



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

36.668

36-668






AN
EARNEST REMONSTRANCE

TO
THE AUTHOR

OF THE
“**POPE’S PASTORAL LETTER TO CERTAIN MEMBERS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD:**”

WITH A POSTSCRIPT,
NOTICING THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, AND OTHER PAMPHLETS,
AND AN APPENDIX ON APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

BY THE
REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.



As a mad man who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, so is the man that
deceiveth his neighbour, and saith, Am not I in sport?—PROV. xxvi. 18, 19.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL’S CHURCH YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, FALL MALL.
1836.

[*Price Two Shillings.*]

668.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

AN

EARNEST REMONSTRANCE,

&c.

SIR,

Two reasons induce me to appeal to you, in reference to your recent Letter: First, that I have escaped your censures: Secondly, that (if report speaks right) you are one from whose straight-forwardness, sincerity, and love of truth, I once anticipated much. In both ways, therefore, I am freed from the risk of personal feelings.

I would, then, regard you as the representative of a certain class (as every one is, more or less); and would direct my observations to an evil prevalent in these times, not to you. That evil (and there could scarcely be a greater) is the use of banter and jest in things serious. It is true that the minds of a large portion of our countrymen seem to have become so inured to this, that persons have even despaired of addressing them, except in a tone even lower than that low tone to which they have sunk. It is true, that even among the better-instructed orders, persons, in their degree serious-minded, have often thought themselves obliged to condescend to the conventional language of the day, as their only

hope to gain a hearing. It is true, also, that the appetite has grown with its unwholesome nourishment; and now, as by a self-created necessity, all seem to be absorbed into the tide; and it is rare to find any cause advocated in the plain, open, straightforward tone, which was once the characteristic of our land. Not simply our periodical literature, or our journals, but our courts of law, and that branch of the legislature which is liable to be affected by popular taste, are infected by the mal-aria of this destructive habit. Man's happiness, or God's displeasure, domestic misery or national sin, are continually a jest. Adultery, fornication, theft, drunkenness, lying, are daily matters of sport. If justice is to be perverted, men's minds blinded, sin to escape unpunished, a jest is the refuge; caricatures are the vehicles of public instruction, and "a mock at sin" the source of public amusement.

It is indeed strange, and a lamentable part of this sad merriment, that many right-minded people are so little sickened at it, or so little express their weariness. But so it is with every other prevailing sin; those who live amidst it are, in their several degrees, infected by it: the fineness of our moral perceptions is blunted by the very acquaintance with sin, all mention whereof we at first loathed; our ears become untuned to the chords of Heaven, by listening constantly to the jarring sounds of earth, and are less offended by their discordancy. Most men feel themselves compelled to an over-acquaintance with the things of the day, and so are insensibly inured to its wretchedness, and deem it irremediable. They are indeed mistaken: the more earnest spirit is not fled; it sleeps only, or rather is drugged by these continued poisonous appliances; and brighter days may yet come, when our countrymen shall again be spoken to, not as members of a vast machine, or as the slaves of temporal interests, but as responsible immortal agents, as Christians, as members of Christ the Son of God.

It is one consolation, that if all our outward privileges, yea, every thing except truth, be lost, then the temptation of ap-

pealing to any other principle but truth and holiness, will be removed also.

These however have been, in many cases, worldly things, treated of by men of this world: a pernicious principle was admitted; but the source of truth and holy earnestness was not yet poisoned; banter had not yet been employed upon things Divine. This is now inadvertently commenced, and the more dangerously because inadvertently. Hitherto it had scarcely been found except among Infidels.

I would then, Sir, request you for a while to lay aside the thoughts of the amusement which your Letter has caused to yourself or others, and to consider in earnestness some of the evils into which it has betrayed you, and may and must betray others. I will confine myself to three:—

1. Irreverent treatment of holy things.
2. Sacrifice of truth.
3. False insinuation, and consequently slandering.

And these I impute, not to yourself: on the contrary, I think that, in your natural character, you would be very far from them. I would speak of them only as inseparable consequences of the line which you have taken.

I. IRREVERENCE.—It may suffice, Sir, to mention some of the subjects which were necessarily brought into your ill-advised jest.

1. Persons' belief as to our Lord's presence in the Communion.
2. The mode in which the Commission ordained for the preaching and maintenance of the everlasting Gospel has been continued to this day.
3. The maintenance of the form of our public worship, and the doctrines therein contained.
4. The comfort which the dying Christian obtains from the provisions of our Church.
5. The unity of the Church of Christ.
6. The authority of His bishops, or of His Church.

7. The quiet frame of mind of a simple, undisputing Christian.

It is not here the question, whether any of the writers whom you ridicule, over-stated the truth upon any of these points. I am convinced that they have not. But granting that they had, is ridicule a safe, a Christian, a godly, weapon to employ in such matters? Is it possible that those who should have been thereby made ashamed of, or scared from, any of those statements, would approach the consideration of the truth itself with that deep and considerate earnestness and reverence of mind which the subject requires,—if, indeed, you yet hold that there be any truth at all connected even with these subjects? Is it not too probable that the infection of this ridicule will extend to other truths; some of which, I presume, you would not wish to see thus assailed? since the efficacy of Baptism, the strengthening of the believer's soul by the Body and Blood of his Lord in the holy Eucharist, the Divinity of our Redeemer, and His sacrifice for sin, have been, and still are by some, represented as relics of Popery? The Socinians, and, more recently, the Rationalists of Germany, regarded or represented themselves as carrying on the work of the first Reformers, in purging Christianity from Papal corruptions.

Ridicule cannot be employed with impunity as a test of truth: error and truth often lie so closely together, nay, most religious error has so much of truth mingled up with it, that the very love of truth ought to preclude the use of jesting; not to say that the fearfulness of the subject, and the majesty of Almighty God, might well instinctively awe man into sobriety. For, through this close connection of truth and error, mire cannot be cast at error, without defiling the truth also. To take the most palpable errors,—Could a man jest at Transubstantiation, and not thereby unfit his mind for the reception of the holy mystery of the Communion? or would not a mocking at the false doctrine of the Mediation of the Saints lower men's notions of their high and holy state? or has not the

jesting, even at the most unreal delusions of the imagination, injured men's faith in the influences of God's blessed Spirit? Throughout, Sir, we are standing upon holy ground; and it beseems us to pull the shoes from off our feet, and tread reverently. Let error be removed as a disease, gently handling those who suffer under it, or repressing those who wilfully propagate it; but let us not sport with the Enemy of men's souls.

This subject, however, has been handled by one to whose talents you would perhaps pay deference,—Bp. Warburton; and to him I would refer you. He has not indeed the earnestness or depth of the writers of the seventeenth century, yet he states facts which it were well for this age to lay to heart. For we are now reaping the harvest which the infidels of his day sowed; only in his times men yet looked to principles—in these they regard only their practical efficiency in carrying a point: then the evil was without, now it is admitted within the Church. I will now, then, request your attention to a few extracts only from his address to the Freethinkers, to whom he dedicates the first three books of *The Divine Legation*.

“Your writers offer your considerations to the world, either under the character of petitioners for oppressed and injured truth, or of teachers to ignorant and erring men. These sure are characters that, if any, require seriousness and gravity to support them. But so great strangers are we to decorum on our entry on the stage of life, that, for the most part, we run giddily on, in a mixed and jumbled character; but have most an end, a strong inclination to make a farce of it, and mingle buffoonery with the most serious scenes. Hence, even in religious controversy, while the great cause of eternal happiness is trying, and men and angels, as it were, attending the issue of the conflict, we can find room for a merry story.

“This quality [of making men laugh] causing the writer to be so well received, yours have been tempted to dispense with the solemnity of their character, as thinking it of much importance to get the laugh on their side. Hence *ridicule* is become their favourite figure of speech. It is inconceivable what havoc false wit makes in a foolish head. ‘The rabble of mankind,’ as an excellent writer [Addison] well observes, ‘being very apt to think, that every thing which is laughed at, with any mixture of wit, is ridiculous in itself.’ Few reflect on what a great wit [Wycherly] has so ingenuously owned, ‘*that wit is generally false reasoning.*’

“To see what little good is to be expected in this way of wit and humour,

one may go further, and observe, that even the ridicule of false virtue hath been sometimes attended with mischievous effects. The Spaniards have lamented, and I believe truly, that Cervantes's just and inimitable ridicule of *knight-errantry* rooted up, with that folly, a great deal of their *real honour*. And it was apparent that Butler's fine satire on *fanaticism* contributed not a little, during the licentious times of Charles II., to bring *sober piety* into disrepute. The reason is evident: there are many lines of resemblance between truth and its counterfeits; and it is the province of *wit* only to find out the *likenesses* in things, and not the talent of the *common admirers of it* to discover the *differences*."

But if these evils result from ridiculing religious error, what shall be said, if what you have ridiculed be after all the truth? And yet, because ultra-Protestants of the present day think any truth to approximate to Popery, it follows not that it is Popish, or if found in Popery, it follows not that it is untrue, else must all the Catholic verities be untrue also. Whenever you shall be pleased to abandon the ground of ridicule, and to treat questions of religious truth with seriousness, then will we also show, that the positions which you have ridiculed are neither Papistical nor untrue, but that you have been ridiculing the truth. Meanwhile, we propose for your consideration a catalogue¹ of writers (which might easily be swelled to any amount), who, upon the subject which you have chosen for your chiefest ridicule, and which ultra-Protestants of this day are most ashamed of, have spoken as strongly as they, whom you on that ground decry as Papists: I mean, Apostolical Succession.

I would only observe by the way, since persons in these days dispense lightly with truths, the value whereof they do not understand, that in jesting at the doctrine of apostolical succession you despise a fact, wherein one of the acutest writers of any age or land saw an evidence for the truth of our holy faith. The apostolical succession of ministers is a fact which satisfies Leslie's criteria of the truth of the history wherewith it is connected; and the sceptical Middleton in vain attempted, during

¹ See Appendix. Tracts for the Times, No. 74.

above ten years, to find any case, to which Leslie's criteria applied, and which yet was untrue.

I will extract such portion of Leslie's words, as may suffice to explain this. (Short's Method with the Deists, iii. 2.)

“Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, were instituted as perpetual memorials of these things (the matters of fact recorded in the Gospel of our blessed Saviour); and they were not instituted in after-ages, but at the very time when these things were said to be done, and have been observed without interruption in all ages through the whole Christian world, down all the way, from that time to this. And Christ Himself did ordain apostles, and other ministers of His Gospel, to preach and administer these sacraments, and to govern His Church, and that always, even unto the end of the world. Accordingly, they have continued by regular succession to this day; and no doubt ever shall, while the earth shall last. So that the Christian clergy are as notorious a matter of fact, as the tribe of Levi among the Jews. And the Gospel is as much a law to the Christians as the books of Moses to the Jews; and it being part of the matters of fact related in the Gospel, that such an order of men were appointed by Christ, and to continue to the end of the world, consequently, if the Gospel was a fiction, and invented (as it must be) in some age after Christ, then, at that time, when it was first invented, there could be no such order of clergy, as derived themselves from the institution of Christ; which must give the lie to the Gospel, and demonstrate the whole to be false. And the matters of fact of Christ being pressed to be true, no otherwise than as there was at that time (whenever the Deists will suppose the Gospel to be forged), not only public sacraments of Christ's institution, but an order of clergy, likewise of His appointment, to administer them; and it being impossible there could be any such things before they were invented, it is as impossible that they should be received when invented.”

Of a truth, you know not wherewith you are trifling; and I would mention this rather as an unexpected benefit, derived from adherence to the truth, than as the use of that truth,—an instance how many hidden values every truth contains within it, though but gradually perhaps evolved to us, how much more than we are aware we lose, if we abandon truth.

The progress of error on this head is indeed a warning how men be ashamed of any, even though it seem to them the least portion of the truth committed to their trust; men first suppressed it as invidious, and an obstacle to charity, then were ashamed of it, then disbelieved it, lastly ridicule it. Those of this generation must lock to it, lest the fear of avowing their

conviction lead to the same result with regard to the sacraments of their Lord ; whether they have not already taken the first steps.

II. SACRIFICE OF TRUTH.

This again I would regard as the inevitable result of the use of ridicule ; and its ill tendency is the more illustrated by its having corrupted your natural love of fairness. It is part of the character which you have adopted, not of your own. For having once resolved on the fiction which was to be the vehicle of your satire, then the laws of composition required that the fiction should be in keeping, however at variance with the laws of truth. The laws of fiction are indeed stern laws, since they require the sacrifice of whatever is at variance with themselves. Having adopted the fiction of a letter from the Pope to certain members of your Church, as being his emissaries, it became necessary, by disguise, or omission, or perversion, to conceal whatever would have disturbed the unity of the drama. For instance, you play not unfrequently upon the words which one of these writers addresses to the Church of Rome,—“*Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses.*” And who would not echo the wish? Who,—bearing in mind the holy truths which Rome, amid her corruptions, yet holds, how much of the highest Christian truth, which many Protestant bodies have lost, or are in jeopardy of losing, on the mystery of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, and its consequences ; or considering, again, the extent of her Communion,—would not wish, and long, and pray that she might be freed from her anti-Christian servitude ; that she, as ourselves have been, might be restored to her primeval purity, when she was once the guardian of Christian truth ; that God would “break the yoke of her burden, the staff on her shoulder, and the rod of her oppressor?” (Is. ix. 4.) Taken then in their obvious sense, the words are the expression of every Christian heart. Your fiction, however, required that they should express a desire for union with Rome AS SHE IS ; and in this sense, accordingly, you

quote them. The very next words of the writer contradict this. He proceeds (and to prevent the possibility of mistake, he has printed these words in capitals),—

“But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy : we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God’s truth ; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed ; it cannot be reformed.”

Honesty required the insertion of these words ; but they would have spoiled the jest, and so they are omitted.

Again, as a member, to all appearance, of our Church, and so having no prejudice against her, it is hardly probable that you should believe what a recent author¹ has well termed “The fable of the Nag’s Head consecration.” Bishop Bull calls it “a putrid fable ;” and even Lingard, who shrinks not from any plausible fable, discards it². It suited, however, your assumed character, and so, in answer to the words—

“As to the fact of Apostolical succession, every link in the chain is known, from St. Peter to our present metropolitans.”

You reply :

“But surely you are aware of all the circumstances of the Nag’s-head consecration. This must at least diminish confidence as to the continuity

¹ Short’s History of the Church of England, chap. viii. § 409.

“Strype has been very particular in recording every thing which was done on this occasion, from the most authentic documents, in order to refute the fable of the Nag’s Head consecration, which was promulgated by the Roman Catholics about forty years after the event had taken place, when it might have been supposed that all direct testimony had been lost. The story is, that the bishops met at a tavern which bore that sign, and that when Oglethorp refused to consecrate them, Scory laid a Bible on each of their heads, and bade them rise up bishops. The tale has been refuted as often as brought forward.”

The following also is the statement of the Calvinist Professor, John Prideaux. “The public acts are still extant in Mason and others, honestly brought forward, and they sufficiently annihilate this *transparent lie* of the calumniators. Archbishop Abbot caused them to be shown to certain priests, to convince them of the impudence of this fiction, that so they might at length cease from seducing so wickedly their credulous Proselytes.” (Controv. de Disciplina Ecclesiæ, p. 248. The Italics are his.)

² Hist. of England, Vol. 7. Note I.

of your links, and compel every reasonable mind to doubt as to the reality of your succession. Even a doubt on such a point is fatal to all the claims of your Church."

Yet you, Sir, can have no "doubt upon this point;" and still you are raising a doubt in the minds of the ignorant and unwary; and countenancing the only pretext of the Church of Rome to deny us the character of a true Church. Your jest again imposed hard laws upon you.

Again; a lay writer in the tracts had said,

"Ordination, or, as it is called in the case of bishops, consecration, though it does not precisely come within our definition of a sacrament, is nevertheless a rite partaking, in a high degree, of the sacramental character, and it is by reference to the proper sacraments that its nature can be most satisfactorily illustrated."

Now this statement is made, not to exalt the priesthood, (although, if *we* duly "magnified our office," it were to be hoped, that it would be exercised more earnestly,) but to meet the common-place objection to the transmission of orders by a regular unbroken succession from the Apostles, viz., that some of the bishops, through whom they were transmitted, may have been unholy men. Now the case of the "proper sacraments" does illustrate this; for since we hold that "the effect of Christ's ordinance is not taken away by the wickedness of evil men," even though they "have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments," forasmuch as "the sacraments be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men," (Art. xxvi.), we cannot consistently object, *à priori*, to the grace of ordination being conveyed down, by virtue of our Lord's institution, even through the hands of evil men. In the words of the layman, (shortly following your extract,) p. 10. :

"He who receives unworthily, or in an improper state of mind, either ordination or consecration, may probably receive to his own soul no saving health from the hallowed rite; but while we admit, as we do, the validity of sacraments administered by a priest thus unworthily ordained, we cannot consistently deny that of ordination, in any of its grades, when bestowed by a bishop as unworthily consecrated. The very question of

worth, indeed, with relation to such matters is absurd. Who is worthy? Who is a fit dispenser of the gifts of the Holy Spirit? What are, after all, the petty differences between sinner and sinner, when viewed in relation to Him, whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity, and who charges His very angels with folly?"

This would have been the question to be considered, had you been in earnest; but it was an earnest question, and so afforded no room for pleasantry. You turn aside, then, to lay hold of the expression, "our definition of a sacrament," and make the pope to say, (p. 13.):

"We do not blame you, beloved brethren, for its not coming perfectly within your Church's definition of a sacrament; but we feel convinced that, when opportunity may serve, you will so alter the definition as to increase the number of your sacraments."

Yet since the "layman" distinguished "orders" from the "proper sacraments," it was an ill pleasantry, which would represent him, as wishing to include them therein, although you need not have gone as far as Rome for a definition which would have included them. St. Augustine's definition of a sacrament, (with which Calvin wishes to show that his own agrees, Instit. iv. 14. 1.) had sufficed: "a visible sign of a sacred thing," or "a visible form of invisible grace." The word "sacrament" has namely, (as every one knows,) a larger use, although the "two proper sacraments" have always had their distinct reverence, as not conveying grace only, but directly uniting men with their Redeemer. In this larger sense, however, even foreign reformers have not scrupled to call ordination not merely "a rite, partaking in a high degree of the sacramental character," but "a sacrament." Thus even Calvin says, (Instit. iv. 14. 20.):

"I am speaking of the sacraments instituted for the use of the *whole* Church. For the imposition of hands, whereby the ministers of the Church are initiated to their office, as on the one hand *I am not unwilling that it should be called a sacrament*, so on the other I do not count it among the *ordinary* sacraments."

And again, (iv. 19. 31.):

"There remaineth imposition of hands, which, *as in true and lawful*

ordinations, I allow to be a sacrament, so I deny that it has any place in this farce, (those of Rome,) wherein they neither obey Christ's command, nor regard the end, to which the promise ought to lead us."

And Melanchthon, (Apolog. Confess. de numero et usu sacram.) :

"If orders be understood of the 'ministry of the word,' we should not scruple to call orders a sacrament. For the ministry of the word has the command of God, and magnificent promises, Rom. i. Is. lv. If orders are understood in this sense, neither should I scruple to call imposition of hands a sacrament. For the Church hath the command to appoint ministers, which ought to be most acceptable to us, for we know, that God approves that ministry, *and is present thereat*. And it is of moment, to set forth and extol, as much as may be, the ministry of the word, against fanatical men, who dream that the Holy Spirit is given, not by the word, but for some preparations of their own if they sit idle," &c.

And again, (Loci, de numero sacram.) :

"I approve most thoroughly that ordination be added thereto, (to the sacraments,) *i. e.*, the calling to the ministry of the Church, and the public attestation of that calling. For all these are ordained by a command of the Gospel, as Tit. i. 5. and there is added a promise, the greatest of all, which attests that God really worketh effectually by the ministry of those who are chosen by the voice of the Church, as that universal saying beareth record of the apostles, and all who transmit the word delivered through the apostles, 'The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' And Christ saith, John xvii., 'I pray not for these alone,' &c., and John xx. 23. Eph. iv. 8—11. Luke x. 16. John xv. 5. 2 Cor. v. 18, 20. 2 Cor. iii. 6. These, and many like sayings, evidently testify that God worketh effectually by this very ministry of those who teach the Gospel, which ministry He wills to preserve in the Church by a continued calling."

We do not, however, need such authorities; we would rather refer you to the wisdom of our English writers, as Hooker, who speaketh of things as being "*as sacraments*," or Archbishop Wake, who objects not to its being called "a kind of Particular Sacrament."

