

15.0.8 }
5664 }
1844
A-D

A

SERMON

DELIVERED

AT THE INSTALLATION

OF THE

REV. JOHN M. P. ATKINSON,

AS

PASTOR OF THE CHURCH AT WARRENTON, FAUQUIER COUNTY, *Va.*

SEPTEMBER 15, 1844.

~~~~~  
BY THE REV. WM. M. ATKINSON.  
~~~~~

WINCHESTER :

• PRINTED AT THE REPUBLICAN OFFICE.
1844.

A

SERMON

DELIVERED

AT THE INSTALLATION

OF THE

REV. JOHN M. P. ATKINSON,

AS

PASTOR OF THE CHURCH AT WARRENTON, FAUQUIER COUNTY.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1844.

BY THE REV. WM. M. ATKINSON.

WINCHESTER :

PRINTED AT THE REPUBLICAN OFFICE.

1844.

SERMON.

2 CORINTHIANS, 1 v. 1.—Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy we faint not.

In the life of the Apostle Paul, from the period of his conversion down to the hour of his death, we behold the brightest example of ministerial character, which is recorded in the annals of the church.

To learn the principles on which he acted and the course he pursued is a most desirable attainment for a christian minister. In the text the Apostle gives us interesting and important information on this subject, and to this I would now invite your attention.

Premising an undoubting affirmation of his ministerial character in the words, "seeing we have this ministry," avowing the full assurance of hope to which he had attained, "we have obtained mercy," and assigning this as a motive for endurance, he affirms, without fear of contradiction, his steadfastness and perseverance in his gospel labors;—"we faint not." If these things were necessary for Paul, they are surely indispensable to our success. Let us then examine them in their order, considering,

I. THE ABSOLUTE NECESSITY TO A MINISTER'S USEFULNESS THAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED VALID AUTHORITY TO PREACH THE GOSPEL; AND THE GREAT IMPORTANCE OF HAVING HIS OWN MIND WELL SETTLED ON THAT SUBJECT.

II. THE NECESSITY THAT HE SHALL HIMSELF HAVE PREVIOUSLY OBTAINED MERCY, OR IN OTHER WORDS, HAVE RECEIVED THE PARDON OF HIS SINS AND EXPERIENCED THE REGENERATING INFLUENCES OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

III. HOW HE MAY PERFORM HIS ARDUOUS DUTIES WITHOUT FAINTING.

I observe then, first, that it is absolutely necessary to a minister's success, that he shall have received a valid commission to preach the Gospel, and that if he desires usefulness or comfort in the ministry, he must be well satisfied in his mind that he has received such a commission.

To establish the first branch of the proposition it is only necessary to inquire whence it is, that a minister's success proceeds and who it is that alone can give a valid commission to preach the Gospel.

The first question is susceptible of a brief and easy solution. Even when Paul planted and Apollos watered, it was GOD who gave the increase. Success then depends on the blessing of God.

We must enquire more leisurely, who it is that gives the commission to preach the Gospel. The answer, I humbly think, will allow us no room to suppose that any man, who labors in the ministry, without a valid commission, has any right to expect that blessing, without which his labors will be vain.

And the solemn truths which this enquiry will draw forth, cannot but make us feel, that he who is not well satisfied in his mind, that he has received such a commission, need never hope, if he be a reflecting and conscientious man, to labor with comfort in the Gospel ministry.

We proceed to enquire who it is that gives the commission to preach the Gospel. The answer to this question depends on a few principles, which will probably be denied by none. That Gospel is the Gospel of CHRIST: a minister of that Gospel is a minister of CHRIST. In the blessed word, he is also described as steward of the mysteries of God, and is even represented as an ambassador of God, beseeching man in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God. The scripture teaches another great truth connected with this subject, which *none* in *this* congregation, and perhaps few *Protestants* in this country will deny;—the great truth to which the Free Church of Scotland are now so nobly testifying, that Christ is the great and *only* head, king, and governor of his Church.

These plain scriptural principles seem conclusively to settle the present question. If ministers be the ministers of CHRIST, who but HE shall call them to their work? If they be GOD's stewards, who but HE shall appoint them to their stewardship? If they be HIS ambassadors, who but HE shall send them forth? All these inferences lead us to the same conclusion, for it is by Christ that God governs, as it was by him that he first created, and it will be by him, that HE will judge, the world. And if Christ be the supreme and *only* head, king, and governor of the church, we cannot believe that HE will fail to administer that government in the essential particular of appointing its most important officers. On these, and other grounds which time will not allow us to enumerate, we deem it clear that all true ministers of the gospel receive their call and their authority from Christ *himself*, as truly and really as did Peter or Paul. We cannot pause to dwell on the manner in which Christ calls his ministers. Suffice it briefly to say, that it is by the influence of his spirit on their minds and hearts and ordinarily also by the leadings of his providence. But at all times the influences of the Spirit have been counterfeited or mistaken, and the leadings of Providence are often misinterpreted: Hence vain and presumptuous men have in every age been prone to rush without

warrant into this office, and to deem zeal (often uninformed by knowledge, and unchastened by christian experience,) and a certain flip-pant fluency of speech, (often the result merely of active animal spirits and inordinate self-conceit) sufficient evidence of their call to a work, the importance and responsibility of which caused even Paul to ask "who is sufficient for these things?" On the other hand, the timid and the humble, even when the Lord may be distinctly calling them, are ready to deem it only the impulse of their own spirit, or, like little Samuel in the temple, to suppose it but the voice of a fellow mortal. It is necessary therefore that there should be some earthly tribunal to judge of this call and to pronounce that judgment. Christ when on earth, with his own human voice, literally called and commissioned his ministers, and even after he had ascended into heaven, he miraculously converted and called and commissioned and sent forth Paul as an Apostle. Yet even in the case of Paul, miraculously converted and miraculously called as he had been, when he and Barnabas were about to enter upon the discharge of the Apostolic office, the Lord by express revelation directed them to be set apart to its performance, by the officers of his Church on earth. It is a highly important fact, which seems of itself conclusively to refute the views of those who contend for the schismatical doctrine of Apostolical Succession, that when these eminent men,—one of them certainly not behind the chiefest of the Apostles,—were about to be introduced into the apostolate, their ordination was, by the express command of Christ, performed, not by those who before filled the office of Apostle but by those who were inferior ministers, prophets and teachers, in the church of Antioch. Strange indeed the supposition that these men might ordain, or, if you please, might consecrate an Apostle and yet had no authority to ordain a Presbyter!

