

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07998406 2

1. Episcopacy -  
2. Popes - Primacy.

ZKD  
Hill







6/15/24 CB

# LECTURES

ON

## EPISCOPACY

AND THE

# PAPAL SUPREMACY,

BY THE

4

REV. WILLIAM H. HILL, M. A.

16.0

RECTOR OF ZION CHURCH, MORRIS, OTSEGO CO., N. Y.

g



“Probe all things; hold fast that which is good.”—1 Thess. v: 21.

“That which is first, is true; the later is adulterate.”—TERTULLIAN.



UTICA, N. Y.

H. H. CURTISS, DEVEREUX BLOCK.

1851.

UHL

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
724045 A  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
R 1934 L

NEW YORK  
NEW YORK  
NEW YORK

TO THE  
RIGHT REVEREND  
WILLIAM HEATHCOTE DE LANCEY, D. D., LL. D.  
BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF WESTERN NEW YORK;  
"HIS OFFICE, A BISHOPRIC; HIS CHARACTER, FIDELITY;  
HIS REWARD, A CROWN OF LIFE;"  
THIS VOLUME IS, BY PERMISSION,  
MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED  
BY THE  
AUTHOR.

84X433



## P R E F A C E .

---

During the winter of 1846-7, in the course of a series of Lectures upon the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, delivered in St. Paul's Church, Brownville; N. Y., of which Parish the Author then had charge, occasion was taken to discuss the important questions of Episcopacy and the Papal Supremacy. The Lectures then delivered on these subjects, were substantially, those to be found in this volume. They were very favorably received by his congregation, and were instrumental in at least inducing a more thorough examination of the whole subject of the original constitution of the Christian Church, not only by his own parishioners, but by others, some of whom have since become members of our branch of the "one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." At the urgent request of many, the author re-delivered the same course during the winter of 1849-50, and he may be permitted, he trusts, again to thank God for His blessing upon them. At their close he was importuned to write out the Lectures for publication in the "Gospel Messenger," with which request he complied, and they accordingly appeared in that paper during the summer of last year. Their reception by his brethren of the Clergy and Laity was far more flattering than he had any reason to expect. Their publication in a more durable and available form, having been solicited by many, to whose better, though perhaps, partial judgment, the author defers, he now commits his little work to the public, with the hope and prayer that it may be blessed of the Great Head of the

Church to the turning of some wandering feet to the true, Catholic fold of the Zion of our God. He is far from claiming any credit for originality or eloquence in them, knowing, as he does, full well, that the whole subject has been exhausted again and again by the giants of former days. But as the opponents of the Church daily pick up old and exploded objections, to hurl again at her venerable walls, he holds it to be the duty of every christian soldier to defend her from the assaults of "the world, the flesh, and the devil," come from what quarter they may. If the publication of these Lectures will but have the effect of strengthening the faith of one of the weakest of his brethren, or will induce but one, now a stranger, to examine candidly and without prejudice the claims of Episcopacy, the author will be more than repaid for all his trouble.

He has only sought to present in a condensed, and so far as possible, popular form, the arguments and facts which were instrumental in leading his own mind from the barren and crude dogmas of Presbyterianism, to that holy and scriptural "doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles," to be found in the Protestant Episcopal Church—the Church of his choice and love, and at whose altars he is permitted to officiate as an humble, but a devoted Minister. That many, very many others may, with him, find "her ways to be ways of pleasantness, and all her paths peace," is his fervent and constant prayer.

W. H. H.

ZION CHURCH PARSONAGE,        }  
 Morris, N. Y., June, 1851.        }

# C O N T E N T S .

---

## LECTURE I.

### Episcopacy--the Scriptural Argument.

Question to be discussed—Charges brought against us as exclusives, etc.—If Episcopacy be TRUE we have nothing to do with the consequences—Two antagonistic theories, Episcopal and Presbyterian—What this last word includes—Vital difference, is in claim of Episcopalians, that Bishops are *jure divino*, superior to Presbyters—Discussion confined to this one point—1. What was the *Apostolic* office?—Two fold, ordinary and extraordinary—Proofs in favor of this position: 2. Was the Apostolic office confined to the twelve?—The *negative* shown—Matthias—Paul—Barnabas—Silas—Timothy—Andronicus—Junia—Also conclusively proved from fact that there were “false Apostles”—There must have been *genuine* or there could not have been *counterfeit* Apostles—3. Was the Apostolic office to be continued beyond the life time of the first twelve?—*Affirmative* shown—Is a question of *fact*, not of conjecture—Examination of Apostolic commission, St. Matt. xxviii, 20—Presbyterian standards agree that the Apostles *had* successors—Only differ from us as to *who* they were—Novel doctrine of Drs Potts and Beecher—Examination of 2 Tim. i. 14, and ii 2. 4. Through whom were Apostolic functions, or the Apostolic office to be transmitted?—Bishops only, to the exclusion of Presbyters and Deacons—St. Paul’s address to Timothy and Titus examined—Cannot be reconciled with the Presbyterian theory—The actual *practice* in some Church traced out—Church of Ephesus selected—Its history—Were more congregations and clergy, than one in it, when St. Paul called its *elders* to Miletus—This fact positively asserted in the “Confession of Faith”—Was then fully organized on the Presbyterian theory—Yet,

Timothy was afterwards placed over it with full Episcopal powers—Same Church examined 30 years later—Angel thereof had like full powers—Church of Ephesus then was *Episcopal*—One clear case settles the whole question—Is said that Presbyters *did* ordain—Examination of the only two passages alleged in proof—Acts xiii. 1-3—Shown not to have been an ordination—Miller *vs.* Barnes—1 Tim. iv. 14—Shown to have been an *Apostolic* ordination—Examination of objection to Episcopacy, arising from common use of names, Bishop and Presbyter in the N. T.—Illustration of ab-urdity of objection—Testimony of Theodoret—Absurdity farther shown by applying it to the word “Deacon,” in the N. T.—Scriptural argument, then, *presumptively* in favor of Episcopacy—If disputed, must go to testimony of those who received the Church from the Apostles—Conclusion.....pp. 1—36.

---

## LECTURE II.

### Episcopacy--the Historical Argument.

Point reached in previous Lecture—Examination of objection against the testimony of the Early Fathers—Inconsistency of our opponents—They rely wholly on this testimony to settle: 1st, the Canon of Scripture—2d, the authenticity of certain passages impugned by Socinians—3d, the change of the Sabbath—Why not equally good to settle the question of the *Constitution* of the Church?—Presbyterians receive or reject this testimony, according as it supports or condemns their particular theories—Dr. Dwight—Dr. Miller—Reason for sensitiveness of Presbyterians in relation to the Epistles of Ignatius—Testimony of the Early Fathers—Clement of Rome—Ignatius—Who he was—Extract from his Epistle to the Ephesians—Tortuous course of Dr. Miller and others in relation to this Epistle—Epistle to the Magnesians—Do. to the Trallians—Testimony of Polycarp—Irenæus—Of the Councils held in the 4th century—All uniform, that Church was Episcopal, Bishops alone possessing the power of ordination—Inquiry confined to first *four* centuries, because, 1st, the Church was then pure, and, 2d, our opponents admit

that *after* that period Episcopacy prevailed everywhere—Most of old Presbyterian writers admit that it prevailed in the 2d and 3d centuries—Absurdity of their pretence that there was a change before that time, demonstrated—Declaration of Chillingworth—Testimony of the Reformers to the antiquity and scriptural authority of Episcopacy—Luther—Melancthon—Calvin—Beza—Du Bose—Challenge of Hooker in 1594, unanswered—Conclusion.....pp. 37—76.

---

### LECTURE III.

#### Deacons—an Order of the Clergy, and not mere Laymen.

This question not unimportant, though minor to that of the superior power of Bishops—Apostolic Ministry was threefold—No controversy about the *second* order of Presbyters—What is the office of a Deacon?—Answer, as given in the Ordination Service in the Prayer Book—We *agree* with our opponents in making Deacons almoners to the poor, but *disagree* as to their power or right to exercise Clerical functions—Who has retained the *whole* of the primitive office?—Scriptural examination of the question—Mere name settles nothing—Examples of its indiscriminate use in the N. T.—Instance of first appointment as recorded in Acts vi.—1. Qualifications required, show that the Deacons were to be something more than Laymen—2. They were *ordained*—3. They did *preach* and *baptize*—Hypothesis that they did so as “Evangelists,” examined—Wonderful *elasticity* of that word in the hands of our opponents—Examination of objection based on Acts vi. 2, 4—Shown to be of no weight—Philippians i. 1, an evidence that the office of Deacon was to be perpetuated—Examination of 1 Timothy iii. 8—13—Officers there addressed *must* have exercised *Clerical* duties—“Good degree” means *higher* rank in the Ministry—*Scriptural* office thus covers all that we claim—Testimony of Early Fathers as to the *fact* of Deacons being Ministers of the Gospel or only Laymen—Uniform in favor of the former position—Clement of

Rome—Ignatius—Polycarp—*Lay* Deacons unheard of for 1500 years after Christ—Who is right, Calvin, or the personal companions of the Apostles?—Conclusion.

pp. 77—95.

---

#### LECTURE IV.

### The Apostolical Succession.

Inconsistency of those who ridicule this doctrine—It *must* be true, or there is no Ministry of Christ on earth—Illustration of the position—Ministerial powers must be derived from the Apostles, through an unbroken Succession, or be verified in each individual case by *Miracles*—We not singular in holding to this doctrine—Was as strenuously maintained by the old Presbyterian writers as by us—e. g.—Dr. Mason—Dr. McLeod—Dr. Hopkins—Objection, that it cannot be true as a matter of fact, answered—Examination of the evidence in favor of an unbroken Succession—A cavil answered—Apostolic commission (St. Matt. xxviii., 19. 20,) is a sufficient evidence, were there no other—So maintained by the Presbyterian controversialist, Dr. McLeod—It terminates only with “the end of the world”—Objection necessarily implies that the *promise* of Christ has failed—It also sweeps away the Bible, for it, too, passed through the “Dark Ages”—But there is other evidence, full and satisfactory to the *candid* inquirer—No inducement in first three centuries for men to intrude themselves unlawfully into the office of a Bishop—Bishops first to be persecuted and martyred—Corruption or failure in the Succession, guarded against in these early ages, by the *purity* and *suffering* of the Church—After its union with the State, by *interest*—The *Mathematical* Argument—Law of the Church—Distinction between an *invalid* and an *irregular* Consecration—Care taken by the early Church to guard against a break in the Succession—“Apostolical” and Nicene Canons—Application of the rule—Traced backwards from our American Episcopacy through the Church of England—Examples—Moral demonstration that a total break has been impossible—Incumbent upon the *objector* to show *when* the break occurred—Passing notice of the “Nag’s Head” Fable—We have then, the *true* Succession, and

are true members of the Church which is the Body of Christ—Examination of objection that we obtained Succession through Rome, and are dependent upon her—1. Not valid, if true—Consequences of the opposite view shown—2. Is *not* true—This will be demonstrated in following Lectures—Objection examined, that our Doctrine is “illiberal, exclusive, unchurching”—*Every* rule must be exclusive—Our opponents not permitted to cast stones—Conclusion.....pp. 97—134.

---

### LECTURE V.

#### The Papal Supremacy—Scripture against it.

Simultaneous attack of Papists and Protestant Dissenters upon the Church of England—Burden of the song of each—Whole question between us and Rome rests upon the dogma of the PAPAL SUPREMACY—Unless *that* can be established, the charges of Romanists that the English Church has cut herself off from communion with the *Catholic* Church of Christ, are baseless and false—Tertullian's Maxim—We aver that the PAPAL SUPREMACY is a *novelty* unknown to Scripture and the Primitive Church—Hence it is to be condemned and repudiated as a heresy—The dogma first to be tested by *Scripture*—Difficulty of fastening any one view of the Papal Supremacy upon Romanists—Claim of *Unity* exploded by diversity of opinions and practice on this one point—Claims of Supremacy over temporal princes, changed according to circumstances—Would not do to promulgate in this country such Bulls as were issued against Henry of Navarre and Queen Elizabeth—Extracts from those Bulls—Romanists in *this* country tried by the standard of Belarmino, Baronius, etc.—But in *this* argument will concede that *spiritual* power alone is claimed by the Pope, viz: that he is *Jure Divino*, “Bishop of Bishops”—Most moderate statement of the dogma of the Papal Supremacy—Tested by Scripture—First position, on which *all* the rest are built, relates to the alleged Supremacy of St. Peter over his fellow Apostles—*Negative* assumed and proved—1. By examination of passage on which Romanists found claim (St. Matt. xvi. 18, etc.)—three several explanations of passage adopted by the Early Fa-

thers, all alike fatal to the Romanists—*Their* view of it, never heard of in primitive Church—All their arguments based upon unauthorized presumptions—Same power granted to Peter, conferred also on *all* the Apostles, (St. John xx. 22, 23,)—This shown by citations from Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, etc.—2. By an examination of St. Matt. x. 2—Fallacy of Romish claim based on this passage, shown—3. BOSSUER's proof drawn from St. John xx. 1—10, prudently discarded by modern Romish controversialists—4. Passage in St. John xxi. 16, examined and shown not to furnish any support for the Supremacy of St. Peter—5. Pope Innocent III. found the Papal Supremacy in Genesis i. 16—Modern Romanists are prudently silent as to this discovery—6. St. Peter never exercised nor claimed any Supremacy over his fellow Apostles—This fact demonstrated by an examination of his acts, in the choice of Matthias—On the day of Pentecost—In the establishment of the order of DEACONS—In his mission to Samaria—In the conversion of Cornelius, and the apology of St. Peter for his acts—In the part he took in the first Council of the Church—In his being publicly blamed by St. Paul and submitting thereto—In the silence of the Epistles written by St. Peter, and especially by St. Paul, *to* and *from* Rome—The *Scriptures* thus condemn, *in toto*, this fundamental dogma of Romanism—This the reason, why Popes *discourage* their perusal—Conclusion.....pp. 135—169.

---

## LECTURE VI.

### The Papal Supremacy—The Primitive Church against it.

Six Postulates of Romanism—One being proved false, all the others necessarily fall—Illustration—Papal Supremacy to be tested by History—Primitive Church as decidedly against this assumption as is Holy Scripture—Postulate that St. Peter founded the Church of Rome and was its first Bishop, examined and shown to be false—If he had any part in the founding of that Church, it was only in partnership with St. Paul—Proofs of this position—Primitive Church never acknowledged Supremacy of

Bishop of Rome—This proved—1. From the utter silence of the five Apostolical Fathers in relation to any such Doctrine—Conclusiveness of this negative testimony—This felt by Rome—Hence the “Forged Decretal Epistles” of the 9th century—Specimens of these Decretals in Appendix B.—2. The celebrated assertion of Irenæus, examined—Does not sustain Romanists—Analogous extract from Tertullian—That Irenæus did *not* acknowledge the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, proved from his conduct in the “Easter” controversy—No Supremacy found in the SECOND century—3. Cyprian’s writings examined—Not favorable to Papal Supremacy—Asserts *equality* of power among *Bishops*, which is fatal to Rome—Held *controversies* with Bishop of Rome, and paid no regard to his pretended excommunication—Extract from Firmilian—Reference to the “Apostolical” Canons—4. Evidence against Papal Supremacy in the 4th century, drawn from the Councils and writings of Basil and others—Need not examine farther—No matter to what extent doctrine was admitted *after* this, it was still a *novelty*, and to be therefore rightly rejected—Remarkable language of Pope Gregory I.—Argument derived from the *titles* bestowed by early writers upon St. Peter examined and refuted—Conclusion..... pp. 171—206.

---

## LECTURE VII.

### The Church of England—Its Origin, History and Catholicism.

Points established in previous Lectures—Remains only to consider origin and Catholicity of Church of England, from which our American Church is derived—Three questions to be answered, viz: 1. When was the English Church established; 2. Was it Episcopal and Catholic? 3. Has it continued such to this day?—Inquiry strictly *Historical* and must be settled by *facts*, not *opinions*—When and by whom the Gospel was first preached in Britain—Proof that it was in the life time of the Apostles—The Church was established there 500 years before the Pope sent Augustine—Proof that that early Church in England was *Episcopal*, and in union with all other

Churches in the world—It was also wholly independent of Rome—Mission of Augustine in the 6th century—Interview between him and the English Bishops—Demands of Augustine and their answer—Remarks on this interview—Canon of the Council of Ephesus—Pope of Rome, under that Canon, had no *right* to Britain—Was only a *usurper*, to be expelled whenever opportunity offered—Fourfold succession in present English Church—Administration of Theodore and its effects—Ultimate union of the ancient British and subsequent Romish-Saxon Churches—Who converted the heathen Saxons?—Subjection of Anglo Saxon Church to Rome, merely nominal for several centuries—Proofs of this—Result of the first *appeal* to Rome, in the 8th century—Acts of a synod of English Bishops in the same century against the Papal Supremacy, then claimed—Protest of do. against image worship—Tenth century—Act of Dunstan, Abp. of Canterbury—Decided stand taken by English Church in this century against *transubstantiation*—Prior to the Norman Conquest, Archbishops, Bishops and Priests were *married* men—Baleful influence of the Norman Conquest in the Church of England—Growth of the Papal claims—Badges of servitude—Anselm—William of Corboil—Bull of Honorius II.—Chains riveted in the 12th century—From this time till the 16th century, the English Church was a *restless* captive—Proof of this—Note—Bishops of the English Church had the right, and were bound to throw off the Papal Supremacy—Their work was *Reformation*, not *Revolution*—Romish slander that the English Church owes its origin to Henry VIII.—Who he was—*Why* the Pope would not grant his requests—No *new* Church then established, but the *old* one reformed—Question to the Romanists—No *rival* Church under Edward VI.—Nor under Mary—Nor under Elizabeth until the 12th year of her reign—Not till then was there a *Romish* Church in England—Romanists in that country cannot escape the charge of schismatics—Note—Present position of English Church—Conclusion.

pp. 207—252.

---

 Appendix A.....pp. 253—262.

Appendix B.....pp. 263—271.

# EPISCOPACY AND THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

---

## LECTURE I.

### Episcopacy—the Scriptural Argument.

The question to be discussed in these Lectures is, "What was the constitution which the Apostles, acting under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, (St. John xiv: 26, xvi: 13,) established for the Christian Church?"

In answering this question I shall take positions and attempt to prove them, which I very well know, are at irreconcilable variance with those entertained by many who "profess and call themselves Christians," and which are characterised by such as illiberal, exclusive and unchurching. I desire to say at the outset, that whatever may be the effect of the arguments advanced upon other systems, I disclaim the slightest wish to wound the feelings of any living being. Were there no other consideration, I should be deterred from such an unwarrantable course, by the recollection of the many friends that I have among Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and others, with some of whom I

am connected by the near ties of kindred—with all of whom I have spent many hours of social intercourse—and whom, their and my errors and sins being pardoned, I hope to meet in Heaven. I have no quarrel with them, nor with the systems which they have adopted. My business is the rather, to advocate Episcopacy as of Divine origin, and if antagonistic systems fall, the fault is not in me. I say farther, that I have as great a desire as any one, to live in peace and harmony with all men. But when I see the Church that I love, and at whose altars I am a humble minister, attacked with such virulence and calumny as have marked the proceedings of our opponents during the past five or ten years, believing as I do, as firmly as that there is a God, that Episcopacy is TRUE, I should be recreant to my trust, did I shrink from the defence of that Church; and in giving a reason for the hope that is in me, attempt to show that whatever may be said of other organizations, *our* Church is built upon that one only sure and true foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, of which Jesus Christ Himself, is the chief corner stone.

Let us well and rightly understand the subject of discussion. I shall not stop a moment to argue the question with those who either

maintain that there is *no* Ministry, or that *Laymen* may give to one of their own number all that is requisite to constitute a Minister of the Church of Christ. If persons holding either of these views, will not be convinced by the clear light of God's word—if they prefer a discovery of the seventeenth century to the uniform action and testimony of the universal Christian Church, they certainly will not be persuaded by any thing that I can say. Our business at present is, to examine the two antagonistic theories, viz: The Episcopal and the Presbyterian. By the use of this last word you will understand me, once for all, to mean, not only those who are called by that name, but also all who deny Episcopacy, and hold to the right of Presbyters to govern the Church, and particularly to ordain. The classification includes not only Baptists, Reformed Dutch and Congregationalists, but also Methodists and Lutherans, who, though holding to a nominal Episcopacy, are in principle only Presbyterians. They expressly deny that *their* Bishops or Superintendents, are of a higher or superior order to their Presbyters. It is a regulation of expediency, not of principle.

Papery has *added* to Episcopacy a fourth order, but I shall take occasion before these Lectures are closed to show that that is a *novelty*,

and that we do right to protest against *all* novel-  
ties, whether they add to, or take away from,  
the Primitive, Catholic,\* Apostolic system.

What, then, are these two antagonistic theo-  
ries? The *Episcopal* is, that the Christian Min-  
istry consists of *three* orders, now called Bish-  
ops, Presbyters and Deacons. That of these,  
the Bishop is alone the successor of the Apos-  
tles, and as such, alone possesses the power of  
ordination, and is thus the ruler of the Church,  
and especially of the inferior orders of the  
Clergy. The *Presbyterian* theory is, that there  
is but *one* order of the Ministry, viz : Elders or  
Presbyters, sometimes called Bishops in the  
New Testament ; that all of this one order are  
equal in power and authority, no one pos-  
sessing the power to try or punish, and especially  
to silence his brother minister. Ordination and

---

\* The reader, will, once for all, understand that when I  
use the word "*Catholic*" in this volume, I do *not* mean the  
*Romish* Church or its doctrine, but the *primitive* Church as  
it was in the Apostles' times, and for three centuries there-  
after, before the heresies and blasphemous conceits of Rome  
had been heard of, or were allowed to corrupt the pure  
"faith once delivered to the saints." The author begs to be  
excused from bearing even such slight tribute of praise to  
the heretical and well nigh *Apostate* Church of Rome, as to  
bestow upon her the time-honored and orthodox appellation  
of *Catholic*!

discipline of the Clergy are only to be exercised by the Presbytery, or whole council of Presbyters. You perceive at once that the vital difference between us is in the claim which Episcopacy presents, that Bishops, or those of the first order of the Ministry, as successors of the Apostles, have alone the power to ordain other ministers, thus wholly excluding Presbyters and Deacons from that right. This, therefore, will be the main question to which our remarks will be addressed. For if we cannot prove that Bishops *are* thus superior to Presbyters, then we will be willing to give up the minor order of Deacons, and admit an entire parity in the Ministry.

Our appeal will be to "Scripture and Ancient Authors." At present the SCRIPTURE argument alone will be considered.

The first question which presents itself is, "What *was* the Apostolic office?" We must settle this premise, or we shall argue forever without a conclusion. The candid reader of Holy Scripture, divesting himself of prejudice and preconceived theories, cannot but perceive that it must have partaken of a two-fold character, extraordinary and ordinary; the one, that which could *not* be transmitted to others; the other, that which *could*, and, as we shall undertake to show, *was* so transmitted.

What, then, was the extraordinary part of their office or duty ? I answer (1.) to be *witnesses* of the resurrection of their Lord. If any doubt that such was a part of their business, Acts i : 22, and iii : 15, would suffice to dispel that doubt. *We* shall certainly never deny that that was a *special* duty of the Apostles. But this was not their *exclusive* prerogative. There were other witnesses of that event. The keepers were such ; Mary Magdalene and her companions were such ; the five hundred brethren were such, and so were many others. It could not, then, have been because they were witnesses of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, that they, as all admit they did do, presided in the councils of the Church, and gave laws to all Christians. One remark of St. Paul in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, settles this question. He asks, (xii : 29,) “Are *all* Apostles ?” The question, as every well informed reader knows, is equivalent to the strongest negative. Now, I respectfully ask, where would have been the force of so earnest a declaration of St. Paul, if the fact had been, and the Corinthians must have been aware of it if so, that there were no Apostles save the *twelve* specially selected witnesses of the resurrection ? It only needs to ask the question to show the absurdity of the conclusion.

A second extraordinary power of the Apostles was the working of miracles. This was necessary in order that they might visibly demonstrate their doctrine to be from God. But even this power they did not possess exclusively.—The Deacons, Stephen and Philip, exercised it. And so, doubtless, did many of the saints, for so only can we explain St. Mark, xvi: 17, 18.—And besides, what is demonstrative of the position that this could not have been the peculiar and distinguishing badge of the Apostleship, is the fact that they did not, either individually or collectively, at all times, possess the power to work miracles. Thus St. Peter could not deliver himself from prison, (Acts xii;) nor Paul and Silas, (Acts xvi;) nor could the whole twelve, (Acts v.) St. Paul, though he earnestly desired his company, was compelled to leave his friend Trophimus at Miletum, sick, (2 Tim. iv: 20,) not possessing then the power to heal him.—This was an extraordinary gift, bestowed when necessary to stop the mouths of gainsayers, or advance the cause of Christ and the Church, but withdrawn when only private convenience was to be consulted. It was of neither of these qualifications that the Lord Jesus Christ spoke when he said to the apostles, (St. John xx: 21,) “As my Father hath sent Me, even so I send

you ;” and again, (St. Matt. xxviii : 20,) “ Lo, I am with you alway, [literally ‘*all days,*’] *even unto the end of the world.*”

What, then, we ask, was that feature of the Apostolic office to which such words might rightly apply? and which, unless the promise is to fail, *must* be continued to the end of the world? I answer, and to this point will our proof be directed, *the power to rule the Church in the place of Him who had ascended into heaven, and to ordain others, who, when they were gone, should in their places feed and govern that same Church.* That the Apostles possessed these powers, all agree. The texts just cited unanswerably prove it. They were to supply the place of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be His visible agents on earth, to establish the Christian Church, and, guided by the Spirit of all Truth, they were to ordain other ministers, and to exercise supreme authority. And we find that they did this. But I need not enlarge upon this point, although I might consume the whole Lecture in its consideration. It is unnecessary, for in every one of these positions the Presbyterians agree with us, that is, that the Apostles *had* these powers. The only dispute is, whether or not they ceased with the original twelve, and that point will be hereafter considered.

The second question to be answered, is—“Was the Apostolical office confined to the twelve?” We answer no; and here we differ from our opponents; but let holy Scripture decide between us. When Judas “by transgression fell,” Matthias was chosen in his place, and the original number again completed. Saul of Tarsus was afterwards added, making *thirteen*; and this fact is sufficient to establish the position we assume. Modern writers in favor of Presbyterianism, pressed by this conclusion, have undertaken to say that the election of Matthias was unauthorized, that St Peter did wrong in proposing, and the rest in assenting to such election; that Matthias had only a “straw Apostleship,” and St. Paul was chosen by the Lord in the place of Judas. It is not strange that *Socinians* should take such a position, but I must express my astonishment to find my orthodox Presbyterian friends willing to borrow and use the ammunition of the Unitarian Buckminster\*, who is, I believe, the original discoverer

---

\* “Paul takes the place in the number of the twelve which was left vacant by the death of Judas. . . . It has been suggested, and perhaps with some appearance of truth, that when the ELEVEN judged it necessary to supply the place of Judas, and chose Matthias by lot, *they did not act by the direction of the Holy Spirit*, which was not yet

of this novel doctrine. It goes the whole length of attacking the plenary inspiration of the holy Scriptures, for if the first chapter of the Book of Acts be not inspired, what evidence have we that any part of that or any other book is? Will my Presbyterian friends, then, for the mere sake of aiming a pointless weapon at Episcopacy, consent to do such despite to the Word of God? I hope not, but that they will at once throw away this "vain tradition of men."

I said this was a *pointless* weapon when aimed at the Episcopal theory, and so it is. For we may admit the objection, throw aside Matthias, and yet find record of other Apostles—Apostles in the highest sense of the term—which cannot

---

given, but merely by dictates of human prudence, which on that occasion *seems to have carried them too far*. . . . It was necessary that the candidate should receive his commission and supernatural powers from Jesus Himself.—Thus our Lord seems to have *superseded the election of Matthias*, and with a view to the conversion of the Gentiles, to have appointed Paul." [*Sermon by Buckminster on the Life and Writings of Paul.*]

Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn, from whose writings the expression "straw apostleship" used in the text, is taken, must feel flattered by being thus enrolled as one of the humble disciples and followers of this Unitarian Commentator!

be gainsayed, nor explained away. In the 14th chapter of the Book of Acts, we have an account of the tumult raised in Iconium, on account of the preaching of Paul and Barnabas. The 4th verse reads thus,—“ But the multitude of the city was divided ; and part held with the Jews and part with the *Apostles*.” What Apostles? The 14th verse informs us,—“ Which, when the Apostles, *Barnabas and Paul*, heard of,” etc. Not *an* Apostle, or ordinary messenger, as the word literally denotes, but *the* Apostles—the peculiar appellation of the highest office then in the Christian Church. *Barnabas*, then, was an Apostle, as well as St. Paul. And the same conclusion, we contend, fairly follows from 1 Cor. ix : 5, 6, and Gallations ii : 8, 9.

In 1 Thess. i : 1, the salutation is sent to that Church in the names of “ Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus ” In chapter ii : 6, St. Paul says,—“ When *we* might have been burthensome as the *Apostles* of Christ.” We contend that by a fair construction of these two passages, Silvanus and Timotheus are included in the list of the Apostles. We admit that standing alone it is not conclusive, but it is a link which fits this chain exactly, and no other as well. The same remark will apply to Romans xvi : 7, “ Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my

fellow prisoners, who are of note among *the Apostles.*'

But what is perfectly conclusive in support of the position assumed, viz : that the Apostleship was *not* confined to the original twelve, is the reference in more than one place to the "*false apostles.*" In 2 Cor, xi : 13, St. Paul says, "For such are *false apostles*, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ." Let us consider this passage a moment. On the theory that none but the original twelve *were* Apostles, these "*false apostles*" must have personated one of them. Who was it? Not St Paul, certainly, for he was well known to the Corinthian Church, and the imposture would be at once detected. At least one of the rest [St. James] was dead, and supposing the other ten to be living, was there, I ask, so much danger that these counterfeits would impose themselves upon the Corinthian Church, as St. Peter or St. John, or some other of the ten, as to require such an earnest caution from St. Paul? I think you will agree with me, that this is not a very *probable* supposition.—There *must* have been, then, *true* Apostles, or there would have been no danger from these counterfeits. But what demonstrates this, is the address to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus,

(Rev. ii: 2,)—"Thou hast *tried* them which *say* they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars." At this time, near the close of the first century, St. John was the only survivor of the twelve original Apostles. And could the Ephesians be so deceived as to mistake these impostors for his venerable form?—More than one false apostle intruded himself into Ephesus. "Thou hast tried *them*," &c. Was it necessary for the Angel of that Church to take so much trouble, as formally to *try*, not one merely, but many? Surely not. It would have been sufficient for him to have said,— "John is the *only* Apostle living. *You* are not John, and therefore you must be an impostor." Now, I ask my Presbyterian friends to square this address to, and commendation of, the Angel of the Church in Ephesus, with *their* theory, that there were but *twelve* Apostles? It cannot be done; and we may, I think, pass this point, by saying, as we did at first, that the Apostolic office was *not* confined to the original twelve.

The third inquiry now arises:—"Was the Apostolic office to be continued beyond the first century, or lifetime of the twelve first appointed?" We take the affirmative. As the history of Scripture ends with the first century, all proof,

from that source, must, as a matter of course, be inferential. But if sufficiency can be obtained to make such a conclusion even probable, then if it is disputed, the testimony of the early Church must come in to settle the *fact*—for the whole issue between us and the Presbyterians is one of *fact*, and not of opinion or conjecture.—The right of an appeal to this secondary authority will be considered, and, I trust, vindicated, in the next Lecture. On this point of the transmission of the Apostolic office, the testimony of the early Church, as we shall then see, is abundant, overwhelming and unanimous. But the Scriptural argument is now alone to occupy our attention. And in proof of such transmission, I remark that no other meaning or force can be attached to the promise annexed to the original Apostolic Commission,—“Lo I am with you *all days* [Greek] even unto the end of the world.” The Son of God could not be with the eleven personally, save only during their lifetime.—What, then, has become of the promise, during the seventeen centuries that have elapsed since the death of St. John ? It follows, necessarily, that they must have left representatives, to whom, standing in their stead, the promise, “Lo I am with you,” would be a perpetual truth, even to the second coming of the Son of Man.

I shall not dwell upon this point, for it is unnecessary. The Presbyterian standards, and all the acknowledged Presbyterian controversialists, prior to the last half score of years, agree with us, i. e., that the Apostles *had* successors, and that this promise applies to the Ministry of the Church. They contend, however, that the whole body of Presbyters are thus successors in office and authority. Very well. We are not now inquiring *through whom* the office was transmitted, but as to the fact itself. Recent writers opposed to us—and I may mention Dr. POTTS, of N. Y., as an example—have repudiated the platform of *their* forefathers and predecessors, and to avoid the conclusion which we have drawn, and in reference to which there had been no dispute, have utterly denied the fact or necessity of *any* succession from the Apostles. “The knife that cuts,” is, according to Dr. BEECHER, the only true and approved knife. A very plausible and taking argument indeed, but a very dangerous one for those who handle it. It is less than ten years since, that I heard the same argument advanced as an infallible evidence that MILLERISM was true, because it made so many converts.—But *that* knife has become very dull, and so has that of our modern revivalists and wild-fire enthusiasts. The argument is as good for the

Mormon as for the New School Presbyterian—  
for the Campbellite as for the Methodist.

No ! the position of the older writers among the Presbyterians, was the true one. They differed not with Episcopalians on that point, but only as to the channel of transmission. I repeat the remark, that the promise of Christ should settle this question. Or if any doubt remained, the exhortation of St. Paul to Timothy should dispel it. Listen to his earnest and emphatic language : “ *That good thing* which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost.” (2 Tim. i. 14.) “ And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, *the same commit thou to faithful men*, who shall be able to *teach others also.*” (Chap. ii. 2.) We are not left in doubt, as to what “ that good thing ” was which had been committed to Timothy. The Apostle himself informs us in Chap. i. 6—“ Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, *which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.*” It was the thing conferred by *ordination*, for all agree that that is here meant. St. Paul, then, by *ordination*, conferred the gift of God upon Timothy, which he was not only to “ keep ” himself, but also to commit to “ other faithful men,” that they might be “ able to teach others also.” THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE, then, that

is, the power to ordain, and as the greater always includes the less, the power to rule the ordained, *was* to be transmitted to others besides the Apostles.

This brings us to the fourth and most important, because vital question, "*Through whom were these Apostolic functions, or the Apostolic office to be transmitted ?*" Here there is a radical separation between us and our opponents.— We say that it is through the first and highest order of the Ministry, call it what you will, and that Presbyters or Elders, and Deacons were, and are, wholly excluded from the exercise of this power of ordination. Our opponents, on the contrary, say that the Presbyters succeeded to the full power of the Apostles—that ordination by them is as valid as that by Bishops—and, in short, that a Church established and governed by Presbyters, is alone in accordance with the primitive Apostolic platform. The issue between us is an important one. Both can not be right.

The Church is ONE, in body as well as in spirit. Else it can not be the *one* body of Christ—the one true vine—the one holy temple—the one family of the God of order and unity.— (See Ephesians iv. 1-6; ii. 19-22; 1 Corinthians xii. 12-27; St. John xv. 1-6; Acts ii. 42.) Come, then, and let us examine this question

seriously and candidly. When we have found the "old paths," they will be the true ones, and we must walk therein. If the Presbyterian Church be what it claims to be, it is the true Church, and it is the solemn, imperative duty of every man to become a member of it. If, on the other hand, Episcopacy be true, it—no, Christ himself—demands that we should receive it. I ask all then, to dismiss their prejudices, and their pre-conceived opinions, and inquire candidly—wholly untrammelled by the restraints of early education, or of family connections.