But before you repeat your jest, allow me one earnest question; When one is set apart for the ministry, and the bishop pronounces over him the words,

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the

Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands,"

do you think that he receives no spiritual benefit? or that no spiritual benefit is thereby implied? if not, are not the words blasphemy? but if the Holy Ghost be thereby bestowed, if the ordained person "receive the Holy Ghost for the office of a priest in the Church of God," is not ordination to him a means of grace, and so, although not a sacrament, does it not "possess in a high degree the sacramental character?" and ought this subject to be treated of in merriment?

Again, a writer after having, in a very interesting paper, pointed out the notices of an extensive Christian ritual, contained in Scripture itself, adduced two passages, "in further illustration of the subject" from Tertullian, A.D. 200, and St. Basil, A.D. 350, both of whom maintain the binding character of usages, which, though not in Scripture, had come down from the Apostles by a "continuous tradition." And who would not? Is not our argument against the modern Church of Rome, that she has introduced "a *corrupt* following of the Apostles," (Art. 25.) "fond things *vainly invented*" and grounded upon no "warranty of Scripture, but rather *repugnant* to the Word of God" (Art. 22.)? The ground taken by the Church of Rome is that all *her present* traditions are to be received, as of equal validity with the written word, because she holds them; our ground, that they are not to be so received, because they cannot be proved to be apostolic, and some are corrupt and vainly invented. Our controversy then with Rome is not an *à priori* question on the value of tradition in itself, or at an earlier period of the Church, or of such traditions, as, though not contained in Scripture, are primitive, universal, and apostolical, but it is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but, on the contrary, *repugnant* to Scripture," are not to be received. It has manifestly, then, nothing to do with the question between Rome and ourselves, what Tertullian and St. Basil held of traditions

which could be proved to be apostolical; nor does our accepting the traditions of the *universal Church in their day*, involve our accepting those of the *particular Church of Rome*, after so many centuries of corruption, *in the present*.

In your Romanist character it is natural to say,

“These are the principles which have ever guided the Catholic Church; by deviating from these the nations of Europe have fallen into anarchy and confusion; and it is only by zealous efforts, such as our children of the University are now making for the restoration of those principles, that peace and harmony and unity can be reproduced.”

But in your real character how will you excuse the fallacy which your assumed one palmed upon your readers? especially when the writer had accompanied his citations with the remark:

“Tertullian is, on the one hand, a very early witness for the existence of the general doctrine which this passage contains, while on the other he gives no sanction to the claims of those later customs on our acceptance, which the Church of Rome upholds, but which cannot be clearly traced to primitive times.”

Do you really believe that Tertullian and St. Basil bear out the claims of modern Rome? If not, your assumed character was too hard for your honesty—if you do, I leave you to arrange the question with a really learned divine and Bishop of our day.

“In the passage to which reference has just been made, Tertullian speaks of written and unwritten tradition; but the cases in which he lays any stress upon the authority of the latter, are precisely those which our reformers allowed to be within its province—cases of ceremonies and ritual observances. Of these he enumerates several for which no express warrant can be found in Scripture, and which must consequently have been derived solely from tradition; the forms, for instance, observed in baptism, in the administration of the Lord’s Supper, and in public prayer.”

Bishop Kaye is here referring to the very passage of Tertullian, the quotation of which, together with that of St. Basil, calls forth your reprobation; and we cannot do better than refer you, and ultra-Protestants generally, to the masterly

manner in which he treats this whole subject, (Tertullian, p. 202—307. ed. 2.) and especially his refutation of Mr. Thirlwall, (p. 297. sqq. note.)

Or I may refer you to the learned Dr. Hammond, “Seasonable exhortations to all true sons of the Church of England, wherein is inserted a discourse of heresy in defence of our Church against the Romanist.” (§. 3.)

I will cite one passage only, but the whole essay is well deserving of study.

“To this also my concession shall be as liberal as any Romanist can wish, that there are two ways of conveying such revelations to us; one in writing, the other by oral tradition; the former in the Gospels and other writings of the Apostles, &c. which make up the Sacred Writ, or Canon of the New Testament; the latter in the Apostles’ preachings to all the Churches of their plantation, which are no where set down for us in the Sacred Writ, but conserved as *deposita* by them to whom they were entrusted.”

“And although in sundry respects the former of these be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands (thus much being on these grounds confessed by Bellarmine himself, that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief), yet there being no less veracity in the tongues than the hands, in the preachings than the writings, of the apostles; nay, ‘prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus,’ saith Tertullian; ‘the apostles preached before they writ—planted Churches before they addressed epistles to them;’ on these grounds, *I make no scruple to grant that apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as apostolical writings, are equally the matter of that Christian’s belief, who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that, as the one is apostolical writing, so the other is apostolical tradition.*”

In the subsequent chapters, Dr. Hammond illustrates from the rules of Vincentius Lirinensis, “where these qualifications may be found.”

I will add one more writer, the great Hooker (and I may note that Whitaker, whom he quotes, leans in some things over-much to Geneva, and so to ultra-Protestantism, and yet is here on the same side). Truly, if we are herein Papistical, we are so in goodly company, and no otherwise than our

whole Church and Hooker were by ultra-Protestants always so accounted.

Hooker then says (Eccl. Pol. i. 14.) :

“ We do not reject them (the Romish traditions) only because they are not in the Scripture, but because they are neither in Scripture, nor can otherwise sufficiently, by any reason, be proved to be of God. That which is of God, and may be evidently proved to be so, we deny not but it hath in his kind, although unwritten, the self-same force and authority with the written laws of God. It is by ours ¹ acknowledged ‘ that the apostles did in every Church institute and ordain some rites and customs serving for the seemliness of Church regimen ; which rites and customs they have not committed unto writing.’ Those rites and customs being known to be apostolical, and having the nature of things changeable, were no less to be accounted of in the Church than other things of the like degree, that is to say, capable in like sort of alteration, although set down in the apostles’ writings. *For both being known to be apostolical, it is not the manner of delivering them unto the Church, but the Author from whom they proceed, which doth give them their force and credit.*”

Again, one of these writers, among the dangers of altering the Liturgy, notices the tendency of change itself to produce the love of changing, the appetite growing with what it feeds on. With this view, he instances objections, which men of *opposite* characters might take to the commencement of the service ; as, one might think, “ the introductory sentences not evangelical enough ;” another, “ the form of absolution not strong enough.” Now the very object of the Tract, and the character of the illustrations, showed the writer to be (as he indeed is), content with things as they stand. The jest, however, required that you should represent the contrary as the opinion of the writers of the Tracts, and the Pope feeling for them when they lament concerning the absolution (p. 12), “ that it is a mere declaration, not an announcement of pardon to those who have confessed.”

Yet granting that a writer had thought *this* “ absolution” not strong enough, this would not make out the writer a Papist, since the absolution in the Communion-service is, (as

¹ Whitaker adv. Bellarm. qu. 6. cap. 6.

is right,) stronger than this; and that in the Visitation for the Sick stronger still; so that a person might even wish for a much "stronger" form of absolution, and yet remain within the bounds of our Church. And so little strong did our form appear to the American Episcopalians, that in the Rubric before the absolution, they substituted the words, "*A declaration concerning the Forgiveness of Sins,*" &c. Yet herein we fare better than usual; for you have equally treated (*ibid.*) as Papistical, words wherein another writer (Tracts, No. xvii. p. 4.) embodies our Church's language in the Visitation for the Sick. If a minister, you must, when called upon, use that same language; whether then it be Papistical or no, we may leave you to decide.

Again, another writer, now asleep in the Lord, gave an historical statement of the gradual compression of the Church services, and especially that which went on in the Romish Church, "*long before the abolition of the Latin service.*" (Tract ix. p. 2.) This the Reformers carried on; it is not Papistical, surely, to say "unadvisedly;" a person may regret that the Communion and Morning Service are conjoined, and think that, but for this, the Communion would probably have been administered more frequently, and yet not be a Papist. For this compression of services had begun in Papistical times, and the error of the Reformers (if it was one) was compliance with the "spirit of [a Papistical] age." This, however, would have afforded no room for pleasantries; and so the whole is represented as being, in our eyes, a departure from Rome, and an error of "our misguided Reformers."

One expression of this writer demanded a candid judgment; he said,

"The idea of united worship, with a view to which identity of time and language had been maintained in different nations, was forgotten."

It is plain that what the writer herein lamented was the loss

not of the Latin language as a medium of prayer, but the loss of that feeling of unity, “with a view to which identity of *time*, as well as language, had been maintained in different nations.” He could not, and did not, object to the disuse of a “language not understood by the people.” (Art. xxiv.) Accordingly he added, “the identity of time had been abandoned, and the *identity of language could not be preserved.*” This last sentence would have embarrassed the fiction, and so you have omitted it.

These instances may illustrate the almost certain risk of sacrifice of truth, entailed by such a fiction as that upon which you have ventured. I need not adduce more; for I have no thought of refuting your statements: this we will do, if ever you take upon yourself seriously to maintain them; at present I would only show you the danger of such trifling in holy things.

Before, however, you venture upon serious controversy, as the champion of ultra-Protestantism, I would recommend you to review your armour;—weapons which you have not proved, however they may make a show in this counterfeit and mockery, will not hold in real earnest. You belong, Sir, to a school which would substitute individual speculation for solid learning and the knowledge of antiquity, and which, consequently, has the reputation of at times reproducing as new, and so giving undue and injurious prominence to, what all divines were before well acquainted with; and at times, also, has fallen into strange unhistorical errors. Now, whether a certain doctrine be Papistical or no, is matter of history, not of speculation; and one not versed in history will be liable, perpetually, to confound the earlier truth, or unobjectionable custom, with the later corruption; especially if he has no very clear idea of Christian theology. Thus you attack—as implying transubstantiation—expressions which convey only the doctrine of the Eucharist, as held in the early Church and our own.

The same want of acquaintance with antiquity, probably led you to confound the early practice of commemorating God's departed servants at the holy communion, and praying for their increased bliss and fuller admission to the beatific vision, with the modern abuse of masses for the dead, and the doctrine of purgatory. You found it stated in the account of the ancient liturgies (Tract lxiii.), that "prayers for the dead" occurred in the several ancient liturgies, founded upon those of St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, and St. John.

Our departed friend, namely, put together an interesting paper, shewing "the antiquity of the existing Liturgies." From the tract itself, it would appear that his main object was to direct persons' attention to the view taken in those Liturgies of the consecration and oblation of the Eucharist (p. 16.), since the consecration of the Eucharist is now so often regarded as a mere preliminary, instead of being in itself an essential part of the service; and this falls in with a part of the self-exalting rationalism of the day. In giving an account, however, of the points wherein "all the ancient Liturgies now existing, or which can be proved ever to have existed, resemble one another" (p. 7.), he was necessitated to mention "prayers for the dead" (p. 8, 9.), or, as he explains it, "for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear;" and having mentioned that they "all contain (4.) a prayer, answering in substance to ours for the whole state of Christ's Church militant," he added (5.), "and likewise another prayer (which has been excluded from the English Ritual) for the rest and peace," &c.

He carefully guarded, then, against perplexing men's minds; he did not put the question prominently forward; he did not blame the Reformers under Edward VI. for having yielded to the judgment of foreign ultra-reformers, against their own previous judgment; he stated the simple fact, that this prayer had been *excluded*, i. e. whereas it had been *retained* on the first putting together of our Liturgy in "Edward VI.'s

1st book," it was *excluded* from the 2nd, at the instigation of Bucer and Calvin; and Bucer's alteration was adopted. The original unbiassed judgment, then, of our Reformers, was to retain the prayer; and it argues no tendency to Popery, if any one wish that our Reformers had, in this and other points, for which they had the authority of the early Church, adhered to their first judgment. These same Reformers had at that time a clause in the Litany, which has since been *excluded*, praying against "the tyrannye of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities;" so that you could hardly accuse them of Papistry¹.

The following is the part of the prayer omitted:—

"We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: grant unto them, we beseech thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace; and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son, may altogether be set at His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, 'Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.' Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

Now to this prayer neither Calvin nor Bucer objected that it was Papistical. On the contrary, Calvin says, in his letter to the Protector (Epp. p. 39. fol.),

"I hear that in the celebration of the Supper there is repeated a prayer for the departed, and I well know that this cannot be construed into an approbation of the Papistical Purgatory. Nor am I ignorant that there can be brought forward an *antient rite of making mention of the departed*, that so the communion of all the faithful, being united into one body, might be set forth: but there is this irrefragable argument against it, viz. that the Lord's Supper is a thing so holy, that it must not be defiled with any human addition."

Calvin argues further against the practice, 1st, as "not being

¹ Cranmer had seen and written against the error of Purgatory even under Henry the VIIIth. "The necessary doctrine and erudition of a Christian man," A.D. 1543, is, *in this respect*, a decided advance beyond "The institution of a Christian man," A.D. 1537. (Comp. Formularies of Faith in the reign of Henry VIII., p. 210 and 375-7.)

founded on Scripture;" 2nd, as "not answering the true and lawful use of prayer."

Bucer, again, says, (*Censura in Ordinatio Eccl. Opp. Angl.* p. 467.)

"I know that this custom of praying for departed saints is very old, although there is no mention of it in the description of the Lord's Supper in Justin Martyr."

And having gone over the testimonies from St. Cyprian, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, Dionysius, he subjoins,

"But however old this Dionysius may be, and however great his authority, or that of the other holy fathers, yet we must prefer Divine authority to human, by how much God is greater than man.—Now Holy Scripture teaches neither by word nor example to pray for the dead. And it is forbidden to add or take away from it. Deut. iv. and xii."

Of Scriptural grounds Bucer adduces John v. 24, only, as opposed to this custom, arguing,

"That *the common people* would think that the departed yet lacked that peace, (and so the full mercy of God, whereby He forgives His servants their sins,) and that our prayers were needed to obtain that mercy. No occasion is to be given to this error, especially when we know with what a sea of more than heathen superstition, and with what plagues Satan has by this false persuasion overwhelmed religion."

It may have been on this ground, as Mr. Palmer conjectured, (*English Ritual*, tom. ii. p. 94—97.) that these prayers were omitted, as being so connected in the minds of the common people with the idea of purgatory, that their continuance would have involved the risk of propagating that cruel and pernicious error. If so, the revisers of the Prayer Book, in abandoning their former ground, did wisely and charitably, and as the necessity of the times demanded; and although neither Calvin nor Bucer thought the practice legitimately connected therewith, yet the *common people* may then well have fallen into the mistake, since yourself, who are said to be a theologian, have now done so; for on this ground alone could you have selected this incidental mention of prayers for God's departed servants, as Papistical.

It may not be amiss to subjoin a few of the remarks of the learned Bp. Collyer¹ on this our first reformed liturgy.

“This recommending the dead to the mercy of God is no innovation of the Church of Rome; but a constant usage of the primitive Church. To justify this reformed liturgy in this point I shall produce unexceptionable authority.”

And having quoted Tertullian, St. Cyprian, the Apostolical Constitutions, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and referred to the ancient liturgies, he subjoins:—

“This custom neither supposes the modern purgatory, nor gives any encouragement to libertinism and vice: not to the latter, for St. Austin, with the apostolical constitutions, affirms, that unless a man dies qualified, he cannot receive any assistance from the prayers of the living. That the ancient Church believed the recommending the dead a serviceable office, we need not question; otherwise, to what purpose was it so generally practised? The custom seems to have gone on this principle, that supreme happiness is not to be expected till the resurrection; and that the interval between death and the end of the world is a state of imperfect bliss. The Church might, therefore, believe her prayers for good people departed might improve their condition, and raise the satisfactions of this period.”

And, again, having considered Bucer's objections:

“There is another text urged in favour of Bucer's opinion, ‘Blessed are the dead, which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.’ But this place amounts to no censure, either of the primitive practice, or the reformed common prayer-book before us; for 'tis supposed by the ancients and the office last-mentioned, that the dead are discharged from the fatigues of this life, and their works follow them, and that they are happy on the main; however, it does not follow from hence, but that their condition may be improved, and that they may be served in some measure by the assistance of the living.—I have already observed, prayer for the dead does not imply purgatory; whence it follows, that though the Church of England condemns the Romish doctrine of purgatory, (Art. 22.) we cannot thence infer her dislike of prayer for the dead.”

With regard to your insinuation that those who approve of the primitive practice of praying for the dead, “will feel a new proof that the Church, which has retained this office, is alone worthy of their regard,” Collyer furnishes the answer, 1. That the Church of England no where restrains her children from

¹ Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain, P. ii. Book iv. p. 257.

praying for their departed friends, if this approves itself to their consciences. 2. That the terms of joining with the Church of Rome are so hard, her corruptions so manifold, that "supposing the Church of England was chargeable with the omission of a primitive usage, *which is more* than I affirm: 'tis more eligible to adhere to her, than part with her communion upon so remarkable an exchange."

Since Rome has blended the cruel invention of purgatory with the primitive custom of prayer for the dead, (not to speak now of her other corruptions) it is not in communion with her that any can seek for comfort from this rite.

It would be well for the modern controversialist with Rome, to weigh Bishop Bull's language on this subject (Sermon iii. ed. Burton, and "Corruptions of the Church of Rome, in answer to the Bishop of Meaux' queries," t. ii. p. 260.) lest he involve himself in difficulty for want of making this distinction. Bishop Bull says,

"Prayers for the dead, *as founded on the hypothesis of purgatory (and we no otherwise reject them)*, fall together with it :"

And with these he contrasts

"The prayers of the ancient Church, either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful at the oblation of the holy eucharist, or the particular prayers used at the funerals of any of the faithful lately deceased. The former respected their final absolution [accomplishment, perfecting,] and the consummation of their bliss at the resurrection, like as that our Church useth both in the office for the Communion, and in that for the burial of the dead, which indeed seems to be no more than that we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer, (if we rightly understand it), 'Thy kingdom come,' " &c.

Indeed, as Bishop Bull here implies, the very idea of an intermediate state involves in it a degree of prayer for God's departed servants; since, knowing them to be in a state of imperfect bliss until the resurrection, whenever we pray for the final "coming of God's kingdom," we do in fact (if we have any thought for the departed) pray at the same time for the perfecting of their bliss. And thus, in the service of the burial for the dead, when we pray God

"Of His gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of His

elect, and to hasten His kingdom; that we, *with all those that are departed in the true faith of His Holy Name*, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul ;”

this undoubtedly implies a prayer for the consummation of the bliss of the departed. And we, who so lose out of mind God’s departed servants, have also almost lost the notion of the intermediate state. On the other hand, as Bishop Bull also points out, these prayers for the departed servants of God, exclude the false invention of purgatory. Bishop Bull writes—

“ In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced person attentively observe the prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient liturgies, and he will be so far from believing the Romish purgatory on the account of those prayers, that he will be found to confess that they make directly against it. For (to omit other arguments) they all run (as even that prayer for the dead, which is unadvisedly left by the Romanists in their own canon of the mass as a testimony against themselves), in this form:— ‘ For all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord.’ Now how can they be said to be ‘ in peace or at rest in the Lord,’ who are supposed to be in a state of misery and torment ?”

I may add the following extract from the “ Antient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem,” which formed part of the devotions of Bishop Andrews¹. As being an antient liturgy, it of course expresses all which could be meant in this reference to “ Antient Liturgies.”

“ Grant that we may all find mercy and favour with all thy saints, who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased Thee in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Thy Christ, from righteous Abel even unto this day; do thou give *them* and us rest in the region of the living in the bosom of our holy Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence sorrow, grief, and lamentation are banished away where the light of thy countenance shines continually; and vouchsafe to bring *them* and us to the full enjoyment of Thy heavenly kingdom.”

I have dwelt the longer upon this subject, as being aware that you have reputed it a vulnerable point, and you have served your purpose well, by giving it a prominence, which it did not

¹ See Dean Stanhope’s translation, p. 47, ed. Christian Knowledge Society.

occupy in our Tracts, nor even in that one of our departed friend, wherein alone it was mentioned, and that but incidentally and of necessity. The object of his tract (and it was a very laudable one), being to point out the agreement as well as the antiquity of the existing liturgies, it would have been dishonest, wilfully to have suppressed any one point, wherein they so agreed. This, therefore, he stated; meanwhile he expressed no opinion on it, attracted no attention to it, but simply set it down, as he found it, a matter of fact; and but for your acute scent of a weak part, it might have remained unnoticed. No evil could have arisen from his simple statement of the fact. You, indeed, may possibly perplex men's minds, little prepared as they are for the discussion of the point, by confounding it with a popish superstition (which Calvin did not do), and thereby giving arms to opponents of our Church: it is ours to vindicate the early Church and our reformers.

It is, meanwhile, not a little remarkable that the main position of this tract which you have selected for censure, is precisely that incidentally maintained by the learned Archbishop Wake, of whose soundness never was any doubt in the Church. The position was;

“That although the several liturgies have been much interpolated and in parts corrupted, much likewise has been handed down from the first uninterpolated, and that means exist for ascertaining what parts are interpolated and what pure and genuine; the pure and genuine parts being those wherein all agree.”