Ever since that time, while by his spirit Christ moves on men's hearts, and by his Providence shows them the path of duty, he has committed to his church the function of judging whether a supposed call is genuine or spurious, and of publicly ordaining to the office those whom she judges to be thus called.

The necessity of investigating the genuineness of supposed or alleged spiritual gifts was felt even in the time of the Apostles, and it was urged upon the church, by the last of that honored band in his first Epistle. "Beloved, believe not every Spirit but try the Spirits whether they be of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world." If this were necessary in those times of primitive nollness and of bitter persecution, how much more clearly is it indispensable in these latter days!

Hence it is evident that Christ alone can make a man a true Gospel minister, and that the office of the church in ordination, installa-

tion, and every thing connected with this whole subject, is purely judicial and declarative. The church on its responsibility to its great head is to decide whether Christ has called an individual to this work, and if she believes He has, then in some solemn, formal, authoritative manner, she is to declare him invested with his office and to exhibit him to the world in this character.

To allow every one to exercise ministerial functions, who might persuade himself that he was called of Christ to do so, would introduce manifold errors, and fill the church with disorder. But God is not a God of confusion, but a God of order. Is it therefore clear that no one has a right to exercise the ministry until he has received the external call or commission, which it is the privilege of the church to give. To give *this* is ordination. That ordination is this and nothing more, is not the view of Presbyterians alone. It is explicitly laid down by one of the most honored names in the English hierarchy, Archbishop Secker, in a work intended particularly and exclusively to teach the true doctrines of his church, for it is his Lectures on the Church Catechism. In writing against the popish view of the Christian Sacraments, among other remarks on the subject of Holy Orders (one of the Sacraments which Romanists have added to those instituted by Christ,) that distinguished prelate observes, that "the laying on of hands in ordination is neither appointed, nor used, to convey or signify any spiritual grace: but only to confer a right of executing such an office in the Church of Christ. And though prayers, for God's grace and blessing on the person ordained, are indeed very justly and usefully added; and will certainly be heard, unless the person be unworthy; yet these prayers, on this occasion, no more make what is done a Sacrament, than any other prayers for God's grace on any other occasion."

In the Presbyterian Church we deem it our duty to exercise the utmost vigilance and caution in introducing men into the Gospel ministry. The long course of preparatory training, through which our young candidates for the ministry are called, is designed not only for the improvement of their minds and the increase of their knowledge, the cultivation of their hearts and the deepening of their piety, but is intended and used also, as a means of enabling the church rightly to judge, by close and continued observation, whether Christ has called the individual to this important and arduous work.

The Church then has no authority to send forth any man to preach the Gospel, except he be one, whom she judges that Christ has called to the work. No, though every branch of biblical learning were as familiar to him as his alphabet, though he spake with the tongues of men and angels, though his piety breathed forth the very spirit of Heaven,—if a man so gifted *could* be found, whom yet the Lord had

never called to preach the Gospel, the Church, if she believed this, would not dare to commission him as a minister of Christ. It would be the very sin of which they were guilty, who "perished in the gainsaying of Core." He then who would preach the Gospel must not only be satisfied that Christ has called him to the work, but he must see to it, that the Church, on trial of the question, concurs in this belief, and is willing to express her concurrence in a regular, authoritative public manner. In imitation of primitive example, the laying on of hands has been deemed the most appropriate mode of signifying, that the Church, satisfied that Christ has called the individual to the work of the ministry, commissions him in the name of her glorious head to execute that work.

If it be necessary to the success of a minister's labours, that he should be properly called by Christ and the Church to engage in them, it is equally necessary to his happiness that his own mind should be satisfied that he has been thus called. He cannot labor in peace and comfort if serious doubts of the validity of his call oppress his mind.

But it may be said by some, if this be true, why do *you* and *your* associates continue in this work? What evidence can *you* have that *you* have thus been called of God, when your call has never been authenticated in the only valid manner, by the Apostolical Church, perpetuated through the golden chain of Apostolical succession from the days of Christ to the present time? At least, if it be necessary, for the comfortable, vigorous, and persevering discharge of your official duties, that your own mind should be fixed and settled as to the validity of your authority to preach the Gospel, and administer the ordinances of Christ, would not wisdom dictate that you should obtain that authority, from a source, which beyond all doubt has a right to confer it, rather than from one, the validity of whose powers in this respect is by many seriously doubted, and by many others positively denied?

Such sentiments, I know, are held by many, and are not unfrequently expressed by persons entitled on some accounts to much respect. They are held and expressed by Papists, and by most of those who belong to the Greek and other corrupt Oriental Churches, and unhappily they are held and expressed by many Protestants. Time was, when in Virginia at least they were *held* probably by few persons, and if *expressed* at all, were expressed rarely and reservedly. Time was, when throughout our land, they were expressed by scarcely any professed Protestants, except the opponents of the free distribution of the Bible, and the advocates of the dogma of baptismal regeneration. But these times are changed. The opinion to which I refer, though urged with more frequency and insisted on with more vehemence by Puseyites and high-churchmen, still seems, at the present

day, to be entertained by many persons of a very different stamp.— Not merely formalists in religion, or those who appear to place the Church on the throne which belongs to her glorious Lord, but many who profess evangelical principles of faith, and give evidence of strong love to the Saviour and zeal for his honor, and manifest a living *inward* faith, by a holy, self-denying, beneficent, *outward* life, are, or allow themselves to appear to be, of this number. They either avow those opinions as their own or at least breathe no sentiment of strong dissent and disapprobation, and utter no earnest remonstrance, when they are expressed by others of their communion. To this statement there are honorable, but too rare exceptions. Nay, strange as it may appear, if a *Presbyterian Minister* remonstrate against views which he cannot but deem erroneous, mischievous and schismatical, and which exclude him and most other Protestant Christians from the pale of the visible Church, while he expressly admits that those who hold them are notwithstanding members of that blessed body, and only claims that members of the beloved Church at whose altars he ministers, and at whose font his children are baptized, ought not to be esteemed aliens and strangers from the Commonwealth of Israel, he is at once considered as making an attack on Episcopacy or Episcopalianism. Is this just? Are high-churchmen forever to deny the validity of our ministerial commission, and low-churchmen to listen unmoved and unanswering, and yet to complain if we defend ourselves? No one who knows me, can suppose me to cherish towards the Episcopal Church any other feelings than those of cordial good will. It is the Church in which, as I suppose, ever since the days of Cranmer, most of my ancestors have worshipped. By one of its ministers I was baptized. It is a Church among whose members are found persons, as dear to my heart as any that walk the earth, save only the beloved children of my bosom, those remembrancers of happy days forever past, those pledges of my best earthly hope of peaceful days yet to come.

