synagogues *sent out* to receive the tenths and dues that belonged to the synagogues. And in like manner the MESSENGERS of the church that carried, letters congratulatory, from one to another, are, by Ignatius, called *δεδρομου* and *θειοπροσβυται*, the DIVINE CARRIERS or ambassadors; and so in the Theodosian Codex, *tit. de Judaicis*, *apostoli* are those that were SENT by the patriarch at a set time, to require the gold and silver due to them."

"The reader will observe," says Mr. Powell, "that St. Paul does NOT number Titus with these apostles, or more properly, *messengers*; and for this plain reason, these messengers were persons chosen or *ordained by the churches* to this business, — Titus was NOT; but only sent in company with them by the apostle; they, therefore, were *messengers of the churches*, and *THEY only*; (2 Cor. viii. 23;) "Whether any do inquire of Titus, *he* is MY partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our *brethren* be inquired of, *THEY* are the MESSENGERS of the churches, and the glory of Christ." "In Phil. ii. 25, it seems to be used again to mean a *public messenger*, a messenger of the church, sent on THEIR public business. Bishop Taylor here actually perverts the sense by a false translation. He renders *συνεργος*, my "*compeer*," in order to raise Epaphroditus, as a prototype of modern bishops, to equality with apostles. He would thus make Priscilla and Aquila, (Rom. xvi. 3,) apostolic compeers, *τους συνεργους μου*; and perhaps Priscilla would stand as a prototype for a race of *female* bishops! Will he also make apostles themselves compeers with God, because they were workers together with him, *Θεου γαρ εσμεν συνεργοι?* (1 Cor. iii. 9.) The apostle's language, however, is distinct, as before:—"Yet I suppose it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, *my companion in labor*, *συνεργον μου*, but YOUR messenger, *υμωνδε αποστολον*." (Phil. ii. 25.) Dodwell has the candor and good sense to see this.

"But we may easily gather from the epistle to the Phillippians to what the office of Epaphroditus, as an apostle or messenger, referred; (chap. iv. v. 18:) 'But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things *which were sent* from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.' *His office, therefore, belonged to PECUNIARY affairs. Rem igitur pecuniariam spectabat illa legatio.*" Powell, pp. 38, 39.

NOTE B.

WE will here add a very interesting passage from this same work bearing on this same subject, (pp. 164, 167.) "Indifference to preaching has characterized all spiritual declensions in the churches: and every revival of religion

has been produced by, and accompanied with, an increased zeal and desire for the preaching of the cross. In proof of this, I refer you to the history of every church in every by-gone time. But you need not read far. Most of us can refer to the days of our childhood, when a ten-minutes' sermon — if sermons it might be called, that unction of truth had none — once on the Sunday, was enough for ears polite — and when our clergy were the sportsmen of our fields, the stewards of our race-courses, and the beaux of our ball-rooms; and the 'Family Bible' was a 'Sunday book.' Howbeit, those were the days in which our grandmothers wore black in lent, and our church bells rang duly, we say not how persuasively, every Wednesday and Friday through the year; the penance of the rapid parson, and the droning clerk, whom the attendance of some half-dozen card-playing septuagenarians brought within the compulsory limits of the law. We have seen great changes, and these are things out of memory, save to our gratitude that they exist no longer.

"But what in scarce the third part of a century has made so great a difference? 'The foolishness of preaching,' the zeal for preaching, and the demand for preaching; first out of our church, and subsequently in it. Our gospel preachers have changed the tastes of the people, and the opinions of the people have affected the whole character of the ministry. The moral essays have succumbed to empty pews; the dissipated churchman has become the marked exception among a body of truly pastoral clergy; the knowledge of divinity is now necessary to reputation in the profession of it; self-interest looks for spiritual gifts in the incumbency; and where the truth is to be heard, the week-day bell no longer rings in vain. We have been witnesses of this great change: and we know it is attributable to God's blessing, not upon sacraments and church services — for they were always there: but upon the evangelical preaching of the cross in the churches. Must we live to see these steps retraced? Are our ministers to be taught once more that it needs no sacred study to read a form of prayer, and no spiritual experience to deliver sacraments, and nothing but ordination and a cure, to make a minister of Jesus Christ?"

"Shall our people be taught again, that all who love or need the word of life must forsake the church and betake themselves to the meeting-house? We trust, and yet we fear. With deepest grief we see the leaven working far distantly from where the insidious mischief lurks. We hear the altered tone of some whose hearts we think unchanged: some who owe the conversion of their souls to the preaching of the gospel; who loved it better than their necessary food; have been cheered by it in their sorrows and checked by it in their sins; and would have made many sacrifices rather than forego it. Now they discover that preaching does not signify, they go to church to pray. We tell them, had they always thought so, they had not been what they are. Why not? There is a liturgy sufficient for the exhibition of the truth. It has not been found so; and it has not been written so. The commission and command of Jesus is to preach and the blessing of the Father has ever been upon the hearing of the gospel. We appeal to scripture and we appeal to facts; we appeal to the experience of your own souls, which you are dulling into indifference, and chilling into stone, by withholding yourselves from the sustentation God has appointed for you; to feed not upon *prayer*, — that was never separated from the hearing of the truth, in public or in private; as if the urging of God's gracious message upon you, should supersede the responses of your soul to him, or the invitations of your grace indispose you to communion with himself. They never did, they never could. You *know* they did not; you know you never joined the public services with less fervor, because you came to hear the truth from the pulpit; possibly you know, that till you heard it from the pulpit, you never felt the value of the liturgy, or enjoyed those services at all. Alas! the liturgy itself is to share the degradation; the value is to be in the place where it is said, the lips that utter it, the parish church, the canonical hours, the clerical vestments, the disused ceremonies. Give us votaries at once to count our paternosters, for our most spiritual liturgy has become a dead-letter, too: waiting upon this mummery to give it efficacy."

LECTURE XI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ESSENTIALLY POPISH IN ITS TENDENCY AND RESULTS.

WE now proceed to show that this doctrine of the apostolical succession is, in its tendency, decidedly and essentially popish, and as such is to be eschewed by every protestant who prefers spiritual liberty and pure doctrine, to spiritual despotism and corruption.

This truth has glared forth upon us already, in attempting to fathom the depths of that thick darkness in which its history is so impenetrably shrouded. But it will be important to bring it into the clearer light of a distinct discussion. For some time, we questioned the expediency of introducing this topic at all. We are well aware, that such a charge, alleged against any sincerely protestant communion, is, if not well sustained, the most opprobrious and calumnious with which we could assail it. We are also apprized that the abettors of this doctrine, from Laud to Percival, or Hook, disavow altogether any tendency toward Romanism, and even controvert many of its grossest errors;¹ and that we may very easily be made to appear, by such representations, in the light of a false witness against men of learning, piety, and true devotion to the English

1) On the disavowal of this charge the London Christian Obs. remarks, (Feb. 1841, p. 72.) "True it is, that the Oxford tract sect are loud in their declamations against what they call 'the errors of the church of Rome,' — though not so loud as in their denunciations of the fundamental tenets of the churches of the ref-

ormation, under the unfair epithet of ultra-protestantism; but amidst all their foil-fencing with popery, they manage never to put in a mortal thrust; there may be dust, and noise, and a little superficial wounding, but its vitality is safe at their hands; it plumes itself upon their aid; it boasts that they advocate its leading principles;

church. Notwithstanding, however, all this, and more than this; and although we may subject ourselves to the charge of illiberality and harshness, we do not feel at liberty to "keep silence." The interests of truth, of charity, and of the great protestant cause, demand the candid and explicit avowal of our sentiments and our fears. The very fact that the true character and tendency of this system is not understood by many who receive it; — by many of the clergymen, and we believe the greatest portion of the members of the protestant episcopal church upon which it is fastening itself, and into whose veins it is infusing its poisonous influence, loudly demands that the subject should be fairly presented to their minds.

The remembrance also of the open, avowed, and continual reprobation of this doctrine, from the very first intimations of it until the present hour, as popish, and as dragging with it many popish consequences, by all our puritan, non-conformist, and presbyterian ancestors; — equally requires that we, their posterity, should sustain them in their faithful contendings for the truth, as far as circumstances make necessary. The signs of the times, the ominous portents which skirt the lowering sky, and foretoken coming danger, the events which are daily transpiring around us, and the boasted and increasing converts to Romanism and

and wherever the Oxford tracts have produced any effect, popery has risen in estimation. It is not indeed immaculate; that is not pretended — but it is much more estimable than protestant slander has accounted it; and much is it lamented that the Anglican and Romanist churches do not better understand each others' good qualities, and make common cause against the incursions of that direful monster — protestantism." To the allegations that these Oxford divines are eminent for piety, for talent, and for opposition to popery, see the reply of Bishop McIlvaine in his "Oxford Divinity," &c., in which he shows that herein lies the greatest danger from their writings. See pp. 12, 27, &c., 30, 132, 133. Again, speaking of their service for Bishop Ken's day, he says, "a more barefaced insult, to all decent consistency with the principles of the Church of England was never perpetrated." p. 271.

"You disclaim," says Dr. George Miller in his Letter to Dr. Pusey, (p. 26,) "and doubtless with sincerity, any intention, or wish, to return to the communion of the church of Rome; but you do actually return to that assertion of church authority,

which by degrees was matured into the monstrous usurpation of the papacy."

See on this apparent opposition to Romish errors, and the greater danger to be apprehended in consequence of it, Lond. Chr. Obs., 1839, p. 631, &c.

Bib. Report, 1838, p. 116.

Mr Taylor, in the second volume of his Ancient Christianity, declares that "the controversy which has been originated by the Oxford tract writers involves nothing less than the substance of christianity itself," (*Dedication*, p. 8,) — that "the venom of the Oxford tract doctrines has been insidiously shed into the bosoms of perhaps a majority of the younger clergy of the episcopal church," (p. 3,) and that "this system differs from popery *theologically* in several points, and *politically* or *ecclesiastically*; but that there is a SPIRITUAL AND MORAL IDENTITY OF THE TWO." (p. 69.) See also Note A.

1) See above in Lect. vii. See Neal's History; Price's History of Nonconformity; Pierce's Vind. of Dissenters, &c. Lond. 1717, part ii. ch. i. p. 6, &c.

prelacy; all conspire to determine the question of duty, and to inspire us to put the trumpet to our mouths and blow an alarm in Zion.

We will, therefore, proceed to a more full consideration of this charge against this system, and to place it in such a light as that it cannot possibly be denied.

We will not, however, argue that, because this system is common to the Roman, and to the Laudean sect in the Anglican church, therefore, the Anglican church is popish; for it is very clear, how many things may be both scriptural and proper, although found in the Romish system, which, with much error, has also preserved much that is valuable and true. We will appeal, therefore, to evidence clear and incontrovertible; and which shall be authenticated by testimony from episcopalians themselves.

This tendency we will illustrate in the first place, by showing the analogy between this doctrine, as embraced by the Romish and by the Anglican churches.¹

The church of Rome puts in the place of the one mediator Jesus Christ, not only angels, the Virgin Mary, and the saints, but the church in general, and every priest in particular. This vicarious religion, by which the heart is led to repose its cares, and to rest its hopes, upon something external to itself; — veiled as it is from full comprehension, by a character of mysteriousness and terror — is the very soul of superstition, and of the whole mass of Romish errors. Now the channel through which the full tide of this mysterious grace is made to flow is the church; and that tide itself is invisibly conveyed by the agency of this lineal succession, on which the honor, the power, the efficacy, and the increase of the church depends. This is the idol, not only of rabbinical and Romish, but also of protestant popery; which has its traditionary legends also, of which this doctrine is the manifestation. Or we may say, that as there is Jewish popery, so this is Gentile rabbinism; of both² which, it is the inevitable tendency, to exalt man and dethrone God; to make void, and vain, and powerless, the divine record; and to confirm human authority; to establish a righteousness to be accomplished by works; and to overturn that righteousness, which is by faith in the meritorious righteousness of another.

These, therefore, are fundamental principles in the system of popery, that God has delegated to the visible corporation of the

1) That is, supposing this system to be embraced, as its advocates contend, by the Anglican church.

2) Whateley on Romish Errors, ch. ii.

3) See McCaul's Sketches of Judaism, p. 2.

church, the entire management and control of man's spiritual relations, and has, therefore, committed to their trust the plenitude of grace: That this visible society is, by express appointment one, unchanged, and perpetual: That however wicked may be the persons who administer the government of this church, the church itself will be assuredly preserved indefectible, and its acts be ratified in heaven: And that the whole efficacy of the church depends on the transmission of this original communication of divine grace, in an unbroken succession of lineal descendants of the apostles.

On these apparently harmless propositions is reared the entire fabric of that spiritual despotism, which at length usurped dominion over the civil and religious interests of man — over his body as well as his soul — over his thoughts as well as his actions — which claimed to direct his understanding and to tutor his conscience — which haunted him with fear through life, with terror in death, and then “delving into the sepulchre,” followed him with its persecuting anathemas to the very fires of that penal wrath, from which it alone could deliver.¹

Now every one of these principles, from which these consequences have flowed, are most certainly included in this prelati- c theory; and are most fully avowed by its advocates. This doctrine of the apostolic succession is nothing more nor less than a second edition of the Romish anathema — *extra ecclesiam prelati- cam salus non esse potest.*² By confining to the clergy — and to one order of the clergy — and to a baronial and aristocratic class of the clergy — the exclusive, supreme, and heaven-appointed right to all ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction — with the uncontrolled power of continuing their own succession, and of interpreting, by their authority, (i. e. the church,) the laws and doctrines of Christ's kingdom — there is a foundation laid, broad enough to sustain the most unbounded exercise of ghostly tyranny. These avowed principles justify all those practices, which necessarily flow from them, and by which the church has asserted her right to a universal lordship over the bodies and the souls of men.

This apostolical succession is distinctly affirmed by Mr. Newman, to be one of those many essential points, which the Romish and the Anglican churches, “in common both hold.”³

It is the same “ruling, grasping, ambitious principle,” in both. — In both, it is involved in that same profound obscurity which gives fitting room for fabulous legends, and unauthentic-

1) See Dr. Rice's Considerations on Religion, pp. 79, 82, 83, 84.

2) See Henry Martyn in

Hough's Vindication, p. 64. He denominates this antichrist.

3) On Romanism, p. 56.

ted affirmations. — In both, it is attended with the same errors in doctrine, and in practice. — In both, it places the efficacy of the gospel in its forms, and not in its doctrines; and the true power and validity of the ministry, in its commission, and not in its character, and qualifications; in its outward and genealogical relations, and not in any inward and spiritual call. — In both, it involves the absolute exclusion from the christian pale, of the greatest part of protestant communions. — In both, it presents an insuperable barrier to the reformation of what is corrupt. — In both, it implies indefectibility, and the continual presence of God's indwelling Spirit.¹ — And, in both, it is attended by the same insuperable difficulties, and monstrous consequences.² Are we unjust in deducing such inferences from such premises? Let us then put ourselves under the guidance of Mr. Palmer. "If," says he, "communion with the Roman see (we say, the prelatial, or Anglican church) be, as they say, absolutely and simply necessary, so that he who is separated from it, is cut off from the catholic church³ of Christ, then the Roman pontiff, (i. e. the church, i. e. the prelates,) must be infallible, in defining controversies of faith; because it is not to be believed that God would impose the absolute necessity of communicating with him (i. e. it) otherwise. It follows equally, that he (the church) must have absolute power in ecclesiastical affairs; for, if he (the church) enforces any thing under the penalty of excommunication, it must be obeyed. It also follows, that the church cannot fall into heresy, even when not defining *ex cathedra*, because no one can be entitled to forsake his communion,"⁴ &c. &c.

This argument is just as conclusive when applied to the Anglican prelacy, as to the Romish hierarchy. Both make substantially the very same claims, to be the one, catholic church of Jesus Christ, and both, therefore, are responsible for all the consequences which such claims necessarily imply.⁵

1) Mr. Gladstone claims inspiration for the church, which is "an inheritance not only of antiquity, but also of inspiration"

2) See Lond. Chr. Ob., May, 1839, p. 290.

3) "Individuals among us," says Dr. Pusey, (Letter, p 218, Eng. ed.) "are bound to remain in the church through whose ministry they have been made members of Christ." See Miller's Letter, to p. 73.

4) Palmer on Church, vol. ii. pp. 529, 530 and see, also, pp. 493, 497, &c. &c. Mr. Newman has a whole

lecture in proof of the indefectibility of the church, lect. viii

5) Thus Mr. Keble, in his Discourse on Primitive Tradition, instances among other difficulties which he supposes must have lately exercised the minds of the Anglo-catholic clergy, "how the freedom of the Anglican church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue to the authority inherent in the catholic apostolical church." P. 6, ed. iv.

In illustrating the guilt of one church throwing off all fellowship

But clear as is this inference from the analogy between these two systems, in those elemental principles which sustain the whole fabric of Romanism, we are able fully to substantiate our charge, by plain and palpable facts.

In order, then, at once and most clearly, to establish the popish tendency of this doctrine, it is only necessary to show, that with it, all those other doctrines which constitute what is now designated Oxford divinity, are necessarily connected; and secondly, that these doctrines, thus springing from this dogma as their germ or root, and branching forth into all the ramifications of the system, are to be pronounced Romish in their character.

Now, that this doctrine of prelatical succession does necessarily imply all those other doctrines by which the Oxford divinity is characterized, will appear from the fact, that these weighty consequences are deduced from this axiomatic principle by these divines themselves, while this connexion is urged upon their brethren as an irresistible argument for their adoption.

In a very able and elaborate treatise on "The American Church," contained in the *British Critic*,¹ for October, 1839,

with others who yet hold to fundamentals, Bishop Davenant remarks: "Non miramur papistas, qui præter ipsum christum aliud fundamentum personale, aliud caput, alium sponsum dederunt ecclesiæ, omnes ecclesias abscindere et abjicere quantumvis fideliter et firmiter christo adhærentes.....Nec miramur stultus eorundem clamores, quibus putant se perterrefacere posse ecclesias Christi." *Adhortatio ad Pacem Eccl. Cant.* 1640, p 57.

1) See on p. 308.

That the *British Critic* may be fairly quoted as high authority in this controversy, will appear, from the following communication, taken from the *Charleston Gospel Messenger* for April, 1841

"*The British Critic*. — Mr. Editor, allow me, through your pages, to call the attention of your readers to the above valuable periodical, which in a recent number of 'The Banner of the Cross,' is thus highly commended by Bishop Doane, of New Jersey. 'It has been among my warmest wishes that a publisher might be found who would give to the clergy and laity of our churches, and to all lovers of high intellect, imbued with PRIMITIVE piety, and CONSECRATED at the ALTAR

of the HOLY ONE, an American edition of this ABLEST of all the British periodicals, at a price accessible to all. I rejoice to say that better even than that is to be done. Wiley and Putnam, of New York, will import the *British Critic*, (two annual volumes of five hundred pages each, in quarterly numbers,) if one hundred persons order it. It is an opportunity MOST AUSPICIOUS to the BEST INTERESTS OF THEOLOGY and literature, and I venture in my ZEALOUS desire for its success, to call the attention of my brethren to it under my own name. I speak advisedly, for I have been a subscriber to it from the commencement of the present series, and the whole set, now twenty-eight volumes, are on the shelves of my library, and AMONG ITS CHOICEST CONTENTS. IT SHOULD BE IN THE HANDS OF EVERY CLERGYMAN, AND SHOULD CIRCULATE IN EVERY PARISH.'"

"A subscription list has been left at the library, Chalmer's street, and at Mr. A. E. Miller's book-store. It is hoped that those who desire to see this valuable work circulate in our country, will use their influence in obtaining the requisite number of subscribers."

Now let the reader contrast with

the writer says, "Now as to the American church, it has been her privilege to begin with so clear an announcement of that rudimental truth on which all true churches rest, that we cannot but believe she is destined, in spite of obstacles, to advance onward to the measure of the stature of its perfect fullness. She has got it in her, and with gratitude we add, that the most considerable of her bishops, living and dead, have developed it accurately no little way. They have gone forward from one truth to another; from the apostolic commission to the succession, from the succession to the office,—in the office they have discerned the perpetual priesthood, in the priesthood the perpetual sacrifice, in the sacrifice the glory of the christian church, its power as a fount of grace, and its blessedness as a gate of heaven."

"They had felt and taught most persuasively the unearthly position in which all christians stand, and their real communion in the invisible kingdom of God. You would not know whether you were in America or England, while their books were before you, in Birmingham or in New York, amid the collieries or sugar-canes. The external world sinks to its due level; and universal suffrage is as little found there, as in the house of commons. How much further they ought to have gone, what doctrines they left latent, and what they but half developed, we have neither purpose nor ability to say; but without determining what would be presumptuous, so much we may safely maintain, that there is no conceivable point of opinion, or practice, or ritual, or usage, in the church system, ever so minute, no detail of faith and conduct ever so extreme, but what might be a legitimate and necessary result of that one idea or formula with which they started. Mammoths and megatheria are known by their vertebræ; men's bodily temperaments have sometimes been discriminated by their nails; and in like manner there is no development ever so ultimate, but may be the true offspring of the apostolical principle. A gesture, a posture, a tone, a word, a

the above encomium the following opinion of this same work taken from the London (Episcopal) Record, and they will at once perceive how matters are working.

"Among these periodicals there are some worse than others. The most rampant in advocating what is popish are the *British Critic*, the *British Magazine*, and the *Church Magazine*.

"What circulation these periodicals have, we know not. Their very existence is a disgrace to our church; and that they should be countenanced

by any of its members is much to be deplored; as the circumstance affords lamentable proof either of great inconsistency or of great ignorance of its real principles. Some are no doubt beguiled by the lofty pretensions that are made, and by the evangelic strain that is occasionally adopted, without considering that all this is in imitation of popery, which combines some truths with the grossest idolatry, and claims the highest prerogatives, while it adopts the most palpable errors and the most puerile absurdities."

symbol, a time, a spot, may be its property and token, whatever be the real difficulty of ascertaining and discriminating such details; nay, and it is not fully developed till it reaches those ultimate points, whatever real danger there be of formality."

Did this writer thus characterize "the American church," unadvisedly, or without authority? "We shall refer," says he as our authorities¹ "to three bishops of their church; and first, to the sermons of Dr. Seabury, of Connecticut, the first consecrated diocesan bishop." Among other things, Bishop Seabury is made to testify as to "the holy eucharist,"² "that there was, however, a *great*, and *real change* made in the bread and the cup, by our Saviour's blessing, and thanksgiving, and prayer, cannot be doubted."

"They were, therefore, by his blessing and word, made to be, what by nature they were not."

"The eucharist is not only a sacrament, but also a *true and proper sacrifice*, commemorative of the original sacrifice and death of Christ, for our deliverance from sin and death."

"When Christ commanded his apostles to celebrate the holy eucharist, in remembrance of him, he with a command gave them power to do so, that is, *he communicated his own priesthood to them*, in such measure and degree, as he saw necessary for his church, to qualify them to be his representatives, to offer the christian sacrifice of bread and wine."

"The eucharist is also called the communion of the body and blood of Christ, not only because, by communing together, we declare our mutual love and good-will, but also, because in that holy ordinance we communicate with God, through Christ the mediator, by first offering or giving to him the sacred symbols of the body and blood of his dear Son, and then receiving them again, *blessed and sanctified by his Holy Spirit*, and for a principle of immortality to our bodies, as well as to our souls."

Similar evidence is then presented by the reviewer, from the writings of Bishop Hobart and Bishop Dehon.⁴

"The reviewer, after fully presenting the evidence in the case, adds, "such are the principles of the American church, legitimately resulting from her IDEA, as CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC."⁵

Not less strong and conclusive in substantiation of this con-

1) Ibid, p 309.

2) Ibid. p. 310.

3) Ibid, pp. 312 - 314.

4) Ibid, pp. 314 - 318.

It is but justice to this venerated man to say, that the evidence adduced

from him by the critic requires some torturing to speak forth the anti-catholic and Romish sentiments, for the support of which his name is introduced.

5) P. 318.

nexion between the doctrine of apostolical succession, as their basis, and the worst errors of this whole system; is the testimony of the London Christian Observer, the organ of the low-church episcopalians in England. In that work for March, 1837,¹ it is said, “to their appalling invention, that the only way of restoration, is through penance, or, as Professor Pusey expresses it, through ‘enduring pains, and abiding self-discipline, and continued sorrow,’ so as ‘again to become *capable* of that mercy:’ — to their exaggerations of priestly absolutions, and the power of the keys, that frightful engine of despotism, the fulcrum of which, was the doctrine maintained in these Tracts, upon the apostolical authority, which every minister of Christ still possesses to bind and loose, the sacraments being the channels for the conveyance of divine grace, and the priest who administers them having ‘power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost,’ ‘power over the things of the unseen world;’ a power never more arrogantly assumed by Rome herself, in the madness of her spiritual tyranny, when ‘drunken with the blood of the saints,’ than in such passages as the following, by Mr. Newman, Mr. Keble, and Dr. Pusey, who actually dare to write, ‘the fountain (of the Redeemer’s blood) has, indeed, been opened for sin and uncleanness,’ but *it were to abuse the power of the keys intrusted to us, (!!!) again* (that is, after a first offence) *to pretend to admit them; and thus now there remains only the baptism of tears —*” (May God forgive men, who thus awfully presume to limit the virtues of the Redeemer’s atonement; who substitute the penance of tears, for the blood of Christ, and who interpose between man and his God, to ‘admit’ or shut out from the kingdom of heaven, as they see fit, just as the popish priests did, to their own pontifical dignity, and great gain, though of this we accuse not the Oxford brethren, till Luther spoiled Setzel’s trade) — to all such presumptuous follies, and anti-scriptural dreamings, our homilies reply as follows,” &c.

To this, we may add the further testimony of Bishop Hoadly, who, in a work ironically dedicated to Pope Clement XI., thus satirically notices these arrogant pretensions of the English clergy, and this very connexion upon which we have been insisting.

“Your holiness is not aware how near the churches of us protestants have at length come, to those privileges and perfections which you boast of, as peculiar to your own church. You *cannot* err in any thing you determine, and we *never do*: that is,

1) P. 152.

in one word, *you are infallible*, and we are always in the right. We cannot but esteem the advantage to be exceedingly on our side in this case, because we have all the benefits of *infallibility*, without the absurdity of pretending to it. Authority results as well from power, as from right, and a majority of votes is as strong a foundation for it, as infallibility itself. Councils that *may err, never do!!*"

"There was no manner of necessity in your church, to discard the scriptures, as a rule of faith open to all christians, and to set up the church in distinction to them. It is but taking care, in some of our controversies, to fix upon the laity, that they must not abuse this right of reading the scriptures, by pretending to be wiser than their superiors, and that they must take care to understand *particular texts*, as the church understands them, and as their guides, (the clergy,) who have an *interpretative authority*, explain them."

"Some have changed the *authoritative absolution* of the Romish church, into an *authoritative intercession* of the priest, who is now become with us, a *mediator* between God and man. This creates the same *dependence* of the laity, upon the priests, and shows how *dexterous* we are in changing words, when there is occasion, without changing them at all."

"As for us, of the Church of England, we have bishops in a succession as certainly uninterrupted from the apostles, as your church could communicate to us: and, upon this bottom, which makes us a true church, we have a right to separate from you, but no persons living have any right to differ or separate from us. Thus we have, indeed, left you, but we have fixed ourselves in your seat, and make no scruple to resemble you, in our defences of ourselves, and censures of others, whenever we think it proper."

"The more exalted doctrine," says Professor Powell, of Oxford, in his "Tradition Unveiled," "of sacramental efficacy, of absolution, and of excommunication, were hardly separable from the claim to the exclusive commission of apostolic ordination to administer them, and to a continuation of the apostolic powers in the episcopal hierarchy. All these soon became (from obvious causes) integral parts of the constitution of the church: and (by the aid of the *disciplina arcani*) soon enjoyed

1) Archbishop Wake was thus led by antiquity to admit the claims in part of all the Romish orders, (Exp. of Doct. of Eng. Ch. in Oxf. Tr. vol. iii. p. 153:) "We maintain the distinction of the several orders in the church; and though we have

none of them below a deacon, because we do not read that the apostles had any, yet we acknowledge the rest to have been anciently received in the church, and shall not, therefore, raise any controversy about them."

1) P. 60, Ox. 1839.

the sanction of primitive tradition. This it was which fixed the *first link* in the chain of the much-boasted *apostolic succession*: a point important to be noticed, since the attention of disputants on both sides has been usually confined to the very subordinate object of tracing the *subsequent* links, which is a mere question of history."

The same writer further says: "If we look at the influence which the system exercises on the multitude of its followers, we shall perceive that it is precisely the *same kind* as that of the Romish church; and though professedly at entire variance with popery in a literal acceptance, yet, in a wider sense, as referring to the ground and character both of doctrinal principles and devotional and ecclesiastical practices, there is that community of spirit and tendency, which belongs to systems alike claiming an absolute authority over the conscience, grounded on an alleged divine commission. And, in common with the system of Romanism, it maintains a powerful ascendancy from appealing to the same, and those some of the most prevalent, weaknesses of human nature. To the many, impatient of inquiry and indolently led by the pretensions of authority, it holds forth the sufficiency of an implicit uninquiring submission to the decrees of the church; and to those who are anxiously seeking some means of satisfying or compounding with some slight demands of conscience, it proposes the comfortable assurance of the efficacy of its observances; propositions which the mass of nominal believers will be always well prepared to embrace."

To this proof of our first position, it is unnecessary to add, as we might easily do, abundant testimony from other and numerous writings, as well American as English. Indeed, the doctrine of prelatical succession being granted, we cannot see how all other doctrines which have gone forth from the church as the prophetic keeper and interpreter of the sacred scriptures, can be questioned; since they are all educed by an easy process, from this "rudimental truth," and rest with it upon the divine authority of the church.

It is only necessary, therefore, in order to establish the charge of a Romish tendency in this doctrine, that we should bring credible testimony from parties capable of giving evidence in the case, to the unquestionable Romanism of this doctrinal system.²

1) Tradition Unveiled, p. 9.

2) In the Methodist Quarterly Review, for Jan. 1841, (see pp. 83-92,) there is an argument to show, that the English church is the other

beast associated with the first beast, or the Romish church, described in the Revelations of St. John, ch. xiii. 11-17.

And here, truly, the only difficulty is, to select witnesses from the gathering multitude, who are all most eagerly pressing into the service, and demanding a hearing for conscience' sake.

Beyond the pale of this new catholic church, there is one unmingled cry of unqualified condemnation uttered against the whole scheme, as being necessarily popish in its innate propensities—its natural longings—and its ultimate developements. Within the sanctuary itself, there is the sound of many voices, rising in their tone of loud and most bitter lamentation, over the apostate tendencies of this semi-papal system. The London Christian Observer, the veteran champion which has contended for pure and spiritual religion, against the host of the assailants, for the last thirty years, is heard from month to month, proclaiming to the friends of protestantism, that “popery is the ultraism of Oxford tract doctrine; and Oxford tract doctrine is popery divested of its most startling results”¹—that it undoes the reformation—and that if these doctrines prevail, there must be a second reformation in England. “It is,” says this noble work, “afflicting beyond expression,² to see our protestant church—and in times like these—agitated by the revival of these figments of the darkest age of papal superstition. Well may popery flourish! well may dissent triumph! well may unitarianism sneer! well may all protestantism mourn, to see the spot where Cranmer and Latimer shed their blood for the pure gospel of Christ, overrun (yet not overrun, for, blessed be God, the infection is not—at least, so we trust—widely spread) with some of the most vain and baneful absurdities of popery.” “The whole matter, doctrinal and practical, hangs together. It is essentially,—are we to have the Bible and protestantism, or the Missal and popery?”³ “The Oxford tract divines just give Rome all that she asks as a basis for the establishment of her pretensions; while they undermine those principles on which the protestant reformation was grounded.”⁴

The same work for October, 1838,⁵ declares, “If indeed we grant to Rome all that the Oxford tracts concede, there is so little left to contend for, that not a few persons are likely to follow the example of the lady, who being remonstrated with by Archbishop Laud, for turning papist, told him that she disliked a crowd, and as she saw which way he and his friends were travelling, she went on first. The Roman catholic priests confidently predict that the Oxford tract doctrines will afford power-

1) P. 661, for 1836.

2) Ibid for 1836, p. 791.

3) Lond. Chr. Obs. March, 1838,

p. 157. and Aug. 1837 and 1838, pp. 651, 711, 719, 723, 749.

4) Ibid, 1838, p. 820.

5) P. 616.

ful aid in preparing the way for the restoration of popery throughout England and Ireland, to the subversion of the protestant episcopal church as a national establishment, and its ultimate downfall as a religious communion. They are sanguine, also, as to the general effect of these doctrines, in weakening the general cause of protestantism throughout christendom."

The Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, the organ of congenial spirits in this American zion, is heard echoing back the cry of danger and alarm.¹ Every where there is a stir in the camps of our brethren. There is a rushing to their neglected arms, and a busy preparation for the expected onset. Already have many single and chosen combatants, come forth between the opposing armies, and manfully contended for the faith once delivered to the saints, against this new disguise, under which popery is coming in upon us like a flood. If we look to England, we recognize the noble bearing of her gallant bishops — John Bird Sumner, the bishop of Chester² — Shuttleworth, now bishop of Chichester³ — Daniel Wilson, bishop of Calcutta,⁴ — Archbishop Whateley⁵ — and the archbishop of Cashel,⁶ as they lead on the sacramental host of God's elect.

There too is that redoubted knight, who has made such proof of his literary prowess, in many a learned contest, the Rev. George Stanley Faber, who in his work on primitive justification, has identified this system, as it regards that grand doctrine of our faith, with Romanism.⁷

There also may be seen the Rev. Mr. Bickersteth, who has been so eminently serviceable by his writings to the cause of truth and piety, boldly proclaiming the popery of these divines.⁸ He says:— "A highly respectable, learned, and devout class of men has arisen up at one of our universities, the tendency of whose writings is departure from protestantism, and approach to papal doctrine. They publish tracts for the times; and while they oppose the most glaring part of popery — the infallibility of the pope, the worship of images, transubstantiation, and the like — yet, though the spirit of the times is marked by the opposite

1) We might, had we room, give large extracts from this paper.

2) Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839, p. 623, and in Popery of Oxf. Tr. p. 9.

3) Ibid, 1840, p. 640. and his work on Tradition, Lond. 1839, 3d edit.

4) Charge delivered to his clergy in July, 1838.

5) Dangers to the Christian Faith, Lond. 1839.

6) Lond. Chr. Obs. June, 1838, p. 393.

7) See the Primitive Doctrine of Justification Investigated, with an Appendix on Mr. Newman's Lectures, Lond. 1839, 2d ed. and as quoted in McIlvaine on Oxf. Div. ch. ii. p. 49, and in his Letter to the editor of "The Churchman," from a personal communication.

8) See Lond. Chr. Obs. 1836, p. 775.

fault, the very principles of popery are brought forward by them, under deference to human authority, especially that of the fathers, the christian ministry and the sacraments; and *undervaluing justification by faith*. With much learning and study of the fathers; with great apparent, and doubtless in some cases real, devotion; and a devotedness ascetic and peculiar; they seem to the author, as far as he has seen and known their course, to open another door to that land of darkness and shadow of death, where the man of sin reigns."

In this judgment the British Critic, before it had become fully committed as it now is, to this system, was heard also concurring.¹

Nor have there been wanting many right-hearted men, who have heard the cry of their endangered Zion, and rushed forward to her rescue. Already has the press teemed with reviews, protests, and larger works, unmasking the concealed popery of these divines, exposing their crafty stealthiness — and unbaring their insidious treachery against the protestantism of the English church.²

1) See No. 67, p. 89, for July, 1838, and in McIlvaine on Oxf. Div. p. 53.

2) Among these we would notice the following Works: 1. Oxford Tracts Unmasked, by Rev. Miles Jackson, of Leeds; 2. Essays on the Church, by a Layman, a new ed. with some observations on existing circumstances and dangers; 3. Nolan's Catholic Character of Christianity, as recognized by the Reformed Church, in opposition to the corrupt Traditions of the Church of Rome; 4. Hook's Call to Union Answered, Lond. 1839, 7th ed.; 5. The Popery of the Oxford Tracts Developed, Lond. 1839; 6. The Listener at Oxford, by Caroline Fay. See her very strong exposure of the popery of its divines, at pp. 27, 39, 48, 170, 173; 7. Powell's Essay on the Apostolical Succession; 8. Episcopacy, Tradition and the Sacraments, considered in reference to the Oxford Tracts, by the Rev. Wm. Fitzgerald, Dublin; 9. Ancient Christianity, by Isaac Taylor, vol. i. published, and vol. ii. in progress; 10. Holden on the Authority of Tradition in Matters of Religion, Lond. 1838; 11. The Popery of Oxford, by the Rev. P. Maurice, Chaplain of New and All Soul's College; 12. A Letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford, containing Strictures upon

certain parts of Dr. Pusey's Letter to his Lordship. By a Clergyman of the diocese, and a resident member of the university; 13. Observations on Mr. Keble's Sermon on Tradition, by the Rev. T. Butt; 14. The Oxford Tract System considered in reference to reserve in preaching. By the Rev. C. S. Bird; 15. This charge is also fully urged against Mr. Manning, another coadjutor of these divines, by "Clericus Cistriensis," who enumerates, among the Romish features of his argumentation, "the same ideal vision of unity, not of faith and love and holiness, BUT OF A SPECIES OF GENEALOGICAL DESCENT and sacerdotal orders, as essential to a gospel church." Lond. Chr. Obs. Ap. 1839, p. 222; 16. See also the Summary of Dr. George Miller's Charges in his Letter to Dr. Pusey, p. 70, &c. See this fully argued in the Review of Tracts for the Times, No. 90, Edinb. Rev. April, 1841, p. 146.

Testimonies against the popery of these doctrines are given in the Tract on this subject, (Lond. 1839,) from Dr. Fawcett, Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford; J. H. Browne, archdeacon of Ely, and late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; the Rev. H. McNeile, of Liverpool; Rev. H. Stowell, Minister of Christ's Church, Salford; Rev. James Scholfield, Regius Professor of Greek,

Most nobly, too, have our own American bishops, Moore,¹ McIlvaine² and Meade,³ unfurled the banner of Christ's pure gospel, and proclaimed eternal warfare against this Romish system of Oxford divinity.

But overwhelming as is this array of testimony, in substantiation of the charge of a popish tendency, against the system maintained by the Oxford divines, — there is one remaining

Cambridge; and the Rev. George Townsend, Prebendary of Durham. See also the testimony of the Rev. James Graham, curate of the cathedral, Londonderry, in Presb. Def. p. 132; of Sir Thomas Bloomfield, in his Introduction to Meade's Sermon, pp. 38, 39; of Sir John Sinclair in Report of the Edinburgh Celebration, p. 14. The clergy of the diocese of Ardagh, Ireland, specially convened Dec. 1838, unanimously protested against these Oxford divines. See in Presb. Def. p. 170. See also an Address to the Clergy of Bath, by a large body of lay members of the Church of England, in which their popery is strongly exhibited. Record, Newsp. Feb. 1840, and Plea for Presb. p. 456.

The same charge has been urged against this system by the leading journals and newspapers in England and Ireland, including the London Times, by the Edinburgh and all the dissenting periodicals, and by almost the whole religious press in this country, including the Epis. Recorder.

See also the testimonies of Dr Clark, of Philadelphia, the Rev. Josiah Pratt and Mr. Bickersteth, in Mr. Boardman's Letters to Bishop Doane, Phil. 1841, p. 22. See also the very strong declarations of the Rev. Dr. Beaseley, in *ibid.* p. 24. See also Archbishop Whateley's additional testimony in a late charge, in *ibid.* p. 48. Also, Mr. Boardman's very able Letter to Bishop Doane in the Presbyterian.

"At the late meeting of the Episcopal Convention in Virginia," says the N. Y. Observer, "one subject of general interest was discussed, — the Oxford Tracts. It was probably introduced with such promptitude, that a full and explicit vote might be had on the matter at the earliest period. The debate arose on the report of the committee on the state of religion, of which Dr. Empie of Richmond was chairman. The committee, in this

report, speak with entire decision on the subject of the Tracts, 'not only do we disclaim all sympathy with them, but we denounce them as popery in disguise;' this, I think, is the language used, and you will admit it to be sufficiently clear. One member appeared to advocate the other side of the question; and one, though he did not advocate it, was not prepared to adopt what he considered the severe language of the committee's report. But when the vote was taken on the acceptance of the report, it was carried without alteration, and, I believe, with entire unanimity. This result, embodying, as it may fairly be presumed to do, the public sentiment of the episcopal church in Virginia upon Oxfordism, no doubt created much pleasure in the bosoms of the bishops, one of whom, Bishop Meade, has recently published a work in defence of the truth against these errors."

1) The venerable Bishop Moore, is reported, in the Episcopal Recorder, to have exhorted his clergy, at the late Virginia convention, *to give no place, nor countenance, no not for an hour, to THESE ABOMINATIONS OF POPERY, issuing from Oxford*, — I say abominations of popery, for I verily believe that the very worst elements of that system are insidiously wrapped up in these writings."

2) See Oxf. Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches, &c. Phil. 1841, p. 546; a work of great power, as may be seen from the fact, that no one has yet had courage enough to grapple with it, in any fair trial of its strength. This system Bishop McIlvaine calls "popery restrained." Oxf. Divinity, p. 12. See also pp. 14, 17, 32, 132, 175, 268, 525, 507, 533, 537.

3) See a chapter on these testimonies to this subject in Bp. Meade's Sermon at the Consecration of Bishop Elliott. Appendix, ch. xv. p. 116, &c.

source of evidence which must put the matter at rest, with all impartial persons. That this system harmonizes, very essentially, with Romanism, is the unequivocal judgment of Romanists themselves.

And first, let Dr. Wiseman and his coadjutors, in the *Dublin Quarterly Review*, be heard in evidence. "We see," say they, "learned and zealous, and we have reason to believe, in some instances, amiable men, contending *in the spirit which belongs to a better church, and a better cause*, in favor of a rigid adherence to principles and doctrines which *we* must approve; yet, thereby, departing from the consistency of their professed faith, and betraying how powerless they are, in wielding the weapons which it has long since blunted, and then thrown aside."

"This tendency of the party at Oxford, to run into catholic principles for shelter, has necessarily attracted the attention of many."

"Nothing can be more clear, than that in the established church, there has been a series of learned divines, whose opinions approximated greatly to those of catholics; who thought that the reformation, however necessary, over-did its work."

"No one, we believe, save themselves, will maintain that they represent the English church, such as the reformation intended it to appear, in harsh and unyielding contrast to the catholic doctrine on the subject."

Let us now hear the testimony of the Romish journal, published at Rome, as quoted by the author of *Ancient Christianity*.² "The attention of all good catholics, and especially of the congregation for the propagation of the faith, cannot be enough excited by the present state of religion, in England, in consequence of the new doctrine, propagated with so much ability and success, by Messrs. Newman, Pusey and Keble, with arguments, drawn from the holy fathers, of which they have just undertaken a new edition, (translation,) in English. These gentlemen labor to restore the ancient catholic liturgy — the breviary, (which many of them, to the knowledge of the writer, recite daily,) fastings, the monastic life, and many other religious practices. Moreover, they teach the insufficiency of the Bible, as a rule of faith — the necessity of tradition, and of ecclesiastical authority — the real presence — prayers for the dead — the use of images — the priest's power of absolution — the sacrifices of the mass — the devotion to the Virgin, and many

1) Lond. Chr. Obs. 1838, p. 822.

2) Vol. i. p. 406, in a passage designated in the contents, — Maa-

bile avvicinemento fra protestanti alle dottrine Cattoliche.

other catholic doctrines, in such sort as to leave but little difference between their opinions, and the true faith, and which difference becomes less and less, every day. Faithful! redouble your prayers, that these happy dispositions may be increased!"

To these testimonies, we would only further add that of John, Bishop of Charleston, or as given in the *Catholic Miscellany*, and therefore, we presume, sanctioned by him.¹

"Our protestant American readers will be astonished to learn that an English protestant bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Mant, has devoted some of his leisure hours to no less an extraordinary task than translating the hymns of the Roman breviary, used by the catholic clergy, into elegant and vigorous English, we presume, 'for the use of the law-established church.' Such, however, is the fact; and a selection of his 'Roman Hymns,' published by Rivington, of London, and copied into the English *Catholic Directory*, now lies before us. This is another of the signs of the times, (of which the Pusey tracts were the earliest,) proving that an extensive and most extraordinary movement towards the ancient religion is in progress in Great Britain.

' A straw will show
How the wind doth blow.'

And here is a whole sheaf of them. The learned doctors of the protestant English universities are devoting their talents to illustrating the dogmas of the catholic church. English protestant laymen, of every grade, are daily adding to her numbers; and lastly, and certainly not least wonderful, is this new evidence of her influence — a prelate of the church establishment can find no work so congenial to his taste as rendering into the popular tongue her ceremonial hymns, which have been bitterly abused by many ignorant and bigoted writers of his own communion. If it were simply a love for this kind of composition, and not for the particular songs in question, that induced the good bishop to undertake the business, Sternhold and Hopkins left him work enough behind, upon the Psalms of David, to have occupied a life-time. But the fact must be confessed, there is latterly a dangerous but irresistible fascination in every thing popish, for the doctors and dignitaries of the English church. The establishment which resisted the radical battering-ram is giving way under their disaffection, and her weeping friends may now exclaim with Berenger: —

' For the last shot that pierced her purple pall,
Who but the muse of song the charge supplied.'

1) Number for March 14, 1840.

“We extract one of the hymns as an evidence of the perfect faithfulness with which the observances of the catholic church are preserved and insisted upon in this version of the protestant bishop.” But for the present we conclude.

1) The following additional testimony, from the Catholic Magazine for 1839, (pp. 165, 179, in Lond. Chr. Obs. Feb. 1841, p. 79,) may be added as a Note: “Most sincerely and unaffectedly do we tender our congratulations to our brethren of Oxford, that their eyes have been opened to the evils of private judgment, and the consequent necessity of curbing its multiform extravagance. It has been given them to see the dangers of the ever-shifting sands of the desert, in which they were lately dwelling, and to strike their tents, and flee the perils of the wilderness. They have already advanced a great way on their return towards that church, within whose walls the wildest imagination is struck with awe, and sobered down to a holy calm, in the enjoyment of which it gladly folds its wearied wings, &c. They have found the clue, which, if they have perseverance to follow it, will lead them safely through the labyrinth of error into the clear day of truth. Some of the brightest ornaments of their church have advocated a reunion with the church of all times and all lands; and the accomplishment of the design, if we have read aright the ‘signs of the times,’ is fast ripening. Her maternal arms are ever open to receive back repentant children; and, as when the prodigal son returned to his father’s house, the fatted calf was killed, and a great feast of joy made, even so will the whole of Christendom rejoice greatly, when so bright a body of learned and pious men, as the authors

of ‘Tracts for the Times,’ shall have made the one step necessary to place them again within that sanctuary, where alone they can be safe from the moving sands, beneath which they dread being overwhelmed. The consideration of this step will soon inevitably come on; and it is with the utmost confidence, that we predict the accession to our ranks of the entire mass.”

At a late meeting for repeal, the Rev. Mr. Hughes, a catholic priest, is reported to have said: “Are protestants aware of the fact, that, out of fifteen thousand protestant clergymen in the Church of England, eleven thousand are now professing the catholic doctrines of Dr. Pusey in the university of Oxford? Dr. Pusey and the Oxford professors of divinity, together with the great bulk of the Church-of-England clergy, have clearly seen the Church of England was in danger, and rapidly falling, and would no longer be perpetuated by any other means, except by establishing as close and proximate affinity as possible between its doctrines and those of catholicity, which have withstood the persecutions and various stratagems and efforts of eighteen centuries to destroy them. I hold in my possession the works of Dr. Pusey, and were I to be concerned in a discussion on religion, I would not desire to be furnished with better works, replete with catholic authorities, and catholic arguments, than the writings of Dr. Pusey.”

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE ELEVENTH.

NOTE A.

“*Oxford Tractarians*.—The line of defence now taken by some of the partial friends of the Oxford tractarians,” says the London Record, “is this:— ‘Though they may be wrong in some things, they have yet done great service in reviving important truths long neglected.’ A more correct statement of the case would be this:— ‘Though they have been right in some things, (and what heresiarchs have not been?) they yet have done immense mischief in reviving pernicious errors long exploded by all true protestants.’ We, in fact, know of no single truth, which may be viewed as a gospel truth, which these writers have revived: but we know of many errors, and those of the most deleterious kind, which they have brought forward anew, rendered plausible by a great show of learning, and circulated through the country to the confusion of minds of unstable men.

“We consider their case a very awful one. They occupy respectable stations. They are connected with a university of high repute in the literary world. They themselves have acquired the name of being learned, and this, certainly to the full extent of what they are entitled. And they have also added to these advantages, by maintaining a conduct strictly moral, and unusually devout, and marked with a considerable degree of austerity. Possessing all these sources of influence, they employ all their talents and all their energies, in opposition, as we firmly believe, to the interest of true spiritual religion, and in behalf of that which is formal and spurious. To neglect advantages for doing good, incurs no small guilt; but to employ them for doing mischief, incurs a much higher guilt. May they see the error of their way, lament the evils they have done, and henceforth employ their time and their talents in counteracting and neutralizing their effects!

“Another thing maintained in their behalf by some of those who are partially their friends, is, that they are most unjustly accused of being Jesuits or papists. That they are really either one or the other under disguise, is what we never believed, though it has been thought by some that there are individuals of this character belonging to the party. However this may be, it is certain that they bear a nearer resemblance to Jesuits and papists than to any of the consistent maintainers of the principles of the reformation. Who can read poor Froude’s *Remains*, without seeing that he was far more satisfied with the main principles of the Church of Rome than with those of the Church of England? And all that has been advanced by papists against scripture and in favor of tradition, has been advanced by these divines, and that with all the subtilty and plausible learning of the Jesuits. Every one acquainted with the subject knows that that there is nothing new in what they have brought forward either on this, or on high-church principles generally: the whole has been fetched out of the exuberant stores of popery. In the controversies at the reformation may be found all the arguments now employed; but most of them, it will be noted, were employed by the papists against our reformers; and not by the reformers against the papists. How, then, can any be blamed for calling these divines papists, since they themselves have mainly adopted their principles, and are constantly employing their arguments? Besides, have not papists themselves recognized them as friends, as the active and efficient promoters of the funda-

mental principles of their system? They are hailed in this country by Romish priests; they are hailed in Ireland by Romish writers in reviews; yea, they are hailed even at *Rome* as harbingers of good, as the advocates and defenders of those principles which cannot fail eventually, if they gain ground, to lead to the re-establishment of popery in this country."

"*The Popery of Oxford*.—It is a question considerably canvassed," says the London (Episcopal) Record, "to what extent Puseyism or tractarianism prevails among us. But wherever the truth lies in relation to its actual extent, there is no question that it occupies a much greater space than hitherto in the public eye. Not confined to the clergy, it occupies the attention of the laity; not shut up in the halls of Oxford, or confined to the columns of 'the tracts,' it engages the attention of the legislature, it is a chief subject in magazines and reviews, and even occupies with eager discussion the columns of the newspaper press.

"Representations are given on the one hand, fitted, we think, to enlarge it beyond its due dimensions, and others are offered calculated to reduce it within limits beyond which it really ex-patiates. Let it be remembered, also, as an important point of the case, that it exercises also a very important influence on society and the church, even where its principles and practices in their grossness are not received.

"To attempt to judge of it, as we have seen done, by estimating the number of the London clergy who have bowed their neck to the yoke, will not lead to a just conclusion. It is said, that not one medical man who had reached the age of forty, at the time of Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, ever received the truth; and it is not to be expected that men of the mature age of the London clergy generally, should hastily give in to new dogmas of this description. We suspect the direct power and influence are chiefly discernible among the younger clergy—among men at that unripe age, when it is difficult for the mind to distinguish between truth and falsehood, to separate the precious from the vile, and when the influence of names and office and learning, real or assumed, exercise a prodigious effect in the formation of opinions. And its direct influence, we have no doubt, is very great indeed, in drawing up the greater proportion of the clergy, including no inconsiderable part of the bench of bishops, to higher church principles than those they previously held, than which there cannot be a more captivating allurements for corrupt human nature.

"But to whatever extent Puseyism has hitherto prevailed, we have reached the state of mind not to be greatly surprised though it had gained a tenfold higher point than we think it has hitherto reached. It is in its essential principle the religion of nature, as that stands opposed to the righteousness of God, and all men, till they are truly taught from above (except where early evangelical training has wrought speculatively into the mind, correct doctrinal truth,) will, as earthy, cleave to that which is earthy, and reject the spiritual, to discern which they have no appropriate sense. (1 Cor. ii. 14.) * *

"They [the Oxford writers] have got *another* gospel, far more obviously and palpably so, than that embraced by the ancient Galatian church. In *principle* they are resting on works equally with the Romish apostacy. They deny this, of course, as boldly as Rome denies it; but this does not alter the case. No doubt many of them deary this and that thing in Rome. No doubt two recent articles in the *Quarterly Review*, justly attributed, we have no doubt, to Professor Sewell, contain an elaborate and able attack on popery, exhibiting the danger of some of its principles, and of many of its machinations, to the peace and security of the state, and to the safety of that branch of the church of which he is a member. And it is asked, how is this fact consistent with the principles of Puseyism being naturally the same with those of popery? The answer is at hand. The leading and fundamental principles of their *theology* may be materially one, while in its developement in religious observances, popery may have sunk into practices not necessarily arising from its fundamental unscriptural principles, and adopted also designs of universal empire, which, though appropriately following from her theological dogmas, and hostile to the civil and religious liberties of the world, are again not necessarily connected with her fundamental departure, in principle, from the truth of the gospel. The tractarians and Rome may differ from one another, in these matters, consistently

with both of them being opposed to the fundamental principles of our apostolic church, of our great reformers, and of the revelation of God to mankind.

"Puseyism, then, is an unhealthy life which has originated in the church, dissipating the spiritual sleep in which multitudes of her members lay enveloped. They have awoke to action, but they have not awoke to truth. They are teaching men, but it is not the gospel of Christ, but another gospel which they teach. We again refer those who doubt this fact, and who have any glimpse of the essential nature of the gospel of Christ, to professor Pusey's elaborated Treatise on Baptism, in the second volume of the *Tracts for the Times*. The difference produced by the change we see is this, instead of men being left alone in a state of religious indifference, they are roused to action in a wrong direction.

"From such defenders of our church, may God in his mercy deliver us. What we want for our security is, that the voice from the pulpit may concur with the voice from the desk;—that the trumpet from both may have one sound; it will then be no 'uncertain' one, but in accordance with the word of God.

"The Puseyites desire another teacher than the *word of God*, and accordingly they bring forward another witness to the truth, 'ANTIQUITY,' and place it on the same level. It is 'scripture *and* antiquity' which constitute their rule of faith.

"This prop is indispensably necessary for their system. To make it stand they must have another witness. Rome, agreeing with them in this, proceeds a step further, and shuts from the eyes of the church the original and only true witness.

"Puseyism, in fact, is but a revived form of opposition to the gospel. Spiritual sleep as surely leads men to eternal ruin as a perversion of the gospel can do. While, then, we are distressed with the progress of Puseyism, let us not be so distressed as if it had supplanted what was previously good. It may have done so in some few instances, but it may be accompanied with good fully counterbalancing this evil. It is in some respects well to awaken men to attention to religion, however erroneous the teaching. If, in God's mercy, the heart gets engaged, it will, sooner or later, be perceived that 'the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it.' Finding no rest to their souls there, they may be led to seek 'a more excellent way.'

"Let us all remember this word, when we are deposed to think that some strange thing has happened to us, 'there must needs be heresies among us, that they that are approved may be made manifest;' and let us also remember that the leading scriptural method of supplanting all heresy, is with redoubled diligence to 'preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, but to them that are called, whether Jews or Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.'"

LECTURE XII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ESSENTIALLY POPISH IN ITS TENDENCY AND RESULTS.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

HAVING in the preceding lecture fully established our position, first, that the dogmas constituting what, in its present phase, is denominated the Oxford divinity, are necessarily connected with the doctrine of prelatial, apostolical succession; and secondly, that these dogmas are characteristically Romish;—our inference is unavoidable, namely, that the tendency of this doctrine of prelatial, apostolical succession, is necessarily and certainly towards popery; that it is, therefore, to be eschewed as evil by all who love protestantism as the true faith of the gospel, and who reject popery as being contrary to God's word.

It may, however, be objected to this conclusion, that it is based merely upon opinion and theory, and not upon facts. Now, although any such objection would be most unreasonable, yet still it may be met by evidence from recent and notorious facts. Our first case will be the conversion of the Hon. G. Spencer, of England, who has recently gone over to the church of Rome, and is now one of its most enthusiastic devotees. He justly argued, that there was "no halfway house," and that consistency demanded that believing, as he did, the doctrines inculcated by these Anglican divines, and especially as it regarded scripture and tradition, he should unite himself with the church of Rome.¹

1) See Lond. Christ. Obs. 1837, p. 146.

In the London Christian Observer, for November, 1839, it is said,

"The most conspicuous convert to Romanism of late years in England, is the Hon. G. Spencer; and he was led to it directly in the path Dr. Hook

Another case, which has excited much interest, is that of a young gentleman of the name of Biden, eldest son of an East-India captain, who now holds a high official appointment at Madras. A full account of the circumstances of his conversion will be found in the London Christian Observer for January, 1841, drawn up by an approver of the Oxford Tracts, and the intimate companion of Mr. Biden.¹ He says, "his conversion and apostacy are ascribed to the writings of Dr. Pusey;" and the truth of this statement I can most positively affirm. "The staple of his conversation was derived from the Oxford tracts." "He told me he had abstained for days together from meat, in order, with his savings, to purchase Dr. Pusey's own, and other theological works of his (Dr. Pusey's) recommendation, more especially some of the early fathers; and to such had his exclusive attention been directed." "He attached," this writer further adds, "as much importance to the shape and fashion of his clerical habit as the pharisees of old to their phylacteries and hems; and spoke repeatedly of his intention to restore (as much as in him lay) the ancient discipline of the church in his choice of the alb, the cope, and other canonical vestments. This is one instance among many such."

A writer in the London Christian Observer for August, 1840, gives from his own knowledge, another example illustrative of this tendency.² "The father of the most influential Roman catholic gentleman in my neighborhood, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and a prebendary of one of our cathedrals. On one occasion³ he preached a sermon at Oxford, on the subject of the authority of the ministry, for which he received the thanks of most of the heads of Houses; with, however, the remark, made by one who dissented — that he disapproved of such doctrines as nearly resembling Romanism, and that the preacher was almost a papist. The accuracy of this judgment was afterwards made manifest, by the perversion of the preacher to the church of Rome, in whose tenets he educated his children. I received this information from a near

asserts was never trodden in the way thither. He is known repeatedly to have declared, that from what Dr. Hook called high-church divines, he learned so much that he found that he needed to learn no more; and most especially in regard to the questions of tradition and the sacraments; and thus he was led from these high-church views in the Anglican pale to what he now considers to be true church views in that of Rome. We

will corroborate our statement by a passage from the Rev. Dr. Nolan's Treatise, just published, entitled, "The Catholic Character of Christianity, as recognized by the Reformed Church, in opposition to the corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome."

1) See p. 659; also, pp. 660, 662.

2) See p. 659, also p. 660, 662

3) See p. 22.

4) See p. 475.

relation of the party, also a minister of the Church of England."

In the same work for January 1841,¹ it is reported as "an indubitable fact, that several young ladies and some young gentlemen have lately found their way to the mystical Babylon via Oxford."

That these are but examples of conversions which are rapidly increasing through the same causes, is insisted upon in the same work. "We have several times," say they,² "noticed the havoc which Dr. Wiseman and other Roman catholic controversialists are making among unstable protestants, by the aid of the suicidal admissions of the Oxford tracts."

"Divines of this class," says Dr. Wiseman, "whether living or dead, have been more than once subservient to the spread of catholicity. The late Mr. Vaughan of Leicester, was ever most assiduous in preaching to his protestant flock, on the high-church doctrine of authority in matters of faith, on the sin of dissent, and the unsafety of those who submitted and adhered not to the church; and the consequence was, that several of his congregation, convinced by his arguments, but following them up to their real conclusions, passed over to the catholic faith, and became zealous members of our holy religion. We had the pleasure of being acquainted with one who for years had exercised the ministry in the established religion, but became a convert to the truth, and, in his old age, took orders in the church. We asked him on one occasion," says Wiseman, "by what course he had been brought to embrace our religion, with so many sacrifices? He informed us that he had always been a zealous high-churchman, and had studied and held the opinions of the old (no, not the old, but the innovating Laudite) English divines. He had thus firmly upheld the authority of the church; he had believed in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed eucharist; he had regretted the destruction of ceremony and religious symbols in worship, and had fully satisfied himself on the authority of his leaders, that many catholic practices usually much decried, were blameless, and might be even salutary. His religious principles being thus formed upon the doctrines of that school, he could not avoid noticing that, practically, they were not held by the church in which he had learned them; he looked around him for some place where they might be found, and to his astonishment discovered, that among catholics his theory of christianity alone existed in a perfect and harmonious scheme.

1) See p. 21.

2) Lond. Chr. Obs. for 1838, pp. 821, 823.

He had little or nothing to change; he merely transferred his allegiance from a party to a church, and became a catholic, that he might remain a consistent protestant!"¹

As illustrative of the popish tendency of that system of which the prelatic doctrine of apostolic succession is the radiating centre of emanating light, we have thus given the conversion of many individuals through its direct instrumentality to the Romish church. To these we are sorry in being able to allude to the case of an individual, who is every way capable of rightly judging upon the merits of the case; who has given unusual attention to the whole bearings of this extensive controversy; and whose present convictions, in favor of the Roman catholic church, were *materially* influenced by the study of these Anglican divines. This most estimable individual has himself informed me, and allowed me to say, that, in coming to his present conclusions, he

1) "FACTS SPEAK.—From some late London papers we take the following facts," says the Episcopal Recorder, of Philadelphia, (for February, 1841,) "showing what is the practical influence of the doctrines of the new Oxford sect upon those to whom they are taught. We deem it a solemn duty to keep our readers informed of these facts:

"The opinions they advocate are so pregnant with danger to the best interests of the protestant church, of that church for which our fathers suffered peril, persecution, and even death itself, I cannot forbear pointing out a case which has recently come to my knowledge, (and I fear it is not a solitary one,) in which the members of the Romish church boldly and triumphantly point to the writings of Keble, Newman, &c. in support of their own idolatrous worship. The circumstance to which I refer is this. A lady has recently become a convert to the Romish faith, and a protestant friend in the neighborhood, out of an earnest desire for the welfare of her soul, wrote to her a most affectionate letter on the subject, pointing out some of the absurdities and inconsistencies of the church into which she had entered. The lady wrote in reply a very long epistle, evidently dictated by her priest, in which she refers to the writings of Keble, Newman, &c., to show that though there was a *slight* difference between the two churches on the subject of transubstantiation, yet that they (Keble and Newman) held the doctrine of

the *real presence*; maintained the authority of *tradition*; *objected* to the *Bible* being the only ground-work of the protestant faith, and in fact differed in *no material* point from the church of Rome. The writer maintains that we are to be content to call the statements of these writers errors, or anti-scriptural vagaries, for these eminent divines hold them to be the doctrines of the protestant church, and consider those in the light of *dissenters* who differ from them. Now, sir, admitting that the Oxford Tract writers do not so fully and entirely agree with the church of Rome, as her priests and people assert them to do, yet it must be evident to every candid mind, that the tendency of their doctrines is most injurious to the best interests of religion: and when a *convert to the church of Rome* quotes their writings in *justification* of what she has done, I think it can no longer be doubted but that they are to be numbered among the most dangerous enemies the Church of England ever had to contend against. What, then, are we to do? if these are right, why have we separated ourselves from the church of Rome? But if their works be evil, if they be blind leaders of the blind, if they be secretly undermining the foundations of our church, or if they be actively engaged in bringing converts within the pale of the popish communion, how is it that our bishops do not prevent men from eating the bread of the church, while they are doing all that in them lies for its destruction?"

was influenced to a very considerable extent, by the concessions embodied in the teaching of the standard Anglican divines — and that he considered it to be impossible for any man consistently to believe all that they taught, and in connexion with this very system, and yet remain out of the Roman catholic communion.¹

If, then, the tendencies of the unrenewed heart are towards popery — and if protestantism depends for its continued preservation and prosperity, upon the sleepless jealousy of its defenders — we may well be excused from the charge of officious zeal, if in repelling this excommunicating system, we lift our loud and unequivocal protest against its Romish tendencies.

Nor has the influence of these views been confined to such recent conversions. It is known that Chillingworth once turned papist, and was for some time enslaved to that wily system. Why he did so, we learn from a labored article in his defence, in the London Christian Observer:² — “But we have further to reply to Mr. Keble, that if Chillingworth became a Socinian, (which we deny,) it was far more likely that he should run into that or any other heresy, as he did for a time into popery, from the unsatisfactory and unscriptural principles in which he was educated — for Archbishop Laud was his godfather and adviser — than from having made the unerring word of God his guide. The Oxford Tract divines are very short-sighted in so pertinaciously urging the history of Chillingworth as a proof of the danger of making the Bible the only rule of faith; for it was because he did not do so from the first that he vacillated; and when he at length arrived at that conclusion, he became settled

1) In a review published in the Catholic Miscellany of Charleston, (for March 6, 1841,) of Bishop Onderdonk's Charge on the Rule of Faith, and which we conclude was written by the individual alluded to, the testimony of these Anglican divines to the Romish doctrines of infallibility, &c., is openly claimed and asserted. “The majority to which we refer in favor of infallibility,” says the reviewer, “is increased by the concurring opinions of a large portion of the clergy of the Church of England, of which the episcopal church of the United States is a branch.” Again: “A very numerous, learned and influential body of the clergy of the Church of England contend that it (i. e. tradition,) “cannot be otherwise than *divinely, infallibly true,*” and “that the whole fabric of christianity is vitally con-

nected with the question of its credibility.” (He refers to Palmer on the Ch. vol. ii. pp. 48, 49, and ref. Note z, vol. i. p. 499.) Indeed, throughout this article, the writer parries every thrust from the two-edged sword of the reviewed prelate, by holding forth the shield of some one or other of his own favorite doctors of the Oxford schoolmen. In proving “the infallibility of traditions,” (§ xxiii.) he says, “the minor is proved by the notorious acknowledgment of protestant episcopalians, one of whom maintains that ‘it is NECESSARY for the right understanding of our duty as christians, that we JOIN TOGETHER SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.’” (Dr. Brett. Trad. Necessary, p. 101. § xxv.)

2) April, 1839, p. 224; see also p. 229.

on the rock of ages. He affirms, in his account of 'what moved him to turn papist,' that it was chiefly that there must be a perpetual, unerring church; that 'the church (not the Bible) is our guide in the way to heaven;' that 'there must to the end be a succession of pastors, by adhering to whom men might be kept from wavering in matters of faith, and from being carried up and down by every wind of false doctrine.' He fancied, also, as Laud taught him, and as Mr. Keble maintains, that the scriptures are not our only guide, (under the teaching of the Holy Spirit,) but that there is an apostolical, unwritten 'depositum,' handed down by tradition, and embodied in the visible church; and hence he was easily persuaded by the Jesuit Fisher, who resided, with several other Romanist priests, about Oxford, that the church of Rome supplied exactly what his previous opinions had led him to consider necessary, but which he could not find in the protestant church. Archbishop Laud, the doctrines of whose school had thus prepared him for embracing popery, labored to remove his scruples, and induced him to return from the Jesuit college at St. Omers, and to reunite himself with the Church of England."

The author goes on to say,¹ "certain it is, that Laud was sadly harassed by his friends and pupils abiding to popery by a sort of elective attraction.² They seemed to be ever sailing on a course so near the Latin gulf-stream, that they were in constant danger of being carried away by it; and though they did not write 'tendimus in Latium' on their colors, the majority of beholders considered them eventually bound to the Italian port. The Hon. Mr. Spencer, who may probably have a cardinal's hat in due time, arrived at his destination by precisely the same mode of steering; indeed, he was not so far advanced as are some of the Oxford Tract teachers and scholars, upon the subject of authoritative tradition, and so forth — those rocks upon which so many have made shipwreck of faith — when a sudden gust induced him to complete the voyage."

It is well known, also, that James II. referred to the preface to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, and to Heylin's History of the Reformation, as the works which mainly contributed to his renunciation of protestantism.³

1) p. 225.

2) Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, in the time of Laud, advocated auricular confession, and in his will declared, "I do acknowledge the church of Rome to be the mother church. And I do verily believe that

no other church hath any salvation in it, but only so far as it concurs with the faith of the church of Rome." And yet the British Critic says he was "a consistent protestant." (Mellvaine on Oxf. Div. p. 277.)

3) Hallam's Const. Hist. ii. 514.

Nor is the danger arising to the protestant cause, from this high-church system, confined to England.

That there are those, in the episcopal churches in this country, who harmonize with these sentiments, and who, therefore, sympathize very tenderly with the Romish church, is beyond controversy. "It may be," says the Rev. John A. Clark, in his recent Letters on the Church,¹ "that there are some within our borders, that feel, and manifest a strong affinity, to the church of Rome. If there are such, they are not true sons of our church. They are enemies in disguise. While with bluster and noise, they would fain make men think they were the only true churchmen, that '*they are the people, and that wisdom will die with them,*' they are, in fact, traitors in our camp. We are not called upon to defend them, or what they teach. It is the church, and her pure doctrines, we are to advocate. The persons just referred to, are mere excrescences upon our ecclesiastical body."

That such principles are diffused to a great extent, even in this country, and are received with favor, by many in the protestant episcopal church, is a truth which cannot be questioned, and should not be concealed. It is made manifest by the fact that several of these Oxford tracts, and other similar productions, have been issued from the press of the Episcopal Tract Society, in New York.²

In one of these publications,³ which is said to have been instrumental in converting a presbyterian minister, from the error of his ways, the identity of the Romish and the Anglican churches, is openly proclaimed, and most tenderly and affectionately represented. In illustrating the difficulties experienced by the prelacy, in preserving the ancient theory of the catholic church, it is said "If no western church now-a-days is quite what its mother (i. e. 'the church of Rome,' see context) used to be, the catholic church in England, Scotland, and America, (that is, the protestant episcopal churches of those countries,⁴) surely comes nearest to her; nay, so near, that they who have well scanned the mother's lineaments, can be at no loss to trace her features in the child"!!!

That society has also republished and adopted as its own, the work of Mr. Perceval, on the apostolical succession. Now

1) Phila. 1839, p. 34.

2) See those bound up in a volume entitled, "Church Principles," and almost all the recent issues of that society.

3) Tract No. 153, "The Ancient Things of the Catholic Church."

4) This, we presume, is the explanation of the American editors, who were justly afraid that even episcopalians in this country would not readily understand this new Romish nomenclature.

in speaking of this writer, the London Christian Observer says,¹ “ Mr. Cumming has good cause to ask the Honorable Mr. Perceval why he does not go over to Rome, as the Honorable Mr. Spencer did, instead of wearing the robes, and eating the bread, of a protestant church? There is nothing essential to hinder his reconciling himself to the Harlot of Babylon; for he expressly says, ‘ I am inclined to believe *that there is NOTHING in the TRIDENTINE STATEMENTS WHICH CANNOT BE FAIRLY RECONCILED with the GOSPEL DOCTRINE.*’ ‘ It seems to me, I confess, that *it is as much in the power of every clergyman of the church of Rome, to preach the true and saving doctrine of justification, according to the New Testament, without violating the decrees of the council of Trent, as it is for the clergy of England to do, without violating the articles of their church.*’ There is another example of the Jesuistry, which we have so often complained of, in the members of this new sect.”

A writer in the Episcopal Recorder,² under the signature of “ Epsilon,” in presenting some “ facts for the church,” uses the following language :—“ Before giving the ‘ extracts ’ to which I refer, (i. e. from these high-church divines of the Oxford school,) I will enumerate their ‘ titles,’ which are my own, but which I submit to the judgment of my brethren, are fully justified by the text.

“ 1. The scriptures are not given for an initiation into the faith, but only as a safeguard against error. 2. It is almost certain that the traditionary teachings of the church catholic, can never conflict with scripture. 3. We should have a religious dread of interpreting the scriptures contrary to the fathers and ancient doctors of the church. 4. Young people should first look for their faith to the church, and not to the scriptures, to form a creed for themselves. 5. It is a matter of choice rather than of obligation, whether they shall compare these teachings of the church with the scriptures. 6. The church is an unerring guide in teaching them that there is a new birth in baptism. 7. They should not wait for any call or conversion, before they enter into full communion with the church, but they must serve God as they have been instructed by the church, take the prayer-book for their guide, and, if possible, (?) read such portions of the scriptures, as the church has appointed in the lessons, daily. 8. Belief of the *divine origin* of the creeds in the prayer-book, stands on the same ground with the canon of scripture. 9. Without the creed, we should not be able to un-

1) For 1637, p. 840.

2) In No. 52, p. 205, 1841.

derstand the scriptures aright, and to know what is most important in them to our salvation. 10. The scriptures are not a safe guide without the teachings of the church.

“Beloved brethren of the church, what think you of some of these propositions? Can you believe that they are openly propagated by a periodical of the church, to each number of which is attached the official sanction of the bishop of the diocese, by way of a standing advertisement!!! and he, too, a professor in the General Theological Seminary, an institution to which the whole church in these United States sends its candidates for orders, to be instructed in the doctrines and principles of the church? Is there nothing alarming here? Nothing that calls for humiliation, and prayer, and effort? — yea, immediate, zealous, united, efficient effort?”

In exposing, therefore, the tendencies of this prelati system toward popery¹ — in pointing out their mutual affinity, and the probable descent from the one to the other, of those who suffer themselves to be led forward by the inward bias of received opinions — we cannot surely be regarded otherwise than as performing an act of friendship toward American episcopacy, as it is based upon the constitution of the protestant episcopal church, in these United States. That while these “traitors in the camp”² (as they are justly called) may be successfully re-

1) The elemental principles of the church of Rome could not be more strongly stated than they are by the Rev. Andrew Fowler, in his Catechism, published in Charleston, in 1840. He teaches that the church is “a judge of controversies between christians in matters of private wrong, of RELIGIOUS DISCIPLINE, AND OF FAITH.” (p. 7. See also p. 15, and again p. 27. Again on p. 29 :) “No man is at liberty to act contrary to the will of God, AND THE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF WHICH HE IS A MEMBER.” Again, on p. 31, he includes among “the ordinances of divine worship,” “other festivals in honor of the birth, death, resurrection and ascension of our Saviour, and IN MEMORY OF THE APOSTLES AND MARTYRS.”

2) One of the editors of the Episcopal Recorder, after speaking of the good effects resulting from opposition to the Oxford Tracts, and giving it as his opinion that “a portion within our pale” would probably be driven in defending their system, to carry it out into its legitimate consequences, and to see that the only place where they can find true sympathy with their

views, is in the bosom of the Romish church,” he adds, “we fear, however, there are those among us who have no love for the articles and homilies of the church,—no affinity with protestantism. They would fain persuade all men that they are the only churchmen among us. They are very boisterous in this claim. Their cry continually is, ‘*The Temple of the Lord,—the Temple of the Lord,—the Temple of the Lord, are we!*’

“This class of persons have been always very forward ‘to tithe the mint, and annis and cummin,’ while they have ‘neglected the weightier matters of the law,’ and have seemed to regard it a far greater sin to deviate from a rubric, than to break one of the most sacred commandments of the decalogue. Their sympathies all lead them to the bosom of her who sitteth upon the seven hills. When they come to carry out to their legitimate results, their ideas in reference to tradition, and the sacraments and the intermediate state, they will find that any ground short of Romanism, is too *ultra-protestant*, is not sufficiently *catholic* for them.”

sisted, the spirit of liberty, of liberality, and of piety, may be aroused in the true-hearted sons of that most worthy branch of the catholic and apostolic church.¹

We have now made good our proposition, that this prelatie theory is essentially popish. It is so, when we examine the elemental principles common to both systems. It is so, because it involves, as necessary consequences, the whole system now understood as "Oxford divinity," or "Puseyism," but which has ever been found in association with high-church principles; and because this system is undeniably Romish.

This conclusion has been irrefragably established by the testimony of friends and of foes — of those within and without the church — of episcopalians and Romanists. But as this is a point of great practical moment, and one upon which much feeling has been excited and great ignorance prevails, we will add some further remarks.²

Admit this doctrine, that the whole authority and promised efficacy of the church is given by delegation, to this prelatial succession, in perpetuity, and can only be received through and by means of it — and how could we justify ourselves in remaining separate from the Romish church? She confessedly, as these divines teach, possesses that true, original, and heaven-ordained succession, upon whose validity depend entirely, the hopes and character of the English prelacy and the American episcopacy. This succession, the Roman church declares she never gave to the English, in her independent character, and its transference, as she teaches, could only be made by her express intention to convey it. Even when surreptitiously possessed, it was, as this Romish church teaches, again forfeited and lost after the reign of Mary, and is now entirely wanting in the English and American prelacy. But that it still remains in all its plenitude in this mother of churches, these writers, on the contrary, freely allow; although they would substantiate a charge of schism against the Romish churches within their dioceses. And how, therefore, is it possible for any one, who thoroughly believes these high-church principles, to hesitate about connecting himself with a church which, as he is thus taught, possesses the

1) See Note A.

2) Our discussion has been in some measure anticipated by the very able reply of the Rev. H. A. Boardman, of Philadelphia, to Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, who had *very conveniently* passed by an octavo volume on the same subject, by an associated member of the prelacy, and seized, as

a prey worthy of his capacious bite, upon a single sentence in a short discourse, and incidentally brought in by a presbyterian clergyman. In this case, however, the "biter was bitten." Our discussion, which had been delivered before Mr. Boardman's publication, is still needed, as the above fact will show.

true succession, and which succession, with all the assurance of infallibility, she declares is not enjoyed by the English or American prelacy?

True, the Romish church teaches many things hard to be believed, which can only be received by an implicit faith, and which many wrest to their destruction; but so also do the abettors of this doctrine.¹ True, the Romish church claims divine authority for traditions oral as well as written; but so also do these divines.² True, the Romish church claims authority to interpret the scriptures, and to give their meaning to the people; and so also do these divines.³ The Romish church attributes a necessary efficacy to the sacraments, by which, of themselves, they are available to salvation; and so also do these church principles.⁴ Does the church of Rome make baptism regeneration and justification? so also does this high-church party. Does the church of Rome teach that in the act of consecration, there is made a real change in the bread and the wine, so that Christ is really present under these signs, and that the eucharist is a true and proper sacrifice? so do these divines.⁵ Does the church of Rome teach that men are not justified by the imputed righteousness of Christ, but by an inherent righteousness wrought within them? so also do these divines.⁶ Does the Romish church claim for herself infallibility? the prelacy claims indefectibility; so that while the one CANNOT err, the other NEVER HAS and NEVER CAN FALL AWAY.⁷ Does the church of Rome throw uncertainty over as many truths as possible, in order to increase the power and influence of the clergy, and subject the laity more entirely to their ghostly rule? so does the prelacy.⁸ Does the Romish church, in order to enslave the mind, becloud the free and gracious mercy of God? so do these divines teach that there is no certainty of pardon for sins committed after baptism.⁹ Does the Romish church assert the existence of a purgatory? so does the prelacy that of an intermediate place, where may be sent especially the souls

1) See Lect. iv. p. 84.

2) Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 15, 20, 48. Oxf. Tr. vol. iv. p. 1, Tr. 80, Eng. ed. See Keble on Prim. Trad. Newman on Rom. pp. 335, 329. Lond. Chr. Obs. 1840, pp. 86, 215.

3) Dr. Pusey's Letter, pp. 18, 20. Brit. Crit. 1839, pp. 456, 459, 461, 465.

4) Newman on Rom. pp. 409, 410; Palmer, vol. i. pp. 310, 313, 315, 317; Dr. Pusey's Letter, pp. 85, 87, Am. ed.; Oxf. Tr. vol. iv. p. 21, Eng. ed.

5) See Tract No. 81, in vol. iv. Eng. ed. Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 26, Am. ed. and 55; Dr. Hook in Lond. Chr. Obs.

Nov. 1839, p. 657; Oxf. Tr. No. 81, p. 47, vol. iv. Eng. ed.; Palmer, vol. i. pp. 518, 524, 525, 527, 530.

6) See Newman's Lect. on Justification, and all of their writings, and McIlvaine on the Oxf. Div.

7) Brit. Crit. 1839, pp. 461, 465; Newman's Lecture on Rom. 192, 193, 233, 234, 259; Dr. Pusey's Letter, Am. ed. p. 29.

8) Newman on Rom. pp. 112, 114, 327; Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839, p. 699.

9) Newman on Rom. pp. 114, 144; Dr. Pusey's Letter, pp. 60, 62.

of those who are "neither fit for heaven or hell."¹ Does that church teach the propriety and duty of invoking saints? so do these divines.²

Does the church of Rome teach that it is right and proper to offer up prayers for the dead? — so do these writers abundantly affirm.³ Does the church of Rome deny the sufficiency of the Bible, as a perfect and infallible rule of faith and practice? — so, also, is it declared by these divines.⁴ Does that church discredit the indiscriminate circulation of the scriptures among the people? — so do these very writers.⁵ Does that church uphold the divine and superior sanctity of virginity, and the celibacy of the clergy? — and so, also, do these divines.⁶ Does the Romish church inculcate the necessity of reserve in communicating the doctrines of the Bible? — and so, also, do these divines.⁷ Does the Romish church teach that the church has — and ought to exercise — the power to ENFORCE HER TEACHING and to DEMAND for THIS PURPOSE the AID of THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE? — and so do these divines.⁸ Does that church claim a plenary authority to absolve men from their sins? — and so, also, do these writers.⁹

Does that church teach us, that there are more sacraments than two? — so, also, do these writers.¹⁰ Does it affirm the duty of confession to the priest? — this also is retained, as these divines teach, in the Church of England.¹¹ Does that church conduct her services in a dead language, altogether unknown to the common people? — and do not these divines regret that the liturgical services are in English?¹² Does that church utterly repudiate, either the right or duty of the exercise of private judgment? — and so, also, and in the very strongest manner, do these divines.¹³ Does the Romish church deny to the laity, any interference in the ecclesiastical government of the church? — so also do these

1) Newman on Rom. p. 213.

2) Palmer, vol. i. pp. 210, 212, and 508; Dr. Pusey's Letter, pp. 133, 138.

3) Bishop Seabury, in British Crit. 1839, pp. 311, 312; Newman on Rom. p. 220; Lon. Ch. Ob. 1840, p. 205.

4) Newman's Lect. on Rom. pp. 36, 69, 180, 471, &c.; Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 39, 64, 319, 358; Palmer, vol. i. p. 220.

5) Lond. Obs. Nov. 1839, p. 660; Dr. Pusey's Letter, Oxf. Tr. vol. iv. Tr. 80, 70, 71, Eng. ed.; Anct. Chris. vol. i. p. 453, 464.

6) Newman on Rom p. 327; Brit. Cr. Oct. 1839, pp. 445, 457; Dr. Pusey's

Lect. Am. ed. pp. 140, 145; Anct. Chr. vol. i. pp. 391, 394, 396, 469, 472, 546.

7) Oxf. Tr. vol. iv. Tr. 80, &c.; Lon. Ch. Obs. 1840, pp. 164, 168; Anc. Christ. vol. i. pp. 459, 468, 500, 506.

8) See the Lecture on the intolerant tendency of this system.

9) Passim.

10) Palmer, vol. i. p. 523; Dr. Pusey's Letter, pp. 57, 64, 65; Palmer, vol. i. p. 439.

11) Palmer, vol. i. p. 518.

12) See Anct. Christ. vol. i. p. 472

13) Newman's Lect. on Rom. p. 292, &c. 293, &c. 323, 339. See Froude's Declarations in Presb. Def. p. 201.

divines.¹ Does it make the people absolutely dependent upon their ghostly rulers, as the agency to whom God has committed their souls?—this, also, is the very doctrine of prelacy.² Does the Romish church hate and detest the reformation, with a perfect hatred?—not less do these divines pour upon it all manner of obloquy and reproach.³ Does that church regard the glorious revolution of 1688, as rebellion and impiety?—their sentiments are echoed back from the chairs of Oxford.⁴ In short, does the Romish church concentrate her pestiferous errors, and perpetuate them, by the reverence attached to the daily use of her breviary? have not these divines re-published it substantially for her—adopted it among the number of their tracts—held it up to admiration and reverence—eagerly pressed its re-adoption and

1) See the Lecture on Intolerance, as above referred to.

2) Brit. Crit. 1839, p. 310: “the agency on earth to which the care of the soul has been intrusted.”

3) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. 241.

That these high-church writers are dissatisfied with the Prayer Book, and with some of the views and principles of the English reformers, see proved in Bishop Meade’s sermon at the consecration of Bishop Elliott, Appendix, chap. xviii. p. 133.

“I believe it will appear that the great work of the reformation was chiefly conducted by lay counsels, in opposition to the clergy. They were active in none of the changes except in the restoration of popery under Queen Mary, and in the cruelties of her reign.” Sir Michael Foster Knt. in his examination of Bishop Gibson’s Codex Juris Eccl. Angl. p. 45.

Newman in Quart. Rev. pp. 306 and 308.

See also Plea for Presbytery, p. 122.

They acknowledge there is but little difference, and an essential agreement with popery. Palmer, vol. i. pp. 181, 185, and 210, 211, 231, 237, 276, 277, and vol. ii. p. 17, 130, 248; Newman on Rom. p. 54; Dr. Hook in Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 171, 172, 173, 175; Percival in Bib. Rep. 1838, p. 112. They advocate union with her; Palmer, p. vol. i. 232; Brit. Crit. 1839, pp. 399, 416, 421. They regret separation from her; Bishop Smith in Bib. Rep. 1836, p. 29. For other popish practices, see Hook’s Call to Union, Am. ed. pp. 110, 118, 126; Lond. Chr. Obs. Ap. 1838, pp. 233 and 37.

On the identity of these doctrines and those advanced by Archbishop Laud, see Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans, Eng. ed. in five vols. vol. ii. pp. 147, 157, 158, 168, 178, 190, 221, 223, 254, 261, 397, 417, 419—vol. iii. p. 167, and the whole account of his trial, and particularly at pp. 170, 173, 182, 187; also shown by McCrie in Report of the Edinb. Celebration, pp. 31, 32; the London Christian Observer therefore denominates this party the Laudean school or sect.

This doctrine of high-churchism also bases itself upon the popish tenet, the intention of the administration. Thus is it constantly argued, that presbyters have no right to ordain, because “the bishops who ordained them did not *intend* to confer such power.” Wks. on Episco. vol. ii. p. 325.

Dr. Bowden says, “but no bishop ever gave a presbyter authority to ordain. (Letters, 1st series xxi. vol. ii. p. 278.) The utmost authority given is to *preach the word*, and to administer the sacraments. Whence, then, did those presbyters who first ordained, derive that power? The office of a presbyter is a gift *mediately* from Christ. But a person who receives a gift, receives just as much as the gift implies, and not a tittle more. But the power of ordaining was not a part of the gift to the presbyters at the reformation. How then could they ordain others when they were not empowered so to do?” And how could prelatists, when they were never so empowered, and are now under excommunication?

4) See Lecture xiii. p. 320.

private use — and included in their edition of it, invocations to the virgin Mary and other gross impieties ?¹

“ Look now on this picture — and on this.”

Seeing, then, that in all these respects, the prelacy and the papacy are distinguished from each other, though not essentially distinct ;² by what possible motive, is a firm believer in the fundamental importance and necessity of this doctrine of apostolical succession to be withheld from at once uniting with that church, which on this ground has acknowledged certainty and security, and on other grounds is scarcely more objectionable than the prelacy itself? And how are those to be blamed, who—being fully indoctrinated in this theory, and taught to seek “ the ancient things of the catholic church,” rather than the true sayings of God and the doctrines of his word, and who being led to reverence and regard the Romish church as their mother, and to glory in resembling her as much as may be—have given their preference to the mother, rather than to her disowned and doubtful child ?³ For ourselves, we utterly reject the foundation-principle on which the whole of this superstructure rests. We regard it as equally devoid of authority in God’s word — or in history — or in fact—and with it we denounce as superstitious, evil, and most deadly and pernicious to the civil and the spiritual interests of men, this whole mass of error.⁴

1) See Oxf. Tr. No. 75, and Lon. Chr. Obs. 1838, pp. 710, 743.

2) Thus, also, Bishop Skinner (6th Lect. in Lent, in Presb. Letters, p. 397) says, “ One great reason why we, who call ourselves ministers of the gospel, deny that there is any proper sacrifice to be offered in the christian church, is because our *commission* is not such as would justify our meddling with that *essential*, that awful part of the priestly office.”

See this connexion also fully established by numerous proofs in Beverly’s Heresy of Human Priesthood, Lond 1839, Letter xviii. p. 74. We will add one illustration from p. 77, Note :

“ It is a canon of piety with all the Oxford school, that their priests should turn their backs to the people, during the time of prayer in the church service. For this purpose they have their favorite ‘ fald-stool ’ placed before the altar, on which the priest kneels, with his face to the stone cross on the altar and his back to the people. This is the fashion at Mr. Newman’s church, at Littlemore, near Oxford. Pope Innocent III. in his book on the Mysteries of the Mass, decided that the

priest should perform the service with his back to the people, and assigns this reason for the practice : because it is written, ‘ thou shalt see my back parts.’ Ex. xxxiii. 13. The real reason is, to impress the idea of the total separation and distinction between the priest and the people ; as if the priest were performing some mystery apart from the laity.

3) See Newman on Rom. p. 324, “ nothing but prudential motives.”

4) While the doctrinal system of high-church prelacy is thus so manifestly identical in all that is essential with Romanism, it is as plainly opposed to protestantism. This will be at once apparent, from the following contrast, taken from the London Record :

PUSEYISM.

“ Thou dost soothe the heart, thou church of Rome ! ”
— [Lyra Apostolica.

“ Rome was our mother, through whom we were led to Christ.” — [Tracts for the Times, No. 77, p. 33.

“ Scripture and tradition, taken together, are the joint rules of faith.” — [Ibid, 78, p. 2.

PROTESTANTISM.

“ The one great apostacy from the truth ; the declared object of Divine displeasure.” — [Bishop Van Mildert.

“ The Church of Rome was ever our mother’s mother ; our Christian faith came not from the seven hills.” — [Bishop Hall.

“ The written word of God is the sole rule of our faith and practice.” — [Bishop Tomline.

Now if prelatists, or any of them, will resent these consequences as an unjust imputation upon their character and principles, we can only rejoice at their inconsistency. But that they are inconsistent with their own inculcated tenets, and that the Romish church is only consistent — even while apostate — in carrying them out to their legitimate results, must, we think, be apparent.

“With what face, then, with what consistency,” to resume the argument of Mr. Palmer, from which we have already quoted, “can those who object to these results and conclusions, maintain the principle from which they are inevitably derived — and maintain it in common with those who avow these consequences — and maintain, too, that identical succession, from which these awful consequences have flowed?”¹¹

These church principles, therefore, as they are now revived, diffused, and authenticated, by so many able and learned prelatists — and founded, as their great fundamental principle, upon this doctrine of the apostolical succession, “smell rank,” as Melville would say, “of papistry and the arrogance of the shavelings.”¹² “These principles,” says their elaborate reviewer, Mr. Isaac Taylor, “embrace every element of the papal tyranny, cruelty, profligacy, and spiritual apostacy, and if

¹¹ *Revelation*, wherever found, in Scripture or antiquity.”—[British Critic for Jan. 1838, p. 224.]

¹² “The Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine grace.”—[Advertisement to vol. i. of Tracts.]

¹³ “Intrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ’s body and blood.”—[Tr. 10, p. 4, ed. of 1834.]
¹⁴ “The Church of England nowhere restrains her children from praying for their departed friends.”—[Ibid, vol. iii. p. 22.]

¹⁵ “The Tridentine Decree declares, that it is good and useful, suppliantly to invoke the saints, and that images of Christ, and the Blessed Virgin, and other saints, should receive due honor and veneration;— words which themselves go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious christian, though possibly admitting of an honest interpretation.”—[Ibid, 71, page 17.]

¹⁶ If this writer had referred to the Church Catechismo, he would have learnt from it that the sacraments are not sources of grace, but means of grace.

“They which add tradition as a part of supernatural, necessary truth, have not the truth, but are in error.”—[Hooker.]

¹⁷ “It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe.”—1 Cor. i. 21.

¹⁸ “It is on both sides confessed that the word of God outwardly administered, (his Spirit inwardly concurring therewith), converteth, edifieth and saveth souls.”—Hooker.

¹⁹ “As if a man could make his Maker.”—Dr. Isaac Barrow.

²⁰ “As the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man goeth straightways either to heaven or to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.”—[Homily on Prayer.]

²¹ “What doctrine can possibly be invented to cross and contradict the scriptures more plainly than this doth?”—Bish. Beveridge.
²² “A church corrupted with idolatry, very much the same, in kind and degree, with the worst that ever prevailed among the Egyptians or the Canaanites?”—[Bishop Horsley.]

²³ “The prevailing notion of bringing forward the atonement, explicitly and prominently on all occasions, is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of scripture.”—[Ibid, 36, p. 74.]

²⁴ “What is the distinction between lesser and greater, venial and mortal sins? or if mortal sins be sins against the Decalogue, as St. Augustine says, are they only the highest degrees of those sins, or are they the lower also?”—[Preface to Tract 67, p. 14.]

²⁵ “A theology which differs from our own, in considering that faith and not baptism is the primary instrument of justification.”—[Newman on Justification, p. 31.]

²⁶ “The argument of ultra-protestantism may be taken; and we may say, ‘The Bible, and nothing but the Bible,’ but this is an undenialful rejection of another great gift equally from God.”—[Tr. 71, p. 8.]

1) *Spiritual Despot*. pp. 325, 341, and all chap. vii. and ix; see also *London Chr. Obs.* Nov. 1839, pp. 659, 661.

2) *Neal’s Puritans*, vol. i. p. 124.

²⁷ “Dwell in your discourses . . . on the one sacrifice of Christ once offered; on the inefficacy of all other means of atonement; on Christ the only Mediator and Intercessor.”—[Bishop Barrington.]

²⁸ “The known distinction of mortal and venial sins, which neither hath God ever allowed, neither, while he gainsays it, will ever the protestant.”—[Bishop Hall.]

²⁹ “The doctrine of sacramental justification is justly to be reckoned amongst the most mischievous errors that are in the Church of Rome.”—[Bishop Burnet.]

³⁰ “The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of protestants.”—[Chillingworth.]

left to work themselves out according to their proper quality, they can have no other issue." "It is equally true that men professing such principles, if once seated in the chair of power, and holding an unchecked license to mould the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of a country at their will, would do nothing less than establish a ghostly tyranny, which in less than a century must place the lives, fortunes, bodies, and souls of the community, at the absolute disposal of a college of priests."¹

The argument of the archbishop of York in the British parliament in 1551, is still, therefore, unanswerable, and with it we will conclude. Either the church of Rome is a true and pure church, or false and apostate. If true and pure, then the Anglican church, being excommunicated by her, and separated from her, is herself false, and has no true or valid succession on which to rely. If, on the contrary, the church of Rome is apostate, then is her succession invalid and worthless, and the Anglican hierarchy, however pure, is equally cut off from any true succession.² There is no middle space between popery and prelacy. They are in heart, in principle, one and the same — and, however different, they are not distinct.