Archbishop Wake says in like manner, (Dissert. on the Apostolical Fathers, c. ix. § 20.):—

“However, since it can hardly be doubted but that those holy Apostles and Evangelists [St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James,] did give some directions for the administration of the blessed eucharist in those Churches; it may reasonably be presumed that some of those orders are still remaining in those liturgies which have been brought down to us under their names; and *that those prayers wherein they all agree, (in sense, at least, if not in words,) were first prescribed in the same, or like terms, by those Apostles and Evangelists*; nor would it be difficult to make a farther proof of this conjecture from the writings of the ancient fathers, if it were needful, in this place, to insist upon it.”

One word more on a connected subject ; you represent the writers as dissatisfied with the changes formerly made in the services, and wishing to introduce others more conformable to the ritual of Rome. (p. 12.)

This (as I have already in part shewn,) is not so ; for, first, you have (as is your wont) confounded the primitive with the Romish ritual : secondly, we never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church ; we bless God that our lot has fallen in her bosom,—that He has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrine and a liturgy so holy ; and although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question : THERE CAN NOT BE REAL ALTERATION, WITHOUT A SCHISM ; and as we claim to have our own consciences respected, and not to have any doctrines suppressed which the formularies of our Church now express, so, even if we had the power of change, would we respect the consciences of others, and not urge upon our superiors, or seek for support in behalf of the restitution of that more antient form, which we hold abstractedly the better.

The whole course of the Tracts has, as you know, and yourself reproach us with, been against innovation ; how, then, is it honest in your assumed character, to give us the following advice ;—

“ You cannot be certain that those in authority would consent to those alterations, which you regard as improvements ; and you must not be hasty in urging them too far ;”

as if we had ever had any such wish ?

I may yet add another instance of the risk, which (for want of better acquaintance with our old divines,) you run of involving unawares in your censures those giants of old times, against whom, for very shame, a modern should not open his mouth, while you think you are only attacking men of modern days like yourself, *οἱ τοὺν βροτοὶ εἰσι*.

Every system of theology, as indeed every tendency of mind, every good disposition, every performance of religious

duty, has its dangers, the danger of degenerating; and so, of necessity, has Protestantism. One of the writers of the Tracts brought forward some of these in warning, especially the tendency to require too rigid argumentation, explicit proof, and not to yield to conviction until compelled. The Romanist is too easy of belief, believes on false grounds; the *tendency* of the Protestant is, to be over-difficult of belief, not to believe on sufficient and true grounds. This was illustrated by reference to the prevailing feelings in some quarters with regard to episcopacy; and it was shown, that the same principle would consistently extend not only to infant baptism, but to a case of "*doctrine, of necessary doctrine, doctrine the very highest and most sacred, where the argument lies as little upon the surface of Scripture,—where the proof, though most conclusive, is as indirect and circuitous as that for episcopacy, viz. the doctrine of the Trinity. Where is this solemn and comfortable mystery formally stated in Scripture, as we find it in the Creed? Why is it not? Let a man consider whether all the objections which he urges against the Scripture argument for Episcopacy may not be turned against his own belief in the Trinity. It is a happy thing for themselves that men are inconsistent; yet it is miserable to advocate and establish a principle, which, not in their own case indeed, but in the case of others who learn it of them, leads to Socinianism. This being considered, can we any longer wonder at the awful fact, that the descendants of Calvin, the first Presbyterian, are at the present day in the number of those who have denied the Lord who bought them?*"

It certainly was not any common mind, which saw how a principle, now so commonly avowed in the instance of episcopacy, will, when carried out, ultimately affect men's belief in the highest doctrines of the faith: it was also popular ground to take, and a great temptation, to represent these writers, as weakening the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity—and you have fallen into it. I must own that I do not understand all which your words would insinuate; but the tone of triumph in which it is announced, implies that you have found, in your opinion, a weak point. You call it (p. 37, 38.)

"a noble passage, which we can never sufficiently admire;"

you tell us,

"you can always triumphantly appeal to your own writings to prove that

you have always maintained on abstract grounds, even when you were not assailing individuals, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not explicitly revealed in Scripture. We shall cite the passage we allude to, because we delight in transcribing truth, and because we would recommend our beloved children to have it engraven on the doors of their houses, as a public announcement of the orthodoxy of their faith, and the righteousness of their conduct."

But what, then, if this statement, for which its author is thus assailed, occur in the writings of those who have been ever regarded as great lights of our Church, and that, in relation to the same subjects? Your irony will reach rather further than you intended.

I will cite two only, Hooker and Bp. Beveridge.

Hooker then says (Eccl. Pol. i. 41.),

"There hath been some doubt, likewise, whether *containing in Scripture*, do import express setting down in plain terms, or else *comprehending* in such sort, that by reason we may from thence conclude all things which are necessary. Against the former of these two constructions, instance hath sundry ways been given. For our belief in the Trinity, the co-eternity of the Son of God with His Father, the Proceeding of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, the duty of baptizing infants; these, with such other principal points, the necessity whereof is by none denied, are notwithstanding in Scripture no where to be found by express literal mention; only deduced they are out of Scripture by collection."

Bp. Beveridge is much fuller, speaks upon the whole subject, and yet it would be difficult to point out any difference between his statements and those of the Tracts. The passage is part of the Preface to his learned Essay on the Canons of the Primitive Church.

"Yet, indeed, this holy Scripture, although in those precepts which are absolutely necessary to the salvation of every man, it be very clear and plain to all; yet in things relating to doctrine and the outward discipline of the Church, it is not, on account of its very depth, understood in the same way by all; but "different people interpret its divine sayings differently, so that it would seem as if as many meanings almost might be extracted from it, as there are men," as Vincentius Lirinensis of old observed, and it abundantly appears from heretics and schismatics, who each obtain their own perverse opinions and practice from holy Scripture, interpreted after their own way. In matters, then, of this sort, if we would be secure against erring or stumbling, first of all, beyond question, we

must beware of adhering too pertinaciously to the private opinions or conjectures, whether of ourselves or others; rather should we review what the whole Church, or at least the majority of Christians thought thereon, and acquiesce in that opinion, in which Christians of all ages agreed. For as ‘in all things the agreement of all is the voice of nature,’ as Cicero saith, so in things of this nature, ‘the agreement of all Christians may well be accounted the voice of the Gospel.’ But there are many things, which, although they are not read expressly and definitely in holy Scripture, yet by the common consent of all Christians are obtained from it. For instance, ‘*That¹ in the ever blessed Trinity Three distinct Persons are to be worshipped, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that each of these is very God, and yet that there is only one God: that Christ is θεῶνθρωπος, very God and very man in one and the same Person.*’ These and the like truths, although they are not delivered in so many words and syllables, either in the Old or New Testament, yet all Christians have been agreed upon them, as being founded in both; excepting only some few heretics, of whom in religion no greater account is to be had, than, in nature, of monsters. So, also, ‘*that infants are to be cleansed by holy baptism, and sponsors to be employed in that Sacrament, that the Lord’s Day or the first in each week is to be religiously kept; that the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Lord into heaven, and the coming of the Holy Ghost, are to be commemorated every year; that the Church is to be every where governed by Bishops, distinct from the Presbyters, and set over them.*’ These and other things of the like nature are no where directed in holy Scripture, expressly and by name; nevertheless, for fourteen hundred years from the apostles, they were everywhere publicly received by this Church; nor can, within that period, any Church be found which does not agree therein. So that they are, as it were, *universal notions*, implanted in the minds of all Christians from the first, not so much from any particular passages of Scripture as from all; from the general scope and tenor of the entire Gospel; from the nature and design of the religion therein established; and from the uniform tradition of the apostles, who, together with the faith, delivered down Church-rites of this sort, and (so to speak) general interpretations of the Gospel, throughout the whole world; otherwise it were incredible, yea, it were altogether impossible, that they should be received with such universal consent, everywhere and always.”

III. IMPUTATION OF FALSE MOTIVES, AND SO SLANDERING.

There is, however, another class of desertions of the truth, which, in your natural character, as we are persuaded, you would most abhor, but which your assumed one has forced upon you; I mean, imputation of dishonesty to men whom, in your con-

¹ The Italics are Bp. Beveridge’s.

science, you believe and know to be honest. This was indeed a necessary part of the fiction; for an agreement with the Church of Rome in things indifferent, or upon which our Church has not deemed it necessary to pronounce, would even to ultra-Protestants appear to involve no very serious charge. It became requisite, then, to insinuate that they agreed with Rome further than was expressed, although prudential or other motives kept them from avowing it. This the fiction enabled you to do covertly, since such dishonesty has ever been part of the corrupt policy of modern Rome. Hence such phrases as—

“We make allowance for those difficulties which impede your perception or *your avowal of the truth.*” (p. 6.)

Further, you know that these authors had written also against Popery, and republished older writings against it: their very tracts are known by the name of “Tracts against Popery and Dissent,” although, when they were commenced, Dissent was every where a pressing evil; Popery had scarcely begun to bestir itself, and was therefore the less noticed¹. You know that all occasions of guarding against the corruptions of Rome had been used in the very tracts corrective of dissent. Such writers, however, would have been but bad allies to the Pope, and therefore this proceeding must, by the laws of fiction, be represented as insincere. Hence such passages as—

“We pardon some expressions towards us; compelled, no doubt, partly by the unhappy circumstances of your country. You have indeed sometimes employed terms which we well know our adversaries use in derision of us; but, we repeat, we can pardon these, whether they are the result of prejudices still entertained by you, or *are employed for some other reason* (p. 6, 7.). That communion, of which the present circumstances of your country have made you, *almost unavoidably*, members. (p. 11.) While we perceive with delight that you have always spoken, in your own persons, in accordance with our sentiments on this head, you have, at the same time, selected some tracts from early writers of your communion,

¹ A new series of “tracts against Romanism” had meanwhile been actually commenced, although not then published.

in which our sentiments are impugned. These old tracts will not be read with much attention, compared, at least, with your own more lively productions : they can too be readily withdrawn when it is expedient ; for they are not a pledge of your opinions as strong as your own writings. In the mean time, you may appeal to your republication of them as a proof that you have not leagued yourselves with us."

Now of all this, Sir, you do not believe one syllable ; you do *not* think that, either in the republication of the older, or the protests of the more modern tracts against Popery, their editors or authors were actuated by any such motives ; ¹ while you impute insincerity, you have reason to believe them as sincere as yourself. It is an ill tree which brings forth fruit thus corrupt.

There is one more evil desertion of truth, which I fear cannot be ascribed to any wish to "adorn your tale," although you have thereby been enabled to convey it in a form less manifestly offensive. You say,

"Another piece of advice which we shall give to you, (as we give it to all our Missionaries,) is, that you should adopt every means to undermine the influence of those whose writings hold out no hope that they may be won over to the true Church. They are, in truth, dangerous men, and you should represent them as such. Be not deceived by their apparent amiability, by their virtuous conduct, or by their extent of learning. These very circumstances render them the more to be dreaded. Suffer not such men to be the instructors of youth. Do not permit them to occupy those places which public spirit alone ought to make you anxious to occupy, even independently of any desire for your individual advancement." (p. 34.)

I can the less lay this to the account of the fiction, because it is manifestly the one object of your whole attack upon these writers ; whether out of private friendship to Dr. Hampden,

¹ Meanwhile, however, the calumny is spread in real earnest. The anonymous compiler of the 'Specimens of Theological Teaching,' &c. among the very few statements on which he ventures, echoes it, 'Indeed, while these writers profess their love and reverence for the Church of Rome [as it is?], they take care to *protest* against it, as all Protestants of course *must do.*'" (p. 37.)

or of alarm for yourself, as a member of the same school—*nam tua res agitur, cum proximus ardet Ucalegon*—it is notorious that you imagined these writers to be the principal authors of the measures taken in consequence of that unhappy appointment, and that your avowed object was, to “effect a diversion¹.” Herein you were mistaken; since there prevailed throughout Oxford one universal feeling of alarm, (which, under the name of “panic,” the heathen, more religiously than we, would have ascribed to “the gods,”) as soon as the appointment was known. These individuals but joined what already existed. But I would now speak of the truth of the imputation only; you have known, or have been aided (we have ground to think) by others acquainted with those of whom you speak; and you dare not, in your own person, avow your belief, or even your suspicion, of the truth of the allegation, which, under your assumed character, you have insinuated. You know and believe it to be untrue; and thus there is another evil of these unhappy disguises, that they furnish men the temptation of half saying, what they would shrink from speaking openly,

¹ The object, thus covertly conveyed in this first essay, is now boldly avowed in the “*Specimens of Theological Teaching*,” and in the *Edinburgh Review*. To any one acquainted with Oxford, the notion is altogether absurd: there is in Oxford, happily, far too much thoughtfulness and scrupulousness to be influenced by any party, however powerful: men here form their individual convictions, according to their own consciences; party-feeling neither existed, nor had it existed, would it have had any influence; but, in truth, individuals of every shade of religious opinion within the latitude left free by our Articles, were united by one feeling of common danger impending over the Church, and that, independently of each other: they met and acted together spontaneously, actuated only by one common apprehension. The opinions, then, of a certain number of the “*Corpus Committee*,” is in reality, *nihil ad rem*; but will any one say that the charges against Dr. Hampden were confined to “*undervaluing antiquity, or the sacraments, or the authority of the Church*,” or that the prominent charges were not rather, his vague and Sabellian notions on the doctrine of the Trinity, the rationalizing of the Atonement, and generally, a system, opposed to the Articles? The Articles of our Church, not the teaching of any set of men, were made our standard; and to this standard and primitive antiquity would we appeal for ourselves.

as knowing or suspecting it to be untrue : but now, if untrue, it is to pass as part of the jest, and so they take courage, and stifle their consciences.

For ourselves, you will have done us good service ; your attack will fall harmless alike on those of us who are now with the Lord, or upon those who remain ; but your revival of the old Presbyterian cry against “ Prelacy and Popery,” will show the members of our Church what is really censured under the name of Popery : they will see the necessity of striking back into the old paths, and manfully avowing truths, which many of late have shrunk from, as invidious. You, Sir, have been consistent ; it is, if we are rightly informed, your favourite maxim that the bishops have been the great hinderers of the development of the Reformation for the last 300 years ; *i. e.*, of such development as Germany has suffered under for the last half century, and from which she is now in part recovering. The Rationalists, it is known, ever maintained the same ; they also complained that our bishops were the great hinderances to the extension of their theories among us. Therein they saw, indeed, but a portion of the truth ; since our bishops were produced by the system, which under God’s blessing they contributed to perpetuate ; but still they saw that our system possessed a principle of stability, or as they deemed it, stationariness, foreign to their own. Those who wish well to our Church will now see, who, under Almighty God, are the real upholders of sound doctrine among us ; they who respect the office of a bishop, even antecedently to any consideration of individual merit in the person consecrated thereto, or they who, as yourself, (p. 16.) ridicule such respect ; they will see that the cry of Popery is but a feint devised by the arch-enemy of the Church, whereby to hurry men down the steep descent of ultra-Protestantism to its uniform end, the “ denial of the Lord who bought them.” And knowing that that Church alone is safe who guards the deposit of sound doctrine committed unto her, they will not be scared by shadows to

abandon the reality, or shrinking from the reproach which our forefathers bore faithfully, fall into the toils, on either side spread for them, whether of the Socinian or the Papal anti-Christianism.

Christ Church, St. Mark's¹ Day.

¹ See Collect for the Day.

POSTSCRIPT.

It were an endless task, and would imply too great a notion of one's own importance, to attempt to occupy the time of others with the refutation of all the statements which have been brought together. I have exhibited those of the "Pope's Pastoral Letter," both as the first explicit attack, and as a protest against the mischief of so handling things sacred. A few words may suffice for the rest.

I. Specimens of the theological tenets of certain members of the Corpus Committee.

1. The object of this pamphlet, and its entire inappositeness, have been already stated. The persons therein assailed,—Mr. Newman, Mr. Sewell, and myself,—were a portion only of a Committee appointed by others, and the organs and representatives of a feeling already existing. Our private opinions have nothing to do with the question wherewith they are mixed up. That question is the soundness or unsoundness of Dr. Hampden's theology, and its probable tendencies; and on this the appeal is to his own works and the Articles.

2. No charges of discrepancy from the Liturgy or Articles are even attempted to be brought against us. Yet is not interference within these limits a tyrannical attempt to put a yoke on men's consciences?

3. For myself it is said,

"What shall be thought of persons, as judges of others, who regard some of the Christian doctrines as fitted rather for contemplative minds than for the vulgar?"

I said,

"When truths, which belong to reverential contemplation rather, and are not fitted for every day impulse upon a mixed multitude, are rudely laid aside."

I spoke neither of "contemplative minds," nor of "the vulgar," but of the "reverential contemplation" of the advanced Christian, and of truths adapted to the mixed multitude of backsliding or half-Christians, or persons almost apostate, or the fleshly-minded. The "vulgar" are

often the most "contemplative." The doctrines which I had mainly in view were the high doctrines of the Holy Trinity; yet the 17th Article also recognizes that the consideration of some subjects may be "full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to the godly," yet, "for curious and carnal persons, a most dangerous downfall."

"In Professor Pusey's peculiar scheme of Theology, the Church and its ordinances become all in all, whilst the teaching of the Spirit by the Word of God, the doctrines of free grace, of justification by faith, of remission of sins through the blood of Christ, in conjunction with repentance, appear only secondary and supplementary parts of the scheme of religion."

Part of this is to me absolutely unintelligible. 1. I spoke of Baptism, throughout, as an ordinance—not of the Church, but of Christ, as the application of the blood of Christ. 2. Because, with Scripture and the ancient and our own Church, I regard the Sacraments as the channels of "free grace," do I hereby make "free grace" "secondary and supplementary?" Is the gift conveyed, "secondary and supplementary" to its channel? 3. In like manner, as to "justification," because I regard it as bestowed in Baptism, and the source of all subsequent holiness, does it thereby become "supplementary?" 4. To Christians baptized in infancy, "the teaching of the Holy Spirit by the word of God," or directly in the heart, *is* "supplementary," since the gift of the new birth was first bestowed; but how is it, therefore, "secondary?" 5. "Remission of sins through the blood of Christ *in conjunction with repentance*" in one sense ought to be "secondary and supplementary," in another, not: they, in truth, who have most grown up in their baptismal holiness, have continually whereof to repent, and for which to pray Him, who is their Advocate with the Father, to intercede for them "by His most precious blood, by His cross and passion:" but as it is ordinarily understood that men fall away from their baptismal privileges so as to need again "to be renewed unto repentance," this ought to be "secondary and supplementary;" it is not a part of the ordinary scheme of God's mercy in Christ. Our Church teaches us to pray to Christ, "who *has* redeemed us by His most precious blood," but it no where teaches us to look for a washing in that blood, except through His sacraments, nor indeed for a complete remission, except through baptism, the baptism into His death.

The above statements are somewhat strangely combined, and do not argue that knowledge of Christian doctrine, which would justify the criticism of others.

II. *Edinburgh Review. Art. The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden.*

A paper, such as this, would not require notice from any Christian, and might be passed over in mere sorrow, but for one statement, which is derived, in some way, from Dr. Hampden himself. The following is the plea now set up for Dr. Hampden, and in proof of the falsity of "the Malignants."

“ The technical language in which Scriptural truths have been expressed, is carefully confounded with the truths themselves ; Dr. H. as carefully distinguishes them, repeating, over and over again, his firm belief, that the Scriptural truths are such in substance as the Church of England represents them ; but agreeing with many good and sound divines, in regarding the language in which they are conveyed in theological writings, as perplexing, and as not setting forth the truth in the same practical manner as it is to be found in Scripture.” (P. 230, 231.)

I would not charge Dr. Hampden with falsifying his own statements ; I believe simply that he does not understand them himself, or is not aware of their extent ; yet I have already shown with regard to the word “ *fact*,” that he now explains his past use of it, in a way altogether different ¹ from the sense in which he did use it, that unwittingly he “ applied it in one sense, and defended it in another.” (See Past and Present Statements p. 25. sqq., 2nd edit.)

In the present instance he has committed a similar oversight². Dr. Hampden certainly expressed his belief in certain “ facts of Divine Providence,” which he thought to be the only truths of revelation : and no one doubted this, (for without this belief Dr. Hampden must have been an universal sceptic ;) on the contrary, Dr. Hampden’s positive statements were again and again noticed by his opponents, (Elucidations, p. 41. sqq. Dr. Hampden’s Theol. Statements, pp. xiii. xxiii. sqq. and p. 62. Past and Present Statements); but Dr. Hampden opposed this “ basis of divine facts,” not simply to the “ technical language wherein Scriptural truths have been expressed,” but to what he termed “ speculations” or “ theories” conveyed *under* that “ language.” At the very outset of his lectures, he proposes to himself, as his object, (what he stated past writers to have neglected,) to “ shew how the intellect of man had insinuated its own conclusions into *the very body of the revelation* in the course of its transmission,” as well as “ modified the expressions by which the truth is conveyed,” (B. L. p. 6. see Theol. Statements, p. 9. sqq.) It is, then, mere forgetfulness or confusion, to speak of this last as having been the only object of the lectures.