But besides those persons in the Episcopal Church, who partook with me of one father's care and of one mother's love, there are many in that communion, honored, respected and beloved as friends and christians; with whom I take sweet counsel in this world, with whom, if through rich grace, I should ever attain to the heavenly rest, I shall take far sweeter counsel in the world of light and love. Should I be called on to name the man with whom I have had sweeter and freer christian communion than with any other, and whose love to me, and mine to him, neither time nor distance can diminish, I should name an Episcopalian and a Minister. And I yield to no man, however firm may be his episcopalian principles, in the high estimation in which I hold those venerable men,—venerable if not aged,—

venerable for piety, venerable for holiness, venerable for the love they manifest to all who by their walk prove themselves christians, venerable for unwearied labors in their master's cause, even more than for the high ecclesiastical office which they so highly adorn and which they so well deserve, if any can deserve it,—those devoted christians and true hearted Protestants, the Bishops of the Episcopal Church, in our own commonwealth. I speak of men whom I have known and esteemed for more than thirty years. And I shall never cease to remember with gratitude, as, if pride were lawful, I should remember with pride, the affectionate regard with which their revered predecessor honored me, for many years. With so much that is personal to attach me to the Episcopal Church, and with a recollection as vivid and an appreciation as just as that of any other man, of all that that Church has done for our common christianity and for our common protestantism, from the days of Ridley and of Latimer, of Rogers and of Fox, down to those of Newton and of Scott, of White and of Jarratt, I cannot easily cherish towards that body, any feelings but those of cordial good will. Whilst indeed I am from conviction a Presbyterian; whilst I believe that in every important point of difference between the two denominations, that to which I am attached holds the truth; I can yet,—if I know myself at all,—say from my inmost heart to that Church,—I would say to that sister Church, if I were permitted—“Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be with—“in thee!” Yet is it strange that one cherishing such feelings should be pained to be pronounced, by so many ecclesiastically connected with the denomination referred to, an unauthorized intruder into the Gospel ministry, and, with the whole body, to which from conviction as well as from affection, he is attached, spoken of as not belonging to the visible Church of Christ, aliens from the covenant; to be saved, if saved at all, by mercy, unrevealed in God's blessed word: whilst by those in that body, who hold other sentiments, the voice of remonstrance is rarely breathed, or if breathed at all seldom uttered loud enough to reach the public ear, while in all official conduct, those opinions seem to be sanctioned by the unanimous voice of that denomination? It may be in deference to the feelings of their high Church associates, that men of unquestionable christian character who regard other orthodox denominations as brethren, still avoid any formal, public recognition of that brotherhood; but it ought to be remembered that *we* too may feel upon this subject. We do sympathise cordially with our low Church brethren in that struggle against doctrinal Popery in the bosom of their own denomination, in which they are now engaged, and we do pray that the Lord will give to them and to his truth the victory; but it cannot be denied that as long as, with much

personal kindness and courtesy shewn to us as individuals, there is yet a cautious, unceasing abstinence from any recognition of the character of our clergy as ministers of Christ, and of our Church as a branch of the Church of Christ, whilst the most high-toned Puseyite is acknowledged as a brother, it is hard for us to exclude, while it is painful to us to admit, the thought, that the outward order of the Church is, in their eyes, of at least equal importance with the precious truth of Christ.

Let it not be said that these opinions of theirs are of no practical importance to us. Is it of no importance to us, that our people, who may not have fully investigated the subject, are made uneasy, by a course of conduct throwing doubts on the validity of our ordinances? Is it nothing to us, that doubts are awakened in the minds of young men about to enter the ministry as to the scriptural authority of our ordination: doubts strengthened even by the regard which *we* manifest to those persons as christians, who thus disparage *our* christian standing? Shall the thought be suggested to our people, "it is best to be on the safe side, to be in a Church which all acknowledge to be a Christian Church, and if you desire to be a Minister, to seek an ordination which all acknowledge to be valid," and shall we esteem this a matter not worth our consideration?

It is true that such suggestions, as I have last mentioned, do probably have most weight with those who are more remarkable for love of ease than for love of the truth, and who would adopt any temporizing expedient to remove disquiet, rather than investigate the principles on which a great question depends. But notwithstanding, the objection ought to be, and on suitable occasions must be, met and answered.

In politics such reasoning would not be tolerated for a moment.— Suppose it were said to the American people, "you agree that in a limited monarchy freedom may be enjoyed without licentiousness or insecurity, but monarchists say, that in a Republican government these things are incompatible. Why do you not therefore, to be on the safe side, adopt as your form of government a limited monarchy?" The descendants of the men of '76 would be at no loss for an answer to such a suggestion.

This question of Apostolic succession has been of late so perseveringly urged upon the attention of the world, and has been so fully discussed in various publications, from the large octavo, to the ephemeral paragraph, from the elaborate series of sermons to the dinner table speech, that a full examination of it would be as unnecessary, as, on the present occasion, it would be impracticable. I must content myself with setting forth some principles and some facts, of which, after mature reflection, my own mind is fully satisfied, referring those who may desire a fuller exposition of the subject to some of the various able works in which such questions are discussed at large.

1. I think then it may be confidently asserted, that it is neither expressly declared in scripture, nor fairly to be inferred from the words of scripture, that in the earliest days of the Church, there was in it any order of men save that of the Apostles, higher than the order of Elders; That scripture Presbyters and scripture Bishops, held the same office, and indeed that these words were terms used indifferently to denote the same men.

2. I think that it may be confidently asserted, that there is no good ground from scripture to believe that the office of Apostle was to be permanent in the Church, but on the contrary that there is every reason to believe it was to be only temporary. The badges of the Apostolic office are borne by no man now living. An Apostle must have *personally* seen Christ, after his resurrection; must have been called to the office not merely by the influence of the Holy Ghost moving on his heart but by the lips of Christ himself; he must have had the power of working miracles and especially the power of conferring the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit on those baptized persons on whom he should lay his hands.