Reminding you again, that the history of Scripture ends with the first century, our inquiries to-night, must be confined to the *facts* of that century, and to the facts, too, contained in holy Scripture. That the Apostles ordained, may be assumed, for it is admitted by all who hold to ordination at all. It may also be assumed that they conferred that power to ordain upon others, for this too is admitted. But upon whom? Our opponents say, upon the Presbyters generally. This we emphatically deny, and say that in the Churches which they established, one was made superior to the rest of the clergy, and upon him alone was conferred the power to ordain, and govern, and punish. Here is the issue, and we proceed

to consider which of the two positions is borne out by the facts and teaching of the word of God.

We ask you first, to consider the remarkable phraseology of the addresses of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus. To the former, and who was at Ephesus, where we shall presently show there were a number of Elders, he thus speaks,—“This charge I commit unto THEE, son Timothy.” (1 Tim. i. 18.) “As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that THOU mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine.” (Ib. i. 3.) Timothy is here directed to *charge* the *teachers* already at Ephesus. Of what use, I ask, would this be, if he had no authority to *enforce* that charge? and that necessarily implies superiority over them. Again, “against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.” (1 Tim. v. 19.) I appeal to the common sense of all, if this power or right to “*receive* an accusation,” did not necessarily imply the power to *try* and acquit, or punish the accused Elder? No one can consistently deny this. And I ask, what Presbyterian minister, old or young, possesses *this* power over his brother clergy? No one—for the very doctrine of ministerial parity negatives the supposition. *All* are equal in power

and authority. Again, St. Paul gives the marks or qualifications which a Bishop and a Deacon should possess, and then says to Timothy, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," (1 Tim. v. 22.) and the text already quoted, "the things which thou hast heard of me, commit *thou* to faithful men," &c. I appeal to you, if these injunctions, implying beyond question, the power to carry them out, are not decisive against the Presbyterian theory of equality in the Ministry. Pressed sorely by this most obvious conclusion, our opponents have invented the theory that Timothy, being called in one or two places, "an Evangelist," must have been some extraordinary officer appointed for some extraordinary purpose. It will suffice to answer this hypothesis, by saying that it is an assumption merely—having nothing to support it in the Epistles themselves—and that the burden of proof rests upon them to *sustain* their position, not on us to prove the denial. They well know that ecclesiastical history is unanimous against them.

We find the same remarkable form of address to Titus, "For this cause, left I thee in Crete, that *thou* shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain Elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Chap. i. 5.) And we find directions given to him, similar to those ad-

dressed to Timothy. Now, if there was no opposing theory to sustain, would any reader gather any other conclusion than this,—that Titus alone possessed the power “to set things in order,” and “to ordain Elders in Crete?” Why was it necessary to send Titus to Crete? Or if there were no Elders at first, why, when he had ordained a few, could *they* not have ordained others? Why, indeed? Upon the Presbyterian theory, no satisfactory explanation can be given. Upon the Episcopal, however, it was the most natural proceeding conceivable, and indeed, the only one that could have been adopted.

But as our opponents deny the correctness of our explanation of these several texts, and still maintain that there was but one order of the Ministry in the primitive Church, that of Presbyters or Elders, all of equal authority, we can not do better than to trace out, if possible, the actual practice in some one Church. That will serve as an example for all, for no one but a fanatic—and with such, we have no argument now or ever—will contend that the Apostles established different forms of government in different Churches, according to the whim or caprice of different people. We will take the Church of *Ephesus*. In the 18th chapter of Acts, we have an account of St. Paul's first visit

to Ephesus. It was short, but Aquilla, Priscilla and Apollos, preached the Gospel there after his departure. In the next chapter we find him again visiting that city and remaining three years. (xx. 31.) Great success attended his labors, for we read, "so *mightily* grew the word of God and prevailed." (xix. 20.) This makes it at least probable, that more than one congregation of christians was gathered in that rich and populous city. The Apostle was driven away by a tumult, but some time after, on his way to Jerusalem, he stopped at Miletus and "sent to Ephesus and called the *Elders* of the Church." (xx. 17.) These elders were clergymen—they are called *Bishops* or "overseers," in the 28th verse. As to this community of names in the New Testament, about which our Presbyterian friends are so strenuous, I shall have something to say presently. Our present business is to establish the fact that, at this time, there were at least, several clergymen, and, as a reasonable consequence, more *congregations* than one in the Church of Ephesus. This is, in fact, not only admitted, but positively asserted in the Presbyterian standards themselves.\* What did

---

\* See the "Confession of Faith," Chap. X, of the Form of Government, Note 1. "*That the Church of Ephesus had more congregations than one, under a presbyterial govern-*

St. Paul say to those Elders? "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (xx. 28—30.) Thus he exhorts them to faithfulness, and warns them expressly against the "wolves" or false teachers, who should arise to worry, and tear, and distract the flock. And yet, not the slightest direction is given to them to arrest, try and punish these false teachers! No! the only advice he gives, follows what I have read,—“Therefore watch and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.” They were only to *watch* themselves, remember the example he had set them, and not be drawn

---

ment, appears from Acts xix. 18, 19, 20; 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9, 19, compared with Acts xviii. 19, 24, 26; xx. 17, 18, 25, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37; Rev. ii. 1—6.”

We shall see presently whether or no, they were “under a *presbyterial* government!” The reader will bear in mind the admission or assertion of the fact, that “the Church of Ephesus had *more congregations than one.*”

away after these false and heretical teachers. Here, then, we find a Church, with its many thousands of believers, with its many Elders, or Overseers, or Bishops, or Pastors—call them what you will—and, according to the Presbyterian theory, it was fully organized, and possessed, in and of itself, full power to ordain and perpetuate its Ministry. And yet, over this same Church, with its many Elders, we find Timothy, a comparatively young man, (1 Tim. iv. 12,) placed by this same St. Paul, with full power to ordain, charge, rebuke and punish, these very Elders—themselves wholly powerless, either to keep out or put out, those “grievous wolves,” that the Apostle warned them would certainly creep in. Now, I ask, can all this be reconciled with the Presbyterian theory? That it cannot, is evident from the fact, that the Presbyterians themselves, are forced to give Timothy an “extraordinary” office. It is clear that so far, the Church of Ephesus was *not* “under a *presbyterial* government.”

We pass on for a period of *thirty* years and more, and coming to the close of the 1st century, we again find the Church of Ephesus mentioned. If there were a plurality of congregations, and a plurality of clergy, in that Church in the year 60, there certainly must have been in A. D. 95.

Timothy has passed away. The hypothesis that he exercised his extraordinary power over that Church as an "Evangelist," if true, will not now avail. And yet what do we find? One person, called "the Angel of the Church of Ephesus," thus addressed by the Lord Jesus himself,—“I know *thy* works, and *thy* labor, and *thy* patience, and how *thou* canst not bear them which are evil; and *thou* hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars.” (Rev. ii. 2.) Now, I appeal to your candor and your common sense, if, upon every fair interpretation of this passage, there was not at the very close of the 1st century, in this large Church of Ephesus, with its mighty host of believers, its numerous congregations, and its many Elders, a *superior officer*, (call him what you will,) A RULER OF THE CLERGY, A TRIER OF FALSE APOSTLES, one held responsible to the Great Head of the Church for all the false doctrines taught in that mighty city? *And this is Episcopacy.*

One clear case settles the whole question. It is unnecessary to examine after other Churches. We therefore pass this point with the remark, which shall be made good if disputed, that there is not in the New Testament, a single allusion to the Christian Church, which can not be harmonized with the Episcopal theory, while there

are many, and a few have been cited, which are utterly and irreconcilably hostile to the presbyterial hypothesis. Which, then, we ask, has *probable* truth in its favor ?

But it is said in answer to all this proof which we have presented, that we have the record of ordination by Presbyters in the New Testament. If this be so, the argument is against us, and we are bound to yield our position. Only two such instances are alleged, and we proceed to consider the passages which are relied upon to sustain Presbyterian ordination. One of these is in Acts xiii : 1—3, and reads as follows : “ Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers—as Barnabas and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them. they sent them away.” Of this passage, Dr. SAMUEL MILLER, late of Princeton, the champion of Presbyterianism for the first quarter of this century, thus boldly avers : “ This is the most ample account of an ordination to be found in

Scripture; and it is an account, which, were there no other, would be sufficient to decide the present controversy in our favor." Such a triumphant and dogmatic assertion from the Goliath of Presbyterianism, must have made the Davids of Episcopacy quail and flee vanquished from the field! But no! in return, they slang the smooth stone of truth with such unerring aim, that the Rev. ALBERT BARNES, who is *now* the champion of our opponents, expressly and most emphatically denies that this occurrence *was an ordination at all!* He says in his commentary on this paragraph:—"Nor is it meant that this was an *ordination* to the *ministry*, to the office of preaching the Gospel. For both had been engaged in this before. Saul received his commission directly from the Saviour, and began at once to preach—Acts ix: 20; Gal. i: 11—17. Barnabas had preached at Antioch, and was evidently recognized as a preacher, by the Apostles—Acts ix: 27; xi: 22, 23. *It follows, therefore, that this was not an ordination in the doctrinal sense of this term, either Episcopal or Presbyterian.*" (Barnes on the Book of Acts, p. 189.) Here I might leave the consideration of this passage—for where these two Champions of Presbyterianism, so emphatically and dogmatically contradict each other, it is hardly

necessary to defend Episcopacy from a blow that does not even reach it. But lest some reader may side with Dr. MILLER instead of Mr. BARNES, and still think that this *was* an ordination, I will say a word in pointing out some of the difficulties in the way of the Presbyterian hypothesis resting upon *this* event as a basis.—

1. St. Paul expressly declares—Gal. i : 1—that he received his Apostleship, “not of men neither *by* man, but by Jesus Christ.”
2. This transaction took place under the personal and audible direction of God the Holy Ghost, and *that* would have sanctioned ordination even by Laymen.
3. If you will refer to Galatians i : 18, and ii : 1, it will be found that St. Paul had been a Minister of the Gospel at least *three*, and in all probability *seventeen* years before this occurrence at Antioch. If *this*, therefore, was an *ordination*, it must have been an ordination to a *higher grade* in the Ministry than he before possessed. And this supposition is fatal to the whole Presbyterian hypothesis, of an entire parity in the Ministry. All these difficulties are in the way of making this a Presbyterian ordination. Is it then, I ask, so clear a text as to set aside the proof which has been advanced in favor of Episcopal ordination and government as practiced in the Church of Ephesus ? I fear

not the answer from any candid man. As to what this occurrence was, there is no difficulty. The sacred narrative itself informs us, and so Mr. Barnes shews in the commentary from which an extract has been quoted. Compare the 2d verse of the 13th chapter, with the 26th and 27th verses of the 14th, and all is plain. "The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, *for the work whereunto I have called them.*" "And thence sailed to *Antioch from whence* they had been recommended to the grace of God for the *work which they fulfilled.* And when they were come, and had gathered the Church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." One of the two cases is disposed of, and I believe you will acknowledge that the walls of Episcopacy are not shaken, much less demolished, as yet.

The only other case which can be cited even as a forlorn hope, is 1 Tim. iv. 14,—“Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.” This passage is cited by *all* Presbyterians, and it is doubtful whether a sermon was ever preached, or a book written by them on this subject, that this solitary text was not brought forward as if it had never been, and

never could be answered by Episcopalians. A few words will, I trust, be sufficient to show, that at least a *doubt* may arise, as to whether or not our opponents give the right construction to this passage. If even that point be reached, the testimony of those who lived with, and received the Church from the Apostles, must be called in to settle the *fact*, either for or against us. 'The point of dispute is, "What was the *Presbytery*?"' The word literally means, "an assembly of elderly men," and is in St. Luke xxii. 66, and Acts xxii. 5, applied to the "Elders of the Jews," or the Sanhedrim. It is derived from a word which simply means a *senior*, or *old man*. This last word is applied in Acts ii. 17, to "old men"—in Acts vi. 12, to the "Elders of the Jews,"—in Acts xi. 30, evidently to the whole college of the Apostles at Jerusalem—in Hebrews xi. 2, to the Old Testament worthies—while St. Peter (1 Peter v. 1) and St. John (2 and 3 John i.) Each apply the term to themselves. I object then, that the mere word "Presbytery," does not settle the question either way. The Presbyterians *say* it refers to *Presbyters*—we, on the other hand, reply, that the *seniors* here spoken of *might* have been *Apostles*. One assumption is just as good as the other. *Other* evidence must be called in to decide. We are at issue. Is it too

much to ask that St. Paul himself may be heard in explanation of his own remark? Turn to his 2d Epistle to this same Timothy, and at chap. i. 6, you will find him thus addressing the same individual spoken of in the former passage —“ Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, BY the putting on of MY hands.” Here, then, is the positive assertion that, whatever that Presbytery was, or what the manner or extent of its concurrence, the gift of God was bestowed upon Timothy *by his own hands*. This was, therefore, an *Apostolic* ordination, and instead of the passage being a firm rock for the Presbyterial hypothesis, it is but a sandy foundation for a mere *assumption* in their favor.

These are the only cases ever brought forward to prove ordination by Presbyters, and I respectfully ask, if they *do* overthrow the concurrent testimony in favor of Episcopacy, running through the whole New Testament?

But here we meet the last, but not with our opponents, the *least* objection to Episcopacy. It is the community of names, confessedly used in the New Testament. It is said—Bishops are called Elders, and Elders Bishops—therefore they were the same, and there could not have been any superiority of one over the other, as

the Episcopal theory necessarily supposes. This objection we *always* meet. It was demolished centuries ago, but it is continually brought up again as perfectly conclusive. Were another book to be written to-morrow in favor of Presbyterianism, this would be the burden of its song, as it had been of all its predecessors. A very brief examination will suffice, I trust, to show its absurdity. I state the objection again—Bishops and even Apostles are *called* Elders—therefore they were all of the same office. The fact we admit—the conclusion we utterly deny. I again say, that the mere *name* settles nothing of itself. “Apostle” means *messenger*—“*Bishop*,” *overseer*, and “*Presbyter*,” an *elder*. The *office* held by each must be determined by the functions which they exercised.

To make the absurdity of the objection apparent, let us suppose a case by way of illustration. Suppose that in the Constitution of the United States and of this State, no *title* had been affixed to the supreme executive office of each—that Gen. WASHINGTON called himself, and was called *President*, while GEORGE CLINTON of this State, took the title of *Governor*. Both words mean essentially the same thing, viz : one who *presides* or *rules* over others. The mere name, therefore, would not decide whether Washington

and Clinton held the same office or not. *That*, you at once perceive, must be determined some other way. Let us continue the supposition a little farther. Suppose, from veneration to the memory of WASHINGTON, as the "Father of his country," his successors, ADAMS, JEFFERSON, &c., had agreed that he alone should enjoy the title of "*President*," while they would be henceforth known as "*Governors*." Would that prove, and would it be a fair deduction to be drawn 1800 years hence, that because ADAMS, and JEFFERSON, and MADISON, &c., were *called* "*Governors*," they did not therefore possess the same powers that Washington did, but were in fact, only like the Governors of the several States? The very stating of the question shows the absurdity of such a conclusion. Very well. The very case we have supposed had its exact parallel in that of the Apostles and their successors, the Bishops of the Church. This is not only evident from a candid perusal of ecclesiastical history, but is directly asserted by THEODORET, an excellent and pious commentator of the Greek Church, who was born A. D. 386, and would, to say the least, be apt to be as familiar with the *facts* of the case, as our otherwise sages of the 19th century. In his Commentary on 1 Timothy iii. 1, he says :

Here the Apostle calls the Presbyter a Bishop, as we have shown in our interpretation of Philip. i. 1. But this may be easily understood from this passage. For after giving instructions to Bishops, he omits Presbyters, and gives those which are proper for Deacons. But, as I have before said, they formerly called the same persons by the names of Presbyter and Bishop, and those who are now called Bishops, they called Apostles. Subsequently, they applied the name of APOSTLE only to those who were truly Apostles, and gave the appellation of *Bishops* to those who before had been called Apostles.

But I propose to show the absurdity of the objection, by pushing it to its legitimate conclusion, the test being the Scriptures themselves. "Bishops are *called* Elders—therefore there was no higher office than is held by those who are *now* called Presbyters or Elders." Such is the argument. Where will it lead us? I read from 1 Tim. iv : 6,—“If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good *Deacon* of Jesus Christ.” In our English version, the word “Deacon” is translated “*minister*,” but you may ask *any* Greek scholar, Presbyterian or Episcopal, if, in the original, it is not the same word, without the change of a letter or an accent, that is translated *Deacon* in the previous chapter and elsewhere in the New Testament? What is the conclusion? Was Timothy only a Presbyterian *Deacon*, whose sole duty was to collect the alms of the congregation

and relieve the poor? Did he need the high qualifications which St. Paul urges upon him, for *such* an office? And yet, if the argument proves the position we are combatting, it does this most clearly. Timothy is *called* a *Deacon*. Hence he must have been precisely the officer known by that name, in non-Episcopal denominations of our day!

Again, I read from Ephesians iii: 7; and Colossians i: 23, 25,—“Whereof I was made a *Deacon*”—“Whereof, I, Paul, am made a *Deacon*”—“Whereof I am made a *Deacon* according to the dispensation of God.” Here, again, is the same word used, without the change of letter or accent. And was St. Paul—he who declares that he was not one whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles, nothing but a *Deacon*—a mere almoner of the charities of the Laity? So the argument proves, if it proves any thing. I will push the objection but one step farther and leave it. I read from Romans xv: 8,—“Now I say that Jesus Christ was a *Deacon* of the circumcision!” Need I say another word? I appeal to you, if the objection, if valid, does not demolish Presbyterianism, and indeed, every thing else, except a theory which yet remains to be discovered, that *Deacons* are the only order of the ministry? Fortunately for Episcopacy, the

argument demolishes itself before a single blow reaches her venerable citadel. It is a weapon of straw, breaking with its own weight.

· May I not claim, in closing this Lecture, that the Scriptural argument is *presumptively* in our favor? Is not, at least, a reasonable doubt raised, whether Presbyterianism be the true, Apostolical system? If so, and our positions are denied, and the texts quoted differently explained, then the only source left, is to go to the same authority and testimony upon which we receive the canon of Scripture itself—that of the primitive Church, which received the constitution which *was* established from the Apostles themselves. The consideration of that testimony will form the subject of the next Lecture

· In conclusion, I ask all to inquire candidly for the truth on this important subject. Episcopacy shrinks from no investigation. Push her claims to whatever conclusion legitimately follows, and she will abide by the result, leaving consequences to her God. May the spirit of Grace help our inquiries, and lead us to find and embrace the true Church, that in and through it we may pass to the Church triumphant.

## LECTURE II.

### Episcopacy—The Historical Argument.

In the Preface to the Ordination Service in our Book of Common Prayer, there is this sentence: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' times, there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church,—BISHOPS, PRIESTS and DEACONS." In the previous Lecture we considered the proof of this position—or rather the corner stone of the position, *the superior power of Bishops over other Ministers*—so far as it is derived from the first of these authorities. The argument was necessarily brief. The mass of evidence could but be glanced at hastily and imperfectly. Upon each point advanced, a volume might have been written. But the proof, as it was presented, seems unanswerable, and irresistible to every candid mind. We need, however, but to look around us to find thousands who will not, or at least, do not, come to the same conclusion that we draw from the premises and proof, considered in the last Lecture. A different construction is placed upon the texts which were brought for-

ward, and the prejudices, not always enlightened, but ever deep-rooted, against Episcopacy induce them to believe that it cannot be the Apostolic, and of course, not the binding system. The *ear* or *eye* may be opened to the truth, but the *heart* is closed. Knowing all this—would that it were otherwise!—I was willing, in closing the consideration of the SCRIPTURAL evidence, to admit that we had advanced only a *presumptive* argument in our favor—or, at least, had raised a *doubt*, as to the Scriptural authority of the Presbyterian theory. In such case we are at issue, and the SECOND authority available, must come in to turn the scale for or against us. To that authority will our attention now be directed.

But before proceeding directly to consider this species of evidence—important as it is—it will be well at the outset, to remove an objection, or rather a cavil, which is ever brought against us. It is said—and the charge has been so often repeated, that charity compels us to suppose it believed by those who make it—that “Episcopalians go to history for their religion, and place the *opinions* of the Fathers on a par with Holy Scripture.” Now this is unfair, because wholly *untrue*. Here is the doctrine of our Church, as contained in Art. VI : “Holy Scripture contain-

eth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." There is the doctrine of Episcopalians. It cannot be concealed. The book in which it is contained, is in the hands of all, and should the minister preach another doctrine, the humblest member of his parish could convict him of unfaithfulness to his vows to preach the doctrine of Christ, "as this Church hath received the same." Unlike some others, *we* do not leave our standards upon the shelf, loaded with the dust of a life-time.

When, then, it may be asked, *do* we appeal to the "Ancient Authors" alluded to in the Preface to the Ordinal? When points are disputed—different constructions placed upon the same texts—and when alleged *facts* are denied to be facts at all. Then, instead of each man setting up himself as an infallible Pope, and claiming that his "Ego Dico," shall be received as truth by all the world besides, thus necessarily producing endless confusion, we say it is better, if it is possible, to go to those who received the Church from the Apostles and Apostolic men, and learn from them as matter of FACT, not of

*opinion*, what *was* the organization and constitution which they received. If it was *Presbyterian*, and they never heard of any other, it settles the question that *we* give the wrong interpretation to the passages of Scripture brought forward to sustain Episcopacy. If, on the other hand, they with one voice declare that it was *Episcopal*, and they never heard of either Presbyterianism or Congregationalism, I will leave it to you to say what conclusion necessarily follows. Are we singular in this appeal to "Ancient Authors?" To peruse the books and pamphlets, and editorials, so lavishly poured forth against us, one would almost suppose that we were. But how is the fact? On points of as great, if not greater importance, our opponents rest their faith and practice as unhesitatingly on this evidence, as we do the argument in favor of Episcopacy. For proof, I refer you to the one all-important question of the CANON OF SCRIPTURE. We have in the New Testament, certain Gospels and Epistles, claiming to be the Word of God, and to be so, too, to the exclusion of all other Gospels and Epistles whatsoever.—How know we that we have got the right ones, and the only ones? These are not the only books claiming to be Gospels, &c. There have come down to us, and some of them from a

very early age,—“The Gospel of the Birth of Mary,” “The Protevangelion, or Gospel of St. James,” two “Gospels of the Infancy of Jesus Christ,” “The Gospel of Nicodemus,” &c.—Who has enabled us to decide that these last are all spurious, and that we have in our present English version of the Bible, *all* that was delivered by inspired men, as the Word of the Lord?—all that is necessary to be believed unto salvation? Did you ever ask yourselves this question? If not, I ask you to ponder it well, and you will find that we are compelled to rest this point, all-important as it is, upon the *testimony* of the primitive Church. *They* received as canonical the very books that *we* do; *they* rejected the others, and *we* reject them.

Again—in reference to our present version of the Scriptures. Certain passages (as for instance, St. Matthew i, St. Luke i, ii, and St. John i, 1—14, and others,) are charged by Socinians to be spurious, or interpolations, and thus they strike out all that proves the Deity of the Son of God. How shall we settle this question? The *originals* are lost, and the same charge will be, and is hurled against the oldest *copies* that can be found. Shall we dispute this point with them till we fall into our graves? Could we ever thus advance one step towards

the truth ? No ! Trinitarians would *say* these passages were genuine—Unitarians, that they were not—and one assertion would be just as strong as the other. Now, if it could be found, as a matter of fact, that all the early writers, who *had* seen the originals, or those persons who had read them, quoted the very passages in dispute as a part of the inspired Word, ought not that fact to settle the dispute in favor of our version as it stands ? So would reason and common sense dictate—and so say our dissenting brethren too, who, upon this point, pin their faith, and rightly too, upon the testimony of the primitive Church.

Once more: we open our Bibles and read the following as coming directly from God Himself: “The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it thou shalt not do any work.*” There stands the command, and I ask of our opponents to show me a single word in the Old or New Testament, directly and authoritatively repealing that command. When we present arguments in favor of the authority of Bishops over other Ministers, it is demanded that we shall bring a positive “Thus saith the Lord,” before they will hear or believe ! The argument is a very specious one, and takes well with superficial thinkers. I have only to say that when my

opponents will bring a "Thus saith the Lord," "Ye may work *every* seventh day," I will most cheerfully comply with this request! They can not do it—they admit they can not do it, and yet every week of their lives they break that command as it stands. It will not do for them to say that they keep the *first* day holy. They may keep as many holy as they please. The question is, how dare they profane the *seventh* day? Why, they tell us very complacently, that they gather by *inference* from the New Testament that the day was changed, and then by going to ecclesiastical history, find, as a matter of *fact*, that it was, and that is enough. So it is, and we only ask the same weight to be attached to the same testimony as to the equally well ascertained *fact* of the Apostolic constitution of the Church.

But here our opponents draw back. On the question of the CANON OF SCRIPTURE, of the passages bearing upon the DIVINITY of the Lord Jesus Christ and of violation of the very letter of the FOURTH COMMANDMENT, "Ancient Authors" are not only unimpeached, but perfectly reliable witnesses. But when we ask that the same umpire shall decide whether the Apostolic Church was Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational they protest. All at once their testi-

mony is nothing but a broken reed! We are gravely informed that some of the early Fathers indulged in curious whims! They present us with some of the vagaries of ORIGEN, for example, and as a smile is raised, they say with an air of triumph,—“Behold your Episcopal witnessses!” Now, all this is grossly unfair—not to say wilfully dishonest. *We* do not appeal to the whimsical interpretation of the Fathers upon certain passages of Scripture, but to their *testimony* as to a *fact* which they must have known all about. Suppose that ORIGEN *had* whims and fancies innumerable. Did they so incapacitate him as a witness, that he did not *know*, as a matter of *fact*, whether, being a Presbyter of Alexandria, his Bishop had authority over him or not? This is all for which we appeal to “Ancient Authors.” *We* say the *Scripture* evidence is sufficient to decide the question in favor of Episcopacy. Our opponents deny this, and maintain, on the contrary, that it proves Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. Very well! let those who received the Apostolic constitution from the Apostles, decide between us.

Here lies the difference between us and our opponents, in the appeal to “Ancient Authors.” *We* admit their testimony as to *all* the *facts*

which either came under their personal knowledge, or in reference to which they could better determine what was the truth than we possibly can. Our opponents, on the contrary, receive or reject their testimony, as it coincides or clashes with their preconceived opinions. An example or two of this wonderful elasticity, of the same species of evidence will verify this assertion. The venerable Dr. DWIGHT, whose theology is so popular with many, when writing on the subject of the TRINITY, INFANT BAPTISM, the change of the SABBATH, etc., makes frequent drafts upon the testimony of the early Fathers, introducing them to the favorable notice of his readers, by such appellations as these, "IGNATIUS, a companion of the Apostles"—"JUSTIN MARTYR, who lived at the close of the first and the beginning of the second century"—"IRENÆUS, a disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John himself, who lived in the second century"—"DYONISIUS, Bishop of Corinth, who lived in the time of Irenæus"—"TERTULLIAN, who also lived in the second century"—"POLYCARP, a disciple of St. John," etc. etc. Not one of these witnesses is impeached. Their testimony is complete and unanswerable. In his sermon on the "Doctrine of the Trinity," he quotes a long list of Fathers, prefacing their testimony with the following very judicious and just remarks :

It will be easily seen that the *time* in which those lived, to whom an appeal of this nature is made, must be important as well as *the character of the witnesses*. *The more ancient* the witnesses are, other things being equal, *the more valuable must be their testimony*, and such testimony, if really ancient, and at the same time, explicit and decisive, can not fail of yielding material satisfaction to every rational inquirer. \* \* \* To the pre-existence of Christ, the following testimonies must, I think, be regarded as *complete*.

And he quotes JUSTIN MARTYR, IRENÆUS, POLYCARP, THEOPHILUS of Antioch, CLEMENS of Alexandria, TERTULLIAN, BARNABAS, HERMAS, &c.

But reverse the picture. Dr. DWIGHT was a Congregationalist, and, like many others, considered himself in duty bound to annihilate the claims of Episcopacy. The Fathers are no longer good witnesses—in fact they are not worthy to be called upon the stand at all! We hear no more of “IGNATIUS, the companion of the Apostles,” etc. etc., but he and the whole host of his illustrious successors, who shed such a brilliancy of light upon the subjects of the TRINITY, INFANT BAPTISM, the LORD’S DAY, etc., are, the very moment they say a word about the equally clear *fact* of Episcopacy, thus unceremoniously turned out of Court in utter disgrace :

As I suppose the testimony of the Fathers of the Church to be the chief ground of reliance, on the part of those who contend for Diocesan Bishops, it will be of some importance to examine on the present occasion,—

1. No testimony from the Fathers can give divine authority to any institution whatever.

The Fathers are merely human witnesses, and are to be regarded with no more confidence, than other human witnesses of equal credibility. All things necessary to life and godliness are given to us in the Scriptures. The testimony of the Fathers, therefore, can add nothing to what is contained in them; can set aside nothing—can change nothing.

*2. The testimony of the Fathers is far from deserving the credit which is sometimes given to it. For those who have testified concerning this subject, have given erroneous testimony concerning other things.*

Now, I respectfully ask, if it is fair, or to be tolerated, that a party may endorse or impeach *his own witness*, at his pleasure?

But the course of Dr. SAMUEL MILLER, of Princeton, throws the worthy Dr. DWIGHT entirely into the back ground. *His* onslaught is upon the Epistles of IGNATIUS, to which reference will soon be made. Among theologians, two sets of these Epistles are known, the "Larger" or "Longer," and the "Shorter" Epistles. The *former* are confessedly interpolated and destitute of authority. The authenticity of the *latter* has been established beyond cavil, and it is from these, that the proofs in favor of Episcopacy are taken. How does Dr. MILLER treat these Epistles? On the subject of the TRINITY, INFANT BAPTISM and the SABBATH, they are as unanswerable in his estimation, as

they were in that of Dr. DWIGHT. He quotes them as decisive against the Unitarians, thus introducing them in his "Letters on Unitarianism :"—

The great body of learned men consider the *smaller* Epistles of Ignatius as, in the main, the real works of the writer, whose name they bear.

But *he*, too, must write on the subject of the "Ministry," and here these same "smaller Epistles" lie across his path. What says he of them now ?—

That even the *shorter* Epistles of Ignatius are unworthy of confidence, as the genuine works of the Father, whose name they bear, is the opinion of many of the ablest and best judges in the Protestant world.

Once more we find Dr. M. engaged in the herculean task of proving that "Ruling Elders," were Scriptural and primitive officers in the Church ! IGNATIUS again crosses his track, and the stumbling block is thus kicked aside :

Intelligent readers are no doubt aware, that the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius has been called in question by a *great majority of Protestant Divines*, and is not only really, but deeply questionable.—*Essay on the Office of Ruling Elder.*

But once again, the Unitarians arise to vex his soul, and IGNATIUS is once more elevated to the rank of an unimpeachable witness ! Hear him now :—

I do not admit that the most learned and able of the critics reject as spurious the *seven shorter Epistles of this Father!*—*Letter on the Eternal Sonship of Christ.*

Now, *we* prefer, instead of making this same species of evidence so very elastic—instead of blowing hot and cold upon the same witness—to make both as good upon the minor *fact* of the Constitution of the Church, as upon the deep and awful but essential mystery of the adorable Trinity in Unity.

The question almost spontaneously arises—“What reason is there for this extraordinary sensitiveness, on the part of Presbyterians, towards the Epistles of IGNATIUS?” We will let GROTIUS, himself a non-Episcopal Divine of the Continent, solve that difficulty. Writing to VOSSIUS, a cotemporary, he says,—“The Epistles of IGNATIUS, which your son brought out of Italy, pure from all those things which the learned have hitherto suspected, BLONDEL, [the champion of the Westminster Assembly of Divines,] will not admit, *because they afford a clear testimony to the antiquity of Episcopacy.*”

And MOSHEIM, the eminent, but non-Episcopal historian, admits the same. He says :

*Perhaps there would be no contention with most persons about the Epistles of Ignatius, if those who contend for the Divine origin and antiquity of Episcopal government had not been enabled to support their cause with them.*

Having now, I trust, cleared away the obstacles heaped in the way of an appeal to this SECOND great authority on this question, I proceed to inquire what the testimony of the early Church was? I admit—clear as the Scripture argument seems to us, if it shall be found as a *fact*, that the Apostles transmitted to their successors the Presbyterian constitution and government—we are bound to yield the whole controversy in favor of our opponents.

The first witness we introduce is CLEMENT, a cotemporary and companion of the Apostles, who is thus spoken of in Philippians iv : 3,—“CLEMENT also, and with other my fellow laborers, whose names are in the Book of Life.” He was—as ecclesiastical history unanimously asserts—made Bishop of Rome in the first century. The Church of Corinth, being again cursed with schisms, heresies and discords, wrote to this holy man for counsel and advice. The Epistle which he returned in answer is yet extant, and is a noble specimen of primitive and godly simplicity and unction. There are two references in it to the Ministry, which I shall quote as bearing on our present discussion. The first is as follows : “So likewise the Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should contentions arise upon the account of

the Ministry. And, therefore, having a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we have before said, and then gave direction how, *when they should die, other chosen and appointed men should succeed in their Ministry.*" Ch. xviii : 16, 17.

This extract is valuable only, as bearing upon the point, which is *now* much disputed, viz : that the Apostles *did* leave successors in the Ministry. In the following he speaks of divers orders—and again you will bear in mind, that mere *names* determine nothing as to the *nature* of the office :—

For the CHIEF PRIEST has *his* proper services; and to the PRIESTS *their* proper place is appointed; and to the LEVITES appertain *their* proper ministries; and the LAYMAN is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen. Ch. xvii : 18.

Here CLEMENT most unquestionably speaks of *three* orders of the Ministry, each bearing appropriate but distinct duties, and all distinguished from the Laity. That he did not refer to the Ministry of the *Jewish* Church, but of the *Christian*, is evident from the verse which immediately follows what we have quoted. "Let every one of *you*, therefore, brethren, bless God in his proper station, with a good conscience and with all gravity, *not exceeding the rule of*

*his service that is appointed him.*" v: 18. Here is CLEMENT'S remedy for the extinguishing of heresy and discord. Here is a writing of the Apostolic age, of the *first* century. Here is a reference to the Christian Ministry, and without dwelling farther upon it, I ask, if CLEMENT speaks of a Ministry of *divers* orders, or of but one? Does he write like an Episcopalian, or like a Presbyterian?

Our next witness is IGNATIUS, whose Epistles are so excellent, or worthless, with our opponents, according to his agreement or disagreement with them. We will now see what IGNATIUS does say of the Ministry, but will first speak a word as to his character—so that you may judge whether or not he is a credible witness. He was the personal disciple of the Apostle St. JOHN, and was by him made Bishop of the Church of Antioch. Though there is some variance as to the length of time that he held this Bishopric, yet it was probably nearly 40 years, beginning about A. D. 70, and ending with his martyrdom in A. D. 107. Full *thirty* years, then, of his eventful christian life were spent in the Apostolic age, and while his instructor, St. John, was living. When he was upwards of four-score years of age, he was arrested and sent to Rome to suffer death for the

crime of being a Christian. During this journey, which he well knew was a journey to the eternal world, where he would meet the Searcher of hearts, he wrote *seven* Epistles, which have come down to us, and which, though once overloaded with heretical additions, have been purified, as GROTIUS expresses it, "from *all* those things which the learned had hitherto suspected."\* A few extracts from these Epistles will suffice to show what opinions IGNATIUS, the disciple of ST. JOHN, held on the subject of the Ministry—whether he was an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian. I read first from his Epistle to the Church of EPHESUS. This was the Church, which, you will remember, we took as our guide in the last Lecture, in tracing out the primitive and Apostolic organization and constitution of the Christian Church. IGNATIUS thus addresses the Ephesian Christians: "I received, therefore, in the name of God, your whole multitude in ONESIMUS who, by inexpressible love is ours; but according to the flesh, is your BISHOP. \* \* \* And blessed be God, who has granted unto you who are so worthy of him, to enjoy such an excellent

---

\* For a triumphant refutation of a still later attempt to throw discredit upon these Epistles, see article in the *London Quarterly Review* for January, 1851.