1) See Anct. Christ. vol. i. p. 426.

2) This Mr. Palmer frequently avows; see vol. ii. p. 232; see also Edward's Preacher, vol. ii. p. 183; see

Bib. Repert. 1836, p. 20, and Dr. Mason's Wks. vol. iii. p. 333.

See Note B.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE TWELFTH.

NOTE A.

WHAT are we to think of the following pamphlet which has just been sent forth?

“A LETTER ON CHRISTIAN UNION, ADDRESSED TO THE BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN THE UNITED STATES, BY THE RIGHT REV. FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, BISHOP OF ARATH, AND COADJUTOR OF THE BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA.”

We will here give a portion of this wonderful production, and will only ask—could any one take such liberties where no encouragement had been given?

“Right Reverend Sirs: A few years since, some remarks on christian union, from the pen of one of your body, led me to address to him a letter, wherein I extended the principles he laid down to what I conceived to be their legitimate consequences. At a later period, an elaborate work, addressed to the catholic hierarchy, by another dignitary of your communion, which concluded with overtures for union, emboldened me to write a treatise in defence of the primacy of the apostolical see, which is the essential centre of catholic unity. Neither the letter nor the treatise has been noticed by either of the prelates. In the mean time, controversy beyond the Atlantic has taken a retrograde march, and, in a celebrated English university, several points of ancient faith and discipline have been vindicated with much learning; popular errors and prejudices have been attacked and overthrown; and principles have been put forward, which the admirers of the new school, as well as its adversaries, seem now to regard as the preliminaries to peace and concord between the Anglican establishment and the Roman catholic church.

“The late tract of the Rev. Mr. Newman not obscurely favors the infallible authority of catholic councils, which he carefully distinguishes from convocations by royal authority, the inspiration of the books called Deutero-Canonical, the seven sacraments, purgatory and prayers for the dead, indulgences, invocation of saints, the real presence, the sacrifice of mass, and other controverted doctrines. Whilst appearing to wish to guard the members of the establishment from straggling towards Rome, he sufficiently betrays a desire to re-establish all the ancient doctrines in the Anglican church, that thus it may be prepared for returning to the communion of the catholic church. He remarks that the leading spirits of the age have observed the many indications of a general desire to return to something that is only to be found in the church of Rome, — the reverential awe for the mysteries of faith, and the tenderness of christian devotion.”

As it is not our object to oppose specially the Oxford tracts — or their authors — or the numerous publications of a similar character now teeming from the press, except so far as they illustrate the spirit and tendency of high-churchism, whose principles have at every period of her history, found numerous advocates in the Church of England, and an increasing number also in the American prelacy — we will not refer to the proceedings which have been entered upon in opposition to the Oxford tractators. These are now matters of sufficient notoriety and are omens for good.

NOTE B.

It is an old adage, that a man is known by his friends. If this is true, then, the peculiar favor shown by prelatists toward the Romish church, while others are scornfully disavowed, is a further evidence of their relationship.

"In the American church," says Mr. Caswall, rector of Christ's church, Madison, Indiana, (Brit. Crit. Oct. 1839, pp. 338, 339, 341,) "the church of Rome is acknowledged, though *corrupt*, to be a *true* church. Nothing can be more exactly worded; but if it is a true church, it must be living, and if living, it must have the gifts of grace, whatever its corruptions may be. It cannot be an outside only. It must have a real faith, and heart, and obedience. It must be in the main orthodox, AS IT IS; for that church which holds aright the doctrines of the holy trinity, incarnation atonement, original sin, regeneration, and the last judgment, we take to be in the main orthodox.

"Now taking the thirty-nine articles, as the exactest form of apostolic truth, still we must consider that the quakers and Dutch reformed deviate from them, as far as the Roman catholics.

"The Rev. Samuel Wix," says Mr. Bristed, (Thoughts, &c. p. 456,) "likewise, is too stout an exclusive churchman, to desire to conciliate, or unite with any protestant dissenters. He prefers coalescing with the pope, to uniting with any non-episcopalian, however sound in scriptural doctrine; however fervent in evangelical faith; however pure and holy in a life regulated by the precepts of his blessed Redeemer. 'No,' says he, 'the union is *not* desired between members of the (English) church and schismatics; but between the church of Rome, and the church of England; *if*, indeed, they may be designated as churches under *different* names. Union is *not*, indeed, nor *ought* to be desired between the true apostolical church, and those who renounce apostolical discipline; but union between the church of England, and the church of Rome, on proper christian grounds."

"The impiety of protestant non-episcopalians is far more injurious to gospel truth, than the errors attaching to the Roman catholic faith."

The relationship of high-churchism and popery is thus graphically illustrated: (Evang. and Lit. Mag. vol. ix, pp 554, 555.) In the market place in Dublin once—Ireland is the country of the bishop of Limerick, and other high-churchmen—it was proclaimed in good Hibernian brogue, "I publish the bans of marriage between the church of England and the church of Rome." A voice was heard in the crowd, "I forbid the bans!" "For what reason?" cried the herald. "Arrah," rejoined the other, "because the parties are too near akin." It is even so. There is near consanguinity between high-church all the world over. And it requires attention and care, to discriminate between what may pass for *tolerable protestantism* among high-churchmen and downright popery."

That the very principles on which prelacy founds its apostolical traditions, have been made the basis of the Romish traditions, is certain.

"Besides, does not your church in this matter infringe the law of charity in another point of view, for must not her anxious retaining and enforcing of her ceremonies tend to harden Roman catholics in their superstition? It is certain that it has had this tendency in time past. Thus it has been shown that Martiall, from the sign of the cross, as used by you, vindicates the popish crossing; that Parsons and Bristowe, (two Romish controversialists,) regard the English Service Book as countenancing their Mass Book; that the Rhemish divines extract from your 'Absolution of the Sick,' a kind of approval of their rites of absolution and auricular confession; and lastly, justify their feast of the assumption of Mary, by reference to the various feasts observed by the Church of England. As a further illustration of this, it is stated in the life of Bishop Hall, that in his voyage up the Maese, he had what he calls 'a dangerous conflict with a Carmelite friar, who argued from the English protestants, insisting on kneeling at the sacrament, that they recognized the doctrine of transubstantiation.'" (Life of Bishop Hall prefixed to his Contemplations, p. 16.)

Mr. Keble argues that the deposit committed by Paul to Timothy, (2 Tim. 1, 14,) "did comprise matter, independent of, and distinct from, the truths,

which are directly scriptural"—"church rules" and "a certain form, arrangement and selection of the whole;" "and also a certain system of church practice, both in government, discipline and worship." (Keble on Trad. 4th ed. p. 21.)

Further: "As often as Tertullian and Irenæus have false teachers to reprove," &c. "do they not refer to the tradition of the whole church, as to something independent of the written word, and sufficient at that time to refute heresy even alone." (See p. 23.) "Do they not employ church tradition as parallel to scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the church, but by authority of that Holy Spirit which inspired the real teaching itself, of which such tradition is the record?" (p. 24.) On p. 25 he argues, that, had the scriptures not been written or perished, tradition alone would have been sufficient for the whole christian world.

Nay, he goes on to say that "apostolical tradition was DIVINELY APPOINTED in the CHURCH, as the TOUCHSTONE OF CANONICAL SCRIPTURE ITSELF." (p. 27.) And that "its despisers are despisers of the scripture itself." (p. 28.) And that "where scripture is silent, or ambiguous, consent of the fathers is a probable index of apostolical tradition." (p. 23, Note.) It is thus "presumption, irreverence, to disparage the fathers under a plea of magnifying scripture," since "the very writings of the apostles were to be first tried by it, before they could be incorporated into the canon." (p. 28.)

Nay, without this tradition, Mr. Keble "does not see how we could now retain real inward communion with our Lord, through his apostles." (p. 38.) He also encourages us to hope that the church may even yet "be so happy as to recover more" of these "precious apostolical relics," by the supernatural guidance of the Holy Spirit. So that the canon of inspired rules and doctrine, is yet open to alteration or amendment. (See p. 42.)

LECTURE XIII.

THE PRELATIC DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION INTOLERANT IN ITS TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

WE will now urge it as a distinct argument against this doctrine, that by its past working, and the facts of history, it is proved to be, in its necessary tendency, intolerant and despotic, antichristian and anti-republican. On this part of our subject, we have ample materials on which we might enlarge, but we will endeavor to be brief.

That this doctrine — to wit — “that there is not one of these prelates who cannot trace his right to guide and govern Christ’s church, and to ordain its ministers, through a long line of predecessors, up to the favored persons who were consecrated by the laying on of the holy hands of St. Peter and St. Paul,” necessarily tends to the establishment of a spiritual despotism, is apparent, not only from its direct and necessary tendency to popery, but also, as has been in part shown, from other considerations. It clothes an order of men with a supremacy which is by divine right; and resistance, therefore, to which, is rebellion against God. It vests in this separate and exclusive order of ecclesiastical rulers, a separate jurisdiction, as well legislative, executive, as judicial; and with which there is no right, in any lower order, or in the laity, to interfere. It asserts a claim of implicit obedience, on the principle of faith, and not of reason, to this church authority. This obedience is made to extend to the canons put forth by these ecclesiastics, as fully as to the word of God.² This authority of prelates, we are expressly told, not merely extends to those powers of administration and of superin-

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 232.

2) See form of consecration by the present bishop of Charleston, in Gos-

pel Messenger, Aug. 1840, p. 155. Also the British Critic, 1839, pp. 429, 430, 445.

tendence over his clergy, *quæ sunt ordinis*, but to a separate authority which is called jurisdiction; and "which is vested in them as depositaries, by the apostles." This power is indefinite.¹ It involves "judicial proceedings before the bishop"²—and "criminal jurisdiction." This jurisdiction is further inherent in the bishop, and emanates from the word of God," and "which may be demonstrated to be inherent in episcopacy." This "canonical yoke" is to "be exercised after an inquisition," and "the inquisition should be conducted with secrecy, and in a summary manner;" for "the principle on which all church discipline rests, is obedience," and "the necessity of obeying ecclesiastical superiors."³

This authority of the prelates, who are, *de facto*, the church, is only limited by their own good pleasure; and our security against oppression rests, we are gravely told, upon the improbability "that the bishops would oppress their clergy."⁴ Thus does the Romish church give us the assured promise of the Holy Spirit, that their infallibility will be infallibly right—and both on as good, but no better grounds, than the religion of Ormuzd, which forbade the Persian despot to ordain any thing but what was good and right, while at the same time it made right whatever he did ordain; and secured to him all authority to ordain whatsoever he pleased.

This authority embraces, further, the interpretation of the Bible; which is to be determined by the universal consent of these prelates, mysteriously preserved through an indeterminate period, which may be lengthened or abridged just as necessity may require. It includes, also, the power to decree rites and ceremonies, and, generally, to supervise and order the affairs of the sanctuary. In this plenitude of episcopal grace, is embraced the power of absolution—that most tremendous engine of ghostly tyranny—and the powers of canonization, consecration, and pronouncing of anathemas, which are also parts of this invisible jurisdiction.

Now the very fact, that for all this assumption of supreme jurisdiction, prelates are without any shadow of support in the word of God, has only led them to insist upon it with the great-

1) "The indefinite nature of episcopal jurisdiction." Cardwell's Document. Annals, vol. i. pp. 288, 317, 412.

2) "The office of consecration WARRANTS every bishop to claim BY THE WORD OF GOD for the correcting and punishing such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, (i. e.) for the exercise of ALL MANNER of spiritual

discipline within his diocese." Bishop Gibson Codex Juris Ecclesiast. Anglic. in Foster's Exam. of, p. 8. Also, pp. 10, 18, 47, 51, 103.

3) See an Art. on Ecclesiastical Discipline in the British Critic, April, 1839, pp. 447, 446, 429, 430, &c.

4) Brit. Crit. 1839, App. p. 447, and Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 327.

er earnestness, and to enforce it with sterner measures of compulsory benevolence. For it being once assumed, that such an order, with such rights and duties, is essential to the existence of the church, and the church to the salvation of souls; of course, all measures became necessarily right, and even merciful, by which this authority of prelates might be sustained against heretics and opposers.¹

Hence we find the earliest of the order, as, *par eminence*, Ignatius, leaning upon authority, for the preservation of their asserted dignity; and thus "laying the first steps of the papal pandemonium,"² in their sacerdotal ambition. This prelatial arrogance had reached a height of preposterous extravagance, as early as the third and fourth centuries; and was unquestionably based upon the perversions of truth, and the corruptions of gospel simplicity, introduced as early as the first century.³ The martyr church thus became itself, by its inherited principles, the executioner of countless multitudes of martyrs. The prelates, at least some of them, of the Cyprianic and following ages, seem to have been filled to overflowing with the most enormous notions of spiritual transcendency, and divine prerogative; and really to have believed, that they were ordained as the means of "immediate connexion between God and man — the chain between time and eternity."⁴ Heaven and earth

1) See Athanasius, in Potter on Ch. Govt. p. 171. Chrysostom, p. 173. Cyprian, pp. 164, 161.

"The following just remarks are from an article in a late number of the American Biblical Repository:

"Real intolerance, the intolerance of the heart, is seldom or never seen by the possessor in its true light. It is sincere, indeed; but there can be no more hurtful form of bigotry than that of deluded fanaticism. Instigated by this spirit, men are guilty of unrighteous oppression, and verily think they are doing God service. Persecutors and persecuted, in multitudes of instances, have been alike animated with sincere zeal for what they considered the right. 'There can be no doubt,' says the persecutor, 'that my views are correct, and that he who does not adopt them endangers his spiritual welfare. It must be a benevolent act to appeal to the temporal interests of my neighbor for the good of his soul. Therefore I am bound to try, by pains and penalties, yes, if it be necessary, by the menace of death itself, to bring him from his

errors into the true faith; and if the actual infliction of death upon him will deter others from injuring their own souls by the same or like errors, does not philanthropy require the stroke?' One of the popes, in a letter enjoining all true followers of the church to ferret out heretics, and punish them with death if they proved obstinate, sustains his injunction by the following argument: 'The man who takes away *physical* life, is punished with death. Now, *faith* is the source of *eternal* life; for it is written: 'The just shall live by faith.' How much more guilty, then, than a common murderer, and how much more worthy of death, must a heretic be, who robs people of their faith — of eternal life!'

"Such is the sophistry with which intolerance has in all ages deceived, or sought to defend itself."

2) Spiritual Despotism, pp. 492, 491.

3) Osborne's Doctr. Errors of the Apostl. Fathers, ch. xi.

4) See Chrysostom on the Priesthood.

were too poor, and kings too humble, to afford apt illustrations of the supereminence of their pontifical glory. To say aught against their order, or to do aught in contravention to their decisions, was sure to call down upon the guilty head the most summary vengeance, — deposition,¹ excommunication, and the brand of infamous schism, heresy, and conspiracy with the devil.² Presbyters were in due season excluded from all synods and councils; and in many cases, not even allowed to preach in the prelate's presence, or only as permitted by him.³ The laity were also deprived of all representation, in the government of the church, by the express authority of that passage of scripture, which teaches us, that "it was not for beasts to touch the mount of God."⁴ All remonstrance was, in this way, effectually silenced, and borne down, and the very memory of it obliterated from the knowledge of posterity. "The spiritual despotism that spoke in the popes, is now," as has been said, "sixteen hundred years old."⁵ The connexion of prelacy, as exhibited in the superstitious and tyrannous polity pursued from the second century, downwards, with the Romish hierarchy; was accidental, and does not, by any means, constitute it what it ever was, and, when unchecked, ever will be, human nature being what it is. When unlimited authority is committed to a few rulers, with the power to judge between themselves and all who resist them, and when this power is sustained by the believed sanction of an immediate divine intercourse, and communication, — what can prevent it from consolidating into the most intolerant despotism? And again, let it be borne in mind, the very soul of such a system, is the doctrine of a supernatural efficacy, resident, by right of transmitted inheritance, in a line of prelati- cal successors.⁶

1) See as an illustration, the conduct of Cyprian as quoted in Potter on Ch. Govt. pp. 165, 166.

2) "Thus," says Professor Powell in his *Tradition Unveiled*, (p. 56,) "by virtue of this celebrated 'Disciplina Arcani,' the tenets of any who ventured to oppose them, were unanswerably proved heretical, and the catholic faith was found to possess a more and more precise and metaphysical form. They had the power in their own hands; and with an ascendancy and a majority, it was easy by arts and practices, obvious even to men less skilled in the knowledge of human nature and the means of influencing it, to maintain that ascendancy, and advance it even to an exclusive dominion."

3) See Note A.

4) *Spiritual Despot.* p. 476. That they anciently participated in the management of church affairs in England, see fully shown in Foster's *Examination of the Scheme of Ch. Power, of the Codex Juris Eccl. Anglic.* pp. 75, 84. He also shows that the exclusion of the laity was owing to the over-ruling power of the church of Rome. See p. 84.

5) *Ibid.* p. 291.

6) The history of this progressive system of church power, is thus given by Sir Michael Foster in his *Examination of Bishop Gibson*, third ed. 1736, p. 12.

"I take the case, with regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to have been thus: when christianity became

The resulting effects of every doctrine, especially, if they have been found invariably consequent, when not hindered by some counteracting agency, are allowed to be a fair test of its inherent character and tendency.¹ We must judge of a system

the public religion of the empire, the laity, who in the earlier ages bore a part in the provincial and diocesan consistory, finding themselves at ease from persecution, began to apply with more attention to their secular affairs, and left church matters to the bishop and his clergy; the clergy being, for the most part, settled at their respective cures, at too great a distance from the mother church to admit of a constant attendance at the diocesan consistory; or perhaps, from a high opinion of the wisdom and integrity of their president, were contented to leave the principal weight of church government in his hands, especially when they looked on it as a barren point of pre-eminence, attended with no profit or distinction to compensate the burden it brought with it. I believe it will appear upon inquiry, that episcopal jurisdiction had originally no better a foundation than what I have mentioned. But the first christian emperors, finding the bishops in possession of a nominal authority, invested them with a real jurisdiction, which by the concessions of succeeding princes increased, till the bishops came to have cognizance, not only of such matters as now make the proper business of the ecclesiastical courts, but of many others, which the wisdom of later times hath restored to the civil judicature."

"But, on the other hand, let it be granted that episcopal jurisdiction is of divine right, and let the imagination be well heated with the beauty and expediency of ranks, degrees and orders in the church; and we shall find it not so difficult as some may imagine for weak people to advance in their conceits from prelates to primates, and thence to patriarchs. King James I. had, or pretended to have, a zeal for the divine right of episcopal jurisdiction; but he could not stop there: his principles carried him up to the spiritual supremacy of the pope, to whom he declares himself willing to submit, as patriarch of the west, and *Primus Episcopus inter omnes Episcopos, et Princeps Episcopo-*

rum; even, says his majesty, as Peter was *Princeps Apostolorum*. [First bishop amongst all the bishops, and chief of the bishops; even, says his Majesty, as Peter was chief of the apostles.]

"I would not be understood to insinuate that the supremacy of the pope is a necessary consequence from the divine right of episcopal jurisdiction. But I believe I may venture to affirm, that the divine right appropriated to ecclesiastics is the cursed root of bitterness from whence the papal supremacy sprung. And if the principle of a right of jurisdiction, undervived from the civil magistrate, doth not always lead to the popery of the church of Rome, it leads to a state of things equally mischievous and more absurd, — *I mean a popery at our own doors*. Our ancestors at and about the time of the reformation had plainly this notion of the matter; and therefore they did not content themselves with barely abolishing the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, but went to the root of the evil, and declared that all jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as civil, is vested in, and exercised by delegation from, the Crown."

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 327.

"The connexion," says Dr. How, in his *Vindication of the Episcopal Church*, (N. York, 1816, p. 76,) "between principle and practice is most intimate. What, indeed, is practice but *embodied principle*? The characters of men are, every where, formed, in a greater or less degree, by the opinions which they entertain. Among the various sects of ancient philosophers, how constantly do we see their principles exemplified in their lives! In truth, the doctrines which any particular society may embrace, will, in time, mould and determine the character of that society. Haughty principles, as a general rule, will produce haughty conduct; licentious principles will produce licentious conduct; virtuous principles will produce virtuous conduct."

by its essential principles, and not by any occasional manifestations it may make. Now, from a very early period in the history of the church, no complaint is more frequently and loudly made, by church writers, than that which bears upon the degeneracy, corruption, and tyranny, of these rulers and governors. The rulers, says Chrysostom, after depicting the miserable condition of the church, are more guilty than any others.¹ Augustine represents the church as in a worse bondage, through their impositions, than it was under the law.² Nazianzen complains of the prelates, who, when they had overrun all things with violence, in fine, tyrannized over piety itself.³ To escape from their impositions, Jerome, as Erasmus thinks, betook himself to a cell. Chrysostom assures us that he feared nothing so much as prelates.⁴ Theophilus of Alexandria declares, that the audaciousness and tyranny of the bishops, before, had ruined the nation, and dispersed the people through the world.⁵

Isidore of Pelusium declares, that prelacy, as divers exercised it, is a tyrannical licentiousness, because they turned it into domination, or rather, to speak freely, unto tyranny.⁶ He further says, that there were very few not thus guilty, and these were afraid to speak out against them.⁷ The tyranny of the prelates hindered any reformation.⁸ Prosper thus bewails this matter: "But we, delighted with things present, while we hunt after the advantages and honors of this life, make all haste to be prelates, not that we may be better, but richer; nor that we may be more holy, but more honored." "We decline the labor of our office, affecting only the profit and the dignity."⁹ This judgment is confirmed by Ambrose, and almost every writer. The pride, ignorance, and superciliousness, of even the chief of the western prelates, is exposed by Basil; while in the east, as Sozomen declares, they were sick of their unworthy prelates, and languishing for want of some who would be truly pastors.¹⁰ What better could be expected, says Chrysostom, when the dignity is put to sale, and he carries it, not who has the richest land, but the fullest purse.¹¹ Thus were the prelates generally the worst of their day, and their authority so degenerately abused,

1) Homil. 29, in Act.
 2) August. Epist. 119, Januario
 c. 19.
 3) Orat. in laud. Athanas. 21.
 4) Epist. 13, and ep. 2.
 5) In Georg. Alex. vet Chysost.
 c. 39.
 6) Isid. l. v. ep. xxi. and epist. ad
 theod. cxxv. lib. ii.
 7) Ibid, ep. lxxxix. l. v.
 8) Ibid, l. iii. ep. 223. For other

testimonies see Socrates' Hist. lib. vii.
 ch. vii. and ch. xi. Canon. in Cod.
 clxxviii. and canon xii.
 9) Prosper de vit. Contempl. l. i.
 c. ii.
 10) Ambrose de Sacerd. degnit.
 cap. v. Nazianzen Orat. Funeb.
 Athanas. et Orat. in laud. Basil.
 Basil epist. xvi.
 11) Hom. in Ephes. and Isid. l. v.
 ep. 276, 470.

that Theophilus, of Alexandria, rather than be controlled by any that were wise and prudent, as George, of Alexandria, and Palladius both affirm, actually filled the vacant see with fools.¹

Such is the representation given of the practical working of this theory, as drawn even by its advocates and its administrators. We may well believe, therefore, all that is charged upon it by the unvarying testimony of history.² "Episcopacy, as developed in this theory of succession," says Professor Powell, a methodist clergyman in England, "as it has hitherto existed in the christian church, has been at the head of nearly all the oppression and persecution that have been found in the church to the present day. I believe abuse very early got into the church in an unguarded, uncontrolled form of episcopacy. It degenerated into tyranny of the worst kind. Popery is its genuine offspring."³ Let no man trust an unguarded episcopacy," says he, "it will do what it has always done, viz. degenerate into popery."⁴ Protestantism had its worst enemies among the apostolical succession bishops. I rejoice to except, after that time, such hallowed names as Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, and Jewell; but they are the exceptions and not the rule. And it must be confessed, that since that time all the persecution of the puritans and nonconformists originated generally with the bishops."⁵

The bigoted intolerance of the Romish church was not abandoned when England separated from Rome. Popery still lived in the prelacy, and prelates were still found to be animated with the spirit of popes. The inquisition was perpetuated in the star chamber and high commission court, and all difference of opinion brought to the test of power, and decided in the court of civil pains and penalties, of fines, imprisonments, and death.⁶

No sooner was prelatic authority fully established under the

1) Isid. l. v. ep. 481, and l. ii. ep. l. Georg. Alex, vit. Chrysost. pp. 202, 203, and cap. xx. p. 185. Sozomen lib. viii. c. vii.

See these and many other testimonies quoted in the original in Clarkson on Liturgies, pp. 185-198, Lond. 1689, and *ibid.* Primitive Episcopacy, pp. 217-219, 1688.

2) Ep. l. Georg. Alex.

Hierarchical Despotism was, as Mr. Taylor argues, one of the four first characteristics of the ancient church, and altogether irreconcilable with apostolic christianity. See *Ancient Christ.* vol. ii. part vi. Advertisement, p. 6, and the following part vii. as there promised.

3) On Apost. Success. p. 143.

4) That popery would have been the result but for the puritans, &c. see *Edwards' Preacher*, vol. ii. p. 183. *Life of Whitgift*, p. 105, ed. 1699, and *Hanbury's Hooker*, vol. i. pp. 33, 34.

5) Powell *ut supra*, p. 144. See also *Neal's Puritans*, vol. ii. pp. 362, 368, 370, 496, vol. iii. pp. 7, 72, et *passim.* *Howitt's Hist. of Priestcraft*, pp. 115, 167, 180.

6) See the spirit and tendency of prelacy illustrated by a chronological series of facts, in "An Answer to a Book entitled an Humble Remonstrance," in which the original of liturgy and episcopacy is discussed. Written by Smectymnuus, Lond

preposterous and horrid tyranny of the theocratic monarchs, than Archbishop Bancroft, in 1588, declared the prelatie order to be, by divine right, the first order in the church, the only medium of divine grace, — and that all other ministers not ordained by their manipulation, were spurious and without any authority. Thus was opened a fountain of bitterness, from whose pestilent stream England is now suffering in the schisms, feuds, and animosities within the hierarchy; — and in all the endless divisions of those without, and which are justly attributable to these principles.

Thus did this single doctrine become the fruitful source of evils, perhaps now only ripening to their dreadful maturity,

1641. Postscript, pp. 85–94. Old South Library.

See also, "A speech of William Thomas, Esquire, in Parliament in May, 1641, being a short view and examination of the actions of bishops in parliament, from anno dom. 1116, to this present of 1641, in the several reigns of the kings and queens of this kingdom of England, &c." In all and each of their times it is made to appear they have been most obnoxious to prince and people, and therefore that it is not fit or convenient that they should continue members of that honorable house, in which they have been so disloyally and traitorously affected to regality, and no less mischievous and pernicious to church and commonwealth. Printed at London by Tho. Harper, 1641. See Baxter's *Five Disputations of Church Govt.* p. 244. "It will not be denied," says Sir Michael Foster in his *Exam. of Bishop Gibson's Codex Juris Eccl. Angl.* pp. 46, 47, —

"It will not be denied that our ecclesiastical affairs were under a mere clerical administration from the year 1628 to the meeting of the long parliament; a period remarkably infamous for a series of weak, angry, ill-concerted measures; measures calculated to beget in weak minds a veneration towards the hierarchy, but executed with a pedantic severity which produced a quite contrary effect. Certain enthusiastic conceits concerning the external beauties of religion, and the necessity of a general uniformity in the business of holy garments, holy seasons, significant gestures, church utensils and ornaments, seem to have been the ruling principles of those times. These filled the gaols with church criminals, and sent thousands

of our most useful hands to seek their bread in foreign parts. Through the influence these principles had on our spiritual governors, multitudes of learned and conscientious preachers were silenced, and exposed at once to the two greatest trials which can befall human nature, public infamy and remediless want. These principles alone, and a conduct on our part suited to them, broke our union with the reformed churches abroad, and fomented a war in Scotland; which, together with a general alienation of affections at home, occasioned in great measure by a rigorous exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, prepared things for that scene of misery which ended in the ruin of our constitution. These were the effects of an administration purely sacerdotal in matters commonly called spiritual! And though his lordship is pleased to say, that there are few times in which the church hath not been a sufferer under a different management, I believe it would puzzle a wise man to show wherein the church hath been a greater sufferer than in the effects of *Laud's* administration, which takes in the whole period I have mentioned. For though he did not get to Canterbury till the year 1633, he was, notwithstanding, prime minister for ecclesiastical affairs from the moment he was advanced to the see of London, (an. 1628.)"

"Were the severities exercised towards the poor Wickliffites conducive to the ends of religion and the interest of the church of God? They were the genuine effects of sacerdotal councils. The laws, I say, under which the Wickliffites, our elder brethren in the reformation, suffered, were made at the special petition of the clergy. His lordship informs us, (c. 402,) that

— as Mahomet concealed behind the truth that there is one God, the multitudinous absurdities of his system. Puritanism, nonconformity, and dissent in all its forms, were forced upon a reluctant and long-patient people, by the urgency of this doctrine, as practically enforced, under the arbitrary measures of Laud, and his ghostly successors. “The early intolerance of our English reformation, necessitated and justified,” says Mr. Taylor, “the noble resistance made to it, first by the puritans, and then by the non conformists.”¹

Nor is this intolerance of the English church now obsolete. It is still found in her declarations; it still blackens her formularies; is fanned by the church, and “lingers in the tempers and upon the tongues of many of its ministers.”² This old leaven of popish intolerance yet “pervades the church, and infects the clerical order to a degree that involves the establishment in extreme danger.”³ “It is but little understood,” adds this writer, “to how great an extent throughout the country the church is putting the whole of her credit and future influence at jeopardy, by the inconsiderate and ill-timed arrogance of her clergy.”⁴ “The same stern theoretic pride from which Rome drew her reasons of intolerance, is maintained, sometimes openly, and often indirectly, and insidiously, by staunch churchmen, in this enlightened age.”⁵ And what is that theory, from which such consequences ensue? Let this episcopal writer again state it. “Episcopacy on this theory is a divine institution:—the whole efficacy of the gospel, and the saving virtue

the statute of the 2nd of Henry IV. was so: and Sir Robert Cotton, speaking of that act, says, ‘This was the first statute and butcherly knife that the impeaching prelates procured or had against the poor preachers of Christ’s gospel.’—‘At this time,’ (8th Henry IV.) says the same writer, ‘the clergy suborned Henry, Prince, in the name of the bishops and lords, of Sir John Tibbot, speaker, in name of the commons, to exhibit a long and bloody bill against certain persons called Lollards; namely, against them that preached or taught any thing against the temporal livings of the clergy.—Wherein note a most unlawful and monstrous tyranny: for the request of the same bill was, that every officer, or other minister whatsoever, might apprehend and inquire of such Lollards, without any other commission; and that no sanctuary should hold them.’ The same writer, speaking of the parliament held in the 5th of Henry V., says, ‘The clergy at

this their own parliament cease not to rage and roar against christian blood, *tanquam leones rugientes*—for whoever did the fault, they cried, crucify Christ, and deliver to us Barabbas.’”

“But I will not pursue an invidious task: it is sufficient to have just mentioned some of our parliamentary proceedings in favor of the church and clergy, which appear to have taken their rise from the petitions of the clergy themselves.”

See Note C.

1) Spiritual Despotism, p. 361.

2) See Spiritual Despot. pp. 356–362, 349.

On the intolerant spirit manifested by the abettors of these principles, see the conduct of Mr. Newman and his associates toward Dr. Hampden, as described by Archbishop Whateley, in *Edinb. Review*, April, 1841, p. 157. See also Note C.

3) Spiritual Despot. p. 407.

4) *Ibid.* p. 404.

5) *Ibid.* p. 405.

of its sacraments, have been formally attached to this institution ; those therefore who reject it, reject the conditions of salvation ; and we dare not tell them they can be saved. In plain words, all separatists from the episcopal church, whatever piety they may seem to possess, are destined to perdition !”

“ Church principles, as at present professed, indulge men with a degree of liberty of inquiry, which the Romish church consistently, and mercifully, as well as absolutely prohibits. But, if any room be left for freedom of thought and inquiry, intelligent men, looking to the general and uniform tenor of history, can come to no other conclusion, than that christianity, if it is to be understood, as the advocates of church principles do understand it, must always be, as it ever has been, the nurse of superstition, the guardian of ignorance, the sister of despotism, and the promoter of cruelty. Nothing can exempt the religion of Christ from these fatal reproaches, if those doctrines are really part and parcel of it which the papacy did but amplify and realize. Infidels may confidently say — ‘ if the early and Nicene church did truly interpret the gospel, then the popery of the middle ages, is what we have to look to, as the final resting place to which it will lead us. If we are not to think at all, in matters of religion, we had better at once take refuge in the bosom of the church of Rome : but if we are permitted to inquire concerning the tendency of religious systems, then it is manifest that christianity, in *the sense of the church of the fourth century*, is nothing but a scheme of superstition, fanaticism, and spiritual tyranny ; and that it corrupts the morals of the mass of men, not less than it shocks the reason of the few.’ ”¹

Again he says : “ If, therefore, when urged to submit themselves to the gospel, they are told that what is meant, is Nicene christianity, they must (if well informed in church history) regard such a proposal as involving the utter prostration of the understanding. What then ? we are to believe with Jerome — with Ambrose — with Palladius ! We are to dote with Cassian, and are to cringe at the feet of Basil, when required to listen to Christ, to Paul, to Peter.”²

“ But suppose such an inference were admitted, what would it have to do with the present question concerning Nicene church principles, as revived by the writers of the Tracts for the Times ? This, namely — that those principles embrace every element of the papal tyranny, cruelty, profligacy, and spiritual apostacy, and that if left to work themselves out, according to their proper quality, they could have no other issue.”

1) Ancient Christianity, p. 420,
vol. i.

2) Ibid, p. 422, vol. i.

“It is quite true, and we may perhaps live to see it to be so, that devoted men, sincerely embracing Nicene church principles, might, so long as they formed a weaker, and a suffering party, eminently exemplify the temper described in the sermon on the mount; but then it is equally true, as we believe, that men professing such principles, if once seated in the chair of power, and holding an unchecked license to mould the civil and ecclesiastical constitutions of a country to their will, could and would do nothing else, but establish a ghostly tyranny, which, in less than a century, must place the lives, fortunes, bodies, souls, of the community, at the absolute disposal of a college of priests, and unmarried priests!”¹

Now that such views and sentiments, involving every essential feature in the Romish spiritual despotism, are still cherished and maintained, and are now boldly avowed, by the English prelacy, is a fact, which we regret to say, is too susceptible of proof.

The doctrine is now insisted on, that the interference of the laity in the ecclesiastical administration of the affairs of the church, is a gross violation of all law canonical or divine; and the American branch of the Anglican hierarchy, is loudly called upon to rid herself of an unauthorized invasion of the aristocratic rights of the prelacy, by excluding their lay delegates from all episcopal conventions.

Let the British Critic be allowed to speak to “the American church,” in the name of this prelatic hierarchy:² — “To tell the truth, we think one special enemy to which the American church, as well as our own, at present lies open, is a refined and covert socinianism. Not that we fear any invasion of that heresy within her pale now, any more than fifty years ago, but it is difficult to be in the neighborhood of icebergs without being chilled, and the United States is, morally speaking, just in the latitude of ice and snow. Here again, as our remarks will directly show, we mean nothing disrespectful towards our transatlantic relatives. We allude not to their national character, or to their form of government, but to their *employments*, which we share with them. A trading country is the *habitat* of socinianism.”

The work then goes on to show the dangers to be dreaded by the prelacy, from the introduction into her communion of commercial men. “They want only³ so much religion as will satisfy their natural perception of the propriety of being religious. Reason teaches them that utter disregard of their Maker is unbecoming, and they determine to be religious, not from love and

1) Ibid, vol. i. p. 426.

2) Oct. 1839, p. 321.

3) Ibid, p. 323.

fear, but from good sense. Now it would be a miserable slander on the American church to say, that she suited such a form of mind as this; how can she, with her deep doctrines of the apostolic commission and the eucharistic sacrifice; but this is the very point; here we see around her the external influences which have a tendency to stifle her true developement, and to make her inconsistent and unreal. If in the English church the deep sea dried up more or less in the last century, why should it not in the American also? Let the latter dread her extension among the opulent merchants and traders in towns, where her success has principally been."

Another ground upon which the Anglican mother is alarmed for the virtuous and established character of her American daughter is, that "in the American church, bishops do not assume sees, but are named from their dioceses. In spite of whatever precedents may be urged in favor of this usage, we are clear that it is a piece of *puras putas protestantismus*. It is difficult to analyze its rationale, but we have no doubt about the fact. The church is *in* a country not *of* it, and takes her seat in a centre. If a bishop has no throne or see, where is the one, *ο αει*, the never-dying priest continual, who is the living apostle of the church? Is a bishop a mere generalization of a diocese, or its foundation? a name, or a person? Generalizations are every where, persons have a position. Does a bishop depend on his diocese, or his diocese on him? Meanwhile, the Roman catholics have located their bishops, and though their succession in the country is later than ours, they have thus given themselves the appearance of being the settlers, not visitors."¹

The way being thus prepared, the writer proceeds boldly to advance the following sentiments:²

"But leaving these agreeable instances of the expansion of the apostolical idea, which show that we have every thing to hope of the American church, we must go on to allude, for our space will hardly allow us to do more, to a much more systematic and overt deflexion from church principles, than any which we have yet mentioned,—the power usurped by the laity over the bishop's jurisdiction, which, at present, is an utter bar to the true developement of catholicity. The Americans boast that their church is not, like ours, enslaved to the civil power; true, not to the civil power, by name and in form, but to the laity; and in a democracy, what is that but the civil power in another shape?"

1) Ibid, p. 326

2) Ibid, pp. 237, 329, 330, 332.

“Again, as to the third point, which is the one immediately before us, the introduction of the laity into the conventions, it is implied by the venerable Bishop White, in his *Memoirs of the American Church*, that that measure originated with him.”¹

“With all due respect to the memory of the venerable author of the pamphlet, we must express our strong feeling that such views imply an insufficient appreciation of the *developments* of the apostolical succession. He advocated them in a pamphlet, published without his name, in 1783, and the principle of lay government was carried by the convention. This was before the introduction of the succession from England, or Dr. White’s own consecration. The only bishop then in America, was Dr. Seabury of Connecticut; and he and his clergy strongly, though ineffectually, protested against it. He wrote to Dr. Smith, of Maryland, with his characteristic clearness and cogency, sweeping away the doctrine of expediency, and joining issue on the question of historical facts. ‘The rights of the christian church,’ he said, ‘arise not from nature or compact, but from the institution of Christ; and we ought not to alter them, but to receive and maintain them, as the holy apostles left them. The government, sacraments, faith, and doctrine, of the church, are fixed and settled. We have a right to examine what they are, but we must take them as they are. If we new model the government, why not the sacraments, creeds, and doctrines, of the church? But then it would not be Christ’s church, but our church, and would remain so, call it by what name we please.’”

“Such,” says this work, “is the serviceable sketch Mr. Caswell gives us of the constitution of the American church; according to which, it would appear, without going to more apostolical considerations, that those whose business or profession is not religious, are, in matters theological and ecclesiastical, put on a level with bishop and clergy. We are quite sure such a constitution cannot work well; and if any one demurs, then we differ from him what *is* well, and what is ill. It may throw light upon its practical working, to quote a passage from another part of Mr. Caswell’s work, which would seem to show that the laity, not to say the presbytery, would have no objection to the same high position in divine ministry, which they are allowed in convention.”

Now, let analogous sentiments to these be avouched as necessary consequences from some political theory embraced by a powerful party in this country;—and how soon, how universally how unqualifiedly, would it be reprobated, as hostile to the genius

1) White’s *Memoirs*, p 291.

of American republicanism! And if civil liberty springs from religious liberty, and never exists apart from it, then why shall we not as decidedly and plainly repudiate the introduction of a system, which avowedly draws after it such anti-republican positions?¹

The claim to unlimited power, to be employed for the suppression of heresy, and the compulsion of the refractory, is plainly asserted in unequivocal terms, and with unblushing effrontery. Thus Mr. Newman, in his *Lectures on Romanism and Dissent*: “If the christian church was intended to come on earth in the power and spirit of Christ himself, her Lord and defender; if she was to manifest him mystically before the eyes and in the souls of men, who is on the right hand of God; if her glory was to be like that of heaven, though invisible, her reign eternal, and her kingdom universal; if she was destined to compel the nations with an irresistible sway, smiting and withering them if rebellious, though not with earthly weapons, and shedding upon the obedient, overflowing peace, and the holiest and purest blessings; it is not extravagant to suppose that she also was destined to an authoritative ministry of the word, such as has never been realized. And that these prospects have been disappointed, may be owing, as in the case of the Jews, to the misconduct of her members. They may have forfeited for her, in a measure, her original privileges.”²

The consistency of such arbitrary power, and unlimited obedience to canonical authority, on the part of the faithful, is thus made to appear:—

“*It has been argued by very high authority, that the arbitrary strictness of military discipline, is not inconsistent with the constitution of a free state, because enlistment is purely voluntary.* This argument applies with greater force to the churchman, whose canonical yoke is freedom itself, when compared with the bondage of the soldier, and who engages in his profession at a more mature age, and with greater deliberation.”³

“Who does not lament,” says Archdeacon Townsend,⁴ “to read in the pages of the learned author of the *History of the Arians*,⁵ the defence of some of the worst principles on which the church of Rome established all its usurpation? Who would believe, that in the present day, when the doctrine of toleration

1) See *British Critic*, Oct. 1839, pp. 323, 326, 327, 329, 330, 332. That this exclusion of the laity was one powerful reason of consolidating the ancient popery, see affirmed in *Spiritual Desp.* p. 208. See also full proofs from ancient authors in *Clarkson's Primitive Episcopacy*, pp. 189, 197,

219, 220. *Bib. Report*, 1837, pp. 15 and 17.

2) See at pp. 241, 242.

3) *Brit. Critic*, April, 1839, p. 446.

4) In a charge to the clergy of Allerton, and Allertonshire.

5) Mr. Newman.

might have been supposed to have become an axiom with governments and individuals, that this learned and laborious member of the University of Oxford, when he is relating in very just language, the evil consequences of the conduct of the heretics, who opposed in the fourth century, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, declares, that it is ‘but equitable to anticipate those consequences in the persons of the heresiarchs, rather than to suffer them gradually to unfold, and spread far and wide after their day, sapping the faith of their deluded and less guilty followers.’ *That is, it is better to inflict punishment upon the persons of the heresiarchs, than to wait to confute their opinions, because those opinions are injurious.*”

Mr. Townsend proceeds: “*Could the church of Rome require any other defence of its persecutions? Who would believe, that in the very same page in which this atrocious sentence is uttered, we should read this passage also? ‘The heresiarch should meet with no mercy. He assumes the office of the tempter, and so far as his error goes, must be dealt with by the competent authority, as if he were embodied evil. To spare him, is a false and dangerous pity. It is to endanger the souls of thousands, and it is uncharitable to himself.’ Could the spirit of St. Dominic animate the inquisition with more intolerable language? Is it to be endured in the present day, among a people who rightly and justly seek for liberty as well as truth . . . that the episcopal church should be rendered odious by such language? ”*

This same Mr. Newman says, that the “English theology justifies absolute anathemas, where the primitive church sanctions the use of them.”¹ Nor is this a private opinion, but is in accordance with the canons. Thus, for instance, the fifth canon of the church in Ireland stands thus:² “Whosoever shall separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the apostles’ rules, in the church of Ireland, and combine themselves in a new brotherhood, accounting the christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the church of Ireland, to be profane and unmeet for him to join with in christian profession, or shall affirm and maintain, that there are within this realm, other meetings, assemblies, or congregations, than such, as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, *let him be excom-*

1) Lecture on Romanism, p. 261.
For what is meant by this anathema,
see Burnet on the 39th art. p. 3.

2) See gloried in by Palmer on
the Church, vol. i. p. 218.

municated, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke his error.”

So it is with the canons generally. “Thus it is evident,” says Mr. Palmer, “that the Church of England requires and provides for unity and order within all her boundaries. Besides this, she does not hesitate to denounce those who separate from her, as guilty — of most grievous sin. Her canons pronounce, that ‘whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the apostles’ rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood,’ accounting the Church of England unfit to be joined with in christian profession, shall be excommunicated, and not restored till after their repentance and public revocation of such their *wicked errors*. Those even, who shall maintain such schismatics, and allow them the name of a christian church, are equally excommunicated by the Church of England. Schism is condemned in every way. Its authors, its maintainers, its conventicles, the supporters of its laws, rules, and orders, are all subjected to excommunication, and regarded as ‘wicked.’ Can any more convincing proof be afforded that the Church of England provides assiduously for the maintenance of entire unity of communion.”¹

Mr. Palmer is equally anxious to show, that this also is the spirit of the articles.

“That she does claim it,” he says, “is shown by Towgood himself, who remarks, that although it is said in the twentieth article that ‘the church may not ordain any thing contrary to God’s word, nor so expound one scripture, as to be repugnant to another, yet of this repugnance and contrariety the church alone, you will observe, and not every private person, is allowed to be the proper judge, for otherwise, the article is absurd; it actually overthrows itself, and takes away with one hand, what it gives with the other.’ He admits, that ‘it does claim for the church some real authority,’ &c. Such are the principles of unity maintained by the British churches. They may be accused of severity, by those who do not believe as she does, that salvation is offered only in the church, (that is, the Church of England,) and that she herself is decidedly and unquestionably the church of God in these countries.”²

“Each bishop is bound to correct and punish such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, within her diocese.”³ The agreement of the English with the Romish church, on these points, is presented in evidence of her true character and claims.

1) Palmer, vol. i. pp. 218, 219.

2) Palmer, vol. i. p. 220.

3) Consecration of Bishops. Palmer, vol. i. p. 218.

She urges unity of communion “as a matter of religious duty, and inflicts punishment on those who offend against unity.”¹ These persecuting and intolerant principles of Rome, “are attributes” we are assured, “of the Oriental and British churches.”² And a “tribunal for the decision of controversies by irrefragable authority, has been, and will be again constituted, whenever the Divine Head of the church shall judge it necessary, for the preservation of the true faith.”³

Until the church can erect this inquisition in her own name and authority, “the right and duty of the prince, to employ the civil sword in defence of the faith and discipline of the catholic church, is most fully admitted, even by those who limit his authority in ecclesiastical matters, so far as to render him rather the servant, than the protector of the church.”⁴

It is the doctrine of the Church of England at this moment, that “the king’s majesty hath the *same* authority in causes ecclesiastical that *christian emperors of the primitive church* possessed; the denial of this position involving excommunication, *ipso facto*. The same doctrine is taught by the thirty-seventh article, which declares that godly princes have the power to rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be *ecclesiastical* or temporal, and *restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers*. And the law of England most certainly recognizes this principle, since, by existing acts of parliament, *temporal penalties* are imposed on any persons who, professing to be members of the church, either establish a worship different from hers, or dare to violate their obligation as her ministers by teaching doctrines contrary to those which she approves. The conclusion which I draw from all these facts is, that christian princes, members of the true church, have a right, and are bound in duty when necessary, to defend the faith and discipline of the true church existing in their dominions, by obliging its professing members to acquiesce in the one, and to submit to the other, by means of temporal power.”

For this doctrine, the author quotes a whole host of popish and other authorities.⁵ He then goes on to say, “in fine, the doctrine and practice of these catholic and apostolic churches, and of our christian sovereigns from the earliest ages, have always been conformable to that universally received.”⁶

It may be well to hear in some particulars the length to which this authority of the magistrate extends,—an authority,

1) Palmer, vol. i. p. 287.

2) Ibid, p. 289.

3) Ibid, p. 287.

4) Ibid, p. 335.

5) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 336.

6) Ibid, pp. 337, 338. 339.

be it remembered, which, when not assumed by the magistrate, devolves upon the church. "Another end of the state's protection of the church, is the preservation of unity and subordination in the church. Hence it is reasonable that the prince should have a right to command superfluous controversies to cease, a power which was abused by the Emperors Heraclius and Constans, in issuing the *Ectheses* and *Typus*; and which the Emperor Charles V. exercised at one time during the reformation, as Joseph II. did in the seventeenth century, in that royal proclamation which still is printed at the beginning of the thirty-nine articles. Of course, the prince has also a right to urge the prelates of the church to suppress superfluous controversies, and to give them any temporal assistance requisite for the purpose."¹

"Now it is certain that the christian kings of England have, like other christian princes, the right of protecting the church's faith and discipline, making laws conformable to them, convening synods, presiding in them, confirming them, and obliging by the civil sword all members of the church, both clergy and laity, to profess its doctrines and remain in unity and subordination. This is a power which may most justly be called government, and it is this power to which the oath of supremacy refers!"²

"Even if the throne were occupied by a heretic or a schismatic, as James the II. was, the church might still very justly admit his ecclesiastical supremacy, that is, his right to protect the faith and discipline of the catholic church established among us, and to use the civil sword to oblige all its members to unity and obedience."³

"It appears to me, on the whole, that though the only regular and ordinary mode of removing a bishop is by an ecclesiastical judgment, there are particular cases in which the temporal power is justified, even without any previous sentence by the ordinary ecclesiastical tribunal, in expelling a bishop from his see. First, the right will not be denied in a case where the occupant of a see is an usurper or intruder, uncanonically appointed. Secondly, the practice of the church seems to favor the opinion, that when a bishop is *manifestly* heretical, when he *manifestly* and obstinately opposes the judgment of the catholic church, when he is manifestly and notoriously guilty of any crime which by the law of the catholic church involves his degradation, and when there is urgent necessity for his imme-

1) Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 342, 343.

2) Ibid, p. 346.

3) Ibid, p. 347.

diate removal, or difficulty in assembling a synod; then a christian prince may justly expel and drive him from his see, by temporal force, and procure the ordination of another bishop in his place!"¹

"Let us first consider the laws *now existing*, which establish the discipline and doctrine of this catholic church. By the act 1st Elizabeth, any minister of the church rejecting the use of the book of common prayer, or employing different forms and ceremonies, is liable to forfeit the yearly profit of his benefice, and to be imprisoned for six months for the first offence; to suffer imprisonment for a year, and to be deprived, *ipso facto*, of his benefices, in case of a second offence, and for a third, to suffer imprisonment for life, besides losing his benefices."²

"In accordance with the principle involved in these laws, and in the articles and canons of the Church of England, I maintain firmly, that the state has a right, when necessary, to oblige members of the church, by temporal penalties, to submit to her ordinances, and neither establish a different worship, nor teach different doctrines from hers. It has a right to prevent persons from separating from her communion, and from troubling the faithful, sowing dissension in the community, and misleading the ignorant and weak-minded brethren."³

Subjection to this authority of the church is required, and her decision of all controversies to be received, "whether she pronounce rightly or not." Thus teaches Dr. Pusey, who in his letter to the bishop of Oxford says:

"But the power of 'expounding,' 'decreeing,' 'ordaining,' implies that her children are to receive her expositions, and obey her decrees, and accept her authority, in controversies of faith: and the appeal lies not to 'their private judgment;' they are not the arbiters, whether she pronounce rightly or not; for what sort of decree or authority were that, of which every one were first to judge, and then if his judgment coincided with the law, to obey? Who would not see the absurdity of this in matters of human judgment?"⁴

So also Dr. Hook, of whom it is declared, that few persons have done more than he has for the church — in his Call to Union — which is the very trumpet-blast of discord and disunion — boldly delivers himself. He quotes with approbation the following standing rule of the English, and, I believe, American-English church: — "and accordingly, in legislating on this subject, the

1) Palmer, vol. ii. p. 348.

2) Ibid, pp. 363, 364.

3) Ibid, pp. 364, 365.

4) Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 19.

5) Lon. Quart. Rev. March, 1840, p. 285.

Church of England ordains that no one shall be accounted and taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, among us, or be suffered to execute any of the ministerial functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to our form of episcopal ordination, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination." On this he proceeds to remark: "Now this regulation very naturally offends the various self-appointed ministers and teachers, who have of late years abounded in the land. They accuse the church of intolerance, bigotry, and illiberality, since they conclude that she implies, by this regulation, the invalidity of all but episcopal ordination: and in this conclusion they are the rather confirmed when they find our canons, denouncing as *ipso facto* excommunicated, not only those who affirm that the Church of England is not a true, and apostolical church, or that the form of God's worship in the Church of England is corrupt, but also those who, not being of the Church of England challenge to themselves in England, the name of true and lawful churches. Under such a reproach some of the members of our church are impatient, and deny that the conclusion must of necessity be drawn. Others, rejoicing in every thing to bear the scandal of the cross, admit the justness of the conclusion, but contend that the church is no more to be blamed for this, than a mirror for the wrinkles or deformities it may bring to view."²

By virtue of this principle and authority it is decided, and by this decision you will perceive its practical operation, "that the presbyterians (of Scotland) were innovators. Their *opinion* was erroneous, but had it merely extended to a preference for the presbyterian form, it might have been in some degree tolerated: it would not have cut them off from the church of Christ: but it was the exaggeration of their opinion: their *separation* for the sake of this opinion, their actual rejection of the authority and communion of the existing successors of the apostles in Scotland, and therefore of the universal church in all ages, that marks them out as schismatics; and all the temporal enactments and powers of the whole world would not cure this fault, nor render them a portion of the church of Christ. With regard to all the other sects in Scotland which have seceded from the presbyterian community, the same observations apply to them all. Their predecessors, the presbyterians, voluntarily separated themselves from the catholic church of Christ, and they in departing from the presbyterian communion, have not yet returned to that of the true church, consequently, they form no part of the church of Christ?"³

1) "Call to Union," p 24.
2) *Ibid*, p. 25.

3) Palmer on the Church, vol. i.
p. 576.

“Such is the awful sentence which is pronounced on those Scottish martyrs, thousands of whom suffered on the gibbet, or were butchered in the mass, by the armed savages sent by Charles the Second and his brother James to dragoon them into conformity to prelacy! Of such commemoration are *they* thought worthy, who, for conscientious adherence to the presbyterian worship, endured torture, imprisonment, exile and death, on a scale worthy of the persecutions inflicted on the christians, by heathen Rome; and which Rome ecclesiastical did not equal, when the darkness in which she had enveloped the Scottish nation, was ‘made visible’ by the flames of martyrdom, in which Hamilton, Mill and Wishart were consumed! These new martyrs to conscience, are declared to be schismatics; and no part of the church of Christ. Such, also, is the judgment held to be due to the two thousand English confessors of 1662. Their separation from the Church of England, was founded not only in schism, but in heresy, and this being the case, they could not have been any part of the Church of Christ. The Guthries, Govans and Learmonth, of Scotland; and the Howes, Baxters and Flavels, of England; the Erskines and McCries, who belonged to christian bodies, derived from the church of which the former were ornaments; and the Doddridges and Wattses, who have trodden in the footsteps of the latter — ‘no part of the church of Christ!!!’ It is worthy of these sentiments, that what is denied to those who are termed ‘the presbyterian and puritan schismatics,’ should be freely conceded to Romanists; and that while ‘the Roman churches’ are declared still to continue a portion of the catholic church of Christ! the Puritans, and the Covenanters, and all who have resembled them, should be consigned to perdition, as totally separated from the church of God.”¹

All who oppose this “outrageous bigotry,” as it is termed by Mr. Taylor, which was cradled in the despotic reigns of Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and Charles II., are classed with “the wicked.” Their errors are “wicked errors.”² Their principles, “pushed to their legitimate consequences,” terminate in “socioinianism”³ — nay, in the licentious atheism of the socialists, which is, we are told, their “natural and necessary development.”⁴ These are the “allies and supporters of Mr. Owen,”⁵ and constitute the mass of his abandoned and wretched follow-

1) Schism, pp. 250, 252.

2) Palmer, vol. i. p. 218.

3) Dr. Hook in Call to Union, p.

44, says, even low-churchmen should be Socinians.

4) Lond. Quart. Rev. March, 1840, p. 265.

5) Ibid, pp. 273, 274, 284.

ers. Such is the character given by a leading journal to the whole body of English dissenters from the establishment, at the present time, including thousands and thousands of England's best and worthiest inhabitants.

There is, then, we affirm, and can be, no important distinction between these principles and those of the Romish hierarchy.¹ The powers here claimed, constitute the sole and exclusive prerogative of Christ's royalty. Their assumption, by any set of men whatever, is an invasion of His sovereignty — a most wanton usurpation of His sceptre, — and stamps their defenders with the most revolting uncharitableness. Nor can we think that any thing is wanting to such persons, but the power — to renew those scenes, which crimson the very pages on which they are recorded.

Can we be wrong in affirming that these principles, and this fundamental doctrine on which they are all based, are irreconcilable with republicanism, or with civil and religious liberty? Do they not lead their defenders to denounce the revolution of 1688, as a rebellion — and to mourn over the deposition of popish James — and the elevation, to the crown, of king William — as a national sin — for which England is even now suffering the just judgments of Heaven?²

As it regards religious liberty, what can be clearer than the entire opposition to it, of these intolerant principles, as they have been developed in this lecture? By rendering salvation in a great measure dependent on the clergy — they thus tutor the minds and consciences of their recipients, to a habit of subjection and unquestioning acquiescence. By connecting the nature and efficacy of the sacraments with the official sanctity of their administrators, rather than the spiritual character and desires of the recipient — they still further entangle the minds and consciences of those, who feel that salvation flows through the episcopal channel, which is in the exclusive keeping of the clergy. This influence is further greatly increased by surrounding these sacraments with all imaginable mystery and awe. Interposing, as they do, a human mediation between the soul and Christ — by the very laws of our moral nature — the attention and regard must

1) See this shown in Hanbury's Hooker, vol. i. pp. 23, 32, and in Towgood. See the valuable sermon of Matthew Henry, on "Popery a Spiritual Tyranny," Works, Lon. 1830, p. 619, &c., where the picture will be found to bear a very striking resemblance to the daughter of this spiritual mother.

2) So says Dr. Pusey in his Letter, p. 182, Eng. ed. See Miller's Letter, pp. 45, 73. See also note D., where will be found the very valuable letter of the late Dr. Rice on "high-church principles, opposed to the genius of our republican institutions."

be withdrawn from that divine head and source of spiritual life, to these human deputies or vicars, on whom dependence is made immediately necessary. By further making the interpretations of the church as essential as the scriptures themselves; and by requiring them to be implicitly received, this bondage is rendered still more insufferable.¹ By denouncing the exercise of private judgment as presumptuous arrogance, and seminal infidelity, and by thus necessitating, in every member, a condition of doubtful anxiety, which can only be relieved by having recourse to the church; these galling chains of spiritual despotism are fast riveted upon the helpless recipients of such opinions.²

1) "For it is notorious that a certain set of men, most impudently assuming to themselves the sole interpretation of the laws of this kingdom, and pretending to an extraordinary zeal for the honor of its Founder, did set up and for many ages maintain a kingdom of their own over the greatest part of the christian world; the most impious and oppressive tyranny that ever exercised the patience of God or man; an empire founded in craft and supported by blood, rapine, breach of faith, and every other engine of fraud and oppression." Sir Michael Foster, Knt. Exam. of the Scheme of Church Power, 3d ed. 1736. See also Anct. Christ. vol. ii. pp. 23, 24, 25, Eng. ed.

2) Hear how this point was argued in ancient days. Mr. Baynes, in his Diocesan's Tryall, (Lond. 1621, 4to. p. 73), says: "That which doth breed an antichristian usurpation, never was of Christ's institution. But bishops' majority of power in regard of order and jurisdiction, doth so; *Ergo*, That which maketh the bishop a head, as doth *influere* derive the power of external government, to other his assistants, that doth breed an antichristian usurpation. But to claim the whole power of jurisdiction through a diocesan church, doth so; for he must needs substitute helpers to him, because it is more than by himself he can perform. But this is it which maketh antichrist, he doth take upon him to be head of the whole church, from whom is derived this power of external government; and the bishop doth no less in his diocesan church, that which he usurpeth differing in degree only and extension, not in kind, from that which the pope arrogateh."

The learned author of "The Rights of the Christian Church," (Lond. 1707, p. 313,) with whose work we have lately met, through the kindness of the Rev. Shepard Kollock, — himself a member of the Church of England, and while defending it against the non-jurors, sustains this view:

"First, as to the form of government itself; if the making of laws, and the executing of them, (without both which there can be no government,) be in the hands of the same persons, the bishops, they will lie under a temptation to make such as regard their own separate interest more than the good of the church; and having the executive power, they may abuse it without the least control, there being no appeal from them, nor can the people (which cannot happen in a government founded by them,) have any right to redress themselves. This being a government so tyrannical in its frame and constitution, can we suppose the Divine Goodness would miraculously interfere to impose it on the church for ever? The thing itself, without any other proof, is a sufficient demonstration of its being a contrivance of the ecclesiastics."

"The priesthood," says Bancroft, (Hist. of United States, vol. ii. p. 457.) "ordaining its own successors, ruled human destiny at birth, on entering active life, at marriage, in the hour when frailty breathed its confession, in the hour when faith aspired to communion with God, and at death."

The prevalence of this belief in the inseparable connexion between prelacy and intolerance is thus acknowledged by Bishop White: "In the minds of some, the idea of episcopacy will be connected with that of im-

It was one of the loudest objections made to the Puritans, that their system implied "a servile deference to a foreign ecclesiastical authority."¹ How powerfully and truly does this objection lie against this system, as far as it exists among us, not only in its avowed character in Romanism, but also in the increasing diffusion of these principles among the clergy of the protestant episcopal church! Imbued with the spirit of docility and reverence for authority, the minds of all who submit to their influence, are inclined to look to the English hierarchy as the immediate source of all spiritual power, and as the great exemplar of all perfection.² We are now to have the Anglo-catholic church of America, and the Anglo-catholic clergy, and the Anglo-catholic theology.³

Should this system extensively prevail, we ask, therefore, what can prevent the growth, also, of an Anglo-political feeling, which may, in due time, repudiate a republicanism that has ever been reprobated, as indirect antagonism to prelacy?

We have now, at some length, examined the doctrine of apostolical succession, as it is publicly taught, and zealously defended, in this country. The works, from which we have drawn our portraiture, are authenticated as among "the choicest contents" of episcopal libraries, and such "as should be in the hands of every clergyman, and should circulate in every parish."⁴

We have analyzed the principles involved in this system. We have investigated its history, as developed in its practical working, and as described by its most candid observers. We have passed from its history in all past time, and in every country, where it has been established, to its present exhibition, by its living and ablest advocates, in their didactic treatises, which ought to be "in the hands of every clergyman, and circulate in every parish." From all our investigations, conducted under circumstances of such undeniable fairness and impartiality, but one conclusion can

moderate power; to which it may be answered that power becomes dangerous, not from the precedence of one man, but from his being independent." *Case of the Episcopal Churches, 1732*, p. 18, by Bishop White.

On the subject of the practical tendency of this system, as illustrated by historical facts, see Bishop Meade's *Sermon at the consecration of Bishop Elliott*, appendix, chap. xvi. p. 118, &c; see also Dr Rice's *Considerations on Religion*.

1) Soame's *Elizabeth. Rel. Hist.* p. 187.

2) "Whoever injures Christ's catholic church across the ocean, in-

juries his church in this broad continent. Christians of the American church, pray for and defend your mother church, now that the unholy alliance of papist, infidel and dissenter, is striving to overthrow her," (that is, we suppose, the establishment in England.) *Odenheimer's Origin of the Common Prayer Book*, p. 75.

3) These terms are already in use on both sides of the water.

4) Bishop Doane's *Commendation of the British Critic*. See quoted at page 262.

Palmer's *Treatise on the Church* is now republished under the superintendence of Bishop Whittingham.

possibly be drawn. That system of church principles, which is based upon the doctrine of apostolical succession, in its practical working, is, and ever has been, intolerant.¹

It is, of course, impossible, in the present state of public sentiment, to carry into practical operation the principles which, as we have seen, are embedded in this prelatical system. Neither do we believe any open manifestation of such a spirit, would be tolerated by the members of the protestant episcopal church. The abettors of this system, in that church, cannot be, relatively to other denominations, very numerous. We are not, therefore, to estimate its tendencies, when thus so partially developed, and so kept under, by any present or actual developments. These, however, though latent, are yet existent. They are in the system, and inseparable from it. Nay, we do find these tendencies actually manifested, to the full extent of their possible opportunities. For the only possible way in which this exclusive and anathematizing spirit could be exhibited, as it is restrained from any overt acts, is in words. And in what other way, than as indicative of this temper of mind, can we regard the introduction among us, as current and familiar terms of designation, of the words dissenter, schismatic, and sectarian?²

1) While bishop of Oxford, Secker issued the following admonition, intended for his brethren in Convocation, 1761, p. 19, (*Oratio Synodalis*, at the end of his Charges, Wks.) "We must always STRIVE, not only to retain the form, but to RENEW the FORCE of the ANCIENT CHURCH GOVERNMENT, so far as it is PROPPED UP either by DIVINE or HUMAN AUTHORITY. And till that be done, our POLITY will be LAME and DEFECTIVE." "Now, what was this ancient church government?" asks Mr. Blackburne, archdeacon of Cleaveland, of Yorkshire, in his *Critical Commentary on his Grace's Letter*, (p. 19), "Even the model left us by some of his Grace's predecessors and their adherents, who never wanted props for it, (if you would take their interpretations of scripture,) either from divine or human authority. And the force of it consisted, in putting a two-edged sword into the hands of church governors, to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people." [See Psalm xlix. 6, 7. To which Archbishop Laud prefixed this title: "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church; and for that power which

he hath given to the church, to rule the consciences of men." In plain English, power to correct heretics, schismatics and dissenters, with the wholesome severities of whips, pillories, fines and imprisonments."

2) See Dr. Chapman's "Sermons to Presbyterians of all Sects," Hartford, 1836, *passim*.; Dr. Bowden's *Letters on Episcopacy*, N. York, 1808, vol. ii. p. 230, et *passim*.; Odenheimer's *Origin of the Prayer Book*, Phil. 1841, p. 46, &c. This writer teaches (see pp. 81, 106, and Note M. p. 148,) that the protestant episcopal church is "THE legitimate branch of the holy catholic church in these United States." Of course, we and all other denominations are *illegitimate* and *bastard*. It is in perfect keeping, when this writer styles "England's first Charles her martyred king, and England's BEST FRIEND AND BISHOP, her martyred Laud." p. 101 Dr. How's *Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch.* pp. 131, 130.

The Rev. William Staunton, in his "Dictionary of the Church," (New York, 1839, 2d ed. p. 419,) defines schism to be "a separation from the church catholic, but with more im

What are we to understand, as American citizens, by these words as descriptive of religious denominations, in this land of equal and impartial liberty? "A dissenter," says Crabbe, in his work on English synonymes, "is one who dissents from the establishment," "a schismatic is the author or promoter of schism;" and "a sectarian or sectary, is the member of a

mediate allusion to it as a breach of unity with our own branch of that church;" and a schismatic, "one who voluntarily separates himself from the church, (i. e. the episcopal church,) or is attached to a schismatical sect or party." p. 421.

See also Bishop Doane's "Further Postscript to his Examination of Mr. Boardman's Letters," Burlington, 1841, pp. 189, 190, 199, where he seems to allude to us schismatists, "and worse," when he says, "the enemy will blaspheme."

See Dr. Bowden's Letters, first series, N. York, 1803, vol. ii. p. 230.

See also a recent sermon by the Rev. Thomas John Young, of John's Island, S. C., on education, published by request of the clergy before whom it was preached, (Charleston, 1841, pp. 16, 17.) Thus the episcopal church is uniformly "THE church." p. 17.

So in Bishop Gadsden's Discourse on the late Bishop Bowen, he speaks of "the protestant catholic church," (p. 27.) and says, "our friend was a protestant catholic," (p. 47.) that is, "a moderate high-churchman." He also speaks of sects, p. 14.

See also "Christian Ballads," lately published by Mr. A. Cleveland Cox, pp. 35, 102, &c. "The Genevan Schism, that is, the reformation on the continent, "purely brought in the neology of the continent of Europe, which denies the Lord that bought them;" "the presbyterian congregations, the relics of the puritan Schism, with only two or three exceptions, deny the Lord that bought them; and the congregational Schism of New England is the father of American Sociinianism and the modern pantheism of Harvard University." p. 101. "In our own land, we often find the holiest and loveliest characters arrayed against what we *know* (his italics,) is THE church, the body of our blessed Lord and Saviour Christ." p. 168. Well may this writer add, "I confess that for myself I have a passion for the BEAUTY OF HOLINESS, (his capi-

tals,) as exemplified in the liturgy and offices of the church." p. 109.

In his "Christian Ballads," (New York, 1840,) is one entitled, "But Regicides found Dissent," (p. 35,) which he explains in his Notes to mean "the turbulent followers of Cromwell, and the murderers of King Charles and Bishop Laud," (p. 102.) Of these founders of dissent, he says, "Their hands are red with murder, and a prince's fall they sing. They would kill the Lord of Glory, should he come again as king." "These things," the author adds, "are too little known; and this age is too careless in allowing the deeds of ITS FATHERS." (p. 102.) He thus politely apologizes for the arbitrary despotism of Charles, and the atrocious cruelties of Laud: "If King Charles had some faults, so had King David; yet withal David was a man after God's own heart, and King Charles died a blessed martyr. If Laud had some superstitions, so had Cotton Mather; and if Laud had Prynne's ears cropped, Cotton Mather burnt witches," &c.

The author of these Ballads, who is, we understand, still quite a young man, is the son of the Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn. These circumstances will be a sufficient excuse for leaving sentiments so utterly alien to charity and to piety, without any comment. Whether the poetry, from this specimen, is of a very high order, will be also sufficiently obvious.

We will only add, as a further illustration of the intolerant spirit of prelacy, as manifested in this country, the following:

Dr. Hewett states that during the early period of the history of this State, (Hist. of S. Carolina, vol. ii. p. 112,) "That the marriages performed by their clergymen, not being ordained by a bishop, were unlawful; and that the children begotten in those marriages, could be considered in law in no other light than bastards."

1) p. 479, 5th ed. Lond. 1829.

sect.” “The schismatic and sectarian,” he adds, “are considered as such, with regard to particular established bodies of christians” or “to any established body of christians of any country, but dissenter is a term applicable only to the inhabitants of Great Britain, and bearing relation only to the established Church of England.”¹

On what conceivable grounds then, can these reproachful designations be employed in this country, where no such thing as an establishment exists, — where, as presbyterians, we have made no split in any episcopal church whatever, — and where, consequently, we cannot be said to adhere to any sect or body, severed from a parent communion? “Words are things,” said the French philosophers, when meditating the revolution; and when other measures more coercive cannot be employed, are made to express, *ideally*, the spirit which, in other circumstances, would manifest itself practically. As American christians, we repel the insinuations conveyed under these names, as altogether inappropriate, absurd, and intolerant. They belong, not to our church, certainly, which in its mother, the church of Scotland, never was properly chargeable with dissent, schism, or sectarianism, towards the English church, though she nobly rejected the yoke of her intended despotism. These terms have no meaning in their transplanted use; or else they signify, not ambiguously, the dissatisfaction of their authors with the free spirit of our institutions, which do not even know what it is to tolerate, since there is no proscription.²

That system which leads to the adoption of such phraseology as this, in such a country as this, and as applied to other denominations of christians as fully recognized and protected as itself; which repels all ministerial recognition or cöoperation even in the prosecution of a common good — which arrogantly shuts the pale of christianity against all beyond itself — and which led even the liberal-minded and venerated Bishop White to disallow the burial of any *sectary* in a consecrated burial ground — that system which leads to consequences like these, is and must be intolerant; nor do we require any thing more to show what would be its developements under more favorable circumstances.³

Personally, the advocates of this system, and the innovating authors of such epithets, may be kind and amiable, but no disposition is proof against the influences exerted by the adoption of an intolerant creed.⁴ Against any external coercion, tests, or

1) P. 480.

2) P. 60, Lect. xiii.

3) See above. See also Notes E. and F.

4) Remember Archbishop Grindal. See Price's Hist. of Prot. Non-conf. vol. i. p. 296.

legislation, such individuals may be as heartily arrayed, as any others; but let it be remembered, as the martyred Johnson told Bishop Sandys,¹ that “persecutors be not all of one sort — some being of the body, and some being of the mind — some of the goods, and some of the good name. As for the good name of your brethren, the opprobrious terms of you and your colleagues in commission, as puritans, schismatics, rebels, and I know not what, doth sufficiently testify.”² Now if the use of such terms was justly regarded as persecution of the good name and character of the early English nonconformists, how much more is it to be so regarded, as applied to the non-prelatic communions in these United States? And when men allow themselves to use such sectarian, schismatical, and bigoted terms — when they endeavor to fasten them upon other denominations for the undue exaltation and pre-eminence of their own — when they proudly scorn to recognize the ministerial character or church-standing, of such christian bodies, by any act of christian brotherhood or courtesy — when they hold them up as aliens from the christian commonwealth, and as beyond the pale of Christ’s universal church — when they even brand them when dead, as not worthy to repose side by side with the remains of some dear departed friend, who may, perchance, lie in consecrated ground — when churchmanship is thus made to take the place of charity, and sectarianism to displace christianity — surely, we have all the evidence that, in the present circumstances of our country, could be given, of the intolerant spirit of this prelatic system.³

1) See Price’s Hist. of Prot Nonconf. vol. i. p. 272.

2) “But now humbly,” say the persecuted puritans, (Price Hist. Prot. Nonconf. vol. i. p. 332, and see p. 330,) “upon our knees, we pray your good lordships to give us leave to advertise you how the adversary very cunningly hath christened us with an odious name, neither rightly applied, nor surely rightly understood.”

3) Of this tendency of this system, let Professor Powell of Oriel College, Oxford, in his recent work, Tradition Unveiled, bear witness: “But,” says he, (pp. 52, 57,) “when I find them, (as they consistently must do,) putting forth an exclusive claim themselves to constitute ‘the church,’ assuming a lofty tone of superiority, and condemning as heretics those who differ from them; affecting the character of infallibility, assuming the seat of judgment over their brethren, and, as far as they have the power, following out their sentence to actual persecution, if not by person-

al infliction, yet by *invading rights and reputations*; then the subject assumes a different aspect; then the system appears invested with a most reprehensible character, and stands most strongly condemned in its own consequences.”

“Non debent ecclesiæ particulares nostra ætate id sibi arrogare quod apostolorum seculo nulla unquam ausa est facere. Non debent ministri ecclesiarum id urgere quod ut fieret ipsi apostoli numquam ausi sunt persuadere. Sed unam particularem ecclesiam renunciare omnem fraternam communionem alteri est res plane inaudita et a prudentia et paxi apostoli prosus aliena.” Bishop Davenant Adhort. ad Pacem Eccl. Cant. 1640. p. 113.

“A bigot,” says the Rev. Mr. Pratt, (The Old Paths, p. 231,) “is one who holds opinions, for which he can assign no reason; or a bigot is one who violently and unjustly condemns all but his own party.”

It is high time that this encroaching tendency should be resisted, not only by all other denominations of christians, but also by the members of the protestant episcopal church itself."¹ Towards that church we entertain the very kindest feelings. Its American constitution is based, as we were of opinion, upon principles of true liberty and patriotism. And although it has reaffirmed that obnoxious canon, which walls it round with the battlements of sectarian exclusiveness;² and has retained some things of an objectionable character in its forms; and although we must conscientiously differ from it, on many of the same grounds which led to the protestant nonconformity of the English Puritans; yet we had not thought it could manifest any affinity to these principles of the Laudean school. And we confidently hope we shall not be found mistaken in this our judgment.

It is not without good reason, we may be assured, this title of schismatic is to be affixed, if possible, upon us, by these high-church prelatists. It is well known, that it would drag with it all the consequences which are, on prelatie principles, involved in the guilt of schism. It is thus advisedly applied, in the knowledge that, on these grounds, schism — that is, separation from their church — cuts off from the church of Christ, — dissevers "from the ministers and sacraments of Christ," — and from the only "covenanted plan of salvation which has been revealed to man."³ Such are the consequences to men spiritually, which

1) Dr. Rice, in his review of Bishop Ravenscroft's *Vindication and Defence*, in reply to the allegation, that he "had attacked the episcopal church, and attempted to excite odium against her members, (*Evang. and Lit. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 370,) replies; "By no possibility can it be shown, that he has done this thing, unless it can be shown, that the *principles of the episcopal church and high-church principles* are identical. When convinced of this, he will acknowledge the charge. The reviewer then affirms constantly, that his assault has been made *not on episcopalians*, but on *high-church principles*. He endeavored to bring odium on them, because he thinks them odious; to discredit them, because he believes them pernicious both to church and state. He is conscientiously their determined enemy; and will, by the help of God, to the latest day of his life, carry on a warfare against them, whatever name they may assume, whatever guise they may wear. But

this, so far from being hostile to any denomination of christians, is regarded by the reviewer as one of the strongest proofs he can give of friendship for that christianity which is common to all."

2) See Canon xxxv. of 1808, and Canon i. of 1829.

3) Daubeny's *Guide to the Church*, vol. i. pp. 177, 178, 179, 249, &c. as recommended to students by the House of American bishops in general convention. The protestant episcopal tract society has now also, as far as it can, pledged the episcopal church in this country to the sentiments propounded by this author, (Mr. Perceval,) of whom the *Lond. Chr. Obs.* says, (for 1837, p. 840.) "But what we complain of is, that he makes the Church of England to declare, that all the ministers of the church of Scotland, and all the protestant pastors on the continent, are not merely sectarians or schismatics, but actually *heretics*; and a heretic is a man who is in *a damnable error*."

flow from the sin of schism, as laid down in a standard work of the American episcopal church, as recommended by the House of Bishops. All non-prelatic communions are by this work excluded from the pale of christianity, and declared to be alien from the commonwealth of Israel.

But there are also consequences from this sin which affect men civilly. For it is taught us in the same work, that "schism and rebellion have in all ages of the world been intimately connected with each other."¹ Being therefore on their showing clearly schismatics, we are to be next involved in the charge of rebellion, as "murmurers and complainers, who will not submit to the established government of the land." And thus is the way made clear for the conclusion that, as a sect equally offensive to God and injurious to society, we are not to be borne.²

1) Ibid, p. 212, Disc. x.

2) The gradual adaptation of the style and language of American prelatists to this ultimate condition of aggrandisement, is very discernible in a recent publication issued in New York. (The Church of England and in America compared, 1841, pp. 27, 32, 34, and 77.) "That these two greatest and purest of national churches are now evidently approximating to each other, much in spirit, somewhat in form." "Now in all this, both in the feeling that dictates the movement, and the results to which it leads, the Church of England is, and will be found to be, approximating both in character and organization, to what the church in America is; and in the mean time, the latter is approaching *her* half way — not, we mean, towards a legal establishment, God forbid! but . . ."

"Where is the federation that binds England's bishops into one, — enabling the church to move forward systematically in its battle array against ignorance, infidelity, and vice, in the land? The answer is, nowhere. An episcopal college exists there but in name, — unity of action is not. Even in the fundamental point of terms of admission to holy orders, each bishop is left to lay down his own laws, and prescribe his own *sine qua non*. But while thus an 'autocrat,' in giving the terms of admission to the candidate, he is left inconsistently powerless in enforcing them. Ecclesiastical discipline has, in truth, almost van-

ished from the English Church. '*Inquisitio*,' '*correctio*,' '*depositio*,' are as forgotten terms."

Again, as to the privileges of the laity, they are to have all the powers which will remain, "leaving CATHOLIC DOCTRINE and DISCIPLINE in EPISCOPAL HANDS, the pastoral charge in clerical hands, *but on all other points* embodying the authority of all its members, personifying their will, and carrying out their resolves."

But still further, on pp. 32 and 34, it is said: "It may be well for her amid such perils, sometimes to look at the safety of a friendly bark that has escaped such dangers, by admitting no *foreign* pilot to the helm; the blessing, we mean, that has attended a national church freely governed." "This, then, is what England now wants, and what her sister church in America practically has, — constitutional forms of ecclesiastical unity, to give a practical centre to her now diffused and scattered influences, whether spiritual or temporal, pervading without encroachment every diocese and parish in the kingdom, warming the hearts of churchmen with the sympathy of a common cause, and exhibiting the church visibly and practically as 'the whole congregation of faithful men.'"

Once more, on p. 71: "The leading lessons to be learned on either side appear to us as obvious as they are clearly just. The American churchman is to learn to lay aside many ultra-republican prejudices,

It may be urged that, in this country, it is ridiculous to talk of the intolerance or persecution of one sect of christians by another, since all are equally tolerated. This is very true; but then prelatists teach, that this is "a liberty, which no human legislature has any right to grant." "No act of any human legislature can make the sin of schism other than it is." Thus, in the work already referred to,¹ which, though written by an English divine, is among the books recommended by the House of American bishops² for the use of American students, it is said, "Wherever, then, the church of Christ exists, an obligation to communion with it is binding upon the conscience of every christian, by virtue of that divine law which accompanied its establishment. This divine law is paramount to every human injunction upon the subject. Whatever liberty, therefore, the act of toleration may be supposed to give, with respect to christian conformity, must be understood as given in a case in which NO HUMAN LEGISLATURE HAS ANY LIBERTY to grant. The civil penalties which were designed to secure it having been removed, the law to which they are annexed is left to stand upon the original ground of its supposed agreement with the revealed will of God; consequently, the obligation to church unity is just what it was in the primitive days of the church, before civil policy interfered with the business." "The sin of schism, therefore, or a wilful separation from the church of Christ, is just what the word of God has pronounced it to be, whatever may be the determination of the magistrate upon the subject."

Such are the necessary deductions from this prelatist system, as drawn even by themselves. No other communions, separate from the prelacy, are tolerable, according to the divine law; and although, when under authority and constraint, the church must submit to such an unchristian toleration, she is yet bound to

when looking at the Church of England; to discriminate in it between the church as voluntarily endowed, and the church as by law established, confounding the two neither in their origin nor their results, nor the feelings with which he regards them. Nor is this all. He is to recognize further, in its alliance of church with state, a moral and christian bond, as well as a legal and arbitrary one, and take care lest his well-founded objection to the one lead him to undervalue the inestimable national blessings that flow from the other, and of which christian England, with all its drawbacks, is the noblest specimen that the world can offer."

Immediately after the close of the revolutionary war, a petition was presented to the legislature of Maryland, signed by Dr. William Smith, (Provost of the College in Philad.) and Thomas Gates, to connect the episcopal church with the state. See given at length in letters addressed to the editor of "A Collection of the Essays on the subject of Episcopacy," &c., by the author of *Miscellanies*, Albany, May, 1806, pp. 31, 32; Sprague's Coll. vol. 419.

1) Vol. i. pp. 140, 141, ed. 2nd. Lond. 1804.

2) See *Canons, &c. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. N. Y.* 1820, p. 53. Signed by Bishop White.

protest against it as unrighteous, and by her spiritual anathemas to assert her exclusive right to be tolerated as the alone church of Jesus Christ.

It may indeed be replied, that a charge of intolerance equally well founded may be made against the presbyterians in England, Scotland, and New England also, in ages that are past. To say nothing, at present, of the plain and palpable distinction to be made between the intolerance which we may confess to have been thus exercised,¹ and that perpetuated and systematic exercise of it, under the Romish and prelatial systems — we would seriously recall the objector to a fair estimate of our ecclesiastical system as it now exists.

We are willing that this prelatial doctrine should be tested by its present tendencies, and not by its past delinquencies; and further, that those tendencies should be measured by the exhibitions which are now made of the system, by its ablest and most recent defenders. It is not the prelacy of past ages, but of this present time, of which we speak. It is not for the sentiments of Parker, or Whitgift, or Laud, of persecuting and notorious memory, we would pass on it a sentence of condemnation; except, indeed, so far as their arbitrary opinions have been re-adopted and sanctioned at the present time. But it is for the declarations, deliberately and didactically exhibited in the writings of existing divines; we have been led to reprobate the intolerant and persecuting tendencies of the system, of which the prelatial doctrine of apostolical succession is the “ethical principle.”²

1) See Bancroft's Hist. of the United States, vol i. ch. 10. “When, therefore, the severities, exercised by the Church of England, (say the puritans, &c.) are referred to,” says Dr. How, (Vind. pp. 477, 481,) we must always “recollect that toleration was not at that time understood or practised by any denomination of christians.”

“Dr. Holmes, in his ‘American Annals,’ offers, as an excuse for the cruelties inflicted upon the quakers in New England, ‘the prevalent opinion, among all sects of christians at that day, that toleration is sinful.’ And this, indeed, is the true palliation. Is it not, then, most unjust and ungenerous, to dwell upon the severities exercised by the Church of England in Europe or this country.”

2) “During many ages,” says Dr. Rice, (Relig. & Lit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 300,) “and in many parts of the world, it has been held, that the church

possesses authority to compel men to receive her doctrines, and submit to her discipline. This pretension grows naturally out of that transfer of power, which it has been maintained that Jesus Christ made to his church. All power in heaven and earth is given to him; he tells his apostles ‘as the Father hath sent me, so send I you.’ The pope is the successor of St. Peter; or, the bishops are successors of the apostles, and as heads of the church, are depositaries of that authority, which Christ gave to these first preachers of the gospel. Reasoning of this sort convinced the bishops, that their authority was rightful. And when even good men are convinced of this, and have power to enforce their claims, they are strongly tempted to tyrannize over conscience. Much more is this the case with the ambitious and worldly-minded, whom a love of wealth and influ-

We heartily join in the unsparing reprehension of whatever acts of cruelty and intolerance our ancestors may have, ignorantly, committed. We utterly repudiate the principles from which such a mistaken and unchristian policy took its rise. And we disown, as a true-hearted member of our church, any who may sanction such principles at the present day. But are they, we boldly ask, to be found in our standards? Are they maintained by our divines, as existing in those standards? Or do we, in our conduct towards other denominations, give manifestation of the existence of such latent sentiments, within our bosoms? By our own words — by our sentiments, and by our conduct, let us be adjudged; and by these, let our acquittal from such an imputation be, in all fairness, honorably declared. But to this subject we will have occasion to recur, when we come to speak of the true liberality and republicanism of presbyterianism.

ence induce to seek high places in the church. Hence originated *acts of uniformity, high-commission; and star-chamber courts; the inquisition*, with all its infernal apparatus; the stake and the wheel, as instruments of conversion. Hence, too, in the name of

the God of mercy, of the most holy and ever-blessed trinity, acts of cruelty have been perpetrated without number, of which fanatical and bloody-minded heathens might well be ashamed."

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE THIRTEENTH.

NOTE A.

DR. BANGS in his *Original Church of Christ*, (N. York, 1837, ed. 2d, pp. 201, 202,) thus speaks of this doctrine: "The succession therefore is void. It is indeed 'a 'able' of man's invention. I fearlessly pronounce it such, and challenge the proof of its reality. But to sweep this cobweb from the shelf of ecclesiastical libraries, where it has lain as an entangler for the flies of clerical upstarts, I will refer the reader to the facts distinctly stated in my previous numbers, which prove that presbyters did claim and exercise the power of ordination for more than 300 years, and in the Scotch church till the year 430.

"This being the fact, it undeniably follows, that whenever the exclusive right of ordination was claimed — I do not say *exercised*, merely — by a third order as distinct from, and superior to, presbyters, it was AN USURPATION, and hence it follows that those who perpetuate this claim to the exclusion of all others, are upholders of an ancient *usurpation over the rights and liberties of the presbyters*. This remark does not apply to those presbyters who, for good and justifiable reasons, voluntarily relinquished their rights of order and jurisdiction. But I repeat, *that those who set up this exclusive claim, as an indispensable pre-requisite to a valid ordination, have USURPED powers which did not belong to them, and that those who plead for its continuance in a third order, are justifiers of this same USURPATION in defence of scriptural authority and apostolic usage.*"

NOTE B.

"I KNOW no way," says an old writer, "to judge of futurity, but by comparing it with things similar that are past.

"Now, sir, on a review, as far as I recollect the history of England, to say nothing of the extravagant encroachment of the catholic bishops, who became so intolerable as to weary out the nation, and prepare in some measure for a protestant reformation: I say, not to mention these, have not the English bishops encroached more and more on the temporal and spiritual liberties of the nation, till they were at last the cause of beheading their king, and overthrowing the government? — Were they not always a public grievance, by abetting popery, retaining many superstitious rights and customs in their worship and government: introducing novelties in the church, making nearer approaches to the church of Rome, to the great offence of the protestant churches of Germany, France, Scotland, and Holland? — Have not those prelates embroiled the British island, and made the dissensions between the two nations of England and Scotland? — Who can avoid charging them with all the civil wars between the king and parliament?"

"Can it be denied they have been the instruments of displacing the most godly and conscientious clergy; of vexing, punishing, and banishing out of the kingdom, the most religious of all conditions, who could not in conscience comply with their superstitious inventions and ceremonies? — By such refugees, who fled from the persecutions of the imperious Archbishop Laud, were Boston, Rhode Island, &c., first planted.

“Have they not tried to bind the nation to themselves in perpetual slavery by their canons, &c.? — Did they not often invade the civil liberty, by preaching passive obedience, and non-resistance, and declaring for arbitrary power, encouraging illegal projects to raise money without parliament? — So glaring their conduct, that even their friends could say little for them. Lord Falkland in a parliamentary speech for them is obliged to own, ‘While mass has been said in security, a conventicle has been a crime, and which is yet more, the conforming to ceremonies has been more exacted than conforming to christianity; and while men for scruples have been undone, for attempts of sodomy, they have only been admonished.’

“*Obj.*: ‘But why reason from the abuse, against the use? Many excellent persons of that order, have been an ornament to the nation.’

“*Ans.*: Doubtless there have in all ages, been very great, learned, pious and candid divines of that order, whose names with peculiar fragrance are transmitted to posterity; nay, some few have appeared on the side of liberty in opposition to popery and arbitrary powers, particularly the *renowned seven* in the reign of James II. who were delivered with the highest applause from the tower. — But surely the most worthy prelates could not deny, that what I have said is true of the greater part of that order. Their power intoxicates, and leads to these dangerous ineasures.

“I shall not now take time to lead you to different nations. — I would only request you to view the effects of introducing bishops without the consent of the people in Scotland. — Please, sir, to read the Memoirs of that Church, the Cloud of Witnesses, Robinson’s celebrated History, Bishop Burnet’s and Crookshank’s, &c — Consider the duke of Lauderdale’s, or the duke of York’s conduct there. — Behold the blood of thousands, of the most valuable persons of the kingdom, inhumanly shed! Besides the many thousands banished, imprisoned and reduced to beggary: all occasioned by imposing bishops and their superstitions on the nation, contrary to their consciences, and many of these mischiefs happened after the restoration, when the nation enjoyed peace abroad.

“*Obj.*: But perhaps you will say, ‘What attempts since the revolution have bishops made on the liberties of the people?’

“*Ans.*: The reason, sir, is abundantly evident. We thank God they have not had so much power. Their convocation, formerly the highest ecclesiastic court in the nation, since the glorious William III. has not, that I have found, been permitted to act any thing, though they meet for the sake of form. You think it hard to be deprived of the privileges of other societies; but you may blame the arbitrary spirit of your bishops, who have always infringed on the estates and consciences of the people.

“That they are not to be trusted yet with our liberties, may be inferred from their treatment of the ‘Free and Candid Disquisitions,’ a book drawn up by most dutiful sons of the Church of England. about twenty years ago, yet it could not be noticed by your bishops; though they proposed in the most humble and modest manner, a review and emendation of the almost innumerable errors and blunders, in your liturgy, matins, Athanasian creed, catechism, collects, prayer and supplicatory offices, rubrics, calendar, canons, homilies, oaths of churchwardens, ecclesiastic courts, pluralities, and non-residence, &c. and offered the authority of the greatest and best writers of the church. But bishops are bishops still.

“That we dare not yet trust bishops with our liberties: only recollect, sir, a recent specimen, the repeal of the stamp act; when the bulk of the nation saw it would ruin Britain and her colonies too, these reverend fathers in God, almost all insisted on the illegal oppression.”

See the tyrannous conduct of the prelacy in Scotland exhibited at length, in the *Altare Damascenum Davidis Calderwood*, pp. 775 — 782.

“Some may say,” says Mr. Jameson, a very old and able writer on this subject, “that the question is not of great moment. I affirm the contrary, were it but on this account only, that all the bloodshed, rapine, confiscation, banishment, imprisonment, fining and confining, that miserable Scotland has been harassed with above one hundred years, were occasioned by this controversy. It gave rise to all the mischief, butchery, hardship, and other pieces of most

barbarous cruelty, that during all these years has been perpetrated." Sum of the Episcopal Controversy, Glasg. 1713, &c. Pref. in the Old South Ch. Lib.

It is customary for prelatists to talk of the sufferings of presbyterians as imaginary. "O, sir," say the authors of a recent "Plea for Presbytery," in vindication of the church, (Plea for Presbytery, p. 301.) "you know not the feelings of indignation that your words excite in many a heart. The sufferings of presbyterians all fancy and imagination! No, sir, they were stern realities. The deeds of atrocity and blood perpetrated by the Church of England will stain her name until history be silent. Look to Scotland. No less than *twenty-two thousand* Scottish presbyterians were, in thirty years, sacrificed to the demon of prelacy. Look to Ireland. Since first presbytery was planted in our island, it has been the object of unrelenting persecution. Often has our church been dripping with blood, but that blood has been her own. Often she has been the sufferer, but *never the persecutor.*" Plea for Presbytery, pp. 299, 301, number of Presb. victims, examples, p. 371, &c. &c.

NOTE C.

To those who are skeptical as to the alleged tendency of this system to intolerant and arbitrary measures, I would recommend an examination of the various pamphlets issued during the controversy occasioned by the election of an assistant bishop to Bishop White, and which are preserved in the Loganian library in Philadelphia. (Pamphlets No. 1867, &c.)

See also the letter to Bishop Hobart, by the Rev. Benjamin Allen, rector of St. Paul's church, Philadelphia. (Philad 1827.) The author thus speaks:— "In the year 1807, you were desirous of preventing the settlement of a particular clergyman in St. Ann's church, Brooklyn. That clergyman (the Rev. H. J. Fellus) had dared to differ from you. What were the means you made use of in order to prevent his settlement? The statement of that gentleman, corroborated by such men as George Warner, &c. is that you charged him with the horrible crime of forgery. (See the whole statements, given in the Appendix.) Your charge was groundless, and your end in making it was not attained. In the year 1811, the Rev. Mr. Jones published a pamphlet detailing a series of oppositions and persecutions experienced at your hands, because, as he states, he would not be subservient to your wishes. The Rev. Mr. Jones has remained in comparative obscurity to this hour.

"The Rev. Dr. Ducachet was so opposed by you, when seeking holy orders, that he was obliged to obtain those orders through the medium of another bishop, and the Rev. Bishop Griswold, for daring to ordain him, was subjected your severe animadversion." pp. 3, 4.

The author then goes on to describe the series of measures taken by Bishop Hobart, to destroy the plans of Bishop Chase, both in this country and in England, because "he refused to make his seminary the satellite of New York." "Did you not" he asks Bishop H. "while in England, circulate handbills and pamphlets against him," &c.

The writer further illustrates this point by the fact, that without and beyond any constitutional authority, "the bishop of the diocese so altered some of these (parochial) reports, that their writers were unwilling to acknowledge them as their own, and declared them essentially changed in character." p. 11.