Now when a diocesan Bishop shall have thus seen Christ with his own eyes, and shall be able to verify that commission before men, by the working of miracles, I will believe him to be an Apostle and will reverently submit to him as such. If he shall, by the imposition of hands, cause baptized converts to prophesy, or to speak in languages they have never learned, I shall believe he has wrought the peculiar miracle of an Apostle, and shall thenceforth regard confirmation, not as I now do merely as a solemn mode of receiving a profession of personal faith from persons who had been baptized in infancy, and of publicly declaring them entitled to all the privileges of full membership in the church, but shall respect it as an Apostolic rite, never to be safely omitted when it may be obtained from the hands of an Apostle.

3. I think that while salvation is clearly and explicitly promised to those who repent, believe, and obey the Gospel, and while this truth is brightly emblazoned on almost every page of the New Testament and *that salvation* is declared to belong to no others, it is no where alleged that either final salvation or the privileges of the visible Church in this world, are *confined* to those, who are in the communion of a Church organized with three orders of clergy, possessing or claiming uninterrupted succession, in a line of prelates reaching back to the Apostles.

If this were a doctrine of the Gospel, I believe that like every other truth essential to the salvation of sinners or to the comfort of God's people, it would be written as with a sun beam, in characters so distinct, that he who runs might read.

4. I think there is no declaration of scripture, and no known prin-

ciples of God's government, which would lead to the belief, that he would withdraw the regenerating and sanctifying influences of his spirit from the great body of his visible Church, in so great a degree as they have been withdrawn, from the Romish, the Greek, and the Oriental Churches, constituting the vast majority of those, who hold three orders of clergy and claim Apostolical succession, and that he would at the very same time, impart those influences, in the measure in which they have been imparted, to the Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, Lutheran and other non-Episcopalian Churches in Great Britain and the United States, if all, who compose the first are members of the visible Church of Christ, while all, who belong to the last, are schismatics, having no valid ministry, and of course no valid ordinances.

5. As it is alleged that the whole Christian world was Prelatical in its government during the first three centuries, and as no doubt the greater part of it was so, at the close of the third century, and yet as it cannot be denied that far the larger portion of that body became heretics in the fourth century, still retaining their three orders of clergy;— as for many centuries during the middle ages, very much the greater part of the Church both Romish and Oriental (still retaining three orders of clergy) was enveloped in darkness, degraded by superstition and sunk in corruption; as from the Popish, the Greek, and Oriental churches, that pall of spiritual death has never yet been removed, though these comprehend at least nine tenths of all those persons, who hold three orders of clergy and an established Liturgy, and claim Apostolic succession, I think, it cannot be justly said that Episcopal government is a sufficient safeguard against the intrusion of the grossest errors in doctrine and practice. For the same reason, I think that the argument drawn from the decline of some Presbyterian Churches, whatever it may be worth, can be used against Episcopacy with immeasurably greater force.

6. While I rejoice to believe that the Episcopal government, and American Episcopal ordination, are not so inconsistent with the principles laid down in scripture, as to throw a just suspicion over the claims of Episcopalians to possess a gospel ministry and valid ordinances, and to constitute a portion of the visible Church—a suspicion which it would pain my inmost soul to harbor for a moment—yet I think there is far less ground to entertain such a suspicion with reference to the Presbyterian and other non-Episcopal Churches in the United States, than there is with regard to the Episcopal Church, if its claims are to be supported on the basis on which its members rest them. That basis I understand to be Apostolic Succession, transmitted through Bishops White, Prevost and Madison, who derived it from consecration given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and through

Bishop Seabury, consecrated by the Scotch non-juring bishops. Because the commission of Christ to his ministers is "to preach the gospel to all the world," and such is the commission given by the Church, in the name of Christ, to all those ministers, whom some Episcopalians call dissenters while Bishops White, Madison, and Prevost were only authorized by the consecration which they accepted, to ordain men to preach the gospel in a part of the world; being expressly inhibited from exercising their Episcopal functions or giving any authority to others to preach in the dominions of the King of England, in which reside probably from one sixth to one eighth of the whole human family. Let this commission be compared with that given to the Apostles, and judge whether they are the same: "Go ye into all the world," says the Saviour to the Apostles. "Ye shall not go into the British dominions," says the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Teach all nations," says the Saviour. "Ye shall not teach the British nation, nor their colonies, nor their subjects, in Europe, Asia, Africa or America," says the Archbishop. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, unto the uttermost parts of the earth," is the commission of the Redeemer to his Apostles. "Ye shall not bear this testimony in Britain, in Canada, in Hindostan, nor authorize others to bear it in those countries," is a part of the commission of the British state and the Anglican church to the American Bishops. If our countrymen who had crossed the Atlantic to receive the Apostolic succession, unable to find a precedent of such Apostleship in the Bible, or in the subsequent history of the church, had requested of the Archbishop a fuller explanation, we may conceive his Grace addressing them in this wise: "Apostolic succession, my beloved American brethren, is always a great mystery. In your case, it possesses peculiarities which make it still more deeply mysterious. Others, to whom it is confided, possess it, in its fulness, from the moment that my hands are imposed and my benediction pronounced. With you, however, it will be in abeyance until your return to your own country. But in your own land, you will enjoy it in all its plenitude, and will be fully authorized to announce to all who have not this blessing, that if there be mercy for them, it is not revealed in the Gospel nor secured in the Covenant. But recollect, though this Apostolic virtue will abide with you in all fulness, in your journeyings through the land, even to the banks of the Niagara, it will have entirely disappeared, as soon as you cross that stream. Like the strong man of old, when his locks were shorn, you, as soon as your feet shall press British or Canadian soil, will become "weak, and will be as other men." And the powers which you impart to others, partaking of the character of the fountain from which they flow, will, in like manner, evaporate and disappear, as soon as their possessors shall enter the British dominions. But be comforted; in

Canada or Britain, those powers will be merely dormant, not dead. As the strength of Sampson returned, when his hair grew again, in the Philistian dungeon, so your Apostolicity shall revive, in all its pristine energy, as soon as you return to your own country."

But it may be said that it was not Bishops White, Madison, and Prevost alone, who brought the succession from Britain. Another divine received it in Scotland. Now if any trace their ecclesiastical genealogy through Bishop Seabury, who was consecrated by Scotch non-juring Bishops, then they claim from those whose own legitimacy is strongly denied by some of the staunchest Episcopalians in England, and as it would seem upon true Prelatical principles. This may be verified by reference to the London Christian Observer for October or November, 1843.