Bishop." i: 4, 5. "And that, being subject to your BISHOP, and the PRESBYTERY, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified." v: 9. "For even Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is sent by the will of the Father; as the BISHOPS, *appointed unto the utmost bounds of the earth*, are by the will of Jesus Christ. Wherefore it will become you to run together according to the will of your BISHOP as also ye do. For your famous PRESBYTERY, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the BISHOP as the strings are to the harp." v: 12—14.

Here, we find at least *twelve* years after the "*Angel of the Church in Ephesus*," is commended by the Lord Jesus Christ, in his addresses to that Church, (Rev. ii: 1, 2,) *one* person, ONESIMUS by name, spoken of as their BISHOP, with whom they must be in concord, and with whom the PRESBYTERY must be "fitted as the strings are to the harp." Was that Bishop, I ask, then, only one of those *Presbyters*, or was he superior to them? Here again our opponents shift ground most surprisingly.—Their Dr. MILLER, (against whose memory I desire to say nothing; and certainly, against whom *I* entertain no hard feelings, for it was *his* tortuous course in reference to these Epistles of Ignatius that first opened my eyes to the

rotteness of Presbyterianism,) at one moment, by garbling, makes IGNATIUS represent these PRESBYTERS as the *only* successors of the Apostles, and of course, the *only* order of Ministers; and then, in a very few pages thereafter, pressed by the *fact* that Ignatius speaks of "Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons," gravely tell us, he meant only the Pastor of the Church, and his board of *Ruling* Elders and Deacons!\* I am content that the Presbyterians should take *either* argument, as they may please, but to use *both*, contradictory as they necessarily are, is a confession of weakness, from which I trust *we* may ever be spared. Use sophistry and special pleading as one may, the *fact* cannot be evaded, that more than *fifty* years after St. Paul called together the *Elders* of the Church of Ephesus, (and our opponents confess—nay, claim that *they* were *Ministers* of the word,) Ignatius addresses ONESIMUS as *the* BISHOP of the Ephesians! Was he, I ask, a *Presbyterian* or an *Episcopal* Bishop? Let candor and common sense answer.

I read next from his Epistle to the MAGNESIANS: "Seeing then I have been judged worthy

---

\* For a specimen of the garbling and torturing of the Epistles of Ignatius by MILLER, POWELL and others, see Appendix A.

to see you by Damas, your most excellent BISHOP; and by your very worthy PRESBYTERS, Bassus and Apollonius; and by my fellow servant, Sotio, the DEACON; in whom I rejoice, forasmuch as he is subject unto his Bishop as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbyters as to the law of Jesus Christ." (Ch. i: 4, 5.) "I exhort you that ye study to do all things in a divine concord; your BISHOP presiding in the place of God, your PRESBYTERS in the place of the council of the Apostles; and your DEACONS, most dear to me, *being intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ.*" ii: 4, 5. Are not *three* orders of the Ministry here spoken of? And though it may be admitted for the sake of the argument, that Ignatius writes in the florid style of the East, yet, I ask, if the conclusion can be evaded, that the BISHOP occupied a *higher* position than did the PRESBYTERS? And can we doubt that *both* were Ministers of the Gospel, when Ignatius expressly and so positively asserts, that even the DEACONS were "*intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ?*" Were they, then, only the *lay* Deacons of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists?

I will invite your attention to but one more extract from the writings of IGNATIUS. I read from his Epistle to the TRALLIANS: "It is

therefore necessary that as ye do, so without your BISHOP you should do nothing; also be ye subject to your PRESBYTERS as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope, in whom, if we walk, we shall be found in Him. The DEACONS also, as being the *Ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ*, must, by all means please all. For they are *not the Ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of God*” “In like manner let all reverence the DEACONS as Jesus Christ; and the BISHOP as the Father, and the PRESBYTERS as the Sanhedrim of God and college of the Apostles. *Without these the Church is not called.*” (i: 6, 9.)

Does Ignatius speak of *one* order of the Ministry, or of *three*? Like explicit declarations might be quoted from his Epistles to the PHILADELPHIANS, the SMYRNÆANS, and to POLYCARP, but we must forbear. Take this testimony of this early Father—this holy martyr, who lived and talked with the Apostles themselves—who sat at the feet of St. John—and tell me, honestly and candidly, of what Church is he speaking, *Episcopal* or *Presbyterian*? If he is to be believed,—and who will say that venerable and holy old man intended to deceive—then were the Churches of Antioch, of Ephesus, of Smyrna, of Magnesia, of Trallia and of Philadelphia,

*Episcopal*, when Ignatius lived, and he was martyred in A. D. 107.

Our next witness is POLYCARP, who was a disciple of St. John, and as the early Church testifies, was the "Angel of the Church in Smyrna," who received such a blessed commendation from the Great Head of the Church. (Rev. ii: 8—10.) He was the companion and intimate friend of Ignatius, but survived him about 40 years, being martyred, as is supposed, about A. D. 148. One Epistle of his is extant. It was written to the Philippians, and is important as bearing upon the present discussion, from the entire endorsement which he gives to the Epistles of Ignatius, which we have just considered. He says: "The Epistles of Ignatius, which he wrote to us, together with what others of his have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order; by which you may be greatly profited, for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that appertain to edification in the Lord Jesus." With this full ratification, making the testimony of Ignatius his own, we may say that if POLYCARP is worthy of credence, the Churches of Asia Minor must have been *Episcopal* from A. D. 70 to A. D. 148.

We pass down the current of History another period of thirty and more years, and come to

the testimony of IRENÆUS. In his youth, he had been the disciple of POLYCARP, and frequently in his writings refers to the instructions of that holy martyr in proof of the correctness of the positions he maintained against the heretics. IRENÆUS, our opponents being judges, was a learned and pious man. He was, at the time he wrote, Bishop of the Church in Lyons. He wrote against the heresies, which, even then, began to rend the body of Christ. Listen to his most explicit testimony :

“We can reckon up those whom the Apostles ordained to be Bishops in the several Churches, and who they were that succeeded them, down to our own times. For the Apostles desired to have those in all things perfect and unreprouchable, whom they left to be their *successors*, [Mark this !] and to whom they committed their own *Apostolic authority*. We have the *successions of Bishops* to whom the Apostolic Church, *in every place*, was committed.”

Again he says : “With the *succession of their Episcopacy*, they have the sure gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father.”

It appears, then, that in the time of IRENÆUS, the “Apostolical Succession” was not that “figment,” that “nursery fable,” that “child’s story, worthy only of all contempt,” that it has

been pronounced to be during the past half score of years !

Again: IRENÆUS says he will not, though he could, give the succession in *all* the Churches, but will content himself with that of Rome, which being the Church of the Imperial City, would justly serve as an example of all. Of that Church, he says : “The Blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, therefore, founding and instructing the Church of Rome, delivered to LINUS, the administration of its Bishopric,—Paul makes mention of this Linus in his Epistles to Timothy ; to him succeeded ANACLETUS ; after whom, in the third place from the Apostles, CLEMENT had the Bishopric allotted to him. He had seen the Blessed Apostles, and was conversant with them, and as yet he had the preaching of the Apostles sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes ; and not he alone, for at that time there were yet many remaining alive, who had been taught by the Apostles.—To this Clement succeeded EVARISTUS, and to Evaristus, ALEXANDER ; and XYSTUS was appointed the sixth from the Apostles ; and after him TELESPHORUS, who suffered a glorious martyrdom ; after him HYGINUS, then PIUS ; after him ANICETUS. And SOTER having succeeded Anicetus, ELEUTHERUS, now [near the close of the

second century,] has the Bishopric in the twelfth place from the Apostles. By this order and succession, that tradition, which is from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, is descended unto us.”

If IRENÆUS is to be believed, I ask if there was not, and had not always been, in that large and flourishing Church of Rome, *one* person who presided over it as the successor of the Apostles? And had that Church but *one* Pastor, even as late as A. D. 170? The idea is preposterous, especially when considered in connection with the recorded fact, that a very few years thereafter, CORNELIUS, Bishop of Rome, had under him forty-six Presbyters and seven Deacons. The *Romish* Church, then, in its purest days, when its Bishops tasted of the cup of martyrdom for the cause of Jesus, was an *Episcopal* Church.

Did the limits of a single Lecture permit, I could go on and read similar testimony from TERTULLIAN, a cotemporary of IRENÆUS; and in the 3d century from ORIGEN, CLEMENT and others, as to the Episcopal character of the Church in Alexandria: from CYPRIAN as to that of Carthage, and of Northern Africa; and of other writers, both of the East and of the West. Their testimony is uniform, that in each

Church, however large might be the number of preaching and baptizing Presbyters and Deacons, there was a BISHOP, and he the superior officer, the ruler of the Clergy, alone possessing the power to ordain.

In the 4th century, we have the evidence of the various Councils held, composed of Bishops from all parts of the Christian world,—and *England* sent Bishops, too, 250 years before Augustine set foot on her shores—that the Church in all regions was under *Episcopal* government. In 324, a Council of Egyptian Bishops declared void the ordinations of Colluthus, a Presbyter, who began for the first to claim a power, which confessedly in all time before had been exercised by Bishops alone. Even JEROME, of the 5th century, whose single exclamation is the sole food of our opponents, only claims that Presbyters possessed as much power as did the Bishops, “except ordination!” an exception which goes the whole length of the claims of Episcopacy!

I have confined this historical inquiry to the testimony of the Fathers of the first *four* centuries, because then the Church was in her purest state. The world had to this time persecuted “all who professed and called themselves Christians.” This persecution had kept

her comparatively pure, and to this time, walking in the true paths of the "Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," she had proclaimed the Gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth. Everywhere we find that the Church is Episcopal—that the Ministry exists in *three* orders, the *Bishop* alone possessing the power to ordain, and in the only case where Presbyters had dared to assume that prerogative, the act is condemned, and the men thus ordained reduced to the ranks of Laymen, to which alone, they rightly belonged.

It was, moreover, unnecessary to extend this inquiry beyond the 4th century, because at *that* time *all* our opponents admit that Episcopacy *everywhere* prevailed. And, indeed, the most of their writers are candid enough to admit such universal prevalence as early as the *second* century. I refer for the proof of this last assertion to BLONDEL, the champion of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who, though pinning his faith, as do all Presbyterians, upon the single assertion of JEROME, that BISHOPS were appointed over PRESBYTERS when the Church began to be troubled with schisms, only attempts to bring this period down to the middle of the 2d century. His words are: "Which cannot be *sufficiently* proved to have been *before* the year

104!" And so do the Westminster Divines understand him. In one of their works (the "*Jus Divinum Ministerium Anglicani*,") they ask the question: "How long was it that the Church of Christ was governed by the common council of Presbyters without a Bishop set over them?" They answer: "Dr. BLONDEL, a man of great learning and reading, undertakes in a large discourse, to make out that before the year 140, there was not a Bishop *set over Presbyters!*" The very argument, it will readily be perceived by all, is a concession that *after* that time a BISHOP *was* "set over," i. e., had power over PRESBYTERS.

GROTIUS, a Presbyterian, or member of the Church of Holland, is most explicit in his admissions. He, unlike others of the same class, understands even JEROME, the forlorn hope of our opponents, to assert most positively that the institution of Diocesan Bishops was from the very first age. An extract or two from the writings of GROTIUS must suffice. One section of the 11th chapter of his work on "Church Government," is thus headed: "The word *Bishop* is explained, and is shown *in this question* to signify a Pastor, *who presides over Pastors by a certain perpetual right.*" There can then be no dispute between us as to the mean-

ing of Bishop, or Episcopacy. Now in this chapter, GROTIUS makes this remark, and the reader may judge whether or no it bears out our assertion: "The third thing is this, that the *Episcopate had its commencement in the time of the Apostles*. The catalogues of the Bishops in Irenæus, Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret and others, all of which begin in the Apostolic age, testify this. But to refuse credit in a historical matter to so great authors, and so unanimous among themselves, *is not the part of any but an irreverent and stubborn disposition.*"

BUCER, one of the Continental Reformers, thus writes :

By the perpetual observation of all the Churches, *even from the Apostles' time*, we see that it seemed good to the HOLY GHOST, that among Presbyters, to whom the procuration of Churches was chiefly committed, there should be one that should have the care or charge of divers Churches, and the whole ministry committed to him; and, by reason of that charge, he was above the rest; and therefore the name of Bishop was peculiarly attributed to those chief rulers.

PETER DU MOULIN, an eminent Theological Professor of the French Presbyterian Church, is thus frank in his concession of the early and universal prevalence of Episcopacy :

Our adversaries unjustly accuse us to be enemies of the Episcopal order; for we must be altogether ignorant in history if we do not know that antiquity speaks honorably of that degree. Eusebius in his Chronicle, witnesseth, that a year after our Lord's death, James, our Lord's brother, was established Bishop of Jerusalem; and that ten years after, Euodius was created Bishop of Antioch; and that after James succeeded Simon in the Bishopric of Jerusalem; from whence descended the succession of Bishops in Jerusalem. St. Jerome, in his book of Ecclesiastical writers, saith that Polycarp, St. John's disciple, was by that Apostle made Bishop of Smyrna. In the same book he saith that St. Paul established Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus, Bishop of Crete. And Tertullian, in the thirty-second chapter of the Book of Prescriptions, calleth those Churches 'Apostolical Churches, and buds and sprigs of the Apostles, whose Bishops were established by the Apostles,' etc. If, sometimes we speak against the authority of Bishops, we condemn not the Episcopal order in itself, but speak only of the corruption which the Church of Rome has introduced into it.

Dr. DODRIDGE .(*clarum et venerabile nomen,*) says "the distinction between *Bishops and Presbyters* does not appear of *earlier date* than the time of *Ignatius!*" Early enough, surely, when *that* carries us back to the Apostolic and Scriptural age!

And not to quote others, the learned Dr. CAMPBELL, of Scotland, while arguing to prove the *original* parity of the Ministry, says that it "seems to have assumed the model of a proper

Episcopate, *as the word is now understood, before the middle of the second century.*"

Even Dr. MILLER, late of Princeton, (" *pax cineri!*") though determined to prove Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Irenæus, etc., etc., only godly Presbyterian Ministers with their benches of Ruling Elders and Deacons, surrenders all opposition when we come to the *fourth* century.

And yet, these very writers who admit the universal prevalence of Episcopacy in the 2d, 3d and 4th centuries, and some of them as early as Ignatius, gravely insist that the *original* constitution of the Church was Presbyterian— all the Ministers being of one grade and equal in power and authority, and that *Episcopacy* was brought about by one in each Church, *assuming* powers over his fellows, and compelling them to submit to his usurped domination! Still, not a record of such usurpation is to be found in *any* Church! nor the first remonstrance of the *degraded*, against the injustice done them! not a protest against the assumption of such unscriptural powers! Can this be so? Why, look at facts for a moment. At the close of the *second* century, and we will take that early period (for the *later* we go, the worse for our opponents to make out even a plausibility,) the Church had spread through all parts

of Asia Minor, and the countries of the East ; Greece had been evangelized ; Italy was “filled with Christians,” as Tertullian testifies ; Egypt and Ethiopia had their hundreds of Churches ; Carthage and Northern Africa, numbered *their* millions of Christians ; Spain and Gaul were “added to the Lord ;” and even far-off England gave up *her* Christian martyrs as seals of her adhesion to the true faith. Every where throughout the known world did “men lift up holy hands” unto the Lord. According to the most reasonable computation that can be made, there must have been full *two hundred millions* of Christians in the beginning of the *third* century. And yet, confessedly, our opponents themselves being judges, *there was not a Presbyterian Church to be found on the face of the whole earth !* Not one which was not governed by Diocesan Bishops, each claiming to rule all the Presbyters under him, and the whole Church *by Divine right !* And we are gravely asked to believe that this great, universal, almost miraculous change was brought about in utter silence ! that all the Presbyters in each Diocese submitted to this usurpation of their equal, without a murmur ! Nay, more ! permitted the Bishops not only thus to mount above them, but to claim everywhere that they did so by virtue

of *Apostolic* authority, and actually to condemn as schismatical, the ordination by Presbyters, and reduce such ordained again to the ranks of the Laity! Yes! all this is done in Asia Minor, in Persia, in Arabia, in Greece, in Italy, in Africa, in Spain, in Gaul, and in Britain, and yet the silence of the grave is found, as to the existence of a protest, or a murmur, on the part of those Presbyters, not out-voted, but everywhere crushed by the tyranny of *one* man! Is not the very pretence preposterous? the claim *absurdity* itself? Why let the experiment be tried now. Let one of the members of a Synod, Presbytery or Association, I care not how venerable and learned and influential he may be, attempt thus to rise above his fellows, and put them down by the mere claim of Divine right, and think you he would succeed? If by the magic influence of his eloquence he could carry with him a party strong enough to enforce his claims, would the crushed minority submit without a protest or a murmur? *Credat Judæus, non Ego!* And yet we are told that all this *did* happen, not in *one* Synod or Church merely, but in every Church throughout the world, and at the very time, too, when the minor question of the proper day to celebrate Easter, called out such discussion and contentions

as to threaten, and well nigh produce a schism between the Eastern and Western Churches !— Well did CHILLINGWORTH say of this claim and absurdity : “ When I shall see all the Democracies and Aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into Monarchies, then will I begin to believe that Presbyterian government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles’ times, should presently after (against the Apostles’ doctrine and the will of Christ,) be whirled about like a scene in a masque, and transformed into Episcopacy.” Who, I ask, *can* believe this ? Is not the very idea preposterous ? and yet, every whit of it *must* be believed if we reject the position that Episcopacy was the Primitive, Apostolical, Scriptural system. CHILLINGWORTH continues from the extract just given, and I commend his words to the careful attention of all : “ In the meantime, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus : Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles’ times. Between the Apostles’ times and this ‘ presently after,’ there was not time enough *for*, nor possibility *of* so great an alteration. And therefore there was no such altera-

tion as is pretended ; and therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be *Apostolic*."

Here I might rest the argument. The fact that Episcopacy is *now* impugned, and that thousands who have voluntarily thrown aside this "better," because ancient and Scriptural "way," seek to justify themselves by attacking that way, does not at all invalidate the evidence in favor of the Divine origin of Episcopacy.—But, knowing as I do, that many will not go back of the era of the Reformation in the 16th century, but prefer to pin their faith wholly upon the doctrines of the Reformers ; I propose, before closing this Lecture, to consider briefly the testimony of these men, from whose justly deserved reputation I have no desire to detract in the least. In England, the Reformers were the Bishops themselves, who destroyed not the venerable building, but only cast out the usurpations and corruptions of Popery. They retained whatever they found in Holy Scripture and the writers of the first four centuries. And I need not stop to say that they there found *Episcopacy*, and did *not* find either *Popery* or *Presbyterianism* ! Hence the English Church was, and is, what it had ever been—Episcopal. But on the continent, with, perhaps, one exception, the

Reformers established a Presbyterian government. But on what ground? That it was Scriptural? No. That it was the government of the Primitive Church? No. But solely on the ground of necessity. The Bishops, borne down with the maledictions and persecutions of the *temporal* as well as the *papal* power, dared not, and could not reform the Churches over which they presided. Hence the Reformers supposed the emergency had arisen, in which "necessity knows no law," and they laid Episcopacy aside. But they regretted this necessity—they avowed their anxious desire to retain Episcopacy—they said it was but temporary—others lamented that they were not so highly favored as were their brethren in England.—Doubtless these sound like strange words to some, but let the Reformers speak for themselves.

LUTHER, regretting that the Popish Bishops would not cease to persecute, says: "We would acknowledge them as our Fathers, and willingly obey their authority, *which we find supported by the Word of God.*"

MELANCTON, the mainspring of the Reformation on the continent, said:

"I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops, for I see what manner

of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical polity being dissolved. I do see that hereafter there will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than ever was before.”

CALVIN, the father of Genevan Presbyterianism, is no less explicit in his admiration and desire for Episcopacy. He says :

If they will give us such a hierarchy, in which the Bishops have such a pre-eminence as that they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ, I will confess that they *are worthy of all anathemas*, if any such there be, *who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it with the utmost obedience.*

BEZA, if I may so call him, the twin-Father of Presbyterianism with Calvin, thus wrote to Archbishop WHITGIFT :

In my writings touching Church Government, I ever impugned the Romish hierarchy, but never intended to touch or impugn the Church of England.

It was essential that, by the perpetual ordination of God, *it was, it is, and it will be necessary* that some one in the Presbytery, chief, both in place and dignity, should preside, to govern the proceedings *by that right which is given him of God.*

If there are any, as you will not easily persuade me, who would reject the whole order of Bishops, God *forbid that any man in his senses should assent to their madness.*

These are not *my* words, but those of the Presbyterian Reformer, BEZA.

DU BOSC, a French Protestant, thus writes in 1660 to Dr. BREVIENT of England :

We acknowledge that this order hath signal advantages, and I think not that any of my brethren will contradict me, if I say that well-ordered Episcopacy hath most important and considerable utilities which cannot be found in the Presbyterian discipline. If we have followed the last in our Churches, it is not for any aversion that we have to the former; it is not because we hold Episcopacy to be contrary to the nature of the Gospel, or because we think it less convenient for the good of the Church, or less worthy of the condition of the true flocks of the Lord; but it is because *necessity* hath obliged us to it; because reformation having been begun in this kingdom by the people and by inferior Churchmen, the places of Bishops remained filled with men of a contrary religion, so that we were constrained to content ourselves with Ministers and Elders as well as we could, for fear of setting Bishop against Bishop in the same town, which would have caused furious troubles and implacable wars, and put a great stop to the progress of the Gospel. If Bishops had embraced the Reformation at the first, I make no doubt but that their order had been maintained in the ecclesiastical polity. Wherefore the practice of the Churches of *France* ought to be no precedent for the Church of *England*. For in the Church of *England* Reformation, having been begun by the Bishops, there would be reason to think it strange if Episcopacy had not been preserved therein. And if there be any in England at this time that be so rigidly partial for Presbyterian parity, as to justle against that ancient order of Episcopacy, and seek to root it quite out to the prejudice both of *Church* and *State*, they cannot but be very much blamed for it.

Such was the uniform testimony of the Reformers. But having let go the sure anchor of primitive Episcopacy, they soon began to drift

towards the quicksands of error, and heresy was added to schism. Many of the same men, or their immediate successors, were found attempting to justify Presbyterianism by the Word of God. But, I ask, if the history of the last 300 years has not fully verified the apprehensions of MELANCTHON? See those continental Churches, sunk in a mass, in the deep and damning slough of Socinianism—while the Church of England, say what her enemies will, is as pure in doctrine now as when she came forth from the furnace of Popish persecution in the 16th century. Yes! and *Popery* knows it well, she is this moment the mightiest champion of Protestant Christendom, and the *only* enemy that *Popery* fears.

I close this argument in favor of the universality of Episcopacy from the Apostles' times—this unanimous testimony against Presbyterianism, either in the Apostles' times, or since, with the words of HOOKER, written in 1594. His challenge was to those who, in England and elsewhere, had *begun* to impugn Episcopacy, and defend the Presbyterian polity. “A very strange thing sure, it were,” said he, “that such a discipline as ye speak of, should be taught by Christ and His Apostles in the Word of God, and no Church have ever found it out, nor

*received it till this present time. Contrariwise, the government against which ye band yourselves be observed everywhere, throughout all generations and ages of the Christian world, no Church ever perceiving the Word of God to be against it. We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, i. e., by Episcopal regimen, since the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant."*

That challenge has never been answered—it never will be—for it never can be. Is not, then, I ask, that declaration of our Church strictly true, when she says in the Preface to the Ordinal: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church,—BISHOPS, PRIESTS and DEACONS?"

I have but glanced at the mass of testimony which can be brought forward on this subject. I have sought to do little more than to throw out suggestions, trusting that you, at your leisure, would follow them out. I repeat, Episcopacy asks, invites, nay, *demands* investigation—full, thorough, and complete. May we be all led to the truth, that it may make us free indeed!

### LECTURE III.

#### Deacons—An Order of the Clergy, and not mere Laymen.

In the first of these Lectures it was stated, in substance, that the main point of difference between the Episcopal and Presbyterian theories, was in the claim of those who held to the former, that BISHOPS were a superior order of the Clergy, possessing alone the power of ordination, PRESBYTERS and DEACONS being wholly excluded from a participation in that right. If we failed to prove this position, it was remarked that we would willingly give up the third and minor order of DEACONS, and agree with our opponents, that there was but *one* order of Ministers, viz: Presbyters. or Elders. To this one point, has this discussion thus far been limited, and it is respectfully submitted, that the position we occupy has been abundantly sustained by the sure testimony of Scripture and Ancient Authors. I did not, however, mean to be understood as conceding, that the question of the Clerical or Lay character of DEACONS, the third order in the Apostolic Ministry, was unimportant, but only that it was *comparatively* so, in

relation to the other cardinal doctrine of the superiority, *Jure Divino*, of BISHOPS. Our position ever is, that the Apostolic, Christian Ministry is *threefold*, consisting of BISHOPS, PRESBYTERS and DEACONS. In relation to the *second*, we have no controversy with our opponents. The arguments and facts, touching the rights and powers of the *first*, have already been presented. And before proceeding with the discussion of other matters, it will not be deemed amiss, I trust, to devote a few moments to the consideration of the evidence in favor of our assertion, that DEACONS were, in Apostolic times and since, “*an order of the Clergy, and not mere Laymen.*”

It will be well to inquire, “what is the office of a DEACON, as understood and maintained in the Church of England, and our own, which has derived the same from that Church?” This inquiry answered, we shall then be ready to compare the office thus held with the only rightful test, Scripture and History. It is not enough to prove our opponents *wrong*. It must also be shown that we are *right*. This is not only good logic, but the common sense view of the case, though it seems to be strangely forgotten by all those who have undertaken to topple down Episcopacy from its sure foundation upon the “Rock of Ages.” The office is thus minutely

described in one of the questions, addressed by the Bishop to the candidate for the Diaconate :

It appertaineth to the office of a DEACON, in the Church where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof; and to read holy Scripture and Homilies in the Church; and to instruct the youth in the Catechism; in the absence of the Priest to baptize infants; and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop. And, furthermore, it is his office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor and impotent people of the Parish, to intimate their estates, names and places where they dwell, unto the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners, or others: will you do this gladly and willingly?

The office of the Deacon is thus declared to be, to search after the poor, etc., that thus they may be relieved by the alms of the Church, and to assist the Priest in performing Divine Service, and especially at the celebration of the Holy Communion. And yet he *may* both *preach and baptize*. In these last particulars we differ *in toto* from our opponents, and we proceed to inquire who has retained the *whole* of the primitive and scriptural office? We *agree* in making Deacons the almoners of the bounties of the Church,—we *disagree*, as to their right or power to exercise *clerical* functions. “To the Law and to the Testimony,” be the appeal.

I remark (1) that the mere *name*, "Deacon," will not decide this question either way. The SEVEN, whose appointment is recorded in Acts vi., are not *called* Deacons, either there or elsewhere in the New Testament. And yet, as all are agreed that there was the *origin* of the office, there is no necessity to argue the question, whether or not, STEPHEN and his colleagues *were* Deacons. The word means simply a *servant* or *minister*, and is most generally translated the latter where it occurs in holy Scripture. It and its kindred word, signifying the *office*, or Deaconship, occur in the New Testament, at least, *fifty-three* times, and perhaps oftener. They are applied to a variety of things, persons and offices, the peculiar meaning of each being determined by the context, or the attendant circumstances. A few examples of these various renderings will illustrate, as well as prove our assertion :

In Acts i : 17, we read thus concerning Judas, "For he was numbered with us and had obtained part of this *Ministry*" [Greek, "*Deaconship*."] Here the word is applied to the *Apostolic* office. In Acts vi : 1, 2, 4, it thus reads, "And in those days when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their

widows were neglected in the daily *ministration*. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and *serve* tables. \* \* \* But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the *ministry* of the word." The word translated "serve," in the second verse, is "Deacon," and that rendered "ministration" in verse 1, and "ministry" in verse 4, is "Deaconship." The Evangelist makes not the change of a letter or an accent, between the "ministration" of alms to the poor widow, and the "ministry" of the word, to which the Apostles were to confine themselves. Evidently, then, the *word* here used does not of itself, determine the nature of these respective offices. Again, in Acts xi : 29, we read, "Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send *relief* [Gr. 'a Deaconship,'] unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea." Here, it will be perceived, the word is applied to the money sent, and not to the bearers thereof. In Acts xii : 25, it reads, "And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their *ministry*," [Gr., "Deaconship,"] alluding to the relief mentioned in the previous chapter. To the Romans, chapter xi : 13, St. Paul thus writes, "Inasmuch as I am the Apos-

tle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine *office*," [Gr., "Deaconship."] Here again the word is applied to the *Apostolic* office. The corresponding phrase, Deacon, is, in Romans xiii: 4, applied to the civil ruler, "For he is the *Minister* [Gr., 'Deacon'] of God to thee for good;" in chapter xv: 8, to the Lord Jesus Christ, "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a *Minister* [Gr., 'Deacon'] of the circumcision;" in 1 Cor. iii: 5; Eph. iii: 7, and Col. i: 23, to the Apostles personally: "Who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but *Ministers* [Gr., 'Deacons'] by whom ye believed?" "Whereof I (Paul) was made a *Minister*:" "Whereof I Paul am made a *Minister*," [Gr., "Deacon."] In Ephesians vi: 21, it is applied to Tychicus, the amanuensis of St. Paul, who is there called "a beloved brother and faithful *Minister*," [Gr., "Deacon."] In Philippians i: 1, we read a salutation to the "Bishops and *Deacons*." Here, as all agree, the word refers to a distinct office, as it also does in 1 Timothy iii: 8—13, to which passage a more particular reference will presently be made.

From these examples of the indiscriminate use of the term, it being applied to the Saviour, to Apostles, to Deacons proper, and even to civil rulers, it is very clear, as already remarked, that the mere *word* settles nothing. I would, how-

ever, in passing, respectfully ask of those who perceive such a world of meaning, and such a conclusiveness of demonstration, in the admitted fact that the *words* "Bishop" and "Presbyter," are once or twice used interchangeably in the New Testament, how they would answer one who should attempt to prove that there was only *one* office in the Ministry, indeed, but that that was the office of a Deacon? He could bring four proofs to one against his *Presbyter* antagonist! I will offset the argument of the one against the other, and leave it to the friends of parity to determine the precise weight which belongs to each!

Having now cleared away the mist which ever attaches itself to a quarrel about mere *names*, we are ready to inquire, "what was the *office*, the institution of which, as all admit, is recorded in the 6th chapter of the Book of Acts?"

Let us somewhat minutely examine the particulars of that transaction, as recorded by the sacred penman.

1. Observe the *qualifications* required by the Apostles. If these Deacons were to be set apart for no other or higher purpose than to take cognizance of the temporalities of the Church, nor all of these, but only of the collection and distribution of alms, it would have sufficed, as all

will agree, that they should have been men possessing an ordinary amount of good sense, integrity and piety. The office in such a case would have been analogous to the Wardens of our own Churches, or the *Lay* Deacons of the denominations about us, and nothing more is required or expected of these. But what did the Apostles enjoin the people on this occasion? "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, FULL OF THE HOLY GHOST AND WISDOM, whom we may appoint over this business." And that they complied is evident from the fact, that it is expressly said of STEPHEN, one of the seven, that he *was* "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." Now I respectfully ask, if it was not strange that the Apostles should have demanded such exalted *spiritual* qualifications for a mere *secular* office? Is there any conceivable relation between *such* qualifications and such an *office*? Let us, for illustration, suppose, what would be an analogous case in our day. One of our Bishops is entrusted with the disbursement of a large fund for the poor and afflicted of his Diocese, or of a particular congregation, it matters not which. At first, he performs all this work himself. But presently the multiplicity of his other engage-

ments does not leave him sufficient time to inquire into the merits of all the applications, and he desires, therefore, to pass over to others this particular branch of his multifarious duties. He prefers that the Church should select the men whom he may thus appoint as almoners for the poor. Now, would it be necessary—I appeal to the common sense of every reader—that for such a purpose only, he should ask the Church to select persons “*full of the Ho’y Ghost and of wisdom?*” Would not the other qualification named, viz: that they should be “*of honest report,*” be sufficient? Surely this is a self-evident position. There is, then, at the outset, *prima facie* evidence against our opponents, who insist that these primitive Deacons were no other than such as we have supposed. The means and the end have no relative proportion to each other. It is well nigh inconceivable, that the Apostles should have required the selection of men endowed with the noblest *spiritual* gifts, to do what any *honest* disciple, of ordinary intelligence and business capacity, would have been abundantly competent to perform.

But, (2) in addition to all this, these persons were solemnly **ORDAINED** by the Apostles.—We read in the sixth verse of this chapter, that

“when they [the Apostles] had prayed, *they laid their hands on them.*” Our opponents cannot deny that this *was* an *ordination*, for so do they interpret this phrase of laying on of hands.—The inquiry arises spontaneously, and its answer is as readily suggested—Is it probable, that for the mere distribution of charity, *such* a solemnity would have been performed? In the supposed case, just put, would that Bishop not only require the highest *spiritual* gifts, but actually deem it necessary to *ordain* the persons chosen, before permitting them to enter upon the discharge of a merely *secular* duty? Does not then, this very fact, that such qualifications *were* demanded, and ordination super-added thereto, well nigh carry conviction—even if there were opposing testimony, which there is not—that *something more* was required than that *secular* duty, in which *none* of these gifts or ordination were at all necessary? The fact that no Church, catholic or heretic, ever conceived the idea of *Lay* Deacons for 1500 years of the Christian Era, is the best answer to such a question.

But, (3) we find farther, that at least two of these seven, STEPHEN and PHILIP, were, immediately after their appointment and ordination,

engaged in *ministerial* labors. "STEPHEN, *full of faith and power*, did great wonders and miracles among the people," (verse 8.) The antagonists who disputed with him "were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake," (verse 10.) "PHILIP went down to the city of Samaria and *preached* Christ unto them." "But when they believed PHILIP *preaching* the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women." (Acts viii: 5—12.) I know very well that it is said by our opponents, that they did not preach and baptize, by virtue of this ordination. But where, I ask, is the *authority* for such an assertion? As *we* are not allowed to *suppose* anything, it is but fair to hold our antagonists to the same rule. The burden of proof lies wholly on the objector. Here is the simple record that PHILIP, at least, *preached* and *baptized*, and unless some other authority for those acts can be shown, the proof is not only presumptive, but unimpeachable, that he did so by virtue of his office of Deacon. I am aware that it is answered to this argument, that PHILIP is called an "Evangelist," and that he must have received authority to preach by virtue of *that*

office, conferred upon him at some time, when or how, no one knows, for the record is wholly silent as to any such transaction. I repeat, the burden of proof is upon those who advocate such a position. PHILIP is not called an "Evangelist," except in the 21st chapter of Acts, and that was nearly thirty years after he preached and baptized in Samaria. As the word "Evangelist," simply means "a Preacher of the Gospel,"—neither more nor less—is it not, I ask, quite as probable that PHILIP received this appellation *because* he *preach'd*, as that he preached *because* he is called an *Evangelist*? It may not be out of place to remark here, that this word "*Evangelist*," is very elastic in the hands of our Presbyterian opponents! Out of it has been made to grow the *Apostolic* authority of TIMOTHY and TITUS! Though adhering to *parity* as a cardinal doctrine—in fact, the very foundation stone of the Christian Ministry,—Presbyterians are forced to manufacture a *new* and *distinct* order, because, forsooth, no other answer *can* be framed against the impregnable position of Episcopalians, that TIMOTHY and TITUS were vested with full APOSTOLIC authority, and that with them commenced that Apostolical Succession, which has not ceased, and will not end until the last saint shall have been born into

the Kingdom of God. Is not this flying to contradictory positions to sustain a foregone conclusion, the evidence, rather, of a weakness in this fundamental dogma of our opponents ?