"In my inmost soul I do honestly believe you (Bishop Hobart) to be the worst enemy of the liturgy, the greatest opponent to the spread of episcopacy, and the certain author of entire ruin to our church, if your policy prevail. In every portion of the United States I have seen and heard discontent, and dissatisfaction concerning you. You are entitled 'the Talleyrand,' the would-be archbishop, and every other name which can indicate the existence of a feeling which regards you as ambitious, imperious, intermeddling, and determined to attain power. Hardly a diocese is there that does not expect it must ask your permission as to who shall be its bishop; scarce a religious institution but beholds you with dread." (p. 30.)

"I repeat," says the Rev. Benjamin Allen, rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, in his letter to Bishop Hobart, (Philad. 1827, p. 33.) "you are unarmed

by the civil power; are not your notions, however, dangerous? Because our ears are safe, and *you cannot touch anything more than* our CHARACTERS, are we therefore to be content?" (His italics and capitals.)

See also Dr. Hobart's System, exemplified in the late proceedings against his colleague, by the Rev. Cave Jones, A. M. New York, 1811. Also, "A Solemn Appeal to the Church, being a Plain Statement of Facts," &c. by Rev. Cave Jones, N. Y. 1811. Sprague's Coll. vol. 420, p. 101, &c. Also, "A Declaration and Protest of the Wardens and Vestry of Christ's Church, Cincinnati, against the proceedings of Bishop Hobart." Cincinnati, 1823.

As an additional illustration, see the account of the treatment of the Rev. Mr. now Bishop McIlvaine, as given in the appendix to the "Review of the Answer to the Remonstrance sent to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church." Philad. 1827, pp. 14, 15.

Why do we publish these things? Because they are facts — they are now matters of history — they are given from episcopal authorities, *only*, — they are in direct confirmation of our position, which is of great importance — and because they are demanded by those who have undertaken to read frequent lectures in their public prints upon the quarrelling, &c. of presbyterians.

NOTE D.

THE REV. JOHN HOLT RICE, D. D., ON HIGH-CHURCH PRINCIPLES, OPPOSED TO THE GENIUS OF OUR REPUBLICAN INSTITUTIONS.

As to the distinction between high and low-church, it is readily admitted, that no line has ever been drawn, which clearly separates the whole episcopal church into two parties. But what then? Do not the parties exist? In the late presidential contest, were there not many citizens exactly in the predicament of a very pleasant and facetious gentleman, named *Christopher Quandary*, who, peace to his memory! lived not four years ago? And if a real line, literally cutting the body politic, as the mathematicians cut a circle, had been drawn, would not many of our fellow-citizens have been bisected? But was there no palpable distinction, after all, between the *Coalition* and the *Combination*; between Adamsites and Jacksonians!

To the student of ecclesiastical history, scarcely any thing is more familiar than the distinction between high and low-church. It began at least as early as the reign of Charles I. Let your respectable correspondent consult the "illustrious Mosheim," (as Bishop Horsley calls him,) [Cent. xvii. part 2, chap. 2, sec. 20,] and he will find that Charles had directed all the exertions of his zeal, and the whole tenor of his administration towards three objects, of which the second was, "the reduction of all the churches in Great Britain and Ireland, under the jurisdiction of bishops, whose government he looked upon as of *divine institution*, and also as most adapted to guard the privileges and majesty of the throne." No doubt, he had learned the favorite maxim of his royal father, "no Bishop, no King."

Your correspondent may next, if he pleases, turn to pp. 505—9, of the same work, (vol. ii. 4to. edition.) and he will find an account of the *latitudinarians*, or *low-churchmen*, and of the *high-churchmen*, or *church Tories*. Of the former, this learned historian writes thus:—"They were zealously attached to the forms of ecclesiastical government and worship, that were established in the Church of England, and they recommended episcopacy with all the strength and power of their eloquence; *but they did not go so far as to look upon it as of divine institution*, or as absolutely and indispensably necessary to the constitution of a christian church, and hence they maintained that those who followed other forms of government and worship, were not, on that account, to be excluded from their communion, or to forfeit the title of brethren." Among these low-churchmen, he mentions the names of Hales, Chillingworth, More, Cudworth, Gale, Whicheot, and Tillotson. Now, I only ask here, were not such men as these, sound episcopalians, and true sons of the church? Mosheim further informs us, that the high-churchmen were so called, "on account of the *high notions which they entertained of the dignity and power of the church*,

and the extent they gave to its prerogative and jurisdiction." Some of their principles are fully embodied in the famous *Act of Uniformity*, "in consequence of which," says the historian, "the validity of presbyterian ordination was renounced, the ministrations of foreign churches disowned," &c.

The same distinction is recognized by the learned *Jablonsky*, who, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, (vol. iii. p. 342,) gives us a specimen of high-church principles, as held by the learned and famous *Henry Dodwell*. He maintained "that a bishop is the vicar of Jesus Christ, and governs the church over which he is appointed, by the authority, and in the place of Christ," &c.

If further evidence were needed, one might refer to the *History of the Bangorian Controversy*—to Bishop Burnet's *History of His Own Times*—to Neale's *History of the Puritans*, &c. Burnet says that "an inclination to favor Dissenters passed among many for a more heinous thing than a leaning to popery itself." (Vol. ii. p. 145, folio edition)

Here, again, I only ask, is it necessary, in order to one's being a good episcopalian, that he should be a high-churchman? Let any one answer who will.

It is evident, that the distinction which originated two centuries ago, and which is as familiar as "household words" to every one versed in ecclesiastical history, exists in full force in this country. For proof, I refer to the events connected with the election of a bishop, assistant to the venerable Bishop White, of Pennsylvania; and the attempt to elect a successor to the late venerable Bishop Kemp, of Maryland.

But I am required to show that I have given a just account of the principles of high-churchmen. And the very worthy gentleman whose letter has called forth these remarks, has intimated that if I can do this, he is willing to give them up to my fiercest denunciations. Nothing can be more easy than the task assigned. But as for the men themselves, I have no denunciations to make. Only, if they must be episcopalians, let them be such sons of the church as Tillotson and Chillingworth. As for the proof—why, gentlemen, your ample paper, should you leave out every thing else for a week, would not hold all the quotations at hand. I shall not, however, ask for more than a column or so for this purpose.

But first, allow me to make an assertion. There is not in the United States a high-churchman, who does not disown the validity of all but episcopal ordination, and refuse to interchange ministerial services with clergymen of any other denomination: not one of them will acknowledge any of their fellow-christians in other societies, as members of the church of Christ; nor will they go to their communion table. If your respectable correspondent doubts this, let him ask the minister of his own parish.

He, however, calls for proof. The following must suffice:—

"When the gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church by participation of its ordinances, at the hands of the *duly authorized priesthood*, is the *indispensable condition of salvation*. Separation from the prescribed government, and regular priesthood of the church, when it proceeds from involuntary and unavoidable ignorance or error, we have reason to trust, will not intercept from the humble, the penitent, and obedient, the blessing of God's favor. But when we *humbly submit to that priesthood* which Christ and his apostles constituted; when, in the lively exercise of penitence and faith, we partake of the ordinances administered by them, we maintain our communion with that church, which the Redeemer purchased with his blood," &c.

After another salvo for those who labor under *involuntary* error, the writer proceeds thus:

"But great is the guilt, and imminent the danger of those who, possessing the means of arriving at the knowledge of the truth, *negligently* or wilfully continue in a state of separation from the *authorized ministry of the church*, and participate of ordinances administered by an *irregular and invalid authority*. Wilfully rending the peace and unity of the church, by separating from the ministrations of its authorized priesthood; obstinately contemning the means which God, in his sovereign pleasure, hath prescribed for their salvation, they are guilty of rebellion against their Almighty Lawgiver and Judge; they expose themselves to the awful displeasure of that Almighty Jehovah, who will not permit his institutions to be contemned, or his authority violated with im-

punity." — ["Companion for the Altar," by the Rev. John Henry (now Bishop) Hobart. New York, pp. 202 and 204.]

"Episcopalians present these doctrines to their hearers, in the full persuasion that the church, the ministry, and the sacraments, are as distinctly and truly appointments of God, for the salvation of sinners, as faith of the Gospel, and that only as these are united in the profession of religion, can the hope thereby given to a man be worthy of the name of assurance.

"Episcopalians consider the grace and mercy of the gospel as matters of strict covenant stipulation; as bound up with the authority to dispense them; as inseparable from that authority; and only by virtue of that authority, (with reverence be it spoken.) *pledging the glorious Source of all mercy and grace to his creatures.*" — Doctrines of the Church Vindicated, by Bishop Ravenscroft, pp. 31, 32.

"You ask, does episcopal, in contradistinction to presbyterial ordination, enter into the essence of the church of Christ? To this I answer, without the slightest hesitation, that it does; and for this plain reason — because I believe the one to have a divine and verifiable commission to ordain, which the other does not possess." — *Id.* pp. 43, 44.

"The authority of Christ is the *only warrant* to act in his name; and succession from his apostles, the *only satisfactory evidence*, that any man or body of men are possessed of this warrant. And, from the very nature of things, ministerial commission and authority can no otherwise be so verified, as to be consistent with assurance, as to the validity and efficacy of religious ministrations in the name of Christ. The ministry of the church is a substitution for the Lord Jesus Christ in person," &c. — *Id.* p. 47.

"When you baptize, do you not profess to bring an alien into covenant with God, and seal him to the day of redemption? When you administer the Lord's supper, do you not negotiate afresh the pardon of the penitent, and replenish and confirm the grace of worthy partakers? When you visit the sick and dying, are not the consolations of religion at your disposal, according to the circumstances of the case?" — *Id.* p. 28.

Is not this proof enough? I might go on to show that high-churchmen deny the sufficiency of the scriptures, and attribute to *the church* — by which they undoubtedly mean in this connexion, the clergy — the right of authoritatively interpreting the scriptures. For that, says a bishop, is to be received as the true meaning of scripture, which the church, in every age, has declared to be its meaning.

Allow me to repeat, gentlemen, that none of the opinions above stated, are necessary to constitute men episcopalians. Otherwise, Cranmer and his noble compeers and successors, down to the days of Laud, were not episcopalians. Even the *judicious* Hooker, the *mighty* Chillingworth, the *eloquent* Tillotson, and hundreds of others, the ornaments of the Church of England, and in whose services the universal church has rejoiced, must be disowned as sound and true episcopalians. In my attack on high-church principles, then, might I not, with the utmost propriety, declare, that I make no assault on the episcopal church — or on individuals as *episcopalians* — but only as high-churchmen? Suppose that an honest Englishman, in writing on the constitution and government of this country, should severely censure the enormous patronage of the federal executive; might he not justly say, I am not censuring the Americans, considered as *republicans*, but as pursuing a practice not at all necessary, to say the least, to constitute them members of a free commonwealth? He might write as awkwardly as Jeremy Bentham, but my life on it, no one in a thousand of the citizens of this country would mistake his meaning, or rail against him as a hostile assailant. True, if we could not be republicans at all, without this great executive patronage, there would be no room for the distinction. But as the case is, the distinction is made every day, and so respectable and amiable a gentleman as your correspondent, required some excitement, surely, before he could refuse to admit it.

Again: I am represented as *injurious*, for saying that high-church principles are opposed to the genius of our institutions. It is useless to disclaim, in presence of heated partisans, all intention of doing injury. But if I can fairly prove the soundness of my opinions, the impartial will acquit me of evil in-

tention, in giving them utterance. I show no enmity when I tell the truth. Hear, then, my reasons.

The laws of our country secure perfect religious liberty to every citizen: and all have equal rights. Methodists, baptists, presbyterians, lutherans, episcopians, &c. all stand on the same level. And the ministers of any one religious denomination have, according to the law of the land, the same authority to teach, and administer ordinances, as those of any other denomination. Marriage celebrated by a *dissenter*, is as valid, and as sacred, as though the service were performed by an *archbishop*. But the high-churchmen, to a man, maintain that none have a right to teach or administer ordinances, save only ministers of their church. Indeed there is no church — there are no true sacraments — no valid administrations, but theirs. Now here is direct opposition. The law of the land says one thing; high-churchmen affirm directly the contrary.

There is, indeed, a just distinction between *civil* and *ecclesiastical* rights; and the high-churchman is by no means charged with confounding them. He doubtless knows and admits that, in this country, the men whom he persists in calling dissenters, have a civil right to do what he denies that they are authorized to do by the law of Christ's church. But this does not destroy the force of the allegation. Because, the religious principle, when excited, is the most powerful in human nature. The interest created by religion is all-absorbing in its influence; it reaches to all man's relations and concerns. More than any thing else, it comes home to his "business and bosom." "It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened." One must be quite ignorant of the history of religion, to deny, that it is comparatively easy to persuade a man, that any thing is totally and absolutely wrong, which he believes to be opposed to the fundamental principles of his religion. But the quotations made above, show that high-churchmen regard the *particular form of the church, as essential to being of the church*. IT IS, IN FACT, A QUESTION OF CHURCH OR NO CHURCH, AND ALL WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH ARE UNDER "GREAT GUILT." The whole body of American christians, belonging to non-episcopal churches, are schismatics, and without any assurance of salvation, are left to uncovenanted mercies. It is the church, ministry, and sacraments, which render the *scriptures sufficient, &c.* I ask, then, is not a religious man, who has adopted high-church principles, under the influence of a cause, which operates against the American principles of perfect religious liberty? Let intelligent and impartial men judge.

It would require more room, I fear, than you could afford, to adduce historical evidence in support of these "reasonings" — for so with Mr. G's leave — *pace tanti viri*, I must call them. Let me only ask, who supported the courts of high commission, and the star-chamber? Who were the staunch advocates of all the arbitrary measures of the house of Stuart? Who opposed the glorious revolution of 1688? and who were the enemies of our own more glorious revolution, but high-churchmen? On the other hand, in all these instances, did not low-churchmen and dissenters, as far as politics were concerned, unite heartily, and coöperate vigorously? The faithful records of history afford, on this subject, a series of most instructive facts, and warrant the strongest conclusions as to the tendency of high-church principles.

But while impartial men easily see the truth of these statements, it may not be so obvious to the most respectable and intelligent, whose minds are filled with the prejudices of education, and excited by the heats of controversy. And unhappily, this has long been a subject of controversy. How can it be otherwise, when high-churchmen proclaim, that all the authority of the church is in their hands; but as for us, our ministers, they say, are intruders into the sacred office; our sacraments are invalid; our hopes unwarranted; and our meetings schismatical assemblages. IN THIS STATE OF THINGS THERE WILL, AND THERE OUGHT TO BE, CONTROVERSY. THE HIGH-CHURCHMEN WILL ENDEAVOR TO SUPPORT THEIR DIGNITY; AND DISSENTERS OUGHT TO MAINTAIN THEIR RIGHTS, AND TO "STAND FAST IN THAT LIBERTY, WHEREWITH CHRIST HAS MADE THEM FREE." YES, THERE MUST BE CONTROVERSY, WHILE EXTRAVAGANT CLAIMS ARE PUT IN ON ONE SIDE, AND THE SPIRIT OF RELIGIOUS FREE-

DOM EXISTS ON THE OTHER. But, it may be asked, do not high-churchmen declare that the effect, of which I speak, has not been produced on their minds; and do they not indignantly repel the charge made against their principles? Undoubtedly they do — and I admit, with the utmost sincerity. The reason is, without any very strong religious feeling, they are, in this country, under the influence of powerful, counteracting causes. A man's opinions are the results of all the intellectual forces which bear on his mind. And in a given case, to form any thing like a correct judgment respecting the tendency of a particular sentiment, we must know all the circumstances which operate on the understanding. In the present age, a very great majority of our fellow citizens are opposed to high-church principles; and the current of public opinion in favor of liberty, civil and religious, is irresistible. The balance of all the forces which press the mind, is therefore in favor of the institutions of the country. But who can say that this would be the case, if a majority of the nation held high-church principles? In England, notwithstanding many a hard struggle, the act of uniformity was not repealed, until England had a presbyterian king, and low-churchmen got into power. The *Corporation* and *Test Acts* could not be abolished, until it was done by dissenters and low-churchmen. Who would not be sorely unwilling to trust his religious liberty with those who have power, and who sincerely believe that none but themselves are of the true church, or have ecclesiastical authority?

I have never said, or thought, that any of my fellow-christians of any denomination, are, in this age, unfriendly to the institutions of our common country. But I have said, and I do still believe, that high-church principles are, in their nature, opposed to the genius of American institutions. And how far the heaven may work, who can pretend to say? The silent, steady, powerful operation of a moral cause, such as that of religion, may, in this modification of it, produce results entirely unexpected, and undesired too, by any christian now living in the United States. If the records of past time afford any ground for reasoning, as to the future, I feel that I am justified in all that I have written on the subject.

And feeling thus, I protest against the inference, that I intended to excite odium against any denomination of christians. I meant to show, that particular sentiments, not necessary to constitute a man a genuine episcopalian, ought to be renounced. I meant to do all in my power to insure their renunciation; and this in the full persuasion that *the church* would flourish more, and be better able to do her part in the great work which must be done by American christians, without these principles than with them. Believe me, gentlemen, — all persons of truly liberal minds *can* believe — that my chief concern, as a minister of the gospel, is that the power of christian truth may be felt, and the blessings of genuine religion may be enjoyed, by all in our country. But this, I am persuaded, can never be the case, while the form and manner in which the truth is communicated, is regarded as equally essential with the truth itself. "In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

Your correspondent represents, in pretty strong terms, that I bring a charge of *stupidity* against great numbers, including many most able and respectable men, when I say that high-churchmen do not perceive the consequences of their own principles. I must confess that this charge surprised me not a little. And the more I have considered the matter, the more I am surprised that Mr. Garnett should have given it such a turn as this. Whether there are many thousands of high-churchmen in the United States, he certainly ought to know better than I do. But how he can speak so confidently, if the line of discrimination has not been clearly drawn between them and low-churchmen, it is not for me to say. I cannot believe, however, without very strong evidence, that in this country, and in the nineteenth century, there are *many thousands of protestants, who believe that clergymen are the substitutes for the person (vicars) of Christ on earth; that, by them alone, the Source of all grace can be pledged to fulfil his own engagements;* that great guilt rests on a man for not being a member of the episcopal church; that ordination by a diocesan bishop is necessary to constitute a true clergyman; that the administration of all others are entirely invalid and null; and that none but episcopalians have any

warranted hope of heaven, &c. I should suppose the number *very* small. But this does not much affect the main point now before us. . . .

It is well known that the matters involved in the high-church controversy are very little studied by the great body of the people. I was once asked by a very intelligent episcopalian, with whom I had the pleasure of daily affectionate intercourse, "What is the reason why our ministers say, you have no right to administer the sacraments?" Indeed, the subject of ecclesiastical polity is rarely made one of careful and continued examination. Its *history* has never yet been adequately treated; and it is not too much to say, that its bearing on civil and religious interests is not generally understood. The prejudices of education, or family influences, for the most part, determine people's church connexions, and very often men become heated with controversy, before they have thoroughly examined the subject in debate. It is so in politics, as well as religion. In all such cases, it is very common to say, without any imputation of stupidity, intended or understood, surely you do not perceive the consequences of your principles. To charge an adversary with consequences which he disavows, is intolerable. To state consequences as legitimately deducible from his principles, is another affair. To state them as an objection to the principles themselves is a very common method of arguing. If the objection is decisive, and the antagonist still holds his opinion, what can one do, but say as in this case I have said to high-churchmen? The present tariff is occasion of great controversy. Half the nation, and perhaps more, with the venerable ex-President Madison at their head, believe it to be constitutional; very many of our ablest politicians, on the other hand, think it a violation of the Constitution. What then? Shall it be said that the majority *design* to violate that sacred instrument? Surely not. Can they say any thing else than this? — Gentlemen, you do not perceive the consequences of your own reasoning on this subject. How furious must be the partisanship of the man, who should start up and exclaim, "So you include us all in one sweeping charge of stupidity. Very modest, and very charitable, truly!" It surely would not be worth while to take as much time to answer a declaration of this kind, as I have employed in hastily writing the above remarks.

A sense of justice, as well as inclination, prompts me here to remark, that, in the times of which I speak, only one man among the reformers had the penetration to discover a sure method, by which the undue power of the clergy may be restrained, even when religion has no connexion with government. He was bred to the law; but having embraced the doctrines of the reformation, he became the best ecclesiastical historian, and the ablest commentator on the Bible, of his age. His consummate knowledge in these departments of learning, enabled him to approximate very nearly to the primitive polity and discipline of the church. And although his character was colored by the spirit of his times, yet he had the sagacity to see, that, by making all clergymen equal, and giving laymen a place in the government and discipline of the church, a complete check might be laid on clerical power. When he had made this discovery, he boldly taught, that the only province of the civil magistrate was the protection of religion. It was this principle, and by no means his theological doctrine, which rendered him so obnoxious to the friends of arbitrary power, in every country. *I speak of John Calvin.* And it is right curious, that, in every age, down to the present, *his bitterest enemies have always been found among those whose church government most approximates to a monarchy.* It is true, too, that all the principles of religious liberty which are now embodied in the fundamental laws of our country, were taught by men of Calvin's school, long before the fathers of those who framed our institutions were born. These principles were brought with them, by many of the first settlers of this western wilderness. Our revolution only gave them clearer developement, and more universal acceptance. And now, while religion is established by law, in every other country in the world, in ours it is perfectly free. Will it continue so? Who can tell? The causes which influence public opinion, and produce changes in national character, are slow in their operation; and the result of our experiment is yet hid in futurity. . . .

It is of the utmost importance, that the real genius and character of christianity should be generally understood. It cannot otherwise exert its full

moral influence. All men ought to know, that he is a christian, entitled to all the privileges of the church and all the hopes of salvation, who so believes the truth as to repent and live a holy life; no matter by what name he is called, or from what minister he received the sacraments. Arrogant and exclusive pretensions produce discord; and an undue regard to external observances makes infidels of some, formalists of others, and fanatics of others. I call that an *undue regard*, which values outward observances, not for the truth which they represent, but for the form with which they are clothed. The law of the land knows no difference between men of different religious persuasions; and it is highly important that public opinion should so far accord with the spirit of the law, as to exert its mighty energies against those who make mere external differences amount to the vital question of "church or no church." To insure peace and tranquillity in a religious community, the different denominations must be liberal enough to acknowledge each other as brethren.

To keep religion and its teachers in their proper places, I should think it very important that *the people* should understand the true nature of ecclesiastical authority; with whom it is lodged; and how it is to be exercised. Without entering into this subject, allow me to present a brief contrast of high and low-church principles.

Low-churchmen maintain that ecclesiastical power is, according to the will of Christ, vested in *the church*. High-churchmen hold that it belongs to *the clergy*.

Low-churchmen hold that it particularly appertains to the church, either collectively or by their representatives, to admit members into the christian society. High-churchmen hold that this is the sole prerogative of clergymen.

In correspondence with this, low-churchmen are of opinion that expulsion from the society cannot take place without the act of the society. High-churchmen believe that excommunication is a part of clerical prerogative.

The former teach that the sacraments are nothing more than very interesting methods of exhibiting truth and enforcing obligation; while the latter maintain that the *duly authorized clergyman*, by administering the sacraments, *confers grace*.

The fundamental principle of the one is, the *sufficiency* of the scriptures; the other denies this, and maintains that *the church, ministry, and sacraments are integral parts of the plan of salvation*.

The low-churchman earnestly contends for the right of private judgment; his antagonist asserts that the church has authority to declare the sense of scripture, and determine what articles of faith it contains.

This one does not believe that any particular form of church government is prescribed in the New Testament, but only general principles, the application of which is left to the discretion of the church. The other is fierce for the *jus divinum*; and stoutly maintains that the *three orders* are essential to the being of a church. At any rate, no bishop, no church.

The low-churchman thinks that, in case of necessity, the people may call a brother to the ministry; and even in ordinary cases there ought to be a judgment of the people in favor of a candidate, before he is called to the pastoral office. But the high-churchman is convinced, that ordination is impossible, unless a bishop is present to communicate something which he has derived from the apostles, and which no one but a bishop ever can possess.

The low-churchman acknowledges as ministers of the gospel, all, who, with the consent (formally expressed) of any christian people, preach the true doctrine of Christ, and all as fellow-christians, who so receive this doctrine as to repent and live holy lives. But with the high-churchman, no man is to be received as a minister who has not been episcopally ordained; and none are christians who are not united with the bishop.

Now, in a country where religion is perfectly free, and is of course out of the reach of the law and the government, I would ask, which best accord with the genius of our institutions—low, or high-church principles? Let the impartial decide.

And if religion should prevail, so as generally to influence public opinion—and that it will I have no doubt—let me ask, which principles of ecclesiastical polity will be most likely to operate in favor of American institutions, those which exalt, or those which restrain, the powers of the clergy?

And, finally, may not the danger of the church becoming the paramount authority in the nation, and so superinducing all the unutterable evils of a corrupt religion, be best avoided by that system which fully recognizes that fundamental principle of religious liberty, the right of private judgment; which commits the management of ecclesiastical concerns equally to laymen and clergymen, and renders it impossible that the people should be oppressed, unless they choose to oppress themselves? Again, I say, let an impartial public decide.

In conclusion, I must be permitted in justice to myself to say, that I have never yet endeavored to persuade a human being to change his religious connexions. And, although I have, what appears to me, a just preference for a particular mode of worship, and form of church government, I have, in no case, represented this as essential to christianity, or disowned brotherhood with those who, in matters of external observance, differ from the church to which I belong. And further: I have never engaged in controversy, except for the purpose of showing that differences of this kind ought to put no bar in the way of communion, and produce no breach of christian fellowship. I have, however, felt it to be a most sacred duty, both as a christian and a citizen, to do what I could to put down contrary opinions: as a christian, because these opinions appear to me to be opposed to the genius of christianity — as a citizen, because I think them contrary to the spirit of our political institutions. And if I am to be represented in the public papers as illiberal, and uncharitable, because I endeavored to expose the claims and pretensions of those, who hold that they are the only christians in the world, inasmuch as they have bishops, priests, and deacons, acting as substitutes for Christ on earth — I must even bear it, as I may.

NOTE E.

TENDENCIES OF PRELACY ILLUSTRATED.

THAT the tendencies of this system are just as powerful in the breasts of Americans when they come under its influences, as in those of Europeans, and that these tendencies are ever now rampant, and only require opportunity fully to develop themselves, will be too evident from the following extract taken from "The Episcopal Recorder" for April, 1841:

"*The Church Record*.—This very able weekly paper, edited by Dr. Hawks, is one of the most acceptable additions to our table. We were pleased with the projection of it, and we have been equally pleased with the execution. But even so thorough and known a churchman as Dr. Hawks is not to be allowed to edit a paper unless he shall first obtain the imprimatur of the bishop of his diocese. Other papers around the *Church Record*, 'great and little,' have been making war with it for a few weeks past, for daring to exist, without first asking proper permission. There is something to our view extremely ridiculous, in thus tacking every thing that is to be done in a church upon the skirts of the bishop. And something very absurd in supposing that in our age and in our land, respectable men are to submit to this weaving into a fringe to adorn the garments of another. The claim on the one side is just as little and undignified as the submission to it on the other. Dr. Hawks says, in reference to this claim, 'Clergymen thought they had as much right to publish a church magazine or paper as they had to publish a sermon or book without episcopal sanction. No one at the present day thinks of asking episcopal sanction, in the writing and publishing of a book on matters connected with the church.' He would perhaps be surprised to know, as a fact which we could tell him, that a bishop in our time has called upon a presbyter who published a book without his previous consent, to remonstrate with him upon the official disrespect involved in such an act, with the assertion that 'no clergyman in his diocese had a right to publish a book without first gaining the consent of his bishop.' How can respectable persons around us feel any thing but disgust and contempt at these unwarrantable claims in some of the officers of our church! We wish it to be distinctly understood,

that while in personal intercourse with our diocesan, we have for years met with no other than the most liberal and gentlemanly deportment, entitling him to, and securing to him, uniform personal and official respect, the idea of applying for episcopal sanction to our paper, as furnishing authority for its instructions, we should consider extremely derogatory to our own character and rights, and are sure would be regarded by him as a conception of authority in him, both undue and inexpedient."

Truly Alarming.—From the last *Churchman*, which has reached us, says "The Presbyterian," we cut the following paragraph:

"What can the orthodox members of the Greek church think of the orthodoxy of our church, when they see its clergy, resident among them, freely intermingling religious services at prayer-meetings, &c., with these 'half-neological' teachers from New England? Of what use is it to *talk* of recognizing the '*episcopal principle*' in our mission to the East, when our missionaries show most unequivocally that they do not regard it?"

"A clergyman of the Church of England, says the Rev. Mr. Cheever, being on heathen ground, proposed attending a prayer-meeting held by the missionaries of the American Board. He was threatened by another episcopal clergyman, though not of the Church of England, but of this country, and it would seem outrunning even his brother of the establishment in the comprehensive energy and despotic consistency of high-church principles, that if he did dare attend the unhallowed conventicle, he should be complained of to the established authorities of his mother church. Rather than make difficulty, the divinely-ordained servant of the establishment, induced by the inconsistent spirit of liberality and lowliness, submissively repressed his yearnings after communion with his missionary praying brethren, and inasmuch as that was all that an establishment could there do to show its superiority, or to maintain the exclusive divine right and dignity of episcopal ordination, left the unanointed missionaries to pray alone! Poor, forlorn, proscribed disciples! Had it been a little earlier in the world's history, instead of quietly pursuing your holy work, with silent pity for the arrogant assumptions of your brethren, and the exhibition of a spirit so inconsistent with the business of the world's conversion, you would have expiated your offence perhaps within the walls of a prison! In the good providence of God, it is mainly through the existence of a church without an establishment in this country, that it has come to be possible for a society of christians not only to pray alone and unmolested any where, but even to be honored and revered of men, and sanctioned and glorified in the descent of the Divine Spirit, though entitled, and unsanctioned, either by the seal of pope or bishop, king or queen."

"What could be supposed, as to the prospect of the world's evangelization, if the spirit of the gospel, instead of being that free, unshackled, benevolent, ethereal essence that it is, had been the narrow, proud, exclusive, dictatorial, persecuting, papistical spirit, that constitutes the essence of a prelatical, and, —in reference to the war it has waged against all sects not within its own bosom, I had almost said —piratical establishment! To convert this world unto Christ, a religion is needed, not of forms and ceremonies, arrogant assumptions and titles, but a religion of humility, meekness, and love; a religion that can, if need be, become all things to all men, and not a religion which, even on heathen ground, would rather part with the spirit of the gospel itself, than relinquish a solitary jot of its unhallowed, haughty, bigoted pretensions."

On this subject our missionaries could tell many tales, which would not a little startle many unbelievers in the spirit and tendency of the system.

In his recent letters on India, (Lond. 1840,) the Rev. William Buyers, missionary at Benares, (p. 194,) thus speaks of Daniel Wilson, bishop of Calcutta: "His policy has given satisfaction to no party. A continual and imprudent intermeddling with things scarcely within his province, and undisguised attempts to extend in every way the power and prerogatives of his office, and that sometimes in affairs too trifling and secular to be creditable to him, and a harsh and assuming carriage towards his clergy, especially missionaries, seem to have made him more or less obnoxious to all parties, whether clergy or laymen." In reference to his representations as to the other missionaries, the au-

thor says : ' But most certainly he had no ground to impeach the conduct and motives of all sects and parties. When called upon, he explained away part of what he had said ; but, though challenged to the proof of his charges, nothing like an *amende honorable*, nor an attempt to substantiate his statements, could be obtained. He seemed to think, that being a bishop possessing power to reprove and correct his own clergy publicly, conferred on him a right of libelling others, without any one having a correspondent right to call him to account. The Calcutta missionaries thought otherwise ; and the collision produced by his unaccountable course occasioned much alienation of feeling." (p. 196.) " It has been the misfortune of England that she never has had any but sectarian bishops," (p. 197,) infusing into her a narrow sensitiveness and insulting jealousy of those who certainly differ from her in externals, but who have the most cordial love for all good men in her communion." " Dr. Wilson with all his excellences has in one way or another greatly increased the spirit of sectarianism in India. Churchmen have been taught to regard dissenters as radicals and bugbears." " Some of the chaplains have lately become quite enamored of the semi-popery of the Oxford tracts, and though formerly members of the Bible and other committees, have refused to sit on such, because there were dissenters on them. At stations where there was no attempt to form any dissenting church, some of them have delivered violent harangues about tithes, church rates, and the danger of dissent — things unknown in India." (p. 198. See the whole Letter on the India Church Establishment.) Such are the awful consequences, threatening, even in our missionary stations, discord, alienation and strife, among those who have been sent forth to proclaim the peace, union and charity of the gospel. See also Note F.

NOTE F.

As facts speak louder than words, so nothing could more palpably demonstrate the tendencies and yearnings of prelacy, than the character of its saints. Now there are no names more frequently introduced by modern high-churchmen, or with greater reverence and honor, than those of King Charles and Archbishop Laud. They have both been canonized, and deemed worthy of all praise. (See on this Lecture, *passim*, " The Cathedral," " Lyra Apostolica," and the Oxford writers, *passim*.)

Mr. Froude thus records his sentiments : " I have been reading Clarendon ; I am glad I know something of the Puritans, as it gives me a better right to hate Milton, and account for many things which most disgusted me in his, not in my sense of the word, poetry. Also, *I adore King Charles and Bishop Laud* ;" to which the whole party cheerfully respond, amen ! " As to the reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would, in these days, call an irreverent dissenter. His defence of the Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I have read."

False statements have also been published by his defenders, in order to sustain his character. See the Lond. Chr. Obs. 1841, p. 163, &c., where will be found a very elaborate article on his history.

Mr. Bristed, an episcopalian, in his " Thoughts on the Anglican and American-Anglo Churches," (N. York, 1822,) thus speaks of Laud : (see pp. 124, 125 : see also p. 126, &c. :) " And all these horrible mutilations and manglings of his fellow-men, by a bishop of the English protestant church establishment ! For what ? Because they were too honest, too conscientious, too intrepid, to subscribe to all his beggarly popish ceremonies and mummerly ; as the established, formal substitute for the worship of that Jehovah, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and transgression, and sin." " Laud's own conduct was sufficient to ruin any church, however pure and apostolic in doctrine and worship ; and to destroy a much better king than Charles ; and to overthrow a much better government than England ever knew, prior to the revolution of 1688. This semi-papist was continually urging Charles to the commission of illegal, arbitrary, cruel acts. Many Puritans were fined in the star-chamber, so excessively, as to sink them from affluence to beggary."

“The present semi-popish Oxford system, began to advance in the reign of James I. and in the next reign, chiefly under the influence of Archbishop Laud, the leaven was widely spread, till church and state fell together.” Lond. Chr. Obs. Oct. 1840, p. 588.

Let episcopalians turn to the accounts given of Laud by the Rev. Benjamin Allen, rector of St. Paul's church, Philadelphia, in his first letter to Bishop Hobart. (Philad. 1827, p. 21, &c)

“In a recent number of the British Magazine,” says the Lond. Evang. Mag. “a sonneteering Puseyite, gives the following character of their mighty champion, —

“Martyred father, holiest man,
Laud, our England's Cyprian.”

[British Magazine, Dec. 1840.]

“It seems strange that any person having the slightest knowledge of history, should venture to speak in such terms as these, of a man whose memory is infamous. It would be needless to enlarge on Laud's atrocious persecution of the Puritans, whom he delighted to torture and mutilate. But what will your readers think of the following notice in his own diary. (Nov. 1630,) of the punishment inflicted on Leighton, a Scotch divine, and father of the celebrated archbishop: — ‘Friday, Nov. 16, part of his sentence was executed upon him in this manner, in the new palace at Westminster, in term time. — 1. He was severely whipped before he was put in the pillory; 2. Being set in the pillory, he had one of his ears cut off; 3. One side of his nose slit; 4. Branded on one cheek with a red-hot iron, with the letters SS; and on that day sevendnight, his sores upon his back, ear, nose, and face, being not cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and there had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of the nose, and branding the cheek.’ This, be it observed, is Laud's own testimony. What must have been the state of that man's heart, who could not only instigate the government to perpetrate such barbarities, but could record them minutely, and with evident satisfaction, in his own private diary! Bonner himself was here ‘out-heroded’ in refinement of cruelty. Leighton was released, after ten years' captivity, by the Long Parliament, having by that time lost his sight, his hearing, and the use of his limbs. See ‘Lives of Eminent British Statesmen,’ by Sir James Mackintosh, and John Forster, Esq. of the Inner Temple, vol. ii. (Earl of Strafford.)

“The Oxford advocates of the *via media*, tell us, that ‘the great archbishop’ was profoundly learned in the ancient discipline and traditions of the church, and has left an example worthy of all imitation by his successors at Lambeth. Ye nonconformist divines, of every sect and denomination, see what you have to expect, should the Reverend Dr. Pusey become the primate of all England! Think of poor Leighton, and prepare to have the wholesome discipline of the ancient church administered for your benefit! The poets of the British Magazine would then probably give vent to their exultation and phrenzy, in some such strains as the following: —

‘Vile schismatics, impious men,
Worthy of the lion's den!
Crop their ears, and slit their noses
As the holy Laud proposes:
Then their cheeks with iron brand,
And let them in the pillory stand!’

“Should any of your readers think that I am treating a grave subject with unbecoming levity, I beg to remind them of the following observation of the great Dr. Isaac Barrow: “Facetiousness is allowable, when it is the most proper instrument of exposing things apparently base and vile to due contempt. When to impugn them with downright reason, or to check them by serious discourse, would signify nothing; then representing them in a shape strangely ugly to the fancy, and thereby raising the derision at them, may effectually discountenance them.”

“The Earl of Strafford was Laud's confidential friend and correspondent. It is quite curious to observe how the devout archbishop could unbend when

writing to his favorite; and I should like to know how his disciples at Oxford will justify his shocking violation of the third commandment, in the following extracts from his letters to Strafford: 'Now you are merry again. God hold it. And what? Dr. Palmer acted like a king,' &c. 'As for Bishop Howland, you never heard of him. What! nor of Jeanès, his wife, neither? Good Lord, how ignorant you can be when you list!' 'You have a great deal of honor here for your proceedings. Go on, a God's name.' (The Strafford Papers, vol. i. pp. 170—329.) So much for Laud's holiness. I suspect that the Tractarians will take some time to digest these precious fragments of their great apostle. But I have not quite done with him yet. As we are investigating his claims to the title of 'holiest man,' I make no apology for introducing the following sentences from Mr. Forster's volume, already referred to:—'Lord Strafford,' he says, 'was a man of intrigue, and the mention of this is not to be avoided in such a view of the bearings of his conduct and character as it has been here attempted, for the first time, to convey. . . . Fidelity to the marriage bed is not apt to be most prevalent where leisure and luxury must abound, &c. Lady Carlisle, one of his favorites,' &c. It appears, then, that Lord Strafford was guilty of habitual adultery; and yet his friend, 'the great archbishop,' though in constant communication with him, never rebuked him for his sin! On the contrary, he frequently addresses him in terms of vulgar flippancy, and sets him an example of profane swearing, by a most irreverent use of God's holy name. And this is the man on whom the Oxford magi gaze with transport, as the brightest luminary of the Anglican church!

"On one occasion, Strafford thus writes to the apostolical prelate: 'I met with a very shrewd rebuke the other day; for, standing to get a shot at a buck, I was so damnably bitten with midges, as my face is all mizzled over ever since.' In another letter, Mr. Forster observes, 'is language which it would be a great outrage of decency to quote. The archbishop appears to have relished it exceedingly.' (Strafford Papers, vol. i. p. 155.)

"I trust that enough has been said to prove that the title bestowed on Laud by the poetical correspondent of the British Magazine is, to the last degree, preposterous.

"In one respect, it is a happy circumstance that the Puseyites have fixed on 'the great archbishop' as the object of their fond idolatry, as their guide, their champion, and exemplar. This fact speaks volumes. It stamps the character of the whole sect, and shows their ignorance of true evangelical holiness. It proves also how unworthy they are of our confidence. They studiously suppress whatever would tell against their favorite authors; and, if they can give such a false character to Laud, who lived two centuries ago, we may expect that they will be equally dishonest in their account of the primitive fathers. It is my firm belief that their whole system will one day crumble to pieces. It has no foundation in truth, and its downfall is inevitable."

LECTURE XIV.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION UNREASONABLE.

THE primitive bishops, who were, both as it regards order of time and resemblance in character, the successors of the apostles in their ordinary ministerial character; presumed not, as we have seen, to assume to themselves the title of apostles. No other official distinction was then allowed among the officers of the church, beyond that of bishop, presbyter, and deacon; or the bishop, elder, and deacon, of the presbyterian church. The terms priest, vicar, mediator, prelate, or successor of the apostles, were then unknown, and they were avoided, because their use would have been thought indecent.¹

Far different, however, is the case now. Now, it is not only thought "decent" to assume these titles, but they are clung to with all that tenacity, which is a sure indication of the groundlessness of the claim by which they are asserted.² As the reigning prince in Madagascar must, in order to prove his right to the crown, trace up his descent to Ralambo, the father of the present race of princes;³ so to sit upon the throne of the christian ministry, the test of validity is now made to depend upon the

1) See Hind's Rise and Progress of Christ. vol. ii. pp. 151, 152.

2) "Our Ecclesiastical Chief." —The following sentence is from the Western Episcopal Observer; 'It will be cheering to our ecclesiastical chief to know that he has clergy who are not disposed to follow him afar off, but ready with the help of the Lord, and according to their measure of strength, to sustain him,' &c.

"Now, kind reader, who do you suppose is the *ecclesiastical chief*, to whose marshalling and control the episcopal clergy of Ohio are thus subject? To whose guidance, think you, do they thus boastingly submit? Perhaps you might answer, Jesus Christ? Verily, you would be mistaken. It is Bishop McIlvaine." Bap. Recorder.

3) Ellis's Madagascar, vol i. p.246.

correctness of the incumbent's genealogical succession from the apostles.¹

There are, we are assured, three distinct castes of ministers, as separate in nature, offices, dignity, and gifts, as the castes of the Hindoos. These are prelates, presbyters, and deacons; the first the sacred caste, and the others the servile; the first appointed to be the dignified repositories of divine grace, the others to minister, and to be in subjection, to their will.² "The plenitude of power which is communicated to inferior ministers by parts," says Archbishop Potter,³ "according to their respective orders, is wholly and altogether lodged in the bishop." "Every bishop is supreme in his own diocese, and SUBJECT TO NONE but Christ; while every member MUST be SUBJECT TO HIS BISHOP who presides over him WITH THE PLENITUDE OF EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY;"⁴ and as "HAVING POWER TO INFLICT PUNISHMENT ON THOSE WHO REFUSE TO OBEY HIM."⁵ By his mysterious gifts, the other orders are made capable of communicating grace, and are empowered to preach and to baptize — so that without him, there could be no church, no ministers, no sacraments, and, therefore, no covenanted salvation. Now, every bishop in the world, as we are told, succeeds to Peter, or some other apostle, and has the same station and authority within his own diocese, which our Lord conferred upon Peter.⁶ This power of the Lord Jesus Christ, "by which alone they are made governors of his

1) "I am thus *emphatically* taught," says the Rev. Mr. Pratt, (Old Paths, p. 128,) 'that the EFFICACY of the christian minister's official acts, depends entirely on the commission which he holds from Christ, AND NOT, as the language and practice of multitudes would lead one to suppose, ON HIS OWN PERSONAL CHARACTER AND QUALIFICATIONS. MY DUTY, THEREFORE, IS TO OBEY them that have the rule over me in the Lord; and I no where read. that this duty is to be relaxed on account of the faults of the minister. He could scarcely omit the reading of the ordinary services, and at the stated seasons the dispensing of the means of grace; and were he so negligent, his bishop would *in all probability*, adopt means either to have the abuse corrected, or the unfaithful pastor suspended from his sacred charge." This truly is passive obedience in spiritual things.

The absurdity of this theory is thus shown by Dr. Rice, (Evang. Mag. vol. x. p. 29.) "Let us suppose," says he, "that after the lapse of twen-

ty centuries, and a thousand changes in this country, the constitution of the United States should be preserved without corruption, and the people of that future age should elect a president according to the mode prescribed in that sacred instrument, could they not determine whether he were duly authorized to administer the affairs of the nation, without going back through every age, and ascertaining whether the ruler of the country had been duly elected, and the chief justice, who administered the oath of office, duly appointed in every case? And does the president derive his authority from the chief justice, who officiates at his inauguration?"

2) See the Sum of the Episcopal Controversy, William Jameson, Glasg. 1713, ed. 2nd, p. 3, and his Cyprianus Isotimus, ch. i. where this is fully established.

3) On Ch. Gov. p. 206.

4) See *ibid*, pp. 182, 183.

5) Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 214.

6) See *ibid*, p. 183.

church,"¹ is derived to this peculiar class, in exclusion of all others, by an unbroken line of personal, lineal successors. All others who pretend to the authority of christian ministers or churches are, *ipso facto*, rebels against God; traitors against his law and government; schismatics; heretics; totally separate from the church of Christ; and beyond the pale of covenanted salvation. This fact, which is true of all protestant communions — lutherans, methodists, and sectarians in general — is especially true, and in its weightiest sentence of guilt and misery, of presbyterians.²

Such is the doctrine of the prelatical apostolical succession, which we have at some length considered. We have brought it to the test of scripture and of historical evidence, and found it to be *tekel*, and utterly groundless and absurd. And we have shown, also, that it stands convicted of a tendency to popery, and the extremest intolerance. It constitutes the very pivot on which has moved the whole apparatus of ecclesiastical tyranny — that ecclesiastical law by which every system of oppression has been supported — and by whose undoubted truth, the extremest exercise of the most barbarous and exterminating cruelty has not only been justified, but approved as merciful to man and glorifying to God. What were the sacrifice of a million lives,

" If o'er it lay the way to lift the throne
Of apostolic power, and fix the rock
On which the eternal church was built?"

1) *Ibid*, p. 184.

2) Mr. Bristed, counsellor at law, and an episcopalian, in his "Thoughts on the Anglican and Anglo-American Churches," (N. York, 1822, pp. 416, 418,) thus speaks of this doctrine: "The doctrine of *exclusive* churchmanship; that is to say, the assumption of all covenant claim to the mercy of God in Christ Jesus being confined to episcopalians, is strenuously avowed by many writers, on both sides of the Atlantic.

"This exclusive churchmanship, in sober christian verity, is a doctrine, which may possibly be enforced with the gallows for its second, and the dungeon for its bottle-holder, as in papal Rome under the benignant auspices of Hildebrand, and as in England, under the sovereignty of the arbitrary Tudors, and the dominion of the execrable Stuarts. But in these United States, whose political institutions permit to all persons free access to the Bible; and where no one is punished *by law* for believing

what God says in his own revealed word; very few theologians will be found with a gorge sufficiently capacious to swallow these dirtiest of all the dregs of popery." "Peradventure, Stillingfleet and Leighton, not now to mention a thousand other distinguished champions of the Anglican church, had examined this matter as conscientiously, and had brought to bear upon the subject as much genuine piety, real talent, and sound learning, as have been mustered upon the same occasion, by any of the modern champions of this popish plea, and yet they shrunk with horror from the impious insolence of *uncovenanting*, *unchurching* the numberless millions of non-episcopalians, who have ever breathed upon earth."

"There are not, then, more than two hundred and fifty thousand churchmen in the United States; and these quarter of a million of episcopalians are the *only* covenant people of God out of an American population exceeding ten millions!!"

There being but one church, and there being covenanted salvation only through its ministrations, and their efficacy being dependent on this transmitted power of apostolic right, of course, whatever opposes this must be from Satanic agency, and resisted, therefore, even unto blood, that

“ this vast body
 May bespread the world, unchecked, and unopposed,
 Like God's own presence, every where displayed —
 An undivided empire, governing
 The universal mind of man.”

This principle once admitted into the heart — and it is the very soul of prelacy — one church, one apostolic succession, and but one way of covenanted salvation — and in proportion to the enthusiasm of him in whom it operates, will it lead to that “ unquestioning devotion,” which will pursue the interest of the church at every hazard, and at every sacrifice. These feelings are well and truly represented by Mr. Milman in the character of his Angelo,¹ as given by Angelo himself.

“ A noble born
 Of Rome's patrician blood, rich, lettered, versed
 In the affairs of men ; no monkish dreamer
 Hearing Heaven's summons in ecstatic vision.
 God spake within this heart, but with the voice
 Of stern deliberate duty, and I rose,
 Resolved to sail the flood, to tread the fire —
 That's naught — to quench all natural compunction,
 To know nor right nor wrong, nor crime nor virtue,
 But as subservient to Rome's cause and Heaven's.
 I've school'd my haughty soul to subtlest craft,
 I've strung my tender heart to bloodiest havoc,
 And stand prepar'd to wear the martyr's flames,
 Like nuptial robes ; — far worse, to drag to the stake
 My friend, the brother of my soul — if thus
 I sear the hydra heads of heresy.”

That such is the necessary tendency of this doctrine, and that it is therefore unchristian, and in utter repugnance to the genius of republicanism, and of civil and religious liberty ; must be admitted, on the evidence of its whole past history, wherever it was allowed free scope to divulge its inherent tendencies.

That it is so regarded by any of its abettors, in this country — and they are, we fear, not a few — we are far from asserting. Rather do we believe, that, in giving it their countenance, they know not what they do ; or that they hope, and believe, that it may be made to accommodate itself to the enlightenment, and liberality of our times. But founded as it is, in alliance with the despotism of ages — drawing its very nutri-

1) In his *Anne Boleyn*. See *Wks.* vol. iii. p. 35. See the whole passage.

ment from the maternal breast of the ancient church—living in her life, and therefore, naturally jealous of her character, and tender towards her abominations;—thus necessarily imbuing the whole soul with the spirit of subjection, and an inward reverence for the idea of unity, and of a governing and presiding head—and containing within it an aristocracy, already surrounded by all the claims of divine antiquity, and ancestral glory—we cannot but regard it, with the late Dr. Rice, as in violent contrast to our republican institutions.¹

In presenting the grounds upon which we rested our claim to an unquestionable scripture authentication of this doctrine of apostolical succession, we dwelt upon the unreasonableness of the whole scheme.² This consideration, which so evidently augments the force of our objection, from the acknowledged want of a positive and clear scriptural institution—is not less strong when applied to the merits of the doctrine at large. We would therefore assign its unreasonableness, as a further ground for the rejection of this doctrine, in addition to those which have been already advanced.³ Without repeating what has been said under the former head, we would offer some further remarks, to show that this doctrine is as traitorous to reason, as it is to civil and religious liberty. When we are gravely invited to embrace the offer of subjection to this supremacy, as the foundation for union, peace, and charity, we are reminded of a classic illustration, thus poeticised by Dryden :

“ Methinks such terms of proffered peace you bring
As once Æneas to the Italian king.
By long possession, all this land is mine—
You strangers come with your intruding line,
To share my sceptre — which you sware is thine.
You plead, like him, an ancient pedigree,
And claim a peaceful seat by fate’s decree.”⁴

It is the sublime doctrine of our confession of faith — and expressing, in brief summary, the very subsistence of all genuine liberty, — that “ God alone, is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in any thing, contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray

1) The opposite character of presbyterianism, we hope to establish in future.

2) See Discourse fourth, Arg. seventh.

3) To disprove such absurd claims as these, is a hardship something like that complained of by Arch-

bishop Tillotson, when he declared, “ that it might well seem strange, if any man should write a book to prove that an egg is not an elephant, and that a musket ball is not a pike.”

4) The Hind and Panther, Poet’s. Wks. vol. ii. p. 118.

true liberty of conscience ; and the requiring an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also.”

Where God has not legislated, and thus finally decided for his church—as he has in all points of necessary doctrine—reason is intrusted with a discretionary liberty to exercise her powers. Her voice, *within her province*, is sanctioned by God, and no earthly authority has any other than an usurped power to inflict penalties, or impose restraints upon her.¹ Whatever is not enjoined as fundamental, and essential in the word of God, cannot be made so, without impious arrogance, by man.

But that God has created “a policied society”² of prelates, to whom all places of honor and profit, and the whole plenitude of authority, jurisdiction and gifts, with the sole power of perpetuating these benefits, are given ; and that, too, not in the shape of a trust, for which they may be held responsible, and called to account by the other orders, or by the laity, but in the character of a prerogative or supremacy, which may be exercised at pleasure, with only an ultimate subjection to Christ, the head ;—this prelatical hypothesis is, we say, without any solid foundation in the word of God. This fact, as we have already shown, is admitted.³ It is expressly declared, that this claim is above the understanding of all, alike.⁴ But as the doctrine itself, from which such claims are deduced, is within the boundaries prescribed for the exercise of human sagacity and wisdom,⁵ it is manifestly unreasonable and absurd. To say that God cannot perpetuate and preserve the church, but through this succession of prelates, is daring impiety. To say that he will not do so, is to assume the very point in debate, and to make void the word of God, where he has declared no such thing. And to say that it

1) See Spirit. Desp. pp. 122, 121.

2) It is so called by Hooker and Warburton. See Div. Leg. b. 2, § 4.

3) See Lect. iv.

4) See Oxf. Tr. vol i. p. 26. In his work on Tradition Unveiled, (pp. 47, 63, and pp. 67, 75.) in exposure of this new system, Professor Powell, of Oriel College, Oxford, says: “And applying these philosophical principles to theology, he learns that ‘an intellectual, a reasonable religion, is a thing which nullifies itself.’ Orthodoxy, if exposed to the rude shock of argument and the tests of evidence, would fall. Rational investigation leads to socinianism and deism. To silence inquiry is the proper way to christian belief. Faith is a duty ; the

more meritorious in proportion to the objections felt and silenced.”

5. That this question regards rites and ceremonies, Mr. Palmer allows. Now, that these come “within the compass of human understanding,” is also affirmed by Archbishop Potter, (see on the Ch. p. 284,) and may, therefore, be judged of “by men of common capacities.” Their evident absurdity is, therefore, a sufficient ground for their rejection, even as it has been sufficient for the removal of other customs allowed to have been apostolical, (see *ibid*, 282.) This is the more evident, as this may be well supposed to come under (p. 285) the “many things ordered by the first bishops, which are not expressly contained in scripture.”

is probable God would decree such an instrumentality, is to affirm that to be probable, which is in itself most impossible and absurd.

The single end of the christian ministry, is the end of the ministry and priesthood of its divine Author — the salvation of souls,¹ and not the offering of sacrifice² — or the infliction of punishment — or the imposition of hands — or the exaltation of a superior order — or the decreeing of rites and ceremonies, and vain pomps. But to make the essential qualification, efficiency, and validity of the christian ministry depend on the preservation of this succession, and not rather on inward and spiritual gifts; so as that the prelatical manifestation of a bishop, is of more importance than the deepest piety — the most extensive knowledge, and the best gifts of oratory and persuasion — this, as we regard it, is the veriest superstition. This is to identify the forms of christianity with christianity itself — nay, rather to exalt them above it — and thus render the immutable and imperishable soul subordinate to the changing and perishable body. It is to inwrap that soul in the winding-sheet of death. How can it be probable that God should infallibly entail his greatest and best gifts to a succession of men, without any regard, in prospect, to their learning, honesty, virtue, or piety; and to men who have been, in fact, many of them characterized by every quality most disgraceful and criminous?³

This is to appropriate Christ's commission and promises, as does the anti-christian papacy, to Peter and his representatives, "propagated by a principle of succession,"⁴ which inheres, and of right attaches to his body, the church. This is to refer all grace, and spiritual power, directly and immediately, to an order of men, who may not even believe in grace or spiritual energy at all;⁵ and not rather to the dispensation of Him, who ever

1) Palmer on the Church, vol. ii. p. 461.

2) Ibid.

3) See Jackson's Wks. vol. i. p. 302.

4) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 46.

5) "Why, then," asks Mr. Keble, "should it be incredible, that a minister of God, as such, may have the same spirit especially abiding in him as for all other parts of his office. So for the custody of the good deposit, the fundamentals of doctrine and practice, and yet BE LIABLE TO ERROR, and HERESY, and APOSTACY?" Prim. Trad. p. 105.

Mr. Melville, whose sermons have been republished in this country,

says, (vol. i. p. 48.) "Though there be a *great deal preached, in which you cannot recognize the voice of the Saviour, and though the sacraments be administered by hands which seem impure enough to sully their sanctity, yet we do venture to assert, that no man, who keeps Christ steadfastly in view, as the minister of the true tabernacle, will ever fail to derive profit from a sermon, and strength from a communion. . . . The ordained preacher is a messenger, a messenger from the God of the whole earth. His mental capacity may be weak, — that is nothing. His speech may be contemptible, — that is nothing. His knowledge may be circumscribed, we say not, —*

liveth as a prince upon his throne, and as head over all things, to his church and people. God's polity is to bestow all gifts, graces, promises, and ministrations, on his church and people — saying, "all are yours." Prelatical polity is to subordinate the church and people of God, to these sacerdotal functionaries, in whose grasp God has left the destinies of immortal spirits; and whose motto is, "all things are ours."

An uncontrolled right to interpret law, and to administer and enforce it, is "a right to enslave;" and this is the policy of ecclesiastics — "Be ye not the servants of men," (1 Cor. vii. 23,) and "call no men masters on earth," and "let no men have dominion over your faith," and "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free;" this is the spirit and the voice of the good shepherd, the bishop of our souls. Give no ear to the traditions of men, whereby they would privily bring you again into bondage; this is the exhortation which speaketh unto us from forth the oracles of God. Obey my statutes, volumes of ecclesiastical laws, canons, injunctions, decrees, rites, orders, ceremonies, days, times, and seasons, and that on pain of spiritual censure; — this is the voice, which, in the loud tone of threatening and terror, calls upon us to "hear the church."

"Be ye in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live. He that doeth my commandments and keepeth my sayings, he it is that loveth me;" — this is the gospel of glad tidings. Obey the church, and submit to her laws, even when they are erroneous;¹ and thus at Rome be a papist, in Saxony a lutheran, in Scot-

that is nothing; but we say, *that whatever the man's qualifications, he should rest upon his office.* We are certain, as upon a truth, which, to deny, is to assault the foundations of christianity, that the chief minister is so mindful of his office, that every man who listens in faith, expecting a message from above, shall be addressed through the mouth, *aye, even through the mistakes and errors of the inferior.* *If, wheresoever the minister is deficient and untaught, so that his sermons exhibit a wrong system of doctrine,* you will not allow that Christ's church may be profited *by the ordinance of preaching,* you clearly argue that the Redeemer has given up his office. We behold the true followers of Christ enabled to find food in *pastures which seem barren,* and water *where the fountains are dry.* *When every thing seems against them,* so that on a carnal calculation you would

suppose the services of the church stripped of *all efficacy,* then by acting faith on the head of the ministry, they are instructed and nourished; though in the main the given lesson *be falsehood,* and the proffered sustenance little better *than poison.*"

"According to this scheme," says Mr. Bristed, (Thoughts, &c. p. 439,) "of exclusive churchmanship, also, if the Anglican and American-Anglo churches were to lapse into socinianism, they would still be true churches; and communion with a socinian bishop would be communion with Christ, and separation from a socinian bishop would be separation from Christ, although that same socinian bishop denies the divinity and the atonement of Christ, denies all that is essential to, and characteristic of, the stupendous plan of christian redemption."

1) See Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 19.

land a presbyterian, and in England, a diocesan prelatist;—this is the sure way of salvation by the church.¹ Woe unto them that teach for doctrines, the commandments of men;—this is the divine anathema. He that will not, in all things, conform to the rights and ceremonies which the church (that is, her prelates) have authority to decree and impose; he, therefore, that in England will not use the sign of the cross in baptism, wear surplices, kneel at an altar, observe times, and seasons, and days, and months, and commemorate dead men; and he, who at Rome, will not use salt and spittle in baptism, chrism, extreme unction, — who will not use holy water, holy earth, holy knives to cut the sacramental bread, holy basins and ewers for the priest to wash in before the sacrament, and a hundred other ceremonies, let him be accursed; — this is the anathema of the church.²

This whole theory we pronounce absurd, because it is contradictory to the whole word and providence of God. From the era of the creation to the coming of Christ, the church never was built on any men or order of men, but was founded on the living God, who is above all, over all, and independent of all. And the very fact that there is no agreement among its friends, either as to the origination of the chain, nor as to its successive links, nor as to the extent of power invested in it, nor as to any one thing about it, but its exclusion from covenanted salvation of all but themselves, this is of itself sufficient to expose its groundlessness and absurdity as a doctrine which is of divine right, of the substance of the faith, and as essential to the existence of the church.³

This doctrine is unreasonable, further, because it is sustained by the most false and sophistical reasoning. Wherever the premises, in any degree touching the hierarchy, are to be laid down, we are then told that there must be a ministry in order to the being of a church — and a ministerial succession, in order to the perpetuation of that ministry — and connexion with this church as a necessary condition to salvation.⁴ But when the conclusion is to be drawn, instead of inferring, as can only be

1) See Hanbury's Hooker, vol. i. p. 39.

2) Hanbury's Hooker, vol. i. p. 30.

3) See Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 141, 242, where is given the argument at length.

See Campbell's Lectures on Eccl. Hist. vol. i. lect. 7. "It is a shrewd presumption," says he, (Lect. on Ec. Hist. lect. vii. p. 138,) "that a system is ill founded, when its most intelli-

gent friends are so much divided about it; and in order to account for it, recur to hypothesis so contradictory; a presumption, too, let me add, that their judgment would lead them soon to adopt the premises of their adversaries, to which they sometimes approach very near, if their passions would allow them to admit the conclusion."

4) See e. g. Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 44, 45, 46.

properly done from such premises, the essentiality of a christian ministry to a christian commonwealth, we are gravely assured that it is thus demonstrated, that this succession can inhere only in a prelacy, which is no conclusion at all. When the rights of presbyters are to be overthrown, then are we told that all that is recorded in the New Testament about bishops, overseers, and so on, is to be understood exclusively of the second order of ministers;¹ but when prelatic dignity is to be asserted, these same divine instructions — for the simple reason that there are no others — are to be understood as descriptive of prelates.²

When it is to be proved that Christ commissioned apostles as the first order in the christian ministry, then we are informed he empowered them to *preach* and to *baptize*.³ This was their duty and office. But when a second order is to be introduced, then are we taught, that in governing and ordaining, lies the supremacy of the prelatic function. When the third order of deacons is to be made out from the word of God, then they are plainly found in the seventy disciples, who were sent forth to preach,⁴ and, of course, to baptize; and yet, when prelates are to be enthroned in the plenitude of their episcopal authority, neither presbyters (which the apostles of course were, when first commissioned, otherwise the three orders fail) nor deacons have any right either to preach or to baptize,⁵ but as permitted by their prelate;⁶ and the work and duty of baptizing is reduced to an inferior and lower ministry!

When presbyters are to be deposed, then is it demanded of us to show proof, strong from holy writ, and which *even a prelatist cannot gainsay or doubt*, that they were authorized to ordain.⁷ — But when prelatic functions are in debate, then, that “it cannot be proved” — that “it is more probable”⁸ — that the early church thought so — and that civil societies do so — are reasons abundantly sufficient to put to silence all objections, and thus to make that which is admitted to be doubtful, “fundamental to christianity!”⁹

When the honor of this succession is involved in the decision, then it is decreed that the Nicene church, the Romish, the Greek, and the Oriental, are all true and christian churches, and to be regarded as within the unity of the body of Christ¹⁰ — although it is plain, and manifest, and allowed — that they held

1) e. g. Bp. Onderdonk, in Wks. on Episcop. as quoted.

2) e. g. Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 205, and elsewhere.

3) e. g. Potter, pp. 43, 46.

4) Ib. p. 46, thrice, and pp. 102 - 104, &c.

5) Potter, p. 238, &c.

6) Ibid, p. 230, and elsewhere.

7) See Bp. Onderdonk in Wks. on Episcopacy, as above, and Potter, p. 109.

8) Potter, pp. 251, 253, &c. p. 109.

9) Potter, p. 249.

10) Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. 180, &c. 202.

and enforced tenets, customs and ordinances which are contrary to God's word, and to all truth and righteousness; and dangerous to salvation.¹ — And all this is to be believed, on the alone ground that these churches make the most worthless pretensions, to the most absurd claim of an apostolical descent, in a valid prelatial succession, for which they can give no reasonable proof. But when charity, and candor, and christian principles, and reason, demand a judgment in favor of the christianity of the protestant churches, even of such as are acknowledged to be pure in doctrine, and exemplary in practice, and which give abundant proof of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; they are all, forsooth, to be excommunicated, because they will not unite in consolidating a spiritual despotism, and usurpation; which is founded upon the enslavement of the laity, the unrighteous subjugation of the clergy; — and the daring elevation to more than imperial power of a lordly prelacy.² This judgment, to use the words of Bishop Hall, is demonstrative of “injurious uncharitableness, and presumption,” “in shutting out those from the church of Christ, who can truly plead all these just claims for their undoubted interest in that holy society.” “What a presumptuous violence is this! What a proud uncharitableness!” So speaks the sainted Bishop Hall, when allowed to utter his FREE thoughts. We stand with him on the same basis, whereby he justified the English church in her separation from the Romish, “her tyranny, under which were comprised her challenged *primacy*, (in her apostolical succession;) her impeccability; her idolatry; her heretical opinions, her flagitious practices and doctrines;” — and spurning from us the re-affirmation, by the prelacy, of that doctrine of primacy, which is the source of all the rest — as equally contrary to the word of God now, as it was then; — we say with this venerated writer, “wo be to them, by whom the offence of our division cometh. We call heaven and earth to the witness of our innocence, and their injustice.”³

Let it also be borne in mind, that there are in the English and American episcopal communions, parties who confessedly differ from each other in doctrinal views, and on points touching the very essence and fundamentals of the gospel.⁴ Both parties agree in regarding the matters in

1) Palmer on Ch. vol. i. p. 459, and Anct. Christ. vol. i. pp. 391, 392, 349, et passim.

2) See this view urged by Bishop Hall, in his Peacemaker, Wks. vol. viii. p. 51, and Baxter's Treatise on Episcopacy, Lond. 1681, pt. ii. ch. xi. and Bishop Davenant, in his Adhor-

tatio ad Frat. Commun. inter Eccl. Evang. Camb. 1640.

3) Wks. vol. viii. p. 52.

4) Thus Mr. Colton, in his Reasons for preferring Episcopacy, p. 45, &c. remarks, “how different this from the practice of a church which has the same creed throughout

dispute, as doctrinal — and as fundamental — and each other, therefore, as fundamentally wrong. And yet neither party unchurch the other, or proceed to an actual separation. What palpable bigotry is it then, to unchurch others, for differing from them on a point which one party of themselves, will allow not to be essential; and which the other party cannot, with any reason, regard as of the same importance with those very points on which they internally differ from their own brethren.

“Doth not the world know,” says the venerated Howe, “that wherein we differ from them, we differ from the papists too? And that, for the most part, wherein they differ from us, they seem to agree with them? We acknowledge their strong, brave and prosperous opposition to popery; but they have opposed it by the things wherein they agree with us. Their differences from us, are no more a fence against popery, than an enclosure of straws is against a flame of fire.”¹

As the unreasonableness of this Rabbinical doctrine² has been very fully and boldly exposed, by an eminent episcopal writer, we would beg leave to close what we deem it necessary to say on this point, by quoting from his work.

“Let those who entertain this high-church intolerance, consider that in the actual application which they must make of it, the most serious danger imaginable is incurred, and the greatest possible violence is done to the dictates of good sense, and to the genuine impulses of christian love. It is no trivial offence, we may be sure, and no slight peril, to miscall God’s work, and Satan’s. This was, in substance, the very sin of the Pharisees, which our Lord branded with the mark of unpardonable blasphemy. The bold bigotry that does not hesitate to assign millions of Christ’s humble disciples to perdition, makes the pillars of heaven tremble. Better had it been for the man who dares

the land, in every man’s, in every woman’s, and in every child’s hand.” And yet this same Mr. Colton, in this same identical work, and in *praise* of this self-same protestant episcopal church declares, that even its prelates knowingly allow diversities of doctrinal views in the clergy, even to the rejection of doctrines fundamental. “Is it not a lesson,” he exclaims, in his self-constituted office of preceptor, “Is it not instructive? Does it not prove that an exact agreement even in the *minor points* of a common creed, and I may add in some of the *cardinal doctrines of christianity*, is not essential to harmony of feeling, to christian fellowship, and general union,” &c.

1) See Rogers’ Life of Howe, p. 367. Also, pp. 362, 358.

2) See the order of the rabbinical succession given in the Bib. Repos. Oct. 1839, pp. 3–6. D’Israeli, in his *Genius of Judaism*, (p. 79, 2nd edit.) speaking of the uninterrupted succession of the rabbins calls it, “an artifice, or rather the marvellous imposture of a bold and obscure fiction, one which admitted of no evidence, and which allowed of no denial, whose airy nature eluded the grasp while it chained the eye, the legend of the rabbins.” (On their catalogues of names, see *ibid*, page 83, &c. and page 264.)

to do so, that a millstone should have been hung around his neck, and he cast into the sea.

“ We say, let such arrogant churchmen consider the violence they do to common sense, as well as to every genuine sentiment. There are certain affirmations which, though wholly destitute of evidence, *may* yet be accepted as true, without surrendering reason; but there are others that are to be entertained only so long as we can force upon ourselves a sort of temporary insanity. For illustration, let us suppose ourselves standing in front of a temple or palace; and that we are assured by one who professes a more than human knowledge of the invisible constitution of things, that each of the columns of the portico, though apparently nothing more than marble, and though cold and hard to the touch, is actually informed with animal and rational life; that it sees, hears, feels, and thinks like ourselves; and, in a word, is very man, while to the eye, a pillar, and to the touch a stone. This we say, marvellous as it is, *may* be believed; all we want, is a reason for giving so much credit to our informant. But now, let this same person, emboldened by our simplicity, in the first instance, go on still further to try our powers of faith, and to affirm that those whom we take to be men and women, ascending the steps, and entering the building, and whom we fancy to hear conversing one with another, and with whom we ourselves, have just before conversed, are not, as they seem, human beings, are not living, are not rational; but are mere stones or statues, and might, without consciousness of pain, or effusion of blood, be shivered by the chisel and mallet.

“ At this point, surely, the most credulous must stop, leaving the mad only to believe. But now this example has a real analogy with the insensate intolerance of those, who after conversing with christian men, and beholding their good works and consistency, and after being compelled to admit that they bear all the *semblances* of piety, will yet call them children of the devil, and heirs of perdition, because, forsooth, they are out of the pale of episcopacy! Transubstantiation is a credible dogma; but this enormity insults reason, quite as much as it does despite to pious benevolence, and actually breaks down the mind that submits to it. What can a man be worth, either in reason, or in feeling, after he has thus been trodden in the dust, and made sport of by bigotry so preposterous? It might indeed seem altogether frivolous, to advert seriously to extravagances of this sort, if it were not very true that they pervade the church, and under different forms and pretexts, infect the clerical order to a degree that involves the establishment in an extreme degree. Church reform may help us, but the church

must look well to herself, and purge out thoroughly the old leaven of popish intolerance, or no reform will save her. Let the common people throughout the country, hear methodists and dissenters spoken of from the pulpit, frequently and freely as christian brethren, not a hat the less would be doffed in the porch on a Sunday : on the contrary, so much frank truth and charity, uttered by the clergy, would immensely benefit the church at the present crisis. Whatever may be the faults or errors of the separatists, they themselves, very many of them, are christians, and as good christians as churchmen ; and to deny this, or to be reluctant to confess it, is not to injure them, but ourselves : nay it is an impudent impiety, such as a wise and good man must shudder to think of, and will never patiently bear.¹

We have thus shown the unreasonableness of this figment of a line of hereditary successors of apostolic grace and power, conveying it to their less favored brethren, in an unbroken series. There is not the shadow of proof for such a succession. These ambassadors, who pretend to a special embassy from God to man, not as ministers merely, but as rulers of ministers, can produce no commission. They bring with them no special instructions. They are confessedly incapacitated for discharging the functions of that office, of which they yet declare that they are the sole plenipotentiaries. In the absence of all such ability, they are also devoid of any supernatural credentials of such supreme jurisdiction in the church of God.²

Neither are they, in fact, the sole and exclusive sources of divine mercy and saving grace ; while they, themselves, and their ministrations also, are frequently destitute of any semblance of a divine unction. The whole scheme is preposterous, contrary to reason, and contradicted by the plainest testimony.

1) Spirit. Desp. pp. 404-407.

2) Dr. Adam Clarke thus speaks on this subject, (quoted in Dr. Miller on the Min. p. 360.) "By the kind providence of God, it appears that he has not permitted any apostolical succession to be preserved ; lest the members of his church should seek that in an uninterrupted succession which must be found in the head alone. The papists or Roman catholics, who 'boast of an uninterrupted succession, which is a mere fable, that never was, and never can be proved, have raised up another head,—the pope.'" Comment on Ezek. xxxiv. 23. Again, he says, "Some make Hebrews (v. 4) an argument for the

uninterrupted succession of popes and their bishops in the church, who alone have the authority to ordain for the sacerdotal office ; and whosoever is not thus appointed, is, with them, illegitimate. It is idle to employ time in proving that there is no such thing as an uninterrupted succession of this kind. It does not exist ; it never did exist. It is a silly fable, invented by ecclesiastical tyrants, and supported by clerical coxcombs. But were it even true, it has nothing to do with the text. It speaks merely of the appointment of a high priest, the succession to be preserved in the tribe of Levi, and in the family of Aaron. But even this succession was interrupted and

“These *uncovenanting* doctors,” says Mr. Bristed, in his *Thoughts on the American-Anglo Churches*,¹ “do actually make belief in a bishop *more* essential to salvation than faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. In what part of the scriptures do these gentlemen find, that eternal life is made to hinge upon connexion with *any* particular external church order and government? The transit of an immortal soul from earth to heaven, or to hell, depends upon *far other* grounds, than whether he was an episcopalian, or presbyterian, or congregationalist. The word of God says: ‘He that believeth, (in Christ, not in the bishop,) and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned.’ Hence, faith in the redeeming God, *is* the indispensable condition of salvation; notwithstanding our divines place this condition upon the participation of christian ordinances at the hands of themselves and their authorized brethren.”

“What! ho! father Abraham!” said Mr. Whitfield, when preaching at Philadelphia — “whom have you in heaven? any episcopalians? No. Any presbyterians? No. Any baptists? No. Have you any methodists there? No. Any independents, or covenanters, or burghers, or anti-burghers? No. Whom have you, then, in heaven?” cried the impassioned preacher. ‘We know not any of those names here; all who are here are christians — believers in Christ; men who have overcome by the blood of the Lamb, and the word of his testimony.’ Is this the case?” continued the venerable speaker; “then, God help me! God bless us all to forget party names, and sectarian distinctions, and bigoted differences, and to become christians, indeed, and in truth. Amen! So may it be, amen!” “This father of the calvinistic methodists might have added an apostrophe to another distinguished personage, and said: “Ho! Beelzebub! ho, Satan! thou prince of darkness, thou destroyer of the souls of men! are there any papists in hell! Yes. Any protestant episcopalians? Yes. Any independents, or congregationalists? Yes. Any presbyterians? Yes. Any methodists? Yes. Any baptists? Yes. Any *lay* churchmen, teachers, and preachers, and expounders? Yes. Have you any christians? No. We have an innumerable multitude of formalists, and bigots, and sectarians, and persecutors of all persuasions and

broken; and the office itself was to cease on the coming of Christ, after whom there could be no high priest; nor can Christ have any successor, and, therefore, he is said to be a priest for ever; for he ever liveth the intercessor and sacrifice for mankind.” Comment. on Heb. v. 4.

See the absurdity of this theory fully exposed also in Dr. Bangs’ *Original Church of Christ*, Numbers 15-19, pp 97-243, and in the *Rights of Christ. Ch.* pp. 313, 314, 317, 364, 365.

1) *Ibid*, p. 256.

denominations, of every tongue, and name, and country, in that region, soil, and clime, where their worm dieth not, and where their fire is never quenched. But we have not one solitary christian, of any age, or either sex.”¹

Who can tell the number of souls who have been lulled into the sleep of eternal death, by those teachers who place the *external* order of their church, upon a level with the merits of the Redeemer, to procure acceptance before God? Nay, as to non-episcopalians, episcopacy is the *first*, and faith in Christ only the *second* requisite; for, says the writer

1) The argument is thus presented in a late number of the Eclectic Rev.: “We will suppose again, that the catalogue could be completed, what would it avail them among a christian people, when it would appear that they inherit through such utter reprobates, infidels, simonists, and monsters, as all history shows have occupied the bishops’ chairs, first in England, and next at the head quarters of Rome? John XII. was degraded by a council, that charged him with every abomination that ever disgraced a human monster. Leo, a wretch little better, was set up in his place. Yet Baronius and Binius trace the succession through John, and not through Leo. John was a simonist, a drunkard, a murderer, an adulterer, a worshipper of idols, and of the devil. Yet this monster was the channel through which our successionists claim to have received the Holy Ghost! Then, at another time, there were three popes, all making war upon each other, and fighting with armies to make their way to the apostolic chair, and convey the Holy Spirit’s influence pure from the Fountain-head to all their christian successors. In the eleventh century simony was universally practised in Italy. It was for a long time much the same in England, and Godwin shows at what exorbitant prices many of the English bishops procured ordination from the pope. ‘Come here,’ says Stillingfleet, ‘to Rome, and here the succession is as muddy as the Tiber itself.’ Iren. p. 322. Much good may it do to the successionists to take their fill of such a stream, and claim their descent through such channels. Yet all this comes, and infinitely more, if we had but room to state it, through their arrogant, thriftless, and con-

temptible boasts of apostolical succession. It deserves to be held up to the utter scorn and ridicule of the whole protestant world. It is an outrageous insult to common sense. If the men who are now perpetrating it in the face of England, were open to the *argumentum ad modestiam*, we would just remind them, that the Homily for Whitsunday, pt 2, declares that ‘the popes and prelates of Rome, for the most part, are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets, and false Christs, which deceived the world a long while;’ and then it prays, that the gospel of Christ may be received in all parts of the world, ‘to the beating down of sin, death, the pope, the devil, and all the kingdoms of antichrist.’ To these homilies, we believe, every clergyman subscribes, as containing ‘a godly and wholesome doctrine, fit to be read in churches by ministers.’ Yet we are now informed by these ministers of Christ, that these popes and prelates are the very men that have communicated to them exclusively the Holy Spirit and the apostolic doctrine. Gentlemen and christian ministers, what has become of your modesty and consistency? Can ye do all this in the face of God, and expect us, or this protestant nation, to believe and respect you? Why does not every honest clergyman disdainfully reject this wicked boast?

“Since the Church of England has, by its public documents, denounced the church of Rome as a heretical, foul, filthy, and antichristian church, we should be glad to know how such a church could communicate the apostolical virtue? Indeed, the successionists shall take either of these alternatives, and must take one of them. Let the church of Rome be a

above cited, "whoever is in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the church upon earth, is in communion with Christ, the head of it; and whoever is not in communion with the bishop, is *thereby* cut off from communion with Christ."

true church, or let it be a false one. We care not which, for in either case the Church of England is condemned. If it was a true church, then the Church of England was guilty of schism in leaving it, and is itself a false church; and if the church of Rome was a false church, then it could not be a pure fountain of apostolical succession, and so your apostolicity is tossed from the one horn to the other of this dilemma. The doctrine of lineal descent is stultified equally, whichever proposition is assumed."

Prelatists are very fond of caricaturing, and then grossly abusing, the doctrine of predestination, as being so merciless and exclusive. "Such an objection comes surely with an ill grace from those, who would have us believe that God has predestined to an exclusive personal election to all the privileges of the church on earth, and to the only covenanted salvation, the prelatial successors of the reverend line of popes, and those who

will submit to their spiritual jurisdiction.

"Such presumption and arrogance," says an episcopalian writer, (Bristed's Thoughts on the Am. Anglo Ch. p. 427,) "would be ridiculous, were it not truly lacrymable, that any one single, individual protestant can be found in the nineteenth century, so foolishly fanatic, so basely bigoted, so unchristian, so antichristian, as to advance this rankest of all the dogmas of popery. And these men, who thus liberally uncovenant, unchurch, unchristianize, all other denominations, call themselves Arminians; and profess to believe, that the Saviour died for all mankind, including heathens and Mahometans, as well as christians; and certainly, the warriors of the crescent, and the worshippers of the innumerable pagan deities, are quite as sturdy *non-episcopalians*, as the presbyterians, or congregationalists, or baptists, can possibly be."

LECTURE XV.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SUICIDAL.

WE now advance to another position, by which we would expose the unsoundness of this doctrine, and that is, that it is suicidal; and destructive in its application, to those who would audaciously stake on this filmy and unsubstantial vision, the whole destinies of the human family.

This doctrine — that apostolical succession, that is, its bold assumption, gives right to apostolic power, and secures to the church possessing it apostolic doctrine — is as destructive to its avowers, as it is intolerant to its rejectors. It is apostatical and not apostolical. — It overthrows the discipline of Christ; while it destroys the hopes of those who are true disciples of Christ. And while contending for Christ's seamless coat, crucifies him afresh in his living members.

Archbishop Laud, the canonized saint and martyr of prelatists,¹ confesses that this succession stands or falls with the opinion that the church of Rome "never erred" in fundamentals;² and that on the ascertained genuineness and validity of her claims to the succession, depend the hopes of the English prelacy.³ Now, as the stream can rise no higher than its source, it follows that whatever virtue, power, authority, or truth, this succession is supposed to confer upon the hierarchy in England, it must confer, *a fortiori*, on the hierarchy of Rome. For if this succession is insufficient to authenticate the claims of the church of Rome, and to perpetuate in her, truth of doctrine and propriety of order; then neither can it enstamp with apostolic character, the doctrines and order of the Anglican prelacy. If after all, this boasted succession does not in fact preserve, or prove, truth; and does

1) See The Cathedral.

2) See Neal's Puritans, vol. iii. pp. 189, 193.

3) Oxford Tracts, vol. i. p. 88.

not, therefore, transmit necessarily authority and power; then it is not the fountain of divine grace; it is not the source of the plenitude of power; it is not the necessary channel of divine mercy and fulfilled promises, — and we are left to seek the true church by other, and more certain, marks and qualities.¹

If the plenary authority to grant this grace and power by prelatial ordination is intrusted to the proper officers of the church, to be exercised for its benefit and at their discretion; then it follows of course, that there is given to these officers, when deemed necessary for securing this object, the power of revoking and annulling the ordinations already infelicitously conferred. Being the source of all the authority thereby vested, they are of course competent to recall it, when in their judgment unworthily received. But if this is so — and on the principles of this doctrine of the apostolical succession, how can it be denied? then truly is the boasted succession of the Anglican, yea, and of the Romish church, for ever blighted.² Let one or two illustrations suffice; and first let us instance, in the memorable case of the Roman catholic see of Utrecht: — “All the

1) “In any other body politic, a man, by leaving it, loses all the powers he had by being of it; and there’s no reason why ’t is not the same in an ecclesiastical society; and consequently all the church powers the protestant bishops could have, must be derived from the members of the new church they then joined themselves with.” (Rights of the Christian Church, by an Episcopalian. Lon. 1707, p. 323.)

2) Again, (pp. 324, 352,) “If a bishop, by leaving the Church of Rome, did not, by that act, lose all the episcopal power he had when he was one of the governors of that church, especially considering no commission can well be extended to authorize the opposing him who bestowed it, yet the popish bishops had as much power to deprive or degrade him as to ordain him; since a sentence is valid, though not right, when done by competent authority; and consequently the popish bishops, in the time of Queen *Mary*, or Queen *Elizabeth*, had as much right to unmake as they had to make a bishop in their father’s or grandfather’s time.”

“This, though no more were said, plainly shows that the hypothesis of ecclesiastical government belonging to such bishops only as derive their power by way of succession from catholic or apostolic predecessors, unchurches not only all the reformed

who are without bishops, but all the episcopalians likewise.”

“In a word, nothing can be more senseless than this notion of an indelible character, because all power, of what nature soever, conveyed by men, is a trust, and as such may be taken away, when the persons intrusted with it act contrary to the ends for which they were intrusted; of which those who intrusted them must needs retain a right to judge; and consequently priests and bishops may be reduced to the lay-state they were at first in.”

Mr. Dodwell argues, (see Rights of the Christian Church, p. 325,) “that the deprivation of the popish bishops was only of their temporalities; their sees, as to their spiritualities, being before vacant; the protestants owing them no duty, even in conscience, before deprivation.”

Now, “If those bishops were not bishops of the protestants before their deprivation, then they had no bishops, and consequently by his own principles, no priests, no sacraments, no christian church; and if they were not obliging in conscience before deprivation, it was because the people, judging them guilty of gross errors, had, by renouncing all communion with them, withdrawn their obedience from them, and deprived them of all

bishops of this see,¹ have been regularly consecrated; but because Dominic Varlet, who a hundred years ago consecrated the first bishop, was at that time under the censure of the pope, the whole see has ever since been declared schismatical, and each successive prelate has regularly received a renewed condemnation from the sovereign pontiff.² A similar example is recorded by Calvin, in the case of Eugenius and Amadeus. When by the decree of the council of Basil, Eugenius was deposed, degraded, and pronounced guilty of schism, together with all the bishops and cardinals, who had united with him in opposing the council, Calvin says, the succession of the ministry was at this time virtually broken, for, ‘from the bosom of these heretics and rebels, have proceeded all the popes, cardinals, bishops, abbots, and priests, ever since.’³

As to the Anglican succession, the case is equally plain. Being, according to this doctrine, derived from the Romish church, and being on the principles of this doctrine absolutely withdrawn by that church, no such valid succession can exist, and the Anglican church is plainly upstart and schismatical. Dr. Milner, as we have seen,⁴ urges that the Anglican bishops, by taking their commission from the king, renounced all title from Christ or his apostles. Dodwell applies the same argument to the Romish bishops who took out commissions from Henry VIII., and who, since there cannot be two originals of the same power, renounced all other and better title to their office.⁴ And thus do prelatists, like the fabled serpent, devour one another.

Further, as prelatists tell us that we cannot preach, unless authorized by prelates; so do the Romanists teach that these prelates themselves cannot officiate, unless empowered to do so by the pope. “Particular bishops,”⁵ say they, “who have only the care of their flocks committed to them, cannot send into the provinces of others; therefore this ought to be

the spiritual jurisdiction they had over them; which, contrary to the whole drift and design of his book, proves that the bishop’s power is derived from and dependent on the people; and what they could do thus themselves by a tacit agreement, they might authorize the Queen to do solemnly and formally; or rather the people having, by renouncing their communion, deprived them of all the spiritual power and authority they could pretend to over them, the Queen took from them all those legal rights and privileges the law had invested them with.⁵

1) Letters on the Min. Rit. and Lit. of Prot. Ep. Ch. by Mr. Jared Sparks, Balt. 1820, pp. 44, 45.

2) See the Pastoral Letter of Archbishop Marechal to the congregation of Norfolk, Virginia, 1819, 2d ed. appendix, p. 84.

3) Institutes; Dedication to the King, p. 25.

4) Doctr. of Ch. of Eng. concerning Independ. of Clergy, &c. p. 23.

5) Limborch Body of Div. b. vii. chap. iii. p. 911.

done by an universal bishop, who has the charge of the whole church committed to him." Now this right the Romanists found both upon scripture and antiquity, and therefore, as Anglican prelates must allow, the mere *plea* of scripture and antiquity, without solid proof, will not suffice for the establishment of these prelatical dogmas; while the assumption of authority and power to give or withhold the ministerial commission, is fatal to both the Roman and the Anglican hierarchy, and may be as justifiably advanced by all other denominations as by either of these.¹

And thus does it appear that there is, on this basis, and when tested by these principles, no certain or valid succession in any extant church.

Once more. If the English hierarchy possesses whatever divine

1) The following confessions taken from Mr. Dodwell, and the author of "The case of the Regale," will be considered as decisive:

Mr. Dodwell says, (Doct. of the Ch. of Eng. Concern. Indep. of the Clergy, § 33,) "that in a revolution of ages, there is no succession in the world, but has some unjustifiable turn. Nor is there," says he, "any thing in the nature of ecclesiastical government, as it is a government of external bodies, managed by men of like infirmities with those who are engaged with civil government, that can secure it against the like violences of ambitious and unreasonable men, who would judge too partially in their own case. Such violences on the government may sometimes make a breach in the due succession, and affect the direct conveyances of that authority from God which is requisite to the giving a title to those spiritual benefits to souls, which are the great design of ecclesiastical communion."

The author of "The case of the Regale," (p. 77, ed. 1st,) also allows "that it would be hard to find a bishop against whom some of these objections (relating to succession) do not lie; for example, all the bishops of the reformation, as well in *England* as elsewhere, are struck off at one blow; for they all derived from those who now account to be, and then to have been heretics. And the ordinations of the church of *Rome* must go off too, especially since the council of *Constance*, that turned out all the popes that were then in the world, which were three anti-popes contending one

with another. And they cannot say of any of their ordinations at this day, that they are not derived from some or other who were '*arians, semi-arians,*'" &c.

"Should we," says the author of "The Rights of the Christian Church," (Lond. 1707, p. 350,) "allow an indelible character, yet the papists make so many things necessary to the obtaining of it, that 't is next to impossible they should have been always regularly performed amongst them. But not to insist on these things, which they more than others suppose necessary to the obtaining of an indelible character, I say that in case of schism, where two pretend to the same see, the schismatic cannot be bishop of a see which was before filled with another; and if not of that he pretends to, much less of any other; and if he were not a bishop before, (the translation of bishops being a modern practice, and contrary to the ancient canons of the church,) he was never in possession of the indelible character, and consequently was not capable of conveying it to another; which, in the church of *Rome*, must be a bar to the apostolical succession, since there have been, as their own historian, *Onuphius*, proves, at least thirty schisms occasioned by several, no less, sometimes, than five or six, pretending to the popedom at once: and one of their schisms lasted more than fifty years, when one pope sat at *Rome* and the other at *Avignon*, thundering out all sorts of curses and censure against each other."

authority and power she claims, by virtue of this succession of prelates, to whom God infallibly secured the fulfilment of his promises and the perpetual enjoyment of his presence ; — then must these same prerogatives as surely attach to every other body of men, who have the same assurance in boasting of this inherited apostolate ; and on this ground may this doctrine be made to enstamp the impress of heaven upon dogmas the most contradictory and false, and upon practices the most puerile and superstitious. These prerogatives must, on this theory of right, belong and now reside in the churches of France, of Spain, and of Rome. Nay, throughout the world, there is scarcely, — not to say a nation, or people, — not even a city of any magnitude or consequence, in which the religion of Christ may be said to exist, that does not ascribe the first planting of its church, to one or other of the apostles, or to some of their immediate and intimate disciples ; so that the Russians, the Poles, the Prussians, the Greeks, the Abyssinians, the Orientals, pronounce themselves, in the spirit of all ancient nations, to be the descendants of the gods, and the genuine successors to apostolic dignity and power.¹

Either then, the English church holds to the same faith, substantially, which is held by the Romish and all these other churches, or it holds to a faith essentially different from them. If the faith, to which the Anglican succession bears testimony, is different from that held by these churches, then must its succession be also different. It is a new succession, for it testifies to a body of truth, differing from that to which the same succession in the Romish and other churches previously attested. It is, therefore, a broken succession. It is not a succession, but a secession — and the Church of England is not a colony, but a revolutionary society. But if, on the other hand, its system of doctrine is not thus different, then are Anglican prelatists in a state of declared excommunication,² and bound to acknowledge themselves, if not Romanists in fact — yet papists in reality. The mere claim of apostolical succession — apart from doctrine — if pretensions as bold, and confident, aye, and as authenticated, as those of the English and Romish churches, are sufficient — will stamp the seal of catholicity on churches of every name and character.

“The Arian churches which once predominated in the kingdoms of the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, the Vandals, and the Lombards, were all episcopal churches, and

1) See Vidal's Mosheim's Comment. vol. i. pp. 145, 146. See the list of these given by Fabricius, in his *Lux. Evang.* pp. 83, 93.

2) See Bp. Hall's *Wks.* vol. viii. p. 50, &c.

all had a fairer claim than that of England to the apostolical succession, as being much nearer to the apostolical times. In the East, the Greek church, which is at variance on points of faith with all the western churches, has an equal claim to this succession. The Nestorian, the Eutychian, the Jacobite churches, all heretical, all condemned by counsels, of which even protestant divines have generally spoken with respect, had an equal claim to the apostolical succession."¹

These churches are all, therefore, equally supreme in power; authoritative to interpret scripture; to decree rites, ceremonies, and forms; to hand down apostolical traditions; and to decide when, and how far, to exercise these vested rights, under the guidance of promises to be infallibly fulfilled; whether it be in the way of legislative, judicial, or executive functions.² That the church should be indefectible in England, and infallible at Rome; the eucharist a real and efficacious sacrifice in the one place, and a real presence of the body sacrificed in the other; and that baptism should be regeneration in both; these are accidental variations, or agreements, that do not affect the substance of the doctrine in question.

The church of Rome, and all other corrupt and apostatical communions, and the Church of England, stand or fall together. Touch but the standing of one, and you pierce that spinal cord by which life and sensation are conveyed to every limb and member of the entire body. That these claims, then, may be verified, the character of the purest and best churches under heaven must be blasted and destroyed, while that of churches the most heretical must be honorably sustained.³

But it so happens, through that law of Providence, by which the partners in evil are sure to conspire against each other, that these several churches have turned king's evidence against each other, and have proclaimed to the world their mutual treachery and deceit. Forth steps the Greek church, and at the bar of Heaven impleads her Latin co-rival for her insolence and heresy, and excommunicates her from all participation in this succession. Then rises the Latin church, in all her wrath, and hurls back her thunders, at the false foundations of this unsubmissive hierarchy.⁴ And when the churches of the reformation attempted to steal fire from the Romish altar, wherewith to erect other and separate altars, with what withering anathemas did this Ro-

1) Edinb. Rev. April, 1839, p. 141. On the heretical character of the Greek and Oriental churches, see the Lond. Chr. Obs. Feb. 1841, pp. 66, 67.

2) See Hanbury's Hooker, vol. i. p. 30.

3) On the absurdity of rejecting presbyterian ordination and admitting the validity of popish, see Towgood's Dissent Justified, pp. 82, 87, 179, 195.

4) See Bp. Hall, vol. viii. p. 50, and his references.

mish hierarchy despoil them, and the English among the rest, of their ill-gotten booty.¹

Bossuet, and others, convict the English church of schism, heresy, and usurpation;² of being, in short, in the self-same predicament of that unfortunate presbyter, Ischryas, of whom it was decreed, in a council of prelates, that he "had assumed to himself an *imaginary* episcopacy," and, in punishment thereof, he was commanded, on the peril of ghostly censure, "to *return* to that order of presbyters whereto he was ordained," — and from which, at the same time, they had just declared his departure to be merely "*imaginary!*"³ Now we will venture to say, that, on strict succession principles, whatever answer is retorted upon these Romish judges, will retort back again upon these prelatists themselves; and that in attempting to secure their own apostolic superstructure, they will be found, as has been said of these Romish architects, "building one assumption upon another assumption, piling one ecclesiastical Ossa upon an ecclesiastical Pelion; placing (after the manner of the Hindoo legend) their spiritual universe upon the horns of the bull, and the bull upon the back of the tortoise, and the tortoise itself upon vacuity."⁴

Certain it is, that that great divine, — now in such goodly repute (is it not by some great mistake?) at Oxford⁵ — the Rev. Thomas Jackson, demonstrates on behalf of the English church, (as one of "US, THE REFORMED CHURCHES"⁶) that the Romish church is "the synagogue of satan," "antichrist," "a usurper in the chair of God's saints" — "an intruder into the church which had been holy and catholic before his intrusion," and guilty of "idolatry much worse than that of the heathen."⁷

Now the query to be resolved by these casuists is this: If this succession consists in the transmitted gifts of the Holy Spirit,

1) Ibid, p. 51.