Do I then deny that Episcopalian prelates are true bishops? By no means. I believe them to be true bishops; as truly so as the Methodist bishops or the Presbyterian bishops, but not more so; as truly bishops as his Grace of Canterbury himself, and indeed more clearly than he, they having been appointed by the Church, he by the King. I rejoice to believe this, and to cherish the assurance that they have received from the Church and her heavenly head a far wider commission than the Archbishop of Canterbury ever gave them, or any earthly head of the Church or his Parliament ever authorized.*

7. As the Episcopalian theory of succession requires a minister to have been ordained by a Bishop, who had received valid baptism, and had been himself ordained Deacon, and Presbyter, and consecrated Bishop, and this by persons who had themselves been in like manner baptized, ordained, and consecrated by persons similarly authorized, and so through every link of the chain up to the Apostles: and as a defect in any one of these particulars, in a single case, through a period of eighteen hundred years (and most of them very dark years, and years of very great confusion) would render the ordination void; I not only do not believe that such Apostolic succession can be verified as a fact, in the case of any man now living, but I think its existence in any case highly improbable. And I rejoice in the belief that the salvation and the church-membership of my Episcopalian brethren rest on a foundation infinitely firmer than this.

8. If I am told that all these considerations though they may tend to disprove the exclusive claims of high Episcopalians do not show our own title to be a part of the Church of Christ, and the title of our ministers to be his ministers, and if I am asked by Episcopalians to show it, I look for the marks of the Church as pointed out by the highest Episcopalian authority; the thirty nine articles, an authority which they will not question. I there read that "the visible Church

* See Appendix A.

of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same."*—19th Art.

I find these marks in the Presbyterian Church. I find them also in the Episcopal and Methodist and Baptist and Lutheran and various other Churches. I rejoice when I meet with them in any association of men. My heart is drawn out in love, not only to those who now bear these marks, but to those who bore them in former centuries, many of them in their day cast out and persecuted as heretics, like the Paulicians and their successors, the Albigenses; many denounced as schismatics, like the Culdees. I grieve to see any of the little flock, little in comparison with those who are without, separating themselves, on any pretext, from their brethren. The Church, as described in that 19th article, is very small at best; the work assigned her by her head is immeasurably large and inestimably important. On her, under God, rests the salvation of the world, the honor of the blessed name of Christ, and the manifestation of the glory of God †

In the 23d Article "Of Ministering in the Congregation," I read that "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

9. If I, believing it my duty to preach the Gospel, am yet unwilling, as I ought to be, to do so without a valid commission from the Church, ought I in prudence (because some Episcopalians deny, and very few of them will distinctly affirm my ministerial authority) to renounce my ordination, in order to seek one that nobody will question? The same prudence would forbid my satisfying myself with Protestant Episcopal ordination. Because the Papists, whom they consider a part of the visible Church, even though many of them deny us that honor, have in the opinion of Episcopalians a valid ordination; (which indeed they are compelled to affirm, because most of the links in their own chain are composed of Popish Bishops;) and yet the Papists deny the validity of Episcopalian ordination, and re-ordain the ministers, who leave the Episcopal Church to become Popish priests, just as the Episcopalians re-ordain the ministers who leave the Presbyterian Church to become Episcopalian Presbyters, or rather Deacons.

Now shall I, in imitation of the Miller in the fable, in order to please every body, or at least obtain an ordination which no one will question, leap over St. Paul's and alight at St. Peter's, and hum-

* See appendix B. † See appendix C.

bly request "his Holiness" the Pope, to lay on my head his pure hands, and thus to impart to me that heavenly gift, which has descended to him from the Apostles, through Alexander the 6th or Archbishop Cæsar Borgia, and a whole host of others, some indeed good men, but many of like character to those successors of the Apostles, whom I have just named? Alas, even here I might be disappointed, for though such an ordination might remove the scruples of my honored Episcopalian brethren, a Papist might well say, that if unfortunately "his holiness" in laying his hands on my head did not in his heart *intend* it as ordination, the act conveyed no Apostolic virtue. And besides, while many a sound Protestant would strongly doubt the validity of an act performed by him whom he considers Anti-Christ, when it ought to be peculiarly the act of the church of Christ, I should still find my Baptist brethren ready to affirm that the Pope had never been lawfully baptized, and of course had no authority to perform ministerial acts, and indeed that I myself, having been only sprinkled in my childhood by an Episcopalian minister, had need to be buried beneath the wave, before I could claim the privilege of administering any valid ordinance, or even of receiving any, save that of baptism. If, therefore, I am never to proceed in my ministry until I can obtain outward qualifications, the sufficiency of which all will agree to recognize, I may as well abandon at once and forever the privilege of preaching Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

In the blessed days of the Reformation no such doctrine was held. Neither Luther, nor Melancthon, nor Calvin, nor Zuinglius, nor Knox, held these opinions, or established prelatial ordination in the churches which they re-formed on what they deemed Gospel principles. The only church of the Reformation, which now maintains the existence and necessity of that Apostolic succession, of which we have been speaking, is the Anglican church, including its branches in Scotland and in the United States, and this church did not maintain it, in the days of the Reformation, and many of her wisest sons do not maintain it now. But allowance, some of our more charitable brethren say, is to be made for the situation of the non-Episcopal churches at the time of the Reformation, because their ministers could not obtain Episcopal ordination, and thus they may have been less guilty of the sin of schism than we are, who have the *opportunity* of obtaining it, but only lack the inclination. The allegation seems to me to imply great inattention to the prominent facts of the history of that time. There were opportunities even in the reign of Henry VIII. of obtaining it, if it had been desired; and if he had deemed it necessary, he would gladly have tendered the services of his bishops to impart it. And can it be doubted, that in the reign of Edward VI. Anglican Bishops would have been readily sent, by that pious monarch, and his ministers

and his prelates, to rekindle on the broken altars of the continental churches, the hallowed fire of Apostolic grace? They did not hesitate to advise with Calvin as to the measures they should take to promote the Reformation, and they gladly called in the aid of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, and other Lutheran and Presbyterian ministers, to give instruction in christian theology to their candidates for the ministry. Would they then have refused to send over a few of their protestant prelates to introduce the succession into the churches of their brethren? Oh! if old Latimer had but believed it necessary, how gladly would he have girded up his loins to perform such a labor of love! And the more courtly but equally steadfast Ridley, his fellow martyr at the stake, how cheerfully would he have been his companion in a pilgrimage so delightful, his associate in dispensing to his brethren blessings so inestimable!