But here we meet an objection, which is based on the declaration of the Apostles, in Acts, vi : 2—4, “It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God, and serve tables. \*

\* \* But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word.”—And is this such overwhelming evidence against us, that it is not to be gainsayed ? Is the Ministry or *Deaconship* (for as we have seen the word is the same in the fourth as in the first verse.) of the *word*, so incompatible with that of *tables*, that the two cannot be united in the same office ? *Must* this consideration sweep away at once, all the presumptive evidence we have founded on the *qualifications* and the *ordination* of these men, and the fact that they did *preach* and *lap'ize*, as well as “serve tables ?” I apprehend not. It only proves that the APOSTLES, then having the *ch ef* work of preaching the Gospel—being “in labors more abundant”—thought it best to relieve themselves from that *lesser* duty which could as well be performed by others who were charged with a less arduous Ministry. Thus St. PAUL refused to *baptize*,

alleging that "Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." (1 Cor. i: 17.)— This declaration, I apprehend, would hardly support the theory that St. PAUL, who was not behind the very chief of the Apostles, had no *authority* to baptize! Nor do the words of the Apostles, upon which we are commenting, any the more invalidate the *sacred* or *clerical* character of those primitive Deacons. The Apostles wished to give themselves "*continually* to the ministry of *the word*." They did not wish to be *interrupted* in that work. But they, by no means, say, or hint, that they could not discharge the duties of these Deacons, without a surrender of their Ministry of the Word! And yet this is implied in the objection, or it has no weight.

I ask, in passing from the consideration of this passage in the 6th chapter of Acts, if there is anything in the record or the transaction, at all inconsistent with the description of the office of a Deacon, as read from the Ordination Service in the Prayer Book? Does not that office harmonize with *all* the duties which these first Deacons were to, and did discharge? Is there not something lacking, when they are made nothing but Laymen?

After the lapse of some twenty or twenty-five years from this first appointment of Deacons, we find St. Paul thus addressing the Philippians: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the *saints* in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the *Bishops* and *Deacons*." (Phil. i: 1.) Here we find a separate class, called DEACONS, distinct from the APOSTLES who send the salutation; from the BISHOPS, or PRESEYTERS, or PRESEYTER-BISHOPS, (call them which you will,) and from the SAINTS or body of the LAITY. As this address could not have been made to all or any of the original seven Deacons, we have here an indisputable evidence that the *office* itself, be it what it may, was to be perpetuated. The question arises, and fortunately it is fully answered in the Scriptures,—What *qualifications* and *duties* were expected, at *this time*, from these officers of the Church? We turn to the cotemporary Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, and there read as follows, after directions had been given as to the character, etc., of a Bishop: "Likewise must the DEACONS be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre." (1 Tim. iii: 8.) Here we find qualifications named which are necessary to fit them for the discharge of the *Lay* portion of their duties,

viz : gravity, sincerity, sobriety and honesty.— The Apostle then continues : “ Holding the MYSTERY OF THE FAITH in a pure conscience.” (verse 9.) A very strange exhortation indeed would this be, to address to such officers as our Wardens and Vestrymen, or to the incumbent of any mere secular office ! Mark the expression : “  *Holding the mystery of the Faith.*” Such language belongs only to one who, as St. Paul says in another place, was “ allowed of God to be put in trust of the Gospel.” It is an address to *Clergymen* and not to *Laymen*. But the Apostle continues : “ And let them also first be proved ; then let them use the office of a Deacon, being found blameless.” (verse 10.) The next two verses refer to the proper conduct of the *wives* of Deacons, after which St. Paul concludes his directions as follows : “ For they that have used the office of Deacon well, purchase to themselves A GOOD DEGREE, and great boldness IN THE FAITH which is in Christ Jesus.” (verse 13.) What is meant by the expression, “ a good degree ?” The word “ degree,” means a *step, a grade of dignity, rank, standing.* We maintain, and so did the Church of Christ : *always* hold, until *Lay* Deacons were invented, that the “ good degree” which the faithful Deacon was to purchase to himself, was a *higher*

*rank in the Ministry*, viz: the office of PRESEYTER, which always has been and is now conferred upon all who "use the office of a Deacon well." On the hypothesis that there is but *one* order in the Ministry, and that Deacons are but Laymen, I submit that these would be words without meaning.

I respectfully ask, if *this* passage does not also square well with the office of Deacons, as described in the Prayer Book? And are there not also here some wide gaps to be filled up, if we adopt the theory of our opponents?

Here ends the testimony of Scripture. If we have succeeded even in raising a question, whether the Deacons of the New Testament possessed a clerical character, then the point is reached—as has been heretofore shown—when an umpire is to be called in. Dispute between individuals is useless, as well as profitless. The testimony of those writers who lived nearest to the Apostles, who conversed with them, and who knew personally the very Deacons appointed by the Apostles, should, if available, settle this question. Here, fortunately, the trumpet gives no uncertain sound. Some of this testimony has already been cited in the SECOND Lecture, and a mere glance thereat, at present, will suffice. CLEMENT of Rome calls

Deacons "Ministers in Faith," adding that the Apostles established such officers. IGNATIUS, in writing to the Magnesians, mentions Bishops and Presbyters, and adds, "and your DEACONS most dear to me, *being entrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ.*" And again: "The DEACONS also, as being the Ministers of the *mysteries* of Jesus Christ, must, by all means, please all; for they are not the Ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of God."—POLYCARP calls Deacons "*the Ministers of God in Christ.*" Surely you will agree with me, that such language was never applied to, nor intended for *Laymen*. Here, then, we find the personal Disciples of St. Paul and St. John, (and no others have been quoted,) declaring that the office of a Deacon was to be a Minister, *not* of meat and drink, but of "the MYSTERIES of Christ." Must they not, then, have been possessed of *Clerical* functions? And when we add to all this, the *fact*, that from the times of these holy Martyrs to the days of JOHN CALVIN in the 16th century, *all* the Deacons in the world *were ordained Ministers*, (and I challenge contradiction of the truth of this assertion,) may we not consider the proof as abundant and overwhelming in favor of the position, that such was the original office of Deacon? If *we* are

wrong. we stand in the midst of a goodly company—by the side of CLEMENT, and IGNATIUS, and POLYCARP, and whether *they* or *John Calvin* knew best about the actual transactions and teachings of the Apostles, let candor, reason and common sense be the judges.

Here I leave the subject. I have endeavored to furnish some of the evidence, on which we assert, that DEACONS have been an “order of Ministers in Christ’s Church,” “from the *Apostles’* times”—and that “no man may presume to execute” this office “except he be first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with *imposition of hands*, be approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority.” \* If I have succeeded in this, then have we found evidence, that in this too we hold to “the APOSTLES Doctrine and Fellowship.” We must try every thing by *that* standard.—“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good,” is the Apostolic injunction. When we have found the *Old Church*, even that which the Lord Jesus Christ, through his Apostles, established; then, if we are members of it, and live as its holy precepts command us, we shall, in and through it, ripen for glory and bliss, immortal and inconceivable.

---

\* Preface to the Ordinal.



## LECTURE IV.

### The Apostolical Succession.

It has been a matter of surprise to me, when, during the last half score of years, I have heard or read the remarks made by our opponents about the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. Every species of ridicule has been heaped upon it. Sarcasms and sneers have been freely used, and by those, too, who profess a monopoly of godliness, piety and charity. It has been sought to annihilate the theory, and, of course, those who maintain it, by calling it “a nursery fable,” “a figment,” “a silly child’s story,” “an inexpressible peurility,” and many other equally chaste, and Christian, and classical epithets! Those who believe in and defend the doctrine, have been classed with the poor, illiterate Papist, who regards his Rosary with superstitious reverence, and with whom the Virgin Mary shares equal honors with his God. I repeat, I have been surprised when I have heard or read such assertions and attacks. Did the persons making them only come out boldly, and deny that there was *any* Christian Ministry—or with equal boldness and Scriptural correctness, assert that

the right to make or unmake a Minister of the Gospel is inherent in *man*, as is the right to appoint and remove the chairman of a public meeting, then I could *understand*, if I could not *appreciate*, these sneers—these biting, withering, *unanswerable* sarcasms! On the contrary, those who indulge in these *weighty* arguments, are as strenuous in their advocacy of the claims of the Ministry, as we are—and full as jealous of any encroachment upon their prerogative.—But notwithstanding this apparent inconsistency, which is ever a mark of error, and this singular species of warfare, I lay down the position—and in this Lecture shall attempt to maintain it—that unless the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION be *true*—in other words, unless there is not, and has not always been an uninterrupted succession from the APOSTLES, there is not now, and there cannot be, without a miraculous interposition, an authorized Christian Ministry on the face of the whole earth.

Before proceeding to the proof of this position, permit me to illustrate the position itself, that you may perceive, whether there is not a *prima facie* evidence of its correctness and truth.

Take my own case, and an humble individual may serve sometimes as an example for illus-

trating a truth. I claim certain powers—not only to preach, but to BAPTIZE and administer the HOLY COMMUNION. I claim these powers to the exclusion of all my congregation. They allow them to me, or if they did not, and one of the communicants of this Church should appear here, and attempt to exercise these important functions of the administration of the Blessed and Holy Sacraments of the Lord Jesus Christ, I should administer the discipline of the Church upon such an one. Now the question at once arises, and it is the one which lies at the foundation of this whole discussion, where did I get this power and these privileges which they confessedly have not? If they are *inherent* in *man*, then every child in my Parish has as much right to preach and administer the sacraments as I have. It will be replied, and rightly, too, that *I* received this commission and authority when I was ordained by the Bishop of Western New York. But then the question arises, what right or authority had *he* to give them to me? The only answer is, that *he* received authority from *his* consecrators. Still the question returns,—where obtained *they* the power? From *their* consecrators. And from whence came it to *these*? Thus you may go back, step by step, year by year, and century by century, and at

every point the inquiry comes up, and it is one which *must* be answered. No matter if 1200, 1500, or 1700 years have elapsed, if we at last come to one who had not authority to confer these fundamental prerogatives, the whole chain falls, unless *Divine* power interposes ; and I need not tell you that *that* must be authenticated by the possession of *miraculous* gifts. This result *must* inevitably follow. Every person of ordinary comprehension cannot but perceive that the mere *lengthening* of a chain does not necessarily *strengthen* it. One thousand *cyphers* are of no more value than the first one written down. If, then, there *be* an authorized Christian Ministry on earth—if I possess these powers to the exclusion of the people of my charge,—they must have been received in a chain, reaching back to the APOSTLES themselves, who alone received power and authority from the Great Head of the Church, or else every one claiming to be a Minister of the Gospel, and of the Sacraments, must show his authority by the personal working of miracles. There is no escape from this alternative.

This, then, is the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION—this the “*figment*,” against which, because it condemns them, professing Christians have said so many hard words. I appeal to you, if it is not

the very corner stone of faith to all those who believe there is a Ministry of Reconciliation—that those now exist who are authorized to break the bread of Life ?\*

---

\* For the benefit, if not instruction, of my *Presbyterian* and *Congregational* readers, if any such shall honor these humble Lectures with a perusal, I subjoin two or three extracts from writers of those denominations, and will leave it for them to judge whether *we* are singular in insisting upon the necessity of an unbroken succession from the Apostles. For the extracts from Drs. MASON and McLEOD, I am indebted to the very able essays of Dr. WAINWRIGHT. For that from Dr. HOPKINS, to another source. 1. We cite Dr. JOHN M. MASON, as a witness: “ Our Lord Jesus Christ delivered their commission to His Apostles in terms which necessarily imply a perpetual and regular successive Ministry. ‘ Go ye and teach all Nations, \* \* \* and lo, I am with you ALWAYS, even unto the END OF THE WORLD.’ That this command and promise, though immediately addressed, were not limited to the Apostles, is so obvious as almost to shame an argument. But since we are sometimes required to prove that two and two make four, we remark, *First*, That as the *command* is to teach *all Nations*, it must spread as far and last as long as nations shall be found. \* \* \* *Secondly*, That as the Apostles were shortly to ‘ put off their tabernacles,’ the command could not possibly be fulfilled by them. It was parallel with the existence of nations. *It must, therefore, be executed by others in every age, who are to carry on the work which the Apostles began, and who by the very terms of the commandment are identified with them in the general spirit of the commission, which is, to preach the doctr. nes, enforce*

But it is said, the Apostolical Succession can not be true as a matter of fact, and with long dissertations on the ignorance, and violence, and sin of the middle ages, we are gravely assured that the succession *must* have been broken! And so it might have been, if the present doctrine of the Romish Church is true, that all must

---

*the precepts, and administer the ordinances of Jesus Christ.*

\* \* \* Since, therefore, the Head of the Church instituted a regular Ministry in His Church, thousands of years ago—since He directed His Prophets to foretell its existence under the new dispensation—since He gave to His Apostles a commission *which necessarily supposes its perpetuity*—since these Apostles themselves acted upon that principle in erecting Churches—since the rule of faith has given instructions to guide its application—since the prophetic Spirit in the last of the Apostles has uttered oracles which are founded upon it—no conclusion is more safe and irrefragable than this—*that a regular, standing Ministry is an essential constituent of the Church of God.*”

2. We cite Dr. McLEOD, the eminent Presbyterian of New York: “The ambassador is an *officer* of the power which appoints him, and Christ’s ambassadors are official persons. \* \* \* The ambassador of Christ does not receive his official power from the men of the world, \*

\* \* nor even from professing Christians in the Church, but from Jesus Christ Himself. \* \* \* When He left the world, He made a deposite of power, ecclesiastical and spiritual, in the hands of the primitive Ministry. \* \*

\* These in a similar way transmitted it to other ‘faithful men,’ and these again to their successors in subsequent

come from or through the Pope of Rome! But as the succession comes, and has always been transmitted through the *Episcopacy at large*, with no dependence upon him who "exalteth himself, and as God, sitteth in the Temple of God," the corruption of any one collateral branch, can not and does not pollute the whole

*times.* The chain of succession may indeed be buried and hid in many of its links, *but none can demonstrate that it has ever been broken and destroyed.* He who has always preserved His Church on earth, amid all the changes and corruptions to which she has been exposed, and who has kept the BIBLE in the hollow of His hand, when it was almost forgotten by the world, *has preserved the Ministry, and in their hands the gift of office, and it shall not be lost in any coming revolution."*

3. We cite Dr. HOPKINS, the Congregationalist, and Father of "Hopkinsonianism:"

"If there be evidence from the Scriptures that such an order and succession of men, as officers in the Church, has been instituted by CHRIST, and is implied in the commission which he gave to his disciples, 'Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: *And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;*' this is sufficient positive proof that such a succession of Ministers does, in fact, take place in the visible Church of CHRIST; and that this commission has been transmitted down from one to another, from that time to this day; and this succession has not been interrupted, and will not be, to the end of the

stream. "The Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome [See Art. XIX.] may err, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith," and still the CATHOLIC Church may continue as the body of Christ, drawing nourishment, grace and life itself from her Divine Head.

---

world. This, therefore, may safely, and with all desirable certainty, be taken for granted. without any farther positive proof by every Minister of the Gospel, unless there be strong positive evidence that such succession has been interrupted, with respect to him; and that he has been irregularly introduced to that office, by him or them, who have not had their commission and authority to ordain, handed down by succession from the Apostles to them.

"Therefore, since the above recited commission implies that there should be a succession of officers in the Church to the end of the world. to proselyte, baptize, and teach men to observe the institutions and commands of CHRIST, to whom he has promised his presence and assistance; and since the Apostles appear to understand their commission in this light. and to practise upon it accordingly, by ordaining Elders in every Church which they formed; and Elders or Presbyters ordained others by laying on their hands; and they who were so ordained, were directed to commit the Gospel, that is, the preaching and dispensation of it, 'to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also; and to lay hands upon them,—not suddenly, but after proper examination and acquaintance, which can be nothing less or more than ordaining them to the work of the Ministry. And Titus is directed to ordain Elders in every city in

We proceed now to inquire, what evidence we have, and any one may have, of an unbroken succession from the Apostles, through the Episcopate ? for *there*, we trust we have proved was the ordaining and transmitting power alone lodged. I am very free to confess, for it weighs scarce a feather against our position, that if a written, authenticated, ever preserved and still extant record of the consecration of every Bishop, in every Church, and every age, is required, such as can be given of the Bishops of our own American Church, and of the English Church since and long before the Reformation, such

---

the island of Crete. Since all this is evident, and certainly so; and there can nothing be found in the Scripture to contradict such a succession appointed by CHRIST, or in the least inconsistent with it, it may, and ought to be considered as positive evidence that there is, in fact, such an uninterrupted succession, sufficient to satisfy the judgment and conscience of an honest man, who is ordained to the work of the Evangelical Ministry, that he has derived his ordination and commission from CHRIST by an uninterrupted succession; unless there be positive proof to the contrary, with respect to his ordination."

If here be not the doctrine of "an unbroken succession from the Apostles," then words have lost their meaning.— And yet the admirers and followers of these men, *now* call it an "inexpressible puerility!" Verily, "*Tempora mutantur,*" etc.

proof cannot be furnished, for it is not in existence. But still there is abundant, though circumstantial evidence—often received as the strongest in a Court of Justice—as clear and as convincing to a *candid* mind, as if one had before him a book full of the records of consecrations, reaching to St. PAUL, St. PETER, St. JAMES, St. JOHN, or any other, or all of the twelve Apostles. Were this last species of evidence in existence and available, you perceive at once, that one determined to object, would demand satisfactory evidence that these records were not a mass of forgeries, or at least, that fictitious Bishoprics and Bishops had not been mixed in with the genuine. A very curious instance of this disposition to cavil for the sake of cavil, was manifested some few years since. The present Bishop SOUTHGATE, then a Presbyter, visited the Syrian or Jacobite Churches of the East. In the convent of the Patriarch of that Church, he was shown a book of records, bearing every mark of great antiquity, which professed to contain the official account of the consecration of every Patriarch and Bishop of that Church, back to, I think, the 5th or 6th century. The Bishop gave an account of this incident in his Book of Travels, only adding, that there was nothing about the book which indicated fraud,

or the forgeries of modern times, and expressing an opinion, that *possibly* the whole might be a true record. But the ridicule and sarcasm heaped upon the poor "credulous traveler," by those who will not be satisfied with any thing short of the "written record," only proved, that when a man is determined *not* to be convinced by any sort of evidence, he will *not* be! But trusting that there are some who are *not* thus unreasonable and captious, I proceed briefly to present the evidence that is extant, of the unbroken Apostolical Succession.

The first, and were it the only evidence, yet would it be sufficient, rests upon the COMMISSION and PROMISE of the Lord Jesus Christ to his Apostles. He said, not to the multitude of the disciples, nor even to the *seventy*, but to the APOSTLES: "I appoint unto you a *kingdom*, as My Father hath appointed unto Me," (St. Luke xxii: 29;) "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you," (St. John xx: 21;) and "Go ye and teach [make disciples of,] all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to *observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*; and lo, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS [all days] EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD," (St. Matt. xxviii: 19, 20.)

I have not time, nor is it necessary, to recapitulate the evidence presented in the previous Lectures, as to the *nature* of this commission, and to whom, and through whom it was to be transmitted. Suffice it for our present purpose to say, that here is a commission—a perpetual commission—one beginning “in the days of Pontius Pilate,” but terminating only when the Archangel’s trump shall proclaim that time itself shall be no longer. “Lo, I am with you, ALWAYS, even unto the *end of the world*” Here is the specific, and *unconditional* promise of that Almighty Being, who is the Great Head of the Church, who purchased that Church with His own blood, who gave to it His holy sacraments as channels of blessings and grace to worthy recipients, and who appointed those, who, in His stead, should feed, not 5000 merely, but the world, with that Living Bread which came down from Heaven. Here is a promise ample enough, and from one abundantly able to *do* all that He undertook to perform. The eminent Presbyterian, Dr. McLEOD, of New York, is willing to take this promise *alone*, as sufficient and unanswerable evidence, of an unbroken ministerial succession; and I again remind you, that it is but very recently that Episcopalians and *Presbyterians* had any controversy on *this* question,

the only dispute being as to the *channel* of transmission. Dr. McLEOD says: "We found the claim to this *ministerial succession*, not on any historical documents of man's invention, for none such are to be trusted, *but directly on the promise of Jesus Christ*, appended to the ministerial commission, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' God did not intend that the *preservation and transmission of office in His Church*, should be a matter of sense, but of faith. And faith's foundation and aliment is the Divine promise. The promise here is, 'Lo, I am with you,' not occasionally and at intervals, but 'always'—not 'always,' during any period of the world's duration, but 'always, even unto the end of the world.' The river may run under ground, and it may be muddied and polluted, but still its current runs on from its source to the ocean."

This is a sound and unanswerable argument, but I desire to say a word farther in pushing home the conclusion of the contrary premises. I ask you, then, to show me a time when the Christian Ministry ceased to exist—when there was no one authorized to transmit this rich blessing—when no man could say to another as did St. Paul to Timothy, "These things commit I unto thee," "and the things that thou hast

heard of me, \* \* \* the same commit *thou* to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also"—and I will show *you* a time when this promise of the Lord Jesus Christ *has failed*. There is no escape from this conclusion. Caviil and object as one may, it comes back to this, that CHRIST, *could not* or *would not* fulfil His own explicit, perpetual, *unconditional* promise, and the Church is this day without a "Ministry of Reconciliation"—is cut off from union to Him who is the only Head over all, God blessed for ever. And is it so hard to believe in an uninterrupted succession of the Ministry, that, though such a consequence is involved, we are absolutely and almost instinctively compelled to reject the doctrine? Does not Dr. McLEOD, (and I again quote him, hoping that *he* may obtain a hearing where *we* are denied it,) well say: "He who has always preserved His Church on earth, amid all the changes and corruptions to which she has been exposed, *and who has kept the Bible in the hollow of His hand, when it was almost forgotten by the world* has preserved the Ministry, and in their hands the gift of office, and it shall not be lost in any coming revolution!" Let us consider a moment farther, the idea here suggested, of the wonderful preservation of the Bible. The *originals* of the several

books have long since been lost. We are not only dependent upon *copies*, but upon copies of copies of other copies innumerable. What evidence have we, that that blessed book passed through the "Dark Ages," uncontaminated? or was even preserved at all? Why, simply this, and no more: We find old manuscripts, of different countries and different ages, agreeing substantially with the version which we have, and we are satisfied that we have the very REVELATION which holy men of old received from the Holy Ghost, and we rest our faith and hopes as implicitly upon this Bible of copies and translations, as if we had the very originals of the Apostolical writers. And could, and did the Lord Jesus Christ thus preserve His written *word*, and yet could he, and would he not that *Ministry*, with whom He expressly promised He would be until the end of the world?

If, therefore, there was not, and never had been the record of a single consecration or ordination since the times of the Apostles, here alone would be a sufficient basis upon which to rest as unwavering a faith in an unbroken Apostolical Succession, as we do in the preservation of the Bible; although we do not know who were the individuals, who, in these different ages, sat down to the laborious and difficult task of conving its sacred pages.

But we do *not* rest the case here. There are other arguments and proofs which show the *improbability*—I think the *impossibility*—of a break in the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. I shall assume as having been proved in the previous Lectures, that the succession must be through what we now call BISHOPS. It is needless to recapitulate the arguments then advanced. If the SUCCESSION has ever failed, then, it must have been either because the Church relaxed her discipline,—or because some intruded themselves as Bishops, without any right or authority so to do, and hence vitiated the ordinations of the Churches over which they presided. Now let us see if such a contingency is *probable*. I take it for granted that you will agree with me that no man acts without some inducement. What inducement then, I ask, existed for a man wrongfully to intrude himself into the office of a Bishop during the *first three centuries* of the Christian era? It could not have been *worldly advantage*, for to be dispoiled of all their earthly goods was a fate which none of them escaped. Was it for the honor of the station? (You perceive we are supposing the person *not* to be actuated by true religion, for *that* would forbid the very attempt at such an impious usurpation.) Honor? Why, the only honor the

primitive Bishop received, was to be beloved by that flock who with him worshipped in fear and trembling, expecting every moment when the heathen officers would burst in upon them, and drag them away to tortures and to death! The BISHOP—so say all the early records, Pagan as well as Christian—was always the *first* to suffer. We know it was so with Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Cyprian, and a host of others, whose blood watered and enriched the Church. And the decree of one persecuting Emperor enjoined, that the ARCHONTES, or rulers of the Church, should alone suffer; the wily heathen hoping that if the earthly shepherd should be taken, the flock would inevitably be scattered. Now tell me, I ask again, what inducement or object a man could have had in usurping the prerogatives of an office which brought only such a reward? So sure was this fate to the Bishop in those three centuries, that frequently, only the aged could be induced to take the office—they who were ready at any moment to surrender up their lives for the Church Militant.

For the first three centuries, then, the *purity* and *suffe ing* of the Church would protect her Ministry against any corruption or failure in the succession: But how was it, may be asked,

when persecution ceased, and the Church began to be allied with the world and worldly honors? It is true that *this* preventive ceased, but another came in its place, which was, if possible, more powerful still. It proved that the Almighty can cause even "the wrath of man to praise Him." I allude to the preventive of *interest*. Until the period of the Reformation, earthly pomp, and emoluments, and power, were attached to the various Bishoprics. The Church was allied to the State, and the *Bishops* of the one were *Princes* of the other. Think you not, then, there would be a powerful incentive to those who earnestly coveted but did not receive these high stations, to watch well, and take good heed that no one *did* enjoy these honors and emoluments, and that dominion, save those who were entitled to them? That no thief or robber stole away the coveted prize? Thus hundreds would be engaged in watching every Bishopric, and the filling of every vacancy would be almost as strictly guarded as would one in the Regal Office. This very principle of *self-interest*, call it a low propensity, if you please, is a strong presumptive evidence, that the succession was *not* broken, even through the corruptions of the Middle Ages—the *only* period, I may remark, at which our opponents aim their shafts

There is another species of evidence on this subject, which, though the phrase may not be strictly correct, I will call the *Mathematical* argument. It demonstrates that instead of there being a *cetainty*, or even a *probability* of a break in the succession, it is *morally impossible that such an event could ever have happened.*

It is, and always has been, the doctrine of the Church, and of Scripture, that *one* Bishop *can* ordain his successor. St. Paul thus ordained Timothy and Titus. True, such ordinations are not now, and have not been for centuries, *canonical.* The *law* of the Church will presently be cited. But while such consecrations would be deemed and held *uncanonical* and *irregular*, they would still be *valid*, and ordinations by *such a* Bishop would be good ordinations. It seems, however, that the early Church from the very first centuries, took unwearied pains to guard against the possibility of a corruption of the Christian Ministry, by the acts of any *one* heretical or unauthorized Bishop. There are CANONS extant, known by the appellation of "Apostolical Canons." It is not claimed or pretended that they were enacted by the Apostles. They are, however, of a very early date. It is supposed that ORIGEN refers to them as the law of the Church in his time, and it has also been

said that CLEMENT, of Alexandria, wrote or copied them. If either of these suppositions is true, it carries them back to the *second century*. One thing, however, is certain,—they are referred to by the COUNCIL OF NICE, held in 325, as “old canons.” Allow only a period of thirty years to this term “old,” and we trace the “Apostolical Canons,” to the *third century*, which was the *pure*, because the *suffering* age of the Church. One of those canons was:—“Let a Bishop be ordained by two or three Bishops, a *Presbyter* by one Bishop, and so likewise a *Deacon*.” Here we have the *three orders*; but I stop not now to speak upon that point. You perceive how much more care was taken to guard the *ordainiug* or *transmitting* office, than either of the other two. The COUNCIL OF NICE, held in 325, and representing the *whole* Church, East and West, North and South, adopted the following CANON to be from thenceforth the *law* of the Universal Church: “A Bishop *ought* to be constituted by *all the Bishops of the Province*, but if this be not practicable by reason of urgent necessity, *three must, by all means*, meet together, and with the consent of those who are absent, let them perform the ordination.” And we find, as a matter of fact, the same rule prevailing in the same age,

in the Churches in Britain, in Gaul, in Spain, in Italy, in Carthage, in Alexandria, in Asia Minor, and in fact in all, the record of whose acts have come down to us. And we have evidence, too, that this canon was *not* a dead letter, but was the law of the Church at least 75 years before the meeting of the Council of Nice.—For in or about the year 250, CORNELIUS, elected Bishop of Rome, was consecrated by *sixteen* Bishops! And what is a still more striking fact—NOVATUS, a Roman Presbyter, who opposed the election of CORNELIUS, and when defeated, determined to set up a rival Bishopric, did not dare even to attempt a *schism*, until he had inveigled three country Bishops into some private place, and there, by the threats of himself and his adherents, compelled them to consecrate him a Bishop! Why all this effort, unless he knew that so universal was then the law of the Church, that he would not be recognized by *anybody*, unless he could show a *canonical* consecration. This canon and this practice shew what care the early Church took to guard the Apostolic office from any fatal corruption or invalidity. Applying the rule already laid down, you perceive that if *any one* of the *sixteen* Bishops who consecrated CORNELIUS, was a true and valid Bishop, then was CORNELIUS also

a successor of the Apostles. And the same remark will apply to *any* Bishop with his three or more consecrators.

We pass now to the other end of the chain, and tracing the succession backward, will see the operation of the rule we have laid down.—The Episcopate of our own American Branch of the Church of Christ, is derived from Bishops SEABURY, WHITE, PROVOOST and MADISON, who were consecrated in England and Scotland, near the close of the last century. *Forty-seven* Bishops have, since their return to America, been consecrated in this country. And although Bishop SEABURY never assisted, except at the consecration of *one* Bishop, and Bishop MADISON of but *two*, yet there is not now, and never has been a Bishop consecrated in the United States, who could not trace his descent from both.\* If, then, any *one* of the four Bishops

---

\* The *American* succession may be found on the covers of the "Church Almanac" for 1850. For the gratification of the curious, and to show the entire truth of the assertion in the text, I subjoin in this note, the list of all the Bishops ever consecrated in this country, with the names of the consecrators:

1. Thomas J. Clagget, 1792, consecrated by Bps. Provoost, Seabury, White, Madison.

2. Robert Smith, 1795, by Bps. Provoost, Madison, Clagget.

named had been validly consecrated, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has now the true Apostolical Succession. We will go one step further back. Bishop SEABURY

---

3. Edward Bass, 1797, by Bps. White, Provoost, Clagget.
4. Abraham Jarvis, 1797, by Bps. White, Provoost, Bass.
5. Benjamin Moore, 1801, by Bps. White, Clagget, Jarvis.
6. Samuel Parker, 1804, by Bps. White, Clagget, Jarvis, Moore.
7. John Henry Hobart, 1811, by Bps. White, Provoost, Jarvis.
8. Alexander Viets Griswold, 1811, by Bps. White, Provoost, Jarvis.
9. Theodore Dehon, 1812, by Bps. White, Jarvis, Hobart.
10. Richard Channing Moore, 1814, by Bps. White, Hobart, Griswold, Dehon.
11. James Kemp, 1814, by Bps. White, Hobart, R. C. Moore.
12. John Croes, 1815, by Bps. White, Hobart, Kemp.
13. Nathaniel Bowen, 1818, by Bps. White, Hobart, Kemp, Croes.
14. Philander Chase, 1819, by Bps. White, Hobart, Kemp, Croes.
15. Thomas C. Brownell, 1819, by Bps. White, Hobart, Griswold.
16. John S. Ravenscroft, 1823, by Bps. White, Griswold, Kemp, Croes, Bowen, Brownell.
17. Henry U. Onderdonk, 1827, by Bps. White, Hobart, Kemp, Croes, Bowen.
18. William Meade, 1829, by Bps. White, Hobart, Griswold, R. C. Moore, Croes, Brownell, Onderdonk.

was consecrated in 1784, by Bishops Kilgour, Petrie and Skinner, three Bishops of the *Scottish* Episcopal Church. Bishops WHITE and PROVOOST were consecrated in 1787, by Arch-

---

19. Wm. M. Stone, 1830, by Bps. White, R. C. Moore, Onderdonk, Meade.

20. Benj. T. Onderdonk, 1830, by Bps. White, Brownell, H. U. Onderdonk.

21. Levi Silliman Ives, 1831, by Bps. White, H. U., and B. T. Onderdonk.

22. John H. Hopkins, 1832, by Bps. White, Griswold, Bowen.

23. Benj. B. Smith, 1832, by Bps. White, Brownell, H. U. Onderdonk.

24. Charles P. McIlvaine, 1832, by Bps. White, Griswold, Meade.

25. George W. Doane, 1832, by Bps. White, B. T. Onderdonk, Ives.

26. James H. Otey, 1834, by Bps. White, H. U. and B. T. Onderdonk, Doane.

27. Jackson Kemper, 1835, by Bps. White, R. C. Moore, Chase, H. U. and B. T. Onderdonk, Smith, Doane.

28. Samuel A. McCoskry, 1836, by Bps. H. U. Onderdonk, Doane, Kemper.

29. Leonidas Polk, 1838, by Bps. Meade, Smith, McIlvaine, Otey.

30. Wm. H. DeLancey, 1839, by Bps. Griswold, H. U. and B. T. Onderdonk, Doane.

31. Christopher E. Gadsden, 1840, by Bps. Griswold, Doane, McCoskry.

32. Wm. R. Whittingham, 1840, by Bps. Griswold, R. C. Moore, B. T. Onderdonk, Doane.

bishop Moore and Bishops Markham, Moss and Hinchcliffe, all of the Church of England.— Bishop MADISON was consecrated in 1790, by

---

33. Stephen Elliott, 1841, by Bps. Meade, Ives, Gadsden.

34. Alfred Lee, 1841, by Bps. Griswold, R. C. Moore, Chase, Brownell, H. U. Onderdonk.

35. John Johns, 1842, Bps. Griswold, Meade, Ives, Whittingham.

36. Manton Eastburn, 1842, by Bps. Griswold, Brownell, B. T. Onderdonk, DeLancey.

37. John. P. K. Henshaw, 1843, by Bps. Brownell, B. T. Onderdonk, Hopkins, Doane, Whittingham, Johns.

38. Carlton Chase, 1844, by Bps. P. Chase, Brownell, B. T. Onderdonk, Ives, Smith.

39. Nicholas H. Cobbs, 1844, By Bps. P. Chase, Meade, McIlvaine, Doane, Otey.

40. Cicero S. Hawks, 1844, by Bps. P. Chase, Kemper, McCoskry, Polk, DeLancey.

41. Wm. J. Boone, 1844, by Bps. P. Chase, Meade, Ives, Doane, Otey.

42. George W. Freeman, 1844, by Bps. P. Chase, Kemper, Polk, Lee.

43. Horatio Southgate, 1844, by Bps. P. Chase, Whittingham, Elliott, Johns, Henshaw.

44. Alonzo Potter, 1845, by Bps. P. Chase, Hopkins, Doane, McCoskry, Lee.

45. George Burgess, 1847, by Bps. P. Chase, Brownell, Eastburn, Henshaw, C. Chase.

46. George Upfold, 1849, by Bps. Smith, McIlvaine, Hawks, Kemper.

47. Wm. M. Green, 1850, by Bps. Otey, Polk, Freeman, Cobbs.

Archbishop Moore, and Bishops Porteus and Thomas, also English Bishops. Here, you perceive, are *nine* different Scottish and English Bishops, uniting in the consecration of the American Episcopate. Applying the rule laid down, it will be seen at once that if any *one* of these *nine* were a true and validly consecrated Bishop, we have the true succession. Go back one step further, and remembering that every one of these *nine* had *three*, and most of them *four* consecrators, and we have *at least* TWENTY-SEVEN new men brought in, and if any *one* of these *twenty-seven* were a true Bishop, we have the true succession. And thus as we go back, at each step scores of new men come in, not to weaken, but to *strengthen* the chain. What probability—I might ask, what *possibility* is there, that the succession should be utterly and hopelessly broken, when, ascending but a few steps, we find hundreds, and even thousands of collateral supports—each of itself upholding, not a colossal statue, but this very common sense and Scriptural dogma and *fact* of the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION!