2) See Faber's *Albigenses*, p. 14, and Palmer, vol. ii. p. 450, &c.; Neal's *Purit.* vol. iv. p. 178.

3) See Potter on Ch. Govt. pp. 262, 263.

4) Faber's *Albigenses*, p. 17.

5) So thinks Bishop McIlvaine also.

6) See Works, vol. iii. pp. 888, b. 12, ch. xxi.

7) See Wks. vol. iii. pp. 882, 883, and b. 12, ch. xix.

We might fill a volume with similar sentiments. How, for instance, does Bishop Bull, in his *Vindication of the Church of England*, expose the errors and corruptions of the Church of

Rome, in a work addressed, too, to a lady, the Countess of Newburgh? How does he speak of that church? "It is to be observed," he says, "by every one now-a-days, that THE FILTH OF OUR CHURCH DOTH EMPTY ITSELF INTO THE SINK OF ROME." See p. 8.

Again he says, "Leaving THE WRETCHES to the righteous judgment of God." Bull's *Vind.* p. 124

Again, "But, alas, we may now cry out, 'how is the faithful city become a HARLOT.'" Ibid, p. 148, Cor. of Ch. of Rome.

Again, "I VERILY BELIEVE THEY ARE IN GREAT DANGER THAT LIVE IN HER COMMUNION." Ibid, p. 151.

as an external efficacious source of episcopal grace and power, then how was this inheritance conveyed, when the church was itself Arian, and believed in no Holy Ghost, but denied Him; and when it had fallen into idolatry, and rejected nearly the whole doctrines of christianity? A title to external office might, even under such difficulties, be easily conveyed; but how inward and personal qualities, and that too in such circumstances, could be possibly transmitted, it is not easy to understand. And yet the belief of this is what is made to be "of the substance of the faith," and essential to covenanted mercy.

If the prelatie order consists merely in its dignity and external functions, then it can communicate no internal grace or efficacious power. And if its virtue consists in this inward grace, then the absurdity and the impossibility of this pretension stares us in the face, for how could this spiritual and divine grace be transmissible, and transmissible through a foul and graceless channel?¹

If it is said, as it is, that the power of the Holy Ghost is assuredly given by the imposition of prelatie hands,² then another absurdity arises; for it is manifest that he, who by this manipulation "*receives* the Holy Ghost,"³ has previously been made to declare that "he is truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ;" that is, that he *has already received* the Holy Ghost — for by this it is, that Christ now calls his servants unto his ministry. And thus is the recipient of prelatie ordination, at one and the same time, made to declare his belief that he has *already* received, and that he *then* receives the Holy Ghost, and a consequent call to the work of the ministry.

But again. In the Oxford tracts,⁴ it is correctly shown, that if the validity and the consequent benefits of the sacraments depend on the design of their administrator, there would be no confidence to any penitent that he had ever received them in truth. Now with tenfold strength we urge, that if the validity of the sacraments depends on a regular unbroken line of successors to the

1) See this made good in Jackson, vol. iii. pp. 876, 878, 880.

2) That the Holy Ghost is actually and truly given, according to this doctrine, by the imposition of the hands of prelates, however notoriously infidel and immoral the recipients may be, is distinctly taught. Thus, as to the former, Mr. Keble says, "St. Paul speaks of the Holy Ghost dwelling *in us*, i. e. in himself and Timothy; and how it had passed from him to Timothy, by the imposition of his hands. The Church of England, you

will remember, supplies FULL WARRANT for THIS INTERPRETATION, by directing the same phrase to be solemnly repeated at the consecration of every bishop. Remember, that thou stir up the grace of God which is GIVEN THEE BY THIS imposition of our hands." On Primitive Tradition, ed. 4th, p. 43; see also Palmer on the Ch. vol. iii. p. 431.

3) See the Form for the Ordaining of Priests.

4) Vol. i. p. 36.

apostles, “whose authority to confer the gifts of the spirit is derived originally from the laying on of the hands of the apostles themselves;”¹—then it is most clearly impossible for any christian now, *or ever after*, to have any assurance that he has partaken, or that he can truly “partake, of the body and blood of Christ.”

And if a hope of covenanted mercy is necessary to christian faith, and peace, and joy, then since this hope, on these principles, is imparted only by the true prelatistical successors of the apostles; and since no human being can be certain that his ministers and their predecessors, up to the time of the apostles, were in every respect their true successors, and qualified to act in their name; no human being can, in life or in death, cherish a well-grounded or comfortable hope of eternal life.²

Another consequence of this doctrine,—by which the poisoned chalice prepared for the destruction of others, is shown to convey death to them by whom it was prepared—is, that by making the efficacy of all ordinances to depend on prelates, who by virtue of their lineal succession, are able to convey the necessary grace;³ they most effectually becloud the certainty of any valid administration of them within their own bounds. For as in all ages, there have been multiplied cases of baptism where no such transmission of “episcopal grace” could take place; so are we informed that⁴ “half the existing hierarchy in America have had their baptism and education from dissent;” which baptism is of necessity no baptism, so far as any prelatist efficacy or validity has been conferred upon it. But upon the validity of baptism, rests the validity of all subsequent orders, which must, of course, to be of any value, be grafted on a good tree, springing from a good root; and hence it cannot by possibility be shown, *on this theory*, that there is a validly ordained minister in any existing hierarchy in the world. Thus are these “conspirators”⁵ against the privileges and rights of others—to use their own words—blown up by their own treasonable plot.

That the christian ministry is of divine institution we believe,

1) See *ibid.*

2) “Let it be THY SUPREME CARE, O my soul”—such is the language which Bishop Hobart puts, in his Companion to the Altar, into the mouth of the communicant,—“to receive the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of the Saviour, ONLY FROM THE HANDS OF THOSE who derive their authority by regular transmission from Christ.” “Where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church, by the participation of its

ordinances at the hands of the DULY AUTHORIZED PRIESTHOOD, IS THE INDISPENSABLE CONDITION OF SALVATION, except in cases of *ignorance, invincible prejudice*, imperfect reasoning, and mistaken judgment.”

3) See e. g. Potter on Ch. Govt. pp. 236, 230, &c.

4) Quoted from an American Episc. author, in British Critic, Oct. 1839, p. 308.

5) Mr. Newman.

and that *ordinarily* the right to enter upon it is avouched by ordination, we also believe ; — and that there ever has been and will be a succession of ministers, is also a part of our faith. — But that this ministry is dependent for its existence, on an order of prelates ; and that its efficacy flows through their consecration ; and that their power to bestow this all-important gift, is determined by the fact of an unbroken lineal succession of such prelates ; — all this we regard as most perfectly visionary.

We repudiate it as antichristian — as no part of Christ's ordinance,¹ and as without any authority from Him, whose ministers and ambassadors we are. Our ministry we have received *through* prelatists, but not of, by, or from, them. To them we attribute no other virtue than as conveyancers of a divine institution, whose efficacy comes — and COMES SOLELY — from a divine power. SCRIPTURE EPISCOPACY is PRESBYTERY, and SCRIPTURE BISHOPS ARE PRESBYTERS. As presbyters we acknowledge and receive prelates, and the ministry from them, as the custodiers of this sacred office ; but whatever they claim more than this, cometh not from above — it is an usurpation — and is perfectly null and void, except as to its criminality. We do not regard existing prelates as antichristian — although prelacy, in all beyond presbytery, we must regard as one branch of sacerdotal and unchristian assumption — “the stairs and way to anti-christianity” by which it has ascended, and may again ascend to power, — “rather than anti-christianity itself.” It is because they have thus preserved the substance of the ministry we recognize prelates at all. — As for this challenged superiority of prelatic jurisdiction, we know it not. — It is a nullity, contrary to the sense of the early English church — to the laws of England — to the testimony of most learned Romish divines — and to the judgment of the best writers and churches all the world over.² To rest the claims of any ministry to the respect, confidence, and honor of the people, or to a divine institution, on this doctrine of succession, as do high-church prelatists in and out of Rome, in England and in America ; is most assuredly to destroy their claims to any respect whatever, with an utter destruction. It is the opinion of Mr. Faber, certainly one of the most learned divines of the present English church, and a firm believer in three orders, and which opinion he sustains by incontrovertible arguments, that “it may perhaps endanger the whole system of apostolical succession, if

1) See Divine Right of the Ministry, p. 26, pt. ii. 1654.

2) See this fully shown in Pow-

ell. See Divine Right of the Ministry, pt. ii. pp. 18, 22.

we rigidly insist upon the absolute necessity of a transmission through the medium of bishops (i. e. prelates) exclusively."¹ "It is most evident," says Dr. Field, a writer of "the very highest authority" with these high-church theologues, "that, that wherein a bishop (prelate) excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power, or order, but an eminency and dignity only, specially YIELDED to one above all the rest of the SAME RANK, for order sake and to preserve the unity of the church."²

To pronounce a sentence of excommunication upon presbyterians, and all other of the reformed churches, — which being reformed, are not therefore new, or novel churches, but the pre-existing and deformed churches made better — because they reject prelacy; is, we must say, an outrageous violence done to reason, scripture, charity, and christianity; and "doth more advance and honor antichrist, than it doth disparage or disgrace us."³ Such a judgment is self-condemned.

There are three species under the genus bishop. There is the scripture bishop, which is a presbyter. There is the primitive bishop, which is a presbyter acting as constant moderator or president. And there is the prelatial bishop, of the after age — the lordly claimant to the succession of apostolic jurisdiction, over the only bishops known to the word of God. Now we challenge the whole bench to show any sufficient authority for this third species in scripture, or in the first two centuries, — the diocesan, prelatial successor of apostles, occupying his order as peculiar, supreme, and by divine right.⁵

1) Faber's *Albigenses*, pp. 553—562.

2) Field of the Church, lib. iii. cap. 39.

3) Div. Right of Min. p. 30.

4) See on this threefold distinction, and the whole subject, the *Altare Damascenum*, Davidis Calderwood, Lugd. 1708, p. 83, &c.

5) "If I were worthy to advise some people," says the author of "The Rights of the Chris. Church," (Lond. 1707, ed. 3d, pp. 316, 317, &c.) "I would desire them not to act like the executioners of the three children, in venturing to burn themselves, that they might be sure to throw others far enough into the fire; and that they would no more attack the dissenters on such principles as unchurch all who departed from *Rome*, those who have as well as those who have not bishops. In order to prove this the consequence of their principles, I here

demand, if the church of Christ be (as they affirm) but one, and that those who refuse communion with it, cut themselves off from it, whether the Romish bishops were at the time of the reformation bishops or not? If they were, the protestants, by separating from them, and by setting up a communion in opposition to them, became schismatics, and thereby cut themselves off from this one church; since two opposite communions, as the clergy on all sides hold, cannot be both ministers of the same church; and if one is a member of the true church, the other cannot be so too; and a false church is no church, at least of Christ; and consequently the protestant bishops cannot be governors in the church of Christ, because ecclesiastical headship supposes a union with the body, and they who break that union must destroy any headship, power, or authority they

We must, however, plead against false testimony ; or the dogmatic interpretation of the testimony given, in a prelatiic sense ; — or the *ex parte* decision of these intolerant hierarchs, sitting in conclave, with closed doors, the laity and the clergy being disallowed to speak ; — as not the voice of the church ; as most insufficient authority ; and as nothing more nor less than the judgment of the usurper upon his own claims. But of this, more again.

had before over the body, or any part of it, since by their schism they cease to belong to the body."

"On the contrary, if the Romish church, at any time before the reformation, ceased to be a true church, they ceased to have a right to those privileges belonging to it, of which the receiving and conveying spiritual power or government is on all sides allowed to be one ; and consequently, they were incapable of bestowing any on the protestant bishops."

In an article on the apostolical succession, in the London Christian

Observer, (for 1838, App. p. 820,) it is said, "But in reprehending the popish abuse of the doctrine of apostolical succession, we would ever keep in mind its sober and scriptural interpretation ; for never can we question that our Divine Lord has always had a church, and that our portion of it is of apostolical lineage. But the Romanists' view of the doctrine is superstitious and unwarranted by Holy Writ ; and when espoused by any professed member of the Church of England, IT IS ALSO AS SUICIDAL AS IT IS UNSCRIPTURAL."

LECTURE XVI.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION CONTRARY
TO THE MORE APPROVED AND CHARITABLE JUDGMENT OF THE
ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

HAVING dwelt upon the unreasonableness of this prelati-
c doctrine of apostolical succession, we are prepared to show that it
has been rejected in whole or in part, by many of the best di-
vines of the English church; and that it is not, in the judgment
of a large portion of it, to be regarded as the established doctrine
of that church.

We are indeed told by Mr. Vagan, in a statement authenti-
cated by Dr. Hook, that "one of the FALSEHOODS propagated
in these days is, that the reformers did not hold the divine right
of episcopacy, (prelacy,) but that this doctrine was subsequently
introduced."¹ In support of this bold assertion, he alleges that
in a certain conference with Romanists, a certain Dean Horn
"observed that the apostles' authority is derived upon after ages,
and conveyed to the bishops, their successors."² He then men-
tions the authority of Bishop Hutton, as the only other ground
of evidence, on which to convict the true friends of the church,
and of the cause of Christ, of the heinous charge of falsehood.

Now as we have been obliged, "in all conscience," and as
we believe, "in all charity," with no hatred or malice towards
any individuals, to speak strongly in reprehension of this theo-
retic doctrine, as being in its necessary tendency in all time to
come, and in its actual developements in all time past, evil and
greatly evil—we would gladly incur the wrath of such zealots for
the "sacred order," if we could be instrumental in wiping off
from one of the stars, which shone in the bright banner of the

1) Hook's Call to (dis) Union,
p. 106, Am. Ed.

2) Ibid, p. 107.

reformation, this foul and dishonoring stain. We would, in this way, hope to give further evidence, that our purpose, in this cause, is defensive, and not offensive — that our opposition is to prelacy, and not to episcopacy — to that popish figment whose absence could in naught deteriorate the character or claims of the protestant episcopal church, but whose presence must identify her with Romanism, even as the soul gives unity to the changed elements of the body; and which must thus gather around her all the odium of intolerance in principle, if not in practice. This doctrine, then, we believe and declare to be separable from episcopacy, as even its abettors allow. Should we fail in giving proof sufficient to establish the truth of what is here called a falsehood, then we can only regret, that in very deed, such an aspersion should fairly be accredited to a church, towards which, so far as she permits, we would ever reciprocate the most fraternal regard.

The editors of the London Christian Observer, the periodical of the evangelical portion of the English episcopal church, in a review of a recent work, by a trained soldier of the Oxford band,¹ thus present the argument, and in a way which may be more satisfactory than were the same language employed by an excommunicated alien from the chosen commonwealth.

“ Amongst the first and most momentous in its consequences, of Mr. Gladstone’s deflections from the truth, is the assumption of what is styled apostolical succession, as absolutely, and under all possible circumstances, necessary to the validity of the ministerial commission. We do not derogate from the importance of the regular transmission of the sacerdotal commission; but in what paragraph of the New Testament — in what authenticated document among the ‘remains of the apostles, — and most assuredly we may add, in what article or homily of the Church of England, is it enjoined, asserted, or intimated, that no man, under any possible circumstances, can lawfully administer the christian sacraments, and exercise the christian ministry, unless in the order of a lineal episcopal succession from some one of the apostles, to the individual who conferred his commission upon him? With regard to our own church, its most distinct and pertinent announcement is contained in the Twenty-third Article, which simply declares that those persons are to be judged as lawfully called to the ministry, who have been chosen and sent by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard. The purport of this declaration, Bishop Burnet describes as follows, under the head of this Article: —

1) Mr. Gladstone’s State in its Relations to the Church.

“The definition here given of those that are lawfully called and sent, is put in very general words, far from that magisterial stiffness in which some (the Nonjurors, &c.,) have taken upon them to dictate in this matter. The article does not resolve this into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large for such accidents as had happened, and such as might still happen. Those who drew it had the state of the several churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced out of the beaten path than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times; necessity has no law, and is a law unto itself.”

“That which is simply necessary as a means to preserve the order and union of the body of christians, and to maintain the reverence due to holy things, is, that no man enter upon any part of the holy ministry, without he be chosen and called to it by such as have an authority so to do; that, I say, is fixed by the article; but men are left more at liberty as to their thoughts concerning the subject of his lawful authority.”

“That which we believe to be *lawful authority* is, that rule which the body of the pastors, or bishops and clergy of a church, shall settle, being met in a body under the due respect to the powers that God shall set over them; rules thus made being in nothing, contrary to the word of God, and duly executed by the particular persons to whom that care belongs, are certainly the lawful authority.”

“The bishop touches more directly upon the case of the foreign protestant churches, as follows:—

“If a company of christians find the public worship where they live, to be so defiled, that they cannot, with a good conscience, join in it; and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely, and in a regular way; if, I say, such a body finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower function, should submit itself entirely to their conduct, or, finding none of those, should, by a common consent, desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things; and should, upon that beginning, grow up to a regulated constitution; though we are very sure, that this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin, unless the necessity were great and apparent; yet if the necessity is real, and not feigned, this is not condemned or annulled by the article; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a body who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordina-

ry case ; whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure, that *not only those who penned the articles, but the body of the church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted, to be true churches, as to all the essentials of a church*, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the article is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.”

“ We do not say that this statement of Bishop Burnet’s, or any other hypothesis, is free from difficulties ; but the most incredible of all the contending opinions is, that there is not a church, a sacrament, or a christian, in any nation, except as connected with episcopal ordination and government, demonstrably transmitted in uninterrupted succession from the apostles. Independently of other **INSUPERABLE DIFFICULTIES, AND MONSTROUS CONSEQUENCES**, involved in the popish (i. e. *the high-church*)¹ view of the apostolical succession, — such as the uncertainty and profound obscurity which envelope some of the links of the chain of transmission, and the foul impurities, both doctrinal and practical, which exhibit many others in disgraceful prominence, together with the absolute expulsion of the greatly larger proportion of protestant Europe out of the pale of christian brotherhood, there is one so portentous, that nothing short of the most irrefragable scriptural demonstration, could sustain a theory which implies it ; we mean the insuperable difficulty interposed in the way of reforming or remodelling a corrupt church. If, as Mr. Gladstone states, in language to us scarcely intelligible, the church, as embodied in its rulers, is ‘ an inheritance not merely of antiquity, but also of inspiration,’ how is it to be brought back to purity when it has diverged from it ? It is this very doctrine of alleged infallibility in connexion with ecclesiastical lineage, that renders the church of Rome impervious to reformation. It may be said, and truly, that the providence of God is pledged for the security of his church, and that from its corrupt ranks he can, and will raise up holy men, who shall trim the lamp when it becomes dim, and supply oil when it seemed almost expiring ; and thankful we are to say, that, at the period of the reformation, he did so in our own land, by inclining the hearts of Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and other bishops and pastors of the church, to perform the work of reformation. But even in England, the great majority of the popish bishops were hostile to amendment ; so that, had not other influences interposed, the reformation could not have

1) See this declared on p. 389, by this work.

been accomplished. In France, Italy, Spain, and most other parts of the Continent, it was absolutely prevented; and in Germany and Switzerland, it was effected only by rudely snapping the chain of episcopal succession. God, we know, can, and will protect his church; but before we can presume on an immediate interposition from above, to prevent the consequences of human ignorance and depravity, we must be assured that the theory which would require an interference out of the ordinary course of his providence, is of divine institution, and that no other remedy is capable of meeting the exigency of the case. We would not treat lightly the evils of deranging a well-arranged ecclesiastical system; and we rejoice that, in our own country, the reformation was effected under the enlightened and prudent superintendence of the rulers of the church. We are merely exposing a THEORY WHICH IS NOT ONLY DESTITUTE OF ALL SCRIPTURAL BASIS, BUT IS IN REALITY PREGNANT WITH CONSEQUENCES THAT FALL NOTHING SHORT OF THE WORST ABUSES OF PAPAL DESPOTISM. The rights and privileges of the priesthood, when justly exercised, are to be held in reverence; but the line of succession in the church was designed to be a bond of order, not an instrument of tyranny and corruption; and if, in escaping from the accumulated mass of human depravity, the foreign reformers wrenched the chain, and fastened it afresh into the rock of scriptural truth, we have no more doubt of its firmness, than we have of the Queen of England's right to the throne, and of her judges to administer the laws, because of disruptions during the heptarchy, or the wars of the Roses, or when James was expelled from his kingdom."

Such is the language and testimony of this able and widely extended organ of the evangelical "members of the established church" in England.

The eighteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles, pronounces those accursed who presume to "say that every man shall be saved by the sect or law which he professeth; since there is salvation only through Christ."¹ Now if the name of Christ is the only way of salvation — and if salvation through him, can be obtained without the pale, and beyond the gift of prelatic successionists, — are not they here pronounced accursed, who presume to say that covenanted salvation can be obtained only by the sect of the hereditary successionists; and who profess to believe this to be the one and only way, or medium of salvation?

The fifty-fifth canon clearly recognizes the membership of other churches. It is as follows:

1) See Blunt on the 39 Art. pp. 121, 124. Eng. Ed.

“Ye shall pray for Christ’s holy catholic church; *that is*, for the whole congregation of christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, &c.”¹

To these evidences may be added the thirtieth canon, of 1603, which says, “The abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, SO FAR WAS IT FROM the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, OR ANY SUCH LIKE CHURCHES, in ALL things which they held and practised, that as the apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endanger the church of God nor offend the minds of men,” &c.

Dr. Holland, king’s professor of divinity at Oxford, says “that to affirm the office of bishop to be different from that of presbyter, and superior to it, (and therefore essential to a church,) is most false; contrary to scripture, to the fathers, *to the doctrines of the Church of England*, and to the schoolmen themselves.”²

It has been already seen,³ that the book of orders up to the year 1662, appropriated to presbyters, and to them peculiarly, the only commission given by Christ for a christian ministry at all;—and also the promises of Christ’s perpetual presence, which are now supposed to secure all apostolic power. This book further enjoined that presbyters, with the bishop, “SHALL LAY THEIR HANDS SEVERALLY upon the head of EVERY ONE that receiveth the order of priesthood.” And hence it is most evident that the Church of England, up to the year 1662, did most solemnly attest her belief that presbyters were the proper successors of the apostles, and that there could be no valid ordination without a presbytery, and apart from presbyters; bishops having no peculiar power of ordination, nor any right to ordain alone. It is also remarkable, as a further illustration of this truth, that anciently, rectors, &c. were (though presbyters) actually denominated prelates.⁴

Besides, by the constitution of the English church, archdeacons, deans, &c. in their peculiars, “to the great blemish of our reformed church,” as Bishop Gibson thinks,⁵ “exercise episcopal jurisdiction of all kinds, independent from the bishops.” And yet these are not prelates, but only presbyters.

1) That our interpretation of this canon is correct, see declared by a correspondent, and also by the editors of the London Christian Obs. for 1838, p. 819.

2) Dwight’s Theol. vol. v. p. 10.

3) See Lect. vi. p. 135.

4) See Johnson’s Clergyman’s Vade Mecum, vol. i. pp. 183, 212, edit. 4th, in Powell, p. 148.

5) Codex Juris. Eccl. Anglic. p. 22 in Foster’s Exam. of p. 10.

Chancellors, also, of whom Dr. Ridley says,¹ they “are equal or nearly equal in time, to bishops themselves; yea, chancellors are so necessary officers to bishops, that every bishop must of necessity have a chancellor”—and who, “as he is the *oculus episcopi*, ought to have an eye unto all parts of the diocese, and hath immediately under the ordinary, jurisdiction in all matters ecclesiastical within the same”—this chancellor may be nothing more than a layman.²

As to the words in the ordinal, which are quoted as demonstrative proof of a claim of divine right, Professor Wigglesworth observes, that “the words in the ordinal are too slender a foundation to build upon in the present case; especially if it be remembered who were the compilers of that book, and what reason we have to conclude that they were of the judgment THAT PRIESTS AND BISHOPS ARE BY GOD’S LAW ONE AND THE SAME.” Sober remarks³ that the Church of England, and its whole episcopate, must trace up the original of its present constitutional existence to the regal supremacy, as exercised by her majesty’s progenitors, the kings and queens of England—commencing with the infamous Henry VIII. And that a divine right is out of the question, is made demonstratively plain by Sir Michael Foster, Kt., in his Examination of Bp. Gibson’s Codex Juris.⁴ Cranmer took out a license to make a metropolitan visitation,⁵ and a commission, also, *during* the king’s *pleasure*, FOR CONFERRING ORDERS and the exercise of all other parts of archi-episcopal jurisdiction, in the name of the king.⁶ So also did Bonner take out his commission “TO ORDAIN WITHIN the DIOCESE OF LONDON SUCH as he SHOULD JUDGE WORTHY of HOLY ORDERS,” &c.

That there is not an iota in the creed, or in the articles of this church, which fairly holds forth this odious and intolerant doctrine, is expressly admitted by the Oxford tractators themselves, who regard the formularies, as on this account, incomplete; and who devoutly long for an opportunity of reforming the church anew, and of branding with a fitting anathema, “this new heresy, which denies the holy catholic church (*that is, the exclusive claims of the prelacy*) the heresy of Hoadly and others like him;”⁷ and we may therefore safely rank the abettors of this extra-ecclesia

1) Ridley’s View, &c. ed. 1662, p. 156.

2) 37 Henry viii. 17, in Foster’s Exam. p. 38.

3) See in Dr. Chauncy’s Appeal to the Public Answered, Boston, 1768, p. 8.

4) Eccl. Angl. ed. 3d, 1736 re-print, pp. 13–24, and p. 43.

5) P. 24.

6) Ibid, p. 23.

7) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 300. “The name of Bishop Hoadly will probably be as long remembered as any on the list of British worthies; and will never be mentioned without veneration of the strength of his abilities, the liberality of his sentiments, and his enlightened zeal for civil liberty.” Bp. White on the Case of the Episcopal Churches, 1782, p. 29.

doctrine, under the third class of religious sects found in these sectarian days, as it is defined by these same tractators; viz. "those who hold more than the truth."¹

The reformers, almost to a man, delivered sentiments most flatly contradictory to such an antichristian usurpation.

Wickliffe "boldly declared that prelates were not to be found in the Bible at all."² This, also, is asserted by the united voice of the framers of the articles, the book of orders and government of the Church of England, in the "Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests." "PRIESTS OR BISHOPS," say they, "had this office, power, and authority, committed unto them by Christ and his apostles."³ This was in 1537 or 1538.

Cranmer affirms that bishops and priests were both one office.⁴ Up to the time of Charles the II. there was no difference, whatever, as has been stated, in the words by which bishops and presbyters were consecrated.

"A considerable number of ministers were, in the reigns of Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, employed in the English establishment, who had only received presbyterian ordination in Holland, or at Geneva. Knox, the Scotch reformer; Whittingham, dean of Durham; the learned Wright, of Cambridge; Morrison, a Scotch divine; and Travers, chaplain to secretary Cecil, and lecturer to the Temple, are among the names which first occur to us. 'All the churches professing the gospel,' writes Travers to Lord Treasurer Burleigh, 'receive, likewise, to the exercise of the ministry among them, all such as have been lawfully called before, in any of the churches of our confession. And in the Church of England—the same hath been always observed unto this day.'"

"We know, also, that several of the foreign reformers were invited to England by Edward. Peter Matyr had the divinity chair given him at Oxford. Bucer had the same at Cambridge; while Ochinus and Fagius had canonries in English cathedrals. 'The reformers,' says Neal, 'admitted the ordination of foreign churches by mere presbyters, till towards the middle of this reign, (Elizabeth,) when their validity began to be disputed and denied.'"⁵

By several acts of parliament the ordinations of such as were

1) See *ibid.*, p. 265.

2) Vaughan's *Life* of, vol. ii. p. 309.

3) Burnet's *Hist. of Ref. Coll. of Rec. B. iii. Add. No. 5.*

4) "Who knows not," asks Bp. McIlvaine, (*Oxf. Div. p. 448.*) "that in the question, what is the doctrine of the articles and homilies of the An-

glican church, one plain testimony from Cranmer and his colleagues, by whom those instruments were constructed, is worth all that could be collected from the writings of all the non-jurors of 1688, and of those their contemporaries, whom our Oxford divines are so fond of quoting?"

5) "Union," by Harris, p. 151.

ordained by presbyters only, are ratified.¹ Thus, also, in the 13th of Elizabeth, cap. 12, it is enacted, "that every person under the degree of bishop, who doth, or shall pretend to be a priest, or minister of God's holy word and sacrament, by reason of any other form of insitution, consecration, or ordering, (*ordaining*;) than the form set forth by parliament, SHALL DECLARE HIS ASSENT and SUBSCRIBE the ARTICLES," and on these conditions retain his orders and benefice. So also in 12th Caroli. cap. 17. By these acts, hundreds of ministers, who had no more than presbyterian ordination, or ordination by presbyters alone, WITHOUT the PRESENCE of ANY BISHOP, were confirmed, in their livings, as true ministers of the Church of England. "No bishop in Scotland, during my stay in that kingdom," says Bishop Burnet, "ever did so much as desire any of the presbyterians to be re-ordained."² That this was the judgment of the Church of England, as late as the year 1609, will incontrovertibly appear from the unexceptionable testimony of Dr. Bernard, the friend and biographer of Archbishop Usher, as given in his collection of that reverend prelate's views, in his work entitled, "The Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh."³ "In a word," says he, "if the ordination of presbyters in such places where bishops cannot be had, were not *valid*, the late bishops of Scotland had a hard task to maintain themselves to be bishops, who were not *priests*, for their ordination was no other. And for this, a passage in the history of Scotland, wrote by the archbishop of St. Andrews, is observable, viz: that when the Scots bishops were to be consecrated by the bishops of London, Ely and Bath, here, at London house, ann. 1609; — he saith, a question was moved by Dr. Andrews, bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, must be first ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop. The archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained, that thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches. This, applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day, and in the place appointed, the three Scottish bishops were consecrated by the aforesaid three English bishops." Baxter, in his Five Disputations of Church Government, says, that "the English prelates maintained that protestant churches

1) See quoted in Powell, p. 77.

testimony of Bishop Cosins, and Archbishop Grindal.

2) See Powell on Ap Succ. p. 14, where may be seen the similar

3) Lond. 1657, pp. 134, 135.

that had no bishops, were true churches, and their ministers true ministers, and so of their administrations. This was so common with them, that I do not think a dissenting vote can be found, from the first reformation, till about the preparation for the Spanish match, or a little before." He then gives a long list of authors in proof.¹

A *catena patrum* of the English fathers and divines, who have opposed the exclusive form of this doctrine, — which we denominate prelacy, — though they believed in episcopacy, more or less firmly, as a fact, but not as of fundamental importance, or of exclusive divine right; might easily be made out, and not

1) Lond. 1659, ch. v. page 178. This subject is thus presented by the Rev. J. Cumming, of the Scottish Church, Covent Garden, in his Apology for the Church of Scotland, (Lond. 1837, pp. 14, 15.)

"In earlier times, the two churches recognized each other by ostensible acts. Such was the respect for Scottish orders among the bishops and reformers of the English Church at the reformation, and for a century afterwards, that nothing was more common than for a minister of the Scottish, or other reformed churches, to receive a license from the bishop of the diocese to exercise all the duties of a presbyter, under the superintendence of the ordinary. Strype remarks, in his Annals, 'that the ordination of foreign reformed churches was made valid, and those who had no other orders were made of like capacity with others to enjoy any place of ministry in England. Whittingham, dean of Durham, was objected to by Sandys, archbishop of York, whose orders were from the church of Rome, but a commission, consisting of several dignitaries, decided that his orders were good, and stated by the mouth of their president, 'They could not in conscience agree to deprive him, or allow of the popish massing priests in our ministry, and to disallow of ministers made in a reformed church.'" Bancroft, archbp. of Canterbury, consecrated presbyters, ordained according to the forms of presbytery, to the offices of bishops, when James I. introduced an order of diocesan bishops into Scotland, and Burnet states, that presbyterial orders were almost universally recognized.

To this day, there is nothing in the rubric or articles of the Church of England, to prevent a bishop from giving his license to a presbyterial clergyman to preach in the pulpits of his diocese."

"A striking illustration of the views entertained of presbyterial orders in the reign of James I. is found in the following fact: A Dr. DeLaune was presented to a living in the diocese of Norwich. The bishop (Overal) naturally asked him where he obtained his orders; he replied, from the presbytery of Leyden. The bishop refused to re-ordain, in these words: 'Re-ordination we must not admit, no more than re-baptization; but in case you find it doubtful whether you be a priest capable to receive a benefice among us or no, I will do the same office for you, if you desire it, that I should do for one that doubts of his baptism, according to the rule in the Book of Common Prayer, 'If thou beest not already,' &c.; yet, for my own part, if you will venture the orders that you have, I will give you institution.'" Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 184.

That this doctrine of high-church prelacy received its first currency in modern times, from the sermon of Dr. Bancroft, in 1589, is evident from the fact, that the only contrary evidence offered by Mr. Soames, is the assumed position of Archbishop Whitgift, (Elizab. Rel. Hist. p. 381.) But as we have shown already, and will again, Whitgift stands upon the very opposite doctrine. See Neal, vol. i. p. 434, and Price's Hist. Nonconf. vol. i. p. 377.

like that delusive catalogue framed by the Oxford writers, and which is altogether beside the purpose.¹

It may not, however, be out of place to add here a few more of the many testimonies, against this uncharitable doctrine, from some of the most eminent divines of the English church, with which our reading has supplied us.² The Rev. J. E. Riddle, the author of several approved works, in his recent and valuable Compend of Ecclesiastical Chronology, thus speaks of the English church.³ "Well may we recognize our happiness in being members of a christian community, which teaches from the Bible, and not from tradition,—which proclaims apostolical truth, instead of boasting of apostolical succession,—which builds upon the sure word of God, instead of appealing to the forgeries and impostures of human fraud, or to the speculations of human imbecility and error,—and which is bound, by its own fundamental principles, to maintain the language of courtesy and respect, and to hold out the right hand of christian fellowship, towards all other churches in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered."

So, also, in his large work on "Christian Antiquities,"⁴ in his "Plea for Episcopacy, Charity and Peace,"⁵ this author remarks, "We may reasonably believe that episcopacy is a divine institution; but we have no right to contend that it is the only system to which that honor is attached."⁶ Again, he says,—

"Among the questions which may well be left open,—being such as will always receive different answers from different inquirers,—is this,—Did they (the apostles) in any way sanction the doctrines commonly connected with the theory of apostolic succession?"⁷ He goes on to give many reasons why they probably did not;⁸ and then adds—"Whatever may become of apostolic succession as a theory or institute, it is IMPOSSIBLE at ALL EVENTS, TO PROVE the FACT OF SUCH SUCCESSION, OR TO TRACE IT DOWN THE STREAM of TIME. In this case the fact

1) Of the forty-three extracts given in the Tracts for the Times, No. 74, as testimonies to the doctrine of the apostolical succession, there are not more than a dozen who do really testify to any thing like the doctrine of the Tracts on that subject.

2) See many of them given in full in Dr. Miller on the Ministry, p. 139, &c. Powell on Ap. Succ. § vii.; Presb. Def. pp. 38-40; Neal's Puritan, v. l. iii. pp. 284, 287, 352, 366, 372, and vol. i. pp. 217, 230, 261, 271,

395, 397, 419, 433. See facts in Prot. Dissent. Catech. pp. 27, 29; Bishop Hall's Wks. vol. viii. pp. 50, 51, 53-57; Bishop Davenant, as there referred to, and in Coleman, Christ. Antiq.; Jewell in Powell, p. 79; Brit. Ref. vol. vii. pp. 217-226, and pp. 26-30.

3) Eccles. Chron. Lond. 1840, pref. p. 9.

4) Lond. 1839, pp. 820.

5) *Ib* d, p. 55, Pref.

6) *Ibid*, p. 65.

7) *Ibid*, p. 70.

8) *Ibid*, pp. 70, 71, 72

seems to involve the doctrine; and if the fact be hopelessly obscure, the doctrine is irrecoverably lost.”

We will now present an extract from the Essays on the Church, by a Layman, which have attracted great notice, and are quoted with approbation, in the London Christian Observer.¹ “If our readers have as carefully perused and weighed these passages as their importance deserves, they will not be slow in coming to the author’s conclusion, that, the ‘*via media*’ then, of the Church of England, is not the *via media* of the Oxford tracts. The first is a wise and just moderation, holding firm to essentials; offering no compromise to the enemies of Christ; decided to have ‘no peace with Rome;’ and yet, at the same time that it maintains its own views of church government, distinctly and meekly offering the right hand of fellowship to all other churches ‘holding the head,’ without requiring them to take the same identical view of those questions of church government, on which the scriptures allow a degree of obscurity to rest.”

“They talk of ‘the old standard divinity of the church;’ but when we come to name the authors, they can think of none but Laud, and Heylin, and Leslie, and Bull! Now we deny that these have the least title to be considered our ‘old standard divines.’ We want the works of those who founded and built up our church; but they offer us those only who tried their utmost, and partly succeeded in pulling it down!”

The London Christian Observer thus speaks:²—

“Now our readers know the extreme displeasure of the Oxford tract divines at there being nothing about the ‘apostolical succession’ in our articles; and that the validity of the orders of foreign protestants has ever been acknowledged by our church, and in the writings of her divines; a few Laudites only excepted. But here we have presented to us a sermon of Cranmer’s, with this ambiguous expression, ‘apostolical succession,’ on its very front. Again, the Oxford tract divines mourn bitterly that there is nothing about ‘the altar,’ or ‘the blessed sacrament of the altar’—that incorrigibly popish phrase—in our prayer book; that the alleged ‘altar’ is studiously called by our reformers, a ‘table,’ and the alleged ‘sacrifice,’ a ‘supper.’ ‘For it cannot be denied, that the Church of England did acknowledge the validity of presbyterian ordination; nay, that presbyters were for many years even allowed to minister within its pale, and to enjoy its preferments; nor did any one of our primates, from Cranmer to Howley, Laud only excepted, ever

1) Oct. 1838, p. 650.

2) Nov. 1838, pp. 221, 820, 822, 826.

dispute the claim of the protestant churches to be accounted portions of Christ's visible kingdom.' 'If any of our readers will refer to Bishop Burnet's 'Vindication of the ordinations of the Church of England,' in which it is demonstrated that all the essentials of ordination, according to the practice of the primitive and Greek churches, are still retained in our church; in answer to a paper written by one of the church of Rome to prove the nullity of our orders, and given to a person of quality; they will see the exceeding injury which the Oxford-tract extravagant doctrine upon apostolical succession (which is not the true Anglican or scriptural doctrine, but the Romish) is likely to do to our apostolical church, and to the reformation in general; indeed, we may say to our common christianity.' We sincerely believe that upon the non-spiritual principles assumed by the objector, the orders of the Church of England would be invalid.'"

The same work for February, of this year,¹ says: "The prominent opinions which divide our church may be classed under three heads."

"There was first, the school of the reformers. This comprised the Cranmers, Ridleys, Latimers, Hoopers, Jewells, and Hookers, of the days of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth. The divines of this school regarded the word of God as the sole authoritative rule of faith and practice; they considered Rome to be antichrist; and though persuaded that episcopacy is of divine institution, and zealously attached to it, both upon principle and by experience, they yet cordially embraced the lutheran and reformed churches as sisterly communions. Their tenets were clearly set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles, and more largely unfolded in the Homilies; and that which gave special life and efficacy to them, was that fundamental doctrine of grace which Rome repudiated, justification by faith, with which, after the example of St. Paul and St. James, they connected all other scriptural doctrines, with their blessed fruits in the heart and life."

"Towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth, and in the beginning of that of James I., there sprang up a new school, widely differing from that of the reformers, and the tenets of which at length acquired the coherence of a system; and under the influence of Archbishop Laud, in the reign of Charles II., became widely prevalent. At the restoration they were resuscitated by the surviving divines of Laud's school; and they were, for the most part, embraced by the non-jurors."

1) 1841, p. 76.

The Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, in his Tract on the Unity of the Church, makes this supposition:¹ "Another christian, bearing in his life and character all the marks of a child of God, wishes to determine whether he should join the episcopalian section of the church of Christ, or the presbyterian. He, too, examined scripture, weighed the evidence on both sides, conversed with upright and intelligent men in both communions, and prayed to be directed right. After much deliberation, he became convinced that diocesan episcopacy has no sanction in the word of God, and that the orders and discipline of the presbyterian body are most conformed to the usages of the church in the New Testament; that presbyterian orders are of divine appointment, and that it was the will of Christ that he should be so ordained. With that opinion he became a presbyterian minister. Am I now to separate from his society? How has he sinned? He was obliged to follow what seemed to him the will of Christ. His conclusions were supported by the decisions of several of the protestant churches. The Lutheran, Swiss, French, Dutch, and Scotch churches, the church of the Vaudois, and a large and pious section of the American church were all on his side. While, in favor of episcopacy, besides the church of Rome, *the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus*; and the eastern churches, which are nearly as corrupt, he found only the Church of England, and three or four small sections of the church of Christ elsewhere, who had retained diocesan episcopacy. Under these circumstances am I to separate from him? Not to have examined the scripture doctrine would have been sin. Not to have followed the conviction of duty, to which the examinations would have led him, would have been sin. In fidelity to Christ, he was obliged to act as he did; and if I separate from him, I do it only because he did his duty."

Stillingfleet² (we mean of course the dean—not the bishop) largely proves, that it was the judgment of the most eminent divines of the reformation that the form of church government depends on the wisdom of the magistrate, and that the form of the church is mutable. He attributes this opinion to Cranmer and other divines in the time of Edward VI., to Whitgift, Bishop Bridges, Dr. Loe, Mr. Hooker, King James, Dr. Sutcliffe, Mr. Hales, and Mr. Chillingworth.³ He, Dr. Stillingfleet, says, "I doubt not to make it evident, that the main

1) Lond. 1838, 25th ed. pp. 11,
12.

2) Iren. pt. ii. ch. viii.

3) Iren. pt. ii. ch. vii.

ground for settling episcopal government in this nation, was not accounted any pretence of divine right, but the convenience of that form of church government, to the state and condition of this church, at the time of the reformation."¹

Dr. Willet, in arguing with Bellarmine, expressly denies the necessity for this asserted succession, which the cardinal makes necessary.²

"First, a local, personal, and lineal succession, is not now needful, as before, under the law; the true worship is not now tied to person or place, as our Saviour showeth, John iv. 21, 'God will be worshipped, neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem;' and by the same reason, neither at Rome, &c. Secondly, yet a succession of doctrine and faithful pastors we grant, and the church was never without; such as the prophet speaketh of, Esai. lix. 21. First, if you will credit St. Hierome, he saith, *olim idem erat presbyter et episcopus*: In the beginning a bishop and a priest were all one, and before that schisms entered into the church, *communi presbyterum consilio ecclesie gubernabantur*, the churches were governed in common by the whole presbytery, &c., which sentence of his is allowed in your own canons: (Decret. part i. dist. 95, cap. 5.) If it be thus, that this distinction of bishops and priests was not brought in in the apostle's time, but afterward, then can no such ordination be showed from the apostle's time."

"Thirdly, we say, that a succession of persons in the same place, without a succession of doctrine which they cannot show, is nothing worth. A succession of the apostolic faith and doctrine proveth a continuance of pastors and teachers, and not contrariwise."³

Let us now hear the sentiments of a few Anglican prelates. Bishop Fowler thus speaks:⁴ "And we can reply, that besides England, Scotland, and Ireland, in which protestancy is the national religion; and in the two former of which, the number of papists is very inconsiderable; and besides Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the United Provinces, in all which it is also the national religion: and besides Germany, Switzerland, Hungary, Transylvania, in which are abundance of protestant churches,

1) Burnet, in his History of his own Times, anno. 1661, says, "to avoid the imputation that book brought on him, he went into the humors of a high sort of people beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things. The book, however, was, it seems, easier RETRACTED than REFUTED, for though offensive to many of both parties, it was man-

aged with so much learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook to answer it." So speaks Bishop White in his Case of the Episc. Churches, 1782, p. 25 of this work.

2) Syn. Pap. p. 165, and also on pp. 81, 82.

3) See Note A.

4) Notes of the Ch. p. 122.

(as there were lately in the kingdom of France, too, and it will never be forgot by what methods they have been extirpated;) besides all those countries, I say, the protestants have also their churches in the new world, no less without the mixture of heretics; and these consist of other kind of believers than those the Romanists boast of in that quarter."

Bishop Hall thus speaks¹ of the reformed churches:

"These sisters have learned to differ, and yet to love and reverence each other; and in these cases, to enjoy their own forms without prescription of necessity or censure."

The martyr bishop, Philpot,² "thus answereth to the argument of succession: that it is no infallible note of the church; for there may be a succession of bishops where there is no church, as at Antioch, and Jerusalem: but if you put to succession of bishops, succession of doctrine withall, as it was in *Augustine's* time, when he used this argument against the Donatists, it is a good proofe."

"The ministrie of God's word, and ministers be an essentiall point; but to translate this, saith he, to the outward glorious succession of bishops, is a plain subiltie."

Bradford thus wrote in his reply to Lady Vane:³ "But be it so, that Peter hath as much given to him as they do affirm, who yet will grant that Peter had a patrimony for his heirs? He hath left (say the papists) to his successors the self-same right which he received. O Lord God! then must his successor be a Satan, for he received that title of Christ himself. I would glad have the papists show me one place of succession mentioned in the scriptures. I am sure that when Paul purposely painteth out the whole ministration of the church, he neither maketh one head, nor any inheritable primacy, and yet he is altogether in commendation of unity. After he hath made mention of one God the Father, of one Christ, of one Spirit, of one body of the church, of one faith, and of one baptism; then he describeth the mean and manner how unity is to be kept, namely, because unto EVERY PASTOR is grace given after the measure wherewith Christ hath endued them. Where, I pray you, is now any title to fullness of power?"

Bishop Andrews says,⁴ "Though episcopal government be of divine institution, yet it is NOT so absolutely necessary as that there can be no church, nor sacraments, nor salvation, without it. He is blind, that sees not MANY CHURCHES flourishing WITHOUT it;

1) Wks. vol. ix. p. 432.

2) Willet Syn. Pap. p. 83.

3) Fath. of the Engl. Ch. vol. vi.

page 133, and British Ref. page 102.

4) See in Bristed's Thoughts, p.

440.

and he must have a heart as hard as iron, that will deny them salvation."

Bishop Hoadly has fully vindicated his rejection of this doctrine of uninterrupted succession, as "a trifle and a nicety" — the "dreams and inventions of men who have made that necessary which they cannot prove to be at all, and which our blessed Lord in his account of the matters upon which salvation is to depend, never once mentions" — in his answer to the representations of the committee of the Lower House, &c.¹

"But," says Bishop Sherlock, in his Examination into Belarmino's Notes of the Church, "as for what he says that succession of doctrine without succession of office, is a poor plea; I must needs tell him that I think it is a much better plea than succession of office without succession of doctrine. For I am sure that it is not a safe communion where there is not a succession of apostolical doctrine; but whether the want of a succession of bishops will in all cases unchurch, will admit of a greater dispute. I am sure a true faith in Christ, with a true gospel conversation, will save men; and some learned Romanists² defend that old definition of the church, that it is *cœtus fidelium*, the company of the faithful, and will not admit bishops or pastors into the definition of a church."³

Thus also he says:⁴ "Now I must confess, these notes, as he well observes, are common to all christian churches, and were intended to be so; and if this does not answer his design, we cannot help it. The protestant churches do not desire to confine the notes of the church to their own private communions, but are very glad if all the churches in the world be as true churches as themselves."

Bishop Burnet, in a passage which the London Christian Observer says should be written in letters of gold, says, "Thus far⁵ I have complied with your desires of answering the paper you sent me, in as short and clear terms as I could. But I must add that this ransacking of records about a succession of orders, though it adds much to the lustre and beauty of the church, yet is not a thing incumbent on every body to look much into, nor indeed, possible for any to be satisfied about; for a great many ages all those instruments are lost; so that how ordinations were made in the primitive church, we cannot certainly know; it is a piece of history, and very hard to be perfectly

1) See Hoadly's Wks. fol. vol. ii. pp. 435, 436. See Bishop White's Opinion of Hoadly, above.

2) Johan Lann. epist. vol. viii. epist. 13, Nicol Gatinaeo.

3) Notes of the Church Examined and Refuted, pp. 54, 55.

4) Ibid, p. 4.

5) Lond. Chr. Obs. 1833, p. 827.

known. Therefore it cannot be a fit study for any, much less for one that has not much leisure. The condition of christians were very hard, if private persons must certainly know how all ministers have been ordained since the apostles' days; for if we will raise scruples in this matter, it is impossible to satisfy them unless the authentic registers of all the ages of the church could be showed, which is impossible; for though we were satisfied that all the priests of this age were duly ordained, yet if we be not as sure that all who ordained them had orders rightly given them, and so upward till the days of the apostles, the doubt will still remain."

"Therefore, the pursuing of nice scruples about this, cannot be a thing indispensably necessary; otherwise all people must be perplexed with endless disquiet and doubtings. *But the true touchstone of a church must be the purity of her doctrine, and the conformity of her faith with that which Christ and his apostles taught. In this the scriptures are clear and plain to every one that will read and consider them sincerely and without prejudice; which that you may do, and by these may be led and guided into all truth, shall be my constant prayer to God for you.*"

The following testimony, given by Bishop Burnet, when seventy years old, and addressing the world, through the press, on an occasion, as he felt, of the greatest solemnity, is peculiarly impressive. It is contained in his Description of a Low-Churchman.¹ "*The raising the authority and power of sacred functions, beyond what is founded on clear warrants in scripture, is, they think, the readiest way to give the world such a jealousy of them, and such an aversion to them, as may make them lose the authority that they ought to have, while they pretend to that they have not.*"

"They dare not unchurch all the bodies of the protestants beyond the seas; nor deny to our dissenters, at home, the federal rights common to all christians, or leave them to uncovenanted mercy. They do not annul their baptisms, or think they ought to be baptized again, in a more regular manner, before they can be accounted christians. *They know of no power in a priest to pardon sin, other than the declaring the gospel pardon, upon the conditions upon which it is offered. They know of no sacrifice in the eucharist, other than the commemorating that on the cross, with the oblation of the prayers, praises and almsgiving, prescribed in the office. They are far from condemning private judgment in matters of religion; this strikes*

1) Past. Care, pref. p. 44, Lond. 1821, 14th ed.; Ld. Chr. Obs. Sep. 1840, p. 554.

at the root of the whole reformation, which could never have been compassed, if private men have not a right of judging for themselves; on the contrary, they think every man is bound to judge for himself, which, indeed, he ought to do, in the fear of God, and with all humility, and caution. They look on all these notions as steps toward popery, though they do not conclude that all those who have made them, designed that, by so doing."

Bishop Warburton, in his Sermon on Church Communion, makes the following remarks:—"My purpose, in this discourse, was only to expose the vain opinion of inherent sanctity, or superiority, or exclusive privilege, in one church above another, merely because founded by a Paul, a Peter, an Andrew, or a James, or merely because administered by an hierarchy, by an equal ministry, or a moderate episcopacy; because such opinions have produced, and do still produce, that wretched spirit, which here, on the authority of God's word, I have endeavored to discredit, and ventured to condemn, confiding in the oracles of eternal truth, *that he that is not against us is for us,*" (the sermon was preached upon Mark ix. 39, or Luke xi. 49, 50,) "and will be treated by our heavenly Father, not as a rebel, but a subject; and, therefore, should be now considered by us, as he will then be by Him, who is the common judge of us both."

When the Rev. Robert Blair desired to labor in Ulster, the Viscount of Clanniboy, "his patron did," says he, "on my request, inform Bishop Knox, how opposite I was to episcopacy, and their liturgy, and had the influence to procure my admission on easy and honorable terms; yet, lest his lordship had not been plain enough, I declared my opinion fully to the bishop, at our first meeting, and found him yielding, beyond my expectation. He told me that he was well informed of my piety, and, therefore, would impose no conditions upon me inconsistent with my principles; only that he behoved to ordain me, else neither of us durst be answerable to the law. I answered him, that his sole ordination did utterly contradict my principles. But he replied both wittily and submissively, 'Whatever you account of episcopacy, yet I know you account a presbytery to have divine warrant; will you not receive ordination from Mr. Cunningham, and the adjacent brethren, and let me come in among them, in no other relation than a presbyter?' This, I could not refuse; and so the matter was performed."

The famous Livingston, who also labored in Ireland at this

1) See Life of Blair, p. 52.

time, gives a similar account of this bishop.¹ “About August, 1630, I got letters from the Viscount Clanniboy, to come to Ireland, in reference to a call to Killinchie, whither I went, and got an unanimous call from the parish; and, because it was needful that I should be ordained to the ministry, and the bishop of Down, in whose diocese Killinchie was, being a corrupt humorous man, and would require some engagement, therefore, my Lord Clanniboy sent some with me, and wrote to Mr. Andrew Knox, bishop of Rapho, who, when I came, and had delivered the letters from my Lord Clanniboy, and from the Earl of Wigtoun, and some others, that I had for that purpose brought out of Scotland, told me he knew my errand; that I came to him because I had scruples against episcopacy and ceremonies, according as Mr. Josiah Welsh, and some others, had done before; and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose, but to do such office: that if I scrupled to call him My Lord, he cared not much for it; all that he would desire of me, because they got there but few sermons, that I would preach at Ramallen the first Sabbath, and that I would send for Mr. Cunningham, and two or three other neighboring ministers to be present, who, after sermon, should give me imposition of hands; but, although they performed the work, he behoved to be present; and although he durst not answer it to the state, he gave me the book of ordination, and desired, that any thing I scrupled at, I should draw a line over it on the margin, and that Mr. Cunningham should not read it: but I found that it had been so marked by some others before, that I needed not mark any thing. So the Lord was pleased to carry that business far beyond any thing that I had thought, or almost ever desired.”

Let us now hear the opinion of a few ARCHBISHOPS.

In his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition,² Archbishop Whitgift says: “Wherefore the controversie is not whether many of the things mentioned by the platformers, were fitly used in the apostles’ times, or may now be well used in some places, yea, or be conveniently used in sundry reformed churches at this day. For none of these branches are denyed, neither do we take upon us to (as we are slandered) either to blame or condemne other churches for such orders as they have received most fit for their estate.”

1) Life of Rev. John Livingston, Glasgow, 1754, p. 13.

2) Fol. Lond. 1574. My copy is that of Leigh Richmond, with his autograph.

3) See pref. to the reader, and see also p. 174, where he shows that the diversity of our times from the apostles requires a diverse kind of government, and of ordering of ministers.

“But to let this pass and come to the purpose : this replie of T. C. (which is of some accounted so notable a piece of work) consisteth of two false principles and rotten pillars : whereof the one is, that wee must of necessitie have the same kind of government that was in the apostles’ tyme, and is expressed in the scriptures, and no other : the other is, that we may not, in any wise, or in any consideration, reteyne in the church any thing that hath bin abused under the pope : if these two first be weake, yea rotten, (as I have proved them to be in this my Defence,) then must the building of necessitie fall.”

“The offices in the church whereby this government is wrought, be not namely and particularlie expressed in the scriptures, but in some points left to the discretion and libertie of the church, to be disposed according to the state of the tymes, places, and persons, as I have further declared in my Answer and Defense following.”

“Archbishop Tillotson once made a remark respecting a more than semi-papist book, by one of his party, which is worth the recollection of some who are perplexed by the Oxford tracts, feeling convinced that their conclusions are ‘palpably false’ and ‘absurd,’ and yet not being always able to sustain their sophistry. ‘Such has been the height,’ says his friend and former pupil, Beardmore, ‘of our *Altitudinarian* divines, as that they have not stuck to challenge the reformed churches beyond the seas, as being no church for want of episcopal government ; as particularly that learned person, Mr. Dodwell, in his book about schism, and his other book, *One Priesthood, one Altar* ; about which I remember having some discourse with our late archbishop, about ten years ago. He told me that Mr. Dodwell brought his book to himself to peruse, before he put it into the press, and desired him to give his judgment of it ; that he freely told him his dislike of it ; that though it was writ with such accuracy and close dependence of one proposition upon another, as that it seemed to be little else but demonstration : so that, saith he, ‘I can hardly tell where it is you break the chain ; yet I am sure it is broken somewhere ; for such and such particulars are *so palpably false*, that I wonder you do not feel the absurdity, they are so gross, and grate so much upon the inward sense.’ And I remember also he said, Mr. Dodwell had run into one extreme, as much as Mr. Baxter had done into the other.”¹

Archbishop Bramhall, in his *Vindication of the Church of England*,² thus speaks : “But because I esteem them churches not

1) Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839, p. 80. 2) Disc. iii. See Oxf. Tr. vol. iii. p. 138.

completely formed, do I, therefore, exclude them from all hopes of salvation? or esteem them aliens and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel? or account them formal schismatics? No such thing.

“It is not at all material, whether episcopacy and priesthood be two distinct orders, or distinct degrees of the same orders, the one subordinate to the other; whether episcopal ordination do introduce a new character, or extend the old.” “Those that unchurch either all, or most of the protestant churches, and maintain the Roman church and not theirs to be true, do call us to a moderate jealousy of them.” “His assumption is wanting, which should be this; but a considerable party of episcopal divines in England do unchurch all or most of the protestant churches, and maintain the Roman church to be a true church, and these to be no true churches. I can assent to neither of his propositions, nor to any part of them, as true *sub modo*, as they are alleged by him.”

“Episcopal divines do not deny those churches to be true churches, wherein salvation may be had. We advise them, as it is our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and not to put it to more question, whether they have ordination or not, or desert the general practice of the universal church for nothing, when they may clear it if they please. Their case is not the same with those who labor under invincible necessity. What mine own sense is of it, I have declared many years since to the world in print; and in the same way received thanks, and a public acknowledgment of my moderation, from a French divine. And yet more particularly in my reply to the Bishop of Chalcedon,¹ episcopal divines will readily subscribe to the determination of the learned bishop of Winchester, in his answer to the second epistle of Molineus. Nevertheless, if our form (of episcopacy) be of divine right, it doth not follow from thence, that there is no salvation without it, or that a church cannot consist without it. He is blind who does not see churches consisting without it; he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation. We are none of these hard-hearted persons — we put a great difference between these things. There may be something absent in the exterior regiment, which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be had.” “This mistake proceedeth from not distinguishing between the true nature and essence of a church, which we do readily grant them, and the integrity or perfection of a church, which we cannot grant them, without swerving from the judgment of the catholic church.”

1) Pres. p. 144, and cap. i. p. 164.

The following is the language of Archbishop Wake in a letter to Le Clerc, as given by Mr. Bristed.¹ “Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen episcopale bene temperatum, et ab omni injustâ dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et, si quid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso apostolorum ævo in ecclesiâ receptum fuerit, et ab üs omnibus retentum fuisset; nec despero quin aliquando restitutum, si non ipse videam, at posteri videbunt. Interim absit, ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejus defectum, (sic mihi absque omni invidiâ appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communionem nostrâ abscindendas credam; aut cum quibusdam *furiosis* inter nos scriptoribus, eas nulla vera ac valida sacramenta habere, adeoque vix christianos esse pronuntiem. Unionem arctiorem inter omnes reformatos procurare quovis pretio vellem.”

In one of his sermons this archbishop expressly says, “For us, whom it hath pleased God, by delivering us from the errors and superstitions of the church of Rome, to unite together in the common name of protestant reformed christians, were we but as heartily to labor after peace, as we are all of us very highly exhorted to it; I cannot see why we, who are so happily joined together in a common profession of the same faith, at least, I am sure, in all the necessary points of it, and I hope, amidst all our lesser differences, in a common love and charity to one another, should not also be united in the same common worship of God too.”

“This makes the difference between those errors for which we separate from the church of Rome, and those controversies which sometimes arise among protestants themselves. The former are in matters of the greatest consequence, such as tend directly to overthrow the integrity of faith and the purity of our worship; and, therefore, such as are in their own nature destructive of the very essentials of christianity. Whereas, our differences do not at all concern the foundations either of faith or worship, and are, therefore, such in which good men, if they be otherwise diligent and sincere in their inquiry, may differ without any prejudice to themselves, or any just reflection upon the truth of their common profession.”

“Indeed, the main object of this admirable sermon is, to expose the essential characteristic of a false and antichristian irreligion; namely, the desire of *unchurching* and excommunicating those who differ from its professors in points *not* fundamental, as

1) Thoughts, &c. pp. 427, 429.

church order and government, rites, ceremonies, and all the exterior of public worship."

Archbishop Usher says,¹ "I think that churches that have no bishops, are defective in their government: yet for justifying my communion with them, which I do love and honor as true members of the church universal, I do profess, if I were in Holland, I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch, with the like affection as I should from the hands of the French ministers, were I at Charenton." "To this," says Mr. Stuart,² "in some measure, may be attributed the respect in which Usher was held by dissenters: and possibly for this, amongst other reasons, he is said, by his contemporary, the Rev. John Livingston, in a spirit indicative both of prejudice and candor, to be not only a learned, but a *godly* man, although a bishop."³

From the Life of Archbishop Usher, by Dr. Nicholas Bernard,⁴ it appears that such was the extent to which he carried his liberal views, that his enemies "scandalized him to King James, under the title of Puritan, of purpose to prevent any further promotion of him." These misrepresentations "induced him, at the request of his friends, to declare his judgment as to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, which was," says Dr. Bernard, "to all good men's satisfaction."⁵

In closing his view of the Archbishop's character, Dr. Bernard, who was long his intimate and familiar friend, says,⁶ "He was not so SEVERE as to disown the ministry of other reformed churches, but declared he DID LOVE AND HONOR THEM, as true members of the church universal, and was ready both for the ministers of Holland and France, to testify his communion with them."

In Archbishop Usher's Letter on the Observation of the Lord's day, in exposing the ignorance and mistakes of Dr. Heylin,⁷ he denies that "the book of the ordination of bishops" can be "admitted into the creed," "because," says Dr. Bernard, "they are either for the most part to be reckoned among the *agenda* rather than the *credenda*."

In this same collection Dr. Bernard publishes a letter, written by Archbishop Usher, not long before his death, and committed to Dr. Bernard for publication,⁸ "containing his judgment of the ordination of the ministers in France and Holland." This letter

1) Letter to Dr. Bernard in Baxter's Life, p. 206.

2) Hist. Mem. of the City of Armagh, Newry, 1819, p. 385.

3) Life of Mr. John Livingston, p. 16.

4) Lond. 1656, p. 50.

5) Ibid, p. 51.

6) Ibid, p. 104.

7) See the judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, &c. by Dr. Bernard, Lond. 1657, p. 110.

8) See *ibid*, p. 123.

was written expressly to refute an allegation that he “regarded the ministry of these churches as null, and looked on them as laymen.” “I have,” says Archbishop Usher, “ever declared my opinion to be, that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine*, and, consequently, that in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination by presbyters standeth valid,” &c. He then shows his belief of the necessity of bishops, but adds, “yet, for the testifying of my communion with these churches, (which I do love and honor as true members of the church universal,) I do profess that, with like affection, I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers, if I were in Charenton.”¹ Dr. Bernard testifies that he knew this ever to have been his opinion.² That it was his opinion, he repeats again and again.³

But further, Dr. Bernard has published, as given to him for that purpose, Archbishop Usher’s “Reduction of Episcopacie unto the form of Synodical Government, received in the Ancient Church.”⁴ In this it is shown, that the ancient form of church government was by the council of presbyters, over whom there was a president, superintendent, or bishop. But these presbyters ruled in common, so as that without them the bishop, or president, could do nothing. Dr. Usher proposed that in each parish the rector, or incumbent pastor, together with the church-wardens, and sides-men, may, every week, take notice of such as live scandalously, &c., that the number of suffragans, answering to the ancient chorepiscopoi, should be increased, who might call together, every month, all the pastors within the precinct, and, according to the major part of their voices, conclude all matters. In like manner he proposed that there should be a diocesan synod held every year, and a provincial synod every third year, constituted in like manner, and making its determinations in the same way. In signing his name to this plan, he declares that he believes it to be accordant to the word of God, “and that the suffragans, mentioned in the second proposition, may lawfully use the power, both of jurisdiction and ordination, according to the word of God, and the practice of the ancient church.”

Now that this scheme is substantially presbyterian, is at once apparent. Indeed, it is headed in the publication, “Episcopal and Presbyterian Government enjoined.” It was agreeable to the Puritans generally. It overthrows the supremacy of prelates,

1) Ibid, pp. 126, 127.

2) Ibid, p. 127.

3) See *ibid*, p. 151.

4) Printed Lond. 1656. Proposed in the year 1641.

and if, as is most credibly believed, the ancient chorepiscopi were presbyters, then it as certainly denies to prelates the exclusive power of ordination, and attributes that right to presbyters.

Dr. Bernard further assures us, that in the judgment of Dr. Usher, all that can be deduced from the promises of our Saviour (as in Matt. xxviii) is, that Christ thus engaged to be with "the whole body of the ministry collectively, then, as it were, in their (the apostles) loins, who should succeed in preaching and baptism," and not to prelates: and that all that is inferrible from the teaching of scripture (as in Heb. vi. 2,) is, "that it was a principle of the catechism taught to christians at their first reception, that there was to be a successive ordination, or setting apart of persons, for the ministry, for an authoritative preaching of faith and repentance, and administration of the sacraments;" which would assuredly give no countenance to the doctrine, that this ministry was to be divided into distinct castes, and the power of ordination, as essential to the being of a church, be limited to the order of prelates.¹

In further illustration of these liberal views of Archbishop Usher, we would quote what is related by the Rev. Robert Blair, a very eminent presbyterian minister, who, during his primacy, labored for some time in Ulster. Being invited in the year 1627 to visit Dr. Usher, at his own residence, "I complied," says Mr. Blair,² "with the primate's invitation, and found him very affable, and ready to impart his mind. He desired to know what was my judgment concerning the nature of justifying and saving faith. I told him in general." . . . "From this he passed on to try my mind concerning ceremonies; wherein we were not so far from agreeing as I feared: for when I had freely opened my grievances, he admitted, that all these things ought to have been removed, but the constitution and laws of the place and time would not permit that to be done. He added, that he was afraid our strong disaffection to these would mar our ministry; that he had himself been importuned to stretch forth his hand against us; and that though he would not for the world do that, he feared instruments might be found who would do it; and he added, that it would break his heart, if our successful ministry in the north were interrupted. Our conference ending, he dismissed me very kindly, though I gave him no high titles; and when trouble came upon us, he proved our very good friend, as will appear in the sequel."

Mr. Blair having been silenced by the bishop of Down, he proceeded to London, where he obtained an order for redress

1) See Certain Discourses by the late Archbishop of Armagh, Lond. 1657, pp. 121, 162, 184.

2) Life of, Edinb. 1754, p. 64.

from the king, addressed to Strafford, who was for some time absent. "At last," says Mr Blair,¹ "that magnificent lord having come over to the lieutenancy of Ireland, I went to Dublin, and presented his majesty's letter to him, adding, that I hoped for a ready compliance with it. But the haughty man did altogether slight that order, telling me, that he had his majesty's mind in his own breast. He reviled the church of Scotland, and upbraided me, bidding me come to my right wits, and then I should be regarded. Which was all the answer I could get from him. With this intelligence I went to Archbishop Usher, which was so disagreeable to him, that it drew tears from his eyes; but he could not help us."

Baxter, in his *Five Disputations on Church Government*,² in illustration of his argument that moderate episcopalians, such as Bishop Hall and Archbishop Usher, would agree to his plan of government, alludes to the scheme of Usher. He says he read it in manuscript, and offered even to go further than he had, for the sake of accommodation. After stating to the bishop his terms, he asked him if they would be acceptable. "They are sufficient," said he, "and moderate men would accept them, but others will not, as I have tried, for many of them are offended with me for propounding such terms." "And thus," adds Baxter, "this reverend bishop and I were agreed in a quarter of an hour, the truth of which I solemnly profess, and I leave this on record to posterity, as a testimony against the dividers and contenders of this age, that it was not long of men of the temper and principles of this reverend archbishop and myself, that the episcopal party and their dissenting brethren in England were not speedily and heartily agreed, for we actually did it. . . . Let this testimony live, that posterity may know whom to blame for our calamities; they all extol peace when they reject and destroy it."³

To these testimonies may be added that of Bishop White. It is well known that in the year 1782, when it was doubtful whether an American episcopate could be either procured or introduced, Bishop White published a considerable treatise, in which he insisted, that for the time being, and until an episcopate could be conveniently obtained, the churches in this country should organize themselves into one body. That the laity as well as the clergy should have a share in the government, and

1) Life, p. 80

2) Lond. 1659, p. 345, in Library of the Rev. Shepard K. Kollock.

3) Baxter, in his *True and Only Way of Concord*, Lond. 1680, pt. iii. p. 85, also says, that some of the two

thousand ejected ministers desired confirmation of their ordination by the synods from such bishops AS OWNED IT, — from Bishop Usher at least, — of others I am uncertain."

form distinct associations; that the clergy and laity together should elect a permanent president over each convention, whose duties ought not materially to interfere with their employments as parochial clergymen; and that their superintendence should therefore be confined to small districts. This superintendent, with other clergymen appointed by the body, was to exercise spiritual powers, as those of ordination and discipline over the clergy. In short, this proposed organization of Bishop White was in all essential features, presbyterian; embracing even a recommendation of its superior representative judicatories to be composed of lay and clerical delegates, chosen by the inferior bodies, and vesting in these lay and clerical representatives, the power not only of electing, but also of depriving, "the superior order of clergy."

And in the contemplation of a continued impracticability in obtaining the episcopate, Bishop White suggested that when "afterwards obtained, ANY SUPPOSED IMPERFECTIONS (and therefore no actual invalidity or nonentity, as he believed) of the intermediate ORDINATIONS might, if it WERE JUDGED PROPER, (Bishop White evidently not regarding such a procedure as at all necessary, although such ordinations were certainly nothing more than presbyterian,) be supplied WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGING THEIR NULLITY by a conditional ordination, resembling that of conditional baptism in the liturgy."

This organization of the American episcopal churches, and these principles upon which it was based, Bishop White proved at large, to be consistent with the principles, opinions, and reasonings, of the constitution, and of standard and eminent divines of the Church of England. And the perfect consistency of these principles and views with scripture and the doctrine of the Church of England, Bishop White continued to maintain until the very close of his life, although they were much opposed by many of his brethren. In his episcopal charges of 1807 and 1834, he introduced similar doctrines, as also in a letter to Bishop Hobart under date December 1830. In this letter he puts to shame the illiberal and sectarian views of that prelate¹ by the following magnanimous declaration: "In agreement with the sentiments expressed in that pamphlet, I am still of opinion that, in an exigency in which a duly authorized ministry cannot be obtained, the paramount duty of preaching the gospel and of WORSHIPPING GOD ON THE TERMS of the CHRISTIAN COVENANT," (so that there may be

1) Bishop Hobart "had early imbibed the Laudean doctrines; and spent his life in attempting to spread them throughout the infant episcopal

church of his native land. He advocated, with great zeal and ability, the system set forth in the Oxf. Tracts." Lond. Christ. Obs. Oct. 1840, p. 589.

covenanted mercy even where there are no prelates,) "should go on in the best manner which circumstances permit. In regard to the episcopacy, I think that it should be sustained as the government of the church from the time of the apostles, BUT WITHOUT CRIMINATING the MINISTRY of OTHER CHURCHES,(!!!) as is the case with the Church of England." Thus does this father of the episcopal church in America renounce for himself, for his church, and for the Church of England, the illiberal, unchristian, untenable, and suicidal claims, which are set forth in the prelatist doctrine of apostolical succession. By acknowledging us as churches, recognizing our ministry, extending to us God's covenanted gifts, and persisting nobly against the growing pride of hierarchical assumption, he thus gives to the clergy of that church an example, by following which, they may maintain the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace, with all their christian brethren. Let his venerable name enshrine his spirit, and these his sentiments, in the heart of that denomination, of which he was a foundation-stone.¹

Time was, when, to use the language of Bishop White's biographer "very lax (that is, very liberal) notions on the subject of episcopacy were adopted" in the southern states, and particularly in South Carolina,² inasmuch that it was thought there was no necessity to resort to foreign bishops to obtain the succession, BUT WE MIGHT APPOINT AND ORDAIN THEM FOR OURSELVES."³ May these sentiments, which would naturally lead to brotherly communion among different denominations, never give place to that system of high-church, and exclusive pretensions, which is now re-enkindling the slumbering ashes of long-buried feuds and jealousies among us !

1) See, for authorities, Dr. Wilson's Mem. of Bishop White, pp. 80-87.

2) Pp. 93, 94.

3) Dr Wilson's Mem. of Bishop White, p. 94. "It is most strange, that this same bishop adopted as a principle of conduct, never to give

permission to the member of another denomination to officiate at the funeral of one of his flock in the church-yard of an episcopal church. See his letter, in Dr. Wilson's Life, p. 398. See, also, Note B., where Bishop White's views are further illustrated.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE SIXTEENTH.

NOTE A.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONIES.

SOME, or many of these testimonies, may be given by the Rev. Dr. Miller in his *Work on the Ministry*. If so, as I have not for some time consulted that work, which is not at present at hand, the testimony will be stronger, as having presented itself equally to both inquirers.

The sentiments of the eminent BISHOP DAVENANT, will be found fully given in two treatises of his — first, “*De Pace inter Evangelicos Procuranda Johanni Duræo hanc suam commentationem.*” — Second, his “*Adhortatio ad fraternam communionem inter Evangelicas ecclesias restaurandum, in eo fundata. quod non dissentiant in ullo fundamentali catholicæ fidei articulo.*” (*Canabrigiæ*, 1640; in the *Old South Church Lib.*)

On page 17, he says, “*Controversias quæ reformatorum ecclesias jamdiu exercuerunt et defatigarunt, non esse ejusmodi, ut sive quis ad horum sive illorum sententiam accedat, a Christo et fundamentali fide discedere et in hæresin fundamentum contrariam incidere judicetur, ETIAM MANENTIBUS HISCE, non tam ecclesiarum quam scholarum dissidiis, communionem fraternam inter protestantium ecclesias universas iniri et custodiri posse fateamur.*”

“*Jam singulorum tandem illa charitas sit quæ permittit christianas ecclesias nulla justa causa prohibita, fraternitatis dextras mutuo abnegare, et ab ineunda unione perpetuo abhorreere.*” (p. 22.)

“*Porro, nullus dubito quin Ecclesiæ Saxonicæ Helveticæ aliæque quæ sive hisce sive illis adstipulantur, agnoscant se ex fraternam communionem cum hac nostra Anglicana, Scotica, Hibernica, aliis que apud externos reformatis ecclesiis habere ac retinere velle. CERTE AD NOS QUOD ATTINET, quamvis non illis suffragemur in omnibus controversæ theologiæ apicibus, FRATRES TAMEN IN CHRISTO AGNOSCIMUS, AC FRATERNAM ET SACROSANCTUM NOS HABERE CUM ILLIS COMMUNIONEM PROTESTAMUR.*” (Do. p. 24.)

Chapter iii. of his *Adhortatio* is “*de UNICO PERSONALI fundamento ecclesiæ Mediatore Dei et hominum Christo Jesu,*” &c. “*Hinc appareat, ecclesiis particularibus quæ retinent cum hoc fundamento salutiferam conjunctionem alias ecclesias nec posse nec debere renunciare fraternam communionem.*” “*Verum enimvero siquæ ecclesia, alteram quam Christo inædificatam non audet negare, audet tamen tanquam membrum putridum abscindere, et a fraterna sua communione abjicere, est hoc in ipsum Christum contumeliosum, et in fratres non modo nostros sed Christi injuriosum,*” p. 58. (See also *passim*.)

Bishop Meade, (of Virginia,) in his *Sermon* at the Consecration of Bishop Elliott, (Washington, 1841, appendix, ch. ix. p. 93.) says:

“*Let me now show in some particular instances how by tradition they wish to support some high views, not to be found in the scriptures or book of common prayer. We have seen how the church expresses her decided conviction that the episcopal form of government is scriptural and apostolic, of course worthy of all to be received, and yet not undertaking to exclude from the covenant those who have not that form. The Oxford writers in like manner make occasional concessions and exceptions, which seem to accord*

with this moderation of the church; but for the most part, in a manner which their readers cannot reconcile, hold a very different language.

"They magnify the sacerdotal office beyond all bounds. We quote from the *Essays on the Church*, 7th edition, 408th page, the following: 'But as a recent and well-rounded specimen of these avowedly high-church doctrines, it may be as well to give the following passage from the last publication of this school, the new volumes of Mr. Froude's *Remains*, recently given to the world under the deliberate sanction of Messrs. Newman and Keble.

"The reformed Church of England has given birth to two martyrs, an archbishop and a king, (Archbishop Laud and Charles I.) and both these blessed saints died for episcopacy. But was it for a form, or a point of discipline, that they resisted thus unto death? Surely not. When they contended for episcopacy as one of the essentials of religion; they no more regarded it as an external and a form, than they regarded Christ's death upon the cross as an external and a form.

Their belief on this subject seems to be contained in the following propositions:

"1st. That before Jesus Christ left the world he breathed the Holy Spirit into the apostles, giving them the power of transmitting this precious gift to others by prayer and the imposition of hands; that the apostles did so transmit it to others; and they again to others; and that in this way it has been preserved in the world to the present day.

"2d. That the gift thus transmitted empowers its possessors, 1st, to admit into, and exclude from, the mysterious communion called in scripture the kingdom of heaven, any one whom they judge deserving of it; and this, with the assurance that all whom they admit or exclude on earth and externally, are admitted or excluded in heaven and spiritually, in the sight of God and holy angels; that it empowers them to bless and intercede for, those who are within his kingdom, in a sense in which no other man can bless or intercede. 2d. 'To make the eucharistic bread and wine the body and blood of Christ in the sense in which our Lord made them so. 3d. To enable delegates to perform this great miracle by ordaining them with imposition of hands.

"According to this view of the subject, to dispense with episcopal ordination is to be regarded not as a breach of order merely, or a deviation from apostolical precedent, but as a surrender of the christian priesthood, a rejection of all the powers which Christ instituted episcopacy to perpetuate; and the attempt to institute any other form of ordination for it, or to seek communion with Christ, through any non-episcopal association, is to be regarded not as schism merely, but as an *impossibility*."

"In Nos. 51 and 52 of the Tracts we have these strong expressions: "Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution to save other men. There is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus, and that is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church."

"I repeat it, the eucharist administered without apostolical commission, may to pious minds be a very edifying ceremony, but it is not that blessed thing which our Saviour graciously meant it to be: it is not verily and indeed, taking and receiving the body and blood of him our incarnate Lord."—Tract 52.

"In Tract No. 24, 8th page: "Whatever be our private differences with the Roman catholics, we may join with them in condemning socinians, baptists, independents, quakers, and the like. But God forbid that we should ally ourselves with the offspring of heresy and schism, in our contest with any branches of the holy church, which maintain the foundation, whatever may be their incidental corruptions."

The ever-memorable Hales, of Eaton, in his tract of *Schism*, holds this language: "And besides all this mischief, (of episcopal ambition,) it is founded in a vice contrary to all christian humility, without which no man shall see his Saviour: for they do but abuse themselves and others, that would persuade us that bishops, by Christ's institution, have any superiority over other men further than of reverence; or that any bishop is superior to another, fur-

ther than positive order agreed upon amongst christians hath prescribed. For we have believed him who hath told us, "That in Jesus Christ there is neither high nor low; and that in giving honor, every man should be ready to prefer another before himself;" (Rom. xii. 10;) which saying cut off all claim most certainly to superiority by title of christianity, except men can think that these things were spoken only to poor and private men. Nature and religion agree in this, that neither of them hath a hand in this heraldry of *secundem, sub et supra*: all this comes from composition, and agreement of men among themselves. Wherefore this abuse of christianity to make it lacquey to ambition, is a vice for which I have no extraordinary name of ignominy, and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a vice to be but trivial."

Dr. Samuel Halifax, (the same we believe who is so well known as the bishop of Winchester,) in his "Three Sermons, occasioned by an attempt to Abolish Subscription to the XXXIX Articles," and preached before the university of Cambridge, (Cambridge, 1772, third ed. p. 5, 6,) speaking of those who dissent from motives of conscience from the established worship, he characterizes them as "differing from us in points of discipline rather than of doctrine." He adds, "If for reasons of PRUDENCE and to SECURE THE EXISTENCE of the national church, we think ourselves justified from the clearest principles of the LAW of NATIONS, in excluding them," &c.

Dr. Clagett, also an eminent episcopalian, thus speaks: (Notes of the Ch. pp. 184 and 193:) "But then we expect that the Church of England, the Lutherans, and the Calvinists, should be heard too, when to the papists charging them with *some differences*, they make the same answer, that they have all the same faith, especially since, when they come to prove the truth of what they say, they will show that the MATTERS WHEREIN THEY DIFFER do not BREAK the UNITY of the CATHOLIC FAITH."

See also Paley's Sermon on a Distinction of Orders in the Church, in Wks. vol. vi. p. 91, &c. and p. 93. "If we concede to other churches the christian legality of their constitution, so long as christian worship and instruction are competently provided for, we may be allowed to maintain the advantage of our own, upon principles which all parties acknowledge—considerations of public utility."

In his Discourse on "The Conformity of the Church of England to Apostolic Precept and Pattern" (London, 1834, page 22,) the Rev. Hartwell Horne thus speaks: "Once more, while you are devoutly grateful, that you are members of a church whose moderation and liberality toward christians of other communions are commended by all, except the enemies of all religion: endeavor to imbibe the social, generous, fervent, sympathizing spirit, which breathes in every page of her liturgy; and while, in the exercise of your inalienable right of private judgment, you deliberately prefer her communion, show to all who profess conscientiously to differ from you, the more excellent way of active christian charity, by imputing to them no sinister motives for their dissent; by uniting with them in every act of holy and christian benevolence, in which you can cordially coöperate; and by praying for their spiritual welfare, that they all 'may hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and righteousness of life.'"

Bishop Heber says, (Serm. in Engl. p. 246,) "I am no ways concerned to deny that, as in cases of extreme public danger, every citizen is a soldier; so situations may be conceived, (though I am not aware that any such have occurred since the first preaching of the gospel,) in which any christian may be authorized and called upon to act as a minister of religion. Far less would I refuse to acknowledge that many of these self-constituted ministers, whose number I deplore, have shown a zeal in the service of our Lord and theirs, which may well call forth our admiration, and our godly jealousy."

Mr Toplady, in his Church of England Vindicated, says, "Nor does it follow that the Church of England, in believing for herself the necessity of episcopal ordination, does thereby unchurch those of the reformed churches abroad, which have no bishops, any more than that those churches unchurch us for retaining our excellent and primitive mode of ecclesiastical government."

So also Mr. Gisborne in his *Duties of Men* says, "it is now admitted by the generality of protestants, that no command was delivered, either by Christ, or by his apostles, assigning to the christian church any specific, unalterable form of government; but, that while various offices, suited to the situation and exigencies of the new converts, were instituted at the beginning, some of which, as that of deaconesses, have long fallen into disuse, christians were left at liberty to adopt in future times such modes of ecclesiastical administration and discipline, as they should deem most eligible, in the circumstances under which they should find themselves placed."

Similar is the judgment of Milner, in his *Church History*, (chap. i, art. 11, vol. i, p. 141, Eng. ed. see also p. 445.) "In vain, I think, will almost any modern church whatever set up a claim to exact resemblance. Usher's model of reduced episcopacy seems to come the nearest to the plan of the primitive churches. It has been an error common to all parties, to treat these lesser matters, as if they were *JURE DIVINO*, or like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. Could it, however, conveniently be done, it may perhaps be true that a reduced episcopacy, in which the dioceses are of small extent, as those in the primitive church undoubtedly were, and in which the president, residing in the metropolis, exercises a superintendency over ten or twelve presbyters of the same city and neighborhood, would bid the fairest to promote order, peace, and harmony."

Sir Matthew Hale, in his "Judgment of the Nature of True Religion, and the Causes of its Corruption" in enumerating the mischiefs resulting from scholastics, says, "But if we observe many persons in the world, we shall find some so highly devoted to this or that particular form of government, as if all the weight of the christian religion lay in it: though the wise and sober sort of conformists know and profess this, yet there be some rash people that will presently unchurch all the reformed churches beyond the seas which are not under episcopal government: that if they see a man, otherwise of orthodox principles, of a pious and religious life, yet if scrupling some points of ecclesiastical government, though peaceable, they will esteem him little better than a heathen or publican, a schismatic, heretic, and what not: on the other side, if they see a man of great fervor in asserting the ecclesiastical government, observant of external ceremonies, though otherwise of a loose and dissolute life, yet they will be ready to applaud him with the style of a *son of the church*, and upon that account overlook the miscarriages of his life, as if the essence and life of christian religion lay in the bare asserting of the best form of ecclesiastical government."

"Come to the reformed episcopal clergy: as to the pope's supremacy they disclaim it; but if you acknowledge not episcopal government, if you swear not canonical obedience to your ordinary, if you submit not to the liturgy, and ceremonies, and vestments, and music, used in the church, you are at best a schismatic."

To these testimonies, it may be interesting to add that of Lord Bacon, (in Price's *Hist. of Prot. Nonconf.* vol. i. p. 443, in *Wks.* vol. vii. p. 48;) "Then," says he, that is, in the early part of Elizabeth's reign, "were they content mildly to acknowledge many imperfections in the church; as tares come up amongst the corn, which yet, according to the wisdom taught by the Saviour, were not with strife to be pulled up, lest it might spoil and supplant the good corn, but to grow on together till the harvest. After, they grew to a more absolute defence and maintenance of all the orders of the church, and stiffly to hold that nothing was to be innovated; partly because it needed not, partly because it would make a breach upon the rest. Hence, exasperated through contentions, they are fallen to a direct condemnation of the contrary part, as of a sect. Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far, as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers."

See this also fully shown by the author of "The Rights of the Christian Church," himself a member of it, and when defending it against the non-jurors. (Lond. 1707, ed. third, pp. 337—343.)

Our position is reluctantly but fully admitted by Dr. How, in his *Vindica-*

tion. (p. 486.) "The episcopal church, it is true, no where says, *in so many words*, that episcopal imposition of hands is necessary to outward ordination; or, which is the same thing, that the visible church cannot exist without episcopacy. She has not thought it necessary or proper formally to make such a declaration; but that this is the fair and inevitable conclusion from her standards, would seem scarcely to admit of a reasonable doubt."

That such a *conclusion* is not either inevitable or fair, we shall find to be the opinion of perhaps as capable commentators upon the standards of the Anglican church as Dr. How himself.

See Mason's *Vindication of the Ordination of the Reformed Churches*. See also Dr. Scott on *Notes of the Church*, pp. 199, 201.

NOTE B.

THE SENTIMENTS OF THE LATE BISHOP WHITE, CONTINUED.

HAVING, after great research, succeeded in procuring a copy of "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States considered," published by Bishop White, in Philadelphia, in the year 1782, (printed by David C. Claypole,) I will annex some little account of it, so far as it bears upon the objects in hand.

The motto on the title-page is itself significant of the spirit of the whole pamphlet. It is as follows: "To make new articles of faith and doctrine, no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of GOVERNMENT, what commonwealth or church is there which maketh not at one time or other."—*Hooker*.

Not less plain is the announcement made in the Preface. "Nothing is further from his wishes than the reviving of such controversies as have been found destructive of good neighborhood and the christian temper. . . . He has, for this reason, avoided the discussion of subjects on which episcopalians differ from their fellow-christians."

In the first chapter, the relation in which the episcopal churches in this country stood to the English church, as constituting a part of the diocese of London, is shown. It is then remarked: "All former jurisdiction over the churches being thus withdrawn, and the chain which held them together broken, it would seem that their future continuance can be provided for only by VOLUNTARY associations for union and good government." (p. 18.)

In chapter ii. he illustrates the rights of the laity. "The power of electing a superior order of ministers, ought to be in the clergy and laity together." (p. 10.) "Deprivation of the superior order of clergy, should also be in the church at large." (p. 10.) In consequence of the difficulty of providing for the support of the superior order of clergy, "of consequence the duty assigned to that order ought not materially to interfere with their employments in the station of parochial clergy; the superintendent of each will, therefore, be confined to a small district, a favorite idea WITH ALL MODERATE EPISCOPALIANS." (p. 11.)

The author then proceeds to offer a sketch of a frame of government.

In refuting the objection to the anti-republican character of episcopacy, he remarks that "in the early ages of the church, it was customary to debate and determine in a general concourse of all christians in the same city; AMONG WHOM THE BISHOP WAS NO MORE THAN PRESIDENT." (p. 18.)

In reference to carrying the plan into immediate execution, he says: "This is founded on the presumption that the worship of God and the reformation of the people, are the principal objects of ecclesiastical discipline; if so, to relinquish them FROM A SCRUPULOUS ADHERENCE TO EPISCOPACY, is SACRIFICING THE SUBSTANCE TO THE CEREMONY." (p. 19.) "Are the acknowledged ordinances of Christ's holy religion to be suspended for years . . . OUT OF DELICACY TO A DISPUTED POINT, AND THAT RELATING ONLY TO EXTERNALS?" "If the episcopal succession should be afterwards obtained, any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied, WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGING THEIR NULLITY, by a conditional ordination, resembling that of conditional baptism in the liturgy."

The above was an expedient proposed by Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Patrick, Stillingfleet and others, at the revolution, and had been actually practised in Ireland, by Archbishop Bramhall." (pp. 19, 20.)

In proceeding to chapter v. he again speaks of the episcopal succession, as "a point of external order," (p. 20,) and goes on fully to substantiate the position that his proposed "departure from episcopacy in the present instance, would be warranted by her doctrines, by her practice, and by the principles on which episcopal government is asserted." (p. 20.)

He shows from the language of the articles and canons, that the Church of England does not consider the episcopal succession as much binding as baptism and the Lord's supper, (p. 21.)

He shows that, in the practice of the Church of England, foreign divines, presbyterially ordained, were not subject to re-ordination, and quotes Burnet, who, in his History of His Own Times, anno 1661, says, that this was the case until the act of uniformity passed soon after the restoration."

After laying down, as he says, "concisely, but as is believed impartially," the doctrine of apostolical succession, he asks, (p. 24,) "CAN ANY REASONABLE RULE OF CONSTRUCTION MAKE THIS AMOUNT TO MORE THAN ANCIENT AND APOSTOLIC PRACTICE? That the apostles employed any particular form, affords a presumption of its being the best, all circumstances at that time considered; but to make it unalterably binding, it must be shown enjoined in positive precept." He then quotes, with approbation, Bishop Hoadly, who denies "the divine appointment of the three orders." (p. 24.)

Again he says, (p. 26:) "It cannot be denied that some writers of the Church of England, apply very strong expressions to episcopacy, calling it a divine appointment, the ordinance of Christ, and the law of God, and pronounce it to be of divine right. Yet in reason, they ought to be understood only as asserting it to be binding wherever it can be conveniently had." "Much more must they think so, who venerate and prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible, but without any idea of divine right in the case. THIS THE AUTHOR BELIEVES TO BE THE SENTIMENT OF THE GREAT BODY OF EPISCOPALIANS IN AMERICA; in which respect, they have in their favor UNQUESTIONABLY the sense of the Church of England, and, AS HE BELIEVES, the opinions of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue and abilities." (p. 28.)

"The churches in each small district should associate together. In every such district there should be elected a general convention, consisting of a convenient number (the minister to be one) from the vestry or congregation of each church." "They should select a clergyman their permanent president; who, in conjunction with other clergymen, to be also appointed by the body, may exercise such powers as are purely spiritual, PARTICULARLY THAT OF ADMITTING TO THE MINISTRY, &c. (p. 12.) "The assemblies in the three larger districts may consist of a convenient number of members, sent from each of the smaller districts severally, within their bounds, equally composed of clergy and laity, and voted for by those orders promiscuously, the presiding clergyman to be always one; and these bodies to meet once in every year." (Ibid.) "The continental representative body may consist of a convenient number from each of the larger districts, formed equally of clergy and laity, and among the clergy, formed equally of presiding ministers and others; to meet stately, once in three years." "The use of this and the preceding representative bodies, is to make such regulations and receive appeals in such matters only as shall be judged necessary for their continuing one religious communion." (p. 13.)

"It is presumed," he remarks on p. 14, "the episcopalians generally are attached to that characteristic of their communion which prescribes a settled form of prayer." (p. 14.)

In chapter iv. he comes to speak of the episcopal succession, and after showing that this could not then be obtained from England, he remarks, "Now, on the one hand to depart from episcopacy, would be giving up a leading characteristic of the communion, which, HOWEVER INDIFFERENTLY CONSIDERED, AS TO DIVINE APPOINTMENT, might be productive of all the evils generally attending evils of this sort." He therefore proposes "to include in the

proposed frame of government, a general approbation of episcopacy, and a declaration of an intention to procure the succession AS SOON AS CONVENIENTLY may be; but in the mean time to carry the plan into effect, WITHOUT WAITING FOR THE SUCCESSION." (p. 17.)

Once more, in his episcopal charge delivered in the year 1834, (*The Past and the Future*, 1834, p. 14, 15,) he declares that, while bound to sustain the integrity of their system, "there is not perceived the necessity of carrying it to the extreme of denouncing all communions destitute of the episcopacy, as departing from the essentials of the christian faith, and as aliens from the covenants of promise." This medium, he asserts to be the position advocated by the articles and ordinal of the Church of England, and then adds, "if there should be any among us who make larger conclusions from the same premises, it is matter of private opinion, and NOT to be OBTUDED as the DETERMINATION of the CHURCH."

The Rev. Benjamin Allen of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, in his Letter to Bishop Hobart, (Philadelphia, 1827, p. 7,) asks, "Are not your sentiments concerning other denominations — giving them over to the uncovenanted mercies of God — altogether contrary to those of Bishop White? declared by him to be counter to the formularies of the Church of England, and contrary to those of the reformers. Were they not condemned by the house of bishops in the reign of Queen Anne, as strange conceits? Are they not precisely those, as to matters of church, held by the Jacobites or friends of the Pretender, and again by the tories? (See Burnet, Warner's *Ecl. Hist.*, &c.) Are they not sentiments directly opposed to the whole of the policy of the whole of the life of the presiding bishop?"

"You" (Bishop Hobart) "are opposed (in your doctrines and views of polity) to the views of the Church of England, of the protestant episcopal church in America, of the senior bishop of that church, of the reformers, of the noble army of martyrs, of the primitive church, of the glorious company of the apostles, of the word of the Most High God; and this I mean to prove by fair reference to your writings and doings during the whole of your ecclesiastical career." (P. 29.)