But if the British channel presented an insuperable barrier to this transmission of Apostolic virtue, what hindered that a few English bishops should pass over to Scotland to inoculate the Scottish Kirk with the conservative virus of the succession? Or, what hindered, that Knox, who had previously laboured in England; should, with two or three of his associates, visit that Kingdom after his return from exile, as White, and Madison, and Prevost visited it after our revolution, to obtain Episcopal consecration? Surely, if they had deemed it a heavenly gift, they would have accounted it cheap, at the cost of a thousand times more labor. But if Lutherans and Presbyterians on the continent believed *at all* in this succession, even though they did not think it worth sending for to England, why did they not, at least; obtain it, when the favored depositaries of this blessing were driven; by the persecutions of Mary, to seek refuge in their houses and their churches? Among these were several bishops, who would gladly, no doubt, receiving temporal succor in their time of need, have repaid the boon with the infinitely richer spiritual gift it was in their power to confer. But it appears neither to have been asked nor offered. Perhaps these continental christians were unwilling to have their religious societies brought back into the pale of the visible church, (out of which it seems, they had strayed, when they abandoned Popery,) by the instrumentality of foreigners and exiles! But were there no prelates among the early converts from popery on the continent? Why could not the Huguenots of France; at least, have handed down the succession through Odet de Coligni, the brother of Admiral Coligni, a leader of the French protestants, Archbishop of Toulouse and Cardinal of Chatillon? But the fact is, that the Anglican church itself, at that day, though she retained her three orders of Clergy, as well as her Archbishops and her Deans, considered the first no more essential to the being of a church than she did the last. Her Article of Religion

on the subject of the ministry is expressed in comprehensive language; which, Bishop Burnet testifies, was adopted to meet the cases of foreign reformed churches, and to which, as it is written, a Presbyterian might readily subscribe.*

No new ordination was required of the foreign divines, who were brought into England, in the time of Cranmer; and for very many years afterwards, the validity of these ordinations by Presbyterians alone, as Bishop Burnet informs us, was never questioned. In the year 1582, Archbishop Grindal, in a license to preach and administer the sacraments, granted to a minister ordained by Presbyterians, recognizes the validity, and praises the form of ordination in the church of Scotland. Indeed, in the 13th year of Queen Elizabeth, ordinations made in other forms than were practised in the Episcopal church, were, by solemn act of Parliament, admitted to be valid. And, indeed, the divine, exclusive right of Episcopacy seems not to have been maintained in the Church of England, until it was announced by Bancroft, in a sermon preached in 1588.

Although this new opinion—new at least among Protestants, and not always held by Bancroft himself—rapidly extended itself, it was never unanimously adopted, having at all times been disavowed by many even of the highest dignitaries of the established Church of England. In a very learned work of Dean Field, on the Church, published during the reign of James I., submitted before publication to the excellent Archbishop Abbot for his sanction, read and approved by him, and of course expressing his opinions, the validity of ordinations by Presbyters alone, is expressly maintained. Archbishop Whately, at the present day, who, if not superior in intellectual vigor to the worldly-minded Philpotts, or in learning to Bloomfield, or in piety to the Sumners, is yet probably, all things being estimated, the first prelate now living, fully concedes the important principles on which this question depends. Such instances might be greatly multiplied, but I forbear.

The Anglican Church, though we believe she has, even in this country, assigned to the three scriptural orders of permanent Church officers, Bishops, Elders, and Deacons, (which we hold as firmly as she does,) functions very different from those which they respectively discharged in gospel times; and although in England she has added to these many ecclesiastical ranks, of which the Apostles never heard, we still hold to be a most respectable and valuable branch of the Church of Christ. If to glory in what God does by his people, were lawful to them, there is much in her history, and more in the history of her sons and daughters, in which she might glory. Established by law in the most powerful, wealthy, and enlightened nation of Protes-

*See Appendix C.

tant Christendom, learned and richly endowed, adorned and supported by the deep piety of many of her children, (although her polity is in some respects defective and in some respects redundant, and although in her liturgy there is much that is seriously objectionable,) she might well be the leader of her sister churches in maintaining the fundamental truths of the Reformation. But her exclusive pretensions, on both sides the ocean, are calculated at once to repel those, who would regard her with reverence and affection, and to raise up, among her own children, apostates from her scriptural protestant faith. The figment of Apostolic succession, not only places her in an attitude towards her sisters, of haughty repulse, if not of hostility, but tends to produce among many of her own sons a disposition to approximate to that "mother of harlots," from whose embrace the Lord brought her forth, three centuries ago. Is it strange that among some that bear her name, there should be a strong disposition to return to many of the superstitions of Popery, whilst others avow either a mind balanced between the two systems, or a decided preference for Romanism? Is it strange that lordly prelates, lordly even in a Republican land, should admit such persons into the Episcopal ministry? Papists aver that all Protestants committed the sin of schism, when they separated from Rome. Many Episcopalians agree that the charge is true with respect to all Protestants, except themselves. All Episcopalians admit the validity of Popish ordination. Many of them deny the validity of any Protestant ordination but their own. All Episcopalians believe that the Church of Rome is a part of the visible Catholic Church. Few of them will distinctly affirm that Protestant non-Episcopal churches do form a part of the visible, Holy Catholic Church, while Papists universally deny that any Protestants are comprehended in it. Now is it not to be expected that these things should produce a constant tendency among the unstable, to affiliate openly with the Romish communion? Is it strange that many, carrying out those convenient principles of caution, by which some have been drawn from Presbytery to Episcopacy, should think it safer to unite themselves with the Romish Church, which all Episcopalians admit to be a part of the Holy Catholic Church, than to remain in the Episcopal communion, which Papists repudiate as heretical and schismatic? Is not salvation at stake? And do not Episcopalians admit that it is to be found in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, while Papists deny that it is to be attained, by those, at least, who, with the means of knowing better, and the opportunity of doing better, still continue to be heretical, schismatic, Protestant Episcopalians? It will be in vain for such persons to suppose that they can avoid the ruin impending over their souls, by merely changing the name of their denomination; by renouncing the name of Protestant,

and assuming that of Catholic; or by claiming to be **THE CHURCH, or THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES**. A change of name will not restore to them the Apostolic succession, which Papists say they lost, three centuries ago. A change of name will not give to them that requisite to salvation, communion, not with a Bishop, which they have fondly thought sufficient, but with **THE Bishop**—of Rome—the veritable successor of St. Peter!