Again, the “ speculations,” as Dr. Hampden speaks, gave rise to the phraseology ; the phraseology was the expression only of the previous ideas.

Again, Dr. Hampden believes what he thinks the main facts of the divine revelation ; now it is possible that some of these might be expressed by different terms ; as our Lord’s death for us, by redemption, atonement, reconciliation, sacrifice, oblation, satisfaction, vicarious suffering, expiation ; and although most of these express some portion of the whole truth with a prominence peculiarly their own, and so it would be unwise and ungrateful to reject them, yet the truth might be adequately expressed, under certain circumstances, by the one or the other of them, and the omission of others would not *necessarily* involve abandonment of doctrine ; although a

¹ The author of the “ Specimens” founds one charge upon this misconception ; he does not understand that the objection was not to the use of the word “ facts,” but to the denial that there were any doctrines beyond the *facts* of Divine Providence on this our earth. Mr. Hull naturally adopts the same explanation, p. 58.

² The same mistake is repeated in the “ Remarks” of W. W. Hull, Esq. pp. 33 sq. 37. 46. 48. 59.

Church, which should habitually abstain from them, would ultimately lose a portion of doctrine, and so change the doctrine itself. There are other cases, however, where the truth has not been so variously expressed, as the consubstantiality of the blessed Trinity, the eternal generation of the Son, the procession of the Holy Spirit, wherein the abandonment of the language involves the abandonment of the doctrine: there are many more, in which persons object to the language, simply because they object to the doctrine therein contained.

Again, one of Dr. Hampden's most frequent charges against the Church-doctrine, was against its realism, *i. e.* its forming into Realities what were only speculations upon words; it was not the *language* of the Church to which he objected, but that she converted into positive, objective truth, what was merely *language*, that she formed inferences from language.

Again, Dr. Hampden condemned all deductions from Scripture; now since many of the truths received in the Church confessedly are deductions, (see Bishop Beveridge, above, pp. 30, 31.) Dr. Hampden must consistently object to these, and did so.

A few extracts can but slightly illustrate the above: the following are instances which cannot be said to be confined to "technical language" only:—

"We are apt to *conceive* that the Unity must be understood numerically." (p. 146.)

"Notions of materialism, we may perceive, were mixed up with these several theories." (p. 121, 2.)

"Let us not identify this *reality* [sc. 'of the sacred facts of Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity,'] with the *theories couched under* a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that Word which has declared the *Name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of *thought* on which our technical language is based?" (p. 149, 50.)

"It was an Unity both *physical* and logical, which the Orthodox held." (p. 126.)

"The *theory* of the Divine Procession, and its modifications by the Sabellian or Arian, demanded their *appropriate phraseology*, without which they could not be maintained." (p. 123, 4.)

"The questions next arose, how to reconcile these different *views* with the Unity of the Divine Being; how to *discriminate* between the Father, Son, and Spirit. Then came also the disquisitions arising from the Incarnation of the Word, and their reaction on the *notions* concerning the Trinity; and the minute discussions concerning the *relation* of the Holy Spirit to the other members of the Trinity, as to the *order* and *mode* of *procession* [sic] and the reaction of these upon the original *hypothesis* of the Trinity." (p. 124.)

It is really scarcely possible, after having studied any portion of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures with any care, to understand how he could persuade himself that he had objected to the "language" only of the Church. Or take the following description of the origin of heresy, and its effect upon the Church.

"All that was intended at the first, by these *Speculations* concerning the Divine Procession, was, to present to the mind a view of the mysterious facts of the Trinity, according to that theory of Causation which was the philosophical creed of the day, and

thus to satisfy the questions of speculative men. Origen, indeed, attributes the origin of all heresies in religion to the anxiety of inquisitive men to understand the doctrines of Christianity. Rather, they were owing to the undue solicitude of Christians to meet the objections of opponents. *Theoretic views* of the Scripture truths, it was thought, might be useful in maintaining an argument with the infidel philosopher, or the sceptical Christian. But soon the more scrupulous or less philosophical believer would take alarm at the introduction into religion of expressions apparently foreign to the truth. The alarm would spread; and the leaders of orthodoxy would be roused to vindicate the sacred cause; the heretic philosopher would be called on for his defence; he would be induced to maintain the *position* which he had originally advanced; and his defence of his *peculiar view* would then lead him into further *speculations* on the subject. Thus were men of both parties, the *reputed* orthodox as well as the *reputed* heretic, *gradually forced into conclusions, and from these conclusions into other premises, at which they might at first have revolted.* They gradually went deeper, until at length their footing was lost, and they abandoned themselves to the current. When once the principle is recognized, that a doctrine must be defended from all the consequences deducible from it, there is no extravagance of theory, which the disputant may not be forced to adopt, for the sake of saving his original hypothesis."

How can this be looked upon, as a question of language ¹ only?

With regard to the other statements of the article in the Edinburgh Review, the ignorance therein displayed, as to the whole tenor of the proceedings at Oxford, even the very order in which they occurred, as well as of the motives of those therein concerned, is perfectly natural: yet it does seem somewhat strange that the writer of the article should profess to review, and condemn of falsehood, a publication which, to all appearance, he had never seen. For, 1. he describes "Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared," as—

"A more elaborate production, in which a number of *propositions* on different points of Theology, are professedly selected from Dr. Hampden's works, and *contrasted with the Articles* of the Church of England."

Now if the writer had seen the Pamphlet, he would have known that they were not *propositions*, but copious *extracts* from Dr. Hampden's works which were so contrasted; the *propositions* stood separately. And the charge above refuted shows that there can be no mistake in this; for he charges the compiler of the second pamphlet with "carefully confounding the technical language, in which Scriptural truths have been expressed, with the truths themselves; whereas Dr. Hampden as carefully distinguishes them."

Yet the compiler simply extracted Dr. Hampden's own words, without adding any thing of his own.

¹ There are in Dr. H.'s works indications of a theory, that the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds have, in our Church, a different meaning from that which their framers, (Parochial Sermons, p. 35—38,) or even our Reformers, intended (B. L. p. 378-9); that their expressions are not to be interpreted in a *positive* sense (ib.) If, indeed, it is first assumed, that the expressions are not to be interpreted as representing realities, then it signifies little how the expressions be objected to; but the assumption is unhistorical, and contrary to Art. viii., that "they are *thoroughly* to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The theory, after all, would apply to but very few of the difficulties of the Bampton Lectures, and adds others.

2. He says,

“ Dr. Hampden’s calumniators took good care not to notice Dr. Hampden’s Parochial Sermons. Now it is manifest that the real nature of a man’s religious views and feelings is to be collected most perfectly from his general pastoral preaching to his own congregation,” &c.

Yet if he had ever seen the Pamphlet, he would have seen that the “ Parochial Sermons” are noticed (p. xviii. sqq.), and it was by combining them with his “ Philosophical Evidence,” and “ Bampton Lectures,” that I came to the conviction that Dr. Hampden’s teaching is Sabellian.

III.—*Propositions attributed to Dr. Hampden by Professor Pusey, compared with the text of the Bampton Lectures, in a Series of Parallels.*

The author of these “ Parallels” is an avowed admirer of Dr. Hampden’s Bampton Lectures, and it is one of his objects “ to direct attention to a work, to which extracts, even in defence, must do partial injustice!” On this ground, I suppose, the propositions, which I extracted from the “ Observations on Dissent,” and the “ Moral Philosophy,” although in some cases flagrantly offensive, are passed over. The immediate object, however, is to throw a doubt over the accuracy of my propositions, by exhibiting in “ parallel columns the genuine unmutilated text of the Bampton Lectures.”

This, if accurately performed, had been useless labour; for that very text had been given,—only more fairly, more fully, and more *accurately*,—in the very work in which I published those propositions; so that the means were already provided whereby people might judge for themselves. I say *more accurately*, because an appearance of contradiction between my propositions and Dr. Hampden’s context, is afforded in his “ Parallels,” in some places by omission, or alteration of words.

Thus, in p. 4 alone, there occur the following (besides two verbal) inaccuracies :

Prop. 16. “ Materialism intruded itself into what was considered the orthodox view [‘ doctrine’ Parallels] of the divine proceeding.”

The compiler, by omitting portions of the context, as,

“ Notions of *Materialism*, we may perceive, were mixed up with these *several theories* of Causation, &c. though in the progress of the *Trinitarian speculations*, the *original Materialism of the Church philosophy* is partly disguised under metaphysics and logic,” &c.

and by connecting the passage with what follows *only*, would make it appear that the charge of Materialism related—not to the Church-system, but—to certain illustrations only.

Again,

Prop. 12. “ The orthodox theory of the Trinity . . . consisted in an exact scientific view of the principle [‘ theory,’ Parallels] of Causation,” p. 118.

In the context we have,

“ The heterodox, whether Unitarians or Tritheists, failed in this speculation,”

for

“the heterodox, *in either extreme*, whether those charged with Unitarian consequences, or those who incurred the imputation of Tritheism, failed in speculating concerning the principle of Causation.”

But although the language is thus softened, the charge remains the same, that the only difference between the orthodox, and those charged with heresy *in either extreme*, was, that the latter failed in a mere matter of speculation.

Again,

Prop. 19.—“The account of the Incarnation itself was more peculiarly logical; still there was a mixture of physical speculation.” (p. 137.)

Against this is placed in the Parallels:

“The *discussions* [the compiler puts this in italics] on the Incarnation were partly physical, partly logical.”

as if to show that Dr. Hampden was speaking of “discussions” only, and that I had substituted the word “account;” he breaks off his quotation just before the words of Dr. Hampden, which I extracted.

All these inaccuracies occur in one single page.

Further, I had given the following proposition as Dr. Hampden’s:

Prop. 2.—“The ready reception of the theory, that Christ, as the sole primary cause of grace, conveyed that grace through the Sacraments, as subordinate instrumental causes, by which the Divine agency accomplished *its* ends, is sufficiently accounted for by the general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church.” (p. 314, 15.)

On this it is said,

“N.B.—The word ‘*its*,’ marked in italics in the column of Propositions has no existence whatever in Dr. Hampden’s passage.”

The phrase, “subordinate instrumental causes, by which the divine agency accomplished *its* ends,” *does* occur in the Bampton Lectures, p. 314, to which I referred. Dr. Hampden’s proposition runs thus:

“The general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church may sufficiently account for the ready reception of *such* a theory of sacramental influence.”

The other words are introduced from the preceding page, to show what this theory is.

The same haste, doubtless, has occasioned the omission of some propositions out of the Bampton Lectures, although the “Parallels” profess to quote them all. Two of these are the following:

Prop. 8.—“Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no DOCTRINES.” (B. L. p. 374.)

Prop. 9.—“The apostolic Epistles contain no *doctrinal* statements.” (Ibid.)

I say “haste,” for besides that I have no ground to believe the compiler dishonest, I suppose that in most instances he actually placed the extracts from Dr. Hampden over against my propositions out of mere

honesty, since, in fact, they establish the fairness of my original propositions; he at least has not pointed out, nor can I conjecture, what objection any one can make to them.

The compiler but seldom ventures upon a comment; when, however, he does so, the matter becomes easy.

As an instance, I had given the following proposition on the Trinity as Dr. Hampden's:—

Prop. 9.—“All the differences of opinion which have ever prevailed upon the doctrine of the Trinity, relate to the history of the human mind as much as to theology; and do not affect the Catholic faith,” p. 149.

The following quotation is made in answer:—

“To me it matters little, what opinion on the subject has been advocated by the shrewdest wit, or deepest learning, has been most popular, or most extensive in its reception. All differences of this kind [not surely differences of opinion] relate to the history of the human mind as much as to theology.”

And people are left to suppose that the differences, to which Dr. Hampden alludes, are simply as to the wit or learning by which the opinions on the Trinity have been advocated. Yet Dr. Hampden clearly shows the contrary; he says,

“*One fact* is clear through all this *labyrinth of variations*, which historical creeds have exhibited; that there is *some extraordinary communication* concerning the Divine Being, in those Scriptural notices of God, which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages. To me, it matters little *what opinion* on the subject has been prior, has been advocated by the shrewdest wits, &c. *All differences of this kind belong to the history of the human mind, as much as to theology; and affect not the broad basement of fact, on which the manifold forms of speculation have taken their rise. The only ancient, only Catholic truth is the Scriptural fact.*”

Now, is it possible to read this, and say that the “differences” are not “differences of opinion,” and that these “differences,” “the labyrinth of variations,” the “manifold forms of speculation,” do not stand opposed to what is called the “only ancient, only Catholic truth,” “the Scriptural fact,” or “*some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being*”? The contrary impression is produced in the Parallels, by stopping short of the words “and affect not,” &c.

Undoubtedly, a writer, who holds fast what he calls the “Scriptural fact” only, will be, as Dr. Hampden says, “neither Sabellian, nor Trinitheist, nor Socinian;” for he will hold no definite statement at all; but neither will he hold the “Catholic faith;” and this is much what was said in my Preface, p. xx. “The utmost at which Dr. Hampden arrives in his several statements, amounts but to the negative side of Sabellianism.”

The compiler of the Parallels, however, selects certain of my propositions, “6, 10, on original sin, and 8, 14, 23, &c., Trinitarian articles, which,” he says, “exhibit painful instances of carelessness and haste in drawing inferences,” &c.

These propositions were :—

Original sin ;

6. “ The term *propagation* (‘ engendered,’ Art. IX.) was introduced into the account of the origin of evil, in order to *prove* its universality,” p. 221.

10. “ The idea, that the corruption of nature exists in infants, is the result of theory,” p. 221.

Dr. Hampden’s words are,

“ The universality of the principle *was* next to be demonstrated. How could it apply to the case of the infant soul, snatched out of the *actual* pollutions of the world?—The *theorist*, not content with referring to the Redeemer’s love as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little infant, sought how to connect this fact with the universal need of redemption. *It was to be brought, therefore, under the theory of original sin. This occasioned the introduction of the term propagation, into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by ‘ propagation,’ then it would exist in the guileless infant.*”

Now I cannot understand how the two propositions could be more distinctly asserted. A certain problem is given, viz. to prove the universality of the principle of evil in the world. To this the *guileless infant*, who died untainted by actual sin, was an apparent exception. Yet all needed redemption ! How could it be proved that the infant needed it ? It must be brought under the *theory* of original sin ; and since it had no actual sin, this could only be effected by *assuming* that “ the corruption of nature descended by propagation.”

Trinitarian articles.

Prop. 8.—“ All the ancient heresies were Trinitarian in principle,” p. 148.

Dr. Hampden’s exact words would be—

“ All the theories proposed on the subject [of the Trinity] are Trinitarian in principle.”

This, of course, related and was applied to the heretics only. It is now endeavoured to show that nothing more is hereby meant, than that persons set out by being Trinitarians, but themselves explained away their hypothesis by their speculations.

Yet Dr. Hampden says,

“ If the opinions of Praxeas, &c. amounted to Unitarianism, *it was only by way of consequence or inference.* They set out with a Trinitarian hypothesis, and *either explained it away themselves by their speculations, or had the consequences of their theories forced on them by their adversaries,* as the principles of their belief. We can plainly perceive, although *unfortunately* but very slight memorials remain to us of their disquisitions, that their anxiety was, to account for certain acknowledged facts of the Scripture narrative. They refer to *admitted manifestations of God, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,*” &c.

Now, since Dr. Hampden would object to the consequences of a theory drawn by an opponent (B. L. p. 448), and as moreover this reference to “ admitted manifestations of God, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,” comes up to his notions of the belief in the Holy Trinity (see “ Dr. Hampden’s Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles

compared," Pref. p. xx. sqq.), how can it appear otherwise, than that Dr. Hampden recognizes these heretics, "of whose disquisitions *unfortunately* very slight memorials remain," as Trinitarians? that a culpable indifference to truth is herein implied?

Moreover on Dr. Hampden's view of the doctrine of the Trinity I had spoken explicitly, (with reference to his several works,) in the "Theological Statements," Pref. l. c. and "Dr. Hampden's past and present statements," p. 5. sqq. 2nd edition. It had been more to the purpose to have refuted these, than to have singled out one, and that not one of the most important propositions for "carelessness and haste."

14. *Unity of God.*—"The revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the *oneness* of the Deity." (p. 147.)

These are Dr. Hampden's own words; and they were selected in order to exhibit, in another form, his mode of getting rid of positive statements, and bringing every thing down to a *mere* relation to ourselves, a *mere* vehicle of practical teaching. It is part of his system, which would have nothing to be known of God,—that God *could* reveal nothing of Himself to us, as He is in Himself, (see Theol. Statements, Pref. p. xxii. sqq.), and it was before pointed out "how large a portion of the faith of the Universal Church is cut off by these maxims." (ib. p. xix.)

When, then, the compiler of the Parallels fills up the above sentence,

"The revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity; but *practically*, to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out;"

this is precisely what I meant to complain of; viz., that he admitted the Divine revelation, not as in itself true, and imparting a knowledge of God, but *negatively* only, and as *practically excluding* superstitions. For the object of Dr. Hampden's remarks is to show that men are not to conceive of God as one; he thinks that "the *repugnance* often felt [in the carnal mind] at the admission of a Trinity in Unity," would be thereby "abated;" he complains that "we are apt to conceive that the Unity must be understood numerically," so that instead of (with our Church) praying,

"Almighty God, who has given unto us His servants grace, by the confession of a true faith to acknowledge the glory of the Eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity," to "keep us steadfast in this faith,"—

we are first to discard our belief in the Unity, otherwise than as a negation of Polytheism, in order to prepare the way for a belief in the Trinity.

23. *Atonement.*—"The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it depressed the power of *man* too low." (p. 253.)

This statement is to be explained away by a sentence, which occurs *four* pages before, (p. 249.) in a subordinate part of the discussion, and relating to Romish errors; meanwhile it is omitted¹ that there *intervenes* a state-

¹ The same oversight occurs in Mr. Hull, Remarks, p. 13 sqq. 35 sqq.

ment (p. 250.) relating to the sacrifice of our Saviour, giving as an instance of this philosophy,

“ The application of the term punishment to the sacrifice of our Saviour.” (Is. liii. 4—6. 11, 12.)

Representing as false, the idea,

“ that the Passion of our Lord, being accepted by God as the means of human salvation, must be a punishment (pœna) sustained by Him, equivalent to the delinquency of sinful man.”

And to the theological use of the word satisfaction, in that

“ it declares the sufferings of Christ to be the voluntary payment, on His part, of what was otherwise not owing from Him, to the Divine justice.”

Now since this view of the sacrifice of our Lord is stated to “ belong to the same philosophy,” how can it be thought that it was not included in this condemnation, especially as Dr. Hampden never in his own person uses the words “ expiation,” &c., which are most opposed to the Socinian doctrines; and there is an alarming indistinctness in all his language even when he does not directly side with the Socinians; as in the denial that “ the Son reconciled the Father to us, as well as us to the Father.” (See Past and Present Statements, p. 9. sqq. edit. 2.)

This may suffice; I need only add that I see no ground to retract any one proposition, although I have re-examined those, upon which any question has been raised: I formed them originally without any bias; or rather, the bias with which I first took up the work, was to hope well of Dr. Hampden’s soundness of doctrine, however superficial I had perceived his knowledge of Church-history to be. I would again repeat my former conviction, that “ the correctness of the propositions will appear to any one, who shall examine the whole context as attentively.” (Theol. Statements, p. 35.)

Three points may be adverted to in conclusion; first, that I had selected not a few only, but (as I find), 104 propositions out of Dr. Hampden’s works, which to myself and others appeared dangerous, and leading to the overthrow of sound Christian doctrine. This is not met by cavils at some half dozen of them, or even by error of mine, if such could be established, in some few instances. These minute discussions are likely to draw people away from the truth, not to promote it. The real question is the general effect of the whole.

2. Is that sound and safe teaching for young men, out of which an individual, who has for many years been studying theology, and wished to see the truth, extracted above 100 propositions, which, if true (and this is conceded on both sides), are of dangerous tendency? and yet both the Bampton Lecturer, and recently the Moral Philosophy, were directed, the latter exclusively to young men, the former concluded by an appeal which could be meant but for them.

“ If there are any, therefore, whose anxiety for the sacred cause has been awakened by any observations in the course of the present Lectures, *I exhort them to proceed,*

fearless of any ultimate shock to the real truth of Christianity by the most searching investigation," &c.