To illustrate this point of the arithmetical *progression*, not *diminution*, of the chances of a true succession, as we ascend towards primitive times, I invite attention for a moment to

the table, or rather, statement\* of the Ecclesiastical or Episcopal Pedigree, (if I may so call it,) of the late ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, (Dr. HOWLEY,) running back only *four* degrees. Dr. HOWLEY was consecrated by *four* Bishops—

---

\* We here insert the statement as a Note.

1. Dr. Howley was consecrated by Bishops Sutton, Huntingford, Fisher and Jackson—4.

2. Bishop Sutton was consecrated by Bishops Moore, Hincheliffe, James, Cornwallis and Beadon; Bishop Huntingford, by Bishops Moore, Porteus, Horsley and Moss; Bishop Fisher, by Bishops Moore, Dampier, Pelham and Cleaver; Bishop Jackson, by Bishops Sutton, Randolph and Cleaver—15—new names, 11.

3. Bishop Moore was consecrated by Bishops Frederick Cornwallis, Keene, Lowth and Thomas, of 1774; Bishop Hincheliffe, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Terrick, Thomas, of 1744, and Young; Bishop James Cornwallis, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Lowth, York and Thomas; Bishop Beadon, by Bishop Moore, Porteus, Hincheliffe and Halifax; Bishop Porteus, by Bishops Markham, Egerton, Law and Barrington; Bishop Horsley, by Bishops Moore, Porteus, Halifax and Smallwell; Bishop Moss, by Bishops Terrick, Thomas, Willes and Pearce; Bishop Dampier, by Bishops Moore, Porteus, North and Moss; Bishop Pelham, by Bishops Moore, Porteus, North and Bagot; Bishop Cleaver, by Bishops Markham, Thurlow, Thomas and Douglas; Bishop Randolph, by Bishops Moore, North and Horsley—43—new names, 20.

4. Bishop F. Cornwallis was consecrated by Bishops Herring, Wilcocks, Benson and Lisle; Bishop Keene, by Bish-

these four by fifteen, *twelve* of whom were *new* men, if I may so express myself, i. e., they did not unite in the consecration of *two* or more Bishops as the remaining *three* did; these *fifteen* Bishops had fifty-nine consecrators. *twenty-*

---

ops Herring, Joseph Butler, Osbaldes on and F. Cornwallis; Bishop Lowth, by Bishops Secker, Terrick, Willes and Pearce; Bishop Thomas, of 1774, by Bishops Terrick, Young and Barrington; Bishop Terrick, by Bishops Hutton, Hayter, Keene and Hume; Bishop Thomas, of 1744, by Bishops Potter, Wilcocks, Claggett, Benson and Gooch; Bishop Young, by Bishops Secker, Pearce, Ellis and Hume; Bishop York, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Terrick, Green, Newton and North; Bishop Halifax, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Young, Thomas and J. Cornwallis; Bishop Markham, by Bishops Drummond, Trevor, Beauclerk and Law; Bishop Egerton, by Bishops Secker, Hayter, Pearce, Keene and Johnson; Bishop Law, by Bishops Drummond, Trevor, Keene and Young; Bishop Barrington, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Terrick and Pearce; Bishop Smallwell, by Bishops Moore, North, Thurlow and Warren; Bishop Willes, by Bishops Moore, Reynolds, Wilcocks and Gooch; Bishop Pearce, by Bishops Herring, Wilcocks, Benson and Joseph Butler; Bishop North, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Terrick, Pearce and Markham; Bishop Bagot, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, North, Moss and Barrington; Bishop Thurlow, by Bishops F. Cornwallis, Keene, Young and Moss; Bishop Douglas, by Bishops Markham, John Butler, Porteus and Pretymann—81—new names, 24.

It will thus be seen, that, in going back for only *four* successions, *fifty-nine* Bishops are connected with the consecration of Bishop HOWLEY.

*seven* of whom were *new*—and these *fifty-nine* Bishops had two hundred and thirty-three consecrators, *forty-seven* of whom were new men. Thus, in ascending but *four* degrees, which carry us back only to 1743, we find *ninety* different Bishops coming in to strengthen—may I not say, to make sure—the probability, aye, the certainty, that Archbishop HOWLEY was a true successor of the Apostles. The same proofs, and the same train of argument will apply to every Bishop that ever lived, as well as to Dr. HOWLEY and the AMERICAN Bishops.

This, then, is what I have termed the *mathematical* argument, in favor of the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. And I respectfully ask, when such overwhelming probabilities thus come in, in support of that promise of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be with His Ministry “ALWAY, even unto the end of the world,” if it is not incumbent upon the *objector* to show when and where *was* that break which he so quietly assumes to have taken place? It will be time enough to stop the leak *when it is found!*

Pressed by these unanswerable *facts*, which establish beyond a peradventure the character of the ENGLISH, and, of course, the AMERICAN Church, as a true Branch of the CATHOLIC (*not Romish!*) Church, the Body of Christ—Papists

and Dissenters have joined hands in the *insinuation*—for few of either have ever had the moral courage or hardihood to aver its truth—of the ridiculous slander of the “Nag’s Head Ordination,” of Archbishop PARKER, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Hoping, by throwing doubt upon the validity of *his* consecration, to sunder the English chain, they pretend that he never *was* consecrated, but assumed the duties of the Archbishopric after some profane mummery at the “Nag’s Head” tavern in London. I need not dwell upon the utter silliness and falsity of this story. Suffice it to say, that even *Romanists* did not dare tell such a lie until more than *forty* years after PARKER’S consecration, and *this* is evidence enough that it *was* a lie. Had it contained the smallest grain of *truth*, or even *probability*, the malignity of that baffled sect would never have permitted it to have slept for *forty days*, much less years! I may pass this forlorn hope of our opponents, by saying that the story has not only been *proved* to be false, by evidence which cannot be gainsayed nor answered, but is *admitted* to be so, by LINGARD, the Romish Historian of England, and by other Romanists.\*

---

\* For a full examination of this story, and of the whole question of “Anglican Ordinations,” the reader is referred to the “Essays on the Anglican Ordinations,” by the Edi-

We claim, then, from the considerations which have been presented, that we have in the English and American Episcopal Churches, the *true* Apostolical Succession, and hence that we are true branches of that one Catholic and Apostolic Church, for which Christ died, and to preserve and defend which, Holy Confessors and Martyrs freely gave up their lives, not counting them as dear, if they might thus win an immortal crown.

But it is said, admitting all you claim to be true, as a matter of fact, yet you obtain your succession through ROME, and she is the "Mystery of abominations," "Anti-Christ," etc. etc., and we should touch nothing that she has! Admitting, for the sake of the argument, that this charge against us is true, I shall still take the liberty of asserting that even *that* would not vitiate our succession. Let us reason a little on this point, and see to what conclusion argument, or rather objection, will inevitably lead. Does *truth* become *falsehood*, because spoken by a man whose character for veracity is not good? Does a gold coin lose its value by passing through the pockets of a bad man? Would a false oath cease to be perjury, because the mag-

---

tor of the "True Catholic." They are unanswerable and deeply interesting.

istrate happened to be an unbeliever in that BEING in whose name the oath was administered? Who will entertain or believe either of these absurdities? Now, suppose the *Papal Church* was the only Church for several centuries, which, by the way, is very wide of the truth! That same Church had the custody of the BIBLE, and she grossly corrupted it, too, by fastening upon it books confessedly Apocryphal. Shall we, therefore, reject the whole *Bible*, or only the *corruptions* of Rome? Again, the Romish Church believes the APOSTLES' and NICENE Creeds. She has added to these formularies of primitive and Bible faith, the crudities, heresies and blasphemies of the Council of Trent. Shall we reject the *first*, because we repudiate the novelties of the last? The Romish Church is *Episcopal*. Shall we reject *Episcopacy*, because she has added to it the unwarrantable assumptions of the *Papacy*? No! this rule will not work. Nor, plausible and specious as it may seem at first, will it do to say, that the unworthiness of the *man* will obstruct or destroy his *ministerial* or *official* act. It will not do it in *temporal* matters—it involves worse consequences still in *spiritual* things. The doctrine of our Church, as contained in Art. XXVI., is sound, and the only true doctrine on this sub-

ject: "Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men." I repeat, this is sound and true doctrine—it is the doctrine of *reason*, too, as well as of Scripture, for the contrary would involve the awful *Romish* doctrine, that the *intention* of the *Priest* makes or invalidates the holy sacraments! Bring the case home and test this principle. Suppose a wicked man and hypocrite, to have intruded himself into the Ministry—and certainly, it must be admitted, that, in this melancholy particular, our dissenting friends are *not* permitted to cast stones!—that he conceals his baseness under his cloak of hypocrisy, and for years enjoys the confidence of his people. At length he is un-

masked and driven in disgrace from his position. Now, while the man is thus to be condemned and abhorred, are his *official acts* to be vitiated? Do his baptisms become no baptisms? If so, where will you begin, and where leave off? What degree of personal wickedness shall invalidate his ministerial acts? You perceive, then, that in any case, we are driven back to the ground occupied by Art. XXVI., that God will not permit his *People* to suffer for the wickedness, often concealed, of the Pastor. *He* shall be punished severely, but *they* shall not lose the promised blessing. Of the false Priest and his dreadful fate in the day of retribution, the Poet has well said :

“Among the accursed, who sought a hiding place  
 In vain, from fierceness of Jehovah’s rage,  
 And from the hot displeasure of the Lamb,  
 Most wretched, most contemptible, most vile,  
 Stood the false Priest, and in his conscience felt  
 The fellest gnaw of the undying worm.  
 And so he might, for he had on his hands,  
 The blood of souls, that would not wash away.”

But we have another answer to this objection, and that is, *it is not true*. The English Church existed centuries before Rome ever sent a missionary there. She *has* the *Romish* succession, and thus the mouth of the Romish objector is stopped. She has also, through her own ancient

Bishops, and the Bishop of Arles, the succession from St. JOHN and the Churches of the East. But this opens for consideration the wide field of the PAPAL SUPREMACY, upon which I shall venture in my next Lecture. I shall then undertake to prove that this *Supremacy* is not a doctrine of Scripture, or of the early Church, but that it is, and it has ever been, a corruption, which the Reformers of the English Church had a perfect right, and indeed, were bound to throw off. I only assert, at present, that all the primitive Bishops had equal *spiritual* power, and the Bishop of Rome, had no more right to arrogate to himself the power of ordination, to the exclusion of other Bishops, than the Bishop of the humblest Diocese that has ever existed, has thus to exclude the Bishop of Rome.

I may, in concluding this Lecture, very briefly notice the objection or charge, that our doctrine is *illiberal, exclusive, unchurching*. It would be sufficient to reply to this, that it has nothing to do with the question. The only inquiry should be, "Is it true?" If it is, be the doctrine what it may, we should embrace it, leaving the consequences with God. Establish any rule you please, and it will be illiberal, exclusive and unchurching to all outside of it. If you maintain that there is *any* Ministry, or literal sacra-

ments, you at once unchurch the Quakers. If you uphold the fundamental doctrine of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, you unchurch the Arians and Socinians of every name and kind. If you insist upon *any* point of faith, or discipline, or external order, you unchurch fanatics, and *their* name is Legion! But I will say farther, that this charge comes with an ill grace from those who are most profuse in making it. I will dismiss it, therefore, with simply showing that however guilty *Episcopalians* may be in this particular, the "little finger of" *Presbyterianism* is "thicker than the loins of" *Episcopacy*. I will only quote from three writers, not of the "dark ages," but of the *nineteenth* century, and residents of these "free and enlightened" United States of America. Dr LYNN, of Schenectady, says: "The classical, or *Presbyterial* form of Church government, is the true and *only* one which Christ has prescribed in His word. The custom of having *Diocesan Bishops* is *corrupt and injurious!*" That, certainly, is as hard a charge against us, as we ever brought against them!

Dr. MILLER, of Princeton, says: "*It is only so far as any succession flows through the line of Presbyters, that it is either regular or valid.*" There is a tremendous *unchurching* assertion! It an-

nihilates in one fell swoop, the Greek Church, all the Independents, and, indeed, the entire Christian Church, up to the *fourth* century, for then first were Presbyters allowed to lay their hands by the side of the Bishops, which practice being observed in *our* Church in the ordination of Presbyters, Dr. M. is willing to concede that *our* Ministry is consequently valid!

But Dr McLEOD is not even thus charitable. He *thought*, and therefore he thus speaks: "A person who is not ordained to office *by a Presbytery* has no right to be received as a Minister of Christ; *his administration of ordinances is invalid*; no Divine blessing is pronounced upon his labors; *it is rebellion against the Head of the Church to support him in his pretensions*; Christ has excluded him in His Providence from admission through the ordinary door; and if he has no evidence of *miraculous power* to testify his extraordinary mission, *he is an impostor!*" Yes, such language is to be found in a *Catechism* of the 19th century, in this country! I respectfully recommend, therefore, to our opponents, instead of troubling themselves about *our* "illiberality, exclusiveness and unchurching propensities," to devote a small portion of their attention to *their* friends and champions, LYNN, MILLER and McLEOD.

I repeat, in conclusion, the only question is—  
“Is Episcopacy true?” If it is, and that is the  
“old path,” walk ye in it, and ye shall find rest  
to your souls.

## LECTURE V.

### The Papal Supremacy—Scripture against it.

Having, in the previous Lectures, considered the primitive constitution of the Christian Church, and I would fain hope, demonstrated that it was organized upon an *Episcopal* platform—with its Ministry, from the first, three-fold, one order superior to the others, and possessing the exclusive power of ordination—and having, I trust, vindicated the doctrine of the “Apostolical Succession,” from the charge of absurdity, brought against it in our day, the argument and discussion might here close. But the English Church, and those who claim to possess an Apostolical Ministry, through her unbroken chain of Bishops, are here simultaneously attacked, by the two extremes of adversaries—papists, and dissenters from our Communion. Both, with the same object in view—the destruction of the English branch of the Church Catholic—but with different weapons, challenge her and her sons to the combat. The one, to excite popular prejudice, always violent, if not always enlightened, charge that she is but a daughter of Rome, drawing her very life from

the Mistress of the Seven Hills, partaking of all her abominations, and with her, to be made partaker, if not of all the woes and judgments of the Apocalypse, yet, of all the ill will and odium of this Rome-hating generation. Thus, this class seek to parry all her claims to their obedience, and to answer all the arguments and facts adduced to prove the Apostolic origin of the English Church, by giving her a bad name, and crying out as loudly and as wisely as did the mob at Ephesus: "Ye are the offspring of her whose name is 'Mystery, Babylon, the Great, the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth!'" (Rev. xvii: 5.)

On the other hand, Rome, though rejoiced to see these enemies of the English Church, her only feared and hated rival and enemy, playing into her hands, and at times, as in the days of Queen Elizabeth, lending her own Jesuits and monks to act the part of Puritan zealots,\* yet herself, openly uses another weapon, which she hopes will prove equally efficacious in working the injury, if not ruin, of her *elder* English sister. Meeting a class, and few are aware how large is

---

\* For proof of the truth of this assertion, see Dr. W. D. WILSON's "History of the English Reformation," pp. 289, 290. The efforts of COMMING, HEATH and others, are there graphically described.

that class, even in our own country, who, sick and wearied with the turmoil and fanaticism, and wildfire proceedings of the "New Lights" of the age, are seeking earnestly and anxiously for that unity, and peace, and order which they find put forth in Holy Scripture as the very essentials of the Church, the Bride of Christ, Rome, with an impudence unequalled, says:—"Behold, it is in me!" St. PETER was constituted the centre and essence of Unity, by the Great Head of the Church—his fellow Apostles were subject unto him—his prerogatives, undiminished and perpetual, have descended and now belong to *his* successor, the Bishop or Pope of Rome, and, inasmuch as the English Church has cast aside this dogma of the PAPAL SUPREMACY, she is schismatic and apostate, and holds no communion with Him who gave Himself for the Church, and bought it with His own blood. If the dogma be *true*, the conclusion is correct; if it be false, then Rome must prepare herself to drink of the plagues denounced as the portion of all who shall *add* unto the things which are written, (Rev. xxii: 18.)

We meet this claim—this pretended superiority and dominion of Rome as the "Mother and Mistress of all Churches," by branding it as a NOVELTY unknown to the Apostles, to in-

spired men, or to the Primitive Church, and, no matter when in after ages it arose, or to whatever height or universality it attained, as condemned now and forever, by that maxim recognized as an infallible test by the Christian Church since the day of TERTULLIAN who first uttered it in words: "Whatever is FIRST is TRUE; whatever is LATER is ADULTERATE." This one enemy destroyed, all the host of Romish perversions, and deceptions, and unfounded claims, fall with it. They all rest upon it, as on one occasion the Philistines did upon the person of *their* champion, GOLIATH. The unfairness and untruth of the charges of the *other* wing of our opponents will be made manifest, when we come to consider, in a future Lecture, the *true* history of the origin, independence, and Apostolical character of the English Church.

In speaking of the Church of Rome, I shall purposely abstain from saying anything of the many corruptions and abuses, which she sanctioned and which were the cause of the Reformation in the 16th century. They have nothing to do with our present discussion. With the followers of Luther and of Calvin, they are, indeed, all in all. *They* must prove that she has become so abominable, as to be apostate and unworthy of the name of a Church of Christ. Per-

sonally, I am of that opinion, especially while the decrees of the Council of Trent are hung as a millstone about her neck. But as it is not my province to judge, I am content to leave that whole question with Him who searches the heart and cannot be deceived. Of one thing I have *no* doubt. All who have left the Communion of the Catholic Church of England or America, for the unholy embraces of her who is but the creature of the Pope, *are* APOSTATES, and God save my soul from being a partaker of the portion of those who have committed such a deep and damning sin!

The sole and important issue between us and the Church of Rome, falsely claiming to be *the* Catholic Church, lies in this one claim of the POPE to exercise supreme dominion over all other Bishops, and to pull down or set up as he pleases. If he had power and right to excommunicate the English Church in 1570, the question is against us. If he had not, as we shall undertake to prove that he had not, then is the English Church now, as she was in the days of St. PAUL, of St. ALBAN, of CONSTANTINE, of FASTIDUS of London, of COLUMBA, of AUGUSTINE, and of CRANMER, a pure and holy branch of the ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLICAL CHURCH of Jesus Christ. In this Lecture the SCRIPTURAL argu-

ment against the SUPREMACY of either St. Peter or the Pope of Rome will alone be considered.

And here, at the outset of the discussion of this question, I cannot but remark how exceedingly difficult it is to fix upon the Romanists *any* one view of this doctrine of the Papal Supremacy, although they all maintain that it is fundamental, and of the very essence of the Church. We may "travel from Dan to Beersheba," and we shall not, indeed, find all barren, but the scene will shift so often, that before the eye can rest on any one pretence of the Romish controversialists, all is changed, and an entirely different view is presented. Boast of *Unity*? Why, let one but trace out the history of this one dogma of Rome, and he will be astonished at the impudence of the claim. There may indeed be an Unity of *materials*—and for one, I have little doubt but what Popery *is*, in all its essential features, what it *was* when GREGORY VII. wielded his iron sceptre over the heads of kings and rulers of the earth, as well as over Bishops of the Church. But then, it is the unity of the kaleidoscope, presenting a new figure at every turn. The history of the Papacy demonstrates its inconsistency. Its claims to universal obedience have changed with almost every wind.—When a weak minded king or prince was to be

dealt with, then would the Pope claim and insist upon almost omnipotent power. But when a "man of sterner stuff" was at the helm, then would be witnessed the spectacle of the Pope cringing and fawning before the temporal monarch, and as did Boniface of Phocas, begging for favors at his hands, bestowing at the same time appellations fit only for an Archangel, upon as depraved and wicked a wretch as ever disgraced an Imperial crown.

The same remarks will hold true now. The awkward and unseemly protuberances of Popery must be concealed from the jealousy of American and English eyes. It would hardly do, in this nineteenth century, for American ears to be saluted by the thunderings of such a Bull as SIXTUS V. in 1585, issued against HENRY of Navarre. Here was *Popish* doctrine then:—"The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, *excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all.*" And applying this doctrine to the case in hand, SIXTUS continues: "By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, *from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fealty and obedience; and*

do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not *dare* to obey them, or *any* of their admonitions, laws and commands!!” I say this would not do in our day, although Popery is *one* and *infa libile*! Nor would it hardly do for the present Pope, PIUS IX. to say of our American President, what his predecessor and namesake, PIUS V. in 1570, said of Queen Elizabeth: “He who reigns on high, to whom all power is given in Heaven and in Earth, delivered one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, without the pale of which is no salvation, to one only person on earth, namely, to the prince of the Apostles, to Peter and to Peter’s successors, the Roman Pontiff, to be governed in the plenitude of power. *This one person He appointed prince over all nations, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, to destroy, to scatter abroad, to disperse, to plant and to build.*” \* \* \* \*

“We, of the plenitude of the Apostolic power, declare that the aforesaid ELIZABETH, being a heretic and the favorer of heretics, and those who adhere to her in the matters aforesaid, have incurred the sentence of cursing, and are cut off from the Unity of Christ’s Body; and, moreover, that she herself is *deprived of her pretended right to the kingdom aforesaid, and also of all and every kind of dominion, dignity and privilege;*

and likewise that the nobles, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others who have in any way whatever sworn to her, *are forever absolved from such oath*, and utterly from all obligation of dominion, fealty and obedience, and we, by authority of these presents, do absolve them; and we deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended right of the kingdom, and of all others aforesaid; and we charge and forbid all and singular the nobles, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they dare not obey her, or her admonitions, commands and laws. Whosoever shall act otherwise, them we bind by like sentence of cursing!!”

I repeat, this would not do in this age and country—for, differ as the American people may do, as to the person and character of the Chief Magistrate of these United States, they are all agreed in one thing. They choose to manage their own affairs, and should Pius IX. attempt to revise and publish a second edition of this interesting Epistle of his namesake of the *sixteenth* century, all parties, as with one voice, would request him to reserve his thunders within the walls of the Vatican, *until they were asked for!* Hence we find Jesuits and Romish Bishops and Priests, and editors, and orators, in *this* country, strenuously denying that the Pope ever

claimed *civil* power, and endeavoring to persuade the American people that Popery is not only entirely compatible with, but in fact necessary to the maintenance and success of *Republican* institutions! How these political weather-cocks reconcile their "new light," with the authoritative and acknowledged teachings of the great doctors BELLARMINE, and BARONIUS, and Fathers CRESWELL and ROSWEYD, the lights of the *golden age* of Popery, I cannot conceive!— I will only call their attention to the "strong meat," of these "doctors and teachers," and leave *Republican* Romanists to digest it as best they may. 1. BELLARMINE. He says: "There is a sort of *heretics* lurking in the bosom of the Church all about Christendom, and in some places stalking with open face, who restrain the Pope's authority so far as not to allow him any power over sovereign princes in *temporal affairs*; much less any power of *depriving them of their kingdoms and principalities!*" 2. BARONIUS.— He says: "They are *all* branded for *heretics*, who take from the Church of Rome and See of Peter one of the two swords, and *allow only the spiritual!*" 3. Father CRESWELL. He says: "It is the sentence of *all* [Roman] Catholics, that subjects are bound to *expel heretical princes if they have strength enough, and to this*

they are tied by the commandment of God, the most strict tie of conscience, *and the extreme danger of their souls!*" [Query. Is not the American President a "*heretical prince?*"]—  
4. FATHER ROSWEYD. He calls all who deny to the Pope *temporal* power over all kings and princes, "*Half Christians, barking Royalists, and a new sect of Catholics!*"

Leaving the Romanist to harmonize these versicolored opinions, touching his fundamental doctrine of the Papal Supremacy, into the one clear ray of his boasted "Unity," I proceed to test the doctrine itself by Scripture and the witness of the Primitive Church. Although the views which I have quoted from their authorized teachers, and from the Bulls of the very Popes themselves, in reference to the Supremacy of the Pope in all *temporal* things, can, notwithstanding the quibblings and denials of Romanists in this country and in England, be legitimately and beyond controversy, fastened upon the Church of Rome, as part and parcel of its authorized and "infallible" teaching, yet in this discussion, I desire so to state the dogma, as that the most sensitive *Republican Romanist* must admit it. I shall, therefore, say nothing farther about the *temporal* supremacy of the Pope, and will, for the sake of the argument,

admit, if the American Romanist pleases, that *such* a power is not now, and never has been, either claimed or exercised. Confining, then, the whole question to a Supremacy in *spiritual* things, the dogma which Rome seeks to fasten upon the Universal Church, as *the* teaching of Scripture and the Church Catholic in all ages, may be thus stated :

ST. PETER was constituted by our Lord the Prince or Chief of all the Apostles, they to receive power and commission from him. To him alone were committed the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Upon him was the Christian Church founded—he being that immovable Rock, against which the gates of Hell should never prevail. This prerogative, and these powers, St. Peter exercised during his lifetime, and they were unhesitatingly conceded to him by his fellow Apostles, and all the Churches. He founded the Church of Rome, and was the first Bishop of that Church. He constituted it as his peculiar See, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches. Hence all his powers and prerogatives, without abatement and without end, have descended to, and have always been possessed and exercised by, his successors, the Bishops of the Church of Rome.—That Bishop is the VICAR of the Lord Jesus

Christ. He is the only visible Head of the Church on Earth. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that all persons and all Churches, should be in perfect subjection to him, because through him alone can they be united with the Church Catholic, the Body of Christ. All who are not thus subject to him, and obedient to all his laws, no matter if otherwise they have received orders in an unbroken succession from the Apostles, and even through the Romish Church itself, are *schismatics*, and in danger, if not absolutely certain, of losing salvation through Jesus Christ.

I believe I have stated the doctrine of the PAPAL SUPREMACY as moderately as it can be stated. If any Romanist denies any one of *these* positions, sure I am that he will encounter the Anathema of the Papal See. He may believe as much more as the state of the times will allow; but *so much*, he must "steadfastly believe." The first point, as will be seen, and upon which the whole superstructure is built, relates to the alleged Supremacy of St. PETER over his fellow Apostles. If *he* possessed not that, of course he could not transmit it to others. If he did, still the conclusion by no means follows that the Pope of Rome has succeeded to it. But more of this hereafter. Our appeal

shall be to Scripture, and to the writers of the Early Church—writers admitted to be Orthodox by Romanists themselves. I mistake much if both do not demonstrate that all these mighty pretensions of him who “as God, sitteth in the Temple of God,” “opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped,” are but unfounded assumptions—*“Vox et præterea nihil!”*

We inquire, then, (1) if St. PETER *was* constituted “Prince of the Apostles,” and as such, exercised such a supremacy over them as we have seen they did over the inferior ministers and laity of the Church? Our answer, of course, is an emphatic *negative*, and we proceed to examine the several passages of Scripture relied upon by Romanists to sustain their position. If this keystone of the arch be taken away, the whole structure will fall from its own unsupported weight. We are always referred, and with an air of triumph, if not of insolence, to St. Matt. xvi. 18; “And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this Rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.” This declaration of our Lord, as every reader of the New Testament well knows, followed the confession of St. Peter, of his unwavering faith in the Divinity of his

Lord and Master. "But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in Heaven. And I say" &c., (vs. 15—17.) Now, whatever was the power or prerogative intended to be conferred by our Lord upon St. Peter, in the words quoted, the inquiry arises preliminarily, did He *then* confer the power, or was it only a promise for the future? Not the former, surely. Or, at least, so must the *Romanist* maintain, for the Council of Trent, under an Anathema, requires him to believe that our Lord did not constitute St. Peter, and the other Apostles, even *Priests*, until the institution of the Holy Eucharist, at the Last Supper! At the 22d session of that Council, held Sept. 17, 1562, the Canons "on the Sacrifice of the Mass," were adopted, the second of which reads as follows:

"CANON II. If any one saith, that by these words, 'Do this for the commemoration of Me,' Christ did not *institute* the Apostles *Priests*; or did not ordain that they and other *Priests* should offer His own Body and Blood, let him be Anathema."

It is very evident, then, that the passage is not so *very* clear in conferring a supremacy upon St. Peter as is alleged ; for from the Canon just quoted, we perceive that a very serious doubt must be entertained, even by Romanists themselves. If it was only a promise, relating to a *future* commission, then the circumstances attending the actual grant must limit and explain the text itself. *That* point will be considered presently. In this discussion, the *onus* of proof rests upon the Romanists. Admitting, for the sake of the argument, that the prerogative—be it what it may—was *instantly* conferred, though its exercise was necessarily to be delayed, until CHRIST had gone away again into Heaven ; still, before the adherents of the See of Rome can claim such unlimited power as they do—drawing as such claim does, such momentous consequences of life or death—it is incumbent upon them to show : 1. That the passage referring to St. Peter is not susceptible of any other meaning than what they give to it ; and, 2. That the Bishop of Rome also possesses by Divine Right all that was thus conferred upon St. Peter. They can do neither, and therefore, with an assurance that would grace Hildebrand himself, assume *both* points as granted ! On the contrary, these, among other difficulties, lie

in the way of the first position—the *second* having not even a pillar of straw to support it. The passage is susceptible of any one of *three* significations, besides that which Romanists claim, and it is worthy of remark that the *early* Fathers are divided in their opinions, as to which of the three is the correct opinion; *while not one of them ever even suggests that the prerogative descended to the Bishop of Rome!* JEROME, who lived at the close of the 4th century, is the first who uses language that can even be so tortured by Romanists as to sustain this last view.

1. The Rock spoken of may be Peter individually, referring to the fact that he was first to preach the Gospel and establish the Church among both Jews and Gentiles. This he did, but Rome can derive no argument in her favor from this fact, for neither the first *Jewish* nor *Gentile* Church was founded in Rome. The prerogative, if *personal*, as this supposition assumes, would die with him. TERTULLIAN and CYPRIAN adopt this view. It is an equally good interpretation with that assumed by the Romanists. It is a significant fact which I may mention here as well as in any place, that the APOSTOLIC Fathers, so called, viz: Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas, never once mention this passage. This is

singular upon the Romish hypothesis, especially in the case of CLEMENT, who wrote as Bishop of Rome to the Corinthians, in relation to their divisions and troubles. But I will not anticipate this *historical* argument against the Papal Supremacy.

2. The passage *may* refer to St. Peter and his successors *generally* and collectively throughout the world. Still Rome would gain nothing over Jerusalem, Antioch, or any other city where that Apostle preached and established the Church. Or,

3. It *may* mean CHRIST Himself, as the Rock of the Church, or rather the confession of faith in that Rock which St. Peter had just made. I know that the Romanists make a great outcry against *this* interpretation, averring that it is absurd upon its very face. I do not undertake to say that it is the right and only interpretation of this passage, but I will say that, whenever Romanists charge that this is an invention of modern Protestants, they either understand not "what they say, nor whereof they affirm," or else they make large drafts upon the credulity of their hearers and readers. For it is a fact which cannot be denied, that a large majority of the early Fathers, considered as orthodox by Rome, who cite and comment upon this pas-

sage, *adopt this very interpretation.* AUGUSTINE is one. He says: "The Church is founded upon a Rock, from whence Peter received his name. For the Rock was not named from Peter, but Peter from the Rock; as CHRIST is not called after the Christians, but the Christians after Christ. Therefore, when the Lord said, Upon this Rock I will build my Church, it was because Peter had said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. Upon this Rock, therefore, he says, *which thou confessest*, I will build my Church. *For Christ was the Rock*, upon which foundation Peter himself was also built. Because no other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus." CHRYSOSTOM is another. He says: "And I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, *that is, upon the faith of the Confession.*" GREGORY, of Nyssa, is another. He says: "Our Lord and God, Jesus Christ is called \* \* \* the Rock of faith, as a foundation; just as the Lord Himself says to the Prince of the Apostles, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church,'—*upon the Confession*, namely, of CHRIST, because he had said, 'Thou art CHRIST, the Son of the Living God.'"

If *we*, then, are to be branded as *heretics*, because we will not admit the interpretation which Rome *now* puts upon this declaration of our Lord to St. Peter, then we share that condemnation with many a saint of the Roman Calendar, and with the whole Catholic Church of the first four centuries.

But we are told that the rest of the words spoken to Peter at this time, settle the question in favor of the Romanists: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven." (v. 19.) There is no dispute as to the meaning of the words—"the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." They are explained in the remainder of the verse. But *does* this settle the question? We have already seen that, according to Romanists themselves, the *power* was not conferred until after CHRIST'S death, and then *this* prerogative in all its fullness was bestowed alike upon *all* the Apostles. "And when he had said this, He breathed on THEM, and said unto them, Receive YE the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins YE remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins YE retain, they are retained." (St. John xx: 22, 23.) Surely there is no su-

premacv here, and *this* was the time when the Apostolical commission was fully given, for Jesus had just said, (v. 21.) "Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent Me, even so I send you." *Equal* power was conferred upon *all* the Apostles. So read the words themselves—so understood the Fathers of the Primitive Church.—ORIGEN says: "If you think the whole Church to be only built on Peter alone, what will you say of John, the son of thunder, and of each of the Apostles." JEROME says: "You say, the Church is founded on Peter; but the same in another place is done upon *all* the Apostles."—CYPRIAN says: "Certainly the other Apostles were what St. Peter was, endowed with *an equal plenitude both of honor and of power.*" And so plain was this revealed and admitted fact, that a Cardinal of the Romish Church, NICHOLAS DE CUSA, is forced to say: "We know that Peter received from Christ *no more power than the other Apostles*; for nothing was said to Peter that was not also said to the others. Therefore, we say rightly, that all the Apostles were *equal* in power with Peter." Many other like quotations might be added, but my only purpose is to show that in saying that this text in St. Matthew's Gospel, does not settle the question

in favor of the Romanists, I only say what the early Fathers did.

I have dwelt thus long upon the passage, because it furnishes nearly the entire staple of Romish evidence from the Scriptures in favor of the Supremacy of St. Peter and his successors of Rome. One or two other texts are sometimes quoted, and submitting what has already been said to the sober, candid and unprejudiced judgment of the reader, I shall notice very briefly these additional passages of the New Testament.

In St. Matt. x. 2., we read thus: "Now, the names of the twelve Apostles are these: the *first*, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother," &c. By displaying the word "first" in flaming capitals, MILNER and KENRICK, the modern champions of Romanism in England and in this country, insist, with great emphasis, that the only meaning can be, that Simon Peter was the *first* or chief, and, of course, Ruler of the Apostles. It is a little singular, if *such* was *intended* to be the meaning, that St. Mark and St. Luke should both omit the word in *their* lists of the twelve Apostles! Particularly is this remarkable in the case of St. Mark, who, as is generally believed, and as the Romish Church expressly asserts, wrote his

Gospel under the direction, and at the dictation of St. Peter himself ! And here I must notice, too, another singular fact. St. Mark, thus writing as St. Peter directs, gives the account of the question asked near Cesarea Philippi, "Whom say ye that I am ;" and Peter's answer thereto, but writes not a syllable of the reply of Jesus to him, out of which grows this whole controversy ! Yes ! on this very chief corner stone of faith, as Papists are required to believe, St. Mark, writing under the very direction of St. Peter himself, *says nothing* ! What is the presumption from that silence ? Is it not, that St. Peter *knew* that he had no authority over his fellows ? But this is a digression.—Why is the word "first" used by St. Matthew ? For the reason that the Romanists give ? So thought not THEOPHYLACT, an ancient commentator on the Scriptures, and one received as orthodox by the Romish Church. With the citation of his opinion I will willingly leave this proof to the decision of every man of common sense. Writing upon this verse in St. Matthew, he says : "He places Peter and Andrew first, *because they were first called* ; then the sons of Zebedee ; and he places James in order before John, *for not according to dignity, but simply by accident*, does he form the catalogue. He says,

therefore, 'James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the publican.' Behold the humility of Matthew in placing himself after Thomas." *This* proof, then, is disposed of.