"Where is the concord in sentiment between these gentlemen," (Bishop White and Dr. Onderdonk,) asks the episcopal author of "Review of the Answer to the Remonstrance sent to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church." (Philadelphia, 1827, in the Loganian Library, No. 2235.) "The former, during a life which has been fruitful in incident; which has witnessed every form of popular prejudice; which has passed through scenes of civil revolution; has not during the whole lapse of his fourscore years, outraged the feelings of other denominations to so great an extent, as the latter has done by a solitary act — an act, the index of his career. Let any one read the expression of sentiments by Bishop White, whether in the pamphlets of '83, or the chronicle of the episcopal church, published in 1820, and compare these with the ultra opinions of the Doctor. Behold the former surrounded in his study by the representatives of every christian communion, guiding the sacramental host to the godlike work of dispensing the Bible to each cottage in the land; then read what the latter says about such a union. Is the former to descend from this moral elevation? Are these bonds to be riven by views not recognized by the Church of England, the protestant episcopal church of America, or the inspired volume? Is the bishop to say to those with whom he walked in brotherly agreement fourscore years; over whose general institutions he has presided in harmony, &c., 'I have learned that you have no part in the gospel covenant?' While just on the verge of the Jordan of death, is he to shake hands and part with those with whom he has reached that verge in concord? Is he to tell them, 'You are no portion of the flock of the Lord? You will find mercy, doubtless; but there is no *covenanted* mercy for you?' Will Bishop White do this? NEVER." (the author's capitals, p. 11 and 12.)

See, also, Bishop White's Lectures on the Catechism, Philadelphia, 1813, *Dissert.* x. p. 425, 426.

LECTURE XVII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SCHISMATICAL IN ITS TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

THE only passage in the Bible in which the term schism is employed in an abstract sense, is 1 Cor. xi. 14-27. It evidently imports here such a derangement of the harmony and brotherhood of a church, as would be found in the human body, were the different members selfishly to confine their functions to their own exclusive benefit. Schism, therefore, exists when the members of any particular church, or when any particular churches, are found alienated from other members or churches, and not co-operating with them in the harmonious advancement of the common interests and welfare of the whole body.

The term has come to signify an actual separation or division in a church or denomination of christians; and is currently applied by prelatists, who assume that they exclusively constitute this church, to all other denominations of christians not in subjection to their ecclesiastical dominion.¹

1) THE REV. THOMAS H. VAIL, in his recently published volume, "The Comprehensive Church," (Hartford, 1841, p. 54,) in introducing the term dissenter as descriptive of other denominations, takes occasion to advise us that this is "a title of familiar and appropriate use, and which we wish to be understood we employ most respectfully." Now, truly a man cannot be respectful in affirming that to be appropriate, which is so only to the lips of high-church or Romish bigotry; and who uses words in a sense in which they have no meaning, or if any, a wrong one; since, in New England, where the author lives, the term dissenter was long "FAMILIAR and APPROPRIATE," as applicable to episco-

pals; who, until of recent years, were in fact, and in the literal and correct sense of the term, dissenters; who assumed the attitude of promulgators of a denominational system, hardly as yet known; and who were uniformly regarded and spoken of as dissenters. Of this, we shall have occasion to produce evidence. Meantime we remark, that all those ecclesiastical establishments being overthrown, the prelacy, in attempting to perpetuate such terms, brands itself as "THE SECTARIAN," and not "the comprehensive church," unless this term indeed is to be understood in a prelatist sense, as including all who can embrace prelacy!!

It is wonderful with what fearfulness and terror this term has become associated ; so that the very mention of it calls up the images of death and perdition, excommunication and anathema. It has been observed by that very learned and judicious divine, as Stillingfleet calls him, the Rev. Mr. Hales of Eaton,¹ that "heresy and schism, as they are commonly used, are two theological scarecrows, with which they who use to uphold a party in religion, use to fright away such as are making inquiry into it, are ready to relinquish and oppose it, if it appear either erroneous or suspicious. For as Plutarch reports of a painter, who having unskilfully painted a cock, chased away all other cocks, that so the imperfection of his art might not appear by comparison with nature. So men, willing for ends to admit of no fancy but their own, endeavor to hinder an inquiry into it, by way of comparison of somewhat with it, peradventure truer, that so the deformity of their own might not appear."²

"The schismatic," says Cyprian,³ "can have no longer God for his father, who has not the church for his mother, but is out of the number of the faithful ; and though he should die for the faith, yet should he never be saved."

So, also, Irenæus⁴ teaches that schism "is such a rending and dividing of the great and glorious body of Christ as equals the guilt of schismatics to that of apostates from the faith, who crucify to themselves afresh the Lord of glory, and put him to an open shame."⁵

Nor have modern prelatists been behindhand in holding forth, to the terror of all uninformed consciences, the most frightful representations upon this subject.

Schism is thus defined, by Dodwell:⁶ "It will follow, that disunion from the bishop was a disunion from Christ and the

1) Tract of Schism, 1642, in Iren. p. 108. This rare tract has recently been republished among the "Tracts for the People."

2) The flippancy with which this term has been bandied about by arrogant ecclesiastics, in all ages, is illustrated by the fact that Firmilian, bishop of Cappadocia, (A. D. 255,) speaks of Stephen of Rome as a schismatic, and as having withdrawn from the unity of the church, because he allowed the validity of heretical baptism ; while Stephen, in returning the compliment, branded his opponents as perverters of the truth and traitors to ecclesiastical unity. Chillingworth acknowledges that "he had

been sometimes himself abused by this fallacy, and known many other poor souls seduced by it, not only from their own church and religion, but to popery by it."

3) De Unit. in Slater's Original Draught, &c. p. 355, Lond. 1717, 2d ed., and in Schism, p. 241, &c.

4) Ibid, Iren. l. iv. cap. 53 and 62, in *ibid.* See also Adv. Haer. iii. 24, p. 223. See also Augustine in Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 54.

5) See, on these views of the Fathers, Owen's Works, vol. xix. p. 111, &c.

6) See in Oxford Tracts, vol. iii. p. 159.

Father, and from all the invisible, heavenly priesthood, and sacrifice and intercession. It will follow, that disunion from any one ordinary, must consequently be a disunion from the whole catholic church; seeing it is impossible for any to continue a member of Christ's mystical body, who is disunited from the mystical head of it. It will follow, that visible disunion from the external sacraments of the bishop, is in the consequence a disunion from the bishop, and from the whole catholic church in communion with him, who ought to ratify each other's censures under pain of schism if they do not."

Bishop Beveridge thus speaks:¹ "As for schism, they certainly hazard their salvation at a strange rate, who separate themselves from such a church as ours is, wherein the apostolical succession, the root of all christian communion, hath been so entirely preserved, and the word and sacraments are so effectually administered; and all to go into such assemblies and meetings, as can have no pretence to the great promise in my text."

"It is but a small part," says Dr. Hammond, "of the character of *schism*, that it is contrary to faith, contrary to charity, and to all the advantages which belong to a member of the church—the benefits of prayer and sacraments; that it is as bad as heresy, and that there never was any heresy in the church which was not founded in it; and that it is constantly forced, in its own defence, to conclude in some heresy or other: each of these particulars, and all of them taken together, are but a small part of the character which the ancient fathers of the church give us of the sin of schism."²

The reader may see similar exhibitions of the character of schism, by Archbishop Sharp and several others, as given in Daubeny's Guide to the Church.³

So also the famous Mr. Scott, in his Christian Life:⁴ "Yet it is a plain case, that if it rejects episcopacy and separates from the communion of it, it thereby wholly divides itself from the catholic church."

"If all this," says Mr. Leslie, in concluding his arguments for episcopacy,⁴ "if all this make but a doubt (it is strange that it should, at least that it should not) in the mind of any considering persons; then can they not with security communicate with any of our dissenters, because, if he that eateth and doubteth is damned, (Rom. xiv. 13,) much more he that shall do so

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. iii. p. 151.

2) Vol. i. p. 60, 62.

3) Pt. ii. ch. vii. p. 153.

4) Letter on, in Scholar Armed, vol. i. p. 86.

in religious matters, wherein chiefly this rule must stand, that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'"

"We hold you to be schismatics, utterly denying that you have either ministry or ordinances." "The ordinances of the gospel administered by unauthorized men, are in themselves void, and no divine promise is annexed to their reception."

"We not only consider them," (i. e. the methodists,) says Dr. Bowden, "as non-episcopal, but also as the most WANTED schismatics that have ever disgraced the christian church."³

"To separate one's self," says the Rev. Mr. Pratt,⁴ "from that society which is the body of Christ, and which continues steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, betrays a spirit which the faithful christian shudders to contemplate; and on which, even they who have yielded obedience to it, will scarcely dare to look. It is the spirit of *pride, and discord, and rebellion*: even the self-same spirit that appeared in the arch-apostate, and gave origin to dissension and division in the kingdom of God: the self-same spirit of emulation and strife and division which the apostle declares to be the mark of the carnal mind: the self-same spirit which gave rise to heresies and kindled the fires of persecution in former ages; and which still so woefully distracts the kingdom of peace here upon earth."

Bishop Skinner,⁵ in his Vindication, says: "The dangerous and deadly thing called schism is a cutting off, or separating, from that ecclesiastical body, of which Christ is the head, and therefore incurs a deprivation of that nourishment and strength, which he affords to all his faithful members."

According to Saravia, they "are not true and lawful ministers," who "are not made ministers of the church by their bishop, nor by his dimissories, nor by any other, according to

1) Dr. How's Vind. of Prot. Ep. Ch. N. York, 1816, p. 39.

2) *Ibid*, p. 75.

3) Works on Episco. vol. i. p. 220. See *Schism* also used in reference to all the reformed churches, by the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne, in his Discourse on "The Conformity of the Church of England to apostolic precept and pattern." Lond. 1834, p. 28.

"Heresy and schism have their day. Nothing is permanent but truth. Nothing will endure to the end of the world but the apostolic church." Dr. How's Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. pp. 29, 30. See also how schism is described by Bishop Horne in the Scholar Armed, vol. ii. p. 275.

"The common outcry," says Matthew Henry, (Of Schism, Lond. 1717, p. 29,) "is, that it is the setting up of *altar against altar*, which is not so, for at the most it is but altar by altar; and though I have often read of one body, and one spirit, and one hope, and one Lord, and one faith, and one baptism, and one God and Father, yet I could never find a word in all the New Testament of one altar, except *Jesus Christ*,—the altar that sanctifies every gift, in whom we all centre."

4) Old Paths, p. 91; and see also pp. 94, 96.

5) P. 440.

the order of the English church." Those who have not, in any diocese, where there is a bishop, taken such institution and induction, "are come in by intrusion and usurpation of cure of souls," and "by the ecclesiastical laws they are excommunicants and schismatics."¹

"We may, therefore, conclude," says Mr. Palmer,² "that voluntary separation from the church of Christ is a sin against our brethren, against ourselves, against God; a sin which, unless repented of, is eternally destructive to the soul. The heinous nature of this offence is incapable of exaggeration, because no human imagination, and no human tongue, can adequately describe its enormity."³

It is very unfortunate for these prelatie judges, that in thus anathematizing and cutting off from Christ, all non-prelatie communions, they could not agree in their fulminating decrees. As it is, by their evident contrariety, they have turned against each other, those weapons by which it was designed to carry destruction to the ranks of their opponents, and are thus, by a just judgment of Heaven, made to overthrow themselves.

The Church of England lies under this imputation as much as we do. Thus the Romish divine, who answered Dr. Sherlock, speaks of "Lutheranism, or Cranmerism," and "the palpableness of their schism."⁴

Thus also Bishop Van Mildert affirms, in his Boyle Lectures: "The Romish writers, indeed, charge them, not only with heresy and schism, but with other errors of the most abominable kind."

Certain it is, that in 1554, the two houses of parliament did

1) Saravia's Priesthood, ed. Oxf. 1840, pp. 20, 21.

2) On the Ch. vol. i. p. 54.

3) Bishop Beveridge most unequivocally identifies separation from the Church of England with exclusion from the catholic church." Wks. vol. ii. pp. 106, 147, 148, 165, and 217.

"A correspondent of the Globe, who attended divine service at St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, on Sunday week, gives an extract of the sermon. The preacher said, the Church of England derived its authority lineally and directly from the apostles, and as such administered its sacraments, and therefore any departure, any separation from it, was schismatic. He then demanded, what must be the ultimate doom of all those persons — schismatics, certainly, —

who, in the polished phraseology of the day, were denominated 'dissenters?' What could they possibly urge in extenuation of their conduct? He might be told by some, they were hereditary dissenters, or dissenters because their fathers dissented. But would that at the last day be received as an excuse for their sin? Would the plea of the adulterer excuse him that he had committed that crime because his father had done so before? or of the murderer, because his father had committed murder? He feared (!!!) very much that the schismatic dissenter would share in the same just punishment that would be awarded against the murderer and the adulterer."

4) Notes of the Ch. p. 57.

5) Boyle Lect. vol. i. p. 286.

publicly declare that the nation "had been guilty of a most horrible defection and schism from the apostolic see."¹

The grounds of the Roman catholic objections to the ministerial orders of the Church of England, are given by Dr. Milner in his *End of Controversy*.² He charges it with "having renounced Christ's commission given to his apostles." "Hence it clearly appears that THERE IS, AND CAN BE, NO APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION OF MINISTRY IN THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, MORE THAN IN ANY OTHER CONGREGATIONS OR SOCIETIES OF PROTESTANTS." Oh, Dr. Milner, how cruel art thou to thy dear sister England!

As the Romish thus denounces as schismatical the English church, so has the English ever been found most prompt and ready to meet all such demands against her, by the most liberal payment in kind.

Archbishop Bramhall,³ as we learn from Jeremy Taylor, "in a full discourse, proves the church of Rome, not only to be guilty of schism, by making it necessary to depart from them; but they did actuate the schisms, and themselves made the first separation in the great point of the pope's supremacy, which was the palladium for which they principally contended. He made it appear that the popes of Rome were usurpers of the rights of kings and bishops; that they brought in new doctrines in every age; that they imposed their own devices upon christendom as articles of faith; that they prevaricated the doctrines of the apostles; that the Church of England only returned to her primitive purity; that she joined with Christ and his apostles; that she agreed in all the sentiments of the primitive church."

Leslie, in his *Letter on Episcopacy*, in defence of the English church, thus speaks of the Romish church:

"By setting up the claim of universality, the church of Rome has thereby commenced that grand schism against all the bishops of the earth . . . but while he would thrust other churches from him, he thrusts himself from the Catholic church."⁴

1) Burnet's *Ref.* vol. ii. p. 454; Fox, vol. iii. p. 90; Price's *Prot. Non-conf.* vol. i. p. 105.

That the Romish church charges schism on the English church, see declared in *Oxf. Tracts*, vol. iii. p. 142; Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.* reply to Sanders' *Work*; Faber's *Albigenses*, p. 14; Palmer, vol. ii. p. 450, &c.; Neal's *Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 178.

See Palmer, vol. ii. p. 538, by Rom.

2) *Letter* xxix.

3) See *Works*, vol. vi. p. 439.

4) Leslie's *Letter on Episcopacy*, in *Scholar Armed*, vol. i. p. 56.

See also *Origin of the Prayer Book*, pp. 72, 78, 148, 150.

See Bishop Doane's *Further Postscript to his Brief Examination*, Burlington, 1841.

See this charge also fully established against the Romish Ch. in Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 454, &c. pp. 465, 469, 472, 478, and in Perceval's *Rom. Schism*.

That the Roman catholic church, in these United States, is schismatic, is proved by Mr. Odenheimer, in his *Origin of the Prayer Book*. Philad. 1841, pp. 81, 106, and Note M. p. 148;

“And herein of all others” says Archbishop Usher, “do our Romanists most fearfully offend; as being the authors of the

and also by Mr. Coleman in his edition of Faber on Romanism.

See also “The charge of Novelty, Heresy and Schism against the Ch. of Rome substantiated,” by the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, in his “State of Popery and Jesuitism in England.” Lond. 12mo.

“*Episcopacy vs. Papacy.*—A dispute has for some time been going on, (says the Boston Christian Watchman, for Jan. 15, 1841.) between the learned doctors of the church of Rome and of the English Episcopal Church, respecting the apostolical jurisdiction and succession of the episcopacy in the British churches. A distinguished writer of the church of Rome has lately undertaken to show that the ordinations of the Church of England are not valid. Dr. Wiseman, on the other hand, a distinguished scholar of the Romish church, in some strictures on the Oxford Tracts, has undertaken to show that, admitting the validity of the ordinations of the Church of England, her bishops have still no just claim to apostolical jurisdiction, and that the obligation still lies on the laity to be in communion with the Roman and not the English hierarchy.

“These strictures have lately been replied to by Rev. Mr. Palmer, of Oxford College, in which he attempts to show them on their own premises, ‘that their hierarchy [in England and by consequence in this country,] is altogether destitute of apostolical succession and jurisdiction; that the works of their ministry are altogether unprofitable; that all who communicate with them are involved in schism; and that the lawful and apostolical administration of the sacraments, and of all other parts of the sacred ministry, can only be found amongst the legitimate and catholic hierarchy of these realms; the only representatives and spiritual descendants of that episcopacy which has flourished among us for seventeen centuries; the only successors of Anselm and Grosteste, of Edmund and Theodore, of Patrick and Augustine, and of the HOLY APOSTLES.’

“Such are the worldly and unprofitable disputes in which men spend their lives, who profess to be the only successors and representatives of the apostles of Christ! We devoutly

thank the gracious Head of the Church that the plea about apostolical succession is utterly disregarded as a figment and fable of popery by all denominations in this country, except the Romish priests and a few high-church episcopalians. Among us, those and those only are acknowledged as successors of Christ and the apostles, who manifest their spirit.”

“On supposition that the church of Rome is a church of Christ,” says Dr. Owen, (Wks. vol. xix. pp. 139, 140,) “it will appear to be the most schismatical church in the world. I say on supposition that it is a church, and that there is such a thing as a schismatical church, (as, perhaps, a church may, *from its intestine differences*, be so not unfity denominatied,) that is the state and condition thereof. The pope is the head of their church, several nations of Europe are members of it. Have we not seen that head taking his flesh in his teeth, tearing his body and his limbs to pieces? Have some of them thought on any thing else but ‘Arise, Peter, kill and eat,’ all their days? Have we not seen this goodly head in disputes about Peter’s patrimony, and his own jurisdiction, wage war, fight and shed blood,—the blood of his own members? Must we believe armies raised, and battles fought, towns fired, all in pure love, and perfect church order? not to mention their old ‘*altare contra altare*,’ anti-popes, anti-councils. Look all over their church, on their potentates, bishops, friars, there is no end of their variances. What do the chiefest, choicest pillars, eldest sons, and I know not what, of their church, at this day? Do they not kill, destroy and ruin each other, as they are able? Let them not say these are the divisions of the nations that are in their church, not of the church; for all these nations, on their hypothesis, are members of that one church. And that church, which hath no means to prevent its members from designed, resolved on and continued murdering one of another, nor can remove them from its society, shall never have me in its communion, as being bloodily schismatical.”

1) Sermon bef. the King, in June, 1624, Lond. 1657, 4to. 4th ed. p. 7.

most cruel schism, that ever hath been seen in the church of God. Those infamous schisms of the Novatians and Donatists were but petty rents, in comparison of this huge rupture, which hath pulled asunder east and west, north and south; and grown to such a head at home, that in our western parts (where this faction was so prevalent) it hath for divers ages past been esteemed catholic. In the 17th of the Revelation we have a woman described unto us, sitting upon seven mountains, and upon many waters. The woman is there expounded to be that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth. The seven mountains upon which that city sat, needed not to be expounded: every child knew what was meant thereby. The waters are interpreted peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues; which is that very universality and catholicism, that the Romanists are wont so much to brag of. For, this woman is the particular church of Rome, the city-church; which they call the mother-church, the Holy Ghost styleth the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth. Those peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues, are such as this proud city reigneth over: the catholic Roman church, they are commonly called by themselves; but by the Holy Ghost, the beast upon which the woman sitteth."

"This woman is the head of the faction, and the very mother of this schism, the beast, that is to say, they that suffer themselves to be thus ridden by her, are her abettors and supporters in it."

This is not all. This exterminating fire is not only directed by the Roman and the Anglican prelacy against each other; it is also kept up by one portion of the English army against the opposite; as it is also by the different companies which, in multi-

1) It is somewhat amusing to see with what pertinacity our Roman catholic neighbors reject all communion with their Anglican brethren, in the title of catholic. "We are proud," says the Roman Catholic Miscellany of Charleston, (for March 6, 1841, art. Catholic,) "of being Roman catholics, and we say that there is no claim to catholic where there is a separation from Rome." "It is discourteous to attempt to give it," i. e. catholic, "to our opponents." "It," the Romish church, "had been, time out of mind, in possession of the title catholic. We care not why it was given; the possession, and the *exclusive possession*, were notorious." "But now it seems there is to be one holy catholic and apostolic church formed into such a patch-work as we

have above essayed to describe; and a curious sort of thing it is, and we are invited to allow ourselves to be gulled into the medley. This really is quite condescending in our brethren, who, feeling some little qualms as to the validity of their title, prefer being admitted as tenants in common with us, to denying that we have any right, but asserting that the whole estate rests in themselves." "We cannot but feel grateful for the generosity of the writers. BUT WE WILL NONE OF IT. If we can have no better claim than this to the name, we are done with it."

Poor prelatists! we are heartily sorry for you. To have deserted your willing friends, and to have your advances rejected in such scorn as this, is hard indeed!

form variety compose the Roman host. The non-juring clergymen at the revolution raised this same clamor against the Church of England,¹ as having separated from the catholic apostolic church, and as having, therefore, no authentic ministry; while, on the other hand, this more liberal branch of the English church maintained towards their non-juring brethren, a front of most determined hauteur and cold neglect.

“Sancroft and others were still considered by their advocates as bishops of their respective sees, and Tillotson and his associates reprobated by them as schismatics.”

The non-jurors and high-churchmen usurped to themselves exclusively, the honorable title of Church of England men.²

The two “Defences of the Deprived Bishops, (the non-jurors)³ which contain the reasons of their separating, and which they are not a little proud of, upon all occasions referring to them, make the present Church of England guilty of the greatest heresy, as striking at what is fundamental in the highest degree, as being fundamental to other fundamentals, the succession of bishops, without which the church cannot subsist. And on this head tragical declamations are made of the great danger the church is in; for which there could not be the least ground, were the present possessors of the sees supposed to be true bishops, and consequently capable of continuing the succession. So that should the deprived bishops die without consecrating others, the non-jurors would, by these principles, be as far from owning the present church as state.”

So speaks that very able and learned work, “The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted,”⁴ which was written “to justify the established church, and to confute those notions by which such as call themselves the true Church of England, attempt to prove the present church guilty of schism.”⁵

“These great apostles of unity,” says Dr. Mitchell,⁶ “who for a hundred and sixteen years have been deafening us with the ‘unceasing cry,’ schism, schism, join us, ‘or be ruined for ever,’ have themselves gone over to one part of the schismatics; and so here is one rent sewed up.”

Nor is there any abatement of that loving concord with which different portions of this church have thus regarded each other. On the contrary, it is found at present to actuate the bosoms of the Oxford sect, or the high-church prelatists, and those who differ from them, with all the strength of a burning passion.

1) Bishop White, in the Case of the Episcopal Churches, 1782, p. 10.

2) See “The True Character of a Churchman, showing the false pretences to that name,” in Scott’s Collection of Tracts, vol. ix. p. 477.

3) Rights of the Christian Ch. p. 329.

4) See ed. 3d, Lond. 1717, p. 416.

5) See preface, p. 58.

6) Presb. Letters, p. 349.

The upholders of this prelati system are denominated by the London Christian Observer "the sect of the tractitians" — "the Laudean school" — "so baleful to the church of Christ and to the souls of men."¹ They are denied to be, in truth, members of the Anglican church. Of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey it is said: "We ask Professor Pusey how, as a conscientious man, he retains any office in a church which requires him to subscribe to all the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to acknowledge as scriptural the doctrines set forth in the Homilies? Will any one of the writers, or approvers of the Oxford tracts, venture to say that he does not really believe all the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies of our church?"²

"The chief schism," says a correspondent of the London Christian Observer,³ "which is now rending our own church, arises from the efforts of some who are going 'beyond the exact prescriptions (or even the intimations) of divine truth,' very much after the fashion of Luther himself respecting consubstantiation; but the remark applies generally; for there is a strong tendency both in individuals and churches to set up unprescribed 'terms of communion;' just as some among us are ejecting the foreign protestant churches, even the Lutheran itself, from covenanted mercy, by reason of their alleged loss of apostolical succession."

1) See for Jan. 1841, p. 10, et passim.

2) See *ibid.*, for 1836, p. 791.

3) Feb. 1841, p. 93.

"The Tractarian Sect," Lond. Chr. Obs. March, 1841, p. 160. The Lond. Chr. Obs. (for 1837, p. 840,) speaks of these divines as "the Oxford schismatists," and for the very reason of their exclusiveness, &c. See pp. 172, and 550.

A writer in the Episcopal Recorder thus speaks of Dr. Pusey, (quoted in Lond. Chr. Obs. Nov. 1840, p. 679,) "With consummate puerility he considers figurative language as if it were literal, and mere images and shadows as if they were realities and substantial entities or beings. With this explanation, hear him speak for himself, pervert scripture, and advocate pernicious heresies."

Of Mr. Newman's doctrine on Justification, the London Christian Observer affirms, (March, 1841, p. 176,) "it is a fearful, a despair-engendering and a soul-destroying doctrine."

Professor Powell styles them "the traditionists," (*Tradition Unveiled*, p.

19,) and "the high-church party." *Ibid.*, p. 5.

On the tendency of this system to socinianism, see Bishop Mellvaine's *Oxford Divinity*, pp. 85, 208, 230.

That they contradict the standard of the English church, is also clearly shown. See pp. 222, 230.

He calls on these divines to "go and learn the alphabet of the gospel! Spell the name of Jesus!" (p. 247.) "Oh, calumniated churches! that one of thine own children and pastors should teach such doctrine for thine!" p. 250.

He represents the doctrines of the Oxford divinity as fundamentally different from those which he defends, and involving the very foundation of a sinner's hope towards God. (p. 505.) "A vital difference upon grand primary questions, involving all that was so nobly contended for by the martyrs of the reformation, and all that is precious to the sinner in the gospel of Christ." pp. 507, 508, 522, 537.

See also Note A.

The London Christian Observer, for January 1839,¹ in speaking of the Oxford monument to be erected to the memory of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, urges as a reason for some monumental building, in preference to a church, that the pulpit of a church might be made to proclaim opinions in direct contrariety to those of these reformers; “especially in a diocese, the ecclesiastical ruler of which—melancholy to relate—has for several years been countenancing the doctrines and actions of the most insidious and dangerous body of men that ever obtruded itself within the precincts of the English church.”

Nor are these divines, on the other hand, at all reluctant in returning these complimentary manifestations of the unity of the Anglican church. Take an example from an editorial address, in the last number of the *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, which contains the following passage:²

“The doctrine that regeneration uniformly takes place in baptism is so clearly taught by the Church of England, and involved in its general procedure, that we hesitate not to say, that the only honorable course, which can be pursued by those who hold the contrary opinion, is to abstain from agitating her communion by their preaching, which they must do, if only commonly honest and consistent,—and to cease, also, to eat her bread, and to fill those pulpits which can only be conscientiously occupied by her sincere and cordial members.

“The doctrine of the total depravity of human nature is another instance of the perversion of scripture, and of contrariety to the sentiments of the Church of England, chargeable upon some of the clergy called evangelical; but it is, unhappily, too consistent with the Calvinistic notions of election and regeneration.”

Thus quietly are the the whole evangelical party discarded as unsound members!³

Dr. Hook thus speaks of the evangelical or low-church party in the episcopal church:⁴ “I am opposed to the opinions maintained by those who call themselves low-churchmen, on this ground: I believe it to be *only on account of their being bad logicians, that they are not socinians.*”⁵

1) P. 64.

2) *The Belfast Christian Patriot*, vol. ii. No. 95.

3) It is explicitly declared by these Oxford tractitians, that there can be no real alteration in what they avouch to be the doctrines of the church without a schism. (*London Quart. Rev. Ap. 1839*, p. 313.)

4) *Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839*, p. 234.

5) “We heed little,” say the editors of the *Observer*, “what Dr. Hook,—who, when he had a purpose to serve, assailed his meek and holy diocesan, Bishop Rider, in print, in an undutiful and overbearing, not to say contemptuous, manner,—may think either of good churchmanship or sound divinity; but with regard to his assertions, we reply, first, that we

“Those professed members of the establishment,” says Crabbe,¹ “who affect the title of evangelical, and wish to palm upon the church the peculiarities of the calvinistic doctrine, and to ingraft their own modes and forms into its discipline, are *schismatics*.”²

The London Christian Observer complained of the Oxford tractators for applying unseemly names to dissenters. In volume fourth of the Tracts,² these writers justify themselves by showing that they applied these epithets to parties within the church and not to those without. “Another remarkable exhibition of the same science is your asserting that one of the tracts called the dissenters ‘a mob of tiptops, gapes and yawns,’ (pp. 172, 174, 177, 185, 186.) Five times you say or imply it. Now it so happens that the tract in question has nothing to do with dissenters; but with persons who wish alterations in the liturgy on insufficient grounds, a circumstance which in itself excludes dissenters.”

“Yawn is a farmer whose sons go to the church school; and he himself ‘scarcely ever,’ as he boasts, ‘misses a Sunday,’ coming into the service ‘about the end of the first lesson.’ Ned Gape, too, is a church-goer, though a late one. In what sense then, Mr. Editor, do you assert that when Richard Nelson, in the end of the story, says that he ‘cannot stand by and see the noble old prayer book pulled to pieces, just to humor a mob of Tiptops, Gapes and Yawns,’ that the writer calls dissenters by these titles?”

In a book entitled “The Oxford Tracts, the Public Press and the Evangelical Party,” by G. Percival, it is said: “The evangelical party in the church are only restrained, from the accident of their position, from the destructive power of rationalistic and socinian principles; the spirit is already there, only its full development is restrained.”

While these parties in the English church thus denounce each other; the prelatial or high-church party, as certainly cut themselves off from the communion of all other churches on earth. For, from the Roman catholic church they are most peremptorily — in common with all other sects — excommunicated. So also are they regarded by the Greek and other Oriental churches, as a schismatical, and withered branch of the

know not of any body of persons who call themselves by the nickname of ‘low-churchmen,’ though we do of some who mounted on Romanist stilts, are pleased so to denominate all true reformation-principle members of the

Anglican communion; and, secondly, that his accusation falls upon the Church of England.”

- 1) English Synonymes, p. 480.
- 2) Eng. ed. Pref. p. 31.

true church. Nor are they satisfied with this exclusion from the greatest portion of the church catholic. They voluntarily pronounce a sentence of excision upon themselves, from nine tenths of the protestant world; and thus with infatuated folly, while making pretensions to be THE ONLY AND TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH, reduce that universal church to the limits and dimensions of their own comparatively feeble denomination.¹

To crown this climax, it will be our object to show, before closing this discussion, that prelatists, both of the Roman and the Anglican school, have been, and are still, justly charged with schism, by all non-prelatical churches; — not for the same reason indeed, but upon the ground of their unchristian pretensions, and that intolerant and anathematizing conduct, by which they attempt to establish a supremacy over the church of God.

Most certain it is, from this review, that the definition ordinarily given of schism, needs to be itself defined, since its authors apply it most appropriately, as they think, to things which, by all ordinary rules of judgment, would appear to be opposites. In order therefore to see our way clear through this mist, and to escape from this sinking bog, into which we have been plunged, by attempting to trace out the course of our prelatical legislators, we must endeavor to ascertain what, after all, is to be understood by schism. And, as it is on all hands acknowledged to be a violation of that unity which is characteristic of the christian church, — and its opposite; by understanding in what this unity consists, we shall at once arrive at a true knowledge of the nature of schism.

Though on this subject we shall again speak, it will be neces-

1) "These remarks are meant to apply, not to the Church of England, but to a party — we are sorry to say, the dominant party — in that church. A party, whose doings implicate her character, if they do not involve her destiny.

"There are three Church of England Reviews at the present time; — one of them is *Puseyite*, another *semi-Puseyite*, but all *anti-evangelical*. The fountains of theological literature, the episcopal bench, and a vast majority of the dignified and benefited clergy, are tainted with a spirit which differs from popery less than the blossom does from the seed."

"They have withdrawn their countenance from all dissenters, great and small, and given prominence to two great principles, by which they have cut themselves off from the church of

Christ throughout the world. The first is, that there cannot be a church, nor any scriptural sacraments, unless holy orders have descended through an uninterrupted line of bishops from the days of the apostles. This principle excludes the continental churches, the church of Scotland, the British and Irish dissenters, as well as all the American churches, except the episcopals and Moravians. But even these are excluded by the second principle, which makes the validity of the clerical functions depend on a civil establishment and the consequent sanction of the magistrate. This schismatical tendency has been exhibited in the most offensive forms, at a time when all other churches are longing and laboring for union among themselves." Belfast Chr. Patriot.

sary to make some remarks. — Now as there is but one supreme and spiritual head of the church, so is there but one universal body of which Christ is thus head ; and this body is composed of all who shall be gathered together in Him, from amid the trackless wastes and ages of time, and who, TOGETHER, shall compose the family in heaven. By the unity of the church, we understand, therefore, that, as there is but one God and Saviour, so ALL who believe and obey the gospel are equally adopted into the family of heaven ; equally enjoy all the promised blessings of salvation, are equally entitled to the free use of all the means of grace, — are baptized into one faith ;¹ and are called, justified, and sanctified, through the same plan of redeeming love and mercy.² The unity of the christian church, — as we shall clearly show in our lectures on the nature of a true apostolical succession,³ is not to be looked for in any uniformity in rites, ceremonies, or ecclesiastical customs ; — nor in any identity as to church forms, polity or order ; — nor in any subjection to one earthly head, or one ecclesiastical polity.⁴

But the unity of the church consists essentially in the unity of the faith whereby all its members equally hold the same divine truths ; and in the unity of the spirit, or that oneness, which subsists between Christ its head, and all its members, and whereby the same spirit dwells in all, and works in all the same christian graces.⁵

There is a very important distinction to be made between union and unity.⁶ The one may very clearly exist where the

1) See the Author's Eccl. Catech. of the Presb. Ch.

2) 24, p. 15, ed. 2d.

3) See Lect. xx. and xxi.

4) Eccl. Catech. pp. 15, 16.

5) Author's Eccl. Cat. p. 16, ed. 2d.

6) This is not, however, the opinion of the Rev. Thomas H. Vail, as his opinions are developed in his "Comprehensive Church, or Christian Unity and Ecclesiastical Union," (Hartford, 1841.) He sets out with the declaration that "the writer is convinced that christian union can NEVER be effected (and of course never yet has existed,) except upon some plan of ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY." (ch. i. p. 25.) "It is EVIDENTLY a scriptural truth, that the church must be one body, BOTH IN RESPECT OF ITS EXTERNAL UNITY, AND OF ITS INTERNAL UNITY; and this truth has been acknowledged by christians of every name, and in every age, the present as well as the past." (p. 27.)

In our humble judgment, this is not a truth, and has always been practically denied by christians of every age, and is the seminal principle and basis of the papacy and of all spiritual tyranny and oppression, and to be utterly rejected by every spiritual freeman. No wonder that from this axiomatic assumption our author came to describe as *comprehensive*, the self-enclosed boundaries of the limited prelacy ; and to regard as universal those peculiarities which are eschewed, as without scriptural support, by a large and growing mass of protestant christendom. If unity is a necessary mark of the true church, then were the apostolic churches no true churches of Christ, for they were divided among themselves ; nor has there ever existed such a church from their time until the present.

"The Church of England," says Dr. Hawks, "and the protestant episcopal church in the United States, are now both in "the unity of the catholic

other is wanting. There may be unity in sentiment, in doctrine, and in feeling, where there is no union in any organized denominational government, under the same rules and the same laws. As it regards the christian church, — where there is concurrence in the same essential and fundamental doctrines which are characteristic of that mystical body, — there, is christian unity, the unity of the spirit. But those principles of doctrine and order which were made necessary to be believed, in order to a full communion with the church of Christ, for the first three centuries, may be firmly held and retained, where there are separate organizations under independent rulers, and under ecclesiastical laws differing from each other on many points, not regarded as within the limits of articles which are fundamental. There may, in this case, be christian unity where there is no ecclesiastical union. These various churches may all be members of the one christian family; may all recognize the one head or parent of that family; may all receive their being from Him, and be united together by the ties, as it were, of a blood relationship; and this, too, although, like the brethren of too many human families, they have become a divided household, and alienated from each other in spirit, and in many of their views.

“UNION is preserved,” says Dr. Hawks in his Constitution of the Episcopal Church, “by means of subordination to the same ecclesiastical law, and a common ecclesiastical ruler; UNITY by an adherence to the same common faith of the gospel.”

On no other ground than this, can ANY CHURCH IN EXISTENCE, for one moment substantiate a claim to the character and being of a church of Christ. For if UNION (as thus defined) is necessary to the perpetuation of the christian church, then, as there is

church,” though “under different systems of polity.

“All communion of churches,” says Dr. Owen, (Wks. vol. xx. p. 291,) “as such, consists in the communion of faith and love, in the administration of the same sacraments, and common advice in things of common concernment. All these may be observed, when, for sundry reasons, the members of them cannot have local presential communion in some ordinances with each church distinctly.”

“There may be unity even where there are differences and separation, just as there are laws of war wherein all agree. (See Leslie’s Short Method with the Romanists, Edinb. 1835, p. 13.) “As all nations upon the earth are one kingdom to God, so all christian churches are one church to Christ,

without any universal monarch in either case,” or identity of laws, officers or government. (See *ibid*, p. 15.) “When the fathers speak of the church, they mean not any particular church, but the whole body or church of christians, though divided into many nations or churches.” (*Ibid*, p. 18.) “The unity of the church was then understood, not as being united under one supreme bishop or church, but in the concord and good agreement of the several churches among themselves, and in the unity of the common faith.” (*Ibid*, p. 19. See also pp. 174, 183.)

“..... on unity in saying or damning principles and practices, in love and charity, for which chiefly we shall be judged at the last day.” (*Ibid*, p. 180.)

no such union to be found, so is there no church extant. Christendom is avowedly disparted, by its various lines of circumscribed denominational boundaries. Now it matters not how this disunion came about, since that it now exists cannot be denied. For whether the ancient sects went out from the church, or the church ejected them — whether the Greek church threw off the Latin, or the Latin separated from the Greek, and thenceforward usurped the sole supremacy — whether the English church was excommunicated and cut off by the Romish, or the Romish abjured by the English — whether the reformed churches were necessitated to separate and become independent organizations by the tyrannical, antichristian, and schismatical conduct of Rome, or were violently thrust out by her as pollutors of the sanctuary — none can deny the fact that all these churches are actually in existence, and that, too, under independent ecclesiastical organizations. And, therefore, there is either no church on earth, Romish, Greek, Anglican, or any other, — which God forbid ; or, on the other hand, UNION is not necessary to christian UNITY ; nor is diversity of rules, orders and forms, in matters not essential to the very being of a church, any hindrance to such unity in all that is fundamental.

In this country, prior to the organization of the episcopal church in 1789, the churches in each state considered themselves as an integral part of the church of Christ, while, as Dr. Hawks affirms, “ perfectly independent in their government of any and every branch of the church in Christendom.” And this is one of the rights still retained by the several dioceses under the constitution.

The fact, therefore, that presbyterians live in a different house, and order their domestic economy in a form different from their neighbors, who dwell in the Romish or in the Episcopal quarter of the heavenly city, and who have, as they believe, more or less materially altered the heavenly discipline ; this does not prove that we are not still fellow-citizens with them in this spiritual Jerusalem, and partakers with them of all its benefits and blessings.

In order, therefore, to make out a case against us, it must be shown, as has been largely proved, that prelacy is of divine right, and of absolute essentiality to the very being of the church ; or otherwise, that we have apostatized from the fundamental doctrines upon which the church is founded. And as the former is impossible, and the latter will not be pretended, therefore is our attempted exclusion from the rank of a true church of Christ, essentially the crime of schism.

It is amazing, with what assurance the most preposterous doctrines, on this subject, have been boldly put forth. Unity —

the unity of the catholic church — has been harped upon until many are, verily, ready to believe that a body, however really divided, that will only asseverate its unity — is thereby possessed of a true and sure mark of the church of Christ. Just as if unity may not belong to a body of rebels, as well as to an army of loyal subjects, or as if, to use the words of Dr. Claggett,¹ “the harlot cannot be one as well as the spouse.”

Unity can only, THEN, be any mark, whatever, of the true church, when it is such a unity as is made obligatory upon her by the scriptures, THAT IS, UNITY IN THE FAITH, UNITY IN THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIAN LOVE, CHARITY AND CONCORD. Unity of association, that is, external union, can only be a duty, when the terms required for such communion are scriptural, necessary and proper: and to judge, therefore, of the sufficiency of any plea for unity, we must first ascertain what are the principles upon which the profession of such union is based. For, so far is mere union from being a sure mark of the true church, that our Saviour contrasts the church to the kingdom of Satan, in that while IT MAY be externally divided, and yet be really united; the synagogue of Satan is not divided against itself, but remains confederated together by the unholy bonds of a self-aggrandizing alliance.²

The unity of the church depends upon the maintenance of that truth as it is in Jesus, which unites to Him, the living head; and of that love, charity and concord, by which all its churches are bound together, as confederated members of the same heavenly commonwealth.

Dr. Barrow, in his learned Discourse on the Unity of the Church, reduces it to the following heads, which are all included under those we have now summarily presented.³ Unity of the church implies, he says, first, consent in faith and opinion concerning all principal matters of doctrine⁴ — secondly, it implies union in the bands of charity and good-will⁵ — thirdly, spiritual cognation and alliance, all being regenerated by the same incorruptible seed⁶ — fourthly, incorporation into the mystical body of Christ, and participation in the same benefits⁷ — fifthly, union in peaceable concord and confederacy, so that they are bound to live together in good correspondence.⁸ The concurrence of the pastors of the church, especially in doctrine, in peace, and friendly intercourse, and for the preservation of truth and charity.⁹ Such a unity in discipline as is required by

1) Notes of the Ch. p. 169.

2) See Matth. xii. and *ibid* p. 180.

3) See Wks. fol. vol. i.

4) *Ibid*, pp. 762, 763.

5) *Ibid*, p. 764.

6) *Ibid*.

7) *Ibid*.

8) *Ibid*, p. 765.

9) *Ibid*, p. 767.

the indispensable sanctions, and institutions, of their sovereign.¹ They are bound to all the same sacraments — and “to uphold that sort of order, government and ministry, in all its substantial parts, which God did appoint in the church.” “In lesser matters of ceremony or discipline, instituted by human prudence, churches may differ, *and it is expedient they should do so,*” &c. This is all which this great writer considered to be scripturally included under the unity of the church of Christ.² Similar are the views given of the unity of the church, by other divines of high authority, as by Stillfleet³ — by Archbishop Potter⁴ — by Bishop Seabury⁵ — by Dr. Jackson⁶ — by Dr. Claggett⁷ — by the Oxford divines themselves⁸ — by the Rev. Mr. Hinds⁹ — by Bishop Pearson¹⁰ — by Archbishop Usher¹¹ — by Bingham¹² — by Dr. Rice¹³ — by Dr. McCrie¹⁴ — and by others, were it necessary to enlarge.

1) Ibid, p. 768.

2) His eighth head refers to conformity in great matters of prudential discipline, though not instituted by God, which he only proves by authority of the council of Nice.

3) Iren. pp. 121, 122, 108, 120.

4) On Ch. Govt. pp. 12, 13, 28, 29, Am. ed.

5) See Sermon on Christian Unity, which he refers to the unity of its head — of its faith — of its baptism — of its heavenly guardian, God — of its hope.

6) See Wks. fol. vol. iii. pp. 875, 877.

7) In Notes of the Ch. Exam. p. 190.

8) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 240, 259.

9) Hind's Rise and Progress of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 39, &c., and p. 92, &c.

10) “Christian unity,” says Bishop Pearson, “has principal relation to the unity of faith.” On the Creed, p. 17.

11) So also Archbishop Usher, in his discourse on this subject delivered before his Majesty, places the unity of the church principally on the unity of the faith professed therein, and the unity of the Spirit. Lond. 1687, pp. 10, 11.

12) Bingham, in his very full and learned Dissertation on the Ancient Doctrine of the Unity of the Church, first treats of that unity which was regarded as “fundamental to the very being of a church, being absolutely necessary and essential; (Antiq. b. xvi. ch. i. vol. vi. p. 10;) and this he

describes as, first, the unity of faith and obedience to the laws of Christ; and, secondly, the unity of love and charity. He then proceeds to discourse upon “other sorts of unity necessary to the well-being of the church,” (Lect. iii. p. 10,) among which he reckons “the necessary use of baptism; secondly, unity of worship; thirdly, unity of subjection of presbyters and people to their bishop; fourthly, unity of submission to the discipline of the church.”

13) “The unity of the church,” according to the Essays on the Church in Dr. Rice's Magazine, (Evang. and Lit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 130,) consists, 1st, in its one head, namely, the Lord Jesus Christ; 2d, in its profession of one faith, or its holding every where the same great system of doctrine; 3d, in that it every where, in all its branches, celebrates the same sacraments as badges of the same profession, and signs of the same system of saving truth.” “It ought, however, to be understood, that this unity does not consist in the mere form or mode of administration, but in the use of the same elements to represent the same spiritual truths.” 4th, in that common hope which is cherished by the whole body of believers; 5th, in the same mind or spirit; 6th, in their common participation of the influences of the same ever-blessed and divine Spirit.

14) Such, also, are the outlines of this unity, as given by Dr. McCrie, in his Discourses on the Unity of the

From this exhibition of the true nature of that scriptural unity which is descriptive of the various portions of the one, holy catholic, and apostolic church; the character of schism which is the violation of this unity, will be as clearly perceived. For, as unity consists in the harmonious relation of all the members of this universal body to one another, and to Christ as their one, common and equal Lord and Master; so is schism to be found, in its measure, in whatever has a tendency to disturb such harmony with one another, or to destroy, or prevent such union with their divine head. Whatever, then, would alienate christian brethren, — whatever would excite envy, jealousy or hatred; — whatever would needlessly restrain christian liberty; — whatever would require conscientious nonconformity or separation; — whatever would mar the purity of the truth; — or isolate one portion of the church from others — this is of the nature of schism.

The term, in its original import, signifies a rent, division, or separation. It is used in a figurative or secondary sense, six times in the New Testament; thrice in the Gospel of St. John, in reference to the differences among the Jews respecting Christ, and thrice in the Epistle to the Corinthians, as applicable to the divisions, which had arisen among the members of that church.² In only one passage in our vernacular translation is the word rendered "schism,"³ being in these other passages translated by the word "division."⁴

Now as it regards the cases to which the word is applied in the gospels, there was first a difference and contrariety of

Church, (Edin. 1821, p. 17, &c.) This unity consists, 1st, in her having one head and Lord; 2d, in the unity of the faith; 3d, in fellowship in the same worship of which baptism is the solemn badge; 4th, in respect of external government and discipline, "as far as is expressly enjoined in scripture, or may be deduced by native inference from the general rules and particular examples recorded in it;" 5th, in the bond of mutual charity and peace.

Such, also, are the views presented by Dr. Harris, in his *Union, or the Divided Church made One*, Am. ed. Boston, 1833, ch. ii.

See also the *Unity of the Church*, by the Rev. Baptist Noel, 27th ed. Lond. 1838.

See also *Schism as opposed to the Unity of the Church*, by Dr. Hoppus, Lond. 1839, 2d ed. This is a prize

essay, for which Sir Calling Eardley Smith offered a prize of one hundred pounds sterling, which was adjudged to this.

On the true idea of, see Owen's *Wks.* vol. xix. p. 160, et preced.

See also Knapp's *Theology*, vol. i. p. 484.

"God," says Stillingfleet, (*Irenic.* pp. 121, 122,) "will one day convince men that the union of the church lies more in the unity of faith and affection than in uniformity of doubtful rites and ceremonies."

1) "So there was a division." *John* vii. 43, xi. 16, and x. 19.

2) *1 Cor.* i. 10, xi. 18, and xii. 25.

3) *1 Cor.* xii. 25.

4) On its scriptural meaning, see full in Dr. Owen's *Treatise on*, in *Wks.* vol. xix. p. 123, &c.; and on the case of the Corinthian church, *ibid*, p. 125, &c.

opinion; and secondly, an alienation of feeling, leading the one party to violence, while the other were required conscientiously to maintain their views. As it regards the case of the Corinthian church, we find that parties, attached to different teachers, had arisen in that church. These were led to cherish variant opinions in some matters, and cold, and disaffected feelings towards one another. The consequences were gross violations of decency and order in the observance of divine worship — contentions respecting their ministers — and unbrotherly and unchristian scenes among themselves. It is for these things they are rebuked by the apostle, for their adoption of party names, and the uncharitable insinuation, that others did not love the Saviour as much as they — for their perversion and abuse of the instituted means of grace — for their obstinate continuance in these evil courses — and their unholy contentions about them. This is what the apostle denominates schism.

You will also observe, as a fact most important in this inquiry, that all these evils were found to exist in the ONE church of Corinth, and while it still remained denominationally ONE church. It was an internal mischief which had superinduced such unhappy and lamentable consequences. Neither have we any intimation whatever, that any actual separation into distinct societies had taken place at Corinth. All that we read of, was the existence, in this christian society, of factious dissensions. “From the entire testimony of scripture respecting this subject, we conclude,” says the author of the late elaborate treatise upon this subject,¹ “that the schisms condemned, were such differences of opinion, and of feeling, among the members of one particular church, on matters connected with their common interest as professed christians, as produced heartburnings, alienations, contentions, party-spirit, and other uncharitable tempers, and unseemly conduct.”² “The scripture examples of schism, exhibit it as little different from variance, strife, faction, or even heresy, in the original meaning of this term.”³ Schism, then,

1) Schism as opposed to the Unity of the Church, by Dr. Hoppus, p. 592, Lond. ed. 1839, see part ii. ch. i. where these views will be found enlarged upon.

2) Schism, p. 227.

3) *αἰρεσις*, a sect or choice, see Acts xxvi. 5; see *ibid*, p. 232.

Even in the time of Clemens Romanus, this original and scriptural meaning of the term was retained, since he every where in his epistle denominates the differences in that

church by the term schism. See Owen's Wks. vol. xix. p. 127.

Of this schism in the Corinthian church, in the days of Clemens Romanus, see a full account in Dr. Owen's Wks. vol. xix. p. 127.

“Leaving the scriptures,” says he, “the next instance of schism to which our attention is turned, is connected with this same Corinthian church, as it is given in the epistle of Clemens Romanus.” “And that which he calls schism (Owen's Wks. vol. xx. p. 241.)

as described in the word of God, though sinful, is far from being necessarily damnable; — though most reprehensible, it is not necessarily exclusive of the divine favor; — though destructive to the prosperity, peace, and harmony of the church, yet not absolutely to its character as a church. Schism, therefore, is an offence against the unity of the church, arising from a state of mind at variance with the humility and charity of the gospel. It is an offence, consequently, which can only be committed by those who are within the church, whether we consider it in reference to a particular congregation, or to different congregations, or denominations; and therefore, to affirm of any individual, of any congregation, or of any denomination, that they are schismatics, is to declare that while still related to the visible church of Christ, and connected with it, they are yet chargeable with unchristian conduct.¹

As the unity of the church does not and cannot be supposed to mean the union of the whole church in one body, under one government or sovereign authority,² — so it is plain that the mere fact that any denomination of christians is not found thus subject to the same ecclesiastical government with some other, does not fairly implicate it in a charge of schism, or exclude it from the pale of Christ's true church.

Separation, then, does not certainly imply schism. There may be disunion where there are preserved the essentials of christian unity. The doctrine that the catholic church is one body, only began to prevail in the third century.³ In the beginning it was

in that church, he calls also strife, contention, sedition, tumult; and it may be observed concerning that schism, as all the ancients call it, that the church continued its state and outward communion. There is no mention of any that separated from it, that constituted a new church."

1) It is ridiculous to argue, as prelatists do, that even were we schismatical, we were on that account no longer a part of the catholic church. For if we are schismatics, we must belong to that body in which we are schismatics; since it is only as members of the one body we could possibly be chargeable with schism. But this body is the catholic church, and therefore as long as we are schismatics, we are an integral part of that body, and cannot be cut off from it, otherwise we must cease to be schismatics in a body to which we do not belong. If, then, we are schismatics, we have this comfort left us, that we

are still catholics, that is, incorporated members of the visible church. And if we are not thus members, then most assuredly we are not schismatics. Let prelatists, therefore, choose for us whatever portion they, in their wisdom, may see fit; we trust, however, they will not sacrifice all claim to the attribute of wisdom, in assigning us such a contradictory and paradoxical situation as that, like limbo, its real portion never can be discovered. See this shown to have been the sense of the ancients in Bingham, *Antiq. b. xvi. § 17.*

2) See twelve arguments in proof of this, with answers to Objections in Barrow's *Disc. Wks. vol. i. pp. 769, 780.*

3) See Riddle's *Ecl. Chronol. Lond. 1840, p. 33.*

"Previously to the third century," says the Rev. Mr. Riddle, "a real, living *unity*, and a well regulated *liberty*, characterized the early constitution of

not so. Then, all the churches were ecclesiastically independent, separate, and distinct, and united only by the bonds of mutual charity, and the acknowledgment of one common faith. The violation of this charity — the breach of this holy alliance and concord — was what was then understood by schism. And if Dr. Barrow is competent to decide, the fathers also,¹ “in their set treatises, and in their incidental discourses about the unity of the church, (which was *de facto*, which should be *de jure* in the church,) do make it to consist only in those unions of faith, charity, peace, which we have described, not in this political union.”

In support of this opinion, he presents quotations, in addition to others already adduced by him, from Tertullian, Epiphanius, Constantine the Great, Gregory the Great, Clemens Alexandrinus, Jerome, &c.²

the church. But liberty was afterwards sacrificed to unity; and this unity itself degenerated into a merely external, forced and dead *union*, which became subservient to the purposes of *oppression*, and to the growth of the *hierarchy*.”

The results which followed from this doctrine of the unity of the catholic church, are exhibited by Euthorius, Bishop of Tyana, A. D. 431, in the preface to his work against heresies. “Its subject,” says Clarke, (Suc. of Sacred Lit. vol. ii. p. 194,) “is the woful effects of ecclesiastical disturbances and persecutions; and it shows how much earlier the spirit of the inquisition existed in the catholic church than the institution itself.”

“Euthorius complains of the violent methods the ecclesiastics of those days resorted to, that those who differed might be brought back to the unity of the church; that they used civil power to produce religious uniformity; and persecution was to enlighten or reduce a dark or refractory mind. ‘It is said that henceforth they will do things hitherto unventured on; that they will no longer underhand and occasionally accuse the simple of heresy; but that, possessing the supreme power, they will madly rage and imperiously command; will prescribe laws, force to their opinions, demand instant obedience, condemn and punish the study of true holiness; that they will revile some and banish others; involve one in accusations,

and despoil another of his credit; browbeat this, and by vaunting persuade that; — I say nothing of bonds, prisons, fines, disgrace, stripes, piteous sights of slaughter, almost incredible, though seen: and this tragedy is acted by priests! (Oh, impious daring! oh, intolerable judgment!) with whom the commencement of public worship and teaching is that most delightful address, ‘Peace be with you all.’ Without judgment comes condemnation; without accusation, sentence; audacity is esteemed courage; cruelty is named zeal; fraud is regarded as wisdom. What tragic strain of wailing is sufficiently mournful! the lamentations of Jeremiah are too weak for the multitude and magnitude of these evils. But from their fruits ye shall know them; and the fruits of these present laborers are to scatter, not to assemble; to persecute, not to bring back; to cast down, not to raise up; to wound, not to heal; to hate the wanderers, not to seek the wanderers.’ Thus does Euthorius describe the ancient methods of christian persecution in those days.”

See also King’s Primitive Christ. pp. 162, 181.

1) Works, vol. i. p. 770.

2) See *ibid*.

Hence will be apparent, how contrary to all truth is the definition given of schism by prelatists, that “it is a direct violation of the order and government established in the church, (that is, the one visible church of the prelacy,) and a consequent separation

It is, however, undoubtedly true, that the established ecclesiastical idea of schism, as most frequently presented by the later fathers, is separation from the worship and communion of some particular church or churches, and from their ecclesiastical government and control. Thus Augustine defines schism to be "a recent separation in a church on account of some difference of opinion."¹ It thus became an ecclesiastical sin committed against church order and authority — against the pride, pomp, and rule of the governors of the church — and against their assumed supremacy and exclusive jurisdiction — and not against the love, truth, and charity of the gospel.² The result of this progressive change of opinion, was the consolidated spiritual monarchy and despotism of the Romish hierarchy.

But as such a union is neither possible, nor proper, nor accordant to scripture and primitive christianity, so is it certain that separate organization in an ecclesiastical capacity cannot, of itself, establish against any church or denomination the charge of schism. Otherwise the apostolic and primitive churches were all schismatical,³ and, along with them, every church that

from it." (Daubeny's Guide to the Ch. vol. i. p. 45.)

Daubeny distinctly refers the charge of schism to the rejection of communion with "a church established by public authority." Guide to the Ch. vol. i. p. 47.

"It is maintained by Dr. Barrow," (in Powell on Ap. Suc. p. 300,) "on the supremacy of the pope, that the ancients did assert to each bishop a free, absolute, independent authority, subjected to none, directed by none, accountable to none, in the administration of affairs properly concerning his church." Suppos. v. § v. p. 220, 4to. edit. 1680. Cyprian maintains it as Dr. Barrow there shows; and see Vitringa de Syn. vet lib. iii. cap. xvii. p. 857, &c.; Mosheim de Reb. ante Constant. p. 152; and Burnet's Ref. vol. ii. anno 1559.

See Note B.

1) See in Schism, p. 232; where see also Zonaria's similar Definition.

2) See illustrated in *ibid*, p. 235.

3) That there were in apostolical times, separate and distinct churches in the same provinces, appears manifest. Gal. i. 22; Acts ix. 31; Gal. i. 2; Acts xvi.; Phil. i. 1; Acts xiv. 22.

Grotius in his Annot. on 1 Tim. v. 17, affirms that in primitive times there were many churches in each of the cities, and that each of these churches

had its own president or bishop, and that Alexandria was peculiar in having but one. See the same largely proved in his work de Imperio, pp. 355, 356, 357.

Grotius was of opinion, that old churches were formed in imitation of the synagogues, and that one city had divers churches and bishops as well as divers synagogues. And Dr. Hammond thought that Rome, Antioch, and other cities, had two churches and bishops, one of *Jeros* and another of Gentiles; and that Peter and Paul had two churches at Rome. The churches of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, and many other places, also had two churches at once by their divisions, and none so long as Rome. See Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1680, part iii. p. 95.

There is evidence to prove, that bishops were ordained in villages, in the outskirts of cities, and often two in the same city; and of course all bishops were supreme in their own districts, and independent of every other, while yet the unity of the church remained. See Corbet on the Ch. pp. 105, 107. That there were either separate churches for the Hebrew christians, or a toleration in them of the observance of the Jewish rites and ceremonies, would appear also from

is now found existing upon earth. For the Romish, the Greek, the Oriental, the Anglican, churches are all separate in their ecclesiastical government, and hence they would all be inevitably excluded by this rule from the character of the true churches of Christ.

It will avail nothing to say, as does the Romish church, that having cast out schismatics and heretics, she is united with herself. For even were this true, which is most contrary to truth, as it regards either the Roman or the Anglican communions, in the bosom of which there are innumerable schisms — yet were this a fact, it is just as true of all other communions, which are also united with themselves. Nor will it sustain this exclusive assumption, for these churches, or either of them, to appropriate to themselves, the title and the privileges of the catholic church; for it were just as easy for any other denomination, which desired to imitate their presumptive arrogance, to make a similar claim, and thus all the sects in Christendom might, each in turn, become the catholic church.

As there may then be schism where there is true doctrine and a true church;¹ so may there be great professed union, where there is neither true faith nor true charity, and where there is therefore real schism. But this, surely, is not the unity Christ enjoins, which is unity of faith, love and charity; and this all churches, which hold to what is essential, possess. The church of Christ is one, only in Christ, only by the appointment and determination of Christ, and only as governed and directed by Him. It is therefore necessarily and essentially one body, nor can men by any self-constructed lines or barriers divide

the fact that the Jewish christians continued in the observance of their peculiar rites until after the time of Hadrian, when one part of them separated from the rest, and threw off the ceremonial law, which the others retained. See Vidal's *Mosheim*, vol. ii. pp. 193, 201.

When almost all the bishops were become arian, the people who adhered unto the orthodox faith, set up their private conventicles in opposition unto them, as for instance at Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and other places. And who will say these were schismatics, or out of the pale of the true church, though beyond the line of apostolical succession.

1) See Dr. Scott in *Notes of the Ch. Ex.* p. 203.

"If there were but one particular church," says Dr. Payne, (*Notes of*

Ch. Ex. p. 154.) "upon the whole earth, that did profess this true faith, *that alone* might be called the *catholic* church, because that alone had that catholic faith which did properly make and constitute the true church."

Tertullian says, (*Ayton*, p. 585, *Tert. de Pœscript. Hæret. cap. xx.*)

"And so Tertullian speaks to the same purpose, when he gives an account of the church's unity, as consisting—'In her adhering to that doctrine which was first preached by the apostles, who, having first delivered it in Judea, and planted churches there, went abroad and delivered the same to other nations, and settled churches in cities, from whence other churches have the same doctrine propagated to them, which are therefore called apostolical churches, as the offspring of those which were found-

THE CHURCH, though they may mark out the limits of their own branch of the church.¹

Let us pursue this idea a little further. Schism, as has been shown, means division, or that which rends asunder a body previously united. But if that which is essential to the nature of the body is still retained by each party, then of course, neither ceases to retain the characteristic qualities of that body. But if one part is thrown off by the other, because it has ceased to possess the qualities necessary to the homogeneity of the body, and to its sound and healthy condition; then will that portion lose, while the other retains, the character of the body. And in this case, the whole fault of such a division will be justly imputable to the corrupted member.

But we may further suppose the body of the church to be divided on questions, which do not affect the essential being of the church, but only its well-being. Now in this case there must be criminality in one or both of the parties so dividing, but neither will cease to be true churches, since both retain what is of fundamental importance. That only can destroy the being of a church which separates it from Christ, and from the life-giving influences of his Holy Spirit; and this nothing short of apostacy from the truth can do. The apostle certainly addresses the church at Corinth as a church of God, in the very epistle in which he so severely rebukes its members for their schisms. He still regards them as a true church, and as one church—as one body and as one family. And although some of the members were in unnatural rebellion against the others, and were alienated in views and feelings from the rest, so that they could not act or worship together; yet did they not, on that account, cease to be one body, though divided, or one family, though disunited. The severance of the bonds of amity had not broken the inseparable bonds of spiritual consanguinity. They did not cease to be children of the same parents, and brethren and sisters of the same domestic circle, though now driven asunder by the force of

ed by them. Therefore, so many and so great churches are all that one prime and apostolical church from whence all others come. And thus they are all prime and apostolical in regard to their unity, as long as there is that communication of that title of brotherhood and common work of peace and hospitality.”

1) See Sherlock in *Notes of the Ch.* pp. 32, 33, 34.

See also *Oxf. Tr.* vol. i. pp. 360, 368; *Chillingworth's Wks.* vol. i. pp. 108, 109; *Schism*, pp. 277, 278, 292,

467; see Augustine in *ibid.* p. 293; *Spiritual Despotism*, p. 163, &c.; *Hind's Rise and Progress of Christ.* vol. ii. p. 165.

“There has been a time,” says Dr. Claggett, (*Notes of the Ch.* p. 178.) “when it was so far from being a note of the catholic church to be united to the pope, that it was impossible so to be without separation from the catholic church.”

See Cyprian and others, quoted in *Potter on Ch. Govt.* pp. 166, 167, 182 and 183.

party strife and internal discord. Guilty they no doubt were for being thus at variance. Guilty were they who first wandered from the path of obedience to the parental law; and they, too, who associated with the disobedient brethren, in this contumelious defiance of the law of the christian family. But nevertheless, they were still children, and they are called upon by the apostle to return to the exercise of the filial and fraternal spirit.

And just so is it at this moment with all the members of the great christian household. They have most evidently fallen out by the way, and are not found walking together in love and amity. And most surely there is a heavy responsibility resting upon *them*, who by their neglect of the divine law and charter of the church, or by the wanton assumption of undue authority over their brethren in the Lord, have led to the present alienations of the various members of the christian family. But still, wherever there is a church which is found holding to the head, even Christ, and to the truth as it is in Him;—there, is a true member of the CHURCH CATHOLIC, WHICH IS MADE UP OF ALL THE PARTICULAR CHURCHES IN WHATEVER PART OF THE WORLD THEY ARE FOUND.

Schism, then, is not separation, nor is that church schismatical that is independent in its organization and ecclesiastical regimen of some other, which is vain and arbitrary enough to claim jurisdiction over it. Separation may, in many cases, be duty, and the source, not of schism, but of greater unity. Union may, in such cases, be sinful, and the fountain whence the most bitter waters of schism may be found to flow. There is nothing in the word of God which makes such consolidated union necessary to christian unity, or which identifies such separate and independent organization with schism. The very contrary is there established. For, while the apostolic churches formed no actual secessions, they were yet schismatical; and while independent of one another, they dwelt together in the unity of the spirit, and the bonds of peace: and thus, as schism may be found where there is union in external form and polity, so may unity co-exist with separation and independence.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE SEVENTEENTH.

NOTE A.

THE NECESSARY TENDENCY OF PRELACY TO UNITY BOTH OF SPIRIT AND OF ECCLESIASTICAL ASSOCIATION.

As this adaptation of prelacy to secure union, in contrast with the undenied differences among other denominations, is now the theme of daily exultation, — as it has been during its entire schism-making course — we feel called upon to give here a few additional illustrations of this tendency.

And first, we will present a portion of a recent letter, published by Bishop McIlvaine, together with the introductory remarks of the editor of the Episcopal Recorder.

Bishop McIlvaine and the Churchman.—Our readers may be grieved, with ourselves, to see and know the necessity for such communications as the following from Bishop McIlvaine. We are sorry to have our paper occupied with evidences of such a state of things in our church as are given in these letters. The unholy and violent course which has been pursued by the Churchman, and we are bound to say sanctioned, because unrestrained and uncontradicted, by Bishop Onderdonk, has given pain and distress to many minds who are deeply concerned for the peace and welfare of the episcopal church. We do not feel at liberty to refuse Bishop McIlvaine the opportunity of self-defence in our columns, after he has been so unjustly assailed. But we feel called upon to do no more in connexion with these discussions than to express our solemn conviction of the destructive and guilty character and tendency of the course which has called for such a defence. The church will see, when ruptured and riven by the violence of this party, her peace destroyed, her truth overshadowed, her integrity broken, what has been the purpose of these movements on their part. To us it will be then, as it is now, an abiding comfort that we labored for peace and truth, and the responsibility of the result may rest, where it belongs, on an *ultra party*, who, by a bold and arbitrary course of denunciation, of the men and the truth of God, have thrown a peaceful body into convulsions and schism.

Bishop McIlvaine to the Editor of the Churchman:

I ask no other answer to your charge of “*almost heresy*,” than that those who read what you have written, will also read what I have written. But why, then, am I so pained and mortified? Is it because such treatment and such opposition from you were unexpected? Alas, Dr. Seabury, I have known you too long and too well, not to know just how such truth, even what, in my view, is no other than “the glorious gospel of the blessed God,” would be relished by you. I knew you would utterly despise, detest, and ridicule it, just as you have done. And I have no idea that you have expressed all you feel with regard to it. Your hatred of such truth is, I have no doubt, even much greater than you have expressed. I say it feelingly and solemnly, for I know the awfulness of such a state of mind. And if I supposed you would deny it, were it not that I suppose you wish to be considered as

in that state of mind, I would not thus lay it to your charge. But as long as I thus understand the views and tastes which you avow, let me tell you seriously, not in the spirit of severity, that until there shall be reason to suppose that God has wrought a great, and what I should call a very blessed change, in your views and tastes and sympathies; when I shall publish any thing distinctive concerning the great matters of the gospel, especially, as to *what a poor sinner must do to be saved*, I shall feel much more confident that I speak "the truth as it is in Jesus," if I find you loathing it, as you do my charge, than if I shall find you praising it.

You recently published in your paper of November 7th, a most abusive and abominable attack upon me, headed, "Oxford Tracts, Charity Exemplified." You charged me with having refused to receive a person as a candidate for orders, "because he had declined joining a teetotal society, and attending services where the liturgy was dishonored." When I requested you to state the grounds on which you published such statements, (which, by the way, had not one least approach to truth,) you declined printing my letter and answering its request for your grounds of charge, "out of respect" (you wrote me) "to my office, and regard to the honor of the church, and because you did not want to be brought into such conflict with your superior," as you foresaw would be the consequence. My dear sir, if your respect to my office, and to your "superior," and to the honor of the church, be so great, how great then must be your hatred of the truth contained in my charge, when it so masters that respect and so casts it behind your back, and makes you treat your "superior" as you have done in the article now under consideration!

But let us ask again, why does your treatment so pain and mortify me? I answer, because of the painful consideration that the Churchman is so widely regarded as representing the clergy of the diocese of New York, and especially because it is "the official organ of the Bishop of New York," and is under his avowed "general direction and supervision," and therefore, where it calls my charge "almost heretical," it is the Bishop of New York whom the Bishop of Ohio must consider as thus speaking; and when it ridicules the writing of the Bishop of Ohio as "mere romance," "not even founded on fact," and as the work of a writer "incompetent," and as containing "a perversion of historical truth," it is not merely Dr. Seabury who is responsible, but it is his endorser, and patron and director and supervisor, his protector in these things; it is the Bishop of New York; who is just so much the more responsible for these expressions and charges, as his influence in giving them weight is greater; and so will he be held by the church as well as by myself.

But here I must say, that I would not have spoken in this letter touching the responsibility under which I hold the Bishop of New York for the conduct of the Churchman towards me, were it not that *I have faithfully and respectfully and kindly tried in vain by a private correspondence to obtain from that bishop some satisfaction, at least some expression of regret for the abominable attack upon my official proceedings*, in the case of the candidate above referred to. My first letter, he answered by declining to be considered as responsible, in the way I held him to be, for such things in the Churchman; while not a word has he said, to indicate that, in the article complained of, he does not entirely concur. My second letter is, to this day, unanswered, though it was written nearly two months ago. However you may have meant it, when you placed me in company with *Whitfield, Wesley, Newton, Scott, and Simeon*, I by no means decline the honor. However I may differ from any of them in some things, I love and honor the whole group, and especially Newton, Scott, and Simeon, as noble "soldiers of Jesus Christ," and God forbid that I should not feel honored by such ridicule as places me at their side.

Then, as to the charge, which you so much reprobate as "almost heretical," I trust the considerate reader will not accuse me of egotism, in introducing the following extract from a letter lately received from my honored friend, the Rev. G. S. Faber; especially as his authority has been so much spoken of lately in recommendation of his work on Election, and as you, sir, have said, in your notice of my book, that "Faber would not thus have conducted the argument." Thus he writes: "I ought before to have acknowledged your kind remembrance of me, in the shape of your very excellent, and *unhappily*

very reasonable Charge on the vitally important subject of justification. In this present day of rebuke, when the Oxford tractarians are doing all that lies in their power to propagate the popish view of justification, which among protestants (as you remark, Charge, p. 153) seems to have been first advanced by Lauterwald, your Charge is *specially* seasonable, and you will quite understand why I say *unhappily* seasonable. You have, however, faithfully done your duty, and I in an inferior grade of the priesthood, though to a greater *typographical* extent, have endeavored to do mine. Among other popish fancies, the tract school now maintain sacramental justification."

So much for the difference of opinion between you and Mr. Faber; you calling that "*almost heretical*," which he calls very excellent, seasonable and faithful. Whose opinion I prefer, perhaps, you will be able to decide. Your charge against me of *perverting historical truth*, and of having made the "marvellous" assertion that Bishop Bull inoculated so many of the best divines of the English and American churches, down to Dehon and Hobart, with the views of Socinianism, will be noticed in another letter. Meanwhile, I am yours, truly.

C. P. McILVAINE.

Gambier, March 6, 1841.

Again, the Editors of the Recorder thus speak:—

"*Trial of Principles.*— We have been often struck with the trial which is given to avowed principles when they come in collision with cherished tempers. The late course of the New York Churchman has given illustrations of this, to which the serious attention of the Church should be directed. We have long ceased to descend into any personal controversy with that paper, and are quite unmoved by any of its frequent assaults upon ourselves. But we would call attention to the violent attacks it has of late made upon the characters of some of our bishops, as strange developments indeed of a course which affects peculiar reverence for the episcopal office and dignity. Its assaults upon the reputation of Bishop McCoskry, and of Bishop McIlvaine, and particularly its late attacks upon the latter, have outraged all decency among gentlemen, as much as all courtesy among christians. Will the church sustain these assaults? Yet this paper is certified to be conducted under the immediate supervision and entire approbation of the bishop of New York. Does *he* authorize and endorse these outrages upon the characters of the bishops of the church? We feel bound, upon such an occasion, to break our uniform silence in regard to that paper, and to enter our solemn protest against a course of insult which is found only there, and which is most contradictory to the high pretensions which are there made to principle upon this subject. We feel under no obligation to defend Bishop McIlvaine in this or any contingency. He can defend himself. Nor do we believe, that "a falcon towering in his pride of height," will "by a mousing owl, be hawked at and killed." But we feel bound, as ministers and editors, to protest against this unparalleled course of violence, on the part of those who assert their claim to a better character and higher perceptions of truth than others. Is it so, that this professed reverence for the episcopal office among the class who sustain the Churchman, is all pretence? Is that an universal fact, which we heard years since from the mouth of a venerable bishop, "that it is easier to govern ten low-churchmen, than one high-churchman?" Whether it be so as a rule or not, it is undoubted that no paper of any class, even from the Romanists, which comes to our office, is so uniformly marked by an evident carnal temper, and the want of all regard for private and official character, as the New York Churchman,— while none makes such pretensions to be a standard, to which, upon church principles, others should be conformed. Is this abusive spirit to be allowed? Does Bishop Onderdonk mean to justify, shelter, and reward it? We protest against it, personally and officially; and while we discuss principles, and are willing they should be discussed with entire liberty, we challenge the production of an abusive or disrespectful expression personally applied, and still more to persons in authority in the church, in all the columns of the paper conducted by ourselves. For the dogmas of the Churchman we feel no concern. But let the church look to the spirit and temper with which it is conducted, while it bears upon its face the solemn testimony of the bishop of New York, "*it has, as it richly deserves, my full and undiminished confidence.*"

"I need not tell you, my dear sir," says the author of 'Letters to a Friend concerning the New Theology of Oxford,' in the Episcopal Recorder for May 9, 1840, "that these writings have proved fire-brands in the church. Where is the peace, unanimity, and cordial co-operation of which we boasted two years ago? We were then a compact, united body, animated by one spirit, moving onward in a career of prosperity. But how is it now? One church periodical arrayed against another, one clergyman looking with suspicion upon his brother; nay, our very bishops tempted to mutual distrust; and all because a few divines in a foreign university have changed the habit of recluses for that of agitators, and persuaded many to believe that we have been all along ignorant of the true doctrines of our church, and that great benefit is to be derived from substituting for the creed, articles and homilies, some as yet undefined and intangible test of orthodoxy!" (See for March, 1841.)

"I do and will mourn, and shall continue to mourn," says the Rev. Benjamin Allen, in his Letter to Bishop Hobart, (Philad., 1827, p. 8.) "YOUR UNSOUNDNESS AS A CHURCHMAN," (his capitals.) Again: "your doctrines and views of polity are unsound and unscriptural," &c. "Are you to propose a plan to cut up the canons and the Psalter, and claim the utmost veneration for our liturgy — to introduce Jacobite notions of church government, and claim to be no schismatic?" (p. 31.)

See further the Second Letter to Bishop Hobart, by this same writer, also published at Philadelphia, 1827, page 70, and Letter Third in the Christian Warrior.

How beautifully — as a poetic vision in contrast with the sad realities of life — does the following quotation from a recent picture of the prelacy, relieve the horrors of such existing facts. "When the English Church," says the author of "The Church of England and the Church in America Compared," (New York, 1841, p. 26.) "we say, shall find time and inclination to note the primitive ecclesiastical polity of the church in America, and the unquestionable blessing that has attended its peaceful exercise; the church character it has given to all her institutions; the growing union of individual efforts in her favor; the ADVANCING HARMONY of DOCTRINAL views AMONG her MEMBERS; the comparative greatness of her missionary results; how UNITED she has stood in the midst of surrounding divisions; how PEACEFUL in the midst of dissensions; how ORTHODOX in the midst of heresies; how tranquil in the midst of fanatical excitement; how energetic in spite of her feebleness; how concentrated in spite of dispersion; how faithful, finally, amid all her early trials, and now at last how solidly prospering and how surely advancing."

What an admirable commentary, also, does this state of things form upon the infallible text of Mr. Daubeny's homily on schism. "Certain it is, that union among christians is to be found only within the walls of THE CHURCH. Upon leaving those walls, that union is exchanged for endless division," and so on, and so on. (Guide to the Ch., vol. i. p. 206, disc. x.)

"Such," says Mr. Staunton, "are the natural results of schism; having no conservative principles, its faith, however pure at first, INVARIABLY deteriorates and proceeds, step by step, along the descent of error, till it finally settles in the depths of avowed heresy." (Dictionary of the Church, p. 418.)

We shall have occasion to recur to this subject when we come to illustrate the efficacy of high-churchism in producing sects.

NOTE B.

THE NATURE OF SCHISM.

WE will here add some additional authorities.

Schism, as thus described in scripture, and as referring to one particular church or communion, implies, says Dr. Owen, these three things: (Works, vol. xx. p. 240.) "1. Want of that mutual love, condescension, and forbearance, which are required in all the members of the same church, with the moral evils of whisperings, back-bitings, and evil surmises, that ensue thereon.

"2. All undue adherence unto some church offices above others, causing disputes and janglings.

"3. Disorder in the attendance unto the duties of church assemblies, and the worship of God performed in them. This is the only notion of schism, that is exemplified in the scripture, the only evil that is condemned under that name."

In order, then, that any person may fall into this guilt of schism, "it is required," says Dr. Owen, (Works, vol. xix. p. 133.)

"1. That they be members of, or belong to, some one church, which is so by the institution and appointment of Jesus Christ. And we shall see that there is more required hereunto than the bare being a believer or a christian.

"2. That they either raise, or entertain, and persist in causeless differences with others of that church more or less, to the interruption of that exercise of love in all the fruits of it, which ought to be amongst them; and the disturbance of the due performance of the duties required of the church, in the worship of God. As Clement, in the forementioned epistle, *φιλονικιοι εστε αδελφοι και ζηλαται περι μη ανηκουστων εις σωτηριαν.*

"3. That these differences be occasioned by, and do belong to, some things in a remoter or nearer distance appertaining to the worship of God: their differences on a civil account are elsewhere mentioned and reprov'd, 1 Epist., chap. 6, for therein, also, there was from the then state of things, an *ηπτημα*, verse 7.

"Unless men can prove," says Dr. Owen, (Works, vol. xix. p. 161,) "that we have not the Spirit of God, that we do not savingly believe in Jesus Christ, that we do not sincerely love all the saints, his whole body, and every member of it, they cannot disprove our interest in the catholic church."

"We do and shall abide by this principle," says Dr. Owen, in his Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet, on the Unreasonableness of Separation, (Works, vol. xx. p. 253,) "that communion in faith and love, with the administration of the same sacraments, is sufficient to preserve all christians from the guilt of schism, although they cannot communicate together in some rites and rules of worship and order."

"In this case, I ask," says Dr. Owen, (Works, vol. xix. p. 245,) "whether it be schism, or no, for any number of men to reform themselves, by reducing the practice of worship to its original institution, though they may be the minor part lying within the parochial precinct; or for any of them to join themselves with others, for that end and purpose, not living within those precincts? I shall boldly say this schism is commanded by the Holy Ghost, (1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Hos. iv. 15)."

"After these things," says Dr. Owen, (Wks. vol. xix, pp. 243, 249,) "The motion of schism began to be managed variously, according unto the interest of them who seem'd to have the most advantage in the application of it, unto those who dissented from them. It were an endless thing to express the rise and declare the progress of these apprehensions. But after many loose and declamatory discourses about it, they are generally issued in two heads. The first is, that any kind of dissent from the pope and church of Rome is schism, all the schism that is or can be in the world. The other is, that a causeless separation from a true church, is schism, and this only is so. But whereas, in this pretended definition, there is no mention of any of its internal causes, nor of its formal reason, but a bare description of it by an outward effect, it serves only for a weapon, in every man's hand; to perpetuate digladiations about it. For every church esteems itself true, and every one that separates himself — esteems himself to have just cause so to do.

"In the following times, especially after the rise and prevalency of the Arian heresy, it was ordinary for those of the orthodox persuasion, to forsake the communion of those churches wherein Arian bishops did preside, and to gather themselves into separate meetings, or conventicles for divine worship, for which they were accused of schism, and in sundry places, punished accordingly; yea, some of them unto the loss of their lives. Yet, I suppose there are none now who judged them to have been schismatics."

"But after that, churches began to depart from this original constitution, by the ways and means before declared; every alteration produced a new supposition of church-unity and peace, whereto every church of a new constitution laid claim; new sorts of schism were also coined and framed."

According to Matthew Henry, in his very rare "Inquiry into the Nature of Schism," the word denotes in the New Testament, (Lond. 1717, pp. 8, 10, 13,

14, 15,) "a division in apprehension; so σχισμα is used. In which place it signifies the different thoughts and apprehensions, that the people or their rulers had concerning Christ, some thinking well of him, others not. Some accusing him, others excusing him. A division in affection; and in this sense it is used three times in the first epistle to the Corinthians, and no where else in all the New Testament." "By this instance, (1 Cor. 3,) it appears, that narrow-spiritedness which confines religion and the church to our way and party, whatever it is, to the condemning of others that differ from us in little things, is the great schismaticating principle, which hath been so much the bane of the christian church, *hinc illae lacrymae*." "We find the word used, *I hear there be σχισματα divisions among you.* (1 Cor. 2, 18.) But the schisms were quarrels and contentions about some little things relating to the circumstances of public worship, and the quarrel seems to have been about the time of beginning their worship, especially when they were to join in the Lord's supper, or their love-feasts, it seems they did not come exactly at the time, therefore the apostle bids them *tarry one for another.*" (v. 33.)

"That is schism, which breaks or slackens the bond by which the members are knit together."

"Now that bond is not an act of uniformity, in point of communion, in the same modes and ceremonies, but true love and charity, in point of affection. 'Tis charity that is the *bond of perfectness*. 'Tis the *unity of the spirit*, that is the *bond of peace*. And schism is that which breaks this bond.

"Now from all this laid together, I draw out this description of schism, which according to my present apprehensions is the true scripture notion of it."

"Schism is an uncharitable distance, division, or alienation of affections, among those who are called christians, and agree in the fundamentals of religion, occasioned by their different apprehensions about little things."

See this view of schism confirmed, in Dick's Theol. lect. xcvii. vol. 4, p. 314, Engl. ed. Campbell on the Gospels, Prel. Diss. ix. p. 3. Edw. Polhill, Esq. on Schism. Brook's Dissent. Fully Justified. See a full discussion of the subject of Schism, in Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1681, part iii. ch. i.

LECTURE XVIII.

THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION
SCHISMATICAL.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED, AND THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH VINDICATED
FROM THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.

WE have, in our previous discourse, entered upon the consideration of the schismatical character and tendency of the prelatial doctrine of apostolical succession. The guilt of schism, as we have there shown, has been imputed by the Romish church, to the English; by the English to the Romish; and by the variant parties within the Anglican church, to one another; while all these vie with each other in magnifying the heinousness of its criminality. We therefore instituted an inquiry into the scripture doctrine of the unity of the church, and of schism, which is a breach of that unity.

The only unity which can be scripturally attributed to the church of Christ, is that unity which has reference to its one common and divine head, — to that one faith upon which, as a foundation, it must every where and alike rest; — to those means of grace which are the efficacious fountains of spiritual blessing, wheresoever the Spirit of God deigns to move upon the waters, and to communicate to them a divine energy; — and to that common brotherhood, by which all who are born of the same regenerating spirit, are constituted members of the same heavenly family, and heirs to the same everlasting inheritance of glory. The unity of the christian church is not, therefore, to be vainly sought — in carnal and Pharisaic blindness — in any uniformity of rites, forms, orders, or ceremonies, which may all of them be found to be no more than the outward gar-

nishing of a whited sepulchre, from which the living spirit of true christianity has fled for ever. Neither is this unity to be looked for in any universal subjection to the dominion of any earthly head, or of any ecclesiastical polity; which would be, on the one hand slavery, and on the other, despotism.—The mere fact, then, of variety in rites, or forms,—or of separateness and independence, as it regards ecclesiastical regimen,—no more establishes the absence of christian unity, than the variety in human forms, or human societies, proves the existence of different orders of human beings, or disproves the certainty of one common and universal parentage — one universal humanity.

So likewise schism, as it is described in the word of God, has reference to this christian unity in faith, hope, and charity. As it is there developed, it existed only in a single church;—and it was manifested while as yet no separation among the members of that church had taken place. The Corinthian schism consisted not in insubordination to any prelatie hierarchy, but in the indulgence of uncharitable and bitter feelings, among the members of that church, one toward another. Whatever, therefore, would disturb the harmony of christian communion;—whatever would alienate the minds of one portion of the christian family from any, or every other;—whatever would tend to elevate and dignify one sect or denomination above the rest, as the special favorites of Heaven, or the entailed possessors of Heaven's peculiar grace;—whatever would exalt unessential points into essential articles of faith, and thus impose burdens on the consciences of men;—whatever would, in this way, erect new terms of christian communion;—whatever, in short, would necessitate opposition, and resistance, and separation, on the part of those who preferred the faith and order of the gospel, to the wisdom, or policy, or traditions of men;—that does the word of God also teach us to regard as schismatical.

This was that evil reprobated by the apostle Paul, and which, like an intestine feud, was wasting the energies of the Corinthian church. This was the evil so earnestly rebuked, in these same Corinthians, by the apostolic father Clement, in his epistles to them. The schism of which later fathers so bombastically treat, and whose criminality they make so deep, as to be actually inexpiable;—that is, resistance to the authority of ecclesiastical rulers, or rejection of the assumed dominion of a hierarchical order;—concerning this schism—as it is called—the scriptures are silent. They know it not. It is a fiction of later times. It is an evident consequence of premises, which had been laid down, in the gradual introduction of the prelatie system. It is the fatal germ of that spirit of priestcraft, which

has wormed its way into the church ; — corroded its vitals ; — and carried blight and mildew, to its fairest and most flourishing branches. It is, then, of transcendent importance, that correct views of a doctrine which has been employed as the fulcrum for supporting every engine of oppression, should be well established ; that a timely resistance may be given to any efforts for the re-establishment of a spiritual despotism, to which our children may be bound in unescapable bondage.

Two questions, therefore, arise from this discussion : first, are we schismatics ? and, secondly, are the abettors of this prelatist theory of apostolical succession schismatical ? The first question we answer in the negative ; and the second in the affirmative. The charge of schism does not, we affirm, lie against us. It does attach itself, so far forth as it is carried out, to the advocates of this prelatist system.

That we we are schismatical, prelatists constantly declare, in language the most severe, bigoted, and illiberal. Nor are such uncharitable and absurd pretensions to an exclusive possession of all the privileges and blessings of the church of Christ, confined to foreign divines ; they are adopted by many in this country, and are daily becoming more current. In addition to the evidence of this fact already produced, we may add, that Dr. Chapman has issued a volume containing twenty-seven “ Sermons to Presbyterians of all Sects ; ” “ the object of which,” as he defines it in his preface, “ is to show the obligation of all believers in christianity, to renounce the way of schism, and attach themselves to the apostolic church of Christ.”²

1) Hartford, 1836, p. 384.

2) The terms schism, dissent, sect, and their correlates, are as freely and dogmatically set forth as they were by the great ancestor of this high church party, Archbishop Laud, who, in his Letter to Bishop Hall, (see in Ayton's Const. of Prim. Ch. app. p. 2.) thus writes ; “ Since they challenged the presbyterian faction to be Christ's kingdom, as yourself expresth it, we must not use any mincing terms, but unmask them. Nor shall I ever give way to hamper ourselves for fear of speaking plain truth, though it be against Amsterdam and Geneva.”

Now that these views are not views pertinent to foreign divines or churches *merely*, nor yet to other portions of our own country *merely*, but are also held and cherished in Charleston, is a fact too susceptible of proof.

The Charleston Gospel Messenger, for February 1839, makes the following statement : “ Episcopalians generally hold, that the doctrine of a ministry, of three orders, deriving its ministry by succession, from the divine head of the church, is a VITAL TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL.” (See p. 384.)

“ Again, in the same work for May, 1839, p. 80, in an article headed Oxford Tracts, No. I. it is declared : “ For ourselves, we have read four volumes, save those parts which contain Professor Pusey's Treatise on Baptism ; and of these alone we can pretend to speak. What the separate publications of their authors may contain, or what errors there may be in Froude's Remains, we are of course unable to say ; but the *general principles* found in these portions we have examined, appear to us to be sound.”

Again, in an elaborate article in

Seeing, then, that this crime, involving, as is alleged, such fearful criminality, is thus publicly laid to our charge; and the effort is now being made to fasten it upon us,—like the mark

the N. Y. Review, for July 1839, on the Oxford Tracts, known to be written by a clergyman of Charleston, the same sentiments are more explicitly advanced. "It next becomes an important question to determine who has authority to administer them, i. e. the ordinances? From whom is this authority derived? And how can any one be assured, that he is not intruding himself, uncalled, and without the divine approbation, into the sacred office? If the Holy Ghost be communicated in these ordinances of religion, who has power over the gift? Such, then, being the sense of the Tracts, and we may add of the whole church, for though she does not in express terms condemn the various sects around her, yet SHE ALLOWS NONE TO BE MINISTERS WHO ARE NOT EPISCOPALLY ORDAINED, and tells us only that Christ has promised to be with the ministers of THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION to the end of the world, thus TACITLY DISOWNING ALL OTHERS,—they cannot acknowledge ANY ECCLESIASTICAL CONFRATERNITY with the dissenting parties, because these divisions are unable to make out their genealogy, or trace their origin. According to their own principles, indeed, they are many of them excluded from all claim to recognition, as having an authorized ministry," &c.

"But their posterity soon departed from these rules; for in many cases, the minister was appointed by the congregation alone; again, they went of their own accord; sometimes they received a pretended ordination from those who had no authority to confer it; and altogether their proceedings have been so confused and irregular, that none of them can with certainty claim even authority of presbyterian orders. For, though they have for the most part ceased from these wild and irregular proceedings, yet as the stream can never rise higher than the fountain, so they are just where their forefathers were. *They may have what are called pious exercises of the mind*, but so had the dairyman's daughter. They may be learned; so was Sir Matthew Hale; eloquent, but not more so than Pitt or Burke. They

may be laboring to do good, so did William Wilberforce. *But as these were not ministers of God, invested with power to baptize and dispense THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST TO THE PEOPLE, no more are those, of whom we have spoken.* There is not any more of bigotry or uncharitableness in DENYING THIS RIGHT TO THE ONE CLASS, THAN THERE IS IN DENYING IT TO THE OTHER. This is the sense of the Tracts on the Apostolic Succession; and in this they are supported by the wisest and best minds of the English Church." See *ibid.* for May, 1841.

Dr. How represents Dr. Miller as "separating from that divinely instituted ministry, (the prelacy,) which, from the apostolic age, has been considered an essential ingredient of the church of Christ, and thus plunging into the sin of schism." *Vind.* p. 130.

The Rev. James Wetmore, in his vindication of the professors of the Church of England in Connecticut, published in Boston, in 1747, at a time, too, when, in comparison with the other part of the population, they constituted but a handful, writes thus: (Hodge's Hist. pt. ii. pp. 466, 474.) "In reference to the charge of schism, which had been brought against the episcopal proselytes in Connecticut, he says, 'If the congregations, the forsaking of which is called schism, be themselves founded in schism, and unjustifiable separation from the communion of the Ch. of England; or in their present constitution, must necessarily be esteemed abettors and approvers of schism, disorders, usurpation, contempt of the chief authority Christ has left in his church, or any such like crimes, then such congregations, whatever they may call themselves, and whatever show they may make of piety and devotion in their own ways, ought to be esteemed in respect of the mystical body of Christ, only as excrescences or tumors in the body natural, or perhaps as fungosities in an ulcerated tumor, the eating away of which by whatever means, tends not to the hurt, but to the soundness and health of the body.'" "The claims and conduct of these

upon the murderous Cain — that wherever we are found we may bear the undeniable evidence of our heaven-daring offence ; it is surely important, reasonable and proper, that we should vindicate ourselves, and our protestant brethren, from such ungenerous and unchristian policy.

Let it then be observed, that the mere fact that presbyterians have been charged with the guilt of schism, is no proof that they have really deserved the imputation. For the same allegation was made by the Jews against our blessed Saviour ; (Mark vii. 1, &c.,) and also against his apostles, and the first christians generally, who were denominated the sect of the Nazarenes, (Acts xxiv. 5.) Nor was the apostle Paul ashamed to acknowledge, that, after the way which was called heresy — that is, sect or schism — so he worshipped the God of his fathers, (Acts xxiv. 14.) On the contrary, this same apostle, on another occasion, openly declares, that, after the most straitest sect — or heresy or schism — of his religion, he lived a pharisee. (Acts xxvi. 5.)

Neither is the fact, that as, compared with the Romish and other prelatic churches, we are in a minority, a reasonable or sufficient ground for imputing to us the guilt of schism. For if we will exclude from our consideration, as even the Anglican church must, — the Romish church, which, since the Council of Trent, has **AUTHORITATIVELY RENOUNCED THE CHARACTERISTIC DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL, AND BASED ITSELF UPON A NEW CREED, WHICH IS LITTLE MORE THAN AN ANATHEMA AND A CURSE, UPON ALL WHO MAINTAIN THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS ;** and also the Greek church, which is pledged to doctrines equally antichristian ; and if we will direct our attention, especially, to the churches of the reformation, then will we be found associated in all essential principles of ecclesiastical polity, **WITH AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF THE TRUEST AND PUREST CHURCHES OF CHRIST.** Besides, if the mere fact of being in a minority, is to exclude us from the pale of christianity, then will the Anglican church be itself rejected by the Romish ; true christians will be out-voted by the world ; and christianity itself will be convicted of schism by the overwhelming masses of paganism. The true church of Christ is not to be sought by numbers, but by the purity of its faith. “ For,” to use the words of Bishop Sherlock, “ if three parts in four, of all the churches in the world, were very corrupt and

missionaries, in many cases greatly increased this irritation. They spoke of all the inhabitants of the town in which they lived, as their parishioners ; as bound both by the law of God and the

state to be in communion with the Ch. of England ; as having no authorized ministers or valid ordinances ; as belonging to churches which were mere excrescences or fungusities.”

degenerate in faith and worship, and were in one communion, this would be the most catholic communion, as catholic signifies the most general and universal; but yet the fourth part, which is sincere, would be the best and truest church, and the catholic church, as that signifies the communion of all orthodox and pure churches."¹

So also Archbishop Bancroft, after stating "that that church," wherever it be, "which maintaineth, without error, the faith of Christ," &c., adds "from which church whosoever doth separate himself, he is to be reckoned a schismatic or a heretic."²

Neither will this conclusion, that we are schismatical, follow from the additional fact, that, as a christian denomination, we are ecclesiastically independent, and separate from other communions of the church catholic.