3. However fearful are the propositions which I have extracted from Dr. Hampden's works, they do to myself (and I hear the same from others) convey an idea of but a small portion of the evil tendencies of those works. To the pernicious tone of the language, and the lowering, uncharitable view of the early Church, I have already adverted. (Theol. Statements, Pref. p. 30 sqq.) At least, much and painful things as I have been compelled to read, I have read few, professing to come from a Christian author, more painful.

Having now noticed four anonymous censures, one may well be allowed to rest. It is somewhat remarkable, in this whole controversy, that on the one side we have had, emanating from one party, a series of anonymous, publications, beginning with the unscrupulous "Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," casting (with the exception of this last) personal imputations, ascribing personal or party motives, from individuals, no one of whom has ventured to risk his own character by publishing his name; on the other, a series of writings from those whom the "men of this world" call persecutors, imputing no motives, confining themselves to facts, painful facts indeed, and painful measures, but still facts only, and pledging their own characters, as ministers of Christ, to the truth and rectitude of what they allege.

¹ Since the above statements were in print, an exception has appeared, in the "Remarks intended to show how far Dr. Hampden may have been misunderstood and misrepresented, during the present controversy, in Oxford, by W. W. Hull, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, late Fellow of Brasenose College."

One of course respects an individual, who lays aside his pursuits to vindicate an early friend, (p. 53,) whom he believes to have been injured; but it is not to be expected that a layman, amid professional studies, should be qualified to enter upon a large theological subject. He has fallen into some of the leading mistakes of the previous writers; and, where occasion offered, these have been just referred to in a note: a more detailed examination seemed hardly called for.

A P P E N D I X,
BEING No. 74 OF THE
TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

CATENA PATRUM.

No. I.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS IN THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH TO
THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

The Baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men? And they reasoned among themselves saying, If we shall say, from heaven, He will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, of men, we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet.

Persons who object to our preaching distinctly and unhesitatingly the doctrine of the Apostolical 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 due to it from the parties addressed.

The doctrine in dispute is this; that CHRIST founded a visible Church as an ordinance for ever, 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.

The passages quoted below contain, it is presumed, this doctrine ; but they are not intended as more than tokens and suggestions of the full testimony contained in the works of their great authors.

List of authors cited.

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Bilson. | 23. Wake. |
| 2. Hooker. | 24. Potter. |
| 3. Bancroft. | 25. Nelson. |
| 4. Andrews. | 26. Kettlewell. |
| 5. Hall. | 27. Hicks. |
| 6. Laud. | 28. Law. |
| 7. Bramhall. | 29. Johnson. |
| 8. Mede. | 30. Dodwell. |
| 9. Mason. | 31. Collier. |
| 10. Sanderson. | 32. Leslie. |
| 11. Hammond. | 33. Wilson. |
| 12. Taylor. | 34. Bingham. |
| 13. Heylin. | 35. Skelton. |
| 14. Allestrie. | 36. Samuel Johnson. |
| 15. Pearson. | 37. Horne. |
| 16. Fell. | 38. W. Jones. |
| 17. Bull. | 39. Horsley. |
| 18. Stillingfleet. | 40. Heber. |
| 19. Kenn. | 41. Jebb. |
| 20. Beveridge. | 42. Van Mildert. |
| 21. Sharp. | 43. Mant. |
| 22. Scott. | |

BILSON, BISHOP.—*Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*,
ch. ix. p. 105¹.

It will happily, [haply] be granted the Apostles had their prerogative and pre-eminence above others in the Church of Christ; but that limited to their persons, and during for their lives, and, therefore, no reason can be made for their superiority, to force the like to be received and established in the Church of Christ for all ages and places; since their office and function are long since ceased, and no like power reserved to their successors after them. I do not deny but many things in the Apostles were personal, &c. . . . yet, that all their gifts ended with their lives, and no part of their charge and power remained to their after-comers, may neither be confessed by us, nor affirmed by any, unless we mean wholly to subvert the Church of Christ. . . . The Scriptures once written, suffice all ages for instruction; the miracles then done, are for ever a most evident confirmation of their doctrine; the authority of their first calling liveth yet in their succession; and time and travel, joined with God's graces, bring pastors at this present to perfection; yet the Apostles' charge to teach, baptize, and administer the Lord's Supper, to bind and loose sinners in heaven and in earth, to impose hands for the ordaining of pastors and elders, these parts of the Apostolic function and charge are not decayed, and cannot be wanted in the Church of God. There must either be no Church, or else these must remain; for without these no Church can continue.

¹ As quoted by Dr. Spry in his Bampton Lectures, p, 311.

HOOKER, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*Ecclesiastical Polity.*
Book. v. § 77.

. . . In that they are CHRIST'S ambassadors and His labourers, who should give them their commission, but He whose most inward affairs they manage? Is not GOD alone the Father of Spirits? Are not souls the purchase of JESUS CHRIST? What angel in heaven could have said to man, as our LORD did unto Peter, "Feed my sheep,—preach—baptize—do this in remembrance of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained, and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose faults you shall on earth forgive?" What think we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The power of the ministry of GOD, translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the earth, and bringeth GOD Himself from heaven; by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible graces; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive. O wretched blindness, if we admire not so great power; more wretched if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding, imagine that any but GOD can bestow it! To whom CHRIST hath imparted power, both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one (a work which antiquity doth call the making of CHRIST'S body,) the same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible. . . . "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted; whose sins ye retain, they are retained." Whereas, therefore, the other Evangelists had set down, that CHRIST did before His suffering promise to give His Apostles the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and being risen from the dead, promised moreover at that time a miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John addeth, that He also invested them even then with the power of

the Holy Ghost for castigation and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accomplished that which the promise of the keys did import. Seeing, therefore, that the same power is now given, why should the same form of words expressing it be thought foolish?

Ibid. § 68.

Now the privilege of the visible Church of God, (for of that we speak) is to be herein like the ark of Noah, that, for any thing we know to the contrary, all without it are lost sheep; yet in this was the ark of Noah privileged above the Church, that whereas none of them which were in the one could perish, numbers in the other are cast away, because to eternal life our profession is not enough.

BANCROFT, ARCHBISHOP.—*Sermon preached at Paul's Cross.*

This hath ever been reckoned a most certain ground and 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. . . .

There are many causes set down by the said ancient Fathers, why so many false prophets do go out into the world; but I will only touch four; whereof I find the contempt of Bishops especially to be one; for unto them, as St. Jerome saith, ever since St. Mark's time, the care of Church government hath been committed; they had authority over the rest of the ministry. . . . "that the seed of schism might be taken away, &c."

Read the Scriptures, but with sobriety; if any man presuming upon his knowledge, seek further than is meet for him, besides

that he knoweth nothing as he ought to know, he shall cast himself into a labyrinth, and never find that he seeketh for. God hath bound Himself by His promise unto His Church, of purpose, that men by her good direction might in this point be relieved; to whose godly determination in matters of question, her dutiful children ought to submit themselves without any curious or wilful contradiction. I could bring many authorities to this effect.

ANDREWS, BISHOP AND DOCTOR—*Sermons on Whitsunday,*
No. 9. (*Works*, p. 695.)

The Holy Ghost may be received more ways than one. He hath many *spiramina*; *πολυτρόπως* “in many manners” He comes; and *multiformis gratia* He comes with. He and they carry the name of their cause; and to receive them is to receive the Spirit. There is a *gratum faciens*, the saving grace of the Spirit, for one to save himself by, received by each, without respect to others; and there is a *gratis data* (whatever become of us) serving to save others by, without respect to ourselves. And there is *χάρις διακονίας*, the grace of a holy calling, for it is a grace, to be a conduit of grace any way. All these; and all from one and the same Spirit.

That was here conferred, (in John xx. 22,) was not the saving grace of inward sanctimony; they were not “breathed on” to that end. The Church to this day gives this still in her ordinations, but the saving grace the Church cannot give; none but God can give that. Nor the *gratis data* it is not. That came by the tongues, both the gift of speaking divine languages, and the gift of *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι*, speaking wisely, and to the purpose: and (we know) none is either the holier or the learner by his ordination.

Yet a grace it is. For the very office itself is a grace; *mihi data est hæc gratia*, saith the Apostle, in more places than one; and speaks of his office and nothing else. The Apostleship was a grace, yet no saving grace. Else, should Judas have been saved. Clearly, then, it is the grace of their calling (this) whereby they were sacred, and made persons public, and their acts authentical, and they

enabled to do somewhat about the remission of sins, that is not (of like avail) done by others, though perhaps, more learned and virtuous than they, in that they have not the like *mitto vos*, nor the same *accipite* that these have.

Ibid.—*Sermon on Absolution. Appendix, p. 90.*

The power of remitting sin is originally in GOD, and in GOD alone. And in CHRIST our Saviour, by means of the union of the Godhead and manhood into one person, by virtue whereof, “The Son of man hath power to forgive sins upon earth.”

This power being thus solely vested in God, He might, without wrong to any, have retained and kept to Himself, and without means of word or sacrament, and without ministers, either apostles or others, have exercised immediately by Himself from Heaven.

But we should then have said of the remission of sins, saith St. Paul, “Who shall go up to heaven for it, and fetch it thence? for which cause,” saith he, “the righteousness of faith speaketh thus, say not so, &c.”

Partly this, but there should be no such difficulty to shake our faith, as once to imagine to fetch CHRIST from heaven for the remission of our sins; and partly also, because CHRIST, to whom alone this commission was originally granted, having ordained Himself a body, would work by bodily things, and having taken the nature of a man upon Him, would honour the nature He had so taken, for these causes; that which was His, and His alone, He vouchsafed to impart, and out of His commission, to grant a commission, and thereby to associate them to Himself, (it is His own word by the prophet) and to make them *συνεργους*, that is *co-operators*, workers together with Him (as the Apostle speaketh) to the work of salvation, both of themselves and of others. From God then it is derived; from God and to men. * * *

Now if we ask, to what men? the text is plain. They to whom CHRIST said this *Remiseritis*, were the Apostles.

In the Apostles, (that we may come nearer yet) we find three capacities as we may term them, 1. As Christians in general. 2. As preachers, priests, or ministers, more special. 3. As

those twelve persons, whom in strict propriety of speech, we term the Apostles.

Some things that CHRIST spake to them, He spake to them as representing the whole company of Christians ; as His *Vigilate*.

Some things to them, not as Christians, but as preachers or priests ; as His *Ite prædicate Evangelium*, and His *Hoc facite* ; which no man thinketh all Christians may do.

And some things to themselves personally ; as that He had appointed them witnesses of His miracles and resurrection, which cannot be applied but to them and them in person. It remaineth we inquire, in which of these three capacities, CHRIST imparted to them this commission.

Not to the Apostles properly ; that is, this was no personal privilege to be in them, and to die with them, that they should only execute it for a time, and none ever after them. God forbid, we should so think it. For, this power being more than needful for the world, (as in the beginning it was said,) it was not to be either personal, or for a time ; then those persons dying, and those times determining, them in the ages following (as we now in this) that should light into this prison or captivity of sin, how could they or we receive any benefit by it ? Of nature, it is said by the heathen philosopher, that it does neither *abundare in superfluis*, nor *deficere in necessariis*. God forbid, but we should ascribe as much to God at the least, that neither He would ordain power superfluous or more than needed, or else, it being needful, would appropriate it unto one age, and leave all other destitute of it ; and not rather, as all writers both new and old take it, continue it successively to the world's end.

And as not proper to the Apostles' person, so neither common to all Christians in general, nor in the persons of all Christians conveyed to them. Which thing the very circumstances of the text do evict. For He sent them first, and after inspired them ; and after both these, gave them this commission. Now all Christians are not so sent, nor all Christians inspired with the grace or gift of the Spirit, that they were here. Consequently, it was not intended to the whole society of Christians. Yea, I add, that forasmuch as these two, both these two, must go before it, *Missio*

and *Inspiratio*, that though GOD inspire some laymen, if I may have leave so to term them, with very special graces of knowledge to this end, yet, inasmuch as they have not the former of sending, it agreeth not to them, neither may they exercise it, until they be sent, that is, until they have their calling thereunto.

It being then neither personal nor peculiar to them as Apostles, nor again common to all as Christians, it must needs be committed to them as ministers, priests, or preachers; and consequently to these that in that office and function do succeed them, to whom, this commission is still continued. Neither are they, that are ordained or instituted to that calling, ordained or instituted by any other words or verse than this, (John xx. 23.) Yet not so, that absolutely without them, God cannot bestow it, on whom, or when Him pleaseth; or that He is bound to this means only, and cannot work without it, For, *gratia Dei non alligatur mediis*, the grace of God is not bound but free, and can work without means either of word or sacrament; and as without means, so without ministers, how and when to Him seemeth good. But speaking of that which is proper and ordinary, in the course by Him established, this is an ecclesiastical act, committed as the residue of the ministry of reconciliation to ecclesiastical persons. And if at any time He vouchsafe it by others that are not such, they be in that case *Ministri necessitatis, non officii*, in case of necessity ministers, but by office not so. * *

The remission of sins, as it is from GOD only, so it is by the death and blood-shedding of CHRIST alone; but for the applying of this unto us, there are divers means established. * * *

In the institution of Baptism there is a power to that end. * * *
 2. Again, there is also another power for the remission of sins, in the institution of the Holy Eucharist. * * *
 3. Besides, in the word itself there is a like power ordained. "Now are you clean," saith CHRIST, (no doubt from their sins) *propter Sermonem hunc*. And the very name giveth as much, that it is entitled, "The Word of Reconciliation." * * *
 4. Further there is to the same effect a power in prayer, and that in the priest's prayers, "Call for the Priests," saith the apostle, "and let them pray for the sick person, and if he have committed sin, it shall be forgiven him." All

and every of them, are acts for the remission of sins : and in all and every of these, is the minister required, and they cannot be dispatched without him.

But the ceremonies and circumstances that here (John xx. 23.) I find used, prevail with me to think, that there is somewhat here imparted to them, that was not before. For it carrieth no likelihood, that our Saviour bestowing on them nothing here, but that which before He had, would use so much solemnity, so diverse and new circumstances, no new or diverse grace being here communicated. * * * I take it to be a power distinct from the former, and (not to hold you long) to be the accomplishment of the promise made (Matt. xvi. 19.) of the power of the keys, which here in this place and in these words is fulfilled ; and have therein for me, the joint consent of the Fathers. Which being a different power in itself, is that which we call the act or benefit of absolution ; in which, as in the rest, there is in the due time and place of it, an use for the remission of sins.

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*On Episcopacy*. Pt. iii. p. 9.

And for you, my dearly beloved brethren at home, for CHRIST'S sake, for the Church's sake, for your souls' sake, be exhorted to hold to this holy institution of your blessed Saviour and His unerring apostles, and bless GOD for Episcopacy. Do but cast your eyes a little back, and see what noble instruments of GOD'S glory He hath been pleased to raise up in this very Church of ours out of this sacred vocation ; what famous servants of GOD, what strong champions of truth, and renowned antagonists of Rome and her superstitions ; what admirable preachers, what incomparable writers, yea what constant and undaunted martyrs and confessors, &c. . . . Neither doubt I but that it will please GOD, out of the same rod of Aaron, still to raise such blossoms and fruit, as shall win him glory to all eternity. So you are to honour those your reverend pastors, to hate all factious withdrawals from that government, which comes the nearest of any Church upon earth to the Apostolical. . . . Let me therefore confidently shut up all with that resolute word of that blessed Martyr and

Saint, Ignatius. . . . "Let all things be done to the honour of God, give respect to your bishop as you would God should respect you. My soul for theirs which obey their bishop, presbyters, and deacons; God grant that my portion may be the same with theirs." And let my soul have the same share with that blessed Martyr that said so. Amen.

LAUD, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.—*Conference with Fisher,*
xvi. 29.

"I am with you always unto the end of the world." Yes most certain it is,—present by His Spirit; or else in bodily presence He continued not with His Apostles, but during His abode on earth. And this promise of His spiritual presence was to their successors; else, why "to the end of the world?" The Apostles did not, could not, live so long. But then to the successors the promise goes no farther, than "I am with you always," which reaches to continual assistance, but not to divine and infallible.

"The Comforter the Holy Ghost shall abide with you for ever." Most true again; for the Holy Ghost did abide with the Apostles, according to Christ's promise thus made, and shall abide with their successors for ever, to comfort and preserve them.

Ibid.—xxv. 15.

Christ promised the Keys to St. Peter. (Matt. xvi.) True; but so did He to all the rest of the Apostles (Matt. xviii. John xx.), and to their successors as much as to his. . . . St. Augustine is plain, "If this were said only of St. Peter, then the Church hath no power to do it," which God forbid! The Keys, therefore, were given to St. Peter and the rest in a figure of the Church, to whose power and for whose use they were given. But there's not one key in all that bunch, that can let in St. Peter's successor to a "more powerful principality" universal than the successors of the other Apostles had.

BRAMHALL, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Vindication of the Church of England.* Discourse III.

I do also acknowledge that Episcopacy was comprehended in the Apostolic office, *tanquam trigonus in tetragono*, and the distinction was made by the Apostles, with the approbation of CHRIST; that the angels of the seven Churches in the Revelation were seven Bishops; that it is the most silly ridiculous thing in the world, to calumniate that for a Papal innovation, which was established in the Church before there was a Pope at Rome; which hath been received and approved in all ages since the very cradle of Christianity, by all sorts of Christians, Europeans, Africans, Asiatics, Indians, many of which never had any intercourse with Rome, nor scarcely ever heard of the name of Rome. If *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus* be not a sufficient plea, I know not what is.

But because I esteem them Churches not 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. First, I know there are many learned persons among them who do passionately affect Episcopacy; some of which have acknowledged it to myself, that their Church would never be rightly settled, until it was new-moulded. Baptism is a sacrament, the door of Christianity, a matriculation into the Church of Christ: yet the very desire of it in case of necessity, is sufficient to excuse from the want of actual Baptism. And is not the desire of Episcopacy, sufficient to excuse from the actual want of Episcopacy, in like case of necessity? or should I censure these as Schismatics?

Secondly, there are others, who though they do not long so much for Episcopacy, yet they approve it, and want it only out of invincible necessity. In some places the sovereign prince is of another communion; the Episcopal chairs are filled with Roman Bishops. If they should petition for Bishops of their own, it would not be granted. In other places the magistrates have taken away Bishops; whether out of policy, because they thought that regiment not so proper for their republics, or be-

cause they were ashamed to take away the revenues, and preserve the order, or out of a blind zeal, they have given an account to GOD: they owe none to me. Should I condemn all these as schismatics for want of Episcopacy, who want it out of invincible necessity?

Thirdly, there are others who have neither the same desires, nor the same esteem of Episcopacy, but condemn it as an Antichristian innovation, and a rag of Popery. I conceive this to be most gross schism materially. It is ten times more schismatical to desert, nay, to take away (so much as lies in them) the whole order of Bishops, than to subtract obedience from one lawful Bishop. All that can be said to mitigate this fault is, that they do it ignorantly, as they have been mistaught and misinformed. And I hope that many of them are free from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the preparation of their minds, being ready to receive it, when GOD shall reveal it to them. How far this may excuse (not the crime but) their persons from formal schism, either *a toto* or *a tanto*, I determine not, but leave them to stand or fall to their own Master.

But though these Protestants were worthy of this contumely, yet surely the Romanists are no fit persons to object it, whose *opiniastrety* did hinder an uniform reformation of the Western Church. Who did invest Presbyters with Episcopal jurisdiction, and the power of ordaining and confirming, but the Court of Rome, by their commissions and delegations, for avaritious ends? And could they think that the world would believe, that necessity is not as strong and effectual a dispensation, as their mercenary Bulls? 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. For it is generally confessed by both parties, Protestants and Roman Catholics, that the same power and authority is necessary to the extension of a character, or grace given by ordination, which is required to the Institution of a Sacrament, that is not human but divine. These avaritious practices of that Court, (though it be not commonly observed) were the first source of

these present controversies about Episcopacy, and Ecclesiastical discipline, which do now so much disturb the peace of the Church.

Ibid.—Vindication of Grotius.—Discourse III.

Excuse me for telling the truth plainly; many who have had their education among Sectaries and Non-conformists have apostated to Rome, but few or no right Episcopal Divines. Hot water freezeth the soonest.

He addeth, that "Grotius himself assures him (whom he hath reason to believe) that there were not a few such among the prelatical men." How! not a few such as these, who have apostated from the Church of England? For ingenuity's sake let him tell us where Grotius saith any such thing. Grotius hath not one word to his purpose, when it is duly examined. But this it is to confute books, in less time than wise or modest men would require to read them.

Hitherto, he is not able to show us any tolerable reason of his warning. But he showeth us the occasion, p. 82. "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 jealousie of them." This is far enough from proving his bold suggestion, that they have a design to introduce the Pope into England. So though all he say were true: yet he can conclude nothing from thence to make good his accusation or insinuation. I wish he would forbear these imperfect enthymematical forms of argument, which serve only to cover deceit, and set down both his propositions expressly. 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.