BOSSUET, a controversialist of the 18th century, finds another proof of Peter's supremacy in St. John xx. 1—10. Upon that passage, he says: "Peter and John ran to the tomb. John arrives the first; but respect restrains him, and he *dare* not enter within the depth before Peter! PETER is the first to see the linen clothes of the burial, deposited in a corner of the sacred tomb, the first spoils of conquered death!" I need only say of *this* explanation, however, that it is too absurd and ridiculous for even MILNER and KENRICK to digest, and they are therefore prudently silent upon this wonderful discovery of the courtier of Louis XIV. !

Another passage relied upon by Romanists to sustain their position, is St. John xxi. 16: "Feed my sheep," or, as Papists would have it read, "Be thou universal Governor of My Church!" Now that St. Peter was constituted by our Lord a Pastor or Shepherd of the sheep, no one denies. But was he so appointed to the exclusion of others—or rather were his fellow

Apostles to be numbered with the sheep whom St. Peter was to feed and rule? *This* is the point, and the only point at issue—for grant to St. Peter as much power as you please—if his colleagues possessed an equality of prerogative with him, the whole superstructure of Popery falls. As this last will be demonstrated when we consider presently the conduct of St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles as recorded in Holy Scripture, I shall not stop to comment at any length upon this passage. It will be seen that Romanists beg the whole question by making the remark of our Lord read: “Do thou *alone* feed my sheep.” This would be contradictory to other parts of Scripture, and must therefore be rejected. *All* the Apostles were constituted shepherds of the flock of Christ, and so are *all* Ministers—for even the *Elders* of Ephesus were exhorted to “feed the Church of God,” over “which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.” The *early* Fathers found no supremacy of right or power granted to St. Peter in this text. As CYRIL well remarked, these words do only “renew the former grant of Apostleship, after his great offence of denying his Lord.” “All of the Apostles,” says CYPRIAN, “were shepherds; but the flock did appear one which was fed *by the Apostles* with

unanimous agreement." What St. Peter was, that same was St. John and all the rest. The supremacy, which Rome seeks here, is an assumption, like all the rest, invented in after ages to sustain a foregone conclusion.\*

Pope INNOCENT III. found the Papal Supremacy clearly set forth in Genesis i. 16—"And God made two great lights; the *greater* light to rule the day, and the *lesser* light to rule the night!" The *greater* light, according to his Holiness, is the *Pope*, and the *lesser* light, the *temporal power*, and, as he expresses it, "the *Pontifical* authority doth so much exceed the *royal power*, as the sun doth the moon!" That was popular doctrine in the 13th century, but as it is *unanimously* repudiated in the NINETEENTH, I suppose we must allow that "Infallible" Church to change front! There *is*, however, as much Papal Supremacy *in that* text as in any other of the Word of God.

But the Romanist will say: "You give the wrong construction to these several passages, and, notwithstanding all your objections, we still insist that they *do* teach the Supremacy of St. Peter over all others in the Christian Church."

---

\*For a triumphant refutation of the Romish claim based on this passage, see "Barrow on the Papal Supremacy," pp. 54—57.

Let us, then, take up the *history* of the Church, and especially of the acts of this Apostle, and see if, as a matter of fact, he either claimed or exercised a Supremacy over his fellow Apostles. If I mistake not, it will appear as clear as a sunbeam, that the very reverse of this was uniformly the case. So true is this, that very many Romish writers concede that Scripture, in its history, is silent as to any exercise of Supremacy of St. Peter over the other Apostles. And surely, if *he* was not thus supreme, the whole fabric of the power of his pretended successor, the Roman Pontiff, built upon that sandy foundation, falls at once to the ground.

The first mention made of St. Peter, after the time when Jesus said to him, "Feed my sheep," is in connection with the choice of a successor to the traitor Judas. He, indeed, takes the lead, in the suggestion, but as the sole Shepherd, the only Vicegerent of the Great Head of the Church, does he constitute the new Apostle; or even designate who he shall be? Neither. *They*, not he, "appointed two," and then the choice was by lot, or, as it was then understood, by a direct appeal to the absent yet Omnipotent Head of the Church. Not the faintest trace of Supremacy, or pretence to Supremacy, can be found in the record of this transaction.

In the 2d chapter of Acts, we read of the descent of the Holy Ghost. Yet in this, *all* shared alike—the cloven tongues sat upon *all* the twelve—and all alike spake with tongues. St. Peter, indeed, preached to the Jews, but with the eleven. And when the multitude of converts were baptized, they continued, as the sacred narrative informs us, “in the *Apostles*’ doctrine and fellowship,” a phrase which would not have been used, had there not been an equality and an unity of power possessed by them. The “doctrine and fellowship of Peter,” would have been the only right expression, if he had been, as Romanists claim, the *only* or chief Pastor of the flock.

In the 6th chapter of Acts, is recorded the choice and ordination of the *Deacons* of the Church. Here was a new order of under Shepherds constituted. Who performed the act? who designated the persons? who ordained? “The *twelve* called the multitude”—“and the saying pleased the whole multitude; and *they* chose,” etc. “Whom they set before the *Apostles*; and when *they* had prayed, *they* laid hands on them.” St. Peter’s name is not once mentioned in this important transaction. Words could not more definitely express an equality of power and jurisdiction, on the part of *all* the

Apostles, than the record in this chapter. St. Peter had no more authority over the action of St. Matthew, for instance, than the latter had over him.

In the 8th chapter, we read of the journey of PHILIP, one of these Deacons, to Samaria, and of his wonderful success in turning many unto the Lord in that city. And then we read as follows: "Now, when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, *they sent unto them* Peter and John." Most remarkable action, indeed, would this have been, if St Peter had possessed that Supremacy which Romanists claim! Did we read that Peter *sent* two of his suffragan Apostles, as the Pope now sends Legates, then we confess it *would* look somewhat like a Supremacy! But to be *sent* by his inferiors!—hard, indeed, will it be to reconcile the difficulty. How would it look now if we should read in the papers of the day, that "Bishops KENRICK and HUGHES, and their colleagues in this country, had *sent* Pope PIUS IX. upon a particular mission?" We should be very sure that the return mail from Rome would bring a bull of excommunication for such unparalleled audacity.—Where, I ask, shall we look for the primacy of St. Peter in this transaction? This one pas-

sage, and Romanists in vain endeavor to parry its crushing force against them, demolishes every argument which Papists can or do bring from Scripture in favor of the Supremacy of Peter. But there is another, more fatal still.

In the 10th chapter we find recorded the circumstances connected with the mission of St. Peter to CORNELIUS, and the conversion and baptism of that Gentile centurion and his friends. Upon the return of the Apostle to Jerusalem, we read that "they that were of the circumcision *contended* with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them," (xi: 2, 3.) And suppose he did? Had he not, as the infallible Vicar of God, a right to do as he pleased, in so small a matter as preaching the Gospel to a Gentile? How dare they *contend* with him, who, Romanists tell us, alone received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and upon whom was alone conferred *all* power, both temporal and spiritual? Surely, such presumption would be checked and crushed at once by St. Peter's asserting his well known and admitted prerogative, and peremptorily forbidding them to question his acts or motives! But no! instead of all this, we find displayed one of the most remarkable examples of humility the world ever saw—supposing the doctrine of his Suprem-

acy to be true. He "rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them," (verse 4.) He tells them of the three-fold message necessary to overcome his reluctance—of the direct and positive command of the Spirit to go with the messengers of Cornelius—of his preaching the word—of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them while he spake, and he concludes his narrative thus: "Forasmuch, then, as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?" (verse 17.) If there is any Supremacy here, it certainly is the very antipodes of that claimed and exercised by GREGORY VII., or even PIUS IX.!

In the 15th chapter is an account of the first Council held in the Christian Church. Here, surely, the Supremacy of St. Peter must be manifest. As the only visible head and representative of Jesus Christ, no one could preside but he, and though, for form's sake, he might condescend to *ask* the opinions of others, he alone would, for he alone, if Romanism be true, *could* give an authoritative decision. On the contrary, the only part which he takes is to refer them to the case of Cornelius, and give it as his opinion, that the Holy Spirit had then decided

that *Jewish* rites were not to be imposed upon *Gentile* converts. Then the council listen to the narratives of Barnabas and Saul, after which St. JAMES sums up and authoritatively says:—*“My sentence is,”* etc. *He* presided in that Council—he gives the decision—and, if Scripture ever *hints* at a Supremacy of any Apostle over his fellows, that one was St. JAMES the Less. “If,” well remarks Dr. JARVIS, “half the testimony which the ancients give to St. JAMES, had been given to St. PETER, we should never have heard the last of it.” (See “Church Review,” vol. i., p. 181 et seq.) St. CHRYSOSTOM, of the 4th century, in speaking of this Council at Jerusalem says: “There was no pride in the Church, but great was its good order. Behold, after PETER, PAUL speaks and no one interrupts him. JAMES waits patiently, and does not leap upon his feet; *for he it was to whom the government was confided.* \* \* \* ‘After they had held their peace,’ it is said, ‘James answered saying, Simon hath declared,’ etc. PETER spake at the beginning more vehemently; JAMES more mildly. *Thus, it always becomes him to do who is in great authority.*” Very clear is it, then, if we would find the Supremacy of St. Peter in the Scriptures, we must look for it elsewhere than in the record of the Council at Jerusalem.

Here, most unaccountably, upon the Romish hypothesis, the sacred narrative leaves the supreme head of the Church on earth, and is wholly taken up with the account of the labors of St. Paul. *He* founds churches and ordains ministers. *He* reproveth the perverse and guilty, and excommunicates apostates, but not a lisp do we find of his ever asking the approbation of St. Peter. On the contrary, as he tells us himself, in his Epistle to the Galatians, (ii: 11, etc.) that when at Antioch, finding St. PETER blameworthy in a certain matter, he “withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed,” and this was no private, but a public rebuke. He “said to Peter before them all,” etc. (verse 14.) Where, again, was this alleged Supremacy of St. Peter? Would the Roman Pontiff *now* thus tolerate a public rebuke, by one of his inferiors and creatures? Let the experiment be tried, and the reprover would speedily meet with the fate of MARTIN LUTHER? But St. Peter submits quietly to this reproof of his fellow and equal, who “was not one whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles.”

Equally unaccountable, on the supposition of a Supremacy by Divine right, is the silence of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, as to any authority whatsoever, exercised by St. Peter

over that Church of which Romanists would have us believe he was the Bishop at that very time. His name is not once mentioned—no salutation sent to him, though a dozen and more of that Church are greeted by name. And again, during the imprisonment of St. Paul in that city, though he wrote Epistles to other Churches, and sends salutations from his fellow Christians in Rome, St. Peter's name is not mentioned. How can this remarkable silence, in regard to the superior officer of that and all other Churches, be accounted for? Let Romanists answer if they can. Look, too, at the two Epistles which St. Peter wrote. Bear they the slightest resemblance to the Bulls and Encyclical Letters of the Popes of our day? No, the minutest, microscopic investigation will fail to find the remotest hint at Supremacy. He exhorts, but it is as an elder brother, who was himself waiting for the coming of his Lord. I repeat; read these Epistles—and read all those written by St. Paul, either to, or from Rome, and tell me if you can find the faintest traces of an allusion to the power and Supremacy of St. Peter, who, Papists tell us, founded the Church of Rome, and was its first Bishop? I fear not the answer, and, in view of this wonderful silence, this unanswerable *negative* evidence, I wonder not that Rome

*discourages*, and where circumstances will allow, *forbids* the reading of the Bible.

Where, then, I ask, in conclusion, can we find the least foundation for the Supremacy of St. Peter in the Scripture history of the Christian Church? Scores of opportunities are presented where it would seem as if the sacred writers *must* have alluded to it, and yet, as we have seen, not the remotest hint is given of any such thing. On the contrary, upon two occasions, at least, is he openly blamed. Holy Scripture, then, we may say, unhesitatingly, authorizes no one of the many arrogant claims of the Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, to be the head of the Church, and to demand that there shall be union with him on pain of eternal death. We say, and ever will say, in answer to all these impudent claims, as St. Peter himself once said to the Elders of the Jews: "We ought to obey *God* rather than *man*."



## LECTURE VI.

### The Papal Supremacy—The Primitive Church Against it.

The assumptions of Papacy, as has been stated, rest upon several positions, all of which are taken for granted by Romanists, all of which we deny, and any one of which being proved to be false, the whole fabric of the Papal Supremacy falls. We shall again state these positions in a somewhat different form, that the evidence advanced of their falsity may be rightly and clearly understood.

1. St. Peter was appointed by our Lord, Prince or Chief of the Apostles. Upon him alone was the Church of Christ built, and to him only were committed the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

2. He claimed and exercised all the prerogatives involved in such grant.

3. He founded the Church of Rome, and was its first Bishop.

4. Hence this Church was constituted exclusively his See.

5. All the powers and rights conferred by the Lord Jesus Christ upon St. Peter, were thus

devolved, "until the end of the World," upon his successor, the Bishop of Rome, and upon him alone.

6. Hence, finally, the Bishop or Pope of Rome is the centre of Unity to the whole Christian Church, and without union with him and his See, and perfect submission thereto, there is no union with the one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ. All that *he* excommunicates are heretics and scismatics, and are shut out of the Kingdom of Heaven, because he turns the keys thereof against them.

Thus is built up this magnificent, though unscriptural edifice of the Papal Supremacy, and Papal infallibility. It will readily be perceived, that upon the removal of *any one* of these stones, the whole superstructure will necessarily fall. Thus, (1,) if St. PETER was *not* constituted Prince or Chief of the Apostles, and if, as a matter of fact, the Church of Christ was *not* built upon him, nor the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to him, any more than they were to the rest of the Apostles, it follows that he could neither have claimed nor exercised such powers. I trust that the proof submitted in the last Lecture, was sufficient to demonstrate the entire correctness and truth of the position *we* occupy on this point, in opposi-

tion to the claims of the Romish Church. Of course, if St. PETER had no such Supremacy, neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any other Bishop, could *succeed* to what he neither possessed nor exercised. The fifth and sixth assumptions of Rome thus fall, having no pretence of support.

But, (2,) admitting the entire correctness of the 1st and 2d Postulates, still the 3d and 4th would not necessarily follow, but must, wholly distinct from all other inquiries, be determined to be true or false, as matters of *historical fact*. If *these* fall for want of evidence, the 1st and 2d may still be entirely established as true, and yet the 5th and 6th Postulates, which contain the sum and substance of the controversy between the Romish and the English Church, be but barefaced assumptions, wholly destitute of truth. In such case the Pope of Rome has no more right to claim obedience from a Bishop or member of the Anglican or American Church, than has one of the successors of Mahommed!

It is well thus to state clearly the precise point at issue. For Romish controversialists delight to throw a fog about this question, so that if they can procure an admission of *one* point, they may spring their trap upon all the rest, and take captive the bewildered victim in

the serpentine folds of full grown Popery. It needs but the touch of Ithuriel's spear of Scriptural and Primitive truth, to develope this disguised monster in all its enormity and hideousness.

In the last Lecture we examined fully, and I hope, satisfactorily, the Scriptural evidence touching the position which St. Peter occupied in the college of the Apostles, and his agency in the establishment of the Christian Church, both among Jews and Gentiles. That evidence was uniform, clear and unanswerable, against both of the first two Postulates. And here the whole argument might be left. For without *that* foundation, not the first stone of the PAPAL SUPREMACY can be laid. But Romanists, touching this Scriptural argument as little and as lightly as is possible, fly off at once to the Historical argument, and assert that *it* proves, as a matter of fact, all they claim—that the Primitive Church confessed not only the Supremacy of St. Peter, but also that that Supremacy descended in perpetuity to the Bishop of Rome, and *he* was uniformly and in all time acknowledged as the only head of the Church on Earth, the only visible bond of Unity, the only channel of connection with Christ Himself. This, they say, was the only true faith and practice,

acknowledged and submitted to by all but heretics and reprobate schismatics. Now I am not about to derogate one whit from the force and correctness of an appeal to HISTORICAL FACTS to decide disputed questions, either of doctrine or of practice. On the contrary, I here re-affirm all that was said on this point in the SECOND Lecture. And I propose to try the assumptions of the PAPAL SUPREMACY by *this* test, too. It will prove as fatal to that dogma as we have already seen the SCRIPTURAL evidence is to that of St. Peter over his fellow Apostles.

The 3d Postulate, that St. Peter “founded the Church of Rome, and was its first Bishop,” rests wholly upon an assumption, having not only no evidence to support it, but with very much to demonstrate its falsity, especially in relation to the latter part of the position. I waive all discussion upon the much disputed question, as to whether or not St. Peter was ever at Rome at all. I will admit that he was, though very many learned writers have denied the fact, and have advanced strong proof to support that denial. But did he *alone* found the Church of Rome? There is not the first evidence of such a fact, either in Scripture or in the writings of the earliest Fathers of the

Church. The *Scriptural* inference is of the strongest kind against such a supposition. The first writer that mentions St. Peter's name, in connection with the Romans, is IGNATIUS, in this one passage of his epistle to that Church : " I do not *command* you as did *Peter and Paul*. They were Apostles ; I am a condemned man. They were free ; I am even until now a slave." If an inference may be drawn from this declaration of this holy martyr, that St. PETER ever personally *commanded* the Roman Church, it will be perceived that St. PAUL is joined with him in the command. The first time that St. Peter's connection with the Church of Rome is *positively* asserted, is about the middle of the *second* century, and from that time to the middle of the *third*, all writers who mention the fact, as positively assert that it was founded *jointly* by St. Peter and St. Paul. Thus, DIONYSUS, of Corinth, who wrote about A. D. 170, says, addressing himself to the Church of Rome : " In this your so great admonition, you have mingled together the planting both of the *Romans* and *Corinthians*, *effected by Peter and Paul*. For both, when they planted us in our Corinth, taught in like manner, and in like manner when they went teaching together into Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time."—

IRENÆUS, a little later in the same century, says: "The blessed *Apostles* [Peter and Paul, of whom he had been speaking.] having founded and established the Church of Rome, committed the office of the Episcopate to LINUS." Here, again, is the joint and equal action of the *two* mentioned—no more supremacy bestowed upon St. Peter than upon St. Paul. Furthermore, IRENÆUS asserts that LINUS, and not St. Peter, was the first Bishop of Rome; and after mentioning his successor ANACLETUS, says that CLEMENT was appointed in the third place.— CLEMENT was an Apostolic man, and as the Romish Church also believes, was appointed by St. Peter. Here, then, were at least *three* Bishops of that Church appointed and ruling the Church of Rome in the first century. And will even Romanists themselves pretend that the Apostle St. JOHN, who survived until the close of that century, was *subject* to Linus, Anacletus and Clement, mere Bishops of one Church in Italy? It must have been so, or the dogma of the Papal Supremacy is but a fiction of the imagination. That it was *not* so, is evident, not only from the very absurdity of the pretention, but also from the fact that even Romanists themselves do not pretend that such a thing ever happened. But I am anticipating. TER-

TULLIAN, too, a contemporary of IRENÆUS, speaks of the *joint* agency of St. Paul, in founding the Church of Rome, and says that both suffered martyrdom there together. CALUS, a Roman Presbyter, writing A. D., 210 says: "I have the monuments of the Apostles to show; for if you will go to the Vatican, you will find the monuments of those who founded the Church!" He was speaking of the death and monuments of St. Peter and St. Paul. From these testimonies it is evident that if St. Peter had any thing at all to do with founding the Church of Rome, it was but a joint act with St. Paul, and this was done by committing the Episcopate to LINUS.— This they might have done, either at Rome or in *Jerusalem*, by consecrating LINUS, and sending him back with those "strangers of Rome," who were converted on the day of Pentecost, and doubtless returned to their home, as soon as the imperial edict of banishment was revoked. This last position is taken, and I may add, incontestably proved, by Dr. JARVIS, that ripe scholar and unequalled Theologian, whose "praise is in all the Churches." (For a thorough and complete discussion of this whole subject of St. Peter's connection with the Church of Rome, see an article from the pen of Dr. JARVIS, in the "Church Review," vol. 1. pp. 165—186.)

But either is equally fatal to all the assumptions and pretensions of the Church of Rome, and I may, without further remark, dismiss the 3d Postulate, as alike unsound and untrue with the first two. The 4th, of course, falls with the 3d.

Still, Rome clings to the 5th and 6th, contending that they, at least, were received, "always, everywhere, by all." We take like issue here, and undertake to show, that they were the adulterations and novelties of after ages, wholly unknown to, or as often as claimed, unanimously rejected by the Primitive Church, which clung to the "faith once delivered to the saints," until the world and earthly ambition crept in to rob her of her precious jewels, and to accomplish that which persecutions had no power to effect.

Did, is our last and only inquiry, the Primitive Church, and by this term, I mean the Church of the 2d, 3d and 4th centuries, acknowledge, as a truth, and act accordingly, that "the Bishop of Rome was the centre of unity to the whole Christian Church, without union with whom and his See, and perfect submission thereto, there was, and could be, no union with the "One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ?" Did that Primitive Church regard *all* who were excommunicated by the Bishop of Rome, as

necessarily "heretics and schismatics, and shut out of the kingdom of Heaven, because he alone possessed the keys thereof?" The inquiry is a historical one, and let historical facts determine the question at issue.

And (1) what is the testimony of the Apostolical Fathers, so called, upon this point? The silence of the grave is not more impressively conclusive, as to the absence of all life and vigor therein, than is the utter silence of CLEMENT, and HERMAS, and BARNABAS, and IGNATIUS, and POLYCARP, as to the faintest shadow of an acknowledgement of a supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, over other Bishops of the Catholic Church of Christ. HERMAS and BARNABAS speak of faith, and discipline, and duties, but not one word of submission to the See of Rome. They knew of "no such custom, neither" did "the Churches of God." POLYCARP writes to the Philippians of his companion IGNATIUS, and of the duties of Priests, and Deacons, and of the Laity, but not the first allusion does he make to that Church, which the Romanist, under an anathema, must believe to be "the Mother and *Mistress* of all Churches," nor to him, whom, under a like anathema, we are asked to believe, was and is the only vicegerent of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Head and Ruler of the Church!

Strange omission, indeed, this, on the part of "the Angel of the Church in Smyrna!" IGNATIUS writes to the SMYRNÆANS, to the PHILADELPHIANS, to the TRALLIANS, to the MAGNESIANS, to the EPHESIANS, and to POLYCARP, enjoining, with all the earnestness of an expectant martyr, obedience to the Bishops and other Ministers, saying, as he does to Polycarp, "My soul be security for them that submit to their Bishop, with their Presbyters and Deacons," but not the first charge or hint, that it is necessary that they, or any of them, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, or Laity, must, or ought to be, in subjection to the Bishop of Rome! He writes to the ROMANS, and except the solitary passage before quoted, makes no mention of even St. PETER himself, nor in any way does he allude to the Bishop of that Church, either to express his submission to him as his earthly head, or even to ask for his blessing to sustain him in his approaching conflict with the wild beasts. Could IGNATIUS have known of, or believed in any such supremacy, as is asserted in the 6th Postulate, and which Rome demands that we should believe on pain of eternal damnation? Absurdity itself could hardly assume that he did. Did it exist, then? Let the Romanist answer if he can. But what shall we say of CLEMENT? He

was the Bishop of Rome, and, according to the dogma of the Papal Supremacy, the only Head and Ruler of the Church. Surely he could not have been such, and himself not have known the fact! Equally clear is it, that if he had possessed any such power, he would have claimed and exercised it, when a suitable occasion offered. Such an occasion presented itself. The Church of CORINTH, being again afflicted with schisms and heresies, wrote to this holy man for advice. His Epistle in reply is still extant. Read that Epistle and see if you find a single allusion to his prerogative as Supreme Head, to dictate or to punish? Not the slightest. He makes no such claim even as St. Paul does in *his* Epistles to that Church. He sends salutation, not in his own name, but begins his Epistle "the Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth." He exhorts them to harmony, to unity in the faith, and to a diligent and careful observance each of his own appropriate duties and functions. But, I repeat, not the slightest allusion to any power or jurisdiction which *he* possessed over them—not one *command*, as of a master to his servant, as to what they should or should not do. What means such impressive silence? Will the Romanist, if he can, account

for this strange conduct of one of the first Bishops of the Romish See ? The only explanation is, and can be, that he *knew* he had no control over them, and hence, only as a brother, exhorted them to love as brethren, and be at peace one with another.

This silence and negative testimony of the *five* Apostolical Fathers, is fatal to the claim of Rome to a Supremacy, either in temporal or spiritual things. It is an unanswerable proof, that there *was* no such thing while the teaching of the Apostles was yet sounding in men's ears.

Romanists, in all ages, have felt the crushing force of this testimony against them. Hence, to parry its force, and in fact, to turn the scale in their favor, there was ushered into the world about the year A. D. 800, a volume of "Decretal Epistles," the work of shameless forgery and imposture, in which these primitive Bishops of Rome, LINUS and CLEMENT, etc., were made to assume and exercise powers like those wielded by the INNOCENTS and BONIFACES of that century. In that age of superstition and moral darkness, this forgery was successfully palmed off upon the Church and the world. And from the 9th to the 16th century, those, now confessedly "Forged Decretal Epistles," were made the basis of the claim and acknowledgment of

many of the stupendous prerogatives then wielded by the Sovereign Pontiff. But when the light of the revival of letters in the sixteenth century was let in upon this foul imposture, it was speedily consigned to its merited oblivion. The great Romish Doctors, BELLARMINÉ and BARONIUS, admit that they were but *forgeries*. DU PIN, another Romish writer, calls the whole collection "a medley," and still another, LABBEUS, stamps the work as a "deformity which can be disguised by no act of coloring." Such was one of the attempts of the Papal See to impose upon the world, and to evade the conclusion which so irresistibly followed this remarkable silence of the Apostolical Fathers. As we proceed we shall have occasion to show that this is not the *only* forgery which has been committed, to uphold the presumptuous and even blasphemous claims of the Pope to universal Supremacy.\*

We have thus advanced fifty years into the *second* century, and not the first trace or hint is found of the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over other Bishops and Churches. Continuing our historical inquiry, we come in the last quar-

---

\* For a specimen of these "Forged Decretal Epistles," and the evidence that they *were* what they are designated in the text, see Appendix B.

ter of this century to IRENÆUS. Over him the Romanists raise a shout of triumph! "Here," say they, "is the Papal Supremacy as clear as a sunbeam. For does not IRENÆUS say, 'With the *Roman* Church, on account of its more potent principality, it is necessary that every Church should agree?'" I answer, that he is made to say so in *Romish* Books, and to those who are not allowed to read any others, doubtless, this appeal to this Bishop of Lyons, seems perfectly conclusive. But not having the fear of the "Index Expurgatorious" before our eyes, we may be permitted to inquire what IRENÆUS *does* say, and what he meant by the declaration, a *part* of which only, and that not correctly, do Romish controversialists quote for the benefit of their confiding readers. He is writing against heretics, who, even in his day, began to disturb the Church with their unauthorized additions to, and perversions of, the faith preached and established by CHRIST and the Apostles. He presents to them, among other considerations, the argument, and it is perfectly conclusive, that the Churches founded by the Apostles themselves, and blessed with their personal presence and teaching, and especially with their written Epistles, must be right in their expositions of doctrines, rites and discipline. Hence, it was

the dictate of wisdom to yield to the better opinion of such Churches. Selecting the Church of ROME, which he reminds his readers was founded by St. PETER and St. PAUL, *two* of the greatest of the Apostles, which possessed at least one of the original Epistles of Holy Scripture, and doubtless others also, written by both the founders of that Church, and which, on account of the magnitude and importance of the Imperial City, was probably the largest and most flourishing Church in the world, IRENEUS thus writes, and it is only necessary to give the whole passage, which, as usual, Romanists garble to make it suit their own purposes. He says: "To [not *with*,—"Ad" is the word,] the Roman Church, on account of its more potent principality, it is necessary that every Church should *resort*; ["convenire" is the word;] that is to say, those of the faithful who dwell on every side of it. For in it, by those who are on every side of it, is thus preserved the tradition which hath descended from the Apostles." The latter clause, which is explanatory of the former, Romanists omit. The whole passage, taken alone and in all its nakedness, means nothing more than that the faithful on every side of the Roman Church should resort thither, on account of its advantages, either to inspect

the originals of the Epistles and Gospels, or to learn directly from those who had heard what was the *tradition*, or oral teaching of the Apostles. That we have given the right interpretation to this passage—which, it will be perceived, strips Rome of any support to her dogma of the Papal Supremacy from IRENÆUS—is made evident beyond question by an analogous argument used by TERTULLIAN, a contemporary of the Bishop of Lyons. Addressing one who is laudably curious to ascertain sound christian doctrine, he advises him to resort to the APOSTOLICAL Churches, where the authentic letters of the Apostles were still recited. His words are: "Still do the very chairs of the APOSTLES remain in their own places; still are their AUTHENTIC LETTERS recited, which sound forth their very tones, and which faithfully exhibit their very countenances. If thou art in Achaia, thou hast Corinth; if in Macedon, thou hast Phillippi and Thessalonica. If thou journeyest to Asia, thou hast Ephesus; if Italy be thy residence, thou hast Rome." This passage sheds a world of light upon that quoted from IRENÆUS. We are to remember that that was not the day of printing presses and of cheap Bibles. Copies of the Gospels and Epistles were rare and costly, and filled with the errors of transcribers.

Let the inquirer then go to the fountain head for information—to the APOSTOLICAL Churches, where the very LETTERS themselves of the Apostles were still kept and recited. If residing in Achaia, he would find in Corinth, its capital, *two* Epistles of St. Paul ; if in Macedon, *three* Epistles from the same, addressed to its principal cities of Philippi and Thessalonica ; if in Asia Minor, at its capital, Ephesus, there would be not only the Epistle of St. Paul to that Church, but also, probably, those of St. John, with his Gospel and Revelation, for he lived and died in that city ; if in Italy, or parts adjacent, in *its* capital, Rome, would also be found, doubtless, correct transcripts of *all* the Gospels and Epistles, if not most of the originals, not addressed to particular persons or Churches.

Now, I ask, how much of Popery there is in these declarations, either of IRENÆUS or of TERTULLIAN ? No one seeks to rob the early and unambitious Roman Church of all the credit due to her, on account of her local privileges, and great influence in the promulgation and defence of the true faith. It is only when she claims to be “the *Mother* and *Mistress* of *all* Churches,” that we reject her pretensions as impious and absurd, *protesting* against them as

a *novelty* unknown to those who had the preaching of Apostles and Apostolic men "still sounding in their ears."

But does the Romanist reject our interpretation of this declaration of IRENÆUS, and still insist that it means, and only means: "*With the Roman Church it is necessary that every Church should agree,*" and hence that IRENÆUS believed in, and meant to assert the doctrine of the PAPAL SUPREMACY in all its length and breadth? Happily there is a test at hand which will *settle* this question, and let common sense judge whether it be in favor of, or against Rome. If that holy man believed in the Papal Supremacy, as now or in past times promulgated, then would his *acts* have agreed with his *words*. In his time the EASTER controversy raged with unbecoming heat. The Churches of the EAST and of the WEST differed as to the proper day when that Festival should be celebrated. In the former they chose the day of the Jewish Passover, i. e., the 14th day of the first new moon after the Vernal Equinox, no matter on what day of the week it fell, to commemorate the *death* of Christ. Of course EASTER was the second day thereafter. In the *Western* Church, however, the death of our Lord was commemorated on the Friday following

that 14th day, and EASTER came on the next Lord's day. This difference caused great excitement and controversy. A Council of Eastern Bishops was held in Ephesus, and they, alleging that they followed the teaching of St. John, determined to adhere to their ancient practice. There happened at this time to be a man in possession of the Bishopric of Rome, (VICTOR,) who attempted to exercise power over other Churches, because he *was* Bishop of the Imperial City. After trying in vain to *persuade* the Eastern Bishops to adopt the rule of Rome and the West, he, after his local Council of Ephesus had resolved to adhere to their old custom, undertook to *compel* them to conform to his wishes. They were as unyielding to his *threats* as to his *persuasions*. Whereupon VICTOR thundered forth an *excommunication* against them in a body, and professed to cut off all these Eastern Churches from union with the *Catholic* Church of Christ. Here, then, was this whole question of the PAPAL SUPREMACY put at issue by the Pope himself. *If* he possessed the power which this doctrine necessarily carries with it, then was that excommunication valid—those Churches *were* cut off from the Catholic Church—and *all* but heretics and schismatics would say, Amen. Above all, if

IRENÆUS, who was contemporary with all this action, believed as Romanists say he did, *he* would have been the last to have questioned this act of his sovereign Lord and Master. On the contrary, he wrote an indignant Epistle to VICTOR, censuring him for his presumption.—And the Eastern Bishops wrote back to VICTOR expressing their condemnation and even contempt of his course. EUSEBIUS, the ecclesiastical historian, says: “There are also extant, the expressions they used, *who pressed upon Victor with much severity.*” What does VICTOR do? and how were these Eastern Churches regarded by the whole Church besides? *He* quietly pocketed the insult, and the Churches of Asia Minor continued in full and acknowledged communion with the *Catholic* Church, VICTOR himself and the Roman Church included. In view of this *unfortunate* proceeding of VICTOR, and of the action of IRENÆUS, and of the Eastern Bishops thereon, where, I ask, is that *Supremacy* of the Pope, which, we are told, was acknowledged from the very beginning? The SECOND century closes with the exclamation: “Verily it is *not* in me.”

Here, again, we might rest the argument.—For if the *Supremacy* of the Pope *should* be found *after* this period, it would still be branded as a

*novelty*, no more worthy of a consideration than a novelty of this very day. But we will continue the search through the first *four* centuries, when, comparatively, the Church was pure. We pass, then, to consider the testimony of the THIRD century. A few proofs only will be advanced, but they will be such as will maintain, beyond question, our position of the *equality* of spiritual power in the Bishops as successors to the Apostles—a doctrine at once and forever fatal to the claims and pretensions of Rome.

Our first witness is CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage, a holy man, who was crowned with martyrdom A. D. 258. Very many of his writings are still extant. In them he uniformly addresses the Bishop of Rome as his “colleague” and “brother,” a style of address, which *no* Romish Bishop of our day would *dare* address to the sovereign Pontiff. During his life time, one or two of the Bishops of Rome, of a like character with the VICTOR of whom we have already spoken, began to claim, as the successor of St. Peter, superior authority over the other Bishops of the Church. Did CYPRIAN acknowledge such a claim, or submit himself to such pretended authority? Let his rebuke of one of these arrogant Bishops answer: “Neither Peter,” says he, “whom the Lord first

chose, and upon whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards contested with him about circumcision, did insolently challenge or arrogantly assume anything to himself, so as to say that *he* did hold the primacy, and that rather those who were newer and later Apostles ought to obey *him* ; neither despised he St Paul because he was before a persecutor of the Church ; but he admitted the counsel of truth, and easily consented to the lawful course which St. Paul did maintain ; yielding, indeed, to us a document both of concord and patience that we should not pertinaciously love our own things, but should rather take those things for ours which sometimes are profitably and wholesomely suggested by our brethren and colleagues, if they are true and lawful."

I submit, whether, if the Bishop of Rome had always followed this wholesome advice of his brother of Carthage, it would ever have become necessary to protest against the monstrous doctrine of the Papal Supremacy, as we meet it in our day ?

Again, writing to STEPHANUS, Bishop of Rome, CYPRIAN says : " Therefore, most dear brother, this body of Priests is copious, being joined together by the glue of mutual concord, and the bond of Unity, that if *any of our college* [mark

this expression,] should attempt to make heresy, and to tear or waste the flock of Christ, the REST may come to succor; and like useful and merciful shepherds, may re-collect the sheep into the flock.”

I ask, if perfect *equality* in the college of Bishops could be more strenuously asserted than it is in this extract?

Again he says: “Clear and manifest is the mind and meaning of our Lord Jesus Christ, sending His *Apostles* and affording to *them* alone the power given Him of the Father; in whose room *we* succeeded, governing the Church of God with the same power.”