The signs of the times seem to show that a great battle is at hand, between Popery and Protestantism. Even now the trumpets are sounding, and the hosts are being marshalled. Neutrality will not long be possible.

In this state of things, is it strange that the thousands of Protestant Episcopalians, who, I rejoice to believe, inherit much of the spirit of Cranmer and Latimer, of Leighton and Usher, should be continually grieved by finding that they have to contend earnestly against persons in their own communion, whom they are obliged to acknowledge as brethren, notwithstanding they reject and disavow the fundamental principles of the Protestant faith, and speak disparagingly of the Reformation and the Reformers? Is it not evident that these good men are in a false position, from which they ought at once to extricate themselves? Is it not evident, too, that in this doctrine of Apostolic succession is to be found the radical error to which the Episcopal Church may truly ascribe the difficulties in which she is now involved? From all those difficulties may the Great Head of the Church deliver her! In the furnace, in which she is walking, may one, like the Son of Man, be present to strengthen her! May she come forth, leaving behind her, her pretensions to Apostolic succession, that chain of old Popish bondage that has so long fettered her limbs and retarded her onward progress! May she come forth purified from every error, enlightened by every trial, with a heart glowing with love to all, who hold the precious truths of the Gospel! May she come forth fair as the sun, clear as the moon, terrible to the enemies of truth, as an army with banners!

I proceed to the second head of my discourse, the absolute necessity of personal purity to the discharge of the duties of the ministerial office, and of eminent piety to their successful and comfortable discharge.

On this subject I must be very brief.

This the Presbyterian Church deems more important to a minister than any splendor of intellect or depth of learning. It is this alone that can supply an inward principle of life and action, by which a minister may be sustained amid the trials, and impelled forward under the various difficulties through which all are sometimes called to pass, in our pilgrimage through this waste, howling wilderness. Embar-

assessments may impede his way, dangers may threaten, obloquy may pursue him, but the power of heartfelt religion retains him in his path of duty, and enables him to run with patience the race set before him. The work of the ministry is not always difficult. The office is not only respectable, but, in the eyes of judicious men, honorable.—Success sometimes crowns the labors of the individual minister; his personal comforts may abound; the voice of praise may fall sweetly on whatever is carnal in his heart; the denomination, with which he is connected, may be prosperous and flourishing in all its outward relations. In such circumstances, it is easy for any man, of respectable intellect, and competent knowledge, and ordinary fluency, to preach the Gospel—and with no deep seated personal piety, to pursue his ordinary course. But in an opposite state of things, when his personal labors seem to be unblest; when slander, that foul harpy, defiles his character by her polluting breath; when the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom seem to decline; when the denomination, with which his judgment and his affections have connected him, is distracted by controversy, or rent by schism; when the faint-hearted look for some snug harbor, where they hope they may lie at anchor safe from the tossing of the billows, and may hear the warring of the tempest only as a distant murmur; when his plans are frustrated and his hopes are overcast; *then* nothing but the constraining love of Christ can sustain his spirit and urge him forward.

But there is yet another view in which a deep personal experience of the Grace of God on the soul, is absolutely necessary to a successful ministry. The Gospel of Christ is indeed good news we are to communicate; it is a message we are to bear; a command we are to announce to our hearers; an offer we are affectionately to urge on their acceptance: but it is something besides all this—it is a *testimony* we are to deliver. Ye shall be witnesses unto me, says the Saviour. But what shall we testify? To all God's revealed truth, not merely as what we have read, but as what we know, for "he that believeth hath the witness in himself."

But besides this, he who is qualified to preach the Gospel, can testify to much from his own experience. He has felt the deep depravity of human nature in his own bosom, and he can testify of it from his own consciousness; he has tasted of the wormwood and the gall, and he can testify of its bitterness; he has felt some of the anticipated horrors of the lost, and he can testify of these; in the words of our text, he has received mercy, and he can testify, to all around, of the Grace of God; he knows that Christ has saved him, and can, therefore, bear witness that he saves the chief of sinners. By heavenly meditation, he has sometimes enjoyed a sweet foretaste of the joys of the blessed above; and thus he can testify of these. By his con-

stant experience in joy and in sorrow, and in seasons of temptation, he knows that his heart is weak and his Saviour faithful; and he can testify of his own weakness and of the unchanging faithfulness of Christ. I have sometimes thought that our ministry might perhaps be more successful, if we would rely less upon reasoning and appeals to the feelings, and more on bearing simple testimony, such as the Apostles bore. Review their discourses as contained in the book of Acts, and see how much they partake of this character. Now no man can properly testify, save he who knows of his own knowledge. Is it not clearly necessary then on this ground too, to a minister's success, that he, like Paul, should have obtained mercy?

Lastly. In the discharge of his duty, a minister must not faint. We have just pointed out many of the discouragements which a Gospel minister may expect. The history of Paul affords a perfect example of what a minister's conduct should be under every trial. He never fainted. From the moment that the scales fell from his eyes at Damascus, to that in which we catch the last glimpse of him in the word of God—when he had finished his course and was ready to be offered—we never see him falter. He refers to his sufferings as a proof of his ministry—2 Cor., 11c., 23–28v. :

23. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I *am* more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.

24. Of the Jews five times received I forty *stripes* save one.

25. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep;

26. *In* journeyings often, *in* perils of water, *in* perils of robbers, *in* perils by *mine own* countrymen, *in* perils by the heathen, *in* perils in the city, *in* perils in the wilderness, *in* perils in the sea, *in* perils among false brethren;

27. In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.

28. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.

How did he demean himself under all these and other still heavier trials, the precise nature of which we do not know? Again he shall speak for himself—2 Cor., 12c., 9–10v. :

9. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

10. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.

But how was he enabled thus to endure and never faint? Our text gives us some information on this subject. He had received mercy!

In the 12th Chapter, he recites to us a precious promise of Christ, and tells us that here, too, he found strength: "My Grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness."