First, I cannot assent to his major proposition, that all those who make an ordinary personal uninterrupted succession of Pastors, to be of the integrity of a true Church, (which is the ground of his

exception) have, therefore, an intention, or can justly be suspected thereupon to have any intention to introduce the Pope. The Eastern, Southern, and Northern Churches are all of them for such a personal succession, and yet all of them utter enemies to the Pope. Secondly, I cannot assent to his minor proposition, that either all or any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in England, do unchurch either all or most part of the Protestant Churches. No man is hurt but by himself. They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own Master. They do not unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian Churches, and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungaria, and those parts of the world, who have an ordinary uninterrupted succession of Pastors, some by the names of Bishops, others under the name of Seniors, unto this day. (I meddle not with the Socinians :) they unchurch not the Lutheran Churches in Germany, who both assert Episcopacy in their confessions, and have actual superintendents in their practice, and would have Bishops, name and thing, if it were in their power. Let him not mistake himself: those Churches which he is so tender of, though they be better known to us by reason of their vicinity, are so far from being "all or most part of the Protestant Churches," that being all put together, they amount not to so great a proportion as the Britannick Churches alone. And if one secluded out of them all those who want an ordinary succession without their own faults, out of invincible ignorance or necessity, and all those who desire to have an ordinary succession either explicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a little flock indeed.

But let him set his heart at rest. I will remove this scruple out of his mind, that he may sleep securely upon both ears. 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 labour 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 acknowledgement of my moderation from a French divine. And yet more particularly in my reply to the Bishop of Chalcedon, Pres. p. 144. and cap. i. p. 164. 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 not 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 denyeth them salvation. We are none of those 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.

MEDE, PRESBYTER.—*Sermon on Urim and Thummim.*—Works, Book I. p. 186.

The Ministers of Christ must be *Lux Mundi*, the Light of the world—*Vos estis Lux Mundi*—"Ye are the Light of the World: Ye are the World's Urim," saith Christ unto His Apostles. "For the lips of the priest should preserve knowledge, and they should learn the law at his mouth." This light of knowledge, this teaching knowledge, is the Urim of every Levite; and therefore Christ, when He inspired His Apostles with knowledge of heavenly mysteries, He sent a new Urim from above, even fiery tongues of Urim from heaven. He sent no fiery heads, but fiery tongues; for it is not sufficient for a Levite to have his head full of Urim, unless his tongue be a candle to show it to others. There came, indeed, no Thummim" [integrity or perfection] "from heaven, as there came an Urim; for though the Apostles were secured from errors, they were not freed from sin; and yet we who are Levites

must have such a Thummim as may be gotten upon earth ; for St. Paul bids Titus in all things to show himself an example of good works, and this is a Thummim of Integrity. But, besides this Thummim, the Ministers of the Gospel have received from GOD more especially another Thummim, like unto that which was proper to the High Priest ; namely, the power of binding and loosing, which is, as it were, a power of oracle, to declare unto the people the remission of their sins, by the acceptance of CHRIST'S sacrifice.

MASON, PRESBYTER.—*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, i. 2.

Anglican. Our Ministry is agreeable to Divine Scripture, and therefore holy. Nor do we doubt, that, when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, they who turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever. However, what is your argument against our ministry ?

Romanist. Can a man be a lawful minister without a lawful call ?

Anglican. Of course not . . .

Romanist. If so, I pray tell me how the Anglican Church can defend her ministry. Surely I may address each of you in Harding's words to Jewel : " What say you, my master ? You bear yourself as though Bishop of Salisbury ; but how will you substantiate your call ? What is your warrant for ministering in the Word and Sacraments ? &c. &c." . . . I ask thee, is your call inward or outward ?

Anglican. Both.

Romanist. An outward call, to be lawful, must be either immediately from CHRIST'S mouth, as the Apostles were called, or mediately through the Church.

Anglican. Well ; we are called by GOD through the Church ; for it is He who gives " Pastors and Doctors for the perfecting of the Saints."

Romanist. They who are called by GOD through the Church, must derive their warrant and power by lawful succession from CHRIST and the Apostles. If you maintain you have proceeded from this origin, it is your business to prove it clearly to us ; to set forth and trace your genealogy . . .

Anglican. The Ministers of the Anglican Church derive their imposition of hands in a lawful way from lawful Bishops, possessed of a lawful authority ; and therefore their call is ordinary [not extraordinary, by miracles].

Romanist. But whence have those Bishops derived their power?

Anglican. From GOD, through the hands of Bishops before them, &c. &c.

SANDERSON, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Divine Right of
Episcopacy.*

My opinion is, that Episcopal Government is not to be derived merely from Apostolical practice or institution, but that it is originally founded in the Person and Office of the Messiah, our blessed LORD JESUS CHRIST ; who, being sent by our heavenly Father to be the Great Apostle (Heb. iii. 1), Bishop, and Pastor (1 Peter ii. 25) of his Church, and anointed to that office immediately after His baptism by John, with power and the Holy Ghost (Acts x. 37, 38), descending then upon Him in a bodily shape (Luke iii. 22), did afterwards, before His ascension into Heaven, send and empower His holy Apostles, in like manner as His Father had before sent Him (John xx. 21), to execute the same Apostolical, Episcopal, and Pastoral Office, for the ordering and governing of His Church, until His coming again ; and so the same office to continue in them and their successors unto the end of the world. (Matt. xxviii. 18—20.) This I take to be so clear, from these and other like texts of Scripture, that if they shall be diligently compared together, both between themselves and with the following practice of the Churches of CHRIST, as well in the Apostles' times as in the purest and primitive times nearest thereunto, there will be left little cause why any man should doubt thereof.

HAMMOND, PRESBYTER, DOCTOR, AND CONFESSOR.—*On the
Power of the Keys. Preface.*

That the prime act of power enstated by CHRIST on His Apostles, as for the governing of the Church, (and exorcising or banishing all devils out of it,) so for the effectual performing that

great act of charity to men's souls, reducing pertinacious sinners to repentance, should be so, either wholly dilapidated, or piteously deformed, as to continue in the Church, only under one of these two notions, either of an empty piece of formality, or of an engine of state and secular contrivance, (the true Christian use of shaming sinners into reformation, being well nigh vanished out of Christendom,) might by an alien, or an heathen, much more by the pondering Christian, be conceived very strange and unreasonable, were it not a little clear that we are fallen into those times, of which it was foretold by two Apostles, that in "these last days, there should come scoffers, walking after their own lusts," &c. . . . I shall design to infer no further conclusion, but only this, that they which live ill in the profession of a most holy faith. . . but especially they that discharge and banish out of the Church those means which might help to make the generality of Christians better, have the spirit of Antichrist working into them, even when they think themselves most zealously busied in beating down his kingdom. What those means are which might most effectually tend to the amending the lives of Christians, I shall need no farther to interpose my judgment, than, 1st, by submitting it to Christ, who put the keys into the Apostles' hands, on purpose as a means to exemplify the end of His coming. . . . 2nd, by minding myself and others what the Apostles say of this power, that it was given them *πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν*, to build up the Church of Christ, &c.

Chapter 3. The only difficulty remaining on the point, will be, who are the Apostles' successors in that power; and when the question is asked of that power, I must be understood of the power of governing the Church peculiarly, (of which the power of the keys was and is a principal branch), for it must again be remembered that the Apostles are to be considered under a double notion, first, as planters, then as governors, of the Church. . . . Which distinction being premised, the question will now more easily be satisfied, being proposed in these terms; 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 that 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.

TAYLOR, BISHOP, CONFESSOR, AND DOCTOR,—*On Episcopacy.*
Introduction.

Antichrist must come at last, and the great apostasy foretold must be, and this not without means proportionable to the production of so great declensions of Christianity. “When ye hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not afraid,” says our Blessed Saviour, “the end is not yet.” It is not war that will do “this great work of destruction ;” for then it might have been done long ere now. What then will do it? We shall know when we see it. In the mean time, when we shall find a new device, of which, indeed, the platform was laid, in Aeriús and the Acephali, brought to a good possibility of completing a thing, that whosoever shall hear, his ears shall tingle, “an abomination of desolation standing where it ought not,” “*in sacris*,” in holy persons, and places, and offices, it is too probable that this is the preparatory for the Antichrist, and grand apostasy.

For if Antichrist shall exalt himself above all that is called God, and in Scripture none but kings and priests are such, “*dii vocati, dii facti*,” I think we have great reason to be suspicious, that he that divests both of their power, (and they are, if the king be Christian, in very near conjunction,) does the work of Antichrist for him ; especially if the men whom it most concerns will but call to mind, that if the discipline or government which Christ hath instituted is that kingdom by which He governs all Christendom, (so themselves have taught us,) then they (to use their own expressions) throw Christ out of his kingdom ; and then either they leave the Church without a head, or else put Antichrist in substitution.

We all wish that our fears in this and all things else may be vain, that what we fear may not come upon us ; but yet that the abolition of episcopacy is the forerunner, and preparatory to the

great Apostasy, I have these reasons to show, at least, the probability. First, &c. * * *

Section 2 and 3. This government was by immediate substitution delegated to the Apostles, by Christ Himself, "in traditione clavium, in spiratione Spiritûs, in missione in Pentecosto"... This power so delegated, was not to expire with their persons; for when the great Shepherd had reduced His wandering sheep into a fold, He would not leave them without "guides to govern" them, so long as the wolf might possibly prey upon them, and that is, till the last separation of the sheep from the goats. And this Christ intimates in that promise, "Ero vobiscum (Apostolis) usque ad consummationem seculi." "Vobiscum;" not with your persons, for they died long ago: but "vobiscum et vestri similibus," with Apostles to the end of the world. And, therefore, that the Apostolate might be successive and perpetual, CHRIST gave them a power of Ordination, that by imposing hands on others, they might impart that power which they received from Christ.

HEYLIN, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR—*On Episcopacy*, i. 6.

The Church at his (St. John's) departure, he left firmly grounded in all the points of faith and doctrine, taught by CHRIST our Saviour, as well settled in the outward government, the polity and administration of the same, which had been framed by the Apostles, according to the pattern and example of their Lord and Master. For being that the Church was born of seed immortal, and they themselves, though excellent and divine, yet still mortal men, it did concern the Church, in a high degree, to be provided of a perpetuity, or, if you will, the immortality of overseers, both for the sowing of this seed, and for the ordering of the Church, or the field itself. This, since they could not do in person, they were to do it by successors, who by their office were to be the ordinary pastors of the Church, and the Vicars of Christ. Now, if you ask the Fathers who they were that were accounted in their times and ages the successors of the Apostles, they will with one accord make answer, that the Bishops were.

ALLESTRIE, PRESBYTER, *Sermons, No. 16.*

The separateness of the functions of the Clergy, the incommunicableness of their offices to persons not separated for them, is so express a doctrine both of the letter of the text, and of the Holy Ghost, that sure I need not to say more, though several heads of probation offer themselves ; as first the condition of the callings, which does divide from the community and sets them up above it. And here I might tell you of "bearing rule," of "thrones," of "stars," and "Angels," and other words of a high sense, and yet not go out of the Scripture bounds, although the dignity did not die with the Scripture age, or expire with the Apostles ; the age as low as Photius words it thus, Τὸ ἀποστολικόν, κ. τ. λ. "That Apostolical and Divine dignity, which the Chief Priests are acknowledged to be possessed of by right of succession." Styles which I could derive yet lower, and they are of a prouder sound than those the modest humble ears of this our age are so offended with. But these heights, it may be, would give ombrages ; although it is strange that men should envy them to those, who are only exalted to them, that they may with the more advantage, take them by the hands and lift them up to heaven. Those nearnesses to things above do but more qualify them to draw near to God, on your behalf, that these your Angels also may see the face of your father which is in heaven, and those stars are, therefore, set in Christ's right hand, that they may shed a blessing [blessed ?] influence on you from thence. . . .

The censures of the Church, the burden of the keys, which (passing by the private use of them in voluntary penitences, and discipline upon the sick,) as they signify public exclusion out of the Church, for scandalous enormities, and re-admission into it upon repentance, have been sufficiently evinced to belong to the governors of the Church. The exercise of them is so much their work, that St. Paul calls them "the weapons of their spiritual warfare, by which they do cast down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." (2 Cor. x. 4.-5.) a blessed victory, even for the conquered, and

these the only weapons to atchieve it with. If those who sin scandalously, and will not hear the admonition of the Church, were cast out of the Church, if not religion, reputation would restrain them somewhat; not to be thought fit company for Christians, would surely make them proud against their vices. Shame, the designed effect of their censures, hath great pungen-
cies; the fear of it does goad men into actions of the greatest hazard, and the most unacceptable; such as have nothing lovely in them, but are wholly distasteful. . . . Now, the infliction of these censures is so much the work to which Church governors are called by the Holy Ghost, that they are equally called by Him to it and to Himself; both are alike bestowed upon them. "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye retain they are retained." (John xx. 22.) And in the first derivations of this office, it was performed with severities, such as this age, I doubt, will not believe; and when they had no temporal sword to be auxiliary to these spiritual weapons.

PEARSON, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*On the Creed*, Article ix.

[After considering the Church as one, by reason of its one foundation, faith, ministry of sacraments, hope, and charity, he continues,—]

Lastly, all the Churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same CHRIST ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation: as, therefore, there is no Church where there is no order, no ministry; so, where the same order and ministry is, there is the same Church. * * *

The necessity of believing the Holy Catholick Church appeareth first in this, that CHRIST hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first, "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved;" and what was then daily done 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 none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," but the name of JESUS; and that is no otherwise given under Heaven than in the Church. As none were saved from the Deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, formed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt lived, but such as were within those habitations whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made; so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into and fixed in the Temple.

Next, it is necessary to believe the Church of CHRIST, which is but one, that, being in it, we may take care never to cast ourselves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to cast those out which do belong to it: for if any neglect to hear the Church, saith our Saviour, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the Church of God; and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of Heaven. For our Saviour said to His Apostles, upon whom He built His Church, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Again, a man may not only passively and involuntarily be ejected, but also may, by an act of his own, cast out or eject himself, not only by plain and complete apostasy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresy; or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrevocable schism.

FELL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*On Ephesians, v. 9.*

Apostles, . . . Prophets, . . . Evangelists, . . . Pastors, . . .

and Teachers. . . . For the three first, some part of their function was temporary and extraordinary ; in what was ordinary and perpetual, Bishops succeeded.

BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Vindication of the English Church, § 24.*

We proceed, in the next place, to the constant visibility and succession of Pastors in our Church And here I make him this fair proposal : let him, or any one of his party, produce any one solid argument to demonstrate such a succession of Pastors in the Church of Rome, and I will undertake by the very same argument, to prove a like succession in our Church. Indeed, the Author of the Letter is concerned, no less than we are, to acknowledge such a succession of lawful pastors in our Church, till the time of the Reformation ; and if we cannot derive our succession since, it is a hard case. But our records, faithfully kept and preserved, do evidence to all the world an uninterrupted succession of Bishops in our Church, canonically ordained, derived from such persons in whom a lawful power of ordination was seated by the confession of the Papists themselves. For the story of the Nag's Head Ordination is so putid a fable, so often and so clearly refuted by the writers of our Church, that the more learned and ingenuous Papists are now ashamed to make use of it.

STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP.—*Unreasonableness of Separation ; Preface.*

. . . . Unthinking people . . . are carried away with mere noise and pretences, and hope these will secure them most against the fears of Popery, who talk with most passion, and with least understanding, against it ; whereas no persons do really give them greater advantages than these do. For, where they meet only with intemperate railings, and gross misunderstandings of the state of the controversies between them and us (which commonly go together), the most subtle priests let such alone to spend their rage and fury ; and when the heat is over, they will calmly endeavour to let them see how grossly they have been deceived

in some things, and so will more easily make them believe, they are as much deceived in all the rest. And thus the East and West may meet at last, and the most furious antagonists may become some of the easiest converts. This I do really fear will be the case of many thousands among us, who now pass for most zealous Protestants; if ever, which God forbid, that religion should come to be uppermost in England. It is, therefore, of mighty consequence for preventing the return of Popery, that men rightly understand what it is. For, when they are as much afraid of an innocent ceremony as of real idolatry, and think they can worship images and adore the Host on the same grounds that they may use the sign of the cross, or kneel at the Communion, when they are brought to see their mistake in one case, they will suspect themselves deceived in the other also. . . . When they find undoubted practices of the Ancient Church condemned as Popish and Antichristian by their teachers, they must conclude Popery to be of much greater antiquity than really it is; and when they can trace it so very near the Apostles' times, they will soon believe it settled by the Apostles themselves. For it will be very hard to persuade any considering men, that the Christian Church should degenerate so soon, so unanimously, so universally, as it must do, if Episcopal government, and the use of some significant ceremonies, were any parts of that apostasy. . . . Three ways, Bishop Sanderson observes, our dissenting brethren, though not intentionally and purposely, yet really and eventually, have been the great promoters of the Roman interest among us; (1) by putting to their helping hand to the pulling down of Episcopacy . . . (2) by opposing the interest of Rome with more violence than reason; (3) by frequently mistaking the question, but especially through the necessity of some false principle or other, which, having once imbibed, they think themselves bound to maintain, whatever becomes of the common cause of our Reformation.

KENN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Exposition of the Church Catechism.*

I believe, O blessed and adorable Mediator, that the Church is

a society of persons, founded by Thy love to sinners, united into one body of which Thou art the head, initiated by baptism, nourished by the Eucharist, governed by pastors commissioned by Thee, and endowed with the power of the keys, professing the doctrine taught by Thee and delivered to the saints, and devoted to praise and to love Thee.

I believe, O holy JESUS, that Thy Church is holy like Thee its Author ; holy by the original design of its institution, holy by baptismal dedication, holy in all its administrations which tend to produce holiness ; and, though there will be always a mixture of good and bad in it in this world, yet that it has always many real saints in it ; and, therefore, all love, all glory, be to Thee. . . .

Glory be to Thee, O Lord my God, who hast made me a member of the particular Church of England, whose faith, government, and worship are Holy, and Catholic, and Apostolic, and free from the extremes of irreverence and superstition, and which I firmly believe to be a sound part of Thy Church universal, and which teaches me charity to those who dissent from me ; and, therefore, all love, all glory be to Thee.

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Sermon on Christ's Presence with His Ministers.*

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. . . .

And this, I verily believe, is the great reason why the devil has such a great spite at our Church, still stirring up adversaries of all sorts against it,—Papists on the one hand, and Sectaries on the other, and all, if possible, to destroy it; even because the Spirit which is ministered in it, is so contrary to his nature, and so destructive of his kingdom, that he can never expect to domineer and tyrannize over the people of the land, so long as such a Church is settled among them, and they continue firm to it. . . .

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. For it is manifest, that this promise was made only to the Apostles and their successors to the end of the world. Whereas, 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, &c. . . .

SHARP, ARCHBISHOP.—*Sermons*, Vol. vii. *Of the Church*.

“Go,” He says, “and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, &c.” . . . This commission of our Saviour we may properly style the Charter of the Church; and mind, I pray, what is contained in it. Our Saviour here declares the extent of His Church, and of what persons He would have it constituted. It was to extend throughout all the world, and to be made up of all nations. He here declares by whom he would have it built and constituted, viz. the Apostles. He here declares upon what grounds He would have it constituted, or upon what conditions any person was to be received into it, viz. their becoming the dis-

ciples of JESUS CHRIST, and undertaking to observe all that He has commanded. He here likewise declares the form or the method by which persons were to be admitted into this Church, and that was by being baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And, lastly, He here promises the perpetual presence of His Holy Spirit, both to assist the apostles and their successors in the building and governing this Church, and to actuate and enliven all the members of it. . . . Thus, I am sure, I have given the true notion of the Church, which the Scripture always intends, when it speaks of the Church as the Body of Christ, when it speaks of the Church which Christ purchased with His blood, when it speaks of the Church into which we are baptized, when it speaks of the Church to which all those glorious promises are made of the forgiveness of sins, of the perpetual presence and assistance of the Holy Spirit, of the gates of hell never prevailing against it, and of everlasting salvation in the world to come ; 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.

SCOTT, PRESBYTER.—*Christian Life*, Part ii. ch. 7.