Again, as head of a Council held at Carthage, in the name of the Bishops there assembled, he thus speaks of the acts of an arrogant Bishop of Rome: “It remaineth that each of us do utter his opinion about this matter, judging no man nor removing any man if he dissenteth, from the right of communion; for neither doth any of us constitute himself Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terror, driveth his colleagues to a necessity of obeying; whereas *every Bishop* hath upon account of his liberty and authority, *his own free choice*, and is no less exempted from being judged by another, than he is incapable to judge another; *but let us expect the judgment*

*of the Lord Jesus Christ, who, and who alone hath power to prefer us to the government of His Church, and to judge of our acting."*

Romanists are welcome to all the Papal Supremacy they can find in this authoritative declaration of CYPRIAN and the Council of Carthage. I have thus dwelt at some length upon the testimony of this eminent man, because, having in some of his letters spoken of the Bishop of Rome as occupying a "higher seat," he is claimed by the Romanists as a decided witness in their favor. The extracts read infallibly demonstrate, that he could *not* have been a believer in the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. Like all others of that day, he speaks of the Bishop of Rome, as the head of the Church in the Imperial City, and then the most powerful and influential Church. Still farther it is evident that CYPRIAN is *not* a witness *for* Rome when her Controversialists are compelled, as they have been, to interpolate forgeries into his writings before they dare quote them, to mislead and delude, not themselves, but those who look up to them for "instruction in righteousness" \*

There is another incident connected with the

---

\* For a striking example of this shameless forgery of CYPRIAN'S writings, see "Church Review," vol. I p. 493.

history of CYPRIAN, alike demonstrative of his position in regard to the Church of Rome—showing that whatever honor he might render to it as the Church of the Imperial City, he stooped not to receive laws from its Bishop—nor did he regard even his anathemas and excommunication as of any force whatever, as against himself. But before alluding to this incident I desire, as introductory to it, to quote a sentence from FIRMILIAN, Bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, who was a cotemporary and a correspondent of CYPRIAN. The controversy to which FIRMILIAN alludes, grew out of the dispute which arose in reference to Baptism by heretics, and also the receiving back into the Communion of the Catholic Church, those who had openly apostatized during the severe persecution which had visited the African Church.—I need not, for present purposes, allude to this controversy farther than to say that CYPRIAN and FIRMILIAN were arrayed on one side, and STEPHEN, Bishop of Rome, on the other. Of the position and argument of the latter, FIRMILIAN says in a letter to CYPRIAN: “What, however, is the error, and how great the blindness of him who says that remission of sins can be given in the synagogue of heretics, and who does not abide on the foundation of the One

Church which was founded on the Rock, may be understood from hence, that Christ said to Peter alone, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind,' etc., and again in the Gospel, when Christ breathed on the Apostles alone, saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' etc. Therefore the power of remitting sins was given to the *Apostles*, and to the *Churches* which they, being sent by Christ, founded, and to the *Bishops* who succeeded them by vicarious ordination. And in this point I have a right to be indignant at the *open and manifest folly of STEPHEN*, (Bishop, or Pope of Rome,) because he who boasts so highly of the place of his Episcopate, and maintains that he is the successor of St. Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, *introduced many other Rocks*, and establishes the fabric of many other Churches." It is very clear from this extract, that FIRMILIAN, so far from having taken an oath of obedience to the Bishop of Rome, considered himself his equal, and freely denounces the conduct of STEPHEN, as "open and manifest folly." What Bishop *now* subject to the Roman See, would dare use such language, even when speaking of an ALEXANDER VI., or a LEO X. ?

STEPHEN attempted an imitation of his predecessor VICTOR, and excommunicated CYPRIAN

and the Churches of Africa, who symbolized with him, and FIRMILIAN with all the Bishops and Churches of the East that advocated or sustained the same side. Here, again, was this whole question of the Papal Supremacy put at issue, and by the Pope himself. What was the result? Did they quail? Did they retract their sentiments? Were they regarded by the Church CATHOLIC as excommunicate? The *first* question is answered by FIRMILIAN, who, in again writing to CYPRIAN, thus gives his opinion of this act of STEPHEN: "*He is the true schismatic, who has made himself an apostate from the communion of Ecclesiastical Unity. For while thou [he is apostropizing Stephen,] thinkest all men can be excommunicated by thee, thou hast only excommunicated thyself from all.*" They never retracted their opinions—were never *formally* reconciled to the Church of Rome. And yet then, and ever since, were they and their Churches regarded as true members of the CATHOLIC Church, STEPHEN'S protest and excommunication to the contrary notwithstanding.—FIRMILIAN stands high in the roll of Doctors, recognized as orthodox by Rome herself, and CYPRIAN is one of the *Saints* whom that Church, above all others, now delights to honor.

It is clear, then, beyond all controversy, that

in the 3d century the Churches of Africa and Asia were true branches of the *one* Church of Christ, whether the Bishop of Rome agreed or disagreed with them.

The APOSTOLICAL CANONS, as shown in a former Lecture, belong to this century, and the testimony derived from them is not unimportant. Speaking of Metropolitan Bishops, or the Bishop of the Chief City in each province of the Roman Empire, these Canons enjoin upon all the Bishops of the province to agree with their particular Primate. And of these Metropolitans, or Chief Bishops, they say: "Each one should only meddle with those affairs which concern his own precinct, and the places under it; and no such Primate should do anything without the opinion of all, that so there may be concord." If the Pope of Rome gets any authority here, it can only be as the METROPOLITAN of the province of Italy; and the Canon expressly says, that he should confine himself there. So say we too, and had he only *obeyed* this Canon, there would never have been any contest between the Romish and the English Church, about this unscriptural, uncatholic dogma of the PAPAL SUPREMACY.

We pass to the 4th century. Almost at its very commencement, Pagan Rome fell, and un-

der the patronage of Christian Emperors, the Bishop of Rome began to push forward the germs of all the future claims and arrogance of a GREGORY and a BONIFACE. But, even in *this* country, when the white garments of the Virgin Bride of the Lamb began to be soiled by contact with the world, we have abundant evidence that this pretended Supremacy of the successor of St. Peter, was rejected by many Bishops and Churches, who, Rome herself being judge, still continued in full communion with the Catholic Church. BASIL the Great—recognized and worshipped by the present Romish Church as a Saint—writing in this century, in the name of the *Eastern Churches*, sternly reproofing the conduct of the *Western Clergy*, uses this remarkable expression: “I would, in the common name, have written to *their ringleader!!* nothing indeed about ecclesiastical affairs, except only to intimate that they neither do know the truth of things with us, nor do admit the way by which they may understand it.” It is very apparent from this, that neither BASIL nor the Bishops and Churches of the East, were at all afraid of the thunders of the Vatican.

As bearing upon this question, we have the negative, but important testimony against the Papal assumptions, in the fact that in a number

of the Councils held in this and the next century, no precedence was given to the Bishop of Rome—he not being allowed to preside, either personally or by his Legates—a point of honor and primacy, which the Pope would not allow to be even questioned at the Council of Trent. Pope PIUS II. when a Cardinal, was honest enough to confess that, “before the time of the Nicene Council, very little regard was had to the See of Rome.” He might, with equal truth, have added—“Nor for some time after” that Council. In the Council of ARLES, held in 314, *eleven* years before that of NICE, and at which *English* Bishops were present, the Bishop of Rome subscribed his name, not in the *first* place, but in the *fifth*. In the Council of Sardica, HOSIUS, of Corduba, presided, and not the Pope, or his Legate; in the *second* of Ephesus, DIOSCORUS, of Alexandria, presided; in the *third* of Ephesus, CYRIL, of Alexandria; and in the *second* of Constantinople, the Oriental Bishops controlled, being guided by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. This negative proof, unwelcome as it is to Romanists, is still true, and irreconcilable with their fundamental doctrine of the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome by Divine right, as a successor of St. Peter.

Though, from the commanding position of the Romish Church—from the patronage of the politic Emperors, particularly of Justinian—from the unhappy dissensions which grew out of the Arian and other controversies, during which, for a long time, the Bishop of Rome was the champion and supporter of orthodoxy and orthodox men, whereby he laid many Churches under a debt of gratitude to him and his See—from the ascendancy which the Popes obtained after the conversion of the Goths, etc., who overran Rome and Italy, and from other causes, which may readily be conceived, the claims of worldly, selfish and ambitious Popes, were more and more widely acknowledged, and the Papal Supremacy advanced with giant strides towards universal acknowledgment; still, at the close of the *sixth* century, we find GREGORY, the Great, a Bishop of Rome, who was the reverse of his successor BONIFACE, thus sternly rebuking the Bishop of Constantinople for assuming the title of “*Universal Bishop* :” “What wilt thou say to Christ, the Head of the Universal Church, in the trial of the last Judgment, who, by the appellation of *Universal*, dost endeavor to subject all His members to thee ? Whom, I pray, dost thou mean to imitate in so perverse a word, but him, [the Devil,] who, despising the legions of

angels constituted in fellowship with him, did endeavor to break forth into the top of singularity, that he might both be subject to none, and alone be over all? who also said, I will ascend into Heaven, and will exalt my throne above the stars. For what are thy brethren, *all the Bishops of the Universal Church*, but the stars of Heaven; to whom, while by this haughty word, thou desirest to prefer thyself, and to trample on their name in comparison to thee; what dost thou say, but I will climb into Heaven? \* \* \* I confidently say, that WHOEVER doth call himself UNIVERSAL BISHOP, or desireth to be so called, doth, in his elation, forerun *Anti-Christ*, because he pridingly doth set himself before all others." GREGORY here characterizes as *Satan*, and the forerunner of *Anti-Christ*, any Bishop who either calls himself, or desires to be called, *Universal Bishop!* And I submit, if that was good doctrine in the 6th century, whether we are to be called *heretics* because we believe it equally sound and orthodox in the *nineteenth?*

I shall make no attempt to trace the progress of Popery through the Middle Ages. It matters not to what height it attained—nor how universally its claims were acknowledged, insomuch as not having been heard of nor received in the

*Primitive, Apostolical, Catholic Church*, it stands forth before the world, branded as a *novelty*, to be repudiated by all who love and hold to the "faith once delivered to the saints."

One *argument* of the Romanists must not be passed by, though a single word will suffice to do it full justice. It is an argument drawn from the *titles* which the Fathers of the first centuries were sometimes accustomed to bestow—not upon the Bishop of Rome, but upon St. PETER. They tell us that he was called by them, "Prince of the Apostles," "Chief of the Apostles," "Head," "President," "Captain," "Grandee," "Choice Apostle." Hence *his* supremacy must have been conceded! Admitting this, in all its length and breadth, and still, it will be seen the connecting link between the Supremacy of *St. Peter* and that of the Pope of Rome, is again quietly taken for granted! But this is no new trick of Romanists. But let us see, if this argument *is* so very conclusive, even as it regards St. Peter himself. It is true that he *is* so called, but why do not Romanists tell the *whole* truth? Why not, to enable their followers to form an *enlightened* and correct opinion, also inform them that St. JAMES is called by one Father,— "Bishop of Bishops," by another "Bishop of the Apostles," and by another, "the Chief Cap-

tain of the New Jerusalem, the Captain of Priests, the Prince of the Apostles, the top among the Heads!" That St. ANDREW is called "the first born of the Apostolic Choir, the first settled Pillar of the Church, the Peter before Peter, the Foundation of the Foundation, the first Fruits of the beginning!" That St. PAUL is called "the Tongue, the Teacher, the Apostle of the World, *who had the whole World put into his hands*, and took care thereof, and had committed to him all men dwelling upon the earth;" that he "was better than all men, *greater than the Apostles, and surpassing them all*"—"none was greater than he, yea, *none equal to him*!"\* Many more like might be quoted. I submit, therefore, to the Papist himself, if the *Rhetoric* of the Fathers is to be received as an evidence of Supremacy, who, among all these, received the greatest share of superlatives, St. Peter or St. Paul? Surely, I need not dwell another moment upon an argument which is so ridiculously absurd.

I ask, in conclusion, if, upon such clear and overwhelming testimony from Scripture and the early Church, against the Supremacy of either

---

\* For these quotations and many more like them, with references to the places where they may be found, see "Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy," p. 61.

St. Peter or his boasted successor, the Pope of Rome, we do not well, and are not even bound to reject both as a heresy, which, having its origin in worldly ambition, has brought incalculable mischief upon the Church of God? Popery is thus demonstrated *not* to be the "good old path," and we will *not* walk therein. In reference to the Tridentine Romish Church and all her abominations, there comes a "voice from Heaven, saying, come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii: 4.)

## LECTURE VII.

### The Church of England—Its Origin, History and Catholicism.

In the former Lectures these points have been considered, and, I would fain hope, established as truths : 1. The Church of Christ was Episcopal in its origin, and designed to be, and, as a matter of fact, always has been, Episcopal. 2. The Apostles had equal spiritual power granted to them, and hence their successors, the Bishops of the Church, are, or should be, equally independent, Christ himself being the only Head, or bond of unity to the Church. Hence, 3. The dominion claimed by the Bishop of Rome over other Bishops, is unscriptural, uncatholic, and of course, unauthorized. If, at any time, he obtained sovereign dominion over other Churches, he was an usurper, and those Churches had a right, and were bound to throw off that usurpation, and to reassert and maintain their original independence. One inquiry more remains, and with the consideration of that, this series of Lectures will close. It is one in which we,—members of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, deriving our origin and

orders from the Church of England,—are practically and vitally interested.

In answering this inquiry, the objection alluded to in a previous Lecture, that we derived our existence from Rome, will also be answered, and the conclusion which I shall seek to establish, will be, that this Church and its Mother, of England, whether Rome say yea or nay, are true and living branches of the “Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church” of Christ. The question is three-fold—“when was the *English Church* (as we shall call it for convenience’s sake) established? was it Episcopal and independent of Rome? has it continued an Episcopal and Catholic Church to this day?” The inquiry is *historical*, and the *facts* of history must answer it. Covering so wide a field as this history does, we can, in the compass of a single Lecture, only glance at a few of the most important facts, but they will be those which are decisive *for* us, and *against* Rome.\*

The Gospel was preached in Britain in the first century. So unanimous is the testimony of the early Fathers and writers on this subject, that no room is left for doubt. As to the *individual* who thus first evangelized this “Isle of

---

\* On this subject, CHURTON’S “Early English Church” will well repay perusal and study.

the West," there has been, indeed, a diversity of opinion. CLEMENT, of Rome, THEODORET, JEROME, VELANTIUS, and others, positively assert that it was St. PAUL, and there is much evidence in support of the probability of that statement. Others—and with this ancient Welch and even Greek writers agree—say that BRAN, a British Prince, who had been kept for seven years a hostage in Rome, being there converted to the Christian faith, carried back with him, on his return in A. D. 59, three other Christians, Ild, Cyndaf and Aristobulus, (mentioned in Rom. xvi. 10.) The "Greek Martyrology" says that "Aristobulus was one of the seventy disciples, followed St. Paul in his travels, and was by him ordained a Bishop and sent to Britain, where he established a Church and died." But the mere question as to the individual who *first* preached in *Britain*, the "unsearchable riches of Christ," is of minor consequence, and I shall not dwell upon it. The fact that that country *was* evangelized in the life-time of the Apostles, is the main point, and this, I repeat, is too clearly established to be disputed. IRENÆUS, A. D. 170, says: "Christianity was propagated by the Apostles and their disciples, to the utmost bounds of the earth, especially in Spain and *the Celtic nations.*" The "Celtic nations," as all

who are well read in history know, were the Germans, Gauls, and *Britons*. TERTULLIAN, cotemporary with IRENÆUS, is still more explicit. He says,—“Some countries of the Britons, which proved inaccessible to the Romans, *are subject to Christ.*” ORIGEN, too, asserts that Britain was a Christian country. EUSEBIUS says that “the Apostles preached among the Romans, Persians, Arminians, etc., and *some passed over the ocean to those which are called the British Isles.*” THEODORET says,—“Our fishermen and publicans, and he who was a tent maker, carried the evangelical precepts to all nations—Scythians, Hunns, *Britons,*” etc. So, too, testify JEROME, CHRYSOSTOM, GILDAS, VENANTIUS, and others. All these writers lived at periods varying from 100 to 400 years before GREGORY, Pope of Rome, sent AUGUSTINE into England. However they may differ as to the original preacher, they all agree, as it will be seen, in testifying that *Britain was* a Christian nation. This at once disposes of the assertion that the *English Church was founded* by AUGUSTINE in the 6th century. It had existed at least 500 years before he ever *saw* that country.

Was that early Church *Episcopal*, or governed by Diocesan Bishops? This is evident from a variety of facts. (1.) IRENÆUS and TERTULLIAN

would not have acknowledged it as a Church, had it been otherwise. Both, as we had occasion to show in a former Lecture, reckoned the fact as conclusive against all heretics, that these last could not show, as every *Catholic* Church could, an unbroken succession of *Bishops* from the Apostles. The *British* Church must have had this succession, or it would never have been cited by them as a Church of Christ. (2.) We have the very names of many of the British Bishops, from the time of IRENÆUS to the Council of Arles in 314. Thus, in the Diocese of London, we have THEANUS in A. D. 170, and his successors ELVANUS, CADOR, OBINUS, CONAN, PALLADIUS, STEPHANUS, ILTUTUS, THEODREDUS, HILARIUS and RESTITUTUS, who were present at that Council. (3.) We have the record of Bishops slain during the persecution of DIOCLESIAN, which extended to Britain. (4.) Bishops of that Church were summoned to, and attended several Councils held in the *fourth* century.—CONSTANTINE, the first christian Emperor, was a native of Britain, having been born there while his father, CONSTANTIUS, was its Governor. The Council of *Arles* was summoned by CONSTANTINE in A. D. 314, to condemn the sect of the Donatists. *Three* British Bishops attended, and their signatures are attached to its decrees.

These were from the three Roman Provinces of Britain, viz : London, York and Cærleon.— They would not have been summoned nor allowed seats in that or any other Council, had not their Catholic and Episcopal character been established beyond a doubt. Though not especially mentioned, English Bishops seem to have been present at the General Council of *Nice* in A. D. 325 ; for historians tell us the creed agreed to by that Council, was adopted “with unanimous consent of the Churches of Italy, Africa, Egypt, Spain, France and *Britain*, and in the Asiatic Dioceses.” We know, as a matter of fact, that they were summoned and present at the Councils of *Sardica* in 347, and *Ariminum* in 360 both called on account of the Arian troubles. ATHANASIUS and HILARY, Poitiers, both testify that during these times of “rebuke and blasphemy,” the “Christians of Britain kept the faith as it is taught in the Nicene Creed, and preserved a good conscience with unshaken steadfastness.”\* (5.) In the 5th century, when the Pelagian heresy troubled the Church, we have the record of the mission of two Gallic Bishops. GERMAIN and LUPUS, to strengthen their British brethren in the faith.— This proves the perfect concord between the

---

\* CHURTON, p. 9.

English and Gallican Churches, which would not have been witnessed had either been regarded as heretical or schismatic. And (6.) notwithstanding the invasion of the Saxons and the consequent spread of heathenism, still, from that time to the coming of AUGUSTINE in 590, the British Church could boast of its unbroken line of Bishops, many of whom the whole christian world has ever delighted to honor as holy, zealous men, who counted not their own lives dear, if they might win even their heathen oppressors to the faith. In this list, bright among the brightest, will ever appear the names of FESTIDIUS, THEONUS, THADDEU, KENTIGERN, St. ASPH, AIDAN and S. COLUMBA, men of whom the world was not worthy. From these facts, and we have given but a few of many, who can doubt that for centuries before the Roman Monk AUGUSTINE, ever set foot in England, The British Church had been established, had flourished wonderfully, though it was at that moment under a cloud, had numbered its bright list of saints, confessors and martyrs, was *Episcopal* in its constitution and government, and was acknowledged throughout the christian world, to be a true, living branch of the Catholic Church of Christ? No one, we are sure, save those who will doubt *every* fact of history

of which they were not personally conversant. Was, then, this early English Church a child of Rome? had she no life nor being save what she drew from the boasted successor of St. Peter? Was this *his* province, over which, under the Canon of the General Council of Ephesus, which will be quoted presently, he had a right to rule, or any power of excommunication? If not, no matter how much jurisdiction he obtained there in *after* years, he was but an usurper, and rightly deserved the fate of usurpers. If he sent missionaries there, they should have gone like the Gallican Bishops of the 5th century, to *help* their British brethren, not to snatch the spiritual sceptre from their hands.—*Two* facts will demonstrate this original of independence of the English Church. One is that Romanists only claim through and from AUGUSTINE, and the other is, that on the disputed point of the proper time to celebrate EASTER, which was alluded to in the last Lecture, the English Churches followed the *Eastern*, and not the *Romish* rule—an indisputable evidence that they had *not* received their laws from Rome.

We now come to the mission of AUGUSTINE, upon which, as we have said, Rome can *alone* rely for her claim of primary jurisdiction over the Church of England. A history of *facts*

will enable the reader to pass upon the soundness of this claim. Unless sustained, all her pompous pretensions to dominion over that Church fall. The Saxon invasion was productive of great misery to the Christians. Bishops were slain and Churches burned. Nearly the whole country was overrun. But the fastness of Wales protected those who fled thither for shelter, and there and upon the coasts of Cornwall, was the light of the Gospel kept burning brightly, though elsewhere Saxon heathenism had almost, though not wholly extinguished it. These remote portions of the island thus became the chief asylum of the British Church; and there, as we learn from USHER, in 587, ten years before the arrival of Augustine, THEGNUS, Bishop of London, and THADIOCUS, Bishop of York, retired with other Bishops, and "by their labors so plentifully propagated the Gospel, that they made these parts especially above all others, glorious by the multitude of their holy saints and learned teachers."

The irruptions and ravages of the northern barbarians in Italy, and the consequences resulting therefrom, seem so to have altered the relation of other nations to the Roman Empire, that in the 5th and 6th centuries, so little

attention or regard was paid to the affairs of England, that its very existence had almost been forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome ; at least, such seems to be the only accountable cause of the ignorance of GREGORY, made Bishop of Rome at the close of the 6th century. The story of his interview with some slaves from that island, and his resolve to go there himself or send missionaries, is thus told, and doubtless correctly :

Having one day observed some light-haired youths, remarkable for the beauty of their complexions, standing in the market-place of Rome, exposed for sale, Gregory enquired who they were ; and having been informed they were Angles, " Ah," replied he, " they ought rather to be called *Angels*." Then demanding from what province they were brought, he was told, " from Deira, a district of Northumbria." " Deira !" he answered ; " that is well : they are called to the mercy of God from his wrath, *de ira*. But what is the name of the king of that province ?" He was informed it was Ælla. " Hallelujah !" he exclaimed,—" Hallelujah must be sung in his dominions." From that day Gregory resolved to endeavor to convert the Anglo Saxons ; and for this purpose, after he succeeded to the Bishopric of Rome, he sent Augustine, a venerable monk, and forty of his brethren over to this country.

AUGUSTINE landed in Kent and was favorably received, Queen *Bertha*, the wife of *Ethelbert*, " Lord of Britain," being herself a Christian, but not a native of England. He was very

successful, and many thousands were converted, the king among the number. Sometime after his arrival, hearing that the Church was yet alive and flourishing in Wales, AUGUSTINE went thither and invited the Bishops of the British Church to an interview. He was met on the banks of the Severn by seven Welsh Bishops, and some of the most learned men from the Monastery at Bangor, including *Dunod* or *Dynoth*, their Abbot. No clearer evidence of the entire independence of Rome of that early British Church can be conceived, than is furnished by this conference. After conversing a long time, AUGUSTINE, filled with zeal for his Master, the Bishop of Rome and his See, for which was then being claimed a Supremacy unknown to the primitive times, demanded that they should yield three things, upon which *he* would give them the right hand of fellowship. "You have," said he, "many practices which are against the custom of the whole Church, not only that of the Church of Rome. But yet, if you will keep Easter at the proper time, [i. e., according to the *Western* instead of the *Eastern* rule,] if you will celebrate the rite of Baptism as the Holy Apostolic Church of Rome does, [i. e., to immerse the candidate *three* times,] and if you will join with us in preaching the

Word of God to the Anglo Saxon, we will bear with all other things." No question is here made as to the validity of their *orders*, nor as to their christian character. If they will conform to *Rome* in the three minor points mentioned, he will pass by all other differences. This very demand of Augustine is a concession of their independence. But not even thus much would these English Bishops concede. They knew the Bishop of Rome as a *brother*, but not as a master. DYNOTH in their name said: "We are bound to serve the Church of God, and the Bishop of Rome, and every godly Christian, as far as helping them in offices of love and charity. This service we are ready to pay; but more than this I do not know to be due to him or any other. We have a Primate of our own, who is to oversee us under God, and keep us in the way of spiritual life." They thus rejected all his overtures, and upon the first appearance of a foreigner upon their domain, they protest against all usurpation. And who had the *right* in this matter? Who gave the Bishop of Rome the power and authority thus to build upon another man's foundation? Not the *Catholic* Church, for she, 150 years before this mission, at the General Council of *Ephesus*, had passed this Canon, which the Romish, as well as other

Churches, acknowledged to be the law of the *Universal Church*. "We declare that they who preside over the holy Churches which are in Cyprus, shall preserve without gainsaying or opposition, their right of performing by themselves the ordinations of the most religious Bishops, according to the Canons of the Holy Fathers and the ancient custom. The same rule shall be observed *in all the other Dioceses*, and in the Provinces *everywhere*, so that *none* of the most religious Bishops shall invade *any other Province* which has not heretofore, FROM THE BEGINNING, been under the hand of himself or his predecessors. But if *any one* has so invaded a Province and brought it by force under himself, *he shall restore it*, that the Canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed," etc. (Canon VIII.)

This Canon, recognized as law by Rome herself, vetoes all claim to the right of her Bishop to dominion over England or the English Church. So far from its, having "*from the beginning*," been under either him "or his predecessors," we have seen that, from the first that Church was independent, Episcopal and Catholic. However, then, the Bishop of Rome, or his Legates obtained power there in *after* times, he is condemned by this Canon. He was there only upon sufferance, and could have been

rightly made, at any time, "to restore" that Province and Church to their original independence.

After this interview, AUGUSTINE made no more overtures to the Welsh or British Bishops, but carried himself with sternness and hostility towards them and their Churches.— He has, indeed, been charged, but probably unjustly, with the instigation of the persecution which came upon them not long after this conference. But persecution and martyrdom could no more extinguish Divine Truth and the Church of Christ, in the *sixth* than in the *second* century. Had AUGUSTINE possessed one half the mildness, conciliation and christian temper of his *sixth* successor, THEODORE, there would probably not have been, for any time, two distinct organizations. But his haughtiness repelled, and the result was the establishment of a Romish, Saxon Church, instead of an Anglo Saxon ; AUGUSTINE being consecrated the first Archbishop of the newly founded See of Canterbury. But he did not, as many have supposed, bring the *Romish* succession into England. When sent by Gregory he was but a Monk in Priest's orders. When appointed *Bishop*, instead of repairing to Rome, he went, by advice of Gregory, who was a far different

man in all things from his successor and namesake, GREGORY VII., to *Arles*, in France, and was consecrated by VIRGIL, Archbishop of that See, and ETHERIUS, Bishop of *Lyons*. These last traced their succession from IRENEUS, of whom we have frequently spoken, who was consecrated by POLYCARP, and he by St. JOHN. So that all the Bishops in the English Church, who trace their descent from AUGUSTINE, trace it also to the Apostle St. JOHN. The Romish succession was brought into England by THEODORE, the *sixth* successor of AUGUSTINE, in the See of Canterbury. Besides these, DAVID, Bishop of St. David's, in Wales, was consecrated by JOHN III., 51st Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, who derived his succession from the Apostle St. JAMES, first incumbent of the See of *that* "Holy Mother Church." Thus, there is in the English Church a *fourfold* cord binding her Bishops to those who heard the Lord Jesus Christ say to them, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." Thus, through the ancient British Bishops, a succession is traced to St. PAUL, who either went to England himself, or sent a Bishop thither, whom he had consecrated. Through AUGUSTINE the line reaches St. JOHN. Through THEODORE, St. PETER and St. PAUL, who jointly founded the Church of Rome; and then, through

the Bishops of St. DAVID'S, another line binds us to St. JAMES and the Mother Church of *Jerusalem*. Ere the 12th century, *all* these streams commingled, and, upon the principles laid down in our *third* Lecture, to which reference is made, there is scarce a reasonable doubt, but what every Bishop of the English Church now, can trace his succession from *all* these four Apostles.\* But this is a digression, and we return to our historical sketch.

THEODORE, who came into England in 668, by his moderation, and at the same time, zeal and purity of character, was instrumental not only in the rapid spread of Christianity among the Saxons, but also in allaying the acerbity of feeling existing between the British and Saxon Churches, created by the unwise course of Augustine and his successors. They soon began to hold communion with each other, and we find two Welsh Bishops in this seventh century, uniting with a Bishop of Wessex (of the Saxon Church) in the consecration of CHAD, Bishop of York.† From this time the streams, if we may

---

\* For the authority for the foregoing statements, and a complete historical account of what could only be hinted at above, see *Churton, Passim*; and *Chapin's "Primitive Church,"* pp. 275, et 569.

† *Churton*, p. 74. Reference is uniformly made to the *London* edition.

so designate the various successions, began to commingle until they all united in one individual river. When, through the mild councils of THEODORE, the persecution of the British Christians, by the Saxons, ceased, the Bishops of the former came out from their seclusion and joined fervently and successfully in the work of converting the heathen invaders to Christianity; and no small share had they in this good work. SOAMES, in his "Anglo Saxon Chronicles," rightly says that "*only two counties north of the Thames, viz: Norfolk and Suffolk, can be said to have been subjected to Roman direction during the transition from Paganism to Christianity; and those two were largely indebted to domestic zeal for their conversion. Every other county from London to Edinburgh, has the full gratification of pointing to the ancient Church of Britain as its nursing mother in Christ's holy faith.*" But it was long, very long, before this *ancient Church*, which alone, under the Canon of the Council of *Ephesus*, had the *right* to domination in England, could be induced or *compelled*, as it eventually was by kingly power, to submit to, or even acknowledge the *supremacy* of the Bishop of Rome. Their uniform answer was, in substance if not in words, "we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God."

But passing by this period, and coming to the time when the *Church of England* was no longer two, but one, I proceed to inquire, as a matter of fact, what was the subjection of even that ANGLO SAXON Church to the See of Rome? I reply, that for centuries it was merely nominal. I would that I had space to copy here the recorded history of each century. But I can only glance at some of the prominent points which fully verify and sustain this position.—The case, however, would not have been altered had the reverse been true. Neither the *tyranny* of an usurper, nor the abject cringing of his *subjects* can ever legitimate his title. He is an *usurper* still, and the realm *cannot thus* be deprived of its right to its original independence.

The first appeal made to Rome was in the *eighth* century, and the experiment was not tried by any one else, until after the NORMAN conquest in the *eleventh* century. The appeal was made by WILFRID, a Bishop, against certain acts of King EGFRID. He went personally to Rome. Pope AGATHO, nothing loth to avail himself of this opportunity to extend his power and supervision, received WILFRID most kindly, listened to his tale of grievances, and sent him back with a BULL addressed to EGFRID, commanding the latter to do as it directed him.—

EGFRID instead of being frightened at the appearance of this new animal in England, very coolly cast WILFRID into prison, where he remained over nine months, and was only then released at the earnest petition of the king's aunt. He tried the same experiment with EGFRID'S successor, ALDFRED, but the BULL of Pope JOHN met with the same fate that attended that of AGATHO. The *first and only* appeal to Rome prior to the *eleventh* century, it is very clear, did not meet with any *remarkable* success!— Did either of these Popes *excommunicate* EGFRID or ALDFRED in consequence of their action? Not at all. They *knew* it would be useless. It was long, long after this, before a *Papal* excommunication frightened anybody in England.

There is another incident belonging to this eighth century which deserves mention as an evidence how little was made of the Papal See, and how jealously, even the Anglo Saxon Church at that late day of Papal pride, arrogance and assumption, guarded and defended the rights of the Church of England against the encroachments of the See of Rome. WINFRID, an Englishman by birth, and in very many respects, a most worthy, as he certainly was a most zealous man, desiring to be employed in the conversion

of the heathen, after long laboring as an English Priest, went to Rome and was consecrated in A. D. 723 by Pope GREGORY II., missionary Bishop of the Germans east of the Rhine.—Himself devotedly attached to the interests of the Papal See, he sought with all diligence to promote the universal and absolute acknowledgment of its Supremacy. Though residing on the continent, he maintained a friendly correspondence with many of the English Bishops, and particularly with CUTHBERT, Archbishop of Canterbury. A synod having been held at Augsberg, which, unlike the one at the same place in the 16th century, conferred greater powers upon the Pope, than had ever been acknowledged in England, WINFRID sent these Canons over to CUTHBERT, earnestly entreating that he would endeavor to have them adopted in the realm of England. So far from complying, CUTHBERT assembled a Synod of English Bishops near Rochester, in 747, wherein “he and the other English Bishops *engaged to maintain their own laws against encroachment, keeping up a free correspondence with foreign Churches, and an union of affection, but not flattering any person because he held a station of higher dignity in the Church.*”\*

---

\* *Churton*, p. 161.

It is clear from this incident, that the English Church was not yet ready to bow down and worship the "image of gold," which the Roman Nebuchadnezzar had set up in the seven-hilled city, even though the "instruments of music" were sounded long and loud, for the *world* to fall down and render homage.

There is still another incident belonging to the latter part of this century, which should be recorded, inasmuch as it is not only a *protest* against the authority of *Rome* to decree matters of faith for the *Universal Church*, but it is a noble example of the comparative purity of the ENGLISH Church and her adherence to primitive doctrine, though at that late day the pall of Papal darkness was fast settling down upon all the nations of the world. A dispute arose about the *worship of images in Churches*. A Council, whose authority Rome *now* acknowledges as œcumenical, had just decreed that such worship should be offered, precisely such worship as is now universal in *all Churches* subject to the Roman See. The Emperor CHARLEMAGNE, in 792, sent over to England a book which had been presented to him, containing the decrees of that Council. ALCUIN, a learned and pious man, English by birth, though for years a resident in the court of CHARLES and

tutor to his sons, was at this time on a visit to England. Whereupon “the Bishops of the English Church, *being of one mind in condemning this new doctrine*—a doctrine which they declared ‘the Church of God holds accursed’—engaged him to write to CHARLEMAGNE against it. He did so; and writing *in the name and with the authority of the English Church*, and using the soundest *Scriptural* arguments, notwithstanding that ADRIAN, *the Pope of that time, had approved of the idolatrous practice*, he effectually engaged CHARLEMAGNE to use his influence to check it. In A. D. 794, that monarch called together a Council at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in which 300 Bishops solemnly condemned the doctrine of the Greek Council and the Pope; and this step prevented for a long time afterwards the progress of that error in Great Britain.”\*

Even in the tenth century we find more than one instance, where not only were the Papal decrees disregarded, but openly impugned. No Romanist *now* dare do either—a proof that Romanism as it *is* in the nineteenth century, and Anglo Romanism as it *was* in the tenth, are two entirely different things. DUNSTAN, Archbishop of Canterbury, in this century, though

---

\* *Churton*, pp. 181, 182.

submissive to the Pope in many things, yet resisted him, and with impugny, in a most remarkable instance. He had administered the discipline of the Church upon an offender high in rank, who, after in vain endeavoring to induce DUSTAN to reverse his decision, appealed to the Pope. From him the offender obtained a letter *commanding* the Archbishop to dispense with his fault and grant absolution. "God forbid," was his noble reply, "that I should do it. If he shows me that he repents of his crime, I will obey the Pope's instructions ; but while he lies in his guilt he shall never insult me by a triumph over the discipline of the Church. I will forfeit my life sooner." The matter was dropped, and DUNSTAN instead of standing in the Roman Pillory, by the side of CRANMER, and LUTHER, and WICKLIFFE, occupies a prominent niche in the temple of the chosen saints of the Romish Church.