Brethren in the ministry, if we, like Paul, can always be sensible of the pardoning love of Christ, we, like him, and like the older saints spoken of by the prophet, shall "run and not be weary, shall walk and not faint." If we, like Paul, can always appropriate to ourselves

the precious promise, "my Grace is sufficient for thee," we, like him, "will glory in infirmities, will take pleasure in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when we are weak, then shall we be strong."

In one word ; *the whole secret of a christian minister's power of endurance is found in a deep experience of the pardoning love of Christ, and in living continually near his cross !*

May He, by His grace, abundantly qualify and strengthen us to endure without fainting ; and then———HIS WILL BE DONE.

APPENDIX.

A. That all who read this Sermon may judge whether I have made a fair representation of the commission given by the Archbishop to the American clergymen, I will insert an extract from the act of Parliament. If my memory does not deceive me, I saw some years ago, a copy of the letters of consecration, (I think that is the name of the instrument given to attest the ordination,) and found it to correspond precisely with the requisitions of the British Statute.

The act, after setting forth the obstacles to the consecration, under the existing laws, proceeds to remove these, and to provide for the consecration of foreigners, as bishops. It contains the following proviso: "That no person or persons consecrated to the office of a bishop, in the manner aforesaid, nor any person or persons deriving their consecration from or under any bishops so consecrated, nor any person or persons admitted to the order of deacon or prelate by any bishop or bishops so consecrated, or by the successor or successors of any bishop or bishops so consecrated, shall be thereby enabled to exercise his or their respective office or offices, within his Majesty's dominions."

I am aware that many Episcopalians maintain that the consecration imparted full *ecclesiastical* power, and that the proviso merely restrained the exercise of that power, as a *civil law* of the realm. To my mind this is not the fair construction of the language, but one adopted by Episcopalians from necessity, as the only means of maintaining their exclusive claims. The intelligent reader can judge for himself. One fact would seem to be conclusive. A Popish priest, if I do not greatly err, becoming a member of the church of England, might have officiated as a clergyman, without being re-ordained. A Presbyterian in the American Episcopal church becoming a member of the church of England, must have been re-ordained in England before he could thus officiate. Was not this a declaration, that American Episcopal orders were less valid than Popish? The law may have been changed since the time when a pious clergyman dared not invite the excellent Bishop McIlvaine to preach in his church, but gave him an opportunity of doing so, on his own private premises. But if such change has been made, it cannot give the succession, I should suppose, without a re-ordination or re-consecration.

B. I cannot concur with Archbishop Whately, highly as I respect his opinion, in the belief that this 19th article is wrongly translated from the original Latin draught of the articles, and that it should have been rendered A visible church, &c. The ar-

icle is evidently borrowed, and in this part of it almost literally transcribed from the 7th article of the Augsburg Confession. As the original works, in which that Confession is contained, may not be in the hands of most of my readers, I transcribe it from Melancthon's works.

"Item docent, (ecclesiæ apud nos) quod una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit. Est autem ecclesia congregatio Sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur Sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem ecclesiæ satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii, et administratione Sacramentorum. Nec necesse est ubique esse similes traditiones humanas, seu ritus aut ceremonias ab hominibus institutas.—Sicut, inquit Paulus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus et pater omnium, &c."

"They also (our churches) teach that one holy church will forever remain. But the church is the congregation of the saints; in which the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments duly administered. And for the true unity of the church, accordancè as to the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments is sufficient. Nor is it needful that human traditions, or rites or ceremonies instituted by men, should be every where alike. As Paul says, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all," &c.

If any doubt should exist that the "ecclesiæ" in the second sentence is the same with the *ecclesia* in the first sentence, and of course refers to the universal church, it would be removed at once by examining Melancthon's explanation of it, in his defence of the confession.

Archbishop Whately's version of the Anglican article would indeed strengthen the testimony that article bears against *exclusive* Episcopacy, but I do not desire the support of truth, on grounds which appear to me erroneous. Besides, the Article as it stands, it seems to me ought to satisfy the candid mind. Such a mind, acquainted with the history of the times, cannot doubt the truth of Bishop Burnet's statement that it was purposely so drawn as to include foreign non-Episcopal churches. If not, why were not three orders of clergy enumerated among the marks of the true church?

C. Some may say that after all, this 19th Article does not militate against the doctrine that Apostolic succession, and three orders of clergy, must be found in any religious community which desires to be reckoned a part of the Universal church. They may allege that in the absence of these, it cannot be said that "Sacramenta recte administrantur," "the sacraments are duly administered." To take this ground however would be most seriously to impeach the integrity of the British reformers. The Augsburg Confession had been circulated throughout Europe, and was no doubt well known to every man, whether Popish or Protestant, who called himself a theologian. The construction put by the Lutherans upon the words just quoted, was equally notorious. Now to suppose that Cranmer and Ridley, and their assistants in the preparation of the forty-two articles (afterwards reduced to thirty-nine) in which these words occur, took them from that confession—the English words, it will be seen, are certainly literally *translated* from it—(the words in the Latin version of the Anglican articles to which I have not access, are therefore probably *exactly borrowed* from it—) and yet in using these words affixed a totally different meaning from that which they were known to bear in the Augsburg Confession, would be to impute to them the grossest dissimulation. This I presume no Episcopalian would be willing to do. But there is abundant evidence that Cranmer never held the doctrine of Apostolic succession, and of course could not have meant to smuggle it into the articles, under cover of this little word "*recte*." In the Bishop's book, or the Institution of a Christian man, published in 1536, he and his brother Archbishop, and nineteen other bishops, declare that there are only two orders mentioned in scripture, those of deacons or ministers and priests or bishops—"and the Institution," says Bishop Short, in his late history, "seems to speak of bishops as a human appointment, in the same manner as the jurisdiction of Archbishops, Metropolitans, &c. over bishops, is declared to be an arrangement made by men." In the Erudition of a Christian man, published six years afterwards, and prepared by a Commission of which he was chairman, and of which some seven or eight other bishops and a number of other clergymen were members, to the same doctrine, that there are in Scripture expressly mentioned only the two orders, priests and deacons, it is added that no bishop has authority over other bishops by the law of God. See Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. 1, p. 466, Carter's edition.—The Bishop, by the bye, in the Appendix to that volume, informs us that the prevailing opinion among the schoolmen and canonists was that bishops and priests were one in office.