Another thing wherein those particular Churches, into which the Catholic Church is distributed, do communicate with each other, is, in the essentials of Christian regiment and discipline : for though the particular modes and circumstances of Christian government and discipline are not determinated by divine institution, but left for the most part free to the prudent ordering and disposal of the governors of particular churches, yet there is a standing form of government and discipline in the Church, instituted by our Saviour himself, which, as I shall show hereafter, is this ; that there should be an episcopacy, or order of men, authorized in a continual succession from the apostles, (who were au-

thorized by Himself) to oversee and govern all those particular Churches into which the Church Catholic should be hereafter distributed; to ordain, &c, &c. And this being the standing government and discipline of the Catholic Church, no particular Church or community of Christians can refuse to communicate in it, without dividing itself from the communion of the Church Catholic; I say, "refuse to communicate in it," because it is possible for a Church to be without this government and discipline, which yet doth neither refuse it, nor the communion of any other Church for the sake of it. A church may be debarred of it by unavoidable necessities, in despite of its power and against its consent. . . . Though this instituted government is necessary to the perfection of a church, yet it doth not therefore follow, that it is necessary to the being of it. . . . But though a community of Christians *may* be a true part of the Catholic Church, and in communion with it, though it hath no episcopacy; yet it is a plain case, that if it *rejects* the episcopacy, and separates from the communion of it, it thereby wholly divides itself from the communion of the Catholic Church.

WAKE, ARCHBISHOP.—*Exposition of the Doctrine of the English Church.* Art. 15.

The imposition of hands in Holy orders, being accompanied with a blessing of the Holy Spirit, may, perhaps, upon that account be called a kind of particular sacrament. Yet since that grace, which is thereby conferred, whatever it be, is not common to all Christians, nor by consequence any part of that federal blessing which our blessed Saviour has purchased for us, but only a separation of Him who receives it to a special employ, we think it ought not to be esteemed a common sacrament of the whole Church, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are. . . . We confess that no man ought to exercise the ministerial office till he be first consecrated to it. We believe that it is the Bishop's part only to ordain. 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.

WAKE.—Art. 25.

Professing in our Creed a Holy Catholic Church, we profess to believe not only that there was a Church planted by our Saviour at the beginning, that has hitherto been preserved by Him, and ever shall be to the end of the world ; but do in consequence undoubtedly believe too, that this universal Church is so secured by the promises of Christ, that there shall always be retained so much truth in it, the want of which would argue that there could be no such Church.

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.—*On Church Government*. Chap. v.

First then, it must be shown, that the office and character of all persons, who are admitted into holy orders, extends over the whole world, and it is manifest, in the first place, that the Apostles had a general commission to “teach and baptize,” and to execute all other parts of their office in all nations. As the bishops of the Church have been shown to succeed the Apostles in all the parts of their office which are of standing and constant use in the Church : so we might reasonably conclude, though we have no farther proof of it, that the office and character of bishop, and consequently of inferior ministers, extends over all the world, because those of the Apostles, their predecessors, did so ; since there is scarce any reason why the apostles’ authority should be universal, which will not hold, at least in some degree, for the same extent of authority in the bishops, as will appear from some of the following considerations :—

There is but one Catholic Church, whereof all particular Churches are members, and therefore, when any spiritual privilege or character is conferred on any particular Church, it must be understood to extend over the whole Catholic Church : thus by Baptism, men are not only made members of the particular Church where they happen to be baptized, but of the Catholic Church over the world ; and therefore whoever has been lawfully

baptized in one Church, has a right to partake of the Lord's Supper, and other church privileges, in all other Churches, where he happens to come; whereas if baptism only admitted men into some particular Church, they must be re-baptized, before they can lawfully be received to communion in any diocese, where they have not been baptized already.

If it was not thus in holy orders, that they who have received them in one place, retain them in others: no minister could have authority to preach the Gospel or to administer the sacraments, or to exercise any other part of his functions beyond the particular district in which he was ordained; the consequence whereas is manifestly this, that the gospel of CHRIST must not be propagated, nor any churches erected, in countries where they had not stood ever since the Apostles' times. For since there can be no ministers without ordination, as was before proved, so then they, who have been ordained in one country, may lawfully exercise their respective functions in others, where there are no ordained ministers already settled, or else those countries must remain for ever without ministers, and consequently without sacraments and other public offices of religion.

NELSON, CONFESSOR.—*Festivals and Fasts.*

The Church being a regular society founded by CHRIST, distinct from and independent of all other worldly societies, must naturally make us suppose that He instituted some Officers for the government of it. . . . [The] Powers peculiar to the superior Order being necessary for the good government of the Church, it is plain in fact they did not expire with the Apostles. But, as our Saviour "glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest," but had His commission from GOD the Father, so after His resurrection, He invested the Apostles with the same commission His Father had given unto Him: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you; and He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the HOLY GHOST." In which commission is plainly contained the authority of ordaining others, and a power to transfer that commission upon others, and those upon others to the end of the world. And to show that it was not

merely personal to the Apostles, our Saviour promises to be with them and their successors in the execution of this commission, "even unto the end of the world." . . . This commission the Apostles and their successors exercised in all places, and even in opposition to the Rulers that then were; so that the Church subsisted as a distinct society from the state, for above three hundred years, when the civil government was only concerned to suppress and destroy it. Indeed when the Church received the benefit of incorporation and protection from the state, she was content to suffer some limitations as to the exercise of these powers, and thought herself sufficiently recompensed by the advantages that accrued to her by the incorporation.

KETTLEWELL, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Practical Believer*,
ii. 6.

Question. There remains yet one instance of the Communion of the Primitive Christians, mentioned by St. Luke, viz. their "continuing in the Apostles' fellowship." (Acts ii. 42.) I pray you what is meant by that?

Answer. Owning their authority and continuing under their government. They were appointed by CHRIST, as His deputies, to govern His CHURCH; and, therefore, to adhere to them, as the delegates of CHRIST, is called living "in their fellowship."

Q. But how can we live in their fellowship, and adhere to their government, now they are dead?

A. By adhering to and owning the authority of our own Bishops, who are their successors, and rule the Church in their stead.

HICKS, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Treatise on the Episcopal Order*, § 2.

Can you, Sir, when you consider that Bishops are appointed to succeed the Apostles, and, like them, to stand in CHRIST's place, and exercise their kingly, priestly, and prophetic office over their flocks; can you, when you consider this, think it novel, or improper, or uncouth, to call them spiritual princes, and their dioceses principalities?—when they have every thing in their

office which can denominate a prince? For what is a prince but the chief ruler of a society, that hath authority over the rest to make laws for it, to challenge the obedience of all the members, and all ranks of men in it, and power to coerce them, if they will not obey? And now, Sir, I pray you attend to what follows, and then tell me, if the office of a Bishop contains not every thing that is in the definition of a chief or a prince. St. Ignatius, who was St. John's disciple, writes of the Bishop in his Epistle, &c.

LAW.—Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor.

“The priests of the sons of Levi shall come near; for them hath the Lord thy God chosen to minister unto Him, and to bless in the name of the Lord.” (Deut. xxi. 5.) Now my Lord, this is what we mean by the authoritative administration of the Christian clergy; whether they be by way of benediction, or of any other kind. We take them to be persons whom God has chosen to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name. We imagine that our Saviour was a greater priest and mediator than Aaron, or any of God's former ministers. We are assured that CHRIST sent His Apostles, as His Father had sent Him; and that, therefore, they were His true successors; and since they did commission others to succeed them in their office by the imposition of hands, as Moses commissioned Joshua to succeed him, the clergy who have succeeded the Apostles, have as divine a call and commission to their work, as those who were called by our Saviour; and are as truly His successors as the Apostles themselves were.

Ibid.—Postscript.

The third objection against this uninterrupted succession is this: that it is a popish doctrine, and “gives Papists advantage over us.” The objection proceeds thus: “We must not assert the necessity of this succession, because the Papists say it is only to be found in them.” I might add, because some mighty zealous Protestants say so too.

But if this be good argumentation, we ought not to tell the Jews, or Deists, &c., that there is any necessity of embracing Christ-

ianity, because the Papists say Christians can only be saved in their Church. Again, we ought not to insist upon a true faith, because the Papists say, that a true faith is only in their communion. So that there is just as much Popery in teaching this doctrine, as in asserting the necessity of Christianity to a Jew, or the necessity of a right faith to a Socinian, &c.

JOHNSON, PRESBYTER.—*Unbloody Sacrifice*, Part II. Chap. 3.

The Eucharist is one, as offered by priests, who are one by their commission. It is very evident that it was not only our Saviour's intention, but His most passionate desire, that, as all His Apostles received their commission from Him, so they might execute it with such a harmony and consent of mind, that there might not be the least jarring between them; for thus He prays for them: "Keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as We are." And the foundation of our Saviour's wishes and expectations for so perfect an union between His Apostles was this, as is expressed by Himself, "I have given them the words which Thou gavest me," that is, He had committed to them the same treasure of Divine truth which the Father had before committed to Him, &c. . . . After His resurrection, He does, with great solemnity, tell them, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you;" from which words it is evident, that the commission of all the Apostles was one and the same; that it was such a commission as CHRIST himself, in His human nature, had received from His Father; and even they who were not of the same order with the Apostles, but only inferior Presbyters under them, yet by deriving their authority from the same fountain-head, and exercising it in conformity to the instructions which they received from them, they still kept the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." . . . It was upon this account that Ignatius, Cyprian, and others, represent the whole college of Bishops throughout the whole world as one person, sitting in one chair, attending one altar: and that, therefore, is the one Eucharist which is celebrated by this one priesthood; and St. Clement of Rome allows nothing to be offered without the inspection of the high priest; and, therefore, when a new altar is erected, a new

Bishop ordained in opposition to the former, then there is just occasion to ask that question, as St. Paul did, "Is CHRIST divided?" 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.

DODWELL, CONFESSOR,—*Discourse on the one Priesthood, one Altar.* Ch. 12.

I observe that the Hierophanta, in their mysteries represented a Divine Person. The same, in all probability, were the thoughts of the primitive Christians, concerning their Bishops. This I take to be the true design of that description of the Majestatic Presence in the Revelations, to represent the Divine Presence, and assistance in the Church, in as lively a way as possible, according to the ways of Mystical Representation received in those times. . . . St. John being particularly to affect the Churches he writes to, those of the Lydian or Proconsular Asia, with a very feeling sense of the Divine presence among them, (which might add the greater authority to his several exhortations respectively,) he represents our Saviour in a human visible shape; and that the rest of the scene might be suitable, (that is, sensible also as well as Himself,) he personates the Angels by their visible Bishops, that so Christ might be apprehended as present with the Bishops, as God was supposed to be wherever these Seven Spirits were, which were peculiarly deputed to represent the Majestatic Presence. This I take to be the reason why he confines his number, not that by any geographical distinction those seven cities were incorporated into a body, more than others of that province, but that he had a particular regard to that number of those Angels of the presence. Therefore he makes seven candlesticks, alluding, as I have said, to the like number of those in the Tabernacle, as emblems of those seven Churches. Therefore seven stars, alluding to the number of the Planets and the Angels who presided over them, as emblems of the Bishops of those Churches. . . . Thus it appears

plainly, that the Bishops are here represented in a mystical way ; and how particularly suitable it was, in this way, to personate them by the name of Angels. They were, indeed, to perform the same office under Christ, as a *visible* human person, which the Angels were under Him as the Logos, in reference to the restitution of souls to their original dignity.

But because even His human nature, though visible in itself, is yet invisible to us, therefore another way was thought of for copying out that heavenly *τελετη*, even in the ordinary external visible government of the Church. And here the Bishop was to personate Christ Himself, as the High Priest had, formerly, represented the Logos. The seven Deacons were to represent the Seven Mystical Angels, as I am very apt to think, they were designed from the very original. I cannot think it casual that the number first pitched on was exactly *seven*. But, that which more confirms me in this opinion is the real suitableness of the office of the Deacon to the Bishops, as representing the Logos in a visible way, with that of those Angels to the same Logos, as He was invisible. The office of the Angels in general is thus described, by the Author of the Hebrews, that they are [“ministering spirits, sent out for a diaconate.”] These are exactly the very terms by which the Church would have expressed the office of these Deacons, if she had been to have described the same office as vested in mortal men. They (the Angels) were to stand before the presence of God, in a posture of readiness to be sent on messages by Him ; and so were the Deacons to stand before the Bishop, to be sent by him on his messages. They were the “eyes of the Lord, which ran to and fro through the whole earth.” So also the Deacons are, in the language of the Ancient Church, called the *Oculi Episcopi*, for the same reason. Now we may not wonder why the Bishops are called Angels, in the formentioned mystical immediate relation to our Saviour Himself as the chief “Bishop of our souls ;” because, indeed, in regard of Him, they bear no higher office than that of Deacons. Accordingly the Primitive Church were extremely vigorous in insisting on this very number of their Deacons, in all places, as I

have elsewhere showed. The council of Neocæsarea imposed it as a universal rule, how great soever the Church were to which the Deacons were to serve; . . . a canon, which, though it were at first designed only for their own province of Cappadocia, was, notwithstanding, afterwards extended, first, to the Eastern Empire . . . afterwards to the Western . . . Therefore, even then it is much more probable that this number was already received in more Churches than otherwise.

And now the comparisons of the Bishops in Ignatius cannot seem so strange, these things being considered, as they did to Blondell, who had considered none of them. They are generally designed to express the sacredness and excellency of the *persons* which the clergy bore in these mystical performances. Nor is there any thing in them that is really affected or strained, much less blasphemous, no, nor any extravagant flights of fancy . . . If he was to compare them with the first invisible archetypes of unity, (as that is, indeed, his great design in those epistles, in opposition to the schisms then rising,) then it was very proper for him to take notice only of the two orders which were then immediately concerned in the office of ministration, and then to compare them with God the Father, and the Logos; because as this unity consists in the unity of the Head, and the Scripture tells us that the Head of every man is Christ, so also the same Scripture tells us that the Head of Christ is God. . . . These things, therefore, being thus solidly laid down by the first fathers, in their disputes against their contemporary Heretics and Schismatics, all the inferences thence deduced against them, will follow naturally and undeniably . . . It will follow, that disunion from the Bishop was a disunion from Christ and the 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 others' censures, under pain of schism if they do not.

COLLIER, BISHOP, AND CONFESSOR.—*Moral Essays*, Part III.

'Tis the bulk and serviceableness of business, and the use it has in the world, which makes an employment honourable. And can any thing compare with the Apostles in this particular? Were they not to form and instruct the Church, and to govern the most noble society upon earth? Were they not to publish the Mysteries of Redemption, the offers of the New Covenant, and the glories of the other world? . . . Fire in the figure of tongues sat upon the heads of each of them. This was an emblem of the gift of languages, and the miracle was as bright as the flame. . . . This was a glorious attestation, this must needs make their commission undisputed, and their character indelible. Should a Prince be proclaimed from the sky, anointed out of the Ampoul, and crowned by an Angel, his authority could not be more visible. . . . I can't help saying, that, in my opinion, a Prince made but a lean figure in comparison with an Apostle. What is the magnificence of palaces, the richness of furniture, the quality of attendance, what is all this to the pomp of miracles, and the grandeur of supernatural power? . . . A Prince can bestow marks of distinction, and posts of honour and authority; but he can't give the Holy Ghost, he can't register his favourites among the quality of heaven, nor entitle them to the bliss of eternity. No, —these powers were Apostolic privileges, and the enclosure of the Church. The prerogative royal cannot stretch thus far; these jewels are not to be found in the Imperial crown. . . . I need not tell you how much they suffered through their progress, and how gloriously they went off into the other world. But before their departure, they took care to perpetuate their authority, and provide governors for the Church. Thus the jurisdiction was conveyed to Bishops and Priests; this succession has continued without interruption for above sixteen hundred years.

LESLIE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Case of the Regale and Pontificale.*

When any constitution of civil government dissolves itself, another immediately succeeds; or, if a Monarchy be turned into a Commonwealth, or a Commonwealth into a Monarchy; and consequently that which was dissolved, is no more; but we cannot say that the Church is no more. There is still a Church, though in servitude, and nothing succeeds to it; if it were dissolved, there would be no Church, but nothing would come in its room, unless you will say a privation, that is the want of a Church. . . . The Church is a society spread over the earth; and, therefore, cannot be dissolved in any one kingdom or state; nor can the concessions of any national Church oblige the Church Catholic; no, nor oblige that national Church herself, otherwise than according to the rules of the Catholic Church; more than a Committee of the House of Lords or Commons can oblige the whole House, or govern themselves by any other rules than those which are prescribed by the House. . . .

The Church is laid as low and fenceless as the sand under their [Atheism, Deism, &c.] storms, which had long since overwhelmed the City of God, (after the change of her governors) if the Almighty promise (Matt. xvi. 18; xxviii. 20.) had not interposed to preserve some embers alive in the midst of these torrents. And they will be preserved till the time appointed by God shall come, when His breath shall put new life in them, to lick up that sea that now covers, but cannot drown them. . . . This is the city, the society, over which the temporal governments of the earth have assumed the dominion; and have said, "Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us." . . .

And let not so weak a thought arise in your minds, as if all this were only the self-seeking of the Clergy, out of pride to advance themselves. Alas! it must have the quite contrary effect with any of them who consider what a heavy charge they have undertaken, and what account will be exacted from them, for their faithful discharge of it! That the blood of all those souls who perish through their negligence or default, will be required at their

hands! That they have to wrestle, not only with flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits that are set up in high places. And whoever opposes these with that truth and freedom that is necessary, instead of honour must expect reproach and persecution; of which it is not the least, that they cannot vindicate the honour of Christ's commission without being thought to seek their own glory. Yet that must not hinder; the successors of the Holy Apostles must be content to pass, as they did, "through evil report and good report, as deceivers, and yet true."

WILSON, BISHOP, CONFESSOR AND DOCTOR.—*Private Thoughts.*

"He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold," &c. A lawful entrance, upon motives which aim at the glory of God and the good of souls; an external call and mission, from the apostolic authority of Bishops.

"A stranger will they not follow;" that is, they ought not to follow such as break Catholic Unity. . . .

Whoever is associated in the Priesthood of CHRIST, ought, in imitation of Him, to sacrifice Himself for the advantage of His Church and for all the designs of God. . . .

"Bishops and priests," saith St. Ambrose, "are honourable on account of the sacrifice they offer." The power of the keys and the exercise of that power, the due use of confirmation, and previous to that of examination . . . are matters of infinite and eternal concern. . . . (*At the Lord's Supper. Before the Service begins.*) May it please Thee, O God, who hast called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this sacrifice for our own sins and for the sins of the people. Accept our service and our persons, through our Lord JESUS CHRIST, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, One God, world without end.—O reject not this people for me and for my sins. Amen.

(*Upon placing the Elements upon the Altar.*) Vouchsafe to receive these Thy creatures from the hands of us sinners, O Thou self-sufficient God!

(Immediately after the Consecration.) We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this bread and this cup. We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies, beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy CHRIST, and this cup the blood of Thy CHRIST; and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion. And together with us, remember, O God, for good, the whole mystical body of Thy Son; that such as are yet alive may finish their course with joy, and that we, with all such as are dead in the LORD, may rest in hope and rise in glory, for Thy Son's sake, whose death we now commemorate. Amen. May I adore Thee, O God, by offering to Thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by JESUS CHRIST. Amen.

Whenever church discipline meets with discountenance, impieties of all kinds are sure to get head and abound. And impieties unpunished do always draw down judgments. The same JESUS CHRIST, who appointed baptism for the receiving men into His Church and family, has appointed excommunication, to shut such out as are judged unworthy to continue in it. If baptism be a blessing, excommunication is a real punishment; there being the same authority for excommunication as for baptism. And if men ridicule it, they do it at the peril of their souls.

BINGHAM, PRESBYTER.—*Sermons on Absolution.* No. 2.

In the first place, the commission of power to Ministers to retain and remit other men's sins, in whatever sense we take it, is a great engagement on them to lead holy and pure lives themselves. For it looks like an absurdity in practice, and is too often really thought so, that men should be qualified to forgive other men's sins, who are loaded with guilt and impurity themselves. There is nothing so natural and obvious to us as, Physician, heal thyself: and, therefore, if it be not a real objection against their office, yet it is an unanswerable one against their persons. If it do not destroy the tenor of their commission in the nature of the thing, yet it certainly diminishes their authority and reputation in the opinion of men; when every

profligate sinner can retort upon them and say, "Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law, dishonourest thou God?" It must needs take off very much from the veneration of the Sacrament of Baptism, to have a man pretend to wash away the sins of others, who is himself polluted and profane; and equally diminish the reverence which is due to the tremendous mystery of the Eucharist, to have it ministered with unholy hands. It cannot relish well with men, to hear an unsanctified mouth giving blessing to others, who in effect is cursing himself; praying that the blood of CHRIST may preserve others to eternal life, while he himself is eating and drinking his own damnation, not discerning the LORD's body. But above all, such a man cannot with any tolerable decency or freedom, discharge the office of punishing and correcting others, who is himself more justly liable to rebuke and censure. With what face can he debar others from Baptism or the Eucharist, who is himself unqualified to receive either? or exclude others from the Church, who is himself unworthy to enter into it? Nothing can be a greater engagement upon Ministers to lead holy and pure lives, than the consideration of the commission which CHRIST has given them, to retain or remit other men's sins, whether in a sacramental way, or a declaratory way, or a precatory way, or a judicial way: because without purity, they can by no means answer the end of this office, and the nature of their trust; but their mal-administration will rise up in judgment against them and condemn them.