This will be made, we trust, indubitably certain, in the discussion of the true succession.³ In order, then, to establish against us the charge of schism, one of two things must be made clear. Either that we have introduced into the church, and insisted on retaining, corruptions in doctrine, worship, or government; or that we have made essential, as a term of communion with the church catholic, that which Christ and his apostles never did make fundamental, or an article of the faith.

It will not surely be pretended that we are bound to maintain and perpetuate corruptions, in doctrine or worship, for the sake of living in external, visible union, with any church, by which such corruptions are resolutely upheld. For, since the church is founded upon the truth, and receives its being from its divine institution; whenever that institution is set aside — and just so far as it is set aside — the character of the church is destroyed; and they who still sacredly regard its welfare, and the authority of its divine Founder, must combine their energies for the support of His institutes, and for the overthrow of such innovations. The guilt, therefore, of that separation from visible and external communion, which such corruptions make necessary, on the part of all who would not be partakers in them, lies, evidently, on those who introduce, and not on those who resist, such corruptions. This is a position in which we are impreguably fortified, by the authority of the greatest names in the English church. We will only, at present, call your attention to the opinion of Bishop Sherlock.⁴

"The plain state of the case," says Sherlock, "is this: All

1) Notes of the Church Examined, p. 56.

2) Serm. at Paul's Cross.

3) See Lect. XX. and XXI.

4) So also speak Laud and Dodwell; "The schism is theirs," says

Archbishop Laud, "whose the fault of it is; and he makes the separation that gave the first just cause of it; not he that makes an actual separation upon a just cause first given." Laud against Fisher, § 21, N. vi. p. 9. "A culpable

churches which profess the true faith and worship of Christ, though intermixed with great corruptions, belong to the one great body of Christ; and to know whether any church be a true church, we must not so much inquire which they communicate with, or separate from, but what their faith and worship is. That external unity is so far from being the mark of a true church, that we may be bound not to communicate with true churches which are corrupt, because we are not bound to communicate in a corrupt faith or worship: and that, in this case, the guilt of separation lies on that side where the corruptions are. And yet all the christian churches in the world, that retain the true faith and worship of Christ, though they are divided from each other upon the disputes of faith, or worship, or discipline, are yet the one church of Christ, as being united in the essentials of faith and worship, which, by the institution of Christ, makes them his one mystical body, and one church.”¹

Now it has never yet been shown — NOR CAN IT EVER BE — that the presbyterian churches, as they rest upon the basis of the Westminster confession, are chargeable with any such corruptions, either as to doctrine, or order. “In fact the Apostle’s — the Nicene and the Athanasian creeds are, — the first verbatim, and the other two substantially adopted by the established church of Scotland.”² And on this ground, therefore, they are justified from the odious charge of schism.

But a church may be equally liable to this grievous charge, when, retaining all fundamental truth, it yet enforces as necessary to be believed or practised, in order to salvation, or to communion with the church catholic; that which Christ or his apostles never did institute as thus essential. For, by thus binding the conscience to the belief or practice, of that which cannot be proved to be of divine original — in which case an implicit, and not a rational, faith is demanded — all, who do not recognize such *credenda* or such *agenda* as divine, but merely as human, and as of injurious tendency — are under obligation to reject them. And since their adoption is made necessary to communion with the body requiring them, such persons are further bound to withdraw from all visible association with it. Presbyterians, therefore, believing that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and the scriptures alone the infallible rule of faith and practice, have ever, and at all hazards, refused

breach of the church’s unity is,” says Dodwell, “what is properly meant by the true nature of schism.” Dodwell on Schism, p. 568.

1) See Notes of the Ch. Exam.

and Ref. See also The Ancient Things of the Catholic Church, pp. 6, 8, Tract No. 153 of Prot. Ep. Ch.

2) Cummings’ Apol. for the Ch. of Scotl. Lond. 1837, p. 7.

submission to any dogmas or practices, contrary to, or beside these sacred institutes. And until it can be established, as of divine right, that the church has power to make that, as a matter of conscience, necessary, which God has not so enjoined; presbyterians must persist in refusing their sanction to a principle so utterly subversive of the throne and kingdom of our only Lord and King — Christ Jesus.

Here also it is very plain, that the guilt chargeable upon such separate organization, as has been made necessary by the enforcement of articles of faith, rites, or ceremonies, which Christ never made necessary — must attach itself to those who have usurped the prerogatives of Heaven; and not to us who, in all our contentings, have fought under the banner of the cross, and for the crown and covenant of the only lawgiver in Zion.

Even this charge, however, of an intolerant exclusiveness, and the limitation of God's gracious favor to our own particular denomination, and to our own peculiar tenets, — even this charge has been confidently made against us, founded upon the declaration contained in our standards, that "out of the visible church, there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation." Now this assertion we believe to be true. But that any one particular denomination, whether the Romish, Anglican, or Greek, constitutes the visible church, out of which, such salvation cannot be ordinarily obtained, this we deny. Such christian bodies are, it may be, parts of that visible church; but they are not such to the exclusion of others. Herein our church, as we shall afterwards have occasion more fully to show, differs totally from the Romish and the Anglican prelacy. With them we agree, in believing that there is no ordinary possibility of salvation, beyond the visible church; but from them we differ in believing, that covenanted salvation, is not only possible but certain, TO ALL THE ELECT WHERESOEVER and IN WHATEVER CIRCUMSTANCES THEY ARE FOUND. While they restrict covenanted mercy, — which is the only possible mercy, — to the visible church; we extend it to the entire body of the invisible church. And while they identify the visible church with their respective denominations, and thus circumscribe the possibility of salvation within their boundaries, we define the visible church as "consisting of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children;"¹ — and as embracing all particular churches, be they more or less pure.² Thus do we enlarge the boundaries of the visible church, so as to include the whole world, and all the various denominations who profess the true

1) Conf. of F. ch. xxv. § 2.

2) Ibid, § 4.

religion. It is beyond this entire and comprehensive body, — AND NOT BEYOND THE PALE OF OUR OWN DENOMINATION, — we profess to say, there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

Now there is a very plain and yet a most important distinction to be here observed, and upon which hinges the decision of this question. There may be a separation *IN* the visible church, and a separation *FROM* it. In the one case the separating body still remains within the pale of the visible church; while, in the other, it is excluded from it. There may be a separation by one portion of the visible church, from some doctrines, practices, or polity, of other portions of it; while yet, in all other respects, and in the maintenance of a spirit of love and charity, there is union and communion with those same bodies. Or where the differences are regarded as essential, there may be a withholdment of any visible communion by those who yet acknowledge one another as parts of the external, or visible church. It is thus with the presbyterian denomination. It regards itself but as one component member of the great body of the visible or catholic church. It is separated from other members of this christian confederacy, by certain peculiar views of christian doctrine and polity.

But this separation is only *WITHIN*, and not *FROM* the visible church; for in this church it expressly includes all professing christians throughout the world. With “all saints that are united to Jesus Christ their head, by his spirit and by faith,” our church teaches its members that they are to “have communion in each other’s gifts and graces, in love.”¹

On our principles, then, there is no difficulty whatever in understanding how there may be a separation of the numerous bodies professing the true faith, *IN SOME THINGS*, while yet they are all *WITHIN*, and none of them *WITHOUT*, the pale of the visible church. Separation from the visible church — which excludes from any *ORDINARY*, but not necessarily from any *COVENANTED* salvation — is, on our principles, a separation from all denominations whatever, which profess the true faith; and not a separation from the presbyterian denomination in particular.

But, on the other hand, on prelatist principles, both Romish and Anglican, the prelacy being supposed to be the catholic visible church, and prelacy, therefore, being essential to the very existence of that church, separation from the prelacy is a separation not *WITHIN*, but *FROM* this visible church. It is exclusion from all possibility of covenanted mercy. And thus are we, and all other branches of the church, who are guilty of the inexpia-

1) Conf. of F. ch. xxvi. § 1.

ble offence of a difference of views as it regards the order of prelates, forever cut off from the only covenanted channel of the divine mercy. Thanks be to God, who has enabled us to read his blessed word differently, and thus to embrace, in the arms of charity, all who in every church and in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus, both theirs and ours.

Is it not, then, demonstrably plain, that while we are free from the charge of originating any new articles of faith, or of imposing, as necessary to salvation, any rites, or ceremonies, not enjoined in the word of God; we are not only justified from the imputation of a narrow and bigoted exclusiveness, but are eminently distinguished for our enlarged and comprehensive charity?

It is a libel upon our real principles, and not a true representation of the case, to allege that we have stood forth in rebellion against the church catholic, in the obstinate vanity of our own sectarian views. We, as presbyterians, have never claimed the right of enforcing our individual opinions — no, nor even our united counsels, as of divine right, upon the conscience of any man. We have, on the contrary, appealed from all human judgment to that which is divine; from the word of men to the word of God; from the councils of fathers, to those of inspired apostles; and from the authority of any earthly head of the church, whether he be a fallen and corrupt prince, or an equally fallible and corrupt pope, to the supremacy of **OUR ONE AND ONLY LORD AND MASTER**. We have thus given our public judgment, as expressed in all our confessions, synods and councils, against such usurpation as utterly subversive of the kingdom, and the authority of Christ. We have, therefore, reclaimed our ancient rights; — our original, and inalienable and heaven-granted privileges, upon the very ground of that written charter by which they were originally bestowed.

Neither did we, in dissevering our connexion with the English church, as we did in our fathers in England; or in again lifting the standard of presbyterianism, which had been long trodden in the dust, by the tyranny of a foreign ecclesiastical power, as did our fathers in Scotland; neither, I say, did we in either of these cases, separate from the catholic or universal church, or separate that church from us. All that is truly catholic we still receive and venerate. Her ancient creeds we still adopt and profess as our faith; and in her steps do we delight to walk as far as she followed Christ. In that holy, catholic, and apostolic church, as instituted by Christ, we trust with an entire faith; nor would we exclude from our communion one genuine son or daughter of this heavenly family. We would rather rejoice to extend to them, as brethren and sisters, all the privileges of our common household.

Neither is there any thing in the true principles of that primitive church, or in her heavenly record, or in her earliest creeds, for hundreds of years together, that will in any wise warrant the unnatural separation of prelatists from their non-prelatic brethren; or their foul denial of our common spiritual nature; or their unjustifiable attempts to wrest from us any portion in the inheritance of our heavenly Father.

If the English church was justifiable from the charge of schism, in separating from the Romish, in becoming independent, and in re-modelling her forms, order, doctrine, and discipline, because, in the judgment of *some* of her ministers and *some* of her people, the principles of the reformation were accordant to the word of God, and sanctioned by its authority, although anathematized at Rome;—then with what consistency can these sectaries, these dissenters from an established faith, these schismatics, as they also were and are reputed, turn round upon us and brand us with names, which are to them so odious; and that, too, for doing what **THEY HAVE DONE**, and upon the very principles by which they profess to have been guided?¹

1) “It could never be pretended for a moment, that a church which derives its succession of bishops through any other church is, therefore, subject to it.” Rev. H. Cary on “the Apostolical Succession in the Ch. of Eng.” p. 6. This argument is admirably put in an old work by Vincent Alsop, (The Mischief, of Impositions, 1680, 4to. Ded. p. 12, in Hanbury’s Hooker, vol. i. p. 92.) “If Rome be a ‘true’ church; if she holds all the essential points of Christianity; if salvation may be attained in that communion; why was there such a stir about reforming of *accidents*, when the *essentials* were secured? Why such a contest about a little easier way, when the other was passable? Why all this ado about a *purer* church, when the other is confessed a ‘true’ church? These things will follow, in a lump, from those concessions; 1. That a person, or party, may separate from *some* ‘true’ church, which holds *all* the *essential* points of the christian faith, without the imputation of being a schismatic. 2. That a person, or party, may separate from *some* church where salvation is attainable, without peril of the guilt of schism. 3. That the only reason, that yet appears, to justify the Church of England’s departure from Rome is, that it *is* lawful, in some cases, to withdraw from the communion of a

‘true’ church, wherein *all* the *essential* points of faith are owned, and wherein salvation may be attained; for the sake of *greater* purity of worship, *greater* clearness of doctrine, and *greater* security of salvation. Is it, then, lawful for England to separate from Italy for *greater* purity? it may be lawful for *others* to separate from *England* for *greater* purity? It is readily acknowledged, that the impurity of the Roman synagogue is much more, inconceivably more, than that of the Church of England; and, therefore, there was not so great cause to leave the latter as the former, upon that account; but, in aspiring after conformity to the institutions of Christ, we are not to consider so much what is behind, as what is before; not so much, what we have left, as what we have yet to reach; not so much the *terminus a quo*,—from what state of impurity we have emerged, as the *terminus ad quem*,—to what state of purity we would arrive. For, if it be true, that there is such a state of purity to be obtained, and such a state of impurity to be avoided, as will justify our forsaking of this for that, and such a measure of both these as will not; it must be exactly stated, what is the *lowest* degree of corruption that will, and, what is the *highest*, that will not, warrant a separation!”

"The reformation," says Mr. F. W. Faber, "was not schismatical. We did not separate from Rome, but Rome separated from us." And how does he reach this conclusion? "They," say he, "denied us church communion. We never denied it to them."

Now, in like manner say we,²—The organization of our churches was not schismatical. We did not separate from the Church of England, but she separated from us. And why? They denied us church communion. We deny it not to them. We remained catholic and apostolic, requiring only what Christ instituted and taught. They, dissatisfied with that common ground, and unwilling to abandon powers derived from tradition and not from scripture, have selfishly excluded from the christian community all who dwell beyond their holy precincts. But nevertheless, we never have separated from the universal church, nor from them as a portion of that church. We are still mem-

1) Tr. No. 151 of the Prot. Ep. Tr. Soc. p. 3.

2) "We hold," says Rutherford, (Peaceable Plea for Paul's Presbytery, pp. 122, 123,) "that Rome made the separation from the reformed churches, and not we from them, as the rotten wall maketh the schism in the house, when the house standeth still, and the rotten wall falleth.

"Because we left not christianity in Rome, but the leprosy of popery growing upon christianity, seeing we kept the apostolic faith, and did positively separate from the pookes, blybes, and ulcers of christian Rome.

"We did not separate from the western churches, either collectively, or representatively gathered in a general council.

"We departed not from a national, provincial, or parishional church, or pastors that we had before, nor from the material temples and churches, except that some not very considerable hirelings and idol-pastors would not go before us.

"And because the succession of fundamental truths from generations to generations is as necessary as the perpetual existence of the true catholic church, while the covenant with night and day, and the ordinances of Heaven shall continue, (Jer. xxxi. 37.) therefore there were a succession of professors and members of the catholic church, that did ever hold these fundamentals, which we

to this day hold against Rome; suppose histories cannot clear the particular persons by name.

"We have not separated from Rome's baptism and ordination of pastors according to the substance of the act, nor from the letter of the twelve articles of the creed and contents of the Old and New Testament, as they stand with relation to the mind and intent of the Holy Ghost, howbeit we have left the false interpretations of the lords of poor people's faith and consciences."

Is it retorted that the Romish church was always the Romish church? We ask, "who, what, where is the church of Rome? (Balt. Lit. & Rel. Mag. Ap. 1840, p. 147.) What is that, of whose unity we speak? Do you mean all the faithful? Or only all the ecclesiastics? Or only the priests? Or only the prelates? Or only the cardinals and the pope? Or only the pope? If any one will examine the great Latin work of the celebrated *Peter de Marca*, entitled the '*Concord of the Empire and the Priesthood*,' he will see reason enough to be satisfied, that the very body, which boasts of its unity, is itself not only incapable of establishing its personal identity, by any rules of judgment established and admitted by itself; but that in truth, taking its own principles as the guide of our judgment, we cannot avoid concluding it entirely out of existence!"

bers of the one, catholic, and apostolic church, and glory in its heaven-bought privileges.

But further. The Church of England is not, we are equally assured, and as we think on good grounds, chargeable with schism, in her separation from the church of Rome, because "of its original independence on the see of Rome."¹ Now if the power of the church of Rome was illegal and usurped, because contrary to the original and chartered freedom of the churches of Christ; just as certainly is the asserted authority of the Church of England, by which she requires conformity to her impositions, illegal, and an usurpation upon the just rights of conscience and of private judgment; and to resist and spurn from us such assumed authority, is therefore no more schism in presbyterians, than it is in prelatists. For even were it proved, as it never has been, and we believe never can be, that the most ancient form of British christianity was prelatic, and not rather, as we think, presbyterian, yet still, if the charter of the church is not prelatic, but on the contrary, gives commission to but one order of teaching ministers, then, as Tertullian teaches, "nobody can prescribe against the truth, neither space of times, nor the patronage of persons, nor the privilege of countries, since our Lord calls himself the Truth, not custom."²

And besides, if a disputed claim to original independence, is a warrantable reason, for throwing off allegiance to the despotism of Rome; then is it an equally sufficient plea, for our rejection of the equally unjustifiable claims of the prelatic hierarchy. For, tracing our descent, as the presbyterian church in this country does, through that of Scotland, which we are clearly entitled to do; then it is a fact that we never did belong to the Church of England. Over us she never did have any rightful jurisdiction. And while she struggled hard to forge upon us the shackles of her service-books, her doctrines, and her forms, yet never has she been able to subdue the indomitable spirit of Scottish freedom, which chose poverty and death, rather than abandon the liberty wherewith Christ had made her free. We are descended from that church which wrested, even from a despotic crown, the reluctant charter of her independent establishment; — from which all prelatists in Scotland, are dissenters and separatists; — and against us, therefore, it is most preposterous absurdity, IN THIS COUNTRY, AND BY AN UNESTABLISHED PRELACY, to raise the cry of schism and dissent.³

1) Jones' Essay on the Church Wks. vol. iv. p. 466.

2) Lib. de Velaud. Virg. cap. i.

3) See this charge plentifully laid to the account of prelatists in

Scotland, in A Hind Let Loose, &c. by Alexander Shiels. Glasgow, 1797, p. 835. See e. g. pref. p. 10, and pp. 269, 280, 309.

This author fully vindicates the

Tracing our spiritual lineage directly to the church of Scotland, through emigrants from that country, and her ecclesiastical colony, the North of Ireland, we may say to the English church, as did the Jews to Christ, "we were never in bondage to any man."¹ Many a century did our forefathers resist the aggressions of Rome, and cling to the simpler forms of her primitive presbyterianism. And when the spirit of reform re-animated her oppressed, and down-trodden children, she plainly saw that popery and prelacy were essentially united, and that to be delivered wholly from the trammelling corruptions of the one, she must tear from her every remnant of a spiritual hierarchy.

church of Scotland "for refusing to acknowledge a corrupt ministry," where "the question of hearing curates is cleared." See particularly on page 258, &c. "Finally, for union's sake, and to avoid schism in the body, we must withdraw from them." p. 309, &c.

See this charge also fully retorted on them, as it regards Scotland, in Henderson's *Review and Consideration*, Edinb. 1706, p. 55. "Besides," says Dr. Mitchell, (*Presb. Letters*, p. 259,) "the episcopacy of Scotland, unlike the religion of the primitive church, was established by the most unpardonable treachery and perfidy, which were followed up by downright force; and it was thus established on the ruins of a form of christianity, which had been, for a considerable time, in legal and quiet possession of the place it held in the country; and finally, it was supported by fine and imprisonment, confiscation of goods, hanging, burning, and such like arguments, not quite so christian as they are potent."

Dr. Mitchell, in his *Letters to Bp. Skinner*, further says, (p. 25,) "and Bishop Skinner is, 'by the grace of God,' primate of a church, which is a schismatic of schismatics; for it separated from us after we had separated from Rome."

1) Dr. Campbell, of Armagh, in his *Vindication of the presbyterians of Ireland*, in answer to the attack of the Bishop of Cloyne, (Lond. 1787, pp. 65-67,) after giving a historical review of that people, remarks: "From this account you will observe, my Lord, that the establishment of the presbyterians in Ireland was of a peculiar kind; that they were not dissenters from your church, more than

you were dissenters; that they made no rent or breach in your church, of which they were never members, except by a comprehension, which should ever be desirable to liberal minds. And I apprehend it will be very difficult for you to point out, on just principles of policy in this kingdom, what the reasons of state are, that should exalt the episcopal church so very high, and depress the presbyterian church so very low. For it may be observed. 1st. That they were not so originally. The presbyterians in Ulster, by an encouragement of government, were on a fair and equal footing, as we have seen, so far as the difference of their church discipline permitted.

"2. That, in establishing their church, they had peculiar privileges; that these privileges they never forfeited to the state, but that they were torn from them by those men, who overturned the constitution.

"3. That, from the nature of their first establishment, they have not only a right to a toleration, in common with other good subjects, but have a claim on the state for support and protection; and that this claim is strengthened by the manner, in which they lost the privileges and emoluments of their church.

"4. That they were invited here to strengthen the hands of government, and to support the constitution; and that, for this end, the whole body of presbyterians was firmly united; but that the established church was not thus united, many of its members being violent in their opposition to King William, and to the Hanover succession; of which a thousand proofs might be adduced, besides those already offered."

Her spirit we have received by inheritance. It has descended to us from our sires. It was breathed into us by mothers who were worthy of those noble women, who crowded around the representative of a despotic monarch, and wrung from him a hearing of the wrongs of their persecuted Zion.¹ With it our minds are imbued, and to its preservation we are ETERNALLY PLEDGED.²

Look we again to our brethren, the Puritans and nonconformists of England. With all their faults — their errors and their short-comings — we love, honor, and revere them. To claim descent from them we should not be ashamed; and to stand or fall with their justification, in allowing themselves to be driven out from the English church, rather than pollute their consciences, by a base conformity to the impositions of men, we are not reluctant. On either hand we are sustained by proof strong as holy writ. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so are the decisions of God's holy word round about us, to protect and defend us against these aspersions of men.

It is further urged, as an *argumentum ad invidiam*, against us, that we countenance and support the ancient schismatics, who were held in reprobation by the early church. This argument, which Dr. Stillingfleet brought forward in his work "On the Unreasonableness of Separation," has been stereotyped by all succeeding publishers of prelatical treatises.

But the argument is unsound. It is worse. It is subversive of the very cause it is brought to sustain. It is not true when applied to us. It is true when applied to its avouchers.

And, first, this argument is not true when applied to presbyterian and other orthodox denominations. This appears, first, from the fact that the church, that is, the doctrines and principles of the church, from which these ancient schismatics separ-

1) See McCrie's Life of Knox.

2) The author cannot but express his surprise, that the descendants of the Huguenots should be so generally found embosomed in the prelacy, when it was against them it first manifested its intolerant and haughty assumptions. Lord Clarendon informs us, that "Lord Scudamore, the last ordinary ambassador at Paris, not only declined going to Charenton, (the protestant church,) but furnished his own chapel with wax candles on the communion table, &c. And, besides, was careful to publish, upon all occasions by himself, and those who had the nearest relation to him, that the Church of England looked not upon the Huguenots of France, as a part of

their communion, which was likewise too much, and too industriously discoursed at home."

He rejoices, however, in knowing that some worthy descendants of this noble ancestry, are not willing, for the sake of any prelatic honors or distinction, or from any other motive, to brand their forefathers, who gave property and life in exchange for calvinism in doctrine and presbyterianism in polity, as schismatics, or aliens from all hopes of covenanted mercy; or to excommunicate from the church catholic, those who abide by their sentiments, and who glory also in their connexion with them, and many of them in their descent from them.

ated, was not the same with that church from which we are declared to be schismatics. Our rejection of the ecclesiastical control of the Anglican prelacy, is not, therefore, as theirs was, a separation from the communion of the church catholic. It is a withdrawal from external communion with a body, which usurps the exclusive title of the catholic church, in those particulars only in which, as we believe, it has separated from Christ. This will be evident, in the second place, if we consider the occasion, motives, and ends of these ancient schisms. It will thus be found, by a recurrence to their history,¹ that they arose from the disappointed ambition of men who desired to impose their peculiar views, on certain matters, upon all others, as terms of communion; and who, being opposed and thwarted in these designs, left the communion of all other churches;—erected churches of their own; and excommunicated all beside. So was it with the Novatians, the Donatists, with Tertullian, and many others.

Now, the fundamental principle upon which we base our repudiation of prelatial dictation and control, is just the reverse of this. For the chief reason we assign, is their unwarrantable assumption of the very power claimed by these ancient schismatics, of imposing upon the church terms and conditions of communion which are not sanctioned by God's holy word.

This will be still further evinced, when we attend more particularly, and in the third place, to the nature of these ancient schisms. Now, their authors so separated from all other churches as to deny to them the character of true churches; or any efficient and valid ministrations; or any possibility of salvation. We, on the contrary, do not deny the church state of other denominations: we do not reject, but recognize, their ministry and sacraments; and rejoice in extending the possibility of salvation to all throughout the world, who profess the true religion.²

It is, therefore, most contrary to fact and to honorable argument, to accuse us of a participation in the same criminality with these ancient schismatics, when we are found to differ from them in every thing essential, and to stand opposed to that fundamental principle which constituted *the gravamen* of their schism.

1) See particularized in Dr. Owen's Wks, vol. xx. pp. 296, 298-303, and vol. xix. p. 194, &c.

2) "And that which was the animating principle of the tumult of the Donatists," says Dr. Owen, (Wks. vol. xx. p. 244,) "was a supposition, that the continuation of the true church state depended on the succes-

sive ordination of bishops, which having, as they thought, (unduly enough,) failed in one or two instances, it became the destruction of a church state, not only in the churches where such mistakes had happened, as they surmised, but unto all the churches in the world, that would not hold communion with them."

While, therefore, we acknowledge the claims of the prelacy to be churches and ministers of Christ, — while we hesitate not to unite with them in communion and in worship, and only separate from them in those things which we must believe to be unsupported by God's word, or to be in themselves inexpedient, or injurious — with what face can the charge of schism, as alleged against these ancient schismatics, be made against us?

But in the fourth place, it is to be observed, that schism, according to the definition, universally approved by Romish and other prelati- cal writers, implies necessarily a voluntary or causeless separation from the catholic church. Now the separation of these ancient schismatics was voluntary, and in many cases, though not in all, without sufficient cause. It was also a separation from the catholic visible church, and not from any particular denomination. And, therefore, were they justly concluded, according to this definition, to be chargeable with the guilt of schism.

But as it regards ourselves, we utterly deny that the separation of our forefathers from the Romish or Anglican churches, was voluntary or causeless. On the contrary, it was made NECESSARY by the plain requisitions of God's word, which forbade their communion with unscriptural dogmas, and unchristian rites. And being thus withheld from all submission to such enactments, while yet these churches obstinately persisted in imposing them, on pain of anathemas and civil penalties, they were driven out by bell, book, and candle, and thus separated from the bosom of their ancestral homes.

We further deny that they separated from the communion of the catholic church. From this church, considered as *invisible*, no power on earth, or in hell, can ever separate one soul which has become truly united to it. From that church considered as *visible*, nothing else can separate but apostacy from the faith of Christ, or disobedience to some institution of Christ. But in neither of these senses did our fathers separate from the catholic church. On the contrary, it was for their maintenance of these very doctrines and institutions, in their purity and their entireness, they were driven out by the ghostly rule of the governors of the church. That from which they separated — that to which they steadfastly refused submission — was the superadded dogmas and self-imposed rites and ceremonies which Christ never instituted; and to enforce which he never gave authority to the rulers of the church. To these, therefore, our fathers neither were, nor could be, subject. Compliance with them and belief of them, would, on the contrary, have been traitorous infidelity to the head of the church.

Were we, EVEN NOW, in ecclesiastical subjection to the Romish church, or to a church modelled on these prelatie principles, then would OUR protestation against their errors and unscriptural practices be as imperative as it was in former days; and our separation from them as conscientiously required. And not only would we be bound to withdraw from these churches, but as Dr. Owen strongly but truly affirms, "from all of them in the whole world, one after another, should they all consent unto the same thing, and impose it in the same manner; if there be any truth in that maxim, 'It is better to obey God than man.'"¹

But, when we consider the case of this prelatie church, do we not find a very striking analogy between its principles and conduct, and those of these ancient schismatics, to whom they liken us.

Like them, the Anglican church has separated from the Romish church, and has utterly disavowed all connexion, intercourse, or communion, with the reformed churches. Like them, are they found condemning all other churches, disowning their ministry, rejecting their sacraments, and denying to them the possibility of covenanted mercy. And as those ancient schisms

1) Dr. Rice informs Bishop Ravenscroft, (Evang. and Lit. Mag. vol. ix. pp. 492, 493, 494,) that "he had no hesitation nor scruple to receive the communion from *episcopal hands*;"* until he plainly enough understood that *episcopal hands* would not receive of him; that is, that episcopalian separated themselves from all other denominations, denying their church-membership, their ordination, and the validity of all their administrations." "According to the old bad Latin proverb, *novus rex novus lex*.† And the reviewer, after much serious deliberation, determined no longer to receive the communion from episcopal hands, because, in his judgment, *episcopal practice in this case is schismatical*. It is an effectual rending of the body of Christ. It is a separation of christians from one another, on account of matters, which, so far from being essential to the being of the church, have never, in any age, conduced to its purity. The spirit of the episcopal church in this day, would have been regarded as *schismatical* by the fathers and reformers of the Church of England. For they *did*

acknowledge the foreign protestants, as branches of the church of Christ; and they *did not*, by the nineteenth article, mean to exclude them from the body of God's covenanted people."

"Chiefly, then, on account of the mere matter of *orders*, episcopalian cut off from the church of God, and all its covenanted mercies, and all its precious hopes, this great body of protestants. They separate themselves from this communion of saints, and cast them off from christian fellowship. If this is not *schismatical* conduct, we do not know what schism is. After coming to this conclusion, we could not any longer receive the communion from 'episcopal hands.'" "And now, as ministers of the Lord Jesus, we solemnly warn and exhort Bishop R., and all who think with him, to consider, whether the charge, which, often in bitter terms, they bring against non-episcopalian, and the denunciations, which they fear not to utter against them, may not return on their own souls in another day, when the great head of the church will make it appear before the universe, how little value he places on matters merely external, and how highly he values that love, which is the fulfilling of the law."

* Episcopal hands here are the hands of a bishop.

† It is about as good, however, as the bishop's "Fast est ab hoste docere."

in Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Rome, and other places,¹ arose chiefly from the pride, ambition and despotism of the prelates,² so have the entire divisions, distractions, and schisms of modern times, resulted from the unyielding tyranny of prelates, in the imposition of their orders, rites, and ceremonies, as necessary terms of communion. And do we not find these modern prelates re-affirming the very principles, which were anciently condemned as inhuman and contrary to brotherly love?³ Do they not, many of them, avow false doctrines and errors? Do they not, as they did, exalt themselves and their church to an exclusive preëminence? Do they not, as they also did, enjoin as necessary what Christ never so required? And if, like those ancient schismatics, modern prelates deny covenanted mercy, and the sacraments, and a ministry, to all who will not submit to their interpretation of the Bible, and thus identify themselves with them; how are they to escape from a like condemnation, or from involving themselves in their immorality?

The rebuke given by Archbishop Usher to the Romanists is no less applicable to these prelatists: "And yet," says he,⁴ "this proud dame and her daughters, the particular church of Rome, I mean, and that which they call the catholic Roman (or

1) Owen, p. 302.

2) See Baxter's *True and Only Way of Concord*, Lond. 1680, pt. ii. ch. v. p. 200, and pt. iii. ch. i. p. 5, &c. where instances are named. Bp. Davenant, in his epistle to Duræus, gives it as "the first and great obstacle, which had as yet prevented the union of the churches of the reformation, *est usurpatum unius in alterum dominium ac tyrannicæ cujusdam potestatis exercitum.*" Cantab. 1640, p. 6.

"But here lay the original of the differences," says Dr. Owen, (*Wks.* vol. xx. p. 294,) and "schisms which fell out in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries; that having all in some measure departed from the original institution, rule and order of evangelical churches, in sundry things, and cast themselves into new forms and orders, their differences and quarrels related unto them, and could have had no such occasion, had they kept themselves unto their primitive constitution."

3) Owen, p. 299, vol. xx. and p. 303. "This claim of theirs to be the only true catholic church, so as to deny the validity of our ordinances, is, says Dr. Owen, (*Wks.* vol. xix.

p. 196,) "1. Cruel and sanguinary; condemning millions to hell, that invoke and call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, believing all things that are written in the Old and New Testaments, for no other cause in the world, but because they are not convinced that it is their duty to give up reason, faith, soul, and all to them, and at their disposal.

"2. It is false, that the union of the catholic church in the notion now under consideration, consists in subjection to any officer or officers; or that it hath any peculiar form, constituting one church in relation to them, or in joint participation of the same individual ordinances whatever, by all the members of it; or that any such oneness is at all possible; or any unity whatever, but that of the faith which by it is believed, and of the truth professed. 3. It is most ridiculous, that they are this catholic church, or that their communion is comprehensive of it in its latitude. He must be blind, uncharitable, a judge of what he cannot see or know, who can once entertain a thought of any such thing."

4) *Serm. bef. his Majesty*, Lond. 1657, 4th edit. pp. 8, 9.

the faction rather that prevailed in them both) have in these latter ages confined the whole church of Christ within themselves, and excluded all others that were under the Roman obedience, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise. The Donatists were cried out against by our forefathers, for shutting up the church within the parts of the south; and rejecting all others that held not correspondence with that patch of theirs: and could they think well then of them that should conclude the church within the western parts of the world, and exclude all other christians from the body of Christ, that held by the same root there that they did? It is a strange thing to me, that wise men should make such large discourses of the catholic church, and bring so many testimonies to prove the universality of it; and not discern, that while by this means they think they have gotten a great victory, they have in very truth overthrown themselves: for when it cometh to the point, instead of the catholic church which consisteth of the communion of all nations, they obtrude their own piece unto us; circumscribing the church of Christ within the precincts of the Romish jurisdiction, and leaving all the world beside to the power of Satan; for with them it is a resolved case, that to every creature it is altogether of necessity to salvation, to be subject to the Roman bishop."

"What must then become of the poor Muscovites and Grecians (to say nothing of the reformed churches) in Europe? What of the Egyptian and Ethiopian churches in Africa? What of the great companies of christians scattered over all Asia, even from Constantinople unto the East Indies, which have and still do endure more afflictions and pressures for the name of Christ, than they have ever done, that would be accounted the only friends of Christ? Must these, because they are not the pope's subjects, be therefore denied to be Christ's subjects?"

So speaks this truly great and eminent man, and in thus vindicating the Church of England, and rebuking Rome, he equally vindicates the presbyterian church and condemns the conduct of the prelacy.

Our reply, therefore, to the question, are we schismatics?— is, that we are not; and sufficient grounds for this opinion have, we trust, been given. To the second question— are the upholders of this doctrine of prelatical succession schismatical?— our reply is, that they are; and our reasons for this conclusion, will be advanced in our next lecture.

LECTURE XIX.

THE PRELATIC DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION SCHISMATICAL.

HAVING laid down the true doctrine of schism, as described in the word of God, and having vindicated the presbyterian church from its imputation, we now proceed to show that this doctrine of prelatie apostolical succession is schismatical in its character and tendency. Let it, however, be first observed, that a body may be justly chargeable with the guilt of schism, while yet it retains the name, the form, the ordinances, and all the external marks and tokens of a visible church of Christ. This is most evident from the fact that the Jewish church, while yet retaining its antiquity, its unity, its succession, its priesthood, with the oracles and ordinances of God, is nevertheless proved by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, to have been broken off from the true church, and thus excommunicated by God, because of unbelief. While the Jewish was actually boasting that it was the only true and catholic church of God, it had become apostate and therefore excommunicate. And, in like manner, is it possible that this charge may, in a measure, lie against the prelacy, even while it proclaims to the world, in a spirit of equal intolerance and lofty pretension, the same exclusive claims to be the true, and only, church of God.

But further, it is not less clear, from holy scripture, that this guilt of schism may attach itself not merely to the apostolic and visible church of Corinth, but also to the church of Rome, upon whose succession the entire claims of the Anglican prelacy must necessarily rest. In the Epistle of Paul, addressed to that church in its first and purest form, he solemnly warns it, by the example of the Jewish church, to beware, lest, by a similar apostasy from the faith, and a like arrogant assumption of supre-

macy, it also should be cut off. (Rom. ii. 22.) "Behold," says the apostle, "the goodness and severity of God; on them who fell severity, but towards thee goodness, if thou continue in his goodness, — OTHERWISE THOU ALSO SHALT BE CUT OFF." Similar also, are the forewarnings delivered by divine authority to the seven apostolic churches of Asia, as emblematic of all others in every age and country. (Rev. chapters 2nd and 3rd.)

It is, therefore, most clear and indubitable, that the mere fact of its existence in a visible and organized church state, having all the external marks of a church, does not by any means prevent the application to the prelacy of this charge of schism.

We proceed to state, that this crime of schism, although necessarily sinful, in all its forms, is not in every degree of heinousness, exclusive of God's promises, or sufficient to cut off the guilty church from the communion and privileges of Christ's body. This certainly was not the case with the Corinthian church, although it is most assuredly condemned for its schismatical procedure. Nor was it otherwise when at a later period, Clemens Romanus addressed his epistle to this same church, and rebuked them for the continuance among them, of this same unhappy and destructive spirit.

In alleging, then, against the prelatial communion the certain charge of schism, we are far from designing thereby, to implicate it in such a degree of criminality as to imply open apostacy, or the loss of the true character and privileges of a church of Christ. We do not deny the being — *the esse* — the form — even of the Roman catholic, as a church of Christ; although we certainly deny it to be — *bene esse* — or in a state of well-being. We do not question the church standing, character, and privileges of the Anglican communion; and much less is it our desire to throw any doubt over the character, as a true church of Jesus Christ of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States of America. We do not sit in judgment upon the character or claims, the merits or demerits, of these churches of Christ. We do not determine the nature and amount of that criminality under which they severally lie, in pretending to a spiritual supremacy over other denominations. But since we are condemned as sectarians and schismatics; since we are held forth as justly excluded from the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church; we plead not guilty to the libel. We repel the injustice of the offensive imputation. We repudiate the pharisaic intolerance and illiberality of those, who in this age, and in this country, create, foster, and re-animate feuds, animosities, alienations, and strifes, among those who should be found dwelling together as brethren in the Lord, and as heirs together to the same divine inheritance.

We are, therefore, compelled to show, that whatever schism may be justly chargeable upon our isolation, and inharmonious estrangement from one another, is to be laid to the account of prelacy and not of presbytery;—of the Roman and Anglican communions, and not of the presbyterian church. But as to the degree of that criminality, in which these churches are involved, we leave all judgment with Him to whom, as the Head of the church, it has been wisely and graciously committed.

Do prelatists demand the subjection of all other churches, to their ecclesiastical sway?—they thereby violate the unity of that catholic liberty, with which Christ has made his churches free. Do they declare that to be necessary, which was not made necessary by the teaching of the apostles, or by the most ancient creeds?—then do they violate the unity of catholic faith. Do they refuse to receive, and associate with us, as christian ministers, and as christian men, except upon terms not prescribed or authorized by God's word?—then do they violate the spirit of catholic communion. So that theirs is not the catholic, but only the Anglican or the Roman communion.

In further establishing this charge against the prelatist doctrine of apostolical succession, we will first show that it follows from their own definitions of schism.

“Schism, then,” says Stillingfleet,¹ “as it imports a separation from communion with a church society, is not a thing intrinsically and formally evil in itself, but it is capable of the differences of good and evil, according to the grounds, reasons, ends and circumstances, inducing to such a separation. The withdrawalment from society is but the materiality of schism; the formality of it must be fetched from the grounds on which that is built.”

This same writer, after quoting the opinion of the Reverend Mr. Hales, says:²

“And so that learned and rational author there fully proves, that those who require unlawful and unnecessary conditions of communion, must take the imputation of schism upon themselves, by making separation from them just and necessary.”

“Where any church retaining purity of doctrine, doth require the owning of, and conforming to, any unlawful or suspected practice, men may lawfully deny conformity to, and communion with, that church in such things, without incurring the guilt of schism.”

“That the pope's usurpation mainly lies in imposing things upon men's consciences as necessary, which are doubtful or un-

1) Iren. p. 108.

2) Irenicum, pp. 108, 116, 117, 118, 119, 124.

lawful, and, wherever the same thing is done, there is an usurpation of the same nature, though not in so high a degree; and it may be as lawful to withdraw communion from one as well as the other."

"So that let men turn and wander which way they will, by the same arguments that any will prove separation from the church of Rome lawful, because she required unlawful things, as conditions of her communion, it will be proved lawful, not to conform to any suspected or unlawful practices required by any church governors upon the same terms; if the thing so required be, after a serious and sober inquiry, judged unwarrantable by a man's own conscience."

"Unless others proceed to eject and cast them wholly out of communion on that account, in which case their separation is necessary, and their schism unavoidable."

So, also, Bishop Hoadly, in his reasons for conformity to the Church of England,¹ says: "If your separation from the Church of England be not necessary, you acknowledge it to be schismatical. If it be, we acknowledge it not to be schismatical."

So, also, speaks the Rev. Mr. Hales, "as learned and judicious a divine as our nation hath bred," as Stillingfleet thought,² in his tract on schism, which, according to the same eminent divine, exhibits such "wisdom, judgment and moderation."³

"Schism, I say, upon the very sound of the word, imports division: division is not, but where communion is or ought to be."

"Yet the great benefit of communion, notwithstanding, in regard of divers distempers men are subject to, dissension and disunion are often necessary; for when either false or uncertain conclusions are obtruded for truth, and acts either unlawful or ministering just scruple are required of us to be performed; in those cases, consent were conspiracy, and open contestation is not faction or schism, but due christian animosity."

"First: there is a schism in which only one party is the schismatic: for where cause of schism is necessary, there, not he that separates, but he that occasions the separation, is the schismatic."

"Second: there is a schism in which both parts are the schismatics; for where the occasion of separation is unnecessary, neither side can be excused from the guilt of schism."

1) See Wks fol vol. i. p. 297.

2) Iren. p. 120.

3) Ibid, p. 121. The cognomen of 'ever-inemorable' is given to Hales by immemorial and universal usage, and his pieces are known by the title

of "Golden Remains." The very highest character is given of him by Clarendon, (see Life, vol. i. pp. 27, 28,) and by Bishop Gibson. See pref. to his Golden Remains.

“ You shall find that all schisms have crept into the church by one of these three ways ; either upon matter of fact, or matter of opinion, or point of ambition. For the first, I call that matter of fact when something is required to be done by us which we either know, or strongly suspect, to be unlawful. So the first notable schism of which we read in the church contained in it matter of fact ; for it being upon error taken for necessary that an Easter must be kept, and upon worse than error, if I may so speak, (for it was no less than a point of Judaism forced upon the church,) upon worse than error, I say, thought further necessary, that the ground for the time of our keeping that feast must be the rule left by Moses to the Jews, there arose a stout question, — whether we were to celebrate with the Jews, on the fourteenth moon, or the Sunday following ? ”

Again : “ Come we now to consider a little of the second sort of schism, arising upon occasion of variety of opinion. It hath been the common disease of christians, from the beginning, not to content themselves with that measure of faith which God and the scriptures have expressly afforded us ; but out of a vain desire to know more than is revealed, they have attempted to discuss things of which we can have no light, neither from reason, nor revelation : neither have they rested here, but upon pretence of church-authority, which is none, or tradition, which for the most part is but figment, they have peremptorily concluded, and confidently imposed upon others, a necessity of entertaining conclusions of that nature ; and to strengthen themselves have broken out into divisions and factions, opposing man to man, synod to synod, till the peace of the church vanished, without all possibility of recall. Hence arose those ancient and many separations amongst christians, occasioned by Arianism, Eutychianism, Nestorianism, Photinianism, Sabellianism, and many more, both ancient and in our time ; all which, indeed, are but names of schism, howsoever, in the common language of the fathers, they were called heresies.”

“ The third thing I noted for matter of schism was ambition ; I mean episcopal ambition showing itself, especially in two heads : one concerning plurality of bishops in the same see ; another, the superiority of bishops in divers sees. Aristotle tells us, that necessity causeth but small faults, but avarice and ambition were the mothers of great crimes. Episcopal ambition hath made this true ; for no occasion hath produced more frequent, more continuing, more sanguinary schisms than this hath done. The sees of Alexander, of Constantinople, of Antioch, and above all, of Rome, do abundantly show thus much ; and our ecclesiastical stories witness no less, of which the greatest part con-

sists in the factionating and tumultuating of great and potent bishops. Socrates, apologizing for himself, that professing to write an ecclesiastical story, he did oftentimes interlace the actions of secular princes, and other civil businesses, tells us that he did thus to refresh his readers, who otherwise were in danger to be cloyed by reading so much of the acts of unquiet and unruly bishops."

"But that other head of episcopal ambition, concerning supremacy of bishops in divers sees, one claiming superiority over another, as it hath been, from time to time, a great trespasser against the church's peace, so it is now the final ruin of it; the east and the west, through the fury of the two prime bishops, being irremediably separated without all hope of reconciliation." Such are the sentiments of Mr. Hales.

Again: "Schism," says Mr. Jones,¹ "is the sin of making a division in the church, and separating ourselves from it." Of course, the sin lies at the door of them by whom that division is made necessary; for as it is absurd to say the majority must necessarily be right, when the standard of right is not the wisdom of man, but the sure teaching of God, the separated party may not be the separating body; and the whole guilt may attach itself to the many and not to the few.

Once more: "Who," asks Bishop Hobart, in his "Church Catechism,"² "are schismatics?"

"They are schismatics who, in any thing essential, depart from the ministry, sacraments, and worship established in the church, or who create division in the church."

Now, it is an indisputable fact, that the portion of the English church, which came to be distinguished by the name of Puritans, was originally composed of the members and ministers of that church; — that their object and design was, not its injury, but its more complete and perfect reformation, according to the desires of its earliest and best fathers; — that they strongly repudiated this charge of schism; and that they had no anticipation of any actual separation, until they were required either to belie their own consciences, or to leave the bosom of their beloved church.³

1) The Churchman's Catech. Wks. vol. ii. p. 427.

2) P. 44.

3) See Hanbury's Hooker, vol. i. p. 395; Pierce's Vind. of Dissent. Calamy's Defence of Nonconf. vol. iii. p. 198, Lond. 1705, 205; Troughton's Apology for Nonconf. p. 107; Baxter's Five Disputations on Ch. Gov. Arg. 3, Disp. i. p. 37, &c.

See the Address of the Essex Ministers in Price's Hist. of Prot. Nonconf. vol. i. p. 330. See also *ibid*, pp. 322, 206. In the first directory, drawn up by Cartwright, the Puritans protest against "the calumny of schism." Price's Nonconf. vol. i. p. 367. The charge deprecated by Cartwright and his fellow prisoners in 1592. Price's Nonconf. vol. i. p. 395; and by Bar-

Their withdrawal from the communion of the Church of England, was forced upon the Puritans, by the prelatiſt, or rather the royal party, who acted under the influence of the crown, in oppoſition to the more enlightened policy of ſome of the wiſeſt members of the hierarchy. This party required the belief of what were regarded great and ſerious errors. That whole ſyſtem of doctrine and practice, which was developed by Archbiſhop Laud, and which is *now maintained by the Oxford divines and other high-churchmen*, we cannot but conſider, as did our nonconforming fathers, as eſſentially popiſh. This ſyſtem, we muſt, with them, believe to be unſcriptural, and conſequentlly, unwarrantable and dangerous. To enforce, therefore, the belief of ſuch tenets, was to make reſiſtance A DUTY, and compliance A SIN. And the Church of England, in ſternly reſiſting upon entire conformity to her views, was eminently ſchiſ-

row, Greenwood and Perry, in 1593. See *ibid*, pp. 419, 423. So alſo in the Millenary petition, preſented by the Puritans to James I. See *ibid*, p. 451. So again under the deſpotic reign of Bancroft, *ib.* p. 504, 508. See Johnson's ſtrong diſavowal of the appropriateness of this charge in his letter to Bp. Sandys. Price's *Hist. of Prot. Nonconf.* vol. i. p. 273. Sampſon and the early Puritans charged the prelacy with ſchiſm in enforcing as neceſſary what could not be ſhown to be articles of faith, and yet allowing no liberty of nonconformity, or ſeparate worſhip. See Soames' *Eliz. Rel. Hist.* p. 53; Price's *Hist. Nonconf.* vol. i. p. 181. See the nonconformiſts defended againſt the charge of ſchiſm, in Owen's *Wks.* vol. xix. pp. 569-616. See alſo Dr. Owen's full Answer to Stillingfleet on the unreaſonableneſs of ſeparation. *Wks.* vol. xx. p. 279. See this ſubject alſo fully treated in *Plain Dealing Defended*, &c. Lond. 1716, and *Lay Nonconf. Juſtified*, &c. by Mr. Grove, Lond. 1717, 6th edit. "A conference between E. and D. or a member of the Church of England and a Diſſenter &c." Lond. 1718. See Matthew Henry's Sermon, "The Chriſtian Religion not a Sect, and yet that it is every where ſpoken againſt." *Wks.* Lond. 1830, p. 314. Baxter wrote a treatiſe, entitled *A Search for the Engliſh Schiſmatic*, (4to. 1631,) of which he gives himſelf the following account, (*Life*, pt. iii. pp. 188, 189, in *Life* by Orme, p. 636.) "Because the accusa-

tion of ſchiſm is it that maketh all the noiſe againſt the nonconformiſts in the mouths of their perſecutors, I wrote a few ſheets called *A Search for the Engliſh Schiſmatic*, comparing the principles and practices of both parties, and leaving it to the reader to judge who is the ſchiſmatic; ſhowing that the prelatiſts have, in their canons, *ipſo facto* excommunicated all the nobility, gentry, clergy, and people, who do but affirm, that there is any thing ſinful in their liturgy, ceremonies, or church-government, even the loweſt officer. Their laws caſt us out of the miniſtry into gaols, and then they call us ſchiſmaticſ, for not coming to their churches; yea, though we come to them conſtantly, as I have done, if we will not give over preaching ourſelves, when the pariſhes I lived in had, one fifty thouſand, the other twenty thouſand ſouls in it, more than could come within the church doors. This book, alſo, and my *Prognostication*, and what I valued moſt, my *True and Only Way of Universal Concord*, were railed at, but never answered, that I know of." See this ſubject, as it regards the reformed churches, fully diſcuſſed by Voetius, in his *Desperata Causa Papatus*. Amſt. 1635, *Libri Tertii*. § 111, p. 693, &c. "*Scisina est, cum in fide consentientes alii aliis hominibus vel exclusis ritibus ita sunt addicti, ut animis et studiis propterea dissideant et factiones ineant.*" p. 698.

matical, and the just cause of that division, and of all the evils which ensued.¹

And inasmuch as these same unscriptural doctrines and prac-

1) The sentiments of Mr. Isaac Taylor have been already given in Lect. xiii. 307. "I think it (dissent) is an evil, which we have in a great measure brought upon ourselves by past pertinacity and remissness," says the Rev. G. Hodson, M. A. Archdeacon of Stafford.

Lord Bacon prophesied to his sovereign, James VI. that the first violent attempts that should be made to establish uniformity would prove fatal to unity, and rend the church in pieces, a prediction signally fulfilled in the reign of that prince's grandson. That all the sects in England are traceable to the prelacy, so that she was "the mother of them all," may be seen affirmed in the *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*, by the Rev. Robert Baylie, Lond. 4to. 1645, p. 7, where he says, "all of them were bred and born under the wings of no other dame than episcopacy." See also pp. 10, 12

"Not chargeable on the dissenters, but undoubtedly on the church." See proved in *Towgood's Dissent Justified*, Lond. 1811, ed. 12th, pp. 23-27, 79-83, 124, 160-165.

"But who, at present," asks the authors of *The Plea for Presbytery*, (Glasgow, 1840, pp. 128, 129,) "are the seclaries? Does the designation apply to all who refuse to yield an implicit obedience to the decisions of an act of Parliament? Can a lay legislature pronounce an infallible judgment upon a question of schism? If so, what is orthodox in Edinburgh must be heretical in London. You speak of the 'endless ramifications of dissent,' as 'the scandal of protestantism,' but you would have expressed yourself more correctly had you said that they are the reproach of the Church of England. She has created separation to a greater extent, and in more varied forms, than any other protestant church in christendom. Had it not been for the immense advantages which an establishment confers, she might long since have been swallowed up by the very evil she has generated. By her despotic constitution and her unwarrantable ceremonies, she has driven from her

pale thousands and tens of thousands, of the most pious and enlightened of British protestants. When the act of uniformity was passed, it was not without weighty reasons, that, in a single day, two thousand of the most learned and godly ministers that ever adorned a christian church, resigned their livings, and retired from her communion. She has never exhibited any symptom of contrition for that foul violation of the rights of conscience; and, until she assume the attitude of repentance and reform, the reasons for dissent must remain obvious and unanswerable. Let the people be permitted to elect their pastors, let the ancient government of the church by presbyteries and synods be restored; and let faithful men, met in her ecclesiastical assemblies, be allowed to cut off with an unsparing hand, whatever is amiss in her constitution and her ceremonies, and then she will have made an effectual movement for the suppression of dissent. You may, perhaps, tell me that presbyterianism in Scotland is split up into many sections, but I can reply, that secession there is neither so rampant nor so varied as in England. Had the Scottish church adhered closely to her own formularies, dissent would have been almost unknown in North Britain. In as far as principle is concerned, the great mass of the Scottish people are perfectly agreed in doctrine, government, and worship. And now that the Scottish establishment is exhibiting the spirit of the olden time, and faithfully recurring to her ancient standards, I rejoice to see that those who seceded from her in her period of defection, are again lifting up their hands to bless her, and returning to the bosom of their venerable parent."

Among the illustrations of schism given by Matthew Henry, in his *Brief Inq. into the nature of Schism* (Lond. 1717, p. 17.) is "concluding hardly as to the spiritual state and condition of those that differ from us, excluding them out of the church, and from salvation, because they are not just of our mind in every punctilio." Witness that notion, which

tices, are now pertinaciously advanced, and are also held forth as the just and necessary inferences from this elemental truth—the apostolical succession; we are hence led to the conclusion that this doctrine is schismatical, and its upholders justly chargeable with the guilt of schism.

Besides, this doctrine, and these, its associated errors, are, by their abettors, enrolled among the articles of faith. They are declared to be “of the substance of the faith,” and therefore, essential as terms of communion with the church of Christ. On the contrary, in unison with a large portion of the Church of England, and its most judicious divines, we believe that such doctrines never can be proved from scripture, and that they may not be held as terms of christian communion, and therefore that to enforce them as such, is schism.¹

Still further, the advocates of this system anathematize and exclude from all covenanted mercy, those who cannot conscientiously receive their unscriptural and unsubstantiated dogmas as true, and much less as fundamentally necessary. Now, that this conduct is most plain and palpable schism, we will prove out of their own writers. “None of us,” says Bishop Bull, in his *Vindication of the Church of England*,² “do affirm that our church is the only true church; for that would be a schismatical assertion, like that of the Donatists of old, and the papists now-a-days, and the highest breach of charity, in damning all the christian world besides ourselves.”

Such, also, is the opinion of Dr. Field, in his work on the

excludes out of the church, and consequently out of heaven, all those, (how orthodox and serious soever they are otherwise,) who are not in prelatical communion; if no diocesan bishops, then no ministers, no sacraments, no church, no salvation, which is certainly the most schismatical notion that ever was broached in the christian world.”

1) See Lects. ii. iii. and iv. and p. 56. Also *Unity and Schism*, pp. 25, 28, 29, by the author of *Hours of Thought*, Lond. 1838; *Spiritual Despot*. p. 426; Bp. Bull's *Vind. of Ch. of Engl.* pp. 105, 113, 114, 115, 149, 117, 167. See this fully shown in Burnet on 39 Art. Page's ed. p. 100; Note from Stillingfleet, and also pp. 486, 488, and in Chillingworth's *Wks.* vol. i. pp. 66, 103, 109, (3 vol. Eng. edit.)

“The spirit of schism, (Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 423,) in addition to its other

inherent characters of sin, implies the desire of establishing minor points as catholic or essential points, or the spirit of exclusiveness.” Laud, however, claims equal power to legislate for the church with the apostles. See on *Liturgy and Episcop.* pp. 42, 46. Thus, also, the second council of Nice determined that the synod which decreed the propriety of image worship, to be schismatical, and not they who resisted that decree, and on these grounds, as expressed by Hales, (see in *Iren.* p. 120.) “First, because it is acknowledged by all, that it is unnecessary. Secondly, it is by most suspected. Thirdly, it is by many held utterly unlawful. Can, then, saith he, the enjoying of such a thing be aught else but abuse? or can the refusal of communion here be thought any other thing than duty?”

2) P. 66, Oxf. edit.

church.¹ "Ye are to be charged with donatism, who deny all christian societies in the world to be where the pope's feet are not kissed, to pertain to the true church of God, and so cast into hell all the churches of Ethiopia, Armenia, Syria, Græcia, Russia."²

Hear, also, Bishop Sherlock in his Examination of the Notes of the Church.³ "For every church which professes the true catholic faith, and imposes only catholic terms of communion, and is ready, out of the principles of brotherly love and charity (that cement of catholic communion) to communicate with all churches, and to receive all churches to her communion upon these terms, is a truly catholic church."

Sir Peter King thus gives his judgment: "Whosoever imposed," says he, — after showing that conformity in rites and customs, or in points considered non-essential, was not required by the primitive churches, — "on particular churches the observance of the former of these two things, or on particular persons the belief of the latter, they were esteemed not as preservers and maintainers, but as violaters and breakers of the churches' unity and concord."⁴

From all that has been adduced, it is therefore evident, that by the definitions of schism, given by prelatists themselves, this doctrine and its abettors must be adjudged to be schismatical.

But there is another view of schism from which this conclusion will as certainly follow. Schism has been recently defined by an American divine, to be "opposition to previously existing churches;"⁵ and on this basis schism is charged upon the American Roman catholic church.

Now if the term schism is to be understood as meaning separ-

1) B. iii. ch. xxviii. in Rutherford's Due Right, p. 82.

2) See exactly similar sentiments, in Bishop Morton's Grand Imposture, ch. xiv. p. 2; Challenge, p. 342, in *ibid.* See also the language of Mr. Hales, as quoted above.

See also Bishop Patrick, in his Christian Sacrifice, pp. 61, 70. Bp. Sherlock, in Notes of the Church Exam. pp. 13, 19, 29, 32. See also Harris's Union, pp. 99 - 102, Am. ed. 127, 226, and Chrysostom and Cyprian in *ibid.* pp. 64, 65. Also, Robert Hall's Wks. 8vo. ed. Engl. vol. ii. pp. 82, 85, 86, 88.

This charge is distinctly made against this system in an able review of the Tracts for the Times, in the Meth. Quart. Rev (Jan. 1841, p. 76.) "The doctrine of a divinely consti-

tuted church, and apostolic succession of clergy, on the contrary, is not only absurd, as we have already shown it to be, but it counteracts christian charity, engenders pride and bigotry. It has thrown the English church out of communion with protestant churches, and has arrayed her on the side of the Romish church, under circumstances highly prejudicial to the principles of true christianity."

3) Notes of the Ch. Ex. p. 13, and see pp. 30, 32, 33.

4) See on the Primit. Church.

5) Rev. John Coleman in Faber's Diff. of Rom. pp. 277, 278, as edited by him. See also Perceval on Ap. Succ pp. 66, 133, 142. Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 68, 70, 576.

ation from some church already established, or which is the most ancient in any given place, irrespective of the causes of such separation, then, instead of being any brand of heresy or error, it will be found to apply equally to the most opposite communions. Thus, while presbytery will, *on this ground*, be schism in England, prelacy will be schism in Scotland, and both schism in France. Thus also in the New-England States *certainly*, and in other portions of this country probably, prelacy is schismatical, and presbytery alone catholic,¹ since presbytery was in these places first established.² Indeed, on a strict application of this

1) See Vind. of Presb. Ord. by Rev. Noah Welles, p. 21.

2) It has been stated, that for seventy years there was not a single episcopal church in New England. And yet, although the established religion in New England had always been puritan and not prelati- cal, yet were the most strenuous efforts made by the Church of England through its society, to introduce prelacy into that country.

"It is well known," as Archdeacon Blackburne informs us, (Cut. Com. p. 42,) "that the society's missionaries in New England have always been more, in a double proportion at least, than in the other provinces in America. In the year 1761, about thirty missionaries were stationed in New England, while in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, the Bahama Islands, and Barbadoes, there were no more than forty-nine, according to the society's abstracts." Mayhew's Observations, p. 45, Lond. ed.

That the Society for the Propagation of Religion, which was instituted for the purpose of sending and supporting the gospel where it was not already established or enjoyed, turned aside from its first and great duty, — that its friends first maligned and misrepresented the New-England colonists, — then expended great efforts and money in proselyting to episcopacy those who were already connected with presbyterian or independent churches; and that it comparatively neglected the more destitute portions of the country, may be seen fully established by Dr. Chas. Chauncy in his Letter to the Bishop of Landaff, (Boston, 1767, see pp. 17–20, 31, 33, 35–37, 51.) He declares that then, when all this effort was being made,

"throughout an extent of territory more than five hundred miles in length, comprehending seven provinces, the four New-England ones, &c. containing more than a million of souls, there are not, by the best information I can get, more than eight or nine episcopal churches, that support themselves. All the rest, to the amount of about sixty, more or less, chiefly made up of converts from other denominations." Indeed, this proselytism, and the introduction of the episcopate is avowed by the Bishop of Landaff, to be the business of this society." See p. 51.

See also Dr. Livingston's Letter to the Bishop of Landaff, N. York, 1768, pp. 14, 15.

"The immense sums expended by the venerable society, are not laid out in missions amongst the native pagans. They are squandered on missions to places where the gospel was preached, and admitting the articles of the Church of England as the standard of orthodoxy, more faithfully preached before. This, my lord, however people at home may be mendicated or sermonized out of their money, is so notorious here, that an attempt to adduce proofs to evince it, would be like holding a candle to the sun."

Dr. Chandler, in his Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson, of King's College, (New York, 1805,) p. 26, allows that in 1722 "the Church of England had scarcely any existence in Connecticut. There were about thirty families at Stratford, chiefly from England," and "all of them poor, and about forty more in the neighboring towns," (p. 39.) "He was then (1723) the only episcopal clergyman in the colony." (Ibid.) See also pp. 38, 111, 113.

rule or standard of schism, it may be argued, that as the protestant episcopal church in this country, is one of the most recent of all established ecclesiastical organizations, it is necessarily schismatical in every portion of the country, and ought by its own rule, to conform to the earlier, and by this mode of judgment, the more catholic communions.

The prelacy, therefore, by its own showing, is in this country schismatical. This it unquestionably is in Scotland, and wherever else it has established its churches in the bosom of other denominations. And upon their principles, it is altogether impossible for prelatial churches to justify their continued separation from Rome. Mr. Palmer delivers the following as his conclusion from an examination into this very subject: "It is impossible that in the same place there can be several different churches, authorized by God and united to Christ. In the case of rival communions in a particular locality, it is possible that *none* of them may be christian; but one alone can be the church of Christ; and it is as impossible that there should be two particular churches in the same place, as two universal churches in the world."

Again: "But what I contend for is, that in one locality there can be but one society, whose communion christians are bound to seek in preference to all others."

We are sustained in this conclusion by the argument presented in "A Dictionary of the church," by the Reverend William Staunton,² in reply to the charge of the Romish church. He there alleges that the mission of Austin the monk, and his coadjutors to England, "and their interference with the existing ecclesiastical jurisdiction," was "on their part an act of schism — a trespass on the order, discipline and prerogatives of a church, to meddle with which they had no shadow of right, under the circumstances of the case." This he shows by supposing the case of a mission into the diocese of Rome, and concludes that "the introduction of Romanism into England was manifestly³ a schismatical intrusion."

Mr. Thorndike, the oracle of the high-church, believed that

At this period, the members of the episcopal church in the northern states hardly constituted one thirtieth part of the population. See Hodge's Hist. Presb. Ch. pt. ii. p. 456. See also pp. 462, 464, 473, and Dr. Humphrey's Hist. of the Soc. &c. p. 217. See A Serious Address to the Members of the Episcopal Separation in New England, by Noah Hobart, A. M. Boston, 1748. Sprague Coll. vol. 412,

and his Second Address *ibid*, 1751, in *ibid*, vol. 419.

That the Church of England was treated as schismatical, and as a dissenting body in New England, see Chandler's Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson, p. 39.

1) On the Ch. vol. i. p. 68.

2) New York, 1839, pp. 419, 420.

3) P. 420.

they were guilty of schism who separated from the church of Rome.¹

Johnson, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, thus speaks:² “When two several pastors assume to themselves the privilege of offering and consecrating the sacrament, not only in two distinct places, but in contradiction to each other, and by two several inconsistent claims, then it is evident that one of them acts by no commission; for if the true EUCHARIST can be had in two opposite assemblies, then CHRIST’S flesh ceases to be one.”

Now what must be the unavoidable application of this rule of judgment, by every rational man. To take an illustration. There are in the city of Charleston, as is evident to all, several separate and independent communions. But, as we are here taught, there can be possibly but one true church among them all; and which is that one, is a question to be determined, first by the uninterrupted possession of the apostolic succession; and secondly, by the fact of priority of establishment. Now the Anglican, and therefore the Americo-Anglican church, acknowledges the succession of the Romish church to be apostolic and valid. Neither can they, while granting this position, deny her antiquity. The Romish church, then, presents herself before us with greater antiquity, with exclusive claims, and with an acknowledged succession.³ And since there can be but one true church in the same place; who, we ask, can hesitate — *if constrained to decide upon these principles* — to give his verdict in favor of the Romish and against the prelatie church? When, too, we bear in mind that the Romish and the Nicene churches differ chiefly, as it is alleged, in reference to ecclesiastical usages or political arrangements; and that the prelacy identifies itself, in all essential principles, with the Nicene church; — by what possible reasoning can prelatists avoid the condemnation of their own schismatic separation? “It will be impossible,” says the author of *Ancient Christianity*,⁴ “or it ought to be so, for the professors of church principles to make good much longer, their own position as ministers of a schismatic church. — Denouncing the reformers, and admitting the Romish church to be only erring in some of its practices, these parties condemn themselves on both hands: — they are sawing the branch on which they sit.”

There is no escaping this condemnatory sentence against the

1) *Weights and Measures in Rights of the Chr. Ch.* p. 320.

2) *Oxf. Tr.* vol. iii. p. 157.

3) We mean, of course, as acknowledged by the prelacy. For our-

selves, we altogether deny the possibility of establishing the fact of an uninterrupted prelatie succession.

4) *Vol. i.* p. 545.

prelacy. Is this doctrine of apostolical succession true, and the consequent theory of schism binding? then are prelatic churches infallibly schismatic. Is this doctrine, on the other hand, and as we believe, untrue and unfounded, and all its unchristian and absurd inferences equally vain and sinful? — then is the prelacy still schismatic in its treatment of other christian communions, that is, nineteen twentieths of all the reformed churches throughout the world. By excommunicating these churches, prelaticists excommunicate themselves,¹ and expose themselves to the enviable notoriety of proclaiming that they alone — A MERE MOIETY OF CHRISTENDOM — CONSTITUTE THE ONLY, TRUE, CATHOLIC, AND UNIVERSAL CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST. Far different was the sentiment of the reformers. “We do not,” say they, in the language of the Helvetic Confession, “by a *wicked schism* separate and break fellowship with the holy churches of Christ in Germany, France, England, or other nations of the christian world.” Far different were the sentiments, also, of the English reformers, as has been already seen; and of her best and greatest divines. “But because I esteem them churches not completely formed, do I, therefore,” says Archbishop Bramhall,² “exclude them from all hopes and salvation? or esteem them aliens and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel? or account them formal schismatics? no such thing.”

But this doctrine, as is avowed, does thus unchurch nearly all the reformed communions; destroys their ministry; renders their ordinances inefficacious and worthless; and severs them, “as *withered branches*,” from the church of Christ. It debars their ministers from the pulpits of the prelacy; it excludes even their dead bodies from burial within its sacred territory; and it withholds from them every token of christian recognition and ecclesiastical brotherhood.³

Thus does this schismatical theory burst asunder the bands of our common christianity, and perpetuate, and MAKE NECESSARY, BY CONNECTING THEM WITH THE OBLIGATION OF A SACRED PRINCIPLE, THE DISCORDS, DIVISIONS, AND ALIENATIONS, OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.

Nor has its influence been less baneful within the bosom of the prelacy itself. Schismatical towards all others, and involving themselves in certain criminality, this system has originated and perpetuated schisms and parties within their own commun-

1) “St. Cyprian, Firmilian, and the Africans, did the like,” says Dr. Claggett, (Notes of the Ch. p. 177,) “in opposition to Pope Stephen; Firmilian plainly telling them, that while he thought to excommunicate all them from himself, he had but

excommunicated himself from them.”
2) Vind. of Ch. of Engl. Oxf. Tr. vol. iii. p. 138.

3) To refuse communion with other churches is schism. See Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 17, 21, 52, 60. Bib. Repertory, 1832, p. 34.

ion. Hostile confederacies are formed within this very church. "In the bitterness of their spirit they glory in their unholy endeavors to arm brother against brother, in the hope of waging worse than a civil war with the deadly weapons of theological hatred."¹ The Anglican church is a house divided against itself.² It is aptly represented, in its motley elements, by the English language, made up, as it is, of the most discordant materials, gathered from every foreign dialect. Avowing, as the great end and aim of this doctrine, the preservation of unity, it prevents its growth. It also violates it, when formed; and thus is schism made the cure of schism. While, therefore, "the Church of England condemns schism in every way, its authors, its maintainers, and its conventicles," so that, as Mr. Palmer boasts, "the subverters of its laws, rules, and orders, are all subjected to excommunication, and regarded as wicked,"³ she must add another anathema against that "schism within *the church*,"⁴ which is equally contrary to the will of Christ, and of which, as the result of this very doctrine, she is notoriously guilty.⁵

1) Hook's Call to Union, p. 17.

2) See the evidences given in Lect. xvii.

3) On the Ch. vol. i. p. 219.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 416.

5) On the existence of such parties in the Church, besides what has been said in Lect. seventeenth, see British Critic, Ap. 1839, pp. 396, 418, Oxf. Tracts, vol. i. pp. 242, and Newman's Lect. on Rom. pp. 10, 23, 40, 403, 404; Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 247, 252, 267, 369, 506; Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839, pref. p. 4, and 592; Hook's Call to Union, p. 44, note, 81, 106; Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 79; Oxf. Tr. vol. iv. (Eng. ed.) pp. 31, 27, 81; Bethel on Bapt. Regeneration, p. 20; Bib. Repert. for 1833, pp. 336-338. See on the altitudinarian and latitudinarian parties in the Eng. Church, and how they pursued each with an unrelenting rage, which not only lasted through life, but was unappeased even by death, the Lond. Chr. Obs. 1839, pp. 80, 81, &c. Three divisions acknowledged in *ibid.*, p. 83. As acknowledged by Mr. Lushington, see Eclectic Rev. Oct. 1838, p. 409. Edinb. Rev. April, 1839, p. 142, &c. The parties into which the English Ch. is divided, are enumerated under three classes, in the Lond. Chr. Obs. Feb. 1841, pp. 76, 77. Four clauses of interpretations of the 39th Art. and

of subscription to them, are given by Overton, p. 18, &c. Lond. Chr. Obs. 1802, p. 27.

The schismatical tendency and practical influence of this doctrine is argued by Baxter, in his True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1680, pt. iii. ch. ix. against Dodwell. See also Baxter's Treatise of Episcopacy, Lond. 1681, pt. ii. ch. viii.

"This document, however," says the Edinburgh Witness, Sept. 19, 1840, "contains an insinuation against the church of Scotland, which its prudent authors did not choose to convert into an assertion. The insinuation is, that presbyterianism does not promote 'unity and order in religion.' From the mouth of papists, this would have come with a better grace, for it is their old argument against all protestant churches. In the mouth of a renegade presbyterian, a love of 'order and unity' sometimes means a love of despotism, sometimes nothing more than a just terror of ecclesiastical discipline. 'Order and unity' forsooth! Who broke in upon the order and unity of the church of Scotland, but the very ancestors of the men who now complain; the old Jacobites of Scotland, at whose instigation Queen Anne's perfidious act was hurried through, and by whom, to a great extent, it is

This system is, then, schismatical. It requires the belief of tenets and practices, which we must regard to be erroneous and unscriptural, and this is schism. It makes terms of communion with Christ's church, which he never enjoined; and this is schism. It anathematizes and excludes from covenanted mercy all who cannot conscientiously embrace it, — and this is schism. It overthrows the unity of the church in its faith, in its charity, in its spiritual cognation and alliance, in its mystical incorporation as one body; in its peaceable concord and confederacy; in the concurrent harmony and coöperation of its ministers, — and this is schism. Tried by the standard of those definitions which have been given of it by prelatival divines, it is found to be schism. And, measured by their reasonings upon the subject, it is declared to be schismatic. Described by the testimony of their own writers, it is schismatical.¹ Estimated by its

still defended? That act alone introduced all the disorder and disunion into the presbyterian family of Scotland. Abolish it, and perfect peace will soon be restored. Meantime, we utterly deny that 'these objects have ever been amply secured' in the Church of England. Much as we respect many of the excellent men in that church, it is impossible not to see, that so far from unity, 'it contains Arminians and Socinians, Pelagians and Puseyites, amongst the clergy: and that whilst the church of Scotland has deposed a Campbell, an Irving, and many more, the Church of England either has not the power or the will to restore 'order' amongst her refractory children. Popery is rioting untouched in the halls of Oxford. Let us lay aside our bigotry, and learn to speak with candor; let us rather imitate what is good in our neighbor churches, than deal in notoriously silly and unfounded assertions, with the effect of misleading the ignorant."

"And who does not know," says Dr. Mitchell, (Letters to Bishop Skinner, Lond. 1869, p. 21,) "that when christians were a small body in comparison of the infidels around them every where; when they were all alike exposed to persecution for their common faith, and when the apostles were set over them, with at least episcopal authority, there were schisms and heresies, that is, divisions and sects among them? Episcopacy the guard of unity! Did not that form of ecclesiastical polity prevail universal-

ly, before the first of the oecumenical councils was convened? What made it necessary to convene those great assemblies, which, by the way, generally aggravated the disorders which they were called to cure? Was it not heresies and schisms, which episcopacy could neither prevent nor suppress? Nay, is it not well known, that contests among ambitious churchmen about dignified stations in the hierarchy, gave rise to heresies and schisms, and sometimes to massacre, and to whatever was most suited to bring disgrace on the clerical character and the christian name?"

1) This doctrine is schismatical because it is thus plainly opposed to the true unity of the catholic church. It makes others beside those points, which even Bingham, with all his hierarchical prejudices, shows to have been anciently regarded as alone necessary to the well-being of the church, — fundamental and essential to its very being. (See Bingham's *Antiq. b. xvi. ch. i.*) It is thus schismatic, because it makes essential to a true church, and to true membership in that church, the belief of dogmas which are not contained in those creeds, in which, as the same author testifies, the church had always collected or summed up those fundamental articles, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand, and sufficient on the other, to admit and to keep men in the unity of the church. (See authorities in *ibid*, vol. vi. p. 4, &c.)

This doctrine is schismatical, be-

fruits, it is found leading to the most bitter schisms. By the word of God, by reason, by common sense, by the universal judgment of all impartial persons, this doctrine of prelatical suc-

cause further it is opposed to, and is destructive of that love and charity, in which one great branch of true christianity consists, (Bingham, b. xvi. ch. i. § ii.) It is schismatical, also, because it requires agreement in the same rites and ceremonies which were anciently regarded as matters of an indifferent nature, (ibid, § 15.) It is no less schismatical, in that it effectually prevents the maintenance of communion between different churches, who, nevertheless, hold the same faith, and profess obedience to all the laws of Christ. It is schismatical because, while the ancients regarded even excommunicate persons, of other sects, to be "in some measure in and of the church;"—(ibid, § xvii. vol. vi. p. 58,)—this doctrine pronounces those who hold to the same creeds, to be entirely without the church, and separated from it. Thus Optatus tells the Donatists, (apud Bingham, b. xvi. ch. i. § xvii. vol. vi. p. 58,) "that they were divided from the church in part, not in every respect; for that was the nature of a schism, to be divided in part, not totally cut asunder. And that for very good reason, because both we and you have the same ecclesiastical conversation; though the minds of men be at variance, the sacraments do not vary. We have all the same faith, we are all signed with the same seal; we are no otherwise baptized than you are, nor otherwise ordained than you are. We all read the same divine testament, we all pray to the same God. The Lord's prayer is the same with us, as it is with you; but there being a rent made, as was said before, by the parts hanging this way and that way, an union was necessary to restore the whole to its integrity." He repeats this again, in other places.

"St. Austin always discourses," says Bingham, "after the same manner, concerning this union, in part (apud Bingham, b. xvi. § xvii. vol. vi. pp. 59, 60;) in many things, ye are one with us, in baptism, in the creed, and the rest of God's sacraments." And hence he also concludes, "that whether they would or no, they were

their brethren, and could not cease to be so, so long as they continued to say, our Father, and did not renounce their creed and their baptism. For there was no medium between christians and pagans. If they retained faith, and baptism, and the common prayer of the Lord, which teaches all men to style God their Father; so far they were christians; and as far as they were christians, so far they were brethren, though turbulent and contentious, who would neither keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, nor continue to be united in the catholic church with the rest of their brethren."

Equally evident is this conclusion, from the inferences of Dr. Barrow. From his discourse concerning the Unity of the Church, Dr. Barrow deduces the following among other corollaries. (Wks. fol. vol. i. p. 781.)

"3. All churches, which have a fair settlement in several countries, are co-ordinate, neither can one challenge a jurisdiction over the other."

"4. The nature of schism is hence declared; viz. that it consisteth in disturbing the order and peace of any single church; in withdrawing from it obedience and compliance with it; in obstructing good correspondence, charity, peace, between several churches; in condemning or censuring other churches without just cause, or beyond due measure."

"In refusing to maintain communion with other churches without reasonable cause; whence Firmilian did challenge T. Stephanus with schism."

Adjudged by these conclusions, how can our prelati brethren escape from the charge of schism? For, as Dr. Barrow says in the same treatise, (Wks. vol. i. pp. 766, 783,) "All christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of piety and charity; in prayer, in communion of the eucharist, in brotherly conversation, and pious conference for edification or advice. So that he who flies and avoids communion with us, you in your prudence may know, that such a man breaks himself off from the whole church. St.

cession is pronounced to be schismatical, as it equally violates the union of the church with its head, and the union of its true members with each other.

Chrysostom doth complain of Epiphanius: *Then when he came to the great and holy city Constantinople, he came not out into the congregation, according to custom and the ancient manner, he joined not himself with us, nor communicated with us in the word and prayer, and the holy communion,*" &c.

"And also, if they do reject communion and peace upon reasonable terms; if they vent unjust and un-

charitable censures; if they are turbulent and violent, striving by all means to subdue and enslave other churches to their will, or their dictates,—if they damn and persecute all who refuse to be their subjects; in such cases we may reject such churches as heretical, or schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their proceedings."

LECTURE XX.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ASSERTED.

THE untenableness of the prelatie doctrine of apostolical succession having been fully established, we might here terminate our labors. Indeed, it was our original design to close our discussion of this doctrine at this point, and to reserve the positive statement of what we regard as the true doctrine on this subject, as an introduction to our subsequent presentation of the claims of presbytery. As, however, there will be some necessary delay in the publication of this proposed course, we have thought it would be more useful and more satisfactory, to present it in the present volume — that while we show cause for the rejection of the prelatie hypothesis, we may not leave any mind bewildered with doubt, but may rather establish it in the true principles, which lie at the foundation of this important subject.

In doing so, we must at once commit ourselves, and our readers, to the alone guidance and control of the infallible rule of our faith and practice.

To the word of God, we render implicit faith and entire homage. This is the standard of our belief — this the fountain of our joys — this the charter of our rights. As christians, and in a double sense as presbyterians, we are pledged to the Bible, and nothing but the Bible. To the fathers, doctors and divines, learned in the lore of ecclesiastical antiquity, we allow the privilege conferred by prelatists upon presbyters and also upon the laity, in reference to their decisions, — that is, the privilege of consenting to the Bible, but not of differing from it; — the privilege of concurring with it, but no right, power, or authority, either of adding to, or subtracting from it.

Let us again remind you, that the system, which, as it regards any reasonable claim to our reception, we have now rejected, is

not episcopacy, but prelacy — not low-church, or evangelical episcopacy, but high-church and unscriptural prelacy. That three grades of ministers may be ordered and arranged by those, who in this way, think they can best govern and advance the church of Christ, with different offices allotted to each separate class — this we have not denied ; this exercise of the right of private judgment we have not assailed. That such an arrangement, *de jure ecclesiastico vel humano*, is warrantable, where it is entered upon with a sincere desire to glorify God, and in a sincere belief that it is enjoined by Him, we have not, in any way, questioned. Nor would we intentionally wound the feelings of those who, in the unity of the spirit, and in the bonds of charity, hold firmly to this arrangement. That they are mistaken, we assuredly believe, and will hope yet to prove ; but that they are so far mistaken, as either not to be good christians or true churches, we are far from believing.

On the other hand, that these orders are, *de jure divino*, so as to be the essential, and only valid constituents of a true and pure church of Christ ; — that they perpetuate, in a personal hereditary succession, the gifts of God's Holy Spirit, and the efficiency of God's promises, so that all other churches, not within the line of such a succession, are beyond the pale of Christ's visible kingdom ; — this doctrine we have denied, and do again deny to be either scriptural or reasonable. This theory of prelatists we have denounced, and do again denounce, as a visionary hypothesis, alike unsupported by scripture, history, fact, reason, or the judgment of the best divines of the church ; and also as intolerant, unchristian, suicidal and absurd. And this we are called upon to do, as we would justify our own character, and sustain our own claims, against such usurping and uncharitable despotism.

But in thus spurning away from us, as unsupportable, what is termed the doctrine of the apostolical succession, or of the apostolical descent, it is not to be supposed that we utterly reject the necessary belief in the visibility, unity, or perpetuity of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church of Christ. In this venerable and most illustrious kingdom, we would ever rejoice. In the identity and unity of this glorious company — the body, of which Christ our Lord is head — we do most heartily believe. It is the imperishable and invincible pillar, by which is proclaimed, on earth and in heaven, the wisdom and glory of Him who is "mighty to save." "He instituted its sacraments ; He consecrated its ministers ; He sketched the great outlines of its polity ; He illuminates it by his spirit ; He honors it with his perpetual presence ; He is the source of its authority, the origin of

its dignity, the model of its purity, the subject of its doctrines, its representative and advocate in the court of heaven,"—its all and in all.¹

That in this church, or kingdom, Christ our Lord and Master has instituted laws and ordinances, and appointed officers to administer and preserve them — who should be the custodiers of its doctrines ; the preservers of its morals ; the heralds of its glad tidings ; and their promulgators to the end of time, and to the ends of the earth ; — in this, also, we most believingly exult. To these spiritual officers is committed whatever of authority or power was left with the church, when the high and sacred functions of the apostolic college were determined at the death of the apostles, and ceased. This is clearly taught us by the apostle, when he says — “ the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou also to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.” (2 Tim. ii. 2.) Here we are instructed that some were to be separated as teachers in Christ’s church ; that they who were thus separated should be found qualified as faithful men ; and that the word, order, and ordinances of God’s house, should be solemnly committed unto them ; that in this way there might be preserved in the church a perpetual succession of appointed teachers, who might “ fulfil their ministry according to this dispensation committed unto them.” So also in that declaration of our Saviour made to Peter : “ Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,” (Math. xvi. 18 ;) which it is not our design at this time fully to discuss — it is as clearly declared that the foundation upon which this church should rest, is the heaven-inspired confession of Peter, that Christ was, in human form, the true Messiah, and in his pre-incarnate nature, the everlasting Jehovah. It is also here fore-shown, that there shall always be in the world a visible church, holding forth to men, in a more or less perfect form, this heavenly doctrine of the ever-blessed Emmanuel, — God with us.

In like manner, do we find in that final commission given to his church, by our ascending Lord, (Math. xxviii. 19, 20,) and which constitutes the ministerial charter, the palladium of the church — it is immutably promised by Him who cannot lie, and who is fully able to accomplish all his will, that even to the end of the world He will be spiritually present, in the way of direction, encouragement, and support, not only with the apostles, but with all his ministering servants.²

1) See Steele’s Phil. of Evid. of Chr. p. 99.

2) See a full exhibition of what

is thus implied in these last two passages in Faber’s *Albigenses*, Pref. and b. i. ch. i. and again at p. 532.

It is all-important to any thing like a clear understanding of the matter in hand, that we should have right apprehensions of the meaning attached to the term church; for this word, as used in scripture, has several senses. It always refers, in its appropriated christian sense, to the kingdom of God, as composed of his professed subjects, who are under the government of his spiritual laws. But it has very different meanings, according to that particular aspect in which this spiritual kingdom is viewed. We may, for instance, consider this kingdom in its universal extent, as embracing all professing christians, in whatever country they are found; or as it is limited to some one particular country, or to some one particular denomination; or we may confine our view to some branch of this widely-extended kingdom, as found in a single city, or congregation. And as the present condition of the church is but a preparation for its future glorious and perfect consummation — when all who have, in any age or period of the world, become true members of the church on earth, shall be found enrolled as members of the church triumphant above — we may consider the term as applicable to this complete and glorious body.

While, therefore, the church is one — one house — one family — one kingdom — one body — one vine — it may be separately considered in any one of these different relations — just as this great republic is one, though made up of many constituent parts, in the several states, territories, cities and families, by the union of which it is formed — or as the human family is one homogeneous body, embracing all who are fellow-heirs to the same humanity, although infinitely diversified as to character, government, and customs.

Now, as it is at once manifest, that what would be proper, as spoken of the republic as a whole, might be very improper when applied to it in any one of its subordinate or separate parts — so is it equally plain, that what may be true of the church in one aspect of it, may be false when applied to it in some other aspect. Herein lies the secret of much of that obscurity and confusion, that perplexity and doubt, in which this whole subject has been involved, by the sophistical reasonings of Romish and prelatical writers. Nor is there any other thread by which we may be able to find our way out of their misty labyrinth, than a careful ascertainment of the true meanings of this important term; so that when it is found laid down in the premise to any argument, in one sense, and then introduced into the conclusion in another, we may be able to detect the wily stratagem, and discover the treacherous arts of those who, by their cunning craftiness, lie in wait to deceive.

The word church is used, we apprehend, in scripture, in five different meanings.¹ It refers to any particular congregation or society of professing christians.² It is applied to several congregations or churches, convened as one body under the same general superintendence.³ It means any assembly of the rulers of the church, when convened as an ecclesiastical judicatory.⁴ It is also applied to the whole body of God's redeemed people, who have been, or who shall be, gathered into one, under Christ, the head, and which is generally called the invisible church.⁵

Considered in this light, the church of Christ is perpetual and indefectible, so that the gates of hell shall never be able to prevail against it. As invisible, the unity of the church is perfect, both as it regards the unity of the faith, and the unity of the spirit. As invisible, the church of Christ embraces all who are true believers; and none but such as are true christians, and very members incorporate of Christ's mystical body. All who are born again by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and none but they who are thus regenerated by the spirit of our God, are received as members into this church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven. Nor is there any thing necessary or essential to a membership in this glorious society, or to the inheritance of its everlasting rewards, but a true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Such a faith unites the soul to Him, as our federal and our vital head; — so as that the merit of his righteousness is imputed to us, and the efficacious presence of his Spirit vouchsafed, and his renewing and sanctifying influences graciously imparted. Neither are any outward means, sacraments, and ordinances, otherwise essential to the procurement of these great and inestimable blessings, than as they are made so by God's express appointment; than as they are accessible to the individual believing; or at all otherwise, than as means toward the end; — namely, this union of the soul to Christ. In this view of the church, it is as large as heaven and earth; wide as the compass of creation; boundless as the race of fallen man; illimitable, save by the mercy and the free promises of God; and enduring as eternity itself.

There is one other and very important sense, in which this word is employed in scripture. It means the whole body of

1) See the author's Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, chap. i.

2) See Col. iv. p. 15, and Rom. xvi. 5.

3) See 1 Cor. i. 2, and xiv. 34; Acts viii. 1. comp. with xxi. 20, and Acts xv. 6, and xvi. 4.

4) Math. xviii. 15, 17; Heb. xiii. 7; 1 Cor. v.; Acts xiv. 27—xv. 2, 30, 32, and ch. xi. 26.

5) See Eph. v. 25, 27; Col. i. 18; Eph. i. 10, 22, 23.

those throughout the world, of EVERY DENOMINATION, with their children, who profess the christian religion. This is commonly called the visible church, because it includes all who make an outward and open profession of christianity, although many of them may not be truly christians, being unrenewed, un sanctified, and unholy, and, therefore, not members of the church invisible.¹ As thus visible, the church includes hypocrites, while as invisible it includes only true believers. As visible, it requires from its members only an external and credible profession of the faith; while, as invisible, it supposes in every member of it a sincere and hearty reception of the truth, in the love of it. As invisible, the only condition necessary to the certain enjoyment of all its blessings, is a true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; as a visible organized body, the church must necessarily be governed by the laws of Christ; she must observe whatever statutes Christ has ordained; she must diligently use whatever means of grace He has chosen to appoint. Thus, as an army, is she enlisted under His banners, as the captain of salvation. Thus, as a family, is she under the wise guidance and discipline of Him, as her head. Thus, as a kingdom, is she in all things subject unto Him, who is the King of Zion, and whose throne is for ever and ever.

Now as all the elements of this visible organization have been instituted for the church, by Christ; as it is his prescribed means to a true membership in the church invisible and eternal; as membership in this church is made necessary to all to whom it is possible;—it is of evident and great importance to learn what these elements are, and wherein consists the essential constituents of a true church. Wilfully to set at naught the ordinances of Heaven, were a just provocative of Heaven's righteous indignation; while ignorant neglect of important means of grace, may lead to the impoverishment of the soul, and the loss of great spiritual mercies.

To the most careless observer, there are evidently great varieties of outward order and administration, in the various bodies claiming to be constituent portions of this visible church of Christ, which is also catholic, or universal. All, however, claim for their peculiar arrangements the sanction of scripture; while some maintain, that their order and polity is so scriptural and divine as to be the only one allowable. They, therefore, hold that conformity to their order is absolutely necessary to any inheritance in Israel; and that any deviation from it thereby cuts

1) See Acts ii. 39, 47; 1 Cor. xii. 1 Corinthians, vii. 14, and x. 32; Acts 12, 13, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Acts viii. 3; xiv. 15.

off the non-conforming body from all the privileges and blessings of this heaven-appointed church. And as this visible church is the ordinary and appointed way to that which is invisible and heavenly; such churches are, therefore, as is believed, cut off from any ordinary or known way of salvation. Such are the views entertained by its abettors of the system of prelacy, as exhibited in the Romish and the Anglican churches.

It is, therefore, the object of our present inquiry, to discover, according to the scriptures, what is, and what is not, essential to the constitution of a true visible church, whether that church be regarded as a single congregation, or as a body embracing many such societies.

That there is such a catholic and visible church; and that its perpetuity is based upon the immutability of its foundation, and the indestructibility of its own materials, we require not, in this place, further to prove, since there is, on this point, a consenting harmony among all the churches of the reformation. Their doctrine of Christ, on this subject, has nowhere been better expressed, than in our own confession of faith: "Unto this catholic visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto."

"This catholic church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them."

"The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a church on earth to worship God according to his will."

We proceed, therefore, to the main question before us. In what does that succession or constitution, by which the church of Christ is preserved and perpetuated, essentially consist? Does it terminate on the officers themselves, as is taught in the prelatist doctrine of apostolical succession, or is it to be determined by doctrines, so that where the true doctrines of Christ are found to be professed, by those who truly live in accordance with them, there we may safely pronounce this succession to exist?

Now we profess to believe, as Zanchius expressed it in the days of the reformation, that, "as it is necessary that there shall always be a church upon earth, because Christ hath promised

that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it ; so also it is every way as necessary that a lawful ministry be preserved ; for the one cannot be separated from the other, neither the church from the ministry, nor the ministry from the church. And hence it appears, that even in the church of Rome, though the worship of God be most corrupt, yet God hath preserved so much of the substance of religion, as was necessary to salvation ; so that, as the church is not wholly extinct therein, so neither was the ministry.”¹

Thus, also, our Puritan and nonconformist fathers declared themselves : “ We say, that our ministry is derived to us from Jesus Christ. We are his ministers and his ambassadors. It is he that gave pastors and teachers to the church, as well as apostles and evangelists. We say, that ordination of ministers by ministers, is no Romish institution, but instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ himself long before antichrist was. That our ministry is descended to us from Christ, THROUGH the apostate church of Rome, but not FROM the apostate church of Rome.² But the ministry, which is an institution of Christ passing to us *through* Rome, is not made null and void ; no more than the scriptures, sacraments, or any other gospel ordinance, which we now enjoy, and which do also descend to us from the apostles, through the Romish and other corrupt churches.”³ This claim to the true ministry, and, therefore, to the true succession of the ministry, not in exclusion of others, but in a state of greater purity and gospel simplicity than is found in many prelatial communions, we shall attempt to make good. At present, however, we only affirm and assert the fact, that on our principles, the succession of the church is not endangered by the undeniable corruption of the Romish hierarchy ; since there never was a period when the Lord had not preserved to himself, within the apostate prelacy, a number, both among the presbyters and the laity, sufficient to act as the salt and the leaven of his church.

But on the system of prelacy, as we have shown, there is not a shred of well-grounded confidence, or even *hope*, that there is any true church now existing upon the earth ; or a single validly constituted minister in the whole world ; and consequently, no certainty that any individual can, according to God’s ordinary plan, be possibly saved. For, if this succession of the church is bound up in the assured certainty of an unbroken line of prelatial

1) Zanch. in *Four Præcep.* pp. 7, 19. This, however, is a very different thing from A PERSONAL PRELATIC SUCCESSION, every link of which is asserted to be genuine and valid.

2) No — nor through the succes-

sion of its pretended *apostles*, who were, many of them, *apostates*.

3) The *Div. Right of the Gospel Min.* pt. ii. p. 33, by the Provincial Assembly in Lond. in 1654. See all chap. iii.

bishops, duly consecrated and qualified, then the perpetuity of the church must be abandoned; for that christians, in the first age of the church, never saw a prelatie bishop, we most firmly believe.

I. What, then, we would in the first place ask, is essential to the being of a church? 1. And first, what is essential to the being of the church, considered generally? Our confession of faith holds this language.

“The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him, that filleth all in all. The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before, under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.”¹

In the Larger Catechism,² this question is asked: “Are all they saved who hear the gospel, and live in the church? Ans. All that hear the gospel, and live in the visible church, are not saved; but only they who are true members of the church invisible.” Again. “What is the visible church? Ans. The visible church is a society made up of all such as, in all ages and places of the world, do profess the true religion, and of their children.”

And, again, in our form of government,³ the same doctrine is laid down. “The universal church consists of all those persons, in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of *Christ*, and of submission to his laws.”

“As this immense multitude cannot meet together in one place, to hold communion, or to worship God, it is reasonable, and warranted by scripture example, that they should be divided into many particular churches.”