2. A second thing which this office of retaining and remitting sins requires of Ministers, is great diligence in their studies and labours, without which they can never be able sufficiently to discharge it. The Church, indeed, has made some part of this work tolerably easy, by a prudent provision of many proper general forms of absolution: to which in her wisdom She may add proper forms of excommunication and judicial absolution. But when this is done, there still remains a great deal more belong-

ing to the full discharge of this office, for which the Church can make no particular provision : and, therefore, that must be left to the industry and diligence of Ministers, in their particular studies and labours. And this requires both a diffused knowledge, and great application ; to be able to understand the nature of all God's laws, and the bounds and distinctions betwixt every virtue and vice ; to be able to resolve all ordinary cases of conscience, and answer such doubts and scruples as are apt to arise in men's minds ; to know the qualifications of particular men, and the nature and degrees and sincerity of their repentance, in order to give them a satisfactory answer to their demands, and grant or refuse them the several sorts of absolution, as they shall think proper upon an impartial view of their state and condition. He that thinks all this may be done without any great labour and study, and a diligent search of the Holy Scriptures, the rule and record of God's will, seems neither to understand the nature of his office, nor the needs of men ; nor what it is to stand in the place of CHRIST, and judge for him between God and man. The Priest's lips should preserve knowledge : and a man that considers the large extent of that knowledge, together with the great variety of cases and persons to which he may have occasion to apply it, would rather be tempted to cry out with the Apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?" And if this be not an argument to engage a man to industry in the office of a spiritual physician, it is hard to say what is so.

SKELTON, PRESBYTER.—Discourse 71.

The next thing the Puritans took offence at, was the Hierarchy of the Church. They looked on the Bishops as the instruments of papal tyranny, and the corrupters of true religion. . . . They . . . were, it seems, so ignorant, as not to know, that the Bishops, of all men, had most reason to oppose the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, who had made himself the only Bishop, and reduced all the rest to cyphers. Nor did they consider, whether it was in the power of man to abolish, at his discretion, an order of the Church, instituted by God Himself, merely because the men who filled this order had degenerated, together with all the rest of the Church,

into superstition and luxury. Here again the scheme of our opposers was not to reform, but to destroy ; and what was equally bold, to begin a new ministry, with hardly any other mission, than such as a number of men, and sometimes one man only, wholly unauthorized, for aught that others could perceive, should assume. From men thus sending themselves, or sent by we know not whom, we are to receive the sacraments. . . . We must not forget, however, that these new orders lay claim to scriptural institution and primitive example. What, all of them ? And without succession ? Do we hear of any man in Scripture who ordained himself, or who presumed to take the ministry of God's word and sacraments upon him, without being sent either immediately or successively by CHRIST ? Or, can an instance of this kind be assigned during the first fourteen centuries of the Church ? . . . So sacred a thing is the succession of ordination, that the Holy Ghost, who had already enabled Barnabas and Saul to preach the word, ordered them to be " separated for the work whereunto He had called them, by fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands,"—that is to be ordained : the SPIRIT of GOD hereby plainly showing, that He himself would not break the successive order of mission established in the Church.

SAMUEL JOHNSON.—*ἐν φιλοσόφου σχήματι πρεσβέων τὸν θεῖον λόγον.* Sermon 7.

With regard to the order and government of the Primitive Church, we may doubtless follow their [the ancients] authority with perfect security ; they could not possibly be ignorant of laws executed, and customs practised by themselves ; nor would they, even supposing them corrupt, serve any interest of their own, by handing down false accounts to posterity. We are, therefore, to inquire from them the different Orders established in the Ministry from the Apostolic ages ; the different employments of each, and their several ranks, subordinations, and degrees of authority. From their writings, we are to vindicate the establishment of our Church, and by the same writings are those who differ from us in these particulars to defend their conduct.

Nor is this the only, though perhaps the chief use of these

writers; for, in matters of faith and points of doctrine, those at least who lived in the ages nearest to the times of the Apostles undoubtedly deserve to be consulted. The oral doctrines and occasional explications of the Apostles would not be immediately forgotten, in the Churches to which they had preached, and which had attended to them with the diligence and reverence which their mission and character demanded. Their solution of difficulties, and determinations of doubtful questions, must have been treasured up in the memory of their audiences, and transmitted for some time from father to son. Every thing, at least, that was declared by the inspired teachers to be necessary to salvation, must have been carefully recorded; and, therefore, what we find no traces of in Scripture, or the early Fathers, as most of the peculiar tenets of the Romish Church, must certainly be concluded to be not necessary. Thus, by consulting first the Holy Scriptures, and next the writers of the Primitive Church, we shall make ourselves acquainted with the will of God; thus shall we discover the good way, and find that rest for our souls, which will amply recompence our studies and inquiries.

HORNE, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Charge at Primary Visitation of his Diocese.*

The Constitution and use of the Church of CHRIST is another subject, on which our principles, for some years past, have been very unsettled, and our knowledge precarious and superficial. Ignorance is dangerous here, because there are so many whose interest it is to flatter us in it, and take advantage of it. The definition of the Church, contained in our Articles, was purposely less definitive than it might have been, to avoid giving further offence to those whom we rather wished to reconcile; but it does not appear, that the Church hath gained any thing by its moderation; it hath rather lost; because in virtue of that moderation, it hath been pleaded against us, that Ecclesiastical Unity may be dispensed with, and that all our differences in this matter are only problematical and immaterial.

But salvation is a gift of grace; that is, it is a free gift, to which we have no natural claim. It is not to be conceived within our-

selves, but to be received, in consequence of our Christian calling, from God Himself, through the means of His Ordinances. These can no man administer to effect, but by God's own appointment; at first, by His immediate appointment, and afterwards, by succession and derivation from thence to the end of the world. Without this rule we are open to imposture, and can be sure of nothing; we cannot be sure that our ministry is effective, and that our Sacraments are realities. We are very sensible the spirit of division will never admit this doctrine; yet the spirit of charity must never part with it. Writers and teachers who make it a point to give no offence, treat these things very tenderly; but he who, in certain cases, gives men no offence, will for that reason give them no instruction. *Light itself is painful to weak eyes; but delightful to them when grown stronger, and reconciled to it with use; and he who was instrumental in bringing them to a more perfect state of vision, though less acceptable at first, may yet, for his real kindness, be more cordially thanked afterwards, than if he had made the ease and safety of his own person the measure of his duty.* It is by no means evident, that the Church hath ever recommended itself the more by receding from any of its just pretensions: generosity obliges and secures a friend; but an enemy construes it into weakness, and then it never does any good. Yet the adversaries of the Church of England have always been persuading her to make the experiment, and have promised great things from it; with what views, it cannot be difficult to discover. It was an unhappy circumstance, and had very ill effects, when some pious men¹ of more zeal than discretion, who set out on the work of reforming this nation, opened an asylum for penitents, which took in people of all persuasions, without exception of any. It came to be inferred from hence, that souls might be saved as well without as with a Church; perhaps better; and when men have once begun to neglect rules, they go on to despise them, and know not where to stop, till all things are brought into confusion. . . .

The ancient Church is the standard by which all modern ones

¹ Mr. Wesley, &c.

are to be examined ; and unless a man knows what the Church was in centuries before the Reformation, he will see but darkly into the troubled waters of later times, in which faction and party have confounded things ; and it hath become as much the interest of some, that the Church of CHRIST should be found every where, as it is the desire of others that it should be found no where If we would guard against popular mistakes in the subject at large, it will be necessary to examine first, what the Church was under the Old Testament ; for there we find its original establishment, its form, its authority, its ministry, its unity and uniformity, its maintenance, its independence ; which things being so particularly laid down, no new establishment is to be found in the Epistles or the Gospels of the New Testament, but the ancient constitution is referred to, to show us, in certain cases, what ought to be from what had been. From the Scripture we should proceed next to observe, what the Church was in the first ages of the Gospel, before worldly policy, miscalled moderation, had any influence upon the opinions of Christians. There is an epistle of St. Clement, on Church unity and Church authority, with which all students in divinity should be acquainted. It will teach them what the Christian society then was, and what it ought to be. Ignatius and Cyprian, both of them martyrs, will give further instruction. The latter is so particular and copious, that a code of discipline might nearly be formed upon his authority. With these preparations, we shall be the better able to judge of what happened at the Reformation, when many things were right and many wrong ; when the Church of England, by the singular blessing of God, preserved its constitution and its doctrines, while many of the reformed fell off by degrees, some into disorder, some into dissolution. What remains with us we must defend and preserve ; trusting that the same GOD who hath raised this Church, when trodden down to the dust, will never forsake us till we forsake Him.

But I must now hasten, in the last place, to a subject of more quietness or less suspicion [than the subject of civil government], in which wise men of all persuasions are more nearly of a mind ; I mean, the conduct of the Christian life. Modern times and

new modes of education have given too great a latitude in the articles of dress, and dissipation, and self-indulgence. Every thing is to be avoided which tends to diminish that gravity and seriousness which God expects to find in all those who are flying from the wrath to come. It was observed of old, that when inconsiderate people are avoiding one extreme, they commonly fall into another, while reason and discretion keep the middle way. When Protestants laid aside the austerities of superstition, they began to see less harm in the liberties taken by the world. The kind of life to which the first Christians conformed, hath been considered as a sort of heroic piety, which had more of suffering and mortification than are now required of us ; as if the way to heaven could be easier, while the number of our temptations is probably increasing from the refinements of modern times, which, instead of giving us more liberty, call upon us for a greater degree of caution and reserve.

To us JESUS CHRIST is the pattern of holiness, the great exemplar of perfection, of whom we are first to learn, what no heathen ever professed, to be "meek and lowly in heart ;" and accordingly, one of the best books extant on the Spiritual life, is entitled, "The Imitation of JESUS CHRIST." Its language is barbarous, but its matter is divine and heavenly, and hath administered instruction and consolation to thousands of devout Christians. The way of true devotion must still be understood to be the same humble, secret, unaffected, un aspiring practice of piety, as it used to be of old. The Cross, which JESUS CHRIST carried for our salvation, is still the true emblem of our profession, from our baptism to our departure out of this life, and is to be borne by us in our minds, as a daily admonition to patient suffering and self-denial.

To assist us in the great duties of prayer and meditation, books of devotion have their use ; but to us of the clergy, the liturgy of our Church is the best companion ; and the daily use of it in our churches and families is required by the canons. It cannot be denied, that from various reasons prevailing amongst us, we are much fallen off, of late years, from the practice of weekly prayers in our churches. Wherever this has been neglected, we should

exhort the people to the revival of it, if circumstances will possibly permit ; and alarm them against a mistake, to which they are all exposed, from a fanatical prejudice of baneful influence, namely, that they come to Church only to hear preaching ; and hence they are indifferent, even on a Sunday, to the prayers of the Church, unless there is a sermon.

JONES OF NAYLAND, PRESBYTER.—*Lectures on Hebrews*, iii.

The Church, in its nature, always was what it now is, a society comprehending the souls as well as the bodies of men ; and, therefore, consisting of two parts, the one spiritual, answering to the soul, and other outward, answering to the body. Hence, some have written much upon a visible Church and an invisible, as if they were two things ; but they are more properly one, as the soul and body make a single person.

In the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apostle gives such a description of that society, into which Christians are admitted, as will show us the nature of it. “Ye are come,” says he, “unto Mount Zion,” &c. The terms here used give us a true prospect of the Church. This is that Zion of the Holy One of Israel, to which the forces of the Gentiles were to flow from all parts of the world the city of the living God, distinguished from the cities of the world, as Jerusalem was from the cities of the heathens, who dedicated their cities not to the living God, but to the names of their dead idols. This, being the city of the living God, must be an immortal society, for the living God does not preside over dead citizens ; He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living, and all the members of this society live unto Him. It is, therefore, called the Heavenly Jerusalem, because it is of a heavenly nature ; and it is called the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and is the mother of us all. . . . Its spiritual nature is further declared, in that it is said to comprehend an innumerable company of angels. In the communion of the Church the spirits of just men made perfect are also included. It is a society which admits only the spirits of the living, and as such cannot exclude the spirits of the dead ; and this confirms what we said

above, that the Church is a spiritual community, comprehending the dead as well as the living.

But it is now to be shown, secondly, that as the Church of God hath always been the same in its nature, it hath likewise preserved the same form in its external economy ; the wisdom of God having so ordained, that the Christian Church under the Gospel should not depart from the model of the Church under the Law. For as the congregation of Israel was divided into twelve tribes, under the twelve Patriarchs, so is the Church of CHRIST founded on the twelve Apostles, who raised to themselves a spiritual seed amongst all the nations of the world. There were then three orders of priests in the Jewish Church ; there was the high priest, and the sons of Aaron, and the Levites. In the Church of CHRIST, there was the order of the Apostles, besides whom there were the seventy Disciples sent out after them ; and, last of all, the Deacons were ordained to serve under both in the lower offices of the Church. The same form is still preserved in every regular Church of the world, which derives its succession and authority from the Church of the Apostles : after whom the Bishops succeeded by their appointment, such as Timothy and Titus, in their respective churches. This authority has been opposed in the Christian as it was in the Jewish Church : Corah and his company rose up against Moses and Aaron for usurping a lordly authority over the people ; so, in the later ages of the Christian Church, a levelling principle hath prevailed, which has appeared in many different shapes.

The Church has also been remarkably conformable to itself in its sufferings. There never was a time, so far as we can learn, when the true Church of God, with its doctrines and institutions, was not hated and opposed by the world ; either persecuted and oppressed by powerful tyrants, or traduced and insulted by lying historians.

HORSLEY, BISHOP.—*Sermon on Matt. xvi. 18, 19.*

The keys of the kingdom of Heaven here promised to St. Peter must be something quite distinct from that with which it hath generally been confounded, the power of remission and retention of sins, conferred by our LORD, after His resur-

rection, upon the apostles in general, and transmitted through them to the perpetual succession of the priesthood. *This* is the discretionary power lodged in the priesthood of dispensing the sacraments, and of granting to the penitent and refusing to the obdurate the benefit and comfort of absolution. The object of this power is the individual upon whom it is exercised, according to the particular circumstances of each man's case. It was exercised by the apostles in many striking instances. It is exercised now by every priest, when he administers or withholds the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, or, upon just grounds, pronounces or refuses to pronounce upon an individual the sentence of absolution.

HEBER, BISHOP.—*Sermons in England*, No. xii.

We must return then, after all, (in ordinary cases, and where an immediate and supernatural commission from the Holy Ghost is neither proved nor pretended,) to the appointment and ordination of those among our fellow-creatures who exercise a legitimate authority in the Church of CHRIST, and who, as being appointed by GOD, are placed in GOD's stead, and commissioned by Him to dispense those graces which are necessary for the feeding of His flock, and to designate those labourers who are henceforth to work in His harvest.

And having arrived at this point of the discussion, even if that discussion were to proceed no further, and if the Scriptures had given us no information as to the persons by whom this authority was to be exercised, the validity of our ordinations would still be sufficiently plain, and the danger of separation from, or rebellion against, our Church would be sufficiently great and alarming; inasmuch as, where no distinct religious officer was instituted by GOD, the appointment of such officers must necessarily have devolved on the collective Christian Church, and on those supreme magistrates who, in every Christian country, are the recognized organs of the public will and wisdom. It happens, however, to be in our power to show (if not an explicit direction of CHRIST for the form of our Church government, and the manner of appointing our spiritual guides), yet a precedent so clear, and

a pattern so definite, as to 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. Nor will the force of such precedent and example on the practice of succeeding Christians be regarded as trifling by those who consider that it is on such grounds as these that the obligation rests of many observances which are allowed by all parties to be essential; among which may be classed the baptism of infants, the observance of the Lord's Day, and our participation in the Lord's Supper.

But, without entering into the question of the absolute necessity of this rule, and without judging those other national Churches which have departed from it, it is evident that those Churches are most wise and most fortunate, who have continued in the path which CHRIST and His Apostles have trodden before; and that religious insubordination is then most unreasonable and most dangerous, when exerted against a form of polity which the majority of our fellow-Christians, the wisdom of our civil governors, and the full stream of precedent, from the time of the Apostles themselves, combine to recommend to our reverence.

We find, accordingly, that our Lord, on His own departure from the world, committed, in most solemn terms, the government of His Church to His Apostles. We find these Apostles, in the exercise of the authority thus received, appointing Elders in every city, as dispensers of the word and the sacraments of religion; and we find them also appointing other Ecclesiastical Officers, who were to have the oversight of these Elders themselves; and who, in addition to the powers which they enjoyed in common with them, had the privilege, which the others had not, of admitting, by the imposition of hands, those whom they thought fit to the ministerial office.

And it is not too much to say, that we may challenge those who differ from us, to point out any single period at which the Church has been destitute of such a body of officers, laying claim to an authority derived by the imposition of hands from the Apostles themselves; or any single instance of a Church without this form of government, till the Church of Geneva, at first from necessity, and afterwards from a mistaken exposition of Scrip-

ture, supplied the place of a single Bishop by the rules of an oligarchical presbytery.

JEBB, BISHOP.—*Pastoral Instructions*, Discourse i.

“And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;”—a promise not occasional or temporary, like that of miraculous powers; but conveying an assurance, that CHRIST Himself, will, in spirit and in power, be continually present with His Catholic and Apostolic Church; with the bishops of that Church, who derive from the Apostles by uninterrupted succession, and with those inferior, but essential orders of the Church, which are constituted by the same authority, and dedicated to the same service.

VAN MILDERT, BISHOP.—*Bampton Lectures*. Sermon viii.

The system, of which the Apostles had laid the foundation, was to be carried on through succeeding generations; but with a gradual diminution of that extraordinary aid, which the circumstances of the case rendered no longer necessary. . . . Yet since the object to be attained was not temporary, but to continue from age to age, the mode, the form, and the instrument to be employed, were still to be conformable to the primitive institution. Accordingly, the Apostles ordained successors to themselves, and took measures for perpetuating in the Church a standing ministry of diverse orders and gradations. In so doing, they showed in what sense we are to interpret our LORD's assurance, that He would “be with them always, even unto the end of the world.” . . .

The evidences, from the best historical records, to the simple fact that a visible Church of this description has actually subsisted from the time of our LORD and His Apostles to this moment, are too well known to require a detail. Nor is there any defect of similar evidence, to show that, whatever errors or corruptions may have occasionally found admittance into it, the Church itself has proved a successful instrument in the hands of Providence, both of transmitting the unadulterated Word of God from generation to generation, and also of promulgating and

maintaining all its great fundamental truths; nay, perhaps, of preserving even the very name as well as substance of Christianity, which, humanly speaking, would probably have been long since extinct, had it not been nurtured and cherished by this its appointed guardian and protector. . . .

Let us take for instance, those articles of faith which have already been shown to be essential to the Christian Covenant:—the doctrines of the Trinity, of our Lord's Divinity and Incarnation, of His Atonement and Intercession, of our sanctification by the Holy Spirit, of ^{the} terms of acceptance, and the ordinances of the Christian Sacraments and Priesthood. At what period of the Church have these doctrines, or either of them, been by any public act disowned or called in question! We are speaking now, it will be recollected, of what in the language of Ecclesiastical history, is emphatically called THE CHURCH; that, which has from age to age borne rule, upon the ground of its pretensions to Apostolical succession. And to this our inquiry is necessarily restricted. . . .

Surely, here is something to arrest attention; something to awaken reflection; something which they who sincerely profess Christianity, and are tenacious of the inviolability of its doctrines, must contemplate with sentiments of awe and veneration. For, though a sceptic may contend that this species of evidence does not amount to a direct and demonstrative proof of the truth of the doctrines; yet if they be not true, how shall we account for their having been so uninterruptedly transmitted to these latter times? How have they withstood the assaults of continued opponents? opponents, wanting neither talents nor inclination to effect their overthrow? If these considerations be deemed insufficient, let the adversary point out by what surer tokens we shall discover any Christian community, duly answering the Apostle's description, that it is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the chief Corner-Stone?"

MANT, BISHOP.—*Parochial Sermons*, xxvii.

Nor had He in this appointment a view to those times only, in which the appointment was made ; but He designed that it should be extended to all future ages ; for so we must understand the words which He pronounced immediately after giving His apostles their authority to baptize : “ lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” A promise this which cannot be supposed to have respect to the persons of the Apostles alone, who in the common course of nature were soon to be taken from the world, to the end of which the promise itself was to extend. . . . In conformity with this meaning, the Apostles, who were themselves holy men and full of the Holy Ghost, did send other persons ; to whom again, they gave power and authority to send others, through whom the office of ministers of the Gospel has been handed down in regular and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles to the present time.

THE END.