So, also, in the Genevan Confession, which was approved by the church of Scotland, in the beginning of the reformation, it is taught,—“but that church which is visible, and seen to the eye, hath three tokens or marks, whereby it may be known. First, the word of God, contained in the Old and New Testaments, which, as it is above the authority of the same church, and only sufficient to instruct us in all things concerning salvation; so it is left for all degrees of men to read, and understand;

1) See chap. xxv. § i. ii.

2) Ques. 61 and 62.

3) See chapter ii.

for without this word, neither church, nor council, nor decree, can establish any point touching salvation."¹

The doctrine of the protestant episcopal church on this subject is contained in the nineteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles. "The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

"As the church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." Thus, also, in one of the prayers appointed to be used at the communion, there is a thanksgiving to Almighty God, "that we are very members incorporate, in the mystical body of his Son," that is, the church "WHICH IS THE BLESSED COMPANY OF ALL FAITHFUL PEOPLE."

In the "Necessary Doctrine of Erudition," the title of a formulary approved by the bishops of England in 1543, and set forth² by the king's majesty, Henry VIII., it is declared: "Wherefore we must understand, that besides the inward and secret calling, which God hath always used, and yet still doth use, he hath also ordained an outward calling of the people unto him by preaching of his most holy word; upon which outward calling, the people's yielding, assenting, and obeying to the same word of God, and receiving it also with true faith, and the sacrament of baptism, (as Christ's law requireth,) be named in scripture *ecclesia*, that is to say, an assembly of people, called out from other, as from infidels or heathens, to one faith and confession of the name of Christ, which word *ecclesia* is in English called *church*." "And forasmuch as God of his goodness calleth people, as afore, without exception of persons or privilege of place; therefore this holy church is also catholic, that is to say, not limited to any one place or region of the world, but is in every place universally through the world, where it pleaseth God to call people to him in the profession of Christ's name and faith, be it in Europe, Africa, or Asia. And all these churches, in divers countries severally called, although for knowledge of the one from the other among them, they have divers additions of names, and for their most necessary government, as they be distinct in places, so they have distinct ministers and divers heads in earth, governors, and rulers, yet be all these holy churches but one holy church catholic, invited and

1) See Irving's Conf. of Faith, p. 130.

2) See Formularies of Faith in the reign of Henry VIII. pp. 244, 245, 248, Oxf. ed. 1825.

called by one God the Father to enjoy the benefit of redemption wrought by our only Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and governed by one Holy Spirit, which teacheth to this foresaid holy church one truth of God's holy word in one faith and baptism. And this church is relieved, nourished and fortified by his holy and invincible word and his sacraments, which in all places have each of them their own proper force and strength, with gifts of graces also distributed by the goodness of Almighty God in all places, as to his wisdom is seen convenient."

"It is to be noted, that this Church of England, and other known particular churches, in which Christ's name is truly honored, called on, and professed in faith and baptism, be members of the whole catholic church, and each of them by himself is also worthily called a catholic church, when they merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to the scripture and apostolic doctrine. And so every christian man ought to honor, give credence, and to follow the particular church of that region so ordered, (as afore,) wherein he is born or inhabiteth."

In conformity with these views is the definition of the church, given by Hooker: "Whereupon, because the *only object* which separateth ours from other religions is Jesus Christ, in whom none but the church doth believe, and whom none but the church doth worship, we find that accordingly the apostles do every where distinguish hereby the church from infidels and from Jews; accounting them which '*call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*' to be his church. If we go lower we shall but add unto this *certain casual and variable accidents*, which are not *properly of the being*, but make *only for the happier and better being* of the church of God, either in deed, or in men's opinions and conceits. This is the error of all popish definitions that hitherto have been brought. They define not the church by that which the church essentially is, but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are."¹

1) Eccl. Pol. b. v. § lxxviii.

"For our constant persuasion," says Hooker, (Eccl. Pol. b. iii. § ii. vol. i. p. 254, Hanb. edition, p. 255,) "in this point, is as theirs, that we have no where altered the laws of Christ further than in such particularities only as have the nature of things changeable according to the difference of times, places, persons and other the like circumstances. Christ hath commanded prayers to be made, sacraments to be ministered, his church to be carefully taught and

guided. Concerning every of these, somewhat Christ hath commanded, which must be kept till the world's end. On the contrary side, in every of them, somewhat there may be added, as the church shall judge it expedient." "Whatsoever Christ hath commanded for ever to be kept in his church, the same we take not upon us to abrogate; and whatsoever our laws have thereunto added besides, of such quality we hope it is as no law of Christ doth any where condemn. Wherefore, that all may be laid to-

So also Burnet on the Nineteenth Article says: "The second thing to be considered in a church is, their association together in the use of the sacraments. For these are given by Christ to the society as the rites and badges of that body. That which makes particular men believers, is their receiving the fundamentals of christianity, so that which constitutes the body of the church, is the profession of that faith, and the use of those sacraments, which are the rights and distinctions of those who possess it."¹

And in like manner Archbishop Usher² says: "The catholic church is not to be sought for in any one angle or quarter of the world, but among 'all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.' (1 Cor. i. 2.) Therefore, to their Lord and ours it was said, 'ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance,' &c. (Psalms ii. 8;) and to this mystical body, the catholic church, accordingly, 'I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather them from the west; I will say to the north, give up, and to the south, keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth.' (Isaiah xliii. 5-7.) Thus must we conceive of the catholic church, as one entire body, made up by the collection and aggregation of all the faithful unto the unity thereof," &c.

But more particularly, to take one or two, from many other apt quotations, which we might make from the work of this eminently godly and learned man, he thus speaks in his Sum of the Christian Religion:

"Since then, God doth not reveal the covenant of grace, nor afford sufficient means to salvation to the whole world, but only to the church, explain here what you mean by the church."

"We speak not here of that part of God's church which is *triumphant* in glory; who being in perfect fruition, have no need of these outward means of communion with him; (Rev. xxi. 22, 23,) but the subject here is the church *militant*. And that we consider also as *visible* in the parts of it; consisting of divers assemblies and companies of believers, making profession of the same common faith; howbeit, many times, by force of persecu-

gether and gathered into a narrower room: First, so far forth as the church is the mystical body of Christ and his invisible spouse, it needeth no external polity. That very part of the law divine which teacheth faith and works of righteousness, is itself alone sufficient for the church of God in that respect. But as the church is a visible society and body politic, laws of

polity it cannot [but?] want." "For in these things, whereof the scripture appointeth no certainty, the use of the people of God, or the ordinances of our fathers, must serve for a law."

1) Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, p 244.

2) Sermon before the King, on Eph. iv. 13.

tion, the exercise of public ordinances may, for a time, be suspended among them."

"Hath Christ, then, his church visible upon the earth?"

"Yea, throughout the world, in the particular congregations of christians, (Rom. iii. 3,) called to the profession of the true faith and obedience of the gospel. In which visible assemblies, and not elsewhere, the true members of the true church invisible on earth are to be sought, (Rom. xi. 5,) and unto which, therefore, all that seek for salvation must gladly join themselves." (Esa. lx. 4.)

"What are the marks and infallible notes whereby to discern the true visible church, with which we may safely join?"

"First and principally the truth of doctrine which is professed and the sincere preaching of the word, together with the due administration of the sacraments, according to the commandment of Christ, our Saviour. Secondly, the right order which is kept, with a sincere and conscionable obedience yielded to the word of God."

"Why do you make the first to be the principal mark of visible profession? Because they are the only outward means appointed by God for the calling and gathering of the saints, and which prove the church to be a *pillar of truth*. (Tim. iii. 15.)"

The same doctrine is beautifully laid down by Bishop Hall. "And we shall find that to be one church, wherein is an agreement in all the essentials of religion. And those the great doctor of the Gentiles hath determined to be, *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*: that is, a subjection to one Lord, prescribed in the decalogue; a belief of the same articles set down in the creed; a joint use and celebration of the holy sacraments, the initiatory whereof is baptism: so as, where there is an acknowledgment of the same living Lord, the God of heaven, whom we profess to depend upon for all things, to serve and obey according to his commandments, to invoke in our prayers for the supply of all our necessities; where there is a profession of the same faith in all the main points of christian doctrine, summed up in that symbol of the holy apostles; where there is a communion in the same blessed sacraments, instituted by our Lord Jesus, there is one and the same church of Christ, however far distermine in places, however segregated and infinitely severalized in persons, however differing in rites and circumstances of worship, however squaring in by-opinion."

"This is a truth, which is, with much consent and serious vehemence, inculcated by all our orthodox divines; amongst whom

1) Usher's Sum and Subst. of Chr. Rel. pp. 375, 376, fol. 1677.

none have so fully cleared the point, as the late honor of our schools, the learned Bishop Davenant, in that last golden Tractate which he wrote, now breathing towards the gates of his heaven, his pious and pithy exhortation of the evangelical churches to a happy peace; wherein the fundamentals of our faith are so evidently laid open, that it is not hard to judge by that unfailing rule, whom we may and must admit to the communion of Christ's church, and whom we ought to exclude from that holy society."

"Doubtless there is the same consideration of a christian, and of a church; for, what is a church, but an assembly of many true believing christians? and what is a christian, but an abridgment of the church, or a church contracted into one bosom? The number makes no difference in the essence."

"What person soever, then, after his due matriculation into God's church, professeth to be built upon Christ, the true corner-stone, to receive and embrace the whole truth of God delivered in the sacred monuments of the prophets and apostles, to believe all the articles of the christian faith, to yield himself to the guidance of that Royal Law, to call upon the only true God in and through Christ, to communicate in the same holy sacraments, instituted by the Lord of life, cannot but be acknowledged a true christian, and worthy of our free and entire communion."

"And if more do so, to the making up of a whole assembly, orderly congregated under lawful pastors, what can debar them of the title and privilege of a true christian church?"

These quotations might be multiplied to any extent; but this is unnecessary, as it is not our present purpose fully to investigate this matter, but merely to ascertain what, according to approved authorities, is regarded as essential to the being of a church. These characteristics we have therefore found to be, first, sound doctrine; secondly, a legitimate ministry; thirdly, the proper use of the sacraments.²

1) Wks. vol. viii. pp. 48, 53.

2) See Acts ii. 42, xiv. 23, and xx. 7; Math. xxviii. 19. See also Harmony of Confessions of the Ref. Churches, § x. pp. 204, 232, ed. 1643.

It may be well to give some authorities in substantiation of these conclusions:

Stillingfleet, in his Unreasonableness of Separation, according to Dr. Owen, in his Answer, "gives the notes of a true church to be the pure preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments, according to Christ's institution." Owen's Wks. vol. xx. p. 230.

Whitgift, in his Defence of the Answer, &c. says, "The substance and matter of government (Pref.) must indeede be taken out of the worde of God, and consisteth in these pointes, that the worde be trulie taught, the sacraments rightlie administered, virtue furthered, vice repressed, and the church kept in quietness and order."

Well enumerated by Dr. Claggett, (Notes of the Ch. p. 192.) "But some of them are necessary to the being of the church; and they are the acknowledgment of the *one Lord*, the profession of *one faith*, and admission

2. This leads us to inquire, secondly, what is essential to the being of the church, as it regards its ministers? Who are to be understood by legitimate ministers? Now they are to be esteemed as true ministers of Christ who have been called to the work according to divine appointment; who discharge the duties of their office as laid down in the word of God; preaching the truth in its purity; administering the sacraments in the true spirit of their institution; and governing the church according to the rules laid down by Christ.

That a lawful ministry is not limited to prelates, has been already fully shown. That it refers specially to presbyter-bishops, that is, ministers who preach, govern, ordain, and administer the sacraments, we will attempt to prove in the continuation of our course. And, therefore, we conclude that this ministry embraces prelates *only because they are presbyters, and only when they are otherwise duly qualified.* They are lawful ministers in whom the forementioned qualities are combined; by whatever name, order, or degree they may be technically designated.¹

into the state of christian duties and privileges by *one baptism.*"

"Nor is there any incongruity in maintaining, that while an outward framework has been by divine providence supported for preserving due order in the visible church, the special object of the divine protection through every age should be that aggregate of pious christians who, in various circumstances, and in distant places, are yet united together in one christian community by their common engraftment into the vine of the gospel." Dr. George Miller's Letter to Dr. Pusey, p. 24.

Calvin gives the notes of a church to be the pure preaching of the word, (Owen Wks. vol. xx. p. 230,) and the administration of the sacraments according unto Christ's institution. Where these are, he allows a true church to be, not only without diocesan episcopacy, but in a form and under a rule opposite unto it, and inconsistent with it.

Calvin's words are, (ibid.) "I would not give countenance unto errors, no, not to the least, so as to cherish them by flattery or connivance. But though I say, that the church is not to be forsaken for trifling differences, wherein the doctrine (of the gospel) is retained safe and sound, wherein the integrity of godliness doth abide, and the use of the sacraments appointed of the Lord is preserved....."

Say the Puritan authors of the Admonition to Parliament, in 1572, (Pref. in Price's Hist. Prot. Nonconf. i. p. 223,) "For to speak of that wherein the best consent, and whereupon all good writers accord. The outward marks whereby a true christian church is known, are, preaching of the word purely, ministering of the sacraments sincerely, and ecclesiastical discipline, which consisteth in admonition and correcting of faults severely."

See a chapter on what is necessary to the constitution, administration and communion of single churches, in Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord. Lond 1681, p. 223, &c.

See full on, in Voetius Desperata Causa Papatus, Amst. 1635, lib. iii. See particularly § i. cap. vii. p. 446. See also Leslie's Short Method with the Romanists. 1835, Edinb. pp. 50 and 182.

See further, Bishop Bull's Vind. of Ch. of Eng. pp. 155, 156, 158; Bishop Sherlock in Notes of the Chr. Exam. and Ref. pp. 1, 3, 9; Div. Right of the Min. pp. 30, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 44.

1) Our form of government thus describes the ministers of the sanctuary:

"The *pastoral* office is the first in the church, both for dignity and usefulness. *The person who fills this office*, hath, in scripture, obtained different names expressive of his various

They are described in the nineteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles, as those "who preach the pure word of God, and duly minister the sacraments." In the twenty-third article it is declared, "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

The ministers of other reformed churches are here not only recognized as true, but it is made OBLIGATORY upon every one who adopts these articles, to acknowledge and receive them "as lawfully called and sent." "Those" ministers "we OUGHT to judge lawfully called and sent which are," &c. That this article was designed to extend to the ministers of all the reformed churches, we have the most unexceptionable evidence, as has been already shown, in the testimony of Bishop Burnet.¹ The article was framed on the principle of comprehension, and with a designed indefiniteness, leaving the manner in which such ministers have "public authority" given to them undetermined. This interpretation is rendered certain by the course pursued in that church for at least fifty years after the article was framed; by the testimony of its best and greatest divines; and by the existing laws in which these principles are expressly avowed.²

Archbishop Usher asks the question — "whom hath Christ appointed to be governors and guides unto the rest?" which he answers thus: "Church officers and ministers appointed to teach and govern the flock of Christ, and to feed it with the wholesome food of the word and sacraments. (1 Cor. xii. 18: 1 Tim. v. 17: John xxi. 15: 1 Peter v. 2.)"³

duties. As he has the oversight of the flock of Christ, he is termed bishop. As he feeds them with spiritual food, he is termed pastor. As he serves Christ in his church, he is termed minister. As it is his duty to be grave and prudent, and an example of the flock, and to govern well in the house and kingdom of Christ, he is termed presbyter or elder. As he is the messenger of God, he is termed the angel of the church. As he is sent to declare the will of God to sinners, and to beseech them to be reconciled to God through Christ, he is termed ambassador. And, as he dis-

penses the manifold grace of God, and the ordinances instituted by Christ, he is termed steward of the mysteries of God." Ch. iv. pp. 408, 409.

1) See on the Art. pp. 336, 338, and Records, in Lond. Chr. Obs. Feb. 1838, p. 86. This is admitted by Dr. Pusey in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 98, and in Oxford Tr. No. 81, p. 27, Note.

2) See Div. Right of the Min. pt. ii. pp. 18, 19, 21, 23, 59; and Powell on Ap. Suc. ch.; Dr. Miller on the Min. &c. &c. &c.

3) See ut Supra, p. 377.

The reformed churches harmonized in the belief that ministers constitute an essential part of the church, considered as visible and regularly organized — that they must be lawfully called to their work by the public authority of the church; and that they are bound faithfully to preach God's word and duly to dispense his ordinances.¹

Sure we are, if the most impartial authorities are to be relied upon, that no where in the earliest fathers of the christian church, can there be found any authority whatever, for making a lineal succession of prelates essential to the being of a true church.² In whatever variety of meanings they may use the term church, (*ecclesia*,) yet do they not employ it in such a sense as this. And although, in some instances, the term is used to designate the believing people in contradistinction to the clergy³ — yet never is it employed where the clergy alone, to the exclusion of other representatives of the church, are understood. The word is commonly applied by them to a particular society of christians, meeting together in one place under their proper pastors, for the performance of religious worship, and the exercise of christian discipline.⁴

Launoy, a learned Romish writer, “proves unanswerably, and by numerous testimonies of every age,” says Dr. Claggett,⁵ “that from the apostles' times till the council of Trent, the constant universal doctrine concerning the church was this, that it is ‘the society of the faithful,’ without ever inserting into the definition of it any thing relating to its being united to the pope, or any other bishop, as to a visible head. Nay, secondly, that all the most learned lovers of antiquity, and godly opposers of novelty, in the Roman communion, both in the time of the council of Trent, and ever since, have retained that notion of the church, and stuck to the ancient definition.”

“What is the church?” asks the present bishop of London. “There is hardly a mistake more injurious to the interests of christian charity, or one which has more effectually impeded the progress of the gospel, and prevented that gospel from having

1) See Harmony of Conf. at Su-
pra, § xi. pp. 233, 269.

2) See King on the Primitive
Church, chap. i.

3) Euseb. lib. vii. cap. xxx. Ma-
carius Hom. xii. applies it to one soul,
και επι μιας ψυχης. Chrysostom in Ps.
See others in Suiceri Thes. tom. i. p.
105.

4) The sentiments of the Greek
fathers may be seen fully collected in
Succeri Thesaurus, tom. i. p. 1049, &c.,

and the fathers generally in Marechal's
Concordantia Sanct. Patr. Gr. et Lat.
tom. i. and ii. as per index, in nomine
Ecclesia. August. Vindel, 1769.

“I call the church the congregation
of the elect,” *αθροισμα των εκλεκτων*.
Clem. Alex. str. p. 514, in Dr. Barrow
vol. i. p. 762.

5) In his Ep. par. viii. p. 353, to
Nec. Gatinaus, in Notes of the Ch.
pp. 186, 188.

free course, and being glorified, as it will be glorified when it has free course, than that erroneous opinion which certainly has prevailed, I would almost say universally — but very generally, and I fear, still too widely prevails, — that the church is the clergy.”

“The church! Am I asked again, what is the church? The ploughman at his daily toil; the workman who plies his shuttle; the merchant in his counting-house; the scholar in his study; the lawyer in the courts of justice; the senator in the hall of the legislature; the monarch on his throne; these, as well as the clergyman, in the works of the material building, which is consecrated to the honor of God, — these constitute the church. The church, as defined by our articles, ‘is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.’”

No one will presume to affirm that any passage can be produced from the New Testament in which the order of prelates, in consociation with two inferior orders subject to them, is declared to be of the essence of a true church of Jesus Christ.

1) Sir Michael Foster, Knt. in his Exam. of Bishop Gibson’s Codex Juris Eccl. Angl. p. 98, repudiates this meaning of the term which confines it to the clergy, as “the sense in which the corruption, ignorance and superstition of succeeding ages have used that word,” and not as the Church of England understands it, “the body or congregation of the faithful.” Well he might, as will appear from what follows: “The church does not teach anything contrary to scripture, and we also may not interpret scripture contrary to her.” Tract No. 159 of the Prot. Episcop. Tr. Soc. p. 13.

Herbert Croft, Bishop of Hereford, in his Naked Truth, says, (Scott’s Col. of Tr. vol. vii. p. 282:) “The gates of hell shall not prevail against the church. I grant, what’s this to a general council? Not the thousandth part of the clergy, not the thousandth part of the church, which in scripture is always put for the whole body of the faithful, though of late it be translated into quite another notion, and taken for the clergy only.”

“The church,” says the ever-memorable John Hales, (Tracts, Lond 1721, pp. 198 and 202,) “as it imports a visible company on earth, is nothing else but the company of professors of christianity, wheresoever dispersed in

the earth. To define it thus by monarchy, under one visible head, is of novelty crept up, since men began to change the spiritual kingdom of Christ to secular pride and tyranny; and a thing never heard of, either in the scriptures, or in the writings of the ancients. Government, whether by one or many, or howsoever, if it be one of the church’s contingent attributes, it is all; certainly, it is no necessary property, much less comes it into the definition and essence of it.” “To speak the truth at once; all these questions concerning the notes, the visibility, the government of the church, if we look upon the substance and nature of the church, they are merely idle and impertinent; if upon the end why learned men do handle them, it is nothing else but faction.” How beautifully does this stand out from the dark ground of the following picture: “Christians universally, for fifteen centuries, considered the priesthood, in the orders of bishops, priests and deacons, as one of the essential characteristics of the church; and considered the reception of the ordinances administered by this priesthood as the DIVINELY APPOINTED MODE OF ENTERING INTO COVENANT WITH GOD.” Bishop Hobart in Coll. of Essays on Episco. N. Y. 1806, Prf. p. 7.

“The church in scripture,” alluding at present to that particular meaning which bears upon our subject, “signifies the whole society of christians throughout the world, including all who profess their belief in Christ, and who are subject to lawful pastors,”—(as 1 Cor. x. 32: and xii. 28.) Such is the conclusion of Mr. Palmer, the most learned advocate of prelatic claims of the present times.¹ The characteristics of a true minister, as given in the divine word, are holiness of life, the call of God, and soundness of doctrine. The commission of the sacred office is to be addressed only to faithful men—who are competent to teach the true faith to others also. Those only, as was maintained by the Waldenses, “are the successors of the apostles who imitate their lives.”² Those only can be true, christian, and valid ministers of Jesus Christ, who have received a true call to the ministry. But he only is truly called, who gives sensible and credible evidence of possessing the qualifications laid down in scripture. They, therefore, who enter the ministry by simony,³ or in the known character of ignorant, immoral, or heretical men, never had any such call, and could not receive it from the ceremony of ordination, which is only efficacious in delegating any really official authority, WHERE SUCH INWARD FITNESS HAS BEEN CREDIBLY PROFESSED. Ordination implies, and proceeds upon the supposition of, this previous call. It is nothing more than a solemn recognition of it.⁴ All, therefore, who have been ordained without such call, were not ministers lawfully called. Their consecration was invalid in the courts of heaven, and a mockery. And thus, as we have before shown, is the whole line of prelatic successionists thrown into irreparable confusion.⁵

1) See Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 4.

2) See Schism, ch. vii. p. 36, &c. Note.

See also Gobat, in his Abyssinia, p. 146.

3) “Need I urge any proofs (Presb. Letters, pp. 254, 258,) that the popes practised simony without shame and without measure. Several of themselves bought the pontificate. Do you think the conscience of such worthies was so very delicate as not to permit them to make the most they could of their bargain? Would those who bought a bishopric, give away the bishoprics, which were at their disposal, for nothing? It is altogether unnecessary to produce particular examples of what all the world knows to have been practised generally,

without concealment or shame: I shall therefore mention only one *holy father*, who made the most of his *jus patronatus*, that could be made. It is Boniface IX. Of this man, who sat in the papal chair from 1389 to 1404, all the historians say, that he bestowed church preferments, as we bestow goods at an auction, on the highest bidder.”

4) See Powell on Ap. Succ. p. 132, &c. Mr Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 165, proves the necessity of such a call, and that the want of it alone disqualifies for the ministry. See page 168. See Note A.

5) See a full discussion of what is necessary to the being of the ministry in Baxter's True and Only Way of Concord, Lond. 1680, pt. ii. ch. v. p. 204, &c.

II. Having thus shown, positively, what is essential to the being of a christian church, both as it regards the church generally and its ministers specially, we will now proceed to show negatively, as far as is needful to our purpose, what is not essential to the being of a church.

1. We affirm, therefore, that unity of communion, or union in the same christian denomination, so as to be in subjection to any one earthly head, government, or discipline, is not essential to the being of a true christian church.

It is, indeed, asserted as a fundamental doctrine, that all churches and ministers not visibly within the pale of the prelacy, either Romish, Anglican, Greek, or Oriental, are by the very fact of their separation, cut off from these catholic churches, and totally excluded from the church of Christ. Now this doctrine we altogether reject, on the grounds already at length exhibited, and because it is alike contrary to the scriptures, to the best fathers, to the sentiments of the greatest divines of all ages and countries, to the facts of ecclesiastical history, and to the practice, and present character, of these churches themselves, which are not thus united; which acknowledge no common head or jurisdiction; which are, on the contrary, disunited, and excommunicated, the one by the other.¹

And here, if our premises are disputed, we “require” these anathematizing prelatists to define what is meant by fundamental, and to prove that their definition of the church, as including prelacy, is correct; and that all other definitions are incorrect. We next ask them to produce the *rule*, by which such fundamentals are to be ascertained, and to prove that rule, and to prove that all other rules are wrong.² When these requirements, which they themselves have instructed us to make, shall have been answered; and there shall be then left any re-

Ministers only essential as a means for the promulgation of the truth. See *Ad Pacem Eccl. Adhortatio* of Bishop Davenant, Cant. 1640, pp. 63, 64.

See “*A Treatise of the Church,*” &c., written by M. Bertrande de Loque, of Dolphinee; imprinted at London, 1581, ch. v. p. 24; where this point is well argued: in Old South Library.

Voetius gives nine reasons why a personal succession of pastors cannot be essential to the being of the church, in his *Desperata Causa Papatus*, Amst. 1635, lib. iii. § i. cap. ix.

There was a time when there were christian churches, which, as yet, had

no succession, and therefore succession cannot be essential to the being of a church. But there never was a time when true doctrine was not necessary, nor was there ever a church without it; and hence it is essential. And in like manner there was a period in the early history of the church, when, as our opponents allow, churches existed, and were organized without prelates, and hence prelates are not essential to the being of the church.

1) We propose a fuller investigation of this subject in an examination of the Notes or Notitia of the Church.

2) This is the course laid down in Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 127.

siduum of such prelatiic assumptions, to give uneasiness to the body of the christian church, it will be time enough to administer some corrective.

This doctrine of ecclesiastical unity, from which it is inferred that there cannot be in any one country or community, several different churches authorized by God and united to Christ — is the doctrine of the apostolical succession carried out, as is allowed, to one of its legitimate conclusions; and will further illustrate to you the exorbitant bigotry and intolerance of a system which would thus separate from the body of Christ every church in Charleston, and in these United States, except the protestant episcopal churches.¹ Having, therefore, overthrown the premises, upon which this conclusion rests, it is unnecessary to enter fully into an exposure of this most groundless and absurd inference from them. The glaring sophistry, with which the argument is conducted, will be apparent to any one who will attentively peruse any prelatiic treatise on the characteristic marks of the church of Christ.² The premises are laid down, as for instance, thus: All christians are united to Christ in one heavenly family. They are thus bound to cultivate towards each other a spirit of love, charity and kindness, and to render towards one another all offices of christian confraternity. The primitive churches, however divided by space, were united in heart, affection, and in coöperation for the spread of the gospel. This union is made an essential mark of Christ's church, and imperatively enjoined upon all Christ's disciples.

Such are the premises, in whose truth and importance we all concur, and whose necessity cannot, at this time, be too earnestly pleaded.

Now from these premises, two very different inferences may be deduced. The first, and which is the only one sanctioned by scripture, reason, or history, is, that however different churches may be separated from each other in regard to place, so long as these several churches hold the truth as it is in Jesus, they should be all united in love, charity, and mutual kindness, without any one church attempting a dominion over the faith of the others, or claiming over them any supremacy of right or prerogative. Thus would they keep the unity of the faith in the bonds of peace; thus would they be found helpers of each other's joy; and thus would they work together, as the different members of one body, of which Christ is the only Head, in fulfilling the purposes of his heavenly will.

The other inference which, with the greatest violence to all

1) Palmer, vol. i. p. 68, and pt. i. chap. iv.

2) e. g. Palmer, vol. i. p. 46, &c.

right reasoning, has been deduced from these premises, is, that, therefore, there is but one authorized body of which prelates are the exclusive governors, and in subjection to which alone, any covenanted salvation can be obtained. Of course separation from the prelacy is elevated to the sublimity of a schism against the body of Christ; — and is made to involve its guilty perpetrators in inexpiable and hopeless ruin. But for such a conclusion there is nothing whatever in the premises; — nothing in the Bible; nothing in the early history of the apostolic churches. It is a dogma, which owes its origin to the later fathers. It is the offspring of sacerdotal pride and ambition. It was cradled in the lap of a fast advancing corruption of christian doctrine and of order; — and matured under the fostering care of a remorseless spiritual despotism, of which this was the most destructive element — the mainspring of its whole machinery. The unity of the scriptures has no reference to mere external uniformity. It is a spiritual unity — binding together in one mass — the minds and hearts of all who, in every place, call upon the Lord Jesus Christ, both theirs and ours.¹ “The key to real unity, must be sought in the reply, which the New Testament gives to the questions already proposed. Who is a christian and what is the church? From this source, we learn that a christian is a spiritual man; and that the church of Christ is a spiritual institution. Hence the unity of the church is a spiritual unity. A christian is such from the *state of his mind and heart*. A christian church is a society composed of persons whose minds and hearts are spiritual. The true unity of the church, therefore, is not formal, geographical, political, or dependent on any human laws; it is a unity which has its seat in the minds and hearts of men. Its centre is CHRIST, the Head of the church. Its producing agent is the SPIRIT of God. It reigns through the medium of the TRUTH, received by faith. Its conservative principle is devotion. Its bond is the common sympathy of regenerate natures — the attraction of minds, kindred in moral tastes, purposes, and interests. Its spontaneous and proper manifestation is LOVE.”

This prelatie dogma of ecclesiastical unity — the real source and origin of almost all scriptural discord and division; and the guilty parent of the most enormous atrocities which have ever been perpetrated; as it is entirely without foundation in the word of God, so is it without sanction in the history of the primitive church. — It is not contained or implied, in any article of the most ancient extant creeds. This doctrine is contrary to

1) See this subject fully and scripturally discussed in three late treatises: Schism, by Dr. Hoppus;

Union, by Dr. Harris; and Unity and Schism, and also in Hind's Rise and Progr. vol. ii. p. 40.

the interpretation put upon that portion of what is commonly called the apostles' creed, which speaks of "the holy catholic church" — by the most ancient of the fathers, who understood by the term catholic, nothing more nor less, as Bishop Pearson shows, than "the whole or universal church." It is equally contrary to the interpretation given to this article of the creed by the later fathers, as this same learned prelate testifies; for they meant by it these four things: First, extension to, or universality, as embracing all men. Secondly, its communication of all that knowledge, which is essential to salvation. Thirdly, its requirement of spiritual obedience from all classes and conditions of men — and fourthly, the fact that to the church are given all graces, whereby all the diseases of the soul are healed.¹

And not only so, but as it regards the creed itself, it is also an unquestionable fact, that this part of the article was not found in the creed at all for some ages — it was first introduced by the Greek — "and was at last received by the Latin creed."² It is just as contrary to scripture, and to history, to allege that the fact of a church being separate in its ecclesiastical relations from another, or from the church of Rome, or the Church of England, convicts it of schism, or divides it from the communion of the church of Christ, "the whole body in heaven and on earth."³ On the contrary, we find no other bonds existing between the churches mentioned in the word of God, than union in truth — union in spirit — union in love — and in good works. That neighboring churches were united together under one presbyterial government is, we think, apparent on the face of the inspired record. But that the whole christian world was organized in

1) Pearson on the Creed, art. ix. p. 520, &c.

"When the fathers speak of the church, they mean not any particular church, but the whole body or church of christians, though divided into many nations or churches." Leslie's Short Method with the Romanists, p. 18.

"Therefore, the archetypal and truly catholic church in heaven, is that which is chiefly and principally meant by the holy catholic church, and the communion of saints in the creed. And there only is perfect unity." Ibid. p. 184.

See Jones of Nayland, lect. on Heb. iii. in Wks. vol. iv. p. 351, &c.

Archbishop Sharp thus defines the church, (Serin vol. vii. Oxf. Tr. vol. iii. p. 152.) "I say that church is always meant of the whole company of

christians dispersed over all the world, that profess the common faith, (though perhaps none of them without mixture of error,) and enjoy the administration of the word and sacrament, under their lawful pastors and governors: all these people, wherever they live, or by what name soever they call themselves, make up together that one body of Christ which we call the catholic church."

2) See authorities quoted in Pearson on the Creed, pp. 500, 513, 516.

The church in the creed refers to the invisible, the universal church, and not to any particular visible church.

3) Jackson's Wks. fol. vol. iii. pp. 821, 837, and 877; and see also lect. xvii.

one body, or considered itself — though one in doctrine, in spirit, in aim, and in hopes; — to be one in form, and order, and polity, and government, — is an absurdity too gross to be for a moment received.¹ There was a christian confederacy of independent bodies, but no consolidated union under one government.

We find Cyprian, one of the most lordly and prelatiſc of the fathers, — and who could fulminate as terribly against schism, as any modern *Jupiter tonens*, in unison with a whole council of African bishops, laying it down as a general rule, “that the people” (even without the authority of their pastors) who are obedient to the Lord’s commandments, and fear God, must separate from a sinful bishop.”² Now what could be more sinful than the usurpations of many of these same prelates. “Heretical bishops were usually,” Archbishop Potter says, “deserted by their flocks.”³ Irenæus affirms, “that we ought to separate from all such, and to adhere to those who faithfully keep the apostles’ doctrine.”⁴ The general council of Constantinople lays down this rule, “that whoever separates from such as publicly teach heresy in the church, even before they are synodically condemned, are not guilty of schism; but maintain the unity of the church from schisms by condemning, not a bishop, but a false bishop and a false teacher.” Such also were the views of the great council of Ephesus.⁵ In the sixth century, nine bishops in the north of Italy, rejected the communion of the Roman bishop, as an heretic, and denied that thereby they lost either communion with the church of Christ, or valid ordination.⁶

But there is no necessity for any further enforcement of this position. It is plain that there were seven apostolic churches in Asia Minor, which are each addressed in a separate epistle, as independent of the others. It is also granted by Burnet and Faber, that Christ’s promises are not confined to any locality, and therefore not to any particular church,⁷ to the exclusion of

1) See Hind’s Rise and Progress of Christ. vol. ii. Jackson’s Works, vol. iii. pp. 837 and 835, and King’s Primitive Christianity, ch. viii.

2) Cyprian Epist. p. 67.

3) Potter, p. 166.

4) Iren. lib. iv. cap. xlv.

5) Potter on Ch. Govt. p. 167.

6) Blair’s Waldenses, vol. i. pp. 93, 97.

7) This very argument we find employed by Dr. Barrow, in his Discourse on the Unity of the Church, which we had not seen when these remarks were written. After stating

that primitively each church was endowed with a perfect liberty and full authority, without dependence or subordination of others,” &c., he goes on to say, “This appeareth by the apostolical writings of St. Paul and St. John to single churches; wherein they are supposed able to exercise spiritual power for establishing decency, removing disorders, correcting offences, deciding causes,” &c. He refers to Rev. ii. and iii.; 1 Cor. xiv. 40; 1 Thess. v. 14; 1 Cor. v. 12, and vi. 1.

others. Of course unity cannot be determined by locality or by any external relations.¹ It is however sufficient to bring the objection to the force of an *argumentum ad absurdum*, in order at once to show that this doctrine being true, neither the Anglican nor the Romish church can sustain any pretensions to be true churches of Christ. For on this scheme, separation from the universal church is, as is allowed, destructive to the church-standing of the party separating, or separated. But both these churches are in a state of separation, the one from the other, and both from all the rest of the christian world. They are neither of them, except, in the most empty pretensions, catholic in the sense of being universal, but are both particular. They neither of them have any claim to unity either in doctrine or in polity; — but are divided from each other, and among themselves.² ON THEIR OWN PRINCIPLES, THEREFORE, THEY WOULD NEITHER OF THEM BE TRUE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST, AND COULD AFFORD TO THEIR FOLLOWERS NO CERTAINTY WHATEVER OF SALVATION.³ That the succession and communion, and unity of the Romish church has been frequently interrupted, so as to leave it, according to the prelatial canons of decision, deformed and lifeless, there can be no doubt. And although Dr. Hook, Mr. Palmer, and others, now stake the fortunes of the English church upon the fact that IT DID NOT SEPARATE FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME, yet we are bold to say this assertion can never be maintained, but is contrary to the most abundant evidence, as we have already fully shown. But in whatever way this question of fact may be determined, we are satisfied with the assurance, that by every just argument wherewith the arrogant assumptions of the Romish church are repelled by the Anglican hierarchy, the assumptions of both can be set aside by ourselves.⁴

But there is another ground upon which we may confidently build our conclusion. That the church catholic may be divided into portions, must be granted, or otherwise the succession of the prelate in this country must be abandoned. The union of those different churches which now constitute, by their adoption of the

1) Faber on Albigenses, pp. 10, 23, and 25, 23.

2) On the various sects in the Romish church, see Conder's View of All Religions, p. 6; Palmer on the Church, vol. i. pp. 239, 290; Edgar's Variations of Popery.

3) Speaking of the uncertainty in which this system rejoices, Pro-

fessor Powell says, (Tradition Unveiled, pp. 45 and 51,) "A frame of mind which seems to me, in one sense, the very essence of superstition; in another, betrays, to say the least, a singular accordance with rationalism or skepticism."

4) See e. g. Palmer, vol. i. pt. i. ch. iv. § iii. and vol. ii.

same government and discipline, the denomination of the prelacy, under the title of the Protestant Episcopal Church; this union was the act of man, and all its regulations the result of man's wisdom. The revolution, by severing the union between the colonial and the English churches, destroyed "the only bond of union they (i. e. the colonial churches) ever had; viz. the common, rulers, and the sacred laws."¹ "Their union was absolutely destroyed." "Testimony would seem to leave no doubt" of the fact, "that in each state the church considered itself an integral part of the church of Christ, perfectly independent in its government of any and every branch of the church in christendom."² This fact Dr. Hawks, in his view of the constitution of that church, fully confirms by an outline of the history of the rise, progress, and maturity of its present organization. The church, as it existed in each state, formally entered into this compact by its delegated representatives. They came together "as independent churches duly organized, and so considered each other." Thus we are informed, that "early in 1785, the clergy of South Carolina met, and agreed to send delegates to the next general meeting, but in complying with the invitation to coöperate in the measures necessary to effect a general union, they accompanied their compliance with an unequivocal proof of their sense of the independence of the South Carolina church, for they annexed to it an understanding that *no bishop* was to be settled in that state."

A general constitution, after having undergone much and repeated discussion, was "finally adopted on the 8th of August, 1789, and became the fundamental law of the protestant episcopal church in the United States. The work commenced at the first general meeting of episcopalians in October, 1784, was thus consummated in August 1789, and during the intervening period there was NO BOND holding the churches on this continent together, but the bond of a common faith."

If, therefore, UNION under one government and discipline, and the actual presence and enjoyment of the episcopate is essential to the being of a true church, certain it is, that BEFORE 1789, THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A PRELATIC CHURCH IN THIS COUNTRY, NOR IN THIS STATE; but only a number of separate and entirely independent communities. And since the present union of these communions under one general government is the result of human action, mutual consultation, and voluntary compact, so that while these several communions, under this consti-

1) Dr. Hawks's Constit. of Prot. Ep. Ch. in Ch. Record.

2) The great object he, Bishop White, "contemplated, was to procure

a union of all the episcopal churches in the United States, into one body or church only." Dr. Wilson's Mem. p. 97.

tution, surrendered certain rights previously enjoyed, they retained others which they still possess. Episcopalians, surely, ought to be, in all modesty, the last among all the churches in this country, to boast either of antiquity, succession, divine right, or the absolute necessity of a perfect UNION of all christian communions, in order to a perfect christian unity in the same common faith.¹

1) It is well known that the question of the introduction of an American episcopate, created one of the most lengthened and bitter controversies which has been carried on in this country; and that its introduction was equally and strenuously opposed both *within* and without the episcopal churches. On this subject we add the following references, from which may be gathered the views entertained of prelacy by our ancestors.

See a Letter to a Friend, containing Remarks on certain passages of a Sermon, by the Bishop of Landaff, by Charles Chauncy, D. D. Boston, 1767, pp. 56.

A Letter to the Right Rev. John Lord, Bishop of Landaff, by William Livingston, N. York, 1768, pp. 25.

A Letter to Dr. Bradbury Chandler, concerning an American Bishop, printed A. D. 1768.

An Address from the Clergy of N. York and N. Jersey to the Episcopalians in Virginia, occasioned by some late transactions in that Colony relative to an American Episcopate, New York, 1771, pp. 58. From this it appears, (p. 5,) that "some who call themselves, and more especially some of their clergy, publicly and formally protested against such an application; and most of all, that they have endeavored to vindicate this proceeding in terms which PLAINLY SHOW that they HAVE LITTLE, IF ANY, REVERENCE FOR THE EPISCOPAL ORDER." "Most of the members of the house of Burgesses, in Virginia, are professed episcopalians, that is, in the lowest sense of the word, friends to bishops. And yet these professed friends to bishops, have declared their abhorrence of them, unless at the distance of three thousand miles; calling the plan for introducing them in the most unexceptionable form, on this side of the Atlantic, a pernicious project." pp. 6, 7.

This controversy commenced in 1672, when a resolution was taken by the king in council to send a bishop to Virginia.

See the American Whig, being a collection of tracts on the subject of the residence of protestant bishops in the American colonies, New York, 1768, 2 vols.

See especially Dr. Chauncy's Remarks on Dr. Chandler's arguments, wherein the reasons for an American episcopate are shown to be insufficient, and the objections against it in full force. Boston, 1768, in Sprague's Coll. vol. 417.

That this opposition to the introduction of the episcopate into America, arose from "the dread of encroachments on the liberties of our citizens," is admitted by Bishop White, in "The Past and the Future," being his episcopal charge, published in Philad. 1834, (pp. 5 and 7,) where he states that "there was strong repugnancy against it in certain respectable members of our ministry."

See full on, in Dr. Hodge's Constit. Hist. Presb. Ch. part ii. p. 449, &c. How generally opposed, p. 454.

The preamble to the act by which the American bishops, Provost and White, were consecrated in England, shows how completely the election and consecration of English bishops are under the control of the crown. The preamble begins thus: "Whereas, by the laws of this realm, no person can be consecrated to the office of a bishop, *without* the king's license for his election to that office, and the royal mandate under the great seal for his confirmation and consecration, &c." So that the American episcopate is not less honored than the English, by tracing itself up in a direct descent to the kings and queens of England, to whose royal supremacy it owes its existence!

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO LECTURE TWENTIETH.

NOTE A.

THE NATURE OF ORDINATION.

We had designed here to give very full illustrations of the sentiments of the reformers and later divines on this subject. We have only room for a portion of our evidence. Wickliffe did not believe in the necessity of imposition of hands. According to Spalatinensis, a multitude of theologians have believed that imposition of hands is not essential to ordination. (De Rep. Eccl. l. 2, c. 4, Numb. 19, in Altare Damascenum, p. 174.) "At the famous conference at *Poissy*," (The Rights of the Chr. Ch. Lond., 1707, pp. 335 and 336.) "between papists and protestants, when want of a call and authority was objected to the reformed ministers, *Beza* declares "that to a legitimate call, imposition of hands was not necessary; but that the chief and substantial tokens thereof were a good life, sound doctrine, and election, (meaning of the people,) nor was it to be wondered at, if they had not received imposition of hands from them, whose corrupt life, superstition, and false doctrine they were to reprove. Or how could it be expected they should ever be allowed of by them, who were enemies to the truth they defended. And after the same manner does the excellent Monsieur *Claude*, and other Huguenot divines write."

"The reformed clergy had no notion that the ministers of Christ must receive their power and authority from antichrist; or that his holy church could not subsist otherwise than by virtue of a power derived from the man of sin, the son of perdition, who had been so frequently drunk with the blood of the saints. They thought that owning a character to be given them by the Beast, who pretended to give an indelible one, was too much like receiving his mark: and therefore that great apostle, *Luther*, proud of being degraded by the Romish church, absolutely disavows and disclaims all popish ordinations, and in his Treatise of the Ministry declares one ought to suffer any thing rather than be ordained by papists."

Dr. McCrie speaks of imposition of hands (Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 55) &c. as "certain external formalities which had been usual in the church, or which, in ordinary cases, may be observed with propriety in the installation of persons into sacred offices. These, as far as warranted by scripture, or conducive to the preservation of order, he (Knox) did not condemn; and his judgment respecting them may be learned from the early practice of the Scottish reformed church, in the organization of which he had so active a share. In common with all the original reformers, he rejected the necessity of episcopal ordination, as totally unauthorized by the laws of Christ; nor did he even regard the imposition of the hands of presbyters as a rite essential to the validity of orders, or of necessary observance in all circumstances of the church."

"But," says Dr. Mitchell, (Presb. Letters, p. 220,) "not only has imposition of hands been frequently dispensed with in practice: the doctrine of its indispensable necessity has not been the constant doctrine of the church. We learn from Fra Paolo, in his History of the Council of Trent, that Gregory IX.

calls imposition of hands a rite 'brought in,' in other words, 'a rite added to those institutions, which have the sanction of divine prescription : ' and he mentions, that the famous canonists, Hortiensis, Joannes, Andreas, Abbas, and others, affirm that the pope may ordain a priest with these words, 'be thou a priest.' He quotes also Innocent IV. the father of the canon law, and the best civilian of his age, as teaching, that, if the *forms* had not been *invented*, it had been sufficient if the ordainer had said, 'be thou a priest,' or some other words of the 'like import.' Fra Paolo opposes this doctrine, and I do not defend it. But it was at one period, the doctrine of the most learned canonists. And that the *practice* of the western church was suitable to it, while it was in vogue, is as probable, as that it was acted upon, in the middle of the third century, by such ecclesiastics as Phedimus, and Gregory of Neocesarea."

"The imposition of hands," says Selden, "upon the minister, when all is done, will be nothing but a designation of a person to this or that office in the church "Tis a ridiculous phrase that of the canonists, *conferre ordines*. 'Tis *cooptare aliquem in ordinem*, to make a man one of us, one of our number, one of our order."

Dr. Chauncy, (p. 49,) in his Dupleian lecture, also defines it thus: "This, the Dr. had told him was the design of ordination. Not for the ordainers, properly speaking, to authorize and empower them themselves, but to declare who the persons were that Christ's commission had empowered." Not to *make them officers*, as Mr. L. would have it: but "to give them an authentic character, as such, in the eye of the world."

As to the virtue attributed to the mere form of imposition of hands, there is no foundation for it in the word of God. The following remarks of the Rev. Mr. Gordon, (Inq. into the powers of Ecclesiastes, Edinb. 1808,) are conclusive. Of the deacons appointed by the apostles he says: "These public trustees did not receive their qualification from their ordination, nor one virtue of which they were not formerly possessed; but contrary-wise, they were appointed to this work, as being men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, and of wisdom. Their ordination, therefore, is to be considered only as a public and solemn declaration of their election. Nor doth it appear that the twelve ordained more in this or any other capacity. Their general commission included in it, no doubt, every measure necessary for the progress of christianity, and the edification of the churches. But what particular pastors they appointed, or with regard to what churches, we are entirely in the dark. The sacred writers furnish us with nothing on this subject."

So after examining other cases, he says, (p. 23, 24, 25,) "From all these it may be allowed that laying on of hands was a rite commonly used in ordaining to the ministerial office. But it ought *here* carefully to be observed, that there is nothing in this that renders it a rite peculiar to ministerial appointment. For it is affirmed that extraordinary gifts were conferred *without* this rite, and that they were communicated *by* it, not merely to the first ministers of religion, but to christians in general. Now, if extraordinary and miraculous powers were not confined to it, if this rite was commonly used in conferring these extraordinary powers on christians in general, I desire to know in what respect it can possibly be considered as characteristic of the ministerial office?"

"What we have here affirmed, and which, we apprehend, will serve to throw very considerable light upon this question, we shall now proceed to prove from the most decisive evidence. *First*, extraordinary gifts were communicated without imposition of hands. 'Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized in the name of Christ Jesus for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost — while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word; and they who believed were astonished, for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God.' *Secondly*, extraordinary gifts were communicated to christians in general by imposition of hands. 'Now, when the apostles had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet he had fallen

upon none of them: only they believed on the Lord Jesus; then laid they *their hands upon them*, and they received the Holy Ghost." "Supposing further, that all who were ordained to the ministerial office, were ordained by imposition of hands: Neither is there any thing characteristic here; since it will admit of no doubt, that this was a form used in communicating gifts of the Holy Ghost on many other occasions. We may, therefore, conclude, that there is not the least evidence in all the apostolic writings, that ordination, as implying the communication of certain spiritual gifts by imposition of hands, was a rite appropriated to the pastoral office, intended to render its ministrations valid, and to distinguish ecclesiastic officers from the body of christians by certain invisible powers."

So in replying to objections, he adds, (p. 29,) "In the *first* place, this objection goes entirely upon a mistake of the author's argument. He is not reasoning against *this* or *that* form of designation to the ministerial function. His reasoning is entirely levelled against this form as *necessary* and *essential* in itself; as necessary to constitute the ministerial character, as essential to the validity of ministerial acts; and, in this view, the whole of his argument points against the connexion between laying on of hands, and certain spiritual powers, supposed to be communicated by this external rite. Dissolve *this* connexion, in which the whole fascination of priestcraft lies, and he acknowledges, that imposition of hands is a very innocent ceremony."

See also Campbell's Lect. on Eccl. Hist., Lect. xi. pp. 192, 194, 199, 208. Dr. Rice in Evang. and Lit. Mag., vol. x. p. 92, &c.

NOTE B.

THAT in many cases separation from all connexion with other churches is necessary, and that in itself considered, separation is a different and distinct thing from schism, might, had we room, be abundantly shown from the opinions of many of the ablest writers. We add some references.

That mere separation will not infer schism, even Romanists must admit, (Palmer, vol. ii. p. 532.) "Who," says Dupin, "would dare to say that Athanasius and the rest were schismatics, and the Arians in the church, because Liberius admitted the latter to his communion, and rejected the former?" (See vol. i. p. 222)

Delahogue also says that "during forty years, (do. do.) of the great western schism, various competitors for the pontificate had their respective obediences; and each of them excommunicated those which did not adhere to them. But we have proved that none of those obediences were schismatical. Hence it is plain that Romanists cannot affix the charge of schism on any church merely from the fact of its not being in the Roman communion." (Delahogue, De Eccl. Christi, p. 393.)

The Reverend Mr. Hales, of Eaton, in his Sermon on Christ's Kingdom not of this World, says "After the revolt of Jeroboam and the ten tribes from the house of David, there were many devout and religious persons in Israel, and yet we find not that they used the outward form of worship which was commanded. Elias and Elisha, two great prophets in Israel, did they ever go up to Jerusalem to worship? Obadiah, a great courtier in King Ahab's court, and one that feared the Lord exceedingly; the seven thousands which bowed not their knees to Baal when they came up to the temple to offer? a thing which doubtless they would have done, if they had understood the commandment of God in that behalf to have been absolute."

See the question of separation fully discussed and the reformers vindicated, in Turretini Opera, tom. iv, "De Necessaria Seccessione nostra ab. Eccl. Rom." &c., and in Voetius passim.

A division of external communion does not necessarily imply schism. Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 73 and 84.

This is also allowed by Daille, as quoted by Stillingfleet in his Unreasonableness of Separation. See in Owen's Wks. vol. xx. p. 281; also by Stillingfleet himself in do. as quoted in do. p. 281. See this point largely argued in Dr. Stillingfleet's Irenic. part i. ch. iv. see pp. 115, 116, 124. Green in his

Unreasonableness of Separation, this author lays down three allowable causes of separation: 1, idolatrous worship; 2, false doctrine; and 3, the making of things indifferent necessary to salvation. See Owen's Answer to, in *Wks.* vol. xx, p. 313. Bingham shows it to be the sense of antiquity that no communion was to be held with a simoniacal bishop or with an intruder into another's diocese, nor with one who had fallen into heresy or idolatry, (*Antiq.* b. 16, ch. i. vol. vi. p. 31.)

See other illustrations, as given by Dr. Claggett, in *Notes of the Ch. Ex'd and Ref'd*, p. 177 and 178, 185, 109, and Bishop Hall, in *Works*, vol. ix. p. 388. See, also, Faber's *Vallenses and Albigenses*, p. 24; Jackson's *Works*, fol. vol. iii. pp. 818, 837, 85, and *Oxf. Tr.*, vol. i. pp. 92, 93; Palmer on the *Ch.*, vol. i., p. 32, and p. 51 and 78, 207, 79—89; Clarkson's *Prim. Episcop.* p. 221, &c.; *Anct. Christ.*, vol. i. p. 379; *Schism*, pp. 275, 292, 277, with authorities; Corbet on the *Church*, in *Remains*, Lond., 1684, pp. 22—24; Jackson's *Works*, fol. vol. iii., pp. 834, 837; Van Mildert's *Boyle Lectures*, vol. i., p. 285.

Owen constantly argues on this supposition. See especially his treatises on schism, in vol. xix. and xx.; also, Blair's *Wald.*, vol. i., pp. 90, 93, 97; Vidal's *Mosheim*, vol. i., pp. 116, &c.

The true church at Jerusalem, under Hadrian, seceded from the remaining church. See Vidal's *Mosheim*, vol. ii., p. 94.

Separation is justifiable when unchristian terms of communion are required. See Heber, in life of Taylor, *Works* of, vol. i., p. 184; see Matthew Henry's able Discourse on "Separation without Rebellion," in *Works*, Lond., 1830, p. 1137 and 1142.

Hence are the Puritans to be justified in their separation. "The only alternative (do. p. 202; see also p. 197) was submission to what they deemed unscriptural and pernicious. Hence the absurdity of the charge of schism, which has been so liberally preferred by the advocates of the church. It matters not, so far as this charge is concerned, whether the principles of the separatists were erroneous or true. They were bound to act upon them, and the attempt to prevent their doing so by deprivation and imprisonment constitutes the only schism of the case. The charge lies against the rulers of the church, and not against those who seceded from her. The former, by their tyrannical impositions, destroyed the unity of the church; while the latter, by refusing to submit to their pleasure, only performed an act of loyalty to Christ."

"In short, it is perfectly childish," says Dr. Price, (*Hist. of Prot. Non-conf.*, i., 202,) "to confound separation and schism. The former may not only be guiltless, but be eminently praiseworthy; while the latter is invariably criminal in its origin, and pernicious in its fruits." So, also, the Rev. Thomas Binney, (*Dissent not Schism*, in do. 203, Note,) "Schism, in fact, is a thing bad in itself; bad in its very nature: separation may be good or bad, according to circumstances. A schismatic is an epithet of criminality; it indicates the personal character of the individual, and it describes that character as bad. A separatist is merely a name of circumstance; in itself it is neither bad nor good; it indicates nothing as to the personal character of the individual, — it merely describes his position in relation to others. Schism can exist, as we have seen, where there is no separation, and separation itself is not necessarily schism; not necessarily so, for, while it may be occasioned by crime, it may be occasioned by virtue; it may result, in those who depart from intolerance attempted, or intolerance sustained, from the pride of faction, or the predominance of principle; attachment to party, or attachment to truth. A schismatic, in short, *must* be a sinner, on whichever side he stands; a separatist *may* be more sinned against than sinning." This distinction is clearly maintained by Chillingworth, and other protestant writers, in their controversy with the Romanists; and the principles which they so triumphantly advocated in behalf of protestantism, are equally applicable to the case before us. "Not protestants for rejecting," says Chillingworth, "but the church of Rome for imposing upon the faith of christians, doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for disturbing the church's peace, and dividing amity for such matters, is, in a high degree, presumptuous and schismatical."

LECTURE XXI.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION ASSERTED.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

HAVING exhibited the weakness of the prelatie doctrine of apostolical succession, when brought to the test of scripture, reason, history, or the judgment of some of the greatest divines; our present object is to ascertain wherein consists the essence of a true church. Our first inquiry was, what is essential to the being of a true church, generally considered? And this we found to be sound christian doctrine, — a lawful ministry — and the due administration of gospel ordinances. We were thus led to inquire, what is essential to the being of the church as it regards its ministers? The characteristics of a true minister, as given in the divine word, are holiness of life, the call of God, and soundness of doctrine. This call of God, which alone can qualify for the office of the ministry, and of which ordination is no more than the outward and solemn recognition, is evidenced by the possession of those qualifications necessary for this office, and by an earnest desire, wrought within the soul, to serve God in the gospel of his Son. This divine call is ratified ecclesiastically, when the individual professing it has been received, approved, and admitted into that office, in the hope and belief that he has been divinely called, by those to whom such authority is given in each particular denomination. But the entire authority of the ministry proceeds originally and essentially from the commission of its divine Head, and not from any earthly tribunal; and the personal fitness for it springs from this

inward and divine call, to which man can add nothing but the sanction of ecclesiastical order, and solemn attestation.

We then proceeded to show, in the second place, what is not essential to the being of a church; when we endeavored to demonstrate that union under one ecclesiastical government is not essential. There were in the beginning — there have been in every age — there are now — and there ever shall be — true and pure churches of Christ, which are constituent portions of the holy, catholic, and apostolic church, who owned, do own, and shall own, no subjection to any one supreme governing power. The mere fact of separation or independence, does not therefore invalidate the claims of any society to the denomination of a true church, or otherwise, there is no such thing as a true church on earth.

2. We will now, therefore, proceed to show, that uniformity in rites, ceremonies, or polity, is not essential to the constitution of a true church, nor to the scriptural unity of the church generally.

The word of God solemnly forbids any severance of the bonds of christian union, on account of diversities of views respecting rites and ceremonies. In some cases there appears unquestionably to have existed such differences in apostolical churches, as in those of Rome and Corinth, and yet they are required to receive one another as Christ had received them. This duty of mutual tolerance — this liberty which is the privilege of every christian, the apostle Paul proclaims and enforces at length, in the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, in his Epistles to the Corinthians, and indeed throughout all his writings. “Let no man judge you,” says he, “in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days. If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as the living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, after the doctrines and commandments of men?”¹

1) See Schism, chap. viii. and pt. ii. ch. ii. p. 326, &c. “In the days of the apostles, there were great errors and disorders in many particular churches organized by them. . . . But there was no breach of communion in the universal church. There was a general acknowledgment of brotherhood, and a communication both of spiritual and temporal benefits. It is not a rash conjecture, that the church at Corinth differed more from the church at Philippi, in mat-

ters connected with true godliness, than any two evangelical churches differ in this country.” Dr. Rice’s Magazine, (The Lit. and Evang. Mag.) vol. ix. 1826, p. 195. Essays on the Church. “The standard adopted by the presbyterian church does not own apostolical dignity in any officer now in the universal church. It is not thought that the *form* of administration is essential to the being of a church.” (Ibid, p. 132.)

There were at a very early period different congregations in the same city, as in Jerusalem, Corinth, Antioch, &c. and yet these were one. So were there different churches in different parts of the same country, and yet these were one. And so again were there churches in different countries, and yet were these one. It is also certain that these churches differed from each other in various points, and yet they remained one. Thus where there were both Jewish and Gentile converts in the same community, they either retained their different views, rites, and customs, (as it is known the Hebrew christians did theirs for a length of time,) while united in the same congregation, or they formed separate congregations, where each maintained their own customs; and yet did they preserve the bonds of peace and unity.¹

“It can be indisputably proved,” says the learned Mosheim, in his Commentaries, “that those of the christians who persisted in adhering to the observance of the law of Moses, did not separate themselves from the rest of the brethren, until Jerusalem, which had just begun to rise again from its ashes, was secondly, and finally, laid waste by the Romans, in the time of the Emperor Hadrian; and that it was upon their so separating themselves, and not before, that they came to be distinguished by the titles of Ebionites and Nazarenes, and were numbered amongst the corrupters of christianity. Previously to their acting thus, they were regarded by no one in any *other light than as true christians*. During the first century, they certainly had not, by any means, forfeited their claim to the title of brethren, although they had given proofs of weakness, and a want of further light. Heretics, it is true, they became, but this was at a subsequent period, when they refused any longer to hold fellowship with those who had discernment enough to perceive, that Christ had relieved the necks of even the Jews themselves from the yoke and burden of the law.”²

Indeed, this very case, of difference of customs in different churches, is provided for in the word of God, in reference to a point in which the subject-matter of division was, to say the very least, as important as those questions of polity which separate the reformed churches, and which are made excuses for

1) See Gieseler's Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 81; Clarkson's Primitive Episcopacy, pp. 78, 106-109; Vidal's Mosheim, vol. i. p. 288, et seq.; King's Primitive Church, p. 155.

2) Mr. Milman, in his recent History of Christianity, expresses him-

self as “confidently believing, that in Rome, as in Corinth, there were two communities, a Petrine and a Pauline, a Judaizing and a Hellenizing church.”

non-intercourse, alienation, and lordly claims to ascendancy and power. "Jewish converts," says the author of *Unity and Schism*, "were permitted to practise circumcision, and to observe other parts of the Mosaic law, so long as they did not attempt to enforce the observance of such things on their Gentile brethren; but the moment they did so, apostolic authority interposed; 'subjection' was not yielded, 'no, not for an hour.' In Paul's epistle to the churches of Galatia, we have an account of a case in which such an infringement of christian liberty was attempted, by 'false brethren unawares brought in.' 'However,' says the apostle, 'not even Titus, who was with me, though a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.' Those who attempted to enforce on their brethren, converted from among the Gentiles, the observance of the Mosaic ritual, received from the Spirit of God, by the mouth of Peter, this severe rebuke: 'Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?'"

"So long as circumcision, and other Jewish rites, were merely permitted, and while those who observed them, were regarded as 'weak in the faith,' as but imperfectly acquainted with the true genius of christianity, it was manifest to all, that 'in Christ Jesus circumcision availeth nothing;' confidence in external rites was discouraged — no ground was afforded it whereon to rest. But once let the observance of these rites have been enforced upon all, and they could have appeared unimportant no longer. Confidence would, in many cases, have been transferred from the atonement of Christ to them; the church would have been driven back on the 'beggarly elements;' and the distinctive spirituality of christianity destroyed. Accordingly, we find that the observance of Jewish rites, was conceded to the weakness and predilections of Jewish converts, *only so long as they did not esteem or inculcate them as possessed of any importance or efficacy under the christian dispensation.* Whenever any of them began so to regard or inculcate them, their observance was permitted to such no longer; it was declared, in their case, to be incompatible with the essence of christian character. The language of inspired authority to such was, 'I say unto you, if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man who is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law. Ye are fallen from grace. . . . for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by

love.' Those who evinced a disposition to attach importance to the observance of superseded ceremonies, necessarily brought into suspicion the genuineness of their faith. 'After that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain . . . I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you.' In accordance with this, we find that separation of Jewish from Gentile brethren, on account of differences subsisting between them regarding ceremonial observances, was emphatically condemned by the same apostle, not only as inimical to christian unity, but also as tending to the subversion of the gospel, by re-investing with importance such observances. 'When Peter came to Antioch,' says he, 'I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For, before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; inasmuch that Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter, before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed on Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law, shall no flesh be justified. . . . If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead is vain.'

That such diversities of forms, order, and ceremonies existed in the early as well as in the later churches, let the canons, decrees, and the various draughts of its worship and order, and all differing from one another, so that scarcely two writers can be found to coincide as to all important matters—let these bear witness. Let the differences between the churches of different countries, and between the same church, when viewed at different periods of time, bear witness.² Let the wide contrast between

1) See pp. 26 - 32.

2) Augustine, speaking of differences of rites, says, "there is nothing more becoming a dignified and pru-

dent christian, than to conform to the practice of that particular church, which he may happen to visit." Epist. 118, ad Januar. cap. ii.

the Oriental, Greek, Western, and Anglican churches, as now constituted and ordered, bear witness.

For many ages, we are well certified, there was no uniformity in the creeds adopted at pleasure by each church severally.¹ Each bishop was supreme in his own diocese, subject only to Christ, and, therefore, there could not two be found agreeing in the same order of public worship, or in the same prayers. Even after liturgies were introduced, which they were not generally for several centuries after Christ,² there was no uniformity among the churches even of the same state or kingdom.³ And so it was, also, with respect to other matters equally important, as in the administration of the sacraments.⁴

It is granted, that even after christendom had become perfectly prelatized, and squared down by pontifical rules, and sacerdotal measurement, so as to exhibit its regular compartments of parishes, dioceses, provinces, and patriarchates, yet "from the first there were portions of the christian world which were not included in any patriarchate, but were governed by themselves. Such were the churches of Cyprus, and such were the British churches. This need not here be proved; it is confessed by papists themselves." "The great council of the whole christian world assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431, and made the following decree: 'We, therefore, decree, that the prelates of the Cyprian churches shall be suffered without let or hindrance, to consecrate bishops by themselves; and, moreover, that *the same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces every where, so that no bishop shall interfere in another province, which has not,*

1) See the author's Tract on A Public Form of Christian Profession scriptural, reasonable, and in accordance with the practice of the primitive and other churches. Also Clarkson on the Liturgies, p. 100, &c.

2) The oldest reaches not beyond the fifth or fourth century, "and these are corrupted with false doctrine, and almost idol worship." Bishop Meade's Sermon for Bishop Elliott, p. 72.

3) See Clarkson, ut supra, and Bib. Repert. 1830, p. 400. There was no uniformity in the order of worship in Ireland until the time of Gillebertus and Malachias, in the twelfth century. Anselm tells us, (Collier, Eccl. Hist. fol. vol. i. pref. p. 11.) that at the instance and command of many of them, he had drawn up a form for divine service, and gone through all the offices of the church. That he engaged in this undertaking to put

an end to the different schismatical usages; that his design was to settle an uniformity of worship, and make all disagreeing compositions give way to the catholic and Roman office. For what looks more like indecency and schism than such foreign unressembling liturgies; where the diversities are so remarkable, that a priest, who is perfectly master of the service in one diocese, knows nothing of it in another?" As it regards the British churches, Mr. Palmer, in his Antiquities of the English Ritual, says, "As, however, each bishop had the power of making some improvements in the liturgy of his church, in process of time different customs arose, and several became so established as to receive the names of their respective churches." Vol. i. p. 186, 2nd edit. Oxf. 1836.

4) Clarkson, *ibid*, pp. 84, 82, 89.

from the very first, been under himself and his predecessors; and, further, that if any one has so encroached and tyrannized, he must relinquish his claim, that the canons of the fathers be not infringed, nor the priesthood be made an occasion and pretence for the pride of worldly power, nor the least portion of that freedom unawares be lost to us, which our Lord Jesus Christ, who bought the world's freedom, vouchsafed to us, when he shed his own blood. Wherefore it has seemed good to this holy oecumenical council, that *the rights of every province should be preserved pure and inviolate, which have always belonged to it, according to the usage which has ever obtained*; each metropolitan having full power to act according to all just precedents in security. And should any rule be adduced repugnant to this decree, it is hereby repealed.' ”¹

Such is the judgment of Sir Peter King, in his work on the Primitive Church,² as it regards the unity of the church. “Negatively, it consisted not in an uniformity of rites and customs; for every particular church was at liberty to follow its own proper usages. One church was not obliged to observe the rites of another, but every one followed its own peculiar custom. Thus with respect to their fast before *Easter*, there was a great diversity in the observation of it. In some churches they fasted one day, in others two, in some more, and in others forty hours; but yet they still retained peace and concord, the diversity of their customs commending the unity of their faith. So also the feast of *Easter* itself was variously celebrated. The Asiatic churches kept it on a distinct day from the Europeans, but yet still they retained peace and love, and for the diversity of such customs, none were ever cast out of the communion of the church. So likewise writes Firmilian, that in most provinces their rites were varied according to the diversities of names and places, and that for this no one ever departed from the peace and unity of the catholic church. So that the unity of the church universal consisted not in an uniformity of rites and usages. Neither in the next place did it consist in an unanimity of consent to the non-essential points of christianity, but every one was left to believe in those lesser matters as God should inform him. Therefore, Justin Martyr, speaking of those Jewish converts who had adhered to the Mosaical rites, says, that if they did this only through their weakness and imbecility, and did not persuade other christians to the observance of the same Judaical customs, that he would receive them into church-fellowship and communion.” “Whosoever imposed on particular churches the observance of the

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 93, 94.

2) Part i. pp. 154, 155.

former of these two things, or in particular persons the belief of the latter, they were esteemed not as preservers and maintainers, but as violators and breakers of the churches' unity and concord."

In confirmation of this opinion, Sir Peter King proceeds, in the second part of his work, to give examples. "Hence," says he,¹ "every church peaceably followed her own customs without obliging any other churches to observe the same; or being obliged by them to observe the rites that they used; yet still maintaining a loving correspondence and mutual concord, each with other; as Firmilian writes, that in most provinces many rites were varied according to the diversities of names and places; but yet, saith he, never any one for this broke the peace and unity of the church. One church or bishop did not in those days anathematize another for a disagreement in rites and customs; except when Victor, bishop of Rome, through his pride and tubulency, excommunicated the Asiatic bishops for their different observation of Easter from the church of Rome; which action of his was very ill resented by the other bishops of the christian churches, and condemned by them as alien from peace and unity, and contrary to that love and charity, which is the very soul and spirit of the gospel; even the bishops of his own party, that celebrated Easter on the same day that he did, censured his rashness and violence, as unchristian and uncharitable, and writ several letters, wherein they severely checked him, as Eusebius reports, in whose time they were extant, all which are now lost, except the fragment of an epistle, written by Irenæus, and other bishops of France, wherein they affirm, that Victor was in the right with respect to the time of Easter, that it ought to be celebrated, as he said, on the Lord's day, but that yet he had done very ill, to cut off from the unity of the church, those that observed otherwise; that it had never been known that any churches were excommunicated for a disagreement in rites, an instance of which there was not only in the time of Easter itself, but in the fast that preceded it; some fasted one day, others more, some forty hours; which variety of observations began not first in our age, but long before us, in the times of our ancestors, who yet preserved peace and unity amongst themselves, as we now do; for the diversity of fasts commended the unity of faith; and as for this controversy concerning the time of Easter, the bishops which governed the church of Rome before Soter, viz. Anicetus, Pius, Higinus, Telesphorus, and Xystus, they never celebrated it at the same time with the Asiatics, neither would they permit any of their people so to

1) Pt. ii. p. 207.

2) See p. 156, &c.

do ; but yet they were kind and peaceable to those who came to them from those parishes, where they did otherwise observe it, and never any for this cause were thrown out of the church ; even your predecessors, though they did not keep it, yet they sent the eucharist to those that did keep it ; and when in the times of Anicetus, blessed Polycarp came to Rome, and there were some controversies between them, they did not separate from one another, but still maintained peace and love ; and though Anicetus could never persuade Polycarp, nor Polycarp, Anicetus, to be of each other's mind, yet they communicated one with another ; and Anicetus, in honor to Polycarpus, permitted him to consecrate the sacrament in his church, and so they departed in mutual love and kindness ; and all the churches, whether observing or not observing the same day, remained peace and unity amongst themselves."

The same author further says : " A church collectively, or the majority of a church, with their bishop, could change their old customs, and introduce new ones, as was done in the affair of Easter, the Asiatics at length submitting to the Roman usage."²

Similar also are the conclusions of the learned author of that now rare work, " Primitive Episcopacy." " Hereby an account may be given of the great diversity of rites and usages in the ancient churches. A single congregation was a competent charge for a primitive bishop, so that episcopal churches were greatly multiplied ; each of such churches had power to govern and order itself, and so followed such orders as every church thought fit, without being obliged to conform to those of others. They had no rule nor order, in things of this nature, requiring invariable observance ; nor did they regard such uniformity, as others, many hundred years after, in ages as many times worse, seem fond of. None of those churches used the same prayers, nor the Lord's prayer, but only at the eucharist. All of them had not the same creed, nor used any of their public worship, but what was repeated by the catechumens at baptism. They had not the same rites in baptism, or the Lord's supper, nor the same way in confirming, marrying, or burying. They used not the same mode, either in reading the scriptures, or singing. They observed not the same methods in admitting members or preparing them for communion, neither in proceed-

1) Pt. ii. ch. vi. p. 212.

2) See also pt. i. ch. ix. § 2, and pt. i. ch. i. § 2.

3) The Rev. David Clarkson, of

Cambridge, Lond. 1688, pp. 221, 223. See also various authorities in his work on Liturgies, Lond. 1689, pp. 86 - 89.

ing to censures, nor reconciling penitents. They differed in their habits and postures. They varied in their fasts, both for time and manner. They observed not the same festivals; nor more, I think, than two of the many that are now observed; so very various were their usages in the primitive ages, each preferring their own and declining others. Such as this, and what might be showed in more instances, was the *uniformity* of the ancient churches. That which is now admired, appears hereby to be a mere novelty. How far were they from counting it worthy of christian pastors, to make this more their business, than the suppressing of sin, and promoting of real holiness? And who can believe, that they design or understand christian peace and unity, who hurry all into divisions and confusions, for haste after that which the best churches thought not worth looking after? Those that have read the ancients, and observed their usages, will question none of this, and so there is no need to bring particular authorities to confirm it, only this in general. In Egypt, Sozomen tells us, many cities and villages not only differed from the observances of Alexandria, and other towns in that country, but from all other churches besides. (Hist. l. 7, c. 19.) In Africa, Austin expresses the diversities to be innumerable, *Nec tamen omnia commemorari potuerint*, (Retract. l. 2, c. 20.) In other parts of the Latin church, Italy particularly, Innocent the First says, that several churches had their several modes of celebrating: *Diversè in diversis locis, vel ecclesiis obtineri, aut celebrari videntur*. (Epist. ad Decentium.) In the Greek church and elsewhere, Socrates gives a large account of their different rites and usages. (Hist. l. 5, c. κ. β., where, after abundance of instances, he says, to reckon up all, is not only difficult, but impossible, *εργῶδες μᾶλλον δε αδυνατον*. (See Sozomen, ubi supra.) And yet there was no hurt in all this, so long as there was an agreement in the faith, if we will believe one of the greatest prelates in the west, and that at no less than six hundred years distance from Christ, *in una fide nihil officii sanctæ ecclesiæ diversa consuetudo*, saith Gregory the first; *where there is one faith, it's no harm to the church if there be diversity of usages*; that is, the church has no harm for want of uniformity. Nay, the faith has advantage by difference in rites, says Irenæus to Victor, in Euseb. l. 5, c. κς η *διαφονια της νηστειας την ομοιαν της πιστεως συνιστησι*, a diversity in less matters commends the church, where there is an agreement in points of faith."

This sentiment of the early christian church, in reference to diversities of form and ceremonies, may be expressed in the famous declaration of Gregory, bishop of Rome, in his answer to

Augustine, whom he had sent on a mission to England, when he told him "he would have him use his liberty in making choice of what he saw best in the differing churches, and if he found any thing that was more pleasing to God than what was at Rome, to prefer that." For, says this same Gregory, "IN UNA FIDE, NIHIL EFFICIT SANCTÆ ECCLESİÆ DIVERSA CONSUETUDO;" that is, where there is one faith, there is no hurt to the church by diversity of usages. And thus, also, did Irenæus nobly affirm, *ubi spiritus, ibi ecclesia, et omnis gratia*; and again, he tells Victor, that their difference about fasting would only consolidate their unity in the faith.

That these were the views on which the churches of the reformation, and the fathers of the English church harmonized, has been already in part proved — and may be at once perceived by a reference to their confessions. We may be permitted to make a few quotations, in order to place this matter in a strong light.² "Let us remember," says Luther, "that all the rights and observances of all the churches, never have been or could be uniform and alike. For the circumstances and varieties of men, of places, and of times, do not permit it, only let the doctrine of faith and morals be preserved, for this ought to be the same as Paul often admonishes." "The truth and unity of the church," says the Helvetic confession, "consist not in ceremonies and external rites, but rather in the truth and unity of the catholic faith. Hence we read that among the ancients, there was a manifold diversity of rites; these being a matter of freedom, by which no one ever imagined that the unity of the church was dissolved." "For it is of little moment," say the Lutheran, Swiss, Calvinistic and Waldensian churches, in the synod of Sandomir, in 1570, when they drew up the Polish agreement, "what rites and ceremonies are employed, provided the fundamental doctrine of our faith and salvation be preserved entire and uncorrupt." Again, in 1614, at the general synod, held at Tonneins, a plan of union was proposed, which was to allow each of the churches to retain its independence, and its own order, and among the rest, as "not essential to salvation," "ceremonies and church government."³

Now that this, — which was the general doctrine of the reformed churches, — was also the received doctrine of the reformed church in England, has been already manifested in the proofs given of the fact that it has never, either in its articles,

1) See Euseb. l. v. c. xxiv.; Iren. to Victor.

2) See Lect. iii. p. 62, &c. and Harmony of the Confessions of the Ref. Churches, in which government,

form of worship, &c. are not ranked among essentials.

3) See quoted in Schism, p. 455, &c.

creed, homilies, liturgy, or other formularies, made those things by which it is distinguished — as isolated and peculiar amongst all the churches of the reformation — to be of divine right, at least in any such sense as to be essential to the being of a church, or to salvation.¹ We may make another selection, from that very early formulary already quoted, and which was authorized by Henry VIII. and all the bishops.² “The unity, therefore, of the church, is not conserved by the bishops of Rome’s authority or doctrine; but the unity of the catholic church, which all christian men in this article do profess, is conserved and kept by the help and assistance of the Holy Spirit of God, in retaining and maintaining of such doctrine and profession of christian faith, and true observance of the same, as is taught by the scripture and the doctrine apostolic. And particular churches ought not in the said doctrine so accepted and allowed, to vary one from another for any lucre, arrogance, or any other worldly affection, but inviolably to observe the same, so that by reason of that doctrine each church that teacheth the same may be worthily called (as it is indeed) an apostolic church, that is to say, following such teaching as the apostles preached, with ministration of such sacraments as be approved by the same.”

“And this unity of the holy church of Christ is not divided by distance of place, nor by diversity of traditions and ceremonies diversely observed in divers churches, for good order of the same. For the church of Corinth, and of Ephese, were one church in God, though the one were far distant in place from the other: and though also in traditions, opinions and policies, there was some diversity among them, likewise as the Church of England, Spain, Italy, and Poole, be not separate from the unity, but be one church in God, notwithstanding that among them there is great distance of place, diversity of traditions, not in all things unity of opinions, alteration in rites, ceremonies and ordinances, or estimation of the same, as one church peradventure doth esteem their rites, traditions, laws, ordinances, and ceremonies, to be of more virtue and efficacy than another church doth esteem the same. As the church of Rome doth affirm certain of their laws and ordinances to be of such estimation that they be of equal force with the word of God, and that whosoever disobeyeth or transgresseth the same committeth deadly sin; yet we perceiving the same to be discrepant from the truth of scripture, must needs therein dissent from them. But such diversity in opinions, and other outward manners and customs of policy,

1) See Lect. iii. p. 63, and Lect. xvi. *passim*.

2) Erudition for any Christ. Man.

or Form. of Faith in reign of Henry VIII. Oxf. 1823, p. 46.

doth not dissolve and break the unity which is in one God, one faith, one doctrine of Christ and his sacraments, preserved and kept in these several churches, without any superiority or pre-eminence, that one church by God's law may or ought to challenge over another."

"And therefore the church of Rome, being but a several church, challenging that name of *catholic* above all other, doeth great wrong to all other churches, and doeth only by force and maintenance support an unjust usurpation; for that church hath no more right to that name than the church of France, Spain, England, or Portugal, which be justly called catholic churches, in that they do profess, consent, and agree in one unity of true faith with other catholic churches. This usurpation, before rehearsed, well considered, it may appear, that the bishop of Rome doeth contrary to God's law in challenging superiority and pre-eminence by a cloak of God's law over all. And yet to make an appearance that it should be so, he hath and doth, wrest scriptures for that purpose contrary both to the true meaning of the same, and the interpretation of ancient doctors of the church; so that by that challenge he would not do wrong only to this church of England, but also to all other churches, in claiming this superiority without any authority by God so to him given; for God by his goodness hath called indifferently and equally all such churches in sundry places, as his high wisdom hath thought good to assemble and call unto him."

"It is to be noted, that this church of England, and other known particular churches, in which Christ's name is truly honored, called on, and professed in faith and baptism, be members of the whole catholic church, and each of them by himself is also worthily called a catholic church, when they merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to the scripture and the apostolic doctrine. And so every man ought to honor, give credence, and to follow the particular church of that region so ordered, (as afore,) wherein he is born or inhabiteth."

The ground so elaborately defended by the celebrated Hooker, in his ever-famous work, the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, however objectionable in many points it may be, yet most fully sustains this position we are maintaining. Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*, has thus carefully deduced Hooker's first six propositions.¹

"That though the holy scriptures are a perfect standard of doctrine, they are not, therefore, of discipline or government; nor is the practice of the apostles an invariable rule or law to the

1) See ch. viii vol. i. p. 446.

church in succeeding ages, because they acted according to the circumstances of the church in its infant and persecuted state ; neither are the scriptures a rule of human actions, so far as that whatsoever we do in matters of religion without their express direction or warrant, is sin, but many things are left indifferent : the church is a society like others, invested with powers to make what laws she apprehends reasonable, decent, or necessary, for her well-being and government, provided they do not interfere with or contradict the laws and commandments of holy scripture : where the scripture is silent, human authority may interpose ; we must then have recourse to the reason of things and the rights of society. It follows from hence that the church is at liberty to appoint ceremonies and establish order within the limits above mentioned.”¹

Similar is the judgment given even by the ultramontaine di-

1) “But we must note,” says Hooker, (Eccles. Pol. b. iii. Sect. ii. and § i. iv. pp. 207, 205, 210.) “that he which affirmeth speech to be necessary amongst all men throughout the world, doth not thereby import that all men must necessarily speak one kind of language ; even so the necessity of polity and regiment in all churches may be held without holding any one certain form to be necessary in them all.”

“In which consideration, as the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names ; so the catholic church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct societies, every of which is termed a church within itself.”

“We teach, that whatsoever is unto salvation termed *necessary* by way of excellency ; whatsoever it standeth all men upon to know or to do, that they may be saved ; whatsoever there is whereof it may truly be said, This not to believe is eternal death and damnation ; or, This every soul that will live, must duly observe ; of which sort the articles of christian faith, and the sacraments of the church of Christ are ; all such things, if scripture did not comprehend, the church of God should not be able to measure out the length and the breadth of that way, wherein forever she is to walk ; heretics and schismatics never ceasing, some to abridge, some to enlarge, all to pervert and obscure, the same. But as for those things that are accessory

hereunto, those things that so belong to the way of salvation as to alter them, is no otherwise to change that way, than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof ; which, be it laid with gravel, or set with grass, or paved with stone, remaineth still the same path ; in such things, because discretion may teach the church what is convenient, we hold not the church further tied herein unto scripture, than that against scripture nothing be admitted in the church, lest that path which ought always to be kept even, do thereby come to be overgrown with brambles and thorns. If this be unsound, wherein doth the point of unsoundness lie ? It is not, that we make some things *necessary*, some things *accessory* and appendant only ; for our Lord and Saviour himself doth make that difference, by terming judgment, and mercy, and fidelity, with other things of like nature, ‘the greater and weightier matters of the law.’ Is it, then, in that we account ceremonies, (wherein we do not comprise sacraments, or any other the like substantial duties in the exercise of religion, but only such external rites as are usually annexed unto church-actions,) is it an oversight, that we reckon these things and matters of GOVERNMENT in the number of things accessory, not things necessary in such sort as has been declared ? Let them, which, therefore, think us blameable, consider well their own words.”

vinces of the present Oxford school. They do not build upon "episcopacy," which they regard as "but an accident;"¹ but solely upon that "ministerial succession," "to their ministerial office," "by appointment of the apostles," "every link in the chain of which is known from St. Peter to our present metropolitans."² These are their words: "We need not deny to the church the abstract right (however we may question the propriety) of altering its own constitution. It is not merely because episcopacy is a better or more scriptural form than presbyterianism, (true as this may be in itself,) that episcopalians are right, and presbyterians are wrong; but because the presbyterian ministers have assumed a power which was never intrusted to them. They have presumed to exercise the power of ordination, and to perpetuate a succession of ministers, without having received a commission to do so."

So also in describing wherein the unity of the church consists, there is nothing in their language, when properly understood, which does not fully harmonize with the doctrine here maintained.³ "In like manner the christian church was, in the beginning, set up in unity; unity of doctrine, or truth, unity of discipline, or catholicism, unity of heart, or charity. In spite of the heresies which then disturbed the repose of christians, consider the evidences, which present themselves in ecclesiastical history, of their firm endurance of persecution, their tender regard for the members of Christ, however widely removed by place and language, their self-denying liberality in supplying their wants, the close correspondence of all parts of the body catholic, as though it were but one family, their profound reverential spirit towards sacred things, the majesty of their religious services, and the noble strictness of their life and conversation. Here we see the 'rod' of the priesthood, budding forth with fresh life; the 'manna' of the christian ordinances uncorrupted; the 'oracle' of tradition fresh from the breasts of the apostles; the 'law' written in its purity on 'the fleshly tables of the heart;' the 'shekinah,' which a multitude of martyrs, saints, confessors, and gifted teachers, poured throughout the temple. But where is our unity now? our ministrations of self-denying love? our prodigality of pious and charitable works? our resolute resistance of evil? We are reformed; we have come out of Babylon and have rebuilt our church; but it is Ichabod; 'the glory is departed from Israel.'"

We shall only further refer to the testimony of Archbishop

1) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. p. 44.

2) Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 44, 45.

3) Ibid, pp. 240, 241.

Potter, as given in that work of his, which is considered the palladium of prelatie rights.¹

To show the conclusiveness of this position, in regard to the established opinion of the English church, so far as it bears on our present inquiry, and as it affects the question of episcopacy, we must observe that episcopacy is not only "an accident," as the Oxford tractators describe it, but that "confirmation, ordination, episcopacy," &c. are enumerated by Mr. Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church*, as among the rites of the church.²

We are aware that there are other marks whereby it is alleged a true church must be distinguished; as antiquity, sanctity, multitude, and even miracles; but at present, it will be sufficient to say of them, as Archbishop Usher has said, "either they are accidental, and in a great part separable, or utterly impertinent, and forged for the upholding of the Romish synagogue," — and that it is our bounden duty to separate from whatever church is "apparently separate from Christ, in respect either of manners, doctrine, or form of public worship."³

We have thus, my brethren, endeavored to conduct you through the intricacies of this perplexing question, which has indeed been purposely obscured, in order more entirely to subjugate the people to the authority and government of the church; that is, to the prelatie order in the church.

We have shown you first, what is essential to the being, and of course to the continuance, of a true church of Jesus Christ; and secondly what is not thus essential either to the existence or succession of such a church. Wherever we can discover the one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, of the scriptures — wherever there is the acknowledgment and profession of the one, true, and adorable Redeemer, and of the great cardinal doctrines of his glorious gospel of grace and mercy — wherever there is a due celebration of his ordinances, whereof baptism is the initiation — there is a true church of Christ — a limb, a member of that one

1) Potter on Church Government, pp. 231, 233. "There are, indeed," says Archbishop Potter, "standing and perpetual laws in the church, like the charters of corporations, which can receive no addition or diminution from any authority, but that which first gave them force; such are the articles of faith, and the moral duties of christianity, as was before observed. But, then, in determining matters of order and decency, which never were, or can be fixed by constant and invariable rules, no reason can be given why the church

should not have the same authority which was exercised by all societies whatever." "In the next ages after the apostles, we find different rules and customs in different churches; which is a proof, that the apostles did not institute these customs by any express precepts from God, for then they would have been more uniform, but followed their own judgment and inclination."

2) Vol. ii. p. 71.

3) *The Sum and Substance of the Christian Religion*, pp. 376, 377, Lond. 1677.

body of which Christ is head. Agreement in these particulars, and such an agreement carried out in the spirit of love, and kindness, and mutual charity — this is the true unity of the church. The denial or rejection of any one or all of these, or the enforcement of any other matters, as articles of belief, or as fundamentals in religion, and as thus necessary to communion with the holy catholic church ; this is schism, and they who are thus guilty, are schismatics. Resistance to all such, whether Romanists, Anglican, Greek or Oriental, is a christian duty ; and the only way to preserve charity, and deliver the universal church from the bondage of an intolerant and schismatic despotism.

We are not to look for the church — “the Lamb’s bride” — by any geographical chart, as if circumscribed by any local or territorial limits. We are not to seek for her historically, as if her march could be tracked by the steppings of a stately prelacy, moving on in an unbroken line of hereditary dignitaries. We are not to seek for her nationally, as if she were wedded to any earthly potentate or power. Neither are we to search for her outwardly, as if her nature consisted in any external ceremonies ; in pomp of service ; in solemnity of ritual ; or orders of attendant ministries ; or in the trappings of any showy and beloved drapery. Would we find this heavenly visitant — this angel of the covenant — this kingdom of heaven — this divine ark — this true tabernacle and temple not made with hands — then, my brethren, we must seek for her spiritually. We must first learn that she is not of this world ; neither earthly nor sensual, nor accordant to the fashion and the pride of carnal and vain man ; but that she is from heaven, like heaven, and designed to fit men for heaven. It is not by the outward architecture, or the inward garniture, nor by the wealth and worldly honor and fashion of any church we are to adjudge its claims. These are not of the Father, but of the world. We must pass within. We must learn what are the spiritualities of the place — the doctrine — the spirit, and the worship, — before we can pronounce upon her character. That no one form of mere church polity, is so essentially connected with the being of a true church, as not to be separable from it, is manifest from this single fact, that every one of them — not even excepting presbytery, which is, as we think, the best and purest and most apostolic of them all — has been found associated with forms of error and heresy ; and that the truth of God has been found embosomed in every one of them. “That christian men,” says Dr. Cook, of Ireland, “should look deeper than outward forms of church government, may be rendered evident from the fact, that every possible form of church government either is, or has

been, the vehicle of error or patron of apostacy. Shall we exclusively confine our admiration to presbytery, the parity of its ministers, and the simplicity of its rites; and, because in one place we find it the vehicle and defence of divine truth, shall we, therefore, pronounce it the certain and unquestionable mark of the only true church? Let us beware of such a rash conclusion; let us turn our eyes to another quarter, and we may, perchance, discover our all-admired presbytery a ready hiding-place for neology and infidelity, and opposing and denouncing 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' If we admire prelacy, and the splendid array of its many clerical orders; and if such an episcopacy we pronounce essential to a true church, and the necessary accompaniment of legitimate ordinances — let us examine it again, and we discover this very form adopted, in all its gorgeousness, to conceal the deformities of the great 'mother of harlots.' Or, if we admire independency, in which every christian assembly is considered a complete church in itself, without reference to the interference or authority of any other; and if we pronounce such a religious democracy the essential mark of the true church — let us turn our eyes to not a few churches, and observe how readily it adapts its forms to all the errors of the Socinian."

"The truth of the matter is this: — the mere outward form, its government, availeth nothing to prove that a church is a church of Christ. Presbytery in the church of Scotland contains and exhibits 'the glorious gospel of the blessed God,' while presbytery in Geneva retains scarcely a spark of its heavenly light. Prelacy in England has retained and announced the truth, in the doctrinal articles of the national establishment, and fostered and accoutred many a noble champion for the 'help of the Lord against the mighty;' while prelacy in Rome has 'made void the word of God,' by the adoption of vain 'traditions,' and stained red her hands in the blood of the saints of God. Independency, in many places, has likewise appeared as an advocate for the truth as it is in Jesus; but none can be blind to the fact, that in England it has often become the hot-bed of the most pestiferous errors."

What is a church, as distinguished from all other societies, but a society of men professing their belief in the doctrines of christianity? The possession of that faith, therefore, must be the essential mark whereby any such church may be known to be such. Without this faith, a mere association of men is not a

1) Miss. Sermons and Speeches Belfast, 1834; p. 27. See also Dr. by Ministers of the Synod of Ulster, Mason's Wks. vol. iii. pp. 30, 31.

christian church, while with this faith it is; and thus is the faith held forth by any such society, the characteristic feature whereby its christian character can be truly determined.

A succession in the true doctrine is therefore the one—great—and final rule by which to admeasure the respective claims of them who say they are the churches of Christ. Where there is truth of doctrine, there may we make a safe entrance on the way to heaven. Where there is truth of doctrine, and purity of discipline and order, there will the church not only subsist and continue, but increase and multiply—and go on conquering and to conquer. Piety may co-exist with great defects in church polity;—but not with the want of substantial verity. And yet, progressive advancement will characterize the church just in proportion to the union within her of purity of doctrine, and apostolicity of practice.

As the mark of the beast—and the sure token of antichrist in every form, is false doctrine;—so the one essential way-mark to him who would find the true church of Christ, is the truth as it is in Jesus. If there is any one point made clear in the word of God, it is this. “To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world,” says the glorious Founder of the church, “that I should bear witness unto the truth.” His promise to his disciples is, “ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;” for “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth.” The commission of its ministers is, to “go and teach all nations whatsoever Christ has commanded.” The church is “the pillar and ground of the truth.” In this “one faith,”—“ONCE delivered,” she is “to stand fast,”—“to be established,” and for it she is “to contend earnestly” “resisting even unto blood.” Heresy, in the denial of this truth, in its essential doctrines,—this is what is represented as excluding from salvation. “He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.” “Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel, (i. e. by perverting it,) let him be anathema.” To deny the Lord that bought us, is “a damnable heresy.” (2 Pet. ii. 1.) They “that confess not Christ”—“they that deny the Father or the Son,”—they are “antichrists.” (2 John vii.) These, and a thousand other passages, in every page of the New Testament, make it indisputably clear that the truth it reveals is the burden and the glory of the church, since God sanctifies “through the truth.”¹

1) See 2 Tim. ii. 2, 24, 25; 2 Tim. i. 13; 1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. i. 15, 16; Eph. iv. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. iv. 13; Col. ii. 19; Rom. xii. 6; Gal.

vi. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 2; Gal. vi. 14; Acts iv. 12. See Acts ii. 42; John x. 27, 28; Eph. ii. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

In order, then, to discover the true church, it is not necessary to ascend to heaven and there examine its commission, and the charter of its privileges, and vested rights. — Neither is it necessary to descend to hell, to behold there the misery of them, who have become outcasts from her divine inheritance. But the talisman by which her virtues may be tested is nigh us, even within this sacred book; and guided by the teaching of God's promised Spirit, we cannot fail to discriminate and judge truly.

The principle that true doctrine and the true church are co-existent, which is thus, as we have seen, so constantly and so plainly insisted on in the word of God, has been acknowledged also by the whole church of Christ, from the very beginning until now. The only succession claimed by the early fathers, and upon which they challenged the scrutiny of their claims, to be members incorporate in the true body of Christ, was a succession, not in the divine right of a line of lordly prelates, but a succession in the truth. This constituted their *διαδοχαι*, or evidences of the genuineness of their faith and divinity. This succession in the faith, they did indeed prove, by their succession from the apostles, and their firm retention of the apostolic doctrines. But these doctrines alone constituted the *depositum* of which they boasted, and of which they felt that they were the sacred guardians. Thus speaks Tertullian:¹ “The apostles having obtained the power of the Holy Ghost, which was promised them, in order to work miracles, and to speak boldly, in all utterance; and having first borne their testimony to the faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judea, and planted churches there, went afterwards into other parts of the world, and published the same doctrine of the same faith to the Gentiles; and so proceeded to found churches in every city: from which afterwards other churches borrowed, and still continue to borrow the offshoots of their faith, and the seeds of their doctrine, that so they might become churches. And by this means they, also, are reputed apostolical, as being the offspring of the apostolical churches. Every kind of which must be accounted of according to its original. And therefore so many and great churches are nothing else but that primitive one, from which all the rest proceed. Thus they are all primitive, and all apostolical, whilst *they all agree in one and the same truth*; whilst there is amongst them a communication of peace, and an appellation of brotherhood, and a league of hospitality; which rights are no

1) De præscript. Heret. c. xx. See also quoted in the Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 378, 555, 556, and other similar quotations in Powell on Ap. Succ.

pp. 57, 49, and King's Prim. Ch. pt. ii. p. 202, and Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 159.

otherwise to be preserved inviolable, *than by an uniform delivery of the same doctrine.*" Again, he says, "Custom takes its rise from ignorance and simplicity, which by succession is corroborated into use, and so vindicated against the truth. But our Lord Christ hath called himself truth, and not custom; wherefore, if Christ was always, and before all, then truth was first and ancientest. It is not so much novelty as verity, that confutes heretics. Whatsoever is against truth is heresy, although it is an old custom."¹

Irenæus distinctly refers to the unity of the church's doctrines. Thus having recited a creed, or a short summary of the christian faith, not much unlike to the apostles' creed, he immediately adds, "the church having received this faith and doctrine, although dispersed through the whole world, diligently preserves it, as though she inhabited but one house, and accordingly she believes these things, as though she had but one soul and one heart, and consonantly preaches and teaches these things, as though she had but one mouth; for although there are various languages in the world, yet the doctrine is one and the same to all the creatures of God in the whole world: so the preaching of the word is a light that enlightens every where, and illuminates all men that would come to the knowledge of the truth."²

Again: Irenæus writes, that those that introduced new doctrines, did divide and separate the unity of the church.³

Clemens Alexandrinus says: "This unity of faith followeth the unity of origination, because the true faith is the true foundation."⁴

Lactantius says:⁵ "But because an assembly of heretics think themselves principally to be christians, and that theirs is the catholic church; we must know, that that is the true church, wherein there is confession and repentance, which wholesomely cures the sins and wounds, to which the frailty of the flesh is subject." He had just before said: "For when they are called Phrygians, or Novations, or Valentinians, or Marcionites, or Anthropians,

1) See Virg. Veland. in King, pt. ii. p. 202. That the *regula fidei* of Tertullian, like the *regula veritatis* of Irenæus, and the *κανων αληθειας* of Clement, have no other foundation, than Scripture, see Bp. Marsh's Lect. on Interpret. of Script. pp. 15, 16.

2) In King's Primit. Christ. pt. i. pp. 159, 160. See also as quoted in Palmer on the Church, ch. i. p. 31 and Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 54, 55, 149.

3) Adv. Hæres. lib. i. c. x. and lib. iii. Irenæus further speaks, (in Owen's Wks. vol. xix. p. 184,) "Indicabit omnes eos, qui sunt extra veritatem, id est. extra ecclesiam."

4) See Stromat. l. vii. c. xviii. in Pearson on Creed, p. 509, note, and see lib. ii. c. 12.

5) De vera Sap. l. iv. c. ult. See also in the Div. Right of the Min. pp. 101, 102, another.

or Arians, or the like, they cease to be christians, who, bearing the name of Christ, have assumed human and external appellations. The only catholic church, therefore, is that which retains true worship."

Justin Martyr teaches the same doctrine.¹ Having cited the words of Christ, "many false Christs and false apostles shall arise, and deceive many of the faithful;" he continues: "There are, therefore, and were, many who, going forth in the name of Christ, taught impious and blasphemous doctrines and practices, and we may call them by the name of those men from whom each doctrine or opinion arose. With none of them do we communicate, knowing them to be irreligious, impious, unrighteous, iniquitous, who, instead of venerating Jesus Christ, only profess him in name."

Irenæus relates² of the apostle John, that when he went to the bath at Ephesus, and beheld there Cerinthus, the heretic, he said: "Let us fly, lest it should fall upon us, for Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth is there."

Polycarp himself, when asked by the heretic Marcion, "whether he knew him," answered, "I know thee, the first-born of Satan." "So great care," says Irenæus,³ "had the apostles and their disciples not to communicate, even by words, with those who adulterated the truth; as Paul also said, 'a man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, reject, knowing that such a one is perverted and sinneth, being condemned by himself.'"

"He is indeed a deacon and minister of the divine will,"⁴ says Clemens of Alexandria, "and he is a presbyter of the church who does both practise and teach what our Lord has prescribed; not being reputed just, only because he is a presbyter; but chosen into the college of presbyters, because he was a just person: though such an one be not honored with the chief seat here on earth, he shall sit on one of the twenty-four thrones spoken of in John's Revelation, judging the people."

"The church," says Jobus Monachus,⁵ "is composed of those who believe in Christ." "The church," says Zonaras, "is the congregation *των πιστων* of believers."⁶ So, also, Cyril Alexandrius, and Critopolus in his confession of faith,⁶ the latter of whom says, "others define the church to be the congrega-

1) Dial cum Typho, p. 208, ed. 3d, in Palmer, vol. i. p. 95.

2) Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. iii. in Palmer, vol. i. p. 96.

3) In *ibid.*

4) Stromat. lib. vi. p. 667.

5) In Biblioth. Photii. cod. cxxii. in Suiceri. Thes. i. p. 1050.

6) Ad Can. st. Gaugr. p. 314, in *ibid.* and also ad Can 48, Carthag. p. 431.

tion of those only who are orthodox, and who are sound in every doctrine."¹ "The only union in the church," says Rufinus, who wrote a treatise on the creed, "is the unity of general belief."² Theophilus, of Antioch, describes churches as "congregations in which, as in secure island havens, the truth is taught where those who desire salvation take refuge."³ Ignatius says, "where Jesus Christ is, there is the church."⁴ "From all such," who have not the fear of God, says Irenæus, "we ought to depart, and to cleave to those who preserve, as we have said, the doctrine of the apostles, and along with their order of presbyters, maintain sound words."⁵

Cyprian is very strong:⁶ "If the channel becomes corrupted and leaky, so that the water does not flow constantly and regularly, it must be REPAIRED in order to the supply of water to the citizens coming down from the Fountain. This ought the ministers of God now to do, observing as THEIR RULE the divine precepts, that if any thing has tottered and shaken from the truth, it should be restored to the authority of Christ, the evangelists and the apostles; and all our proceedings are to take their RISE there, whence all order and divine authority rise. FOR CUSTOM WITHOUT TRUTH IS ONLY ANTIQUATED ERROR. Therefore, forsaking error, let us follow the truth, knowing that, as in Esdras's opinion, truth is victorious, so it is written, '*truth remains and prevails for ever, it lives and reigns through endless ages.*' Neither is there with truth any distinction or respect of persons, but only that which is just it ratifies; neither is there in the jurisdiction of truth any iniquity but the strength, and dominion, and the majesty and power, of all generations. Blessed be the God of truth! This truth Christ shows in the gospel, saying, 'I am the Truth.' Therefore, if we be in Christ and Christ in us; if we remain in the truth, and the truth abide in us, let us hold those things which are of the truth."

Firmilian writes, that at Rome, they did not observe the same day of Easter, nor many other customs which were practised at Jerusalem; and so, in most provinces, many rites were varied according to the diversities of names and places.⁷

Gregory Nazianzen is also very explicit,⁸ in his oration in

1) Suicer. Thes. ibid.

2) See synopsis of his sentiments in Blair's Waldenses, vol. i. p. 75.

3) Theophil. ad Autolyicum, lib. ii. p. 123, in Palmer, vol. i. p. 14.

4) Ep. to Smyrnians.

5) Adv. Hæres. lib. iv. c. 44.

6) Ep. 74, in Powell, p. 179. See

further in Div. Right of Min. pt. ii. p. 100.

7) Apud Cyprian, Ep. 75, § 5, in King, pt. ii. p. 205.

8) Athanasii Opera, vol. ii. App. edit. Paris, 1627, Orat. in Athian. Thus Gregory Nazianzen says, Το μέγ
γαρ σμολναιμον, και σμολναινον, &c.

praise of Athanasius. Speaking of his election as bishop of Alexandria to the chair of St. Mark the evangelist, who is supposed to have founded that church, he says, that Athanasius was “not less the successor of St. Mark’s piety than he was of his preëminence. For if,” says he, “you consider Athanasius only as one in the number of the bishops of Alexandria, he was the most remote from St. Mark; but if you regard his piety, you find him the very next to him. *This succession of piety* ought to be esteemed **THE TRUE SUCCESSION**. For he who maintains the *same* doctrine of *faith* is *partner* in the *same* chair; but he who defends a contrary doctrine, ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an *adversary* to it.”

“This man, indeed, may have a *nominal* succession, but the other has the *very thing itself*, **THE SUCCESSION IN DEED AND IN TRUTH**. Neither is he who *usurps* the chair by violent means, to be esteemed in the succession; but he who is pressed into the office; not he who *violates* all *law* in his *election*, but he who is elected in a manner consistent with the laws of the case; not he who holds *doctrines opposed* to what St. Mark taught, but he who is indued with the **SAME FAITH** as St. Mark. Except, indeed, you intend to maintain such a **SUCCESSION** as that of *sickness* succeeding to *health*; *light* succeeding to *darkness*; a *storm* to a *calm*; and *madness* succeeding to *soundness of mind*.”

The following testimony from Augustine is very decisive. “As if,” says he,¹ “antiquity, or ancient custom should carry it against the truth. Thus murderers, adulterers, and all wicked men may defend their crimes; for they are ancient practices, and began at the beginning of the world. Though from hence they ought rather to understand their error; because that which is reprehensible and filthy, is thereby proved to have been ill begun, &c.: nor can it be made honest and unprovable by having been done long ago.”

“But this is a part of the devil’s craft and subtilty,” as he excellently observes in the same place, “who, as he invented those false worships, and sprinkled some juggling tricks to draw men into them, so he took such course, that in process of time, the

“The one is of the same judgment with truth, and sits on the same throne, the other is of an opposing judgment, and sits on a rival throne; the one has the name, the other has the reality of succession.” St. Ambrose also observes: “He who has not the faith of Peter, inherits nothing from Peter, and vainly boasts of suc-

ceeding Peter.” *Cathedræ successio nihil successionis præter nomen habet, sed idem sentiendi successio veritatem inquit.* Gregor. Nazianz. in Math. 23, in *Tumet. Op. tom. iv. p. 217.*

1) *Qæst. ex. Vet. et Novo Tes. ii. 114, in Notes of the Ch.*

fallacy was commended, and the filthy invention was excused by being derived from *antiquity*; for by long custom that began not to seem filthy, which was so in itself. The irrational vulgar began to worship demons, or dead men, who appeared to them as if they had been gods; which worship being drawn down into custom of long continuance, thinks thereby to be defended, as if it were the truth of reason. Whereas, the reason of truth is not from *custom*, (which is from *antiquity*,) but from *God*; who is proved to be God, not by long continuance, (or antiquity,) but by eternity."

St. Ambrose says, "They have not the inheritance, and are not the successors of Peter, who have not Peter's faith." And again: "If any church rejects the faith, it cannot possess the foundation of apostolic doctrine. It must be, therefore, deserted. Thy Peter is Christ."

"The church is called one," says Jerome, "because of the unity of the faith."

But it is unnecessary to enlarge. It has been shown by Du Pin and others, that by that rock on which our Saviour was to build his church,³ "Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, Bede, Paulinus, Rabanus, Anselm, Lombard, Innocent III., &c, understand it to mean *our Lord himself*; and that the majority interpret it of *the true faith*. This, according to Natalis Alexander, is the doctrine of Hilary, Gregory, Nyssene Ambrose, Hilary the deacon, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenalis, Leo, Petrus Chrysologus, Theodoret, Eucherius, Felix III., Gregory

1) De Penitentia, lib. i. cap. vi.

2) In Luc. lib. ii. cap. ix.

3) Jerome in Ps. 24, 11.

See also Newman on Romanism, pp. 265, 266. So also Cassander, a learned Romish divine, holds this language: "For there is to be considered, as to the church, the head and the body. From the head, there is no departure but by doctrine disagreeable to Christ, the head. From the body, there is no departure by diversity of rites and opinions, but only by the defect of charity." See in Conder's View of all Religions, p. 9.

Jerome, as quoted in Dr. Barrow, (Hier. Ps. 132, in Barrow, vol. i. p. 771.) has this strong enunciation of the truth of our position. Catholicam facit simplex et verus intellectus, intelligere singulare, ac verissimum sacramentum, et unitas anemovum. Ecclesia non parietibus consistit sed in dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia sancta

corpus est Christi uno spiritio vivificata, unita fide una, et sanctificata." Hugo de Victoire de Sacrum. lib. ii.

"Anciently," says Knapp, (Theol. vol. ii. p. 489.) καθολικος was synonymous with ορθόδοξος, and *fides catholica* was the same as *fides orthodoxa*, which was the faith held in opposition to heretics; because it was supposed that the true faith, which accords with the will of Christ and the apostles, must be the universal faith of all christians, and be found in all the churches established by the apostles. Hence *ecclesia catholica* is that *quæ habet fidem sive veritatem catholicam*, i. e. the right and pure doctrine and constitution, in opposition to those churches which have not the pure apostolic doctrine, but belong to the heretics." That the succession of the fathers was a doctrinal succession. Turretini Opera, tom. iii. p. 32.

the Great, Bede, John Damascenus, Hadrian I., Druthmar, Jonas Aurelianensis, Hinemar, Nicholas I., John VIII., Theophanes, Theodorus, Abucara, Stephen VI., Odo Claniacensis, Rupert, Tuitensis, Innocent II., Hadrian IV., Urban III., Thomas Aquinas, Stephen, bishop of Paris, Alphonsus Tostatus, Clivovæcus, Eckius, Renetus Benedictus.”

This same principle, which is thus attested as true by such a cloud of witnesses among the fathers, is not less fully declared by later writers.¹ It was most strenuously urged by reformers generally.² And it has been the very stronghold in which the reformed churches have entrenched themselves, and by which they have been enabled to repel all the aggressive movements of the papacy. Nor has it ever been denied by any true protestant writer, that true doctrine is the grand feature by which a true church may be recognized,³ although there have been some, who, for the sake of better sustaining the fabric of the prelacy, have united with the Romanists in denying true doctrine to be necessary as a mark of Christ's church.⁴ These individuals, however, very consistently reject the title of protestant, and cast odium upon the glorious reformation.

To say that this principle, as being essential to the honor of God — the inspiration and glory of his word — the detection of all errorists — and the perpetuation of the church — has ever been maintained and defended by presbyterians, would be unnecessary to any who are at all acquainted with our principles. We will give but one or two examples, in addition to what have been already adduced.

The Rev. Richard Byfield,⁵ one of the Westminster divines, in his Treatise on the Church of Christ, thus lays down the infallible notes of a true visible church: “Wherever Jesus Christ is held for the foundation and corner-stone, and the doctrine of the prophets and apostles touching the faith of Jesus, and the commandments of God that concern holiness and righteousness, there is the true church.” (Eph. ii. 19, 20.) “Whatever soci-

1) See Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. pp. 26, 27.

2) Luther de Ecclesia, in Palmer i. p. 26; Calvin's Instit. lib. iv. c. i. § 7, 9, in vol. ii. pp. 220, 221; Harmony of Confessions of the Ch. &c. Genevan Conf. in Irving's Conf. of the Ch. of Scoll. p. 130; Hooper in Brit. Ref. vol. vii. p. 215, 218. Ridley in Letters of Martyrs, pp. 73, 74. See also in Schism, p. 485, 487, 488, 498, 492.

3) See Archbishop Usher, in his Sum and Subst. of Christ. Rel. pp.

375-377; Bp. Hall's Wks. vol. viii.; Jackson's Works, tom. iii. pages 876, 877, 878, 888; Pearson on the Creed, Art. ix. pp. 508-513, 527, 530; Oxf Tr. vol. i. pp. 96, 44; Burnet on 39th Art. pp. 233, 240, 241, 244. See Note A.

4) See Palmer on the Ch. vol. i. p. 243, note. Contrast, however, vol. ii. p. 110.

5) A Short Treatise on the Ch. of Chr. &c. Lond. 1653, 4to. pp. 28, 30.

ety of men, associating in a religious way, do hold Christ and the prophets and apostles' doctrine for faith and holiness, that society is a particular visible church." (Eph. ii. 22.)

"In whatever particular society religious, there is to be found all the furniture of the temple, (all the glory, the mercy-seat, the two altars, the table of shewbread, the candlestick, the laver,) that is, a true particular visible church—it is the temple of God, therefore the church of God. Who can deny that that is Zion, where it can be truly said, the tabernacle of God is with these men?"¹

Gerhard lays it down as the chief note of difference between an impostor and a truly called minister. "The first and chief rule of trial is, the harmony and agreement of the doctrines they preach with the doctrine of the scriptures. For our Saviour Christ, tells us, that false Christs should arise, and false propets, and should show great signs and wonders, inasmuch (if it were possible) they should deceive the very elect. And the apostle tells, that the coming of antichrist shall be after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders."

In the defence of the presbyterian ministers, against the charge of antichristianism, urged against them by the independents, Mr. Firmin, in his *Separation Examined*, thus defines antichristianism, and repels the accusation.² "But if you would know what is properly antichristianism, I pray take it from a far more able man than myself, one well known, and that deserves honor, Mr. Burroughs; he well observed, the

1) In the same work, the writer enumerates among those who defile the temple of God, "they that dischurch the true churches of Jesus Christ, because they are faulty in discipline, or in government, and chiefly to dischurch them when they thirst after, pray for, use all means God affords them for reformation."

"Like to these also are those that make up churches of those of their own opinion, and separate from others that do hold the unity of faith, and the rule of righteousness; but who can separate from those that are of the same faith, and not break fellowship with the Lord Jesus? Differences in opinions should not dissunder us in affections, much less make divisions, separate us into church-ways against church-ways; the same faith, and the same commandments for holiness should be more powerful to cement us in one church, than dif-

ference in opinions through petulancy to put every opinion into practice; note, this should be of force to loose us in the building, or lay us in a frame, whose cement and mortar, whose mould and fashion, is from a conspiring in an opinion; these conspiracies in opinion, joined with separation from other churches, that hold the faith of Jesus and the commandments of God, are no right gathering of churches; they are conventions, sinful, and schismatical, and unlawful, carnal, and proud separations; they that hold one faith ought in lowliness of mind and forbearance of one another, in love, to endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Eph. iv. 2, 3."

2) *Separation Examined*, &c. by G. Firmin, Min. of the Ch. in Shalford, Essex, Lond. 1652, and Burrough's *Expos. of Hos. b. i. p. 162*. See also pp. 8, 9, and dedication.

madness of people, that cry out against any thing that displeases them, that it is antichristianism, then sets down thus, wherein it consists :

1. Whosoever shall obtrude any doctrine upon the church, to be believed by their own authority.

2. The intrusion of such offices, and officers in the church, as merely belong to the spiritual man.

3. The imposing of any ordinance, or new institution, upon the church.

4. The imposing of laws to bind conscience, as the laws of Christ do."

The views of these non-conformists, as to the supreme importance of truth, and the comparative indifferency of mere polity or ceremonies, may be seen and read in the whole history of their struggles. It is, however, true, and to be admitted, that oftentimes there was manifested by them, in accordance with the spirit of the age, the most unworthy and contradictory notions, as it regards the toleration of separate and opposing sects. That this spirit, which was generated by the extraordinary circumstances in which they were called to act, was not, however, diffused through the entire body, nor inherited by their posterity, will appear from the following reply to this charge, as urged by Bishop Stillingfleet, from the sainted Howe.¹ "For the assembly," says Howe, "I think it fit those that survive of them should be as much concluded by what they then determined, as this reverend author by the Irenicum. But I know no reason that such as they never represented, nor who ever pretended to be of their party, should be concluded to the world's end. Nor do understand why even the same party may not be as well supposed in a possibility, to vary from itself in forty years, as the same man from himself in less than twenty. If they did incline to deal too hardly with their brethren, that will not justify them who deal more hardly. It is hoped such as have been so inclined have, being smitten, and having suffered the rebukes of the Almighty, repented it, and are become wiser; and when some think themselves grown wiser by prosperity, others by adversity, there is less reason to suspect the latter."²

1) See Wks. vol. iv. p. 433.

2) "Or do we think," says this same writer, (see Rogers' Life of Howe, p. 331.) "there is no difference to be put between controversies about matter of circumstance, and about the essentials of christianity." "As I often think of that saying of an ancient, Clement of Alexandria, that he

counted not that philosophy, which was peculiar to this or that sect, but whatsoever of truth was to be found in any of them; so I say of christianity, 't is not that which is appropriate to this or that party, but whatsoever of sincere religion shall be found common to them all."

We have thus, we trust, made it appear from scripture, and the testimony of the church at different periods, and from numerous divines, that neither unity of ecclesiastical relations, nor uniformity in ecclesiastical polity, rites, and ceremonies, are essential to the valid constitution of a true visible church of Christ, however such different forms may be believed to be more or less scriptural, and, therefore, more or less conducive to prosperity, edification, and success. It has also been shown wherein that unity, which is essential to the character of a true church, does positively consist. As it regards the church generally, that is a true, visible church of Christ, where there is found "a society of visible saints, and true ministers consenting together to worship God in his holy ordinances."¹ Here, to adopt the style of the logicians, here is the *material* cause of a church, to wit, visible saints, or such as make a credible profession of the truth as it is in Jesus. Here, also, is the *formal* cause of such a church; that is, their consenting to worship God according to his word, in the observance of all his ordinances. Wherever, therefore, there are such true believers, and such a union in heart and purpose, as far as they are not *necessarily* hindered by the powers that be, to set up and observe all God's holy ordinances, there are all the elements of a true church, which is the effect or necessary result of such a combination.

And, as to the ministers of the church, in order to constitute any individuals true ministers of Christ, they must, as the *efficient* cause, be called by the spirit of God, who alone hath supreme power to fit and qualify for this his own service. They must, also, as the *material* cause of the christian ministry, possess such qualifications as are sufficient to capacitate them for the discharge of its various functions, (2 Tim. ii. 2, *οιτινες ικανοι εσονται*.) There must be, also, as its *formal* cause, and orderly call or appointment by those in authority in the church; and there must be, as the *final* end or cause of such a ministry, and that for which the ministry is appointed and called of God, the preaching of the truth; for the work of the ministry is the perfecting of the saints, and the edifying of the body of Christ. Wherever these causes are found in combination, where there is a manifestation of real grace in the heart, and an experimental acquaintance with the working of God's spirit; where the truth of God, in all its holy mysteries, is received in the love of it, and proclaimed in the power of it; wherever individuals, with such qualifications, are chosen by any society of saints, and set

1) See Firman's Separation Examined, ut supra, p. 2. See also Burroughs on Hos. pp. 8, 1.

over them as their pastors or ministers, by such as have authority; and wherever God, by the communication of his most gracious influences, renders such a ministration the power of God to the salvation and edification of many souls; there do we find a true ministry, and there do we perceive a true, visible, and organized church of Jesus Christ. Let him that would deny this conclusion shrink from the guilt of blaspheming God's Holy Spirit; setting up human wisdom against the wisdom of God; and of making the word and the grace of God of none effect, by vain traditions.

We have also, at some length, proved, that the true doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ, as taught us in his word, is the front-mark, and most essential characteristic of a true church. That alone can be a safe and trustworthy building of God, which rests upon the doctrine of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

Now, by this test in particular, and by each of these tests, in all their severity, we are willing, as the presbyterian church, that our claims should be tried; and thus brought to a comparison with those of the Romish, the prelatic, or of any other denomination.

Let Rome boast of her miracles, which are but lying wonders wherewith she deceiveth the simple. — Let her boast of her unity, while she is riven asunder by schisms, jealousies, factions and adverse parties. Let her boast of her sanctity, while she is foul with the corrupting sores of infidelity, immorality, and vice. Let her boast of her antiquity, while she bears the marks of novelty and of nullity in all the dogmas, that are peculiar to her. Let her boast of her apostolic lineage and exclusive power, in which she is joined by the prelacy, and wherein she is a most manifest usurper of a throne and a dominion, never granted; and of which apostolicity she is a successor, neither by right nor in spirit, nor in fitness for the discharge of any of its peculiar offices.² We, on the contrary, rest our claims to the character of a true church, upon christian union with Christ our head, and with his body, the holy church universal throughout the world. We will boast of that true apostolicity and lineage divine — that sacred doctrine, to establish which Christ poured out his blood upon the cross, as our substitute and sacrifice; — and for which the whole company of apostles and martyrs counted not their lives dear to them, when sacrificed for this “testimony of Jesus.”

To use the language of John Leger, in his History of one branch

1) That the prelatic successionists have been treacherous to the truth, see Powell on Ap. Succ. pp. 144, 145, 148.

of our presbyterial and apostolic family, when he thus nobly vindicates their claims :—

“That man” says he, “would be undoubtedly ridiculous, who should wish to persuade poor people that they do not belong to the race of Adam, because it is impossible for them to show the tree of their genealogy, and by their continual succession from father to son, that they are really descended from him. And if from this he should infer either that they are fallen from the clouds, or that they are sprung up like mushrooms in a night, or that these are a new race of men, he would be set down for absurd more than for subtle. The reason is, because learning from the word of God that the whole human race is “of one blood,” and finding in them as in others the nature of humanity, we boldly conclude that they must proceed from the same stem. In like manner, because the holy scriptures declare that the true church is the same from the beginning of the world, and that all who hold the true faith which she teaches, are her legitimate children; the inhabitants of the valleys invincibly proving that they have always professed and still profess the same faith, are also without contradiction, the true succession of the church, not local or personal, but of the church of the faith and sound doctrine, as the Holy Ghost teaches that Abraham is ‘the father of them that believe,’ though they be ‘not circumcised.’ And in the words of Jesus, ‘whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.’ And again, ‘if ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.’ And as Gregory Nazianzen declares in his funeral oration over Athanasius, ‘all those who follow the faith of Abraham, are the children of Abraham.’”

“So long as the church of Rome retained the true faith, and true religion established by the holy apostles, without any necessity of having recourse to the proof of genealogies and of the succession of families, their disciples and successors through all Italy, nay, all the world, will acknowledge that each of the Italian churches, as Turin, Milan and Aquileia, has had from thence the succession of faith as well as the Roman church has had, and that they all remain united with Jesus Christ their only chief, and in union with one another. And so far was it from being their duty to devise any schism or separation, that the very thought of it would have been criminal.”

It has indeed been alleged by Mr. Keble, in his work on Tradition, that while true doctrine is a necessary mark of true apostolical succession, that yet “the treasure of sound doctrine was to be guarded by the grace of the apostolic succession,”¹ and that

“where the one, the succession fails, there, as this verse (2 Tim. i. 14) would lead us to expect, and all church history proves, the truth of doctrine is immediately in imminent jeopardy.”² “We are to look,” therefore, he adds, “before all things, to the integrity of a good deposit, the orthodox faith;” that is, “the creed of the apostolical church, guaranteed to us by holy scripture, and by consent of pure antiquity.”

Now, that “the treasure of sound doctrine” has been guarded by those who have received, as these divines imagine, “the grace of the apostolical succession,” we most peremptorily deny. The apostles themselves, until endowed with the Holy Spirit, and thus led into all truth, would have stood opposed to what, by that guidance, they were led to believe to be the true doctrine of Christ and of his church. And it will not be pretended that this inspiration of the Holy Ghost rests, and has ever rested, upon all the boasted successors of the apostles. Was not Judas one of the twelve, and an apostle? And Peter also, was not he an apostle, when he denied Christ and blasphemed, and when he violently resisted, in his blinded ignorance, the necessity of Christ’s sufferings and death? Was he not an apostle, when Paul withstood him to the face, as teaching that which was contrary to sound doctrine? Do not the apostles frequently admonish us concerning some who would arise, and who would claim to be apostles, but whose false doctrines would prove that they “were not?” Were not many of the earliest heretics, as far as ecclesiastical forms went, regular successors of the apostles? Did not many of the very churches established by the apostles themselves, and whose ministers were apostolically consecrated, become apostate, corrupt, and deny the faith, and thus hand down as the apostolic truth, the evil doctrines and commandments of men? Did not the early heretics generally rise up in the bosom the church, under the guardianship of this very grace of the succession, and in the full enjoyment of all its transmitted efficacy?

And was there not a time, when Athanasius was against the whole world, in maintaining the doctrines of the gospel, and when the “treasure of sound doctrine” was abandoned by the whole church, notwithstanding this grace of apostolical succession? Nay, what are we to think of the papacy itself, which has been brought forth, cradled, and matured, by this very grace of apostolical succession? What are we to think of the universal establishment of this antichristian system, under the guard, and by the instrumentality of this grace of apostolical succession, in England and in Ireland, and that for ages of darkness, impiety,

1) Keble on Tradit. p. 42.

2) Ibid, p. 44.

and crime? What are we to think of the monstrous errors, and idolatrous superstitions, and worse than heathen enormities, which have been fostered and sustained by the guardian care of this apostolic succession in the Greek and other oriental churches? With what ferocious zeal did this "grace" contend against the reformation of the church, and consign to miserable agonies the defenders of Christ and his gospel? And with what vigilant jealousy for the preservation of the truth as it is in Jesus, did this "grace of the apostolic succession" watch over it in England, during the reigns of the Charles's and of the James's, and until within a very recent period — when Arianism, Socinianism, perjury, infidelity, and the universal decay of moral virtue, were the characteristic traits of many of these apostolical successors!

With what arrogant effrontery does this writer challenge an examination into the merits of this doctrine of apostolical succession, on the ground of its preservation of "the treasure of sound doctrine." *Illi robur et æs triplex circa pectus erat.* The very reverse is true. These apostolical successors have been many of them graceless betrayers of their sacred trust; — perverters of the truth; — enemies of Christ by wicked works; — and the abettors of all that is heretical in doctrine, and immoral in practice.

Are we not now startled, as by a midnight cry of fire, or the sudden approach of an invading host, by the fact, that while these gracious apostolical successors are modestly claiming for themselves the exclusive possession of the Holy Ghost; and professing their adherence to the church of the reformation — TWO THOUSAND of the clergy in England are, at this moment, committed to a system of doctrine and of practice, which in the judgment of their brethren and of the Romanists themselves, is in no essential feature different from popery? Most justly, therefore, is this doctrine of prelatical succession found guilty of aiding, assisting, and abetting in a conspiracy against the truth and order of the gospel, in every period of the church.

And although we are denounced, by *these lovers of peace*, as "communities which deny what they believe to be fundamentals of the gospel of Christ;" — although our views are characterized as "the turbulent notions with which Calvin obscured the truth;" although the most calumnious vituperation is heaped upon the venerated names of Luther and of Calvin;¹ — yet do we challenge all the world to show that our doctrines and our polity are not according to the pattern laid down for us in the word of God, and the pure and uncorrupt teachings of his holy oracles. "To the law and to the testimony" — this is our appeal, and by this standard are we willing to be adjudged.

1) See Tract, No. 153, as above, at pp. 8, 10, 12, &c.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO LECTURE TWENTY-FIRST.

NOTE A.

TRUE DOCTRINE — THE TRUE SUCCESSION.

THAT the true doctrine is the true mark of a pure and safe church of Christ, we will further prove by some additional authorities:

“This hath ever been reckoned a most certain ground of principle in religion, that that church which maintaineth without error the faith of Christ, which holdeth the true doctrine of the Gospel in matters necessary to salvation, and preacheth the same, which retaineth the lawful use of those sacraments only which Christ hath appointed, and which appointeth vice to be punished, and virtue to be maintained, notwithstanding in some other respects, and in some points, it have many blemishes, imperfections, nay, divers and sundry errors, is yet to be acknowledged for the Mother of the Faithful, the House of God, the Ark of Noah, the Pillar of Truth, and the Spouse of Christ. From which church whosoever doth separate himself, he is to be reckoned a *schismatic or an heretic.*” — Archbp. Bancroft’s Serm. at Paul’s Cross.

“To this trial one will stand,” says Bp. Bull, in his Vindication of the Church of England, “let that church that most earnestly presseth this real piety, carry the bell, and be acknowledged for *the best church.*” — Oxf. edn. p. 6.

Bishop Heber, in his Life of Taylor, (Taylor’s Wks. vol. i. p. 183,) remarks, “In the first of these supposed consequences, Taylor assumes that ‘the government of the church is in *immediate* order to the good and benison of souls.’ But this is plainly untrue, since for this great end nothing more is *immediately* necessary, (speaking always in subordination to the merits and sacrifices of Christ,) but the sincere word of God, as delivered in scripture, to enlighten and establish our *faith*, and the means of *grace*, which are afforded us in baptism and the Lord’s supper. The government of the church is in *immediate* order to the faithful preaching of the truth and the decent and orderly ministration of the sacraments, but it is only through their means, and as a consequence of them, that it seeks the salvation of souls. It must rank, therefore, as Hooker wisely teaches, not among the points essential to salvation, but, ‘those things that are accessory hereunto, those things that so belong to the way of salvation, as to alter them, is no otherwise to change that way than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof, which, be it laid with gravel, or set with grass, or paved with stones, remaineth still the same path.’ Archbishop Whitgift himself speaks of ‘the doctrine established in the churches of England, which is the main note of the churches.’” (Stype’s Whitgift, i. 248, in Price’s Hist. Prot. Nonconf. vol. i. p. 333.)

Dr. Barrow, on the Unity of the Church, shows at length, that departure from the faith, *ipso facto*, cuts off from the Catholic church. (Wks. vol. i. p. 763.) See the testimonies of the English martyrs, Philpot, Bradford, in Fox and Willet, p. 83, Syn. Pap. See the testimonies of Huss, Barnard, Lambert, the forged Clementine Epistle, Pope Felix, and Petrum Antioch. Symmachus Decret. p. i. Barlaam, lib. de princip. c. xiii. &c. in Dr. Willet on

Syn. Pap. p. 167, 168, and others again at p. 83, where there are many. For this article, among others, Huss died, that the Pope was not a true successor of, but contrary in doctrine and life to, the apostles. (Ibid.)

"When the Apostles were removed, their writings were put in their place. The New Testament succeeded to the Apostolic administration." (Dr. Rice in *Evang. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 551.)

"The case," (ibid, p. 552,) he adds, "of ordinary ministers of the gospel is very different. They bring no new terms, they reveal no truths unknown before, they make no new discoveries in religion. But their simple business as preachers is, to assist their fellow-men in understanding the terms of salvation, and to persuade all men to embrace them as they are revealed in the gospel. — *The whole authority is lodged in the gospel as a revelation of the will of God; and not an atom of it is in man.*"

He then goes on to exhibit in contrast the presbyterian and the prelatic doctrine.

Reviewer. — "Having been appointed a teacher in the church of Christ, I do declare unto you that *such* and *such* are the doctrines of Christ, as revealed in the Bible. Believe them, *not because of my word, but because they are the doctrines of Christ.* It is this which gives them their whole authority to bind your consciences, and regulate your faith. The authority, I repeat, is not in the *man* but in the *word.* I speak as unto wise men — search the scriptures, and judge ye what I say."

Bishop. — "I, the authorized agent of heaven, the substitute for the person of Christ on earth, do declare that the will of God is so and so; and by the authority vested in me, I pledge the God of truth to fulfil these promises of his word. This is a peculiar power vested in me, and in all my brethren, with which no other men on the earth are clothed. If, therefore, you would escape perdition, and cherish an authorized hope of heaven, receive the truth as I deliver it to you."

"The unity of the church, then, let all bishops know, consists essentially in that which constitutes her identity, UNITY OF DOCTRINE IN MATTERS NECESSARY TO SALVATION" (Dr. Rice in *Evang. and Lit. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 520.) After giving a short summary of fundamental doctrines, he adds, (ibid p. 530,) "We believe that all who, with the whole heart, receive these doctrines, are united to Christ, and belong to that one body, of which he is the Head and King; that they are bound to recognize each other as brethren, and hold communion as disciples of a common Lord; and that any who reject from the fellowship of saints, those who receive and live by these truths, are schismatical and contentious, laying a stress on outward things, which Jesus Christ has not laid, and thus deeply injuring the true interests of the Church which he has purchased with his blood. Here are the principles on which we are willing to hold communion with Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, or christians of any outward form whatever."

That truth of doctrine is the only sure and infallible mark of the church of Christ, see asserted also by Dr. Freeman, in *Notes of the Ch. Ex'd. and Refuted*, pp. 69, 71, 75; Dr. Payne, in *Notes of Ch.* pp. 150, 155, 156; Dr. Claggett do. pp. 170, 180, 190, 194; Bishop Fowler in do. pp. 111, 121; Dr. Resbury in do. p. 233; Dr. Scott in do. pp. 198, 209; Bishop Williams in do. pp. 103, 121; Bishop Sherlock pp. 2, 6, 10, 16, 29, 34, 35, 40, 41, 44; Bishop Patrick p. 89. See authorities quoted in Willet Syn. Pap. p. 86; Stillingfleet's *Irenic*, pp. 114, 4to, ed. 2nd, 1662; Storr and Flatt's *Bibl. Theol.* p. 501, sect. cvi; De Moor Comment in *Marckii*, vol. vi. sect. ii. p. 54; Turretini *Opera*, tom. iii. p. 121, and tom. iv. *De Secessione*, p. 316; Rutherford's *Due Right of Presb.* p. 286; Limborch's *Body of Div. B.* in ch. iv. vol. ii. p. 946.

CONCLUSION.

WE have now brought this examination of the prelatie doctrine of apostolical succession to a close. We have endeavored fairly, fully, frequently, and in the language of many of its most received advocates, to state the doctrine in question, with the several claims and consequences inseparable from it. To many we may have appeared needlessly circumstantial and prolix. But the developements which are daily made of the prevalence of these views, even among the laity, and of their open avowal and defence by a numerous and increasing body of the clergy, will, we believe, fully justify the extended investigation which has been made of this important subject. As it is, we have left many points unnoticed, to which our attention has been directed, and many materials untouched, with which our argument might have been greatly enlarged in its dimensions.

For all the reasons which have been brought forward in the course of this discussion, the conclusion of the whole matter is, that the assumed exclusive prerogatives, to which the prelaty lays claim, upon the strength of its apostolical succession, are baseless, without any honest credentials whatever, and altogether unworthy of our regard.¹

1) "We have seen," says the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, in his *First Five Centuries of the Church*, (or, the *Early Fathers no Safe Guides*, Lond. 1839, p. 31,) "that the unscriptural exaltation of the clergy laid the foundation for all the other abuses which crept into the church; almost all the false doctrines and senseless ceremonies, which then disfigured it, being introduced by them."

"We have read and heard a great deal," says Dr. Rice, (*Evang. and Lit.*

Mag. vol. ix. p. 534,) "about the virtue of what is called apostolical succession. For the life of us, we never could get down to the meaning of this thing; but we are perfectly sure, that it has no efficacy in this most important part of a minister's office. Undeniable facts afford most decisive evidence, that there is no stream of wisdom or knowledge running through the succession, and pouring out its rills, through episcopal fingers, into those on whom bishops lay their hands;" nor is this denied to any

This doctrine, upon which, as a foundation, the whole system of the prelacy rests, has been found utterly wanting, when weighed in any one of the balances provided. The tests laid down by the authority of its advocates, can be met in reference to no one link in the entire chain of this boasted succession, from St. Peter to the present time. Its historic evidences are found to be in no better preservation, nor of any greater strength, than the relics of its mouldering abbeys, whose name, date, and origin, have sunk beneath their accumulated ruins. This doctrine, which, like a proud, triumphal arch, was to span the earth and climb the heavens, depends for its support upon the undoubted certainty of myriad millions of probabilities, any one of which might fail, and by the failure of which, its instantaneous demolition was inevitable.

These prelatial successors sue in the court of law, for the entire and exclusive possession of a divine inheritance, by a grant of primogeniture, and in defeasance of all other claims. But when we demand the exhibition of their patent and charter, that we may there see the exact boundaries of their grant;—the charter itself is wanting; the boundaries cannot possibly be traced in any extant record; nor can it be even shown that the estate itself has been in perpetual possession of this boasted ancestry.

We ask for the signs of an apostle, the title, the offices, the gifts, the duties; but these successors have them not. There is in fact, nothing characteristic of an apostle, as such, to be found about either them, or their office, except the assumption of an authority which is supported only by empty claims. They are apostles, and apostolical, by virtue of a descent in which all apostolic qualifications are utterly lost; and “they are canonically appointed to govern,” while in the appointment of many of them, every canon, human and divine, has been notoriously broken. And this succession secures the power of transmitting divine virtues, and the plenitude of grace, though the giver may have been an atheist, a murderer, and every thing that was selfish, carnal, and devilish; and although the receiver may have waxed worse and worse, in imitation of his apostolic predecessors. More palpable, and therefore less preposterous, is the system of the Calmuck Tartars, whose successive priests drink,

because he was not episcopally ordained. Where, in the New Testament, is any thing to warrant such opinions as these? In the rule given us by our blessed Saviour, *form*

is nothing, *truth* is every thing; it is by the truth we are sanctified; by the truth we are made free; by the word of God we are begotten to a lively hope.”

each in turn, a cup wherein are mingled the ashes of his predecessor."¹

Trace this doctrine in its course through history, and that course is readily distinguished by the unwashed marks of blood, and the unburied bones which lie bleaching in the sunshine and the storm, and which still cry aloud for vengeance. The full ascendancy of this system can only be gained by the prostration of civil and religious liberty. The tiger may be chained, starved, subdued, and made to obey his keeper, but he is a tiger still, and only waits the taste of blood to whet his appetite for more.

But this doctrine is as useless, as it is unreasonable and intolerant. It is a good way to try the validity of any general principle, to push it to its extremest length, and thus prove whether or not it is of universal application. Now here is an axiom, that out of that church, which possesses this apostolical succession, there is no covenanted salvation; no saving efficacy, or divine authority. It follows, therefore, that there is not now, in all christendom besides, any *genuine* piety, or any efficacious ministry, or any sanctifying ordinances. It follows, also, that there never has been any such, in the ages that are past; and that there never will be any in the ages that are to come. Now a doctrine which is at once reducible to such an infinite and palpable absurdity, **MUST BE FALSE**, even should we not be able to detect the fallacy. Just as the doctrine of the infinite divisibility of matter, however seemingly it may be demonstrated on paper, is repudiated by an appeal to actual experiment and fact, and by thus bringing it to an application to the concrete substance. So is it here. Let us bring out this doctrine, from its obscurity, as it is concealed in ecclesiastical canons, and apply it to the actual manifestations of divine grace; and it receives an instantaneous condemnation, as a bold denial of the work and grace, and free mercy of God.²

But this anathematizing condemnation of the christianity of millions, flows necessarily from this doctrine, of which it is the essence that he, who disbelieves it, is an infidel, as to the "substance of the faith." God, therefore, in the working of his grace, sets to his seal, that this doctrine is utterly untrue. Nor will it do to reply, that even among those who deny other doctrines which are held to be fundamental, there are yet many who are, apparently, christian and devoted. For, even granting this to be the case, we know not but that in such cases, the truth

1) See Ely's Call to Hear the Church Examined, p. 12.

2) See Spiritual Despotism, p. 405.

may have been conveyed to the mind, while such individuals were, nevertheless, blinded to its actual perception in its distinct and explicit form. Neither do we dare to set limits to the stream of God's saving mercy, or arrogantly say, thus far shalt thou go and no further. But here we have a very different case. Here we *have a defined boundary*, a walled city, an embanked channel; within which, alone, the promised blessings of heaven can be found, whatever a man may believe. And yet beyond them all, and in most copious abundance, the dew of divine mercy distils upon the rejoicing hearts of God's regenerated children. Thus are we assured, by God himself, that this doctrine, "whosoever he be that giveth this counsel, shall, before God, be able to do us no more profit than the fig leaves did unto Adam."¹

That this appeal to the fruits of our ministrations, as the test of the quality of the tree itself, is a fair one, we learn not only from our opponents themselves, but also from the sure word of God, where a false ministry is threatened with barrenness; (Jer. xxiii. 32;) and where we hear even an apostle, by this very evidence, attesting the lawfulness of his ministry. (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2.) Even in the days of former generations, our non-conformist fathers could exhibit the proofs of their heavenly calling in many thousands of souls converted by a heavenly agency, and could retort on those who bitterly maligned them, what we may apply to many who have, in like manner, gone out from us, and turned upon us with tongues of bitterness and malice.

"There are many that cry down our ministry, and separate from us as no ministers, THAT CANNOT DENY BUT THAT THEY HAD THEIR CONVERSION FROM US. And if our ministry be antichristian, how is their conversion christian?"²

But there is one argument by which we are assailed, and which is believed to be of itself sufficient to overwhelm and confound us. This is the acknowledged antiquity, and the very early prevalence, of the system of prelacy. Now that this system is ancient, we believe; but that it is apostolical, we deny; and from this very plea of hoary age, do we deduce an argument by which to blunt the edge of this keen weapon, if it will not rather turn it in restless power against the arm that wields it. By this very antiquity of prelacy, would we prove that it is apocryphal, and not canonical—apostatical, and not apostolical—ecclesiastical, and not divine.

The apostles themselves admonish us, that there would arise

1) Hooper in Letters of the Martyrs, p. 95.

2) Div. Right of the Ministry, pt. 2d, p. 30. See also Calamy's Def. of Nonconf. vol. i. pp. 216, 217.

those who would lay claim to a supernatural investment with apostolic power — who would sit in the temple of God, which is the church, and there exalt themselves to the throne of supremacy — who would claim for their decrees, canons, and burdensome impositions, that reverence which is due only to the laws of God — who would thus legislate as if above all law, and as the makers of law for others — who would in this way shut the kingdom of heaven against all who should resist or oppose — and who, arrogating to themselves divine authority, would trace up their pedigree to the apostles themselves. This mysterious (*or then concealed*) wickedness, is, says the apostle Paul, *already at work*, and only waits till the restraining power be withdrawn, fully to develop itself.

Now that these predictive warnings of the apostles, insisted upon with frequent solemnity, apply to the system of the papacy, all are agreed. They refer not, however, to that system, as accidentally associated with the church of Rome; nor to that church exclusively; but they refer to those principles which have been more or less developed in the Greek and other churches; and which we therefore distinguish by the term prelacy, as applicable equally to them all. The papacy, however, did not originate — it only carried out these principles to their extreme, though legitimate consequences. The principles themselves were clearly, and to a great extent practically, developed in the Nicene age; which is, as prelatists teach us, the very embodiment of their views and principles, and the standard of their imitation. The forewarning of the apostle must, therefore, be applicable to this age, since the system had commenced its operation even in the apostles' days, and stealthily advanced until it was finally consummated in the superstitions and corruptions of a later period.

That the prelacy, as now developed by the Oxford divines, and attributed by them to the English church, comes strictly under the denunciations of the apostles, is fully argued by the author of "Ancient Christianity," and "Spiritual Despotism," who is himself a member of that church, and a friend to what he believes to be the primitive episcopacy.¹ "If Jerome and others," says the learned Musculus, "had seen as much as they that came after, they would have concluded that" this office of prelate "was never brought in by God's spirit, to take away schisms, as was pretended; but was brought in by Satan to waste and destroy the former ministry that fed the flock."² So

1) See Spirt. Despot. p. 337; Ancient Christianity, passim.

2) See in Div. Right of the Min. pt. ii. p. 118.

also teaches Sadeel.¹ Dr. Whitaker also says, that "many holy and wise men have judged it (prelacy) more pernicious than the disease itself, (schism;) and although it did not by and by appear, yet miserable experience afterwards showed it. First, ambition crept in, which at length begat antichrist, set him in his chair, and brought the yoke of bondage upon the neck of the church."²

The very certainty, therefore, of the early prevalence of this system in its essential principles, instead of constituting an infallible demonstration of its apostolicity, may, on the contrary, identify it with that corrupt and antichristian system, of whose insnaring power these inspired apostles have so pointedly admonished us. And the very plea which is so continually offered, of the undeniable antiquity of prelacy, is only a surer mark, in connexion with other circumstantial evidence, of its connexion with that corrupt apostacy from primitive truth and order, and a loud warning to us all, not to be deceived by lying wonders of men, or by their endless genealogies; or by any traditions received from the fathers; but to make our appeal to the law and to the testimony, as the only infallible rule of either faith or practice.

The true and only church of our Lord Jesus Christ, is to be found, according to this prelatic theory, in that order of prelates, who, in linked brotherhood, extend in a long array of brightening succession, to the very throne of the apostles. This is the fact for which is claimed the seal of historic testimony.

Now let any one who desires to bring this matter to a very palpable issue, either trace in the actual perusal of some impartial record, or if this has been already accomplished, then let him review in imagination, the successive individuals, who constitute by their summation, this entire prelatical succession. Let him, without exaggeration, but with a severe fidelity, recall the various scenes which have been enacted through their agency, and by their authority, in the exercise of that plenary power to which they make such ample pretensions. Let Ireland present to the view of such an inquirer, those seasons of blood, treachery and death, when her ministers were silenced and imprisoned; her churches closed and her ordinances prohibited; and when the blood of her martyred thousands stained many a gory field and desert moss. Let Scotland unroll the page of her history, and reveal those tragedies of guilt and death, which, under the patronage of these apostolical successors, have from time to time filled her land with groans, and tears, and lamentations. Let England present to view her two thousand ejected ministers, as they wandered about in pining hunger, poverty, and wretched-

1) Ibid, p. 119.

2) See also Nazianzen, in *ibid*, p. 119.

ness, or sunk to death in damp and dreary prisons — while their deserted flocks were famished by the wasting destitution of God's word and ordinances, in their heart-felt purity. Let the mass of her reviled, abused, and calumniated Puritans, together with the blessed company of martyrs, who have lighted up the fires of Smithfield, or hung, felon-like, on Tyburn, pass in review before him. Let France then take up the lengthening story, and tell how, on one single occasion, as an exemplification of many, the streets of every city throughout that extensive kingdom, flowed with the blood of slaughtered thousands, while pæans of victory were ascending to heaven from altars at which ministered the ghostly successors of apostles, who rejoiced to give absolution and reward to the fiendish actors in these scenes of butchery and murder.¹ Let every nation in Europe, yea, and throughout the world, where these spiritual despots have established their dominion in the full plenitude of unrestricted power, again give up the dead that are in them; unbar their inquisitorial gates; open their prison cells, and break down those hollow walls, within which have mouldered the bones of incarcerated victims. Let every Alpine summit, in whose rifled chasms, and underneath whose fallen glaciers, the noble army of primitive martyrs, the men, women, and children, who loved the truth dearer than life, and who gladly chose death with liberty, rather than life with spiritual slavery and a corrupted faith; — let these, and all other similar and innumerable horrors, which such a review must bring before him, display to such an inquirer the workings of a system originated, perfected, and administered, by these successors of the apostles.

On any impressible mind, what must be the result of such an appeal to historic testimony, as to the character and tendency of this prelatical succession? Would it not, to such an one, appear blasphemous against the honor of God and of his truth, and subversive of every principle of reason, to admit that these men were the favorites and counsellors of Heaven? — that to these were exclusively given all heavenly gifts and graces? — that on these was exclusively poured out the influences of the divine spirit? — and that from these alone flowed those streams, whose living waters were for the healing of the nations? Grant that all who

1) In one of his most eloquent orations, Bossuet thus eulogizes the persecuting spirit of Chancellor Le Tellier, who closed his career by signing the fatal revocation: "You have," says this renowned prelate, "strengthened the faith; YOU HAVE EXTERMINATED THE HERETICS; IT IS THE

MOST MERITORIOUS ACT of your reign. King of Heaven! preserve the king of the earth! It is the ardent desire of the church, *it is the ardent desire of the assembly of her pastors and of her bishops.*" Bossuet's Orations, Lond. 1801, p. 147.

make up this long succession were not of the character here described ; yet were there not enough of such a character, and implicated in such inhuman and unparalleled atrocities, even overlooking the impurity of their personal character, to stamp with utter reprobation a theory which would appropriate to them, as the depositaries of Heaven's grace, the instrumental power of alone communicating eternal life ? Grant that similar charges may, in many cases, be justly thrown back upon other denominations, as upon our own. When we or they assert any similar and exclusive right to the powers of the world to come, by virtue of some mysterious grace transmitted through some unbroken line of personal successors to the apostles, then let such charges be produced ; and let them consume, as with the lightning's flame, such baseless arrogance. We rejoice to know that against all such intolerant and preposterous assumptions, there would be, on the part of all protestant denominations, one universal burst of indignation. And what we have to regret is, that while all parties in time past have been found criminated by their sanction of unchristian tenets, there should be any now found clinging tenaciously to principles which, by their necessary working, have sodden the path of christianity with the tears and blood of Christ's truest followers, the true successors to the faith and fellowship of apostles and martyrs.

INDEX.

[N. B.—Many references not deemed necessary, are omitted.]

- A.**
- Acetius, referred to, 172.
- Acton, Rev. Henry, quoted, xiii.
- Address to the Episcopalians of Virginia, quoted, 220.
- Admonition to Parliament, quoted, 497.
- Albigenses, their testimony, 205.
- Allen, Rev. Benjamin, quoted, 345, 412, 442.
- Alsop, Vincent, quoted, 455.
- Ambrose on Bishops as Apostles, 234, 304; quoted also, 539.
- American succession doubtful, 218, &c.; opposed, 508, 509.
- American Whig, quoted, 509.
- American churches — grossly misrepresented, 309, 310, 324, 443, &c.
- Ancient Things of the Catholic Church, quoted, 941.
- Ancient Christianity, by Isaac Taylor, Esq. quoted in the Eng. edit. vol. i. 16, 18, 47, 58, 59, 60, 66, 74, 78, 79, 87, 91, 134, 142, 169, 172, 206, 303; vol. ii. 258, 305.
- Andrews, Bishop, quoted, 392.
- Anderson's Defence of Presbyterianism, quoted, 150, 210.
- Anglican succession, the, defective, 200, &c.; can only be traced up to Henry VIII., 209; a separation, 217; and secession, 365, &c.
- Antichristian, the Romish church has ever been so regarded, 204, 208.
- Antiquity of prelacy, 554—556.
- Apostle, different meanings of the word, 236, 238, 255; different theories about, 149, 150; when the title was given to bishops, 234, &c.; their call, 239; their endowments, 239, 242; their office, 242, 246; had no successors, 243, 244, 251, 252; duties of, 247.
- Apostolical succession, what it implies as prelatists teach, 3, 7, 38, 39, 52, 53, 183, 195, 230, 262, &c.; as Romanists teach, 231.
- Apostolical succession, doctrine of, see stated, 75; see question.
- Apostolical succession, the true, claimed by Presbyterians, 43.
- Archer's Lectures on Puseyism, quoted, 132, 162, 201.
- Articles of the Church of England, quoted, 63, 115, 492, 498; REQUIRE the recognition of the ministers of other churches, 498.
- Assert, what we, *Introduct.* §. v, page xxvi.
- Athanasius, quoted, 81, 102, 301, 304, 537.
- Augusti, quoted, 233.
- Augustine, quoted, 20, 82, 102, 173, 236, 304, 414, 518, 538.
- Authority, unlawful, we are naturally disposed to resist, 33.
- Ayton's Original Constitution of the Church, quoted, 79, 149, 185, 253, 447.
- B.**
- Bacon, Lord, quoted, 409, 472.
- Baltimore Literary and Relig. Magazine, quoted, 126, 456.
- Bancroft, *Hist. of U. States*, quoted, 321, 330.
- Bancroft, Archbishop, quoted, 450, 547.
- Baptism necessary to ordination, 120.
- Bangs, Dr., his Original Church of Christ, quoted, 361.
- Baptists, bigotry of prelatists towards, 26.
- Baptist Recorder, quoted, 347.
- Baronius, on the character of the Popes, 199, 226, 227.
- Barrick, Rev. Edward, of Trinity College, Dublin, quoted, 24.

- Barrow, Dr. Isaac, on the Apostolical Office, 238, 239, 246, 253; also quoted, 69, 122, 186, 205, 429, 433, 435, 481.
- Basil, quoted, 81, 304.
- Baxter, his True and Only Way of Concord, quoted, 56, 155, 156, 200, 403, 435, 444, 463, 479, 497, 501; his Five Disputations on Ch. Govt. quoted, xxi, 153, 306, 385, 403, 470; Treatise on Episcopacy, 198, 357, 479; Search for the English Schismatics, 471.
- Bayard, Rev. Mr., quoted, 6.
- Baynes, his Diocesan's Tryall, quoted, 136, 144, 153, 186, 198, 243, 244, 320.
- Bellarmino, quoted, 119, 149, 199, 246, 252, 253.
- Bentley, Dr., quoted, 252.
- Bernard, Dr., quoted, 400, 401.
- Bethel, Bishop, quoted, 479.
- Beveridge, Bishop, quoted, 75, 149, 150, 156, 242, 415, 417.
- Beverly, R. M., Esq., his Heresy of Human Priesthood, quoted, xxx—xxxii, 4, 50, 123, 292.
- Beza, quoted, 510.
- Biblical Repertory, quoted, 237, 246, 258, 293, 479.
- Biblical Repository, quoted, 301, 358, 520.
- Bickersteth, quoted, 123, 205, 269.
- Bigotry of Prelatists. See Prelatists.
- Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ, quoted, 113, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 198, 234, 243, 430, 480, 481.
- Bird on the Oxford Tract System, 270.
- Bishops and Presbyters identical, 156, 159.
- Blackburne, Archdeacon, quoted, 323, 475.
- Blair, Rev. Robert, quoted, 395, 402, 403.
- Blair's History of the Waldenses, quoted, 42, 205, 513.
- Blondel, David, quoted, 62.
- Blunt on the Articles, quoted, 381.
- Bossuet, his intolerance, 548.
- Boardman, Rev. H. A., quoted, 271, 283.
- Bowden, Dr., quoted, xiv, 52, 54, 80, 102, 103, 133, 143, 151, 222, 234, 240, 242, 291, 323, 324, 416.
- Boyd, Rev. Mr., of Derry, quoted, 97, 157, 203, 222.
- Bower's History of the Popes, quoted, 185, 191, 192, 193, 246, 247.
- Bradford, Bishop and Martyr, quoted, 186, 392.
- Bramhall, Archbishop, quoted, 112, 397, 418.
- Brett, Mr. quoted, 149, 150.
- Bristed, Counsellor, quoted, xv, xvi, xviii, 165, 296, 344, 349, 354, 363.
- British Critic, quoted, 3, 5, 7, 16, 23, 73, 110, 111, 112, 183, 262, 263, 264, 270, 289, 290, 291, 299, 300, 309, 310, 311, 312, 379.
- Burnet, Bishop, quoted, 8, 12, 57, 63, 84, 85, 89, 114, 115, 120, 122, 205, 207, 211, 227, 384, 393, 394, 418, 494, 498.
- Bull, Bishop, quoted, 62, 68, 108, 186, 218, 371, 473, 497, 548.
- Burton, Dr., Hist. of the Ch. quoted, 253.
- Butt's Obs. on Kebles on Tradition, 270.
- Butt, Dr. S., his Discourse on Church Government, quoted, 241.
- Buyers, Rev. Wm., Missionary, quoted, 343.
- Byfield, Rev. Richard, 540, 541.

C.

- Causa Episcopatus, Hierarch. Lucifuga, quoted, 164.
- Calamy, quoted, 101, 193, 470, 554.
- Calderwood's Altare Damascenum, quoted, 42, 137, 253, 375.
- Calvin, quoted, 63, 108, 115, 122, 146, 185, 193, 246, 367, 497, 540.
- Campbell, Professor, rebuke to Dodwell, quoted, 19, 87, 162, 186, 214, 243, 355, 444.
- Campbell, Dr., of Armagh, quoted, 97, 458.
- Canons, the, of Ch. of England, quoted, 63.
- Cardwell's Documentary Annals, quoted, 300.
- Cassander, quoted, 539.
- Cathedral, the, quoted, 365.
- Cartwright, quoted, 64, 65, 470.
- Cashel, the Archbishop of, quoted, 269.
- Catholic Church, what, 43, 484, 485, 487, 489, 491, &c. 499, 505, 531.
- Catholic Miscellany, of Charleston, quoted, 273, 283, 420.
- Ceswall, Rev. Mr., quoted, p. 23.
- Challenge, what we, Introd. § v, p. xxv.
- Chandler, Dr. quoted, 42, 111, 475, 476.
- Chapman, Dr. quoted, 251, 323.
- Chauncy, Dr. of Boston, quoted, xxvii, 13, 383, 475, 509, 511.
- Charleston Gospel Messenger, quoted, xx, 5, 8, 36, 262, 299, 447, 448.
- Cheever, Rev. Mr., quoted, 343.
- Chester, Bishop of, quoted, 123.
- Chillingworth, quoted, 36, 48, 57, 58, 59, 67, 121, 184, 205, 227, 437, 473.
- Christ's prerogative, invaded by prelatists, 320.

- Christian Observer, the London, quoted, xxviii, xix, 8, 14, 16, 81, 101, 112, 218, 257, 258, 261, 265, 268, 279, 280, 281, 283, 292, 345, 378, 388, 422, 479.
- Chrysostom, quoted, 102, 237, 239, 247, 251, 301, 304, 499.
- Church, The, Independent of the Civil Government, quoted, 62.
- Church, the, destroyed by prelacy, 145; what, 161, 171, 229, 543.
- Church, the indefectible, as prelatists teach, 77.
- Church, The, in England and America Compared, quoted, 328.
- Church and state, prelatie views on, 328, 329.
- Church, the English, parties in, 359, and Lect. xvii. 442, 478, 479.
- Church, several meanings of the word, 486-488, 499.
- Church, not the clergy, 499, 500.
- Churchman, The, quoted, xxi, 105, 106.
- Civil magistrate, has plenary power, as prelatists teach, in ecclesiastical matters, 315, 317.
- Claggett, Dr. quoted, 87, 197, 408, 429, 437, 478, 496, 549.
- Clark, Rev. Dr. of Philadelphia, quoted, 7, 8, 95, 128, 271, 285.
- Claude, of Turin, quoted, 65.
- Clement of Alexandria, 102, 499, 535, 536, 542.
- Collier's Eccl. History, quoted, 520.
- Coleman's Christian Antiquities, quoted, 233, 253.
- Coleman, Rev. John, quoted, 474.
- Colton, Rev. Mr. quoted, 357.
- Commission of Christ to the Apostles, 142, 144.
- Conder, Protestant Nonconformity, quoted, 54; his View, &c. 507, 539.
- Confession of Faith, quoted, 9, 10, 37, 38, 491, &c.
- Congregationalists. See Independents.
- Controversy, demanded of us, 8, 9, 15, 16; importance of this, *Introduct.* sect. iii. and iv.; the cause of all denominations at stake, 14, 17; how long it must continue, 19.
- Cooke, Dr. quoted, xxv, 52, 103, 143.
- Cooke, Rev. Dr. of Ireland, quoted, 532.
- Corbet on the Church, quoted, 435, 513.
- Cox, Mr. A. Cleveland, quoted, 324.
- Cox, Dr. Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, quoted, 54.
- Crabbe's English Synonymes, quoted, 424.
- Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, quoted, xiii.
- Cranmer, quoted, 185, 205, 213.
- Croft, Herbert, Bishop of Hereford, quoted, 100, 101, 103, 136, 143, 150, 159, 500.
- Cumber, Dr. quoted, 193.
- Cummings's Apology for the Ch. of Scotland, 386, 451.
- Cyprian, quoted, 14, 103, 168, 192, 301, 302, 414, 506, 536.
- Cyril, of Jerusalem, quoted, 45, 82.
- Cyril, of Alexandria, quoted, 81, 536.

D.

- Daubeny's Guide to the Church, quoted, xx, 49, 327, 329, 435, 442.
- Davenant, Bishop, quoted, 69, 148, 149, 165, 175, 245, 262, 326, 355, 406, 463, 502.
- Dehon, Bishop, 264.
- Delahogue, quoted, 512.
- Dechard, quoted, 101.
- Dick's Theology, quoted, 444.
- D'Israeli, Genius of Judaism, quoted, 358.
- Divine Right of the Ministry, quoted, 186, 190, 239, 374, 375, 490, 497, 554.
- Doane, Bishop, quoted, 247, 248, 250, 262; his great prudence and mistake, 288, 322, 324.
- Doctrine, true, the all-essential mark of a true church, 532-5.
- Doctrine of the Succession. See Question.
- Dodwell, quoted, 91, 105, 149, 175, 252, 366, 367, 368, 414, 451.
- Dodsworth on Romanism and Dissent, quoted, 54, 83, 91, 191, 216.
- Dryden, quoted, 37, 351.
- Dudley, Hon. Judge, design of his Lecture, xxiv.
- Dupin, quoted, 512.
- Dutch Reformed churches, bigotry of prelacy towards, 23.
- Dwight, Dr., quoted, 382.

E.

- Eclectic Review, the, quoted, 362, 479.
- Edgar's Variations of Popery, quoted, 199, 507.
- Edinburgh Review, quoted, 5, 121, 175, 187, 307, 373.
- Edinburgh Witness, quoted, 479.
- Edwards, Dr., quoted, 136, 305.
- Eleutherius, quoted, 103.
- Ellis's Hist. of Madagascar, quoted, 347.
- Ely's Call to Hear the Ch. Exam., 553.
- English Reformation, a relation of, &c. quoted, 213.
- England, Bishop, of Charleston, quoted, 6, 56.
- Ephesus, Council of, 13, 506, 520.

- Epiphanius, quoted, 190, 192.
 Episcopacy, distinct altogether from the question of high-churchism, 6, 7; we make no attack on episcopacy as such, Intro. § i. 6, 60; only a rite, 59; not in scripture, this admitted, 73; this distinction granted, 7.
 Episcopal church in this country, novelty of, 507, 508, 509.
 Episcopal Tract Society, now identified with Oxford divinity, 235, 500.
 Episcopal Recorder, the, quoted, 123, 249, 260, 282, 256, 422, 439, 441, 442.
 Episcopius, his views on this doctrine, quoted, 53, 225.
 Escott, Rev. T., bigotry of, 3.
 Espenceus, quoted, 251.
 Essays on the Church, quoted, 270.
 Essays on Romanism, quoted, 80.
 Essential truths all in the Bible, 48; what, 50.
 Eusebius, quoted, 79, 183, 236, 499.
 Eutherius, Bishop of Tyana, quoted, 434.
 Evangelical episcopalians. See Low-church.
 Evangelical Magazine, Lond. quoted, 345.
 Exeter, Bp. of, quoted, xxii.
 Extent of this doctrine, 4, 111, 285, 226, and the whole context, 425; avowed in Charleston, 447, 448.
- F.
- Faber's Vallenses and Albigenses, quoted, 43, 65, 122, 146, 205, 371, 375, 418, 507, quoted, 269, 485.
 Faber, Rev. F. W., quoted, 456.
 Fabricius, quoted, 186.
 Fathers, our, the memory of, 20, 21.
 Fathers, the, not authoritative, 35, 46, 47, 76, &c. 80; uncertainty and confusion of, 79, 80; perverted and abused, 81.
 Fell, Bp. quoted, 149.
 Field, Dr. quoted, 116, 121, 375, 473.
 Firmilian, quoted, 537.
 Firmin, his Separation Exam. quoted, 543, 544.
 Fitzgerald on Episcopacy, &c. 270.
 Fleetwood, Bp. quoted, 8.
 Formularies of Faith, in the reign of Henry VIII., quoted, 492, 526, 527.
 Foster, Sir Michael, Knt. quoted, 133, 210, 291, 302, 303, 306, 321, 383, 500.
 Fowler, Rev. Andrew, quoted, xx, 257.
 Fowler, Bp., quoted, 46, 87, 226, 390, 549.
 Fox, quoted, 201, 203, 418.
 Freeman, Dr. quoted, 549.
 Frith, John, Martyr, quoted, 64.
- Froude, Rev. Mr. quoted, 216, 249, 344.
 Fry, Caroline, quoted, 250, 255, 256.
 Fulk, Dr. quoted, 185, 193.
- G.
- Gadsden, Bp. quoted, 324.
 Genevan Confession, quoted, 491.
 Gerhard, quoted, 541.
 Gibson, Bp. quoted, 300, 382.
 Gieseler's Ecc. Hist., quoted, 517.
 Gisborne, Rev. Mr. quoted, 409.
 Gladstone, Mr. quoted, 261.
 Gobat's Abyssinia, quoted, 501.
 Godwin's Lives of English Bishops, quoted, 207.
 Goodman, Bp., a papist, 284.
 Gordon's History of Ireland, quoted, 202.
 Gordon, Rev. Mr., quoted, 243, 511, 512.
 Gregg, Rev. I. D., his insulting language, quoted, 24.
 Gregory Nyssene, quoted, 82.
 Gregory, Bishop of Rome, quoted, 524, 525.
 Grotius, quoted, 237, 435.
- H.
- Hale, Sir Matthew, quoted, 409.
 Hales, the ever-memorable, quoted, 54, 101, 186, 407, 414, 468, 470, 500, 512.
 Halifax, Dr. Samuel, quoted, p. 408.
 Hall, Rev. Robert, quoted, 474.
 Hall, Bp., quoted, 205, 218, 369, 370, 392, 357, 495, 540.
 Hallam's Const. Hist. quoted, 254.
 Hammond, Dr. quoted, 71, 149, 191, 252, 415.
 Hanbury's ed. of Hooker, 470, &c.
 Harmony of Conf. of the Reformed churches, 496, 499, 525, 540.
 Harris, Dr. quoted, 218, 334, 431, 474.
 Hawks, Dr. quoted, 342, 426, 427, 428, 507.
 Hawkins, Dr., his Dissertation on Unauthoritative Tradition, quoted, 35.
 Heber, Bp., quoted, 71, 149, 170, 408, 513, 548.
 Hegisippus, quoted, 79.
 Helvetic Confession, quoted, 63, 525.
 Henderson, Alexander, quoted, 34, 72, 79, 453.
 Henry, Matthew, his work on Schism, quoted, 99, 153, 416, 443, 444, quoted also 133, 320, 471, 482.
 Henderson, Rev. Alexander, quoted, 190.
 Heresy, what, according to Mr. Palmer, 58.
 Hewitt's Hist. of S. C. quoted, 324
 Hicks, Bp., quoted, 150.
 Hide, Dr. quoted, xxi.

- High-church Miracles, quoted, 95.
 High-churchism, see Low-churchism.
 History of its principles, xxx.
 High-churchism, propriety of this term explained, 8, 29, 335, 341. An old Treatise on, quoted, 8. On its use among Episcopalians, see references on, 8. On its injurious effects on missionary ground, 343, 344.
- Hinds, of Queen's College, Oxford, quoted, 50, 78, 137, 149, 191, 244, 245, 246, 347, 430, 506.
- Hill, Dr., his View of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, quoted, 42; Lectures, 194.
- History of Popery, by several gentlemen, 101.
- Historical and Rational Inquiry into the necessity of an Uninterrupted Succession, quoted, 152.
- Hoadly, Bp., quoted, 126, 148, 149, 161, 253, 265, 393, 468.
- Hobart, Rev. Noah, quoted, 475.
- Hobart, Bp., quoted, xx, 6, 336, 337, characterized, 404, and note to lect. xiii, 500.
- Hodge, Dr., his Constitutional Hist. of the Presb. Church, quoted, 448, 476, 509.
- Hodson, Archdeacon, quoted, 472.
- Holden, on Tradition, quoted, 270.
- Holmes, Dr., quoted, 230.
- Horne, Rev. T. Hartwell, quoted, 408, 416.
- Hough, Rev. Mr., quoted, 165, 170, 206, 240.
- Hook's Call to Union answered, quoted, 270, 317, 319, 377.
- Hooker, quoted, 43, 54, 71, 149, 179, 193, 200, 253, 320, 355, 493, 523.
- Hooper, Bishop and Martyr, quoted, 64, 233, 554.
- How, Dr., his Vindication of the Protestant Episcopal church, quoted, xiv, xix, xxii, 50, 52, 54, 108, 155, 214, 303, 323, 410, 416, 448.
- Howe, Rev. John, quoted, 173, 542.
- Howitt's Hist. of Priestcraft, 305.
- Huguenots, presbyterians, and persecuted by prelatists, 559.
- Humphreys, Dr., quoted, 475.
- Hurd, Bp., quoted, 100, 204.
- I.
- Ignatius, quoted, 132, 237, 536, 537
 Implicit subjection required, by prelatists, to their laws, whether right or wrong, 312, 317.
 Independents or congregationalists, bigotry of prelatists towards, 23, 24.
 Inett, Dr. quoted, 201.
 Innocent, Pope, quoted, 97.
 Intolerance and cruel tendency of pre-
- lacy, 171, &c. exemplified, 318, 319, 324, 325, 326, 342, 344, 469, 470.
 Invisible church, what, 487.
 Irenæus, quoted, 43, 102, 188, 414, 506, 535, 537.
 Irving, Rev. Edward, his Confessions of Faith, quoted, 492, 540.
 Isidore of Pelusium, quoted, 304, 305.
- J.
- Jackson, Rev. Thomas, quoted, 54, 145, 163, 218, 245, 353, 371, 372, 430, 505, 540.
 Jackson, Rev. Miles, quoted, 270.
 Jameson, Rev. Wm., Lecturer of History in the University of Glasgow, quoted, xxv, 151, 348.
 Jebb, Bishop, quoted, xxxi.
 Jerome, quoted, 71, 191, 236.
 Jewell, Bishop, quoted, 70, 163.
 Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, 382.
 Jones, Rev. Mr., of Nayland, quoted, xxi, 57, 69, 457, 470, 505.
 Jones, Rev. Mr., of Oswestree, quoted, 200.
 Justin Martyr, quoted, 102, 535.
- K.
- Keble, Professor, of Oxford, quoted, 6, 56, 57, 69, 70, 75, 84, 94, 103, 104, 156, 213, 221, 261, 289, 296, 297, 372, 353, 545.
 Kenrick, R. Catholic Bishop, his letter to the Prelatists, proposing union, 295.
 King's Primitive Christianity, 434, 474, 499, 521, 523.
 Knapp's Theology, quoted, 431, 539.
 Knox, John, quoted, 63.
 Knox, Bishop, testimony of, 395, 396.
- L.
- Lactantius, quoted, 102, 535.
 Laity, the, by this doctrine to be excluded from all conventions in America, and kept excluded in England, 309, 312.
 Lardner, quoted, 188.
 Lathbury, Rev. Thomas, quoted, 419.
 Land, Archbishop, his views, 54, 149, 150, 185, 217, 291, 323, 450; true character of, 344, 346.
 Launoy, quoted, 499.
 Law, Rev. Wm., quoted, 150.
 Ledwich's Antiq. of Ireland, quoted, 202.
 Leger's Work on the Waldenses, 545.
 Leslie, quoted, 95, 110, 138, 150, 166, 176, 363, 415, 427, 418, 497, 505, 540.
 Letters of the Martyrs, edited by Bickersteth, quoted, 20, 21, 205, 233.

- Liberality of Presbyterianism, 38.
 Lightfoot, quoted, 149, 246.
 Limborch, quoted, 367, 549.
 Liturgy, this does not characterize
 prelacy, or form the subject of dis-
 cussion, 7.
 Livingston, Rev. John, quoted, 396,
 400.
 Livingston, Dr., quoted, 13, 475, 509.
 London Quarterly Review, quoted,
 183, 207, 217, 230, 232, 317, 319,
 423.
 Loque, M. Bertrand de, of Dolphinee,
 quoted, 502.
 Low-church episcopalians, on the dis-
 tinction, 8, 29, 335, 341; our kind-
 ness towards, pref. 6, 42, 484, &c.;
 are coming over to this doctrine, 123.
 Lowth, Bishop, quoted, 177.
 Loyd, Bishop, quoted, 190.
 Luther, quoted, 62, 525, 540.
 Lutherans and Reformed churches,
 bigotry of prelatists towards, 27.
 Lyra Apostolica, quoted, 170.
- M.
- Magdeburgh centuriators, quoted, 185.
 Maunbourgh, quoted, 126.
 Manning, Rev. Mr., quoted, 111.
 Marechal, Archbishop, quoted, 367.
 Marechal's Concord. Sanct. Patrum
 Gr. et Lat. 499.
 Mason's Vindiciæ Eccl. Anglicanæ,
 quoted, 112.
 Mason, Rev. Dr., quoted, 119, 151,
 204.
 Mason, Dr. Monck, quoted, 202.
 Martyn, Henry, quoted, 260.
 Mayhew's Observations, 475.
 Maurice on the popery of the Oxford
 tracts, 270.
 McCaul, Alexander, D. D., of Trinity
 College, Dublin, his Old Paths quo-
 ted, 30; Sketches of Judaism, 259.
 McCrie's Life of Knox, quoted, 54,
 93, 204, 248, 249, 459; on Unity, 430,
 510.
 McCrie, Rev. Thomas, quoted, 291.
 McIlvaine, Bishop, quoted, xiv. 258,
 270, 271, 284, 384, 422.
 Meade, Bishop, quoted, xxi, 52, 249,
 271, 391, 322, 406, 407, 520.
 Melancthon, quoted, 62, 163.
 Melville, Rev. Mr., quoted, 353.
 Mendhams, his History of the Council
 of Trent, quoted, 36.
 Methodists, bigotry of prelatists to-
 wards, 26, 46; their Quart. Review,
 quoted, 267, 474.
 Mildert, Van, Bishop, 218, 417, 513.
 Miller, Dr. George, his letter to Dr.
 Pusey quoted, 47, 185, 258, 261, 270,
 320, 497.
- Miller, Dr. Samuel, quoted, 188, 190,
 246, 360, 387, 498.
 Miller, Rev. John, quoted, xxxi.
 Milman, quoted, 172, 253, 349, 350,
 517.
 Milner, Rev. Dr., quoted, 206, 220,
 231, 418.
 Milner's Church History, quoted, 409.
 Ministry, proper subjects for, 114,
 162; what is essential to the being
 of, 497, 507, 543.
 Miracles demanded in proof of prelat-
 ic claims, 77, 78, &c.
 Mitchell, Dr., Presbyterian Letters to
 Bishop Skinner, quoted, 54, 108,
 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 133, 134, 135,
 164, 209, 211, 215, 222, 253, 458, 480.
 Monro, Dr., quoted, 149.
 Moor, De, quoted, 62, 101.
 Moore, Bishop, quoted, 271, 549.
 Morton, Bishop, 474.
 Mosheim's Commentaries, quoted, 190,
 435, 436.
 Morning Exercises against popery, 218.
 Muir, Rev. Dr., quoted, 30, 31.
 Musculus, quoted, 555.
- N.
- Neal's History of the Puritans, quoted,
 64, 72, 185, 199, 218, 258, 291, 293,
 305, 365.
 Necessity for examining and discuss-
 ing this subject, *Introd.*; this due to
 its abettors, xxiii, 5, 110, 111, 155,
 287; this due to ourselves and our just
 claims, xxiii, 9, 44; this due to truth
 and liberty, 13, 44, 111 287; this
 due to charity and peace, *Introd.*,
 18; this due to the memory of our
 fathers, 20; Dr. Rice on, 29, 30;
 Mr. Perceval on, 30; this doctrine
 cuts off all other denominations from
 salvation, *Introd.* § 3.
 Necessary doctrine of erudition, quo-
 ted, 492, 526, 527.
 Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, quoted,
 217.
 Newman, his Lectures on Romanism
 and Dissent, quoted, 12, 16, 36, 43,
 58, 67, 68, 69, 78, 82, 88, 107, 146,
 165, 199, 210, 261, 289, 290, 313.
 New York Review, quoted, 8.
 Nice, council of, quoted, 13, 192.
 Nichols, Dr. William, quoted, 150.
 Noel, Hon. and Rev. B. W., quoted,
 85, 148, 151, 390, 431, 551.
 Nolan, Rev. Mr., quoted, 205, 270.
 Norwich, the bishop of, quoted, 20.
 Noyes, Rev. Mr., quoted, xxvi.
- O.
- Odenheimer, Rev. Mr. of Philadelphia,
 quoted, 6, 7, 117, 322, 323, 418.

- Onderdonk, Bishop, quoted, xiv. 39, 40, 46, 50, 68, 73, 92, 93, 106, 131, 233, 356.
- Optatus, quoted, 190.
- Ordination, what presbyterians and the reformers believe concerning, 41, 42, 156, 157, 160, 510-512; presbyterian ordination, cases of, 157; form of, essential to prelatical ordination, 113, 114, 156.
- Origen, quoted, 102.
- Osborne's Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical Fathers, 301.
- Overton's True Churchman, 218, 479.
- Owen, Dr. quoted, 61, 164, 247, 414, 419, 426, 431, 432, 442, 443, 460, 463, 471, 496.
- Oxford Tracts, quoted, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 17, 25, 26, 34, 40, 45, 46, 53, 55, 71, 72, 82, 83, 90, 111, 113, 144, 145, 157, 168, 176, 183, 245, 289, 299, 352, 365, 383, 473, 529, 540. Origin and history of, xxix—xxxii.
- P.
- Palmer's Treatise on the Church, quoted, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 25, 26, 27, 36, 39, 42, 43, 46, 50, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65, 67, 68, 69, 78, 82, 88, 90, 93, 108, 109, 111, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120, 122, 131, 149, 156, 198, 199, 205, 208, 216, 232, 242, 261, 289, 293, 313, 314, 315, 318, 417, 474, 476, 500; Antiq. of the English Ritual, 520.
- Paley, quoted, 134, 408.
- Papacy, the, antichristian, 204, &c.
- Parker, Archbishop, his consecration invalid, 210, &c.
- Parry on Inspiration, quoted, 246.
- Pastoral Letter of the Roman Catholic Bishops, quoted, 231.
- Patrick, Bishop, quoted, 474.
- Paul, Father, of the order of Servites, quoted, 226.
- Payne, Dr., quoted, 81, 436, 549.
- Pearson, Bishop, quoted, 149, 192, 430, 505, 540.
- Perceval, Rev. Mr. G. quoted, 424.
- Perceval, on the Apostolical Succession, quoted, 15, 30, 112, 116, 134, 135, 221, 291, 474: his character, 327.
- Permanent moderators, allowable by presbyterians, though not expedient, 42.
- Perkins, Rev. Mr., quoted, 218.
- Peter, never at Rome, 185, 186, 233; never Bishop of Rome, 187; had no certain successors, 187, 194, 233.
- Philpot, bishop and martyr, 392.
- Pierce's Vind. of Dissenters, 258, 470.
- Pierce, Rev. Edward, Rector, his Vindication of the Principles and Practices of the Moderate Divines and Laity of the Church of England, quoted, 29.
- Platon's Summary of Christian Doctrine, quoted, 54.
- Polish Agreement, the, quoted, 63.
- Polycarp, 536.
- Popery, the, of the Oxford Tracts, developed, quoted, 270.
- Popes, the character and succession of, 199, 200, 225, 227.
- Popery, History of, by several gentlemen, quoted, 227; principles of, 259.
- Potter, Archbishop, on Church Government, quoted, 54, 134, 149, 168, 171, 172, 192, 244, 246, 247, 302, 371, 343, 352, 355, 430, 437, 506, 530.
- Powell, Thomas, a Wesleyan minister, his Essay on the Apostolical Succession, quoted, 11, 14, 78, 207, 238, 291, 355, 305, 385.
- Powell, Professor, of Oxford, quoted, 4, 29, 78, 103, 159, 163, 193, 266, 267, 302, 326, 422, 507.
- Pratt's Old Paths, quoted, xix, 40, 101, 142, 326, 348, 416.
- Preaching, opposed by prelates, 248, 250.
- Prelacy, why the term used, see 8; extent of, 4; guilt of, 554-6, 173; what we object to, 7, 3, 33, 39, 105, 127; leads to popery, 16, 17, 46, 207, 217, 257, &c. 302; unreasonable, 83; afraid of scripture, 94, 232, 103, 130, &c. 159; made an article of the faith, 36; not in scripture 73, 83, 87, 99; irreverence toward scripture, 96; destroys the church, 121, 122, 145, 146, 147, 152, 194, 288, 373, &c. 507, 546; against preaching, 248; has originated sects, 469, 470, 472, 478.
- Prelatists, bigotry of, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 17; fully shown in Note A, Lect. i. 38, 52, 56, 105, 106, 110, 111, 318, 319; rebuked, 19, 175, 183, 319; their discord, 131; argue popishly, 146, 175.
- Presbyterians, what we believe on this subject, 9, 10, 37, 41, 66, 74, 114, &c. 122, 485, 489, 490, 491; hereditary opposition of to prelacy, 20, 66; bigotry of prelatists towards, 24; their fearlessness, 164-173; not schismatics, Lect. xvii.
- Presbyterianism, extent of, 14, 21; liberality of, 38; fearlessness of scripture, 94; reverence for scripture, 96; security of, 122, 135, 152, 159, 160, 177, 178, 373, 374, 544; demonstrated, 176.
- Presbyterianism defended, by four

- members of the synod of Ulster, in Ireland, quoted, 5, 88, 214.
- Presbyters, their succession certain, 135, 136, 159, 160, 176, 178.
- Presbytery, plea for, quoted, 116, 161, 190, 199, 201, 291, 472.
- Price, Dr. his Hist. of Prot. Nonconf. quoted, 325, 326, 386, 418, 470, 471, 513.
- Profession, the author's public form of, scriptural, reasonable, and proper, &c. quoted, 520.
- Proof, the burden of, on prelatists, 37, 174, 184, 240.
- Prosper, quoted, 304.
- Protestantism, the doctrine of, stated, 60, 62, 65.
- Protestant, prelatists repudiate the name, 216; and the thing, 292, 293.
- Puritans, the, 459, 470-472.
- Pusey, Dr. quoted, 4, 11, 72, 91, 111, 139, 216, 247, 261, 289, 290, 317, 320, 354, 498.
- Q.
- Question, the question at issue fully stated, *Introd.* § i. and iii. 37, 44, 52, 55, 105, 106, 110, 127, 132, 147, 174, 181, 182, 195, 230, 231, 348, 483, 484, 489, 490; the importance attached to it, 111, 112, 155.
- R.
- Ravenscroft, Bishop, quoted, xix, 74, 112, 337.
- Rebaptization condemned, and Separation without Schism, quoted, 15.
- Record, the London, quoted, 275, 276, 292.
- Rees' Encyclopedia, quoted, 116.
- Reid's Hist. of the Presb. Ch. in Ireland, quoted, 248.
- Report of the Edinburgh Celebration of the Second Reformation, quoted, 11.
- Republicanism, prelacy opposed to, 311, 312, 320-322.
- Resbury, Dr., quoted, 78, 549.
- Reynolds, Bishop, quoted, 185.
- Rhind, Rev. Mr. 149.
- Riddle's Ecclesiastical Chronology, quoted, 193, 387; his Christian Antiquities, 223, 387, 433.
- Rice, Dr. on High-churchism, 29, 30, 296, 335, 327, 330, 348, 351, 462; on the fathers, xxvi, 80, 122; quoted, xxiv, 174, 186, 212, 260, 430, 549. See his Letter on High-churchism, Note D to Lect. xiii.
- Rights of the Christian Church, quoted, 118, 197, 321, 366, 368, 375, 409, 421, 510.
- Rogers' Life of Howe, 358.
- Romish church, as prelatists teach, true and orthodox, 296; antichristian, as all protestant churches teach, 204-208.
- Rose, Rev. Mr. quoted, 218.
- Rufinus, quoted, 247, 536, 537.
- Rushworth, quoted, 72.
- Rutherford's Due Right of Presbyteries, quoted, 60, 549; his Plea, &c. 218, 456.
- S.
- Sadeel, quoted, 555.
- Sage, Rev. Mr., 149.
- Salters' Hall Sermons, 218.
- Saravia, quoted, 70, 73, 96, 140, 149, 416, 417.
- Scaliger, quoted, 185.
- Schism, meaning of the term in scripture, 413, 443; in the fathers, 414, 427, 443, 481; among prelatists, 414, 416; exclusiveness is schism, 427, 444, 478; occasioned by prelates, 469, 471, 472, 478.
- Schism, by Dr. Hoppus, professor in London, a prize essay, and a very large and valuable work, quoted, 7, 19, 63, 89, 198, 319, 431, 432, 437, 500.
- Schismatics, this term applied by prelatists to other denominations, 323, 324; why so applied, 327, 328, 413, 414, 416; the ancient identified with prelatists, 459, 463.
- Sclater, a Romanist, quoted, 97.
- Scott, Dr. John, quoted, 149, 415, 436, 549.
- Scotland, Church of, bigotry of prelatists towards, 26, &c., 318.
- Sects occasioned by prelacy, 469, 470, 472, 478.
- Scotland, our Scottish forefathers, 21, 458.
- Scriptures, the, the only tribunal by which authoritative decisions can be given, 34, 35, &c., 76, &c.
- Seabury, Bishop, quoted, 157, 230, 264, 430.
- Sectarian, who is the true, 19.
- Secker, Archbishop, quoted, 8, 323.
- Selden, quoted, 510.
- Sendomir, Synod of, 525.
- Separation not schism, 511, 513, 517.
- Serious Thoughts on a late administration of Episcopal Orders, quoted, 219.
- Sharp, Archbishop, quoted, 415, 505.
- Sherlock, Bishop, quoted, 48, 49, 393, 417, 437, 449, 450, 474, 497, 519.
- Shiel's Hind Let Loose, quoted, 457.
- Shuttleworth, Bishop, quoted, 269.
- Sketch of the history and principles of

- the Presbyterian Churches in England, quoted, 31, 152.
- Skinner, Bishop, quoted, 103, 292, 416.
- Slater's Original Draught, 414.
- Smectymmius, quoted, 305.
- Smith, Bishop, quoted, 218.
- Smith, Dr. Pye, quoted, 43.
- Smith, Dr. Wm., his petition for union of church and state, 329.
- South Carolina, the opposition of Episcopalians in, to high-church notions, 405; and to bishops, 508.
- Soames' Elizabethan Religious History, quoted, 3, 8, 322, 386, 471.
- Southwark Lectures, 218.
- Sozomen, quoted, 304.
- Spalato, Archbishop of, 149, 510.
- Spanheim, quoted, 149, 185, 186, 252.
- Sparks, Rev. Jared, quoted, 211, 212, 367.
- Staunton, Rev. Wm., quoted, 192, 193, 218, 323, 442, 476.
- Stapler, quoted, 53.
- Steele's Philosophy of the Evidences, &c., quoted, 149, 485.
- Stevens' Spirit of the Church of Rome, quoted, 200.
- Stillingfleet, quoted, 54, 61, 149, 190, 200, 201, 248, 390, 430, 431, 467, 496.
- Storr and Flatt's Theol., quoted, 549.
- Stuart's History of Armagh, quoted, 202, 400.
- Succession, the Romish, broken, 121; that of presbyters alone undenied and secure, 122, 135, 152, 159, 160, 176, 179; of presbyters believed, 43, 181; the Anglican depends on the Romish, 185, 204;—is defective, 200, &c.;—only traces back to Henry VIII., 209; a separation, 217, 218; the American, doubtful, 218, &c.; was given by the English crown, and is thus regal, 509; its introduction opposed, 509.
- Suiceri Thesaurus, quoted, 236, 499.
- Sumner, John Bird, Bishop, quoted, 269.
- Suthivius, quoted, 252.
- Syrian Church, its testimony, 206.
- T.
- Taylor, Isaac, his Spiritual Despotism, quoted, 40, 108, 109, 110, 130, 157, 175, 185, 197, 213, 293, 301, 306, 352; preface to Life of Luther, 227.
- Taylor, Jeremy, Bishop, 68, 87, 149, 150, 157.
- Terms of communion with the church catholic can only be prescribed by Christ, 56.
- Tertullian, quoted, 82, 103, 163, 190, 191, 237, 436, 457, 534.
- Tests, the, by which this doctrine must be tried, 105, &c.; a very practical one, 553, 556.
- Theodoret, 103, 234.
- Theophilus of Alexandria, quoted, 81, 304; of Antioch, 536, 537.
- Theophilact, quoted, 237.
- Thomas, William, Esq., quoted, 306.
- Thorpe, Dr., quoted, 46, 199.
- Tillotson, Archbishop, quoted, 150, 351, 397.
- Tomline, Bishop, quoted, 72.
- Tonneins, Synod of, quoted, 63, 525.
- Toplady, Rev. Mr., quoted, 408.
- Towgood, Rev. Mr., quoted, 320, 370, 472.
- Townsend, Archdeacon, quoted, 312, 313.
- Tradition made by prelatists of equal authority with the Bible, 289, 296, 297.
- Troughton's Apology, 470.
- True Character of a Churchman, the, quoted, 421.
- Tucker, Rev. John, his Dudleian Lecture, quoted, 51.
- Turretine, quoted, 53, 62, 101, 512, 539, 549.
- U.
- Uncovenanted mercies, see on, *Intro.* § iii, 171.
- Unity and Schism, quoted, 142, 473, 518.
- Unity, destroyed by prelacy, 18, 19.
- Unreasonableness of prelacy, 82, &c., 107, 347, &c., 553, 556-558.
- Unity, christian, explained, 425, 431, 503, 504; not union, 426, 427.
- Ursuline Manual, quoted, 13.
- Usher, Archbishop, quoted, 7, 103, 135, 157, 400, 403, 419, 430, 463, 494, 495, 498, 530, 540.
- V.
- Vail, Rev. Thomas H., corrected, 413, 246.
- Vagan, Rev. Mr., quoted, 377.
- Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, quoted, 384.
- Vidal's Commentaries of Mosheim, quoted, 369, 435, 436, 513.
- Vigilantius, his testimony, 205.
- Visible church, what, 483.
- Voetius, quoted, 62, 184, 227, 471, 497, 502.
- Vossius, quoted, 190.
- W.
- Wake, Archbishop, quoted, 218, 266, 399.
- Waldenses, their testimony, 204, 205.
- Warburton, Bishop, quoted, 8, 71, 395.

- Watchman, the Boston, quoted, 419.
 Welles' Vind. of Presb. Ordin. quoted,
 151, 252, 475.
 Wetmore, Rev. James, quoted, 448.
 Whateley, Archbishop, quoted, xvii,
 49, 50, 54, 79, 121, 148, 218, 240,
 245, 259, 269, 307.
 Whitby, Dr., quoted, 136, 149, 239.
 White, Bishop, quoted, 71, 80, 150,
 186, 218, 219, 311, 321, 383, 390, 403,
 405, 410, 412, 421, 509.
 Whitaker, Dr., quoted, 186, 253.
 White, Rev. Hugh, quoted, 169.
 Whitgift, Archbishop, quoted, 70, 396,
 496.
 Wickliffe, quoted, 173.
 Willet, Dr., quoted, 54, 70, 71, 119,
 121, 149, 186, 193, 223, 238, 246,
 390, 543, 549.
 Williams, Bishop, quoted, 45, 87, 199,
 549.
 Wilson's, Dr., Memoirs of Bishop
 White, 405, 508.
 Wilson, Daniel, Bishop, quoted, 269;
 his high-churchism, 343.
 Wiseman, Dr., quoted, 165, 272, 281.
 Wix, Rev. Samuel, quoted, 296.
 Wordsworth's Eccl. Biography, 207,
 217.
- Y.
- Young, Rev. Thomas, quoted, 324
- Z.
- Zanchius, quoted, 490.
 Zeph. iii. 11, quoted, 2.
 Zonarus, 536.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01010 6690