But in another proceeding of this century, not an Archbishop, merely, but the whole English Church appear before us as the champions of the primitive faith, against one of the most monstrous heresies and absurdities of Romanism, but which is now, and has been for the last 600 years and more, the "Shiboleth" of orthodoxy in that Church. I allude to the heresy of

*transubstantiation* as opposed to the Scriptural and primitive doctrine of the SPIRITUAL presence of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist. In the *ninth* century the controversy on this subject had troubled the Christian world. A French Monk, PASCHASE RADBERT, *then*, for the first time, taught the doctrine of *transubstantiation* as now held by the Church of Rome, viz : That after the consecration of the elements, the substance is changed into the same body that was "born of the Virgin Mary." This *novelty* was then strenuously opposed by ERIGENA or JOHN SCOT, of England, and by King ALFRED and the English Bishops. They held, as the early Church held, and as the English Church *now* holds, that the only change in the sacramental elements, is *spiritual* or *moral*, not *physical* or *material*. The book of BERTRAM or RATRAMN, well known to theologians, and intensely hated by ROME, was their guide then, as in the sixteenth century it was the means of opening the eyes of CRANMER and RIDLEY to the truth on this all important subject. But the fact connected with the *tenth* century must not be overlooked. We find at its very close, Archbishop ELFRIC and other English Bishops, openly teaching and defending the doctrine of BERTRAM in opposition to that of RADBERT,—

The Church of Rome dogmatically taught the latter. Could a more remarkable instance of the relative position of the two Churches be cited, than this same controversy? We find, then, the English Church holding and teaching in the *tenth* century what the Council of Trent denounced in the *sixteenth* as "damnable heresy."

Besides all these things, previous to the *Norman Conquest*, the baleful influence of which upon the English Church, will presently be considered, Archbishops and Bishops were married men and heads of families. No anathema was incurred for so being. And in thus *not* being wiser than Holy Scripture that Church was saved from sinking into that deep slough of shameless licentiousness, that in the Romish Church called for, not only the execrations of man, but the vengeance of the God of holiness and purity.

Thus, having verified the position that, for centuries the subjugation of even the *Anglo Saxon* Church to the Papal See was merely nominal, I proceed to speak of the results of the *NORMAN* conquest, under the effect of which, and its introduction of hordes of foreign clergy, the English Church was at length, in the *twelfth* century, bound a captive at the feet of her once

loved sister, but now usurping and imperious tyrant of Rome.

The influence of the *Norman Conquest* was most baleful upon the independence of the English Church. WILLIAM, the Conqueror, treated England as a conquered nation, though he made it the head quarters of his dominions. Not only were the Anglo-Saxon Nobles depressed and degraded, and foreigners, the creatures of WILLIAM, exalted to the highest places of honor, trust, and profit, to the exclusion of native born English, but the independence and rights of the Church were invaded. "For nearly one hundred years after the conquest," says CHURTON, "not a single Saxon was promoted to any Bishopric, or other eminent place in the Church. These places were filled by Normans, or foreigners, few of whom could speak a word of English; so that THOMAS, the first Norman Archbishop of York, requested WULFSTAN to visit his Churches for him, fearing the dislike of the people whose language was unknown to him; and it was nearly a full century after the death of WULFSTAN, before they heard another sermon from a Bishop which they could understand." These foreigners, too, belonged to Churches that had long time been most obsequious upholders of the Papal Supremacy. Under

the auspices of GREGORY VII. and his successors, this dogma was fast being universally acknowledged. It was no wonder, then, that William and his successors, and his imported foreign nobles and Bishops, should endeavor to fortify themselves against the dislike, illwill, and even hatred of the English, by bringing all the powers of the Papal See to be exerted in their behalf. The Popes were nothing loth to avail themselves the opportunity offered to humble their proud rival, the Church of England, and their demands rose commensurate with the emergencies which presented themselves, until the base and recreant King JOHN consented to do homage for his very crown, at the feet of the Legate of the Pope. But I am anticipating.\*

---

\* The following summary, from Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, will verify the statements in the text :

1. There doth not appear much of the Pope's power in this realm before the Conquest. But the Pope having favored and supported King William the First, in his invasion of this kingdom, took that opportunity of enlarging his encroachments, and in this king's reign, began to send legates hither, and prevailed with Henry the First, to give up the donation of Bishoprics; and, in the time of King Stephen, gained the prerogative of appeals; and, in the time of Henry the Second, exempted all Clerks from secular power. 1 Haw. 49, 50.

2. And, not long after this, by a general excommunication of the king and people for several years, because they would

How could the English Church hope to sustain herself against this united encroachment of Princes and Popes—this corruption and venality, in both temporal and spiritual affairs?—Badges of servitude began to be hung about her neck by her proud and imperious rival—placed there too often, we are sorry to say, by her faithless sons. ANSELM, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of the profligate WILLIAM RUFUS, though possessing many excellencies of character, and, in many things, a worthy and zealous officer of the Church, has forever stained his memory. by consenting to be one of the instruments of Papal assumption and aggression. Educated in Italy, where all were the

---

not suffer an Archbishop to be imposed upon them; King John was reduced to such straits, that he was obliged to surrender his kingdoms to the Pope, and to receive them again, to hold of him for the rent of a thousand marks. 1 Haw. 50.

3. And, in the following reign of Henry the Third, partly from the profits of our best Church benefices, which were generally given to Italians and others residing at the Court of Rome, and partly from the taxes imposed by the Pope, there went yearly out of the kingdom £70,000, an immense sum in those days. 1 Haw. 50.

4. The nation, being under this necessity, was obliged to provide for the prerogative of the Prince and the liberties of the people; as will appear, etc. 1 Haw. 50.

*Burn*, vol. 3, p. 115.

slaves of the Pope, he sought little else than to extend his dominion over the realm, of which ANSELM was the chief Bishop. It is true, he was goaded on to this course by the outrageous conduct of WILLIAM RUFUS, but he should still have remembered that "*two wrongs can never make a right.*" He gained for the Pope the right of *investiture*, or the ceremony of delivering a ring and crosier or pastoral staff to a Bishop or mitred Abbot, on his succeeding to his preferment.

This was no idle ceremony, but an acknowledgment, *per se*, of the Papal power as supreme. GREGORY VII first peremptorily enforced this right in Western Europe. But his decree had no effect in England until ANSELM obtained the right for Pope PASCAL II., after a long contest with HENRY I., in whose reign ANSELM was also Archbishop of Canterbury.

But the subjection was not even yet complete. The right of *investiture* was an acknowledgment of the Pope as head of the Christian Church. But not even ANSELM allowed him the right to interfere in the election or designation of the persons who were to be Bishops and Archbishops of the English Church. *That* farther step was taken in 1125 under the auspices of WILLIAM, of Corboil, a French Monk, who was raised to the See of Canterbury. His appointment

was exceedingly odious to the Monks of England, who, since the time of DUNSIAM in the tenth century, had supplied this, and, indeed, most other Sees from their own number. To protect himself from their dislike, WILLIAM procured a Bull from Rome, appointing himself the LEGATE of the Pope—thus making the primacy in England to consist in acting as the Pope's deputy. Here is the Bull of Pope HONORIUS II. conferring this power; and I quote it as being the final rivet in the chains of England's subjugation to the domination of the Bishop of Rome :

HONORIUS, the Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to my beloved brethren, the Bishops, Abbots, Barons, and all other Clergymen and Laymen in England and Scotland, health and the Apostolic benediction. The holy Church, the bride of Christ, rooted on the foundation of the Apostles' faith, as a devoted and kind mother is accustomed to minister to her mild and humble children far and near, the food of life. Those that are near, are visited by our personal presence; those who are distant, by the ministry of our Legates. Since, therefore, we know that you will be as the dutiful and loving sons of St. Peter, we have entrusted to our very dear brother WILLIAM, Archbishop of Canterbury, the office of our Vicar in England and Scotland; that appointed there by us, the Legate of the Apostolic See, relying on the help of your charity, he may amend what needs amendment, and confirm what needs confirmation, to the honor of God and the holy ROMAN CHURCH (!!!) and the health of your souls. Wherefore we command and instruct your whole body, that you, one and all, show him

humble obedience *as our Legate*, and unanimously meet at his bidding, and hold councils with him for the welfare of the Church and advancement of the christian religion. Given at our Lateran Palace, January 25, 1125.

Here are the dictates of a *master* to his *slaves*. In vain was resistance made to this usurpation. "Ichabod" was for a season, to be written upon the banners of the English Church, but only until "the time of the end." "Thus," says a writer on this subject, "was the independence of the English Church lost by the folly of one French priest; and it cost a struggle of full four hundred years, till in the Reformation its freedom was restored." WILLIAM was execrated for his meanness, even while his power was not questioned. The writers, even of that time, speak of him with the utmost contempt. Said one,—“He ought not to be called William of *Corboil*, but William of *Turmoil!*” “Truly,” said another, “I would speak his praises if I could, but they are beyond expression, *for no man has yet discovered them!*”

I have thus, I trust, satisfactorily demonstrated these positions: 1. That the English Church was originally an Apostolic Church, and wholly independent of Rome or any other Church. 2. That for centuries she was recognized as independent and yet Catholic, her Bishops sitting in council with those from all parts of the world.

3. That by the law of the *Universal Church*, as defined at the Council of Ephesus, 150 years before AUGUSTINE set foot in England, neither the Bishop of ROME, nor any other foreign Bishop, had any *right* in that kingdom. 4. That after the Bishop of Rome *had* intruded himself, and established an Anglo-Saxon Church, by uniting with the ancient British Church, the subjection to him was for centuries merely nominal, the Bishops and rulers of the Church of England, uniformly rejecting his arrogant claims. And 5. That it was not until the *secular* arm had driven native Englishmen from their Sees, and had introduced in their places hordes of foreign, ignorant and unprincipled clergy, that the English Church, in the twelfth century, sat down a captive at the feet of her imperious mistress. And had I time and space, I could show that from that time until the sixteenth century, she was an unwilling and restless captive. More than once, as she made efforts under the auspices of WYCKLIFF and GROSTETE, and others (who all *died* in the "communion of the Catholic Church,") to throw off the galling yoke of servitude, ROME even, in those dark days, trembled lest she might lose all that she had so infamously and unchristianly acquired.\* But this

---

\* I trust the reader will excuse me if I here group together in a somewhat extended note, various proofs of

would be unnecessary. Even if there had never been the slightest movement in the sluggish waters of Roman depotism, during all these four hundred years, still that usurpation and captivity would have given the Pope no more *right*

---

the assertion in the text, that England was exceedingly restive under this Romish domination.

"This year," (A. D. 1100,) says Collier, "Guido, Archbishop of Vienna, came into England with a commission from the Pope to be legate in the whole island. This was looked upon as an authority *primæ impressionis*, [without precedent,] and everybody was much shocked at it. It being a thing never heard of, as Eadmer speaks, that any person should represent the Pope in England except the Archbishop of Canterbury. For this reason Guido's character was universally disowned; neither was he allowed to exercise it in any one instance.

"Thus, we see the English Church stood upon their ancient right, and would not submit to every imposition of the court of Rome. They did not offer to disprove Guido's commission, nor question the truth of his credentials, but refused him on the score of an unprecedented authority."

In the reign of Henry III., A. D. 1255, "the Pope and conclave set up a new project of interest, and made an order that every exempt abbot should take a journey to Rome, upon his election, for the completing his character, and receiving the Pope's benediction. Matthew Paris complains of this innovation, as very prejudicial to the interests of the monastic institution; that it would occasion frequent disputes about the validity of elections; that the discipline of the convent would suffer by the absence of their abbot; and that the king, having the custody of the abbeys in the vacancy, and officers of the crown would have a long opportunity to prey upon the revenues.

"This decree of the court of Rome was soon after enlarged to a farther encroachment upon the Church. For now every elect, exempt or not exempt, was obliged to

there, than the Babylonish captivity would have justified NEBUCHADNEZZAR in usurping the office and functions of the Jewish High Priest.

The conclusion which follows from these premises, is legitimate and unavoidable. When,

cross the Alps, and empty his coffer into the Roman exchequer. This order did not only reach the abbots, but extended to all the Bishops' Sees where their chapter consisted of monastics."

This encroachment was met at the time by a protest on the part of Sewall, Archbishop of York. "He had too much conscience to digest the immoderate exactions of that court, [of Rome,] and wrote a sharp remonstrance to Pope Alexander IV. on the subject. His holiness was so disgusted with the censure of his conduct, that he endeavored to lessen the Bishop's authority, to distress him in his fortune, and sink his credit. At last he proceeded to an open revenge, and had him solemnly excommunicated. It seems the Archbishop had taken the freedom, amongst other things, to tell him that when our Saviour commissioned St. Peter to feed his sheep, he did not give him any authority to flay or eat them. Another ground of the Pope's displeasure, was the Bishop's refusing to admit unqualified Italians to any living in Diocese. When he was upon his death bed he complained of the Pope's injustice, and made his appeal to Heaven. He wrote several tracts, and died with the character of so pious a prelate, that Matthew Paris mentions a miracle wrought by him in his last sickness."—*Collier*, pp. 467, 468.

GROSTETE, referred to in the text, was Bishop of Lincoln in the 13th century. Pope INNOCENT IV. sent him a bull, commanding him to institute a favorite of his, a mere Roman boy, into an important and valuable benefice. From the Bishop's answer to this demand the following extracts are quoted:

"The letter," he says, referring to the Pope's bull, "is altogether different from the Apostolical character. First, because of the *Nonobstante* so frequently made use of now-

in the sixteenth century, the eyes of the Bishops of the English Church were opened to perceive the unchristian and uncatholic character of the Papal Supremacy, and those other manifold corruptions which that supremacy had brought into

---

a-days, which has nothing of natural equity in it. Indeed, this scandalous clause brings in, as it were, a deluge of mischief upon Christendom, and gives occasion to a great deal of inconstancy, breach of faith, and bold measures.—It shakes the very foundation of trust and security, and makes language and letters almost insignificant. And thus the purity of religion and the peace of society suffer extremely by this latitude. Besides, next to the sins of Lucifer and Antichrist, there cannot be a greater defection, or which carries a more direct opposition to the doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, than to destroy people's souls by depriving them of the advantages of the pastoral office; and yet 'tis evident those persons are guilty of this sin who receive the profit without discharging the duty. For not to perform the office of a pastor, is, in the Scripture account, a downright murdering of the sheep."

The Apostolic See, he adds, has authority for edification, and not for destruction; and "under this restriction can never countenance or command so horrid and pernicious a prevarication. To attempt anything of this kind would be a notorious abuse, if not a forfeiture of her authority. It would be straying to a lamentable distance from the throne of glory, and the representative of our blessed Saviour; instead of this, such persons may be said to be placed in the chair of pestilence, and in a manner to sit upon the bench with the Devil and Antichrist. \* \* \* For this reason, since the instructions above mentioned are so plain a contradiction to the Catholic faith and the sanctity of the Apostolic See, I must refuse them on the score of duty, and not comply even out of deference to the person by whom they are sent."

When Innocent IV. received this letter of Grostete, Bishop of Lincoln, he is reported to have exclaimed: "What

that Church, they had a right—nay, they were bound by all the solemnities of their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ—to throw off all these usurpations and corruptions, and to restore the Church of which they were the only rightful

---

old dotting man is this that has outlived his brains and his manners, and presumes to censure my conduct with so much confidence? By St. Peter and St. Paul, were it not for the restraint of my own temper, I would confound him to such a degree, make him such an example, such a prodigy of a wretch, that the world should stand amazed at his punishment. For is not his sovereign the king of England, our vassal? nay, is he not our slave? It is therefore, but signifying our pleasure to the English court, and this antiquated prelate will be immediately laid by the heels, and be put to what farther disgrace we shall think fit."

For this manly opposition to the crying abuses of the papacy and its depredations on the Church of England, as abetted by the Dominicans and Franciscans, this truly Christian Bishop was excommunicated by the Pope. His Clergy, notwithstanding, adhered to him; he died in the exercise of his office, and was honored and obeyed to the last moment. A proof, says Collier, that the English Church, even when the papal encroachments were at their height, did not always think themselves bound to be concluded by the Pope's excommunication.—*Collier*, 1, pp. 460—463.

When Boniface VIII. sent a bull to Edward I., the successor of Henry III., alleging that the sovereignty of Scotland belonged to the Roman See, and commanding Edward to desist from his attempt against the Scots, the king and nobility protested against the Pope's authority. In a letter addressed to Boniface, having premised the justness of the king's cause, the nobility proceed:

"That our sovereign lord, the king, is by no means obliged to own the jurisdiction of your court, or submit to your holiness' sentence, with respect to his sovereignty over the kingdom of Scotland, nor indeed, in any other temporal

rulers, to its *original* independence, and conformity with the *Primitive Church*, instead of submission to the great "corrupter of the nations." This they did, and it was all that they did. *Their work was reformation, not revolution.*

---

matter whatsoever. Neither is he to suffer his rights above mentioned to be called in question.

"Neither is your holiness to expect any embassy from the king upon this subject, in regard that any of these applications would tend to the manifest disparagement of the royal dignity and crown of England, be plainly subversive of the liberties, customs, and ancient laws of the country; for the maintenance of which we are all bound by faith, and by grace of God are resolved to defend them to the utmost of our power." This was written A. D. 1301.

In 1307 it was enacted in Parliament, "that no abbot, prior, or any other religious person of what state or order soever within the king's dominions, should pay any rent, tallage, or impositions charged upon them by any foreign superiors, or agreed between themselves; neither were they permitted to go beyond the sea to visit any such monasteries, in order to convey any part of their revenues or effects thither."

In the reign of EDWARD III. and RICHARD II., the celebrated statutes of "Præmunire," and "Provisors" were passed, the object of each being "to restrain the Pope's power in the realm of England."

Under Henry IV., A. D. 1404, the statute 6 Hen. IV. cap. 1, reads as follows:

"For the grievous complaints made to our sovereign lord, the king, by his commons of this Parliament, holden at Coventry, the 6th day of October, the 6th year of his reign, of the horrible mischief and damnable custom, which is introduced of new in the court of Rome, that no parson, abbot, nor other should have provision of any Archbishopric or Bishopric which shall be void, 'till he hath compounded with the Pope's chamber to pay great and excessive sums of money, as well for the first fruits of the same Archbishop-

They retained what was essential to the Church of Christ, and they rejected the vain and corrupt additions of man. Hence, they preserved the *Episcopacy*, but they utterly and rightfully repudiated the *Papacy*.

I know it is the fashion of modern Romanists to speak of the ENGLISH Church as the creature

---

ric or Bishopric, as for other less services in the same court, and that the same sums, or greater part thereof, he paid beforehand, which sums pass the treble or the double at the least of that that was accustomed of old time to be paid to the said chamber, and otherwise by the occasions of such provisions; whereby a great part of the treasure of this realm hath been brought and carried to the said court, and also shall be in time to come, to the great impoverishing of the Archbishops and Bishops within the same realm, and elsewhere within the kings dominions, if convenient remedy be not for the same provided." The remainder of the act proceeds to restrain the papal exactions and impose forfeitures on all who shall comply with them.

The 9th Hen. IV., cap. 8, A. D., 1407, declares:

"Our said sovereign lord, the king, considering how that the money of his realm of England is in divers ways conveyed out of the same realm to the court of Rome in exchange, by provisions, or provisions purchased of the Pope, and translations of Archbishopsrics and Bishoprics, to the great impoverishing of the same realm; hath ordained and established by the assent aforesaid, that all the statutes," etc. The act here confirms former statutes and adds, "that from henceforth all the elections of all Archbishopsrics, Bishoprics, abbeys, friars, deaneries, and other dignitaries, or any other elections, be free, without being in any wise interrupted by the said Pope, or by commandment of our said sovereign lord, the king."

Many more like evidences might be cited, but these must suffice. For the foregoing extracts, I am indebted to a series of exceedingly able articles on this subject, in the N. Y. "Churchman" of June 22, 1842, *etseq.*

of HENRY VIII., owing its origin to his licentious passions. A very worthy specimen, this, of the tactics of Rome, the charge being as untrue as if it had originated with the "Father of lies." It is true that HENRY, having quarrelled with the Pope, protected the Reformers of England from the penalties of Papal excommunication. And here *his* agency in the English Reformation began and ended. HENRY lived and died a Romanist at heart and brutal, licentious tyrant as he was, there was no moment of his life when the Pope would not gladly have welcomed him back to full communion with Rome—have re-conferred upon him the title of "Defender of the Faith," and even have decreed him a canonization, if he would but have done as his daughter MARY did, submit himself to the so-called "Apostolic See." HENRY was the same *man* before his quarrel with the Pope that he was after that rupture. His divorce from CATHARINE of Aragon, would have been unhesitatingly sanctioned by the Pope, had he not feared the *greater* power and influence of her nephew, the Emperor CHARLES V. So he prevaricated, and was guilty of almost incredible duplicity, until HENRY VIII. resolved to take that matter into his own hands. But otherwise, he was no more of a Protestant against Rome, than was the Empe-

ror himself. The enactment and enforcement by him, even to the infliction of death, of what are called "the six articles," prove this assertion.\*

But this is neither the time nor place to discuss the personal character or religious opinions of HENRY VIII. We have only to demonstrate the falsity of the charge that the English Church *originated* in his time. If this be so, and a *new* church was then set up in England, where I ask, was the *old* Church at the same time? We find the Sees of Canterbury, and York, and London, and all the rest filled with Bishops, all agreeing with HENRY *outwardly*, whatever might be their *secret* opinions, in the rejection of the Supremacy of the Pope. All these, with Henry himself, were excommunicated by the Pope, and according to the Romish theory, were all heretics, *not* Bishops

---

\* It is worthy of note, and the fact is especially commended to the attention of Papists, who are wont to rail so furiously at *Henry VIII*, that his funeral Sermon was preached by *Gardiner*, Bishop of Winchester, of infamous and bloody memory, who will not be accused by any one of any partiality or leaning towards Protestantism. His text was Revelations XIV. 13, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord," and in his Sermon, "he set forth the loss both high and low had sustained, *in the death of so good and gracious a King*."—Lives of the Queens of England, Vol. V. p. 89.

of the Catholic Church. Where, then, pray, *was* the *Catholic* Church in England all this time? *Who* were its Bishops? *Where* were their Sees? How many clergymen were subject to them? In short, will Romanists tell us what was the relative and comparative position of these *two* distinct organizations, for, according to their story, there *must* have been two? General declamation will not do. We ask for facts, for particulars, for full statistics. They *know* very well, for all their pretension is but well dissembled hypocrisy, that there *was* no rival Church. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND was where it had always been—I mean locally. She held the same Bishoprics and the same Sees, and controlled the same parishes and clergymen she ever had. It is true that many were dissatisfied with the movements made in the reign of HENRY. They sympathized with the Pope and would, if they could, and as they did, under MARY, have restored allegiance to him. But they set up no rival Bishoprics nor parishes. No Pope's legate came there to organize a *Roman* in opposition to an *Anglican* communion. There was but *one* Church in England at the *death* of HENRY VIII., as there certainly was but one at his *birth*. It was the *old* CHURCH OF ENGLAND, purified indeed, of some of her corruptions, but still needing a farther application of the pruning knife.

Where, too, was the *rival* Church, under EDWARD VI.? Though Bishops, sympathizing with Rome were displaced, did they start rival organizations and rival Sees, and because acknowledging submission to Rome, claim to be the only *Catholic* Church in England? Not a bit of it. The Church of England was *still* one, —Bishops, Priests and people, all worshipping according to the Reformed Ritual in the old and unchanged Sees, Parishes and Churches. The malcontents still murmured and threatened, but they dared not secede. They *knew* that that Reformed Church was the only true Church of England, and they feared the brand of schismatics, should they set up a rival spiritual kingdom.

Where, too, we ask, was this rival Church—these two distinct Episcopal organizations under MARY? True every thing was changed, and England and the English Church once more for a brief space were subjected to the dictation of the Papal See. But did the Reformers now rebel? No; they suffered, even unto death, but they dared not raise their sacrilegious hands against that Church, which, with all its faults, was the Church of England still. They prayed and they suffered, but they left it to God to vindicate them and His cause in His

own good time. That time came sooner than they had dared to hope. MARY was summoned to give an account of her stewardship, and the cause of truth, and right, and purity of the faith again triumphed.

Where, too, we ask once more, was that rival Church in England when ELIZABETH ascended the throne, and the Papal Supremacy was again discarded? For *eleven* years longer still did all unite in the worship and allegiance of that one, undivided Church of England. *Thirty-five* years had elapsed since HENRY struck the first blow at the Supremacy, ere it seems to have occurred to the Pope of Rome to doubt the authority of the English Church to exclusive possession in that realm. At length, *eleven* years after ELIZABETH was Queen, the BULL is issued and the adherents of Rome are commanded to *withdraw* from the Church of England. Then, for the first time, *two* organizations appeared in that country—and *since* that time, but never before, has been witnessed the spectacle of rival Bishops, rival Clergy, and rival Parishes, each claiming to be the *Catholic* Church of England. And which has the right to be so called? That Church, which, existing since the Apostles' times, had ever been acknowledged to be *the* Church of England, or

that rival, which, numbering only its 80 Ministers out of the 12,000 then in England, went out from her, and at the bidding of the Pope *began* to live in 1569? I fear not the answer of the *true* Catholic to this question. It is an unwelcome truth to the Romanist—but an unalterable truth, nevertheless, that the present *Romish* Church in England had its beginning in 1569. It originated in *schism*, and in *schism* has it continued to this day.\* It prefers to

---

\*Doubtless, to many, these sound like strange words.—The charge has been so often made by Romanists and repeated by our dissenting brethren, that the English Church *separated* from the Romish Church in the reign of Henry VIII., and hence, like the various communions upon the Continent, was a *new* Church, that it may possibly be, the relators of the story, actually believe it to be true. Never was a greater mistake. We have not space to discuss this point at length. We refer the inquirer to “Churton’s Early English Church,” and for a brief summary of the *facts* in the case, to the tract entitled “Outlines of the British Church,” published by the P. E. Tract Society.—An extract from this tract, and from PALMER, one of the ripest scholars and Theologians of England, must suffice: “For,” we quote from p. 29 of the tract, “as the judicious Hooker observes, ‘We hope that to *reform* ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church, we were, and we are so still.’ And moreover—‘It is certain that during the reigns of Henry VIII. and his successors, until the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, there were not two separate communions and worships in England. All the people were subject to the same pastors, attended the same Churches and received the same sacraments. It was only about 1570 that the *Romish party*, at the instigation of foreign emmissaries, separated itself, and

cling to the corruptions and sins of the Apostate of Trent, and with her must drink of the plagues of the Lord God Almighty. Meanwhile the CHURCH OF ENGLAND will continue as ever, the one only Catholic Church of that nation.— She has defied and will continue to defy the efforts of foes without and foes within, to break down her walls, and lay her fair places waste. Even if under the inscrutable will of Divine

---

fell from the Catholic Church of England. Sir Edward Coke, in the trial of Garnet, the Jesuit, in 1606, asserts that before the Bull of Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth, in the *eleventh year of her reign*, there were no recusants in England; all came to Church, (however popishly inclined or persuaded in most points) to the same Divine Service we now use; but thereupon, presently they refused to assemble in our Churches.’”

PALMER in his Church History has the following: “The accession of the illustrious Queen Elizabeth was followed by the restoration of the Church to its former state. The clergy generally approved of the return to pure religion and retained their benefices, administering the sacraments and rites according to the English ritual. In 1562, the synod or convocation of England, published a formulary of doctrine divided into 39 Articles, in which the doctrines of the Catholic faith were briefly stated, and various errors and superstitions of the Romanists and others were rejected. The formulary was again approved by the convocation in 1571, and ordered to be subscribed by all the clergy. *There was no schism for many years in England; all the people worshipped in the same Churches, and acknowledged the same pastors.* At last, in 1569, Pius V. issued a bull, in which he excommunicated Queen Elizabeth and her supporters, absolved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and bestowed her dominions on the King of Spain. *This bull caused the schism in England;* for the

Providence, her sun shall once more be obscured by clouds, yet its light will continue to shine, and it shall again break forth with more than its pristine splendor, to gladden the lovers of truth, of godly simplicity, and of primitive catholicism, until the Archangel's trump shall proclaim that "Time shall be no longer." Of this "Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," from which we in this country, derive our descent and our commission, I say in conclusion: "Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof, Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generations following. FOR THIS GOD IS OUR GOD FOREVER AND EVER; HE WILL BE OUR GUIDE EVEN UNTO DEATH." (Psalm xlvi., 12, 14.)

popish party which had continued in communion with the Church of England up to that time, *during the eleven past years of Elizabeth's reign*, now began to separate themselves."

"Bedingfield, Cornwallis and Silyarde were the first popish recusants, and the date of the Romanists in England, as a distinct sect or community, may be fixed in the year 1570." And again: "It is evident, then, that the whole separation or schism was originated and perfected by the Roman Pontiffs and their adherents, not by the Churches among us. I repeat it as a fact which ought never to be forgotten, that *we did not go out from them*, but as the Apostle says, they went out from us."

## APPENDIX A.

(Referred to on page 55.)

---

Those who *feel* and *know* that they have *truth* on their side, have no occasion to resort to the dishonorable proceeding of misquoting, and especially of misrepresenting the writings of those to whom they profess to refer. And yet, this is a trick common to both Papists and the Presbyterian opponents of the Church. Some allusion to the doings of the latter has been made in the body of this work. No writer stands higher among the Presbyterians than the late Dr. MILLER of Princeton. There was an air of sanctity and candor about his very appearance and writings that seemed to say that it was *impossible* for him to deceive. And so Presbyterians generally, as did the writer of this once, pin their faith implicitly upon his assertions. Yet who can read the following *pretended* extracts, which he avers to have honestly and fairly made from the Epistles of IGNATIUS, and believe that he did not *purposely* deceive and mislead those who looked up to him as a "Father in Israel?" He *chose* to quote these Epistles, and knowing that the mass of his readers would never see them in any other shape, than in his work, he so quotes them as to support *his* view, indeed, but at the same time, to make IGNATIUS assert directly the *opposite* of what he actually has done in the Epistles themselves! Is this *honest*?

The same remarks will apply to the celebrated Mr. POWELL, who has undertaken and performed a like ignoble work for the *Methodists*. *How* he has done it, let the reader of the following extracts judge.

The author had himself intended to compile extracts from these two volumes; but finding the work so much

better and graphically done by the Rev. F. S. MINES, (who was cured of *his* Presbyterianism by being convinced of this dishonesty of his former tutors,) that, by permission, a few paragraphs are quoted from his admirable treatise—"A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church," now being published in the columns of the N. Y. "Churchman," and to be issued in a more permanent form by the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union. It is to be hoped that this work will have a wide circulation. It is calculated to do good, and its well-told shots have already been felt in the ranks of the enemy!

Here is his expose of MILLER and POWELL on Ignatius :

In the year of grace, 1835, Doctor Miller prepared by "particular request" for "The Presbyterian Tract and Sunday School Society," a third work entitled, "Presbyterianism, the truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church;" in which, after quoting Theodoret only, and him but once, on the Episcopal side, and accompanying the quotation with the remark that "No one doubts that in Theodoret's time, Prelacy had obtained a complete establishment," he goes on to say :

"It is very certain that the Fathers who flourished nearest to the Apostolic age, generally represent Presbyters, and not Prelates, as the successors of the Apostles. Ignatius, in particular, who was contemporary with the last of the Apostles, expresses himself again and again in the following language: "The Presbyters succeed in the bench of the Apostles;" and again, "In like manner, let all reverence the Presbyters as the sanhedrim of God, and college of the Apostles;" and again, "Be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope." And once more, 'Follow the Presbyters as the Apostles.' Which shall we believe, Ignatius or Theodoret?"

Is it to be wondered that the students of Princeton and readers of quotations like these are satisfied with Presbyterian ordination? Do, young gentlemen, allow your eyes to look farther than your ears, and be at the trouble for once to see what Ignatius did really say. But let us, first of all, ascertain exactly who Ignatius was; for you can never learn it from your own writers. One of your latest writers, the

Rev. Edwin Hall, says of Ignatius that "*he comes too late by a whole hundred years, to have any thing to say of the primitive Church!* Why, gentlemen, on the death of Euodias, he became Bishop of Antioch in the year 70; was *intimate with Apostles*, and for forty years, under the eyes of Apostles, was Bishop of the aforesaid metropolis of Syria. Now for the quotations!

We are now quite ready to answer the question, Which shall we believe? "Ignatius or Theodoret?" We answer, *Both!* For with Ignatius, as with Theodoret, it is Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons.

*The Ignatius of Princeton.*

1. "The Presbyters succeed in the place of the bench of the Apostles," said to be declared by Ignatius "again and again."

2. "In like manner, let all reverence the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and college of the Apostles."

3. "Be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope."

*The Ignatius of Antioch.*

Ignatius never wrote such a passage in his life. Its author was a "venerable father" who flourished at Princeton toward the middle of the nineteenth century.

2. "In like manner let all reverence *the Deacons as Jesus Christ; and the Bishop as the Father; and the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God and college of the Apostles.*" (Ep. to Trall. sec. 3.) The words here italicized the Doctor did not see.

3. "*Do nothing without your Bishop, even as ye are wont, and be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope, in whom if we walk, we shall be found in Him.—The Deacons also, as being the Ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, etc.*" (Ep. to Trall. sec. 2.)—Again I have put in italics the words that escaped the Doctor's notice.

4. "Follow the Presbyters as the Apostles."

4. "Follow *your Bishop, as Jesus Christ did the Father; and the Presbytery, as the Apostles; and reverence the Deacons, as the command of God.*" (Ep. to Smyrneans, sec. 8.) Poor *Bishops and Deacons!* still not noticed by the Doctor! And if any person will show me in Ignatius the passages that, Dr. Miller says, represent a Bishop as "THE PERSON by whom all marriages were celebrated," who was "to be PERSONALLY acquainted with all his flock," or 'to take notice WITH HIS OWN EYE of those who were absent from public worship,' I promise to commit this work of mine to the flames, and to present to the Seminary at Princeton a complete and handsome series of the Fathers of the first ten centuries.

Now, kind reader, I have something to show you that is odd. On page 53 of the same work Ignatius is brought forward again in the following passage:

"With respect to the testimony of Ignatius, early in the second century, who is commonly regarded and resorted to as the sheet-anchor of the Episcopal claim; we would scarcely wish for a more distinct and graphic description of Presbyterianism than his Epistle represents as existing in all the Churches which he addressed. Ignatius speaks expressly of a Bishop, Elders, and Deacons existing in every worshipping assembly which he addressed. Is this the language of **Prelacy**? So far from it, nothing can be plainer than that this language can be reconciled with the Presbyterian system alone. Presbyterians are the only denomination who have, in every worshipping assembly, a Bishop, Presbyters, or Elders, and Deacons."

Now what are we to make of this? In the former place,

he quotes Ignatius as proving that the *Presbyters* or *Pastors* were the successors of *the Apostles*; but now he says "Presbyterians are the only denomination who have in every worshipping assembly a Bishop, *Elders*, and Deacons." Well done! In page 47, it is *the Presbyters* that succeed the Apostles; on page 53 the very same word, in the same passages, is translated *Elders*; and we have a pastor with his *Elders* and Deacons "in every worshipping assembly." Ignatius, by the by, says not one word of any "worshipping assembly;" his Epistles are to *Churches*—one, for example, to the Church of Ephesus, a Church which, in St. Paul's time, had Presbyters that *preached* and "fed the Church of God." Certainly these Presbyters of Doctor Miller remind one of the bats; when the cat comes, each of "the bench" of bats cries, "You mistake, sir, I am not a mouse," and when the hawk comes, "I am not a bird."

Poor Ignatius! the manner of his martyrdom seems to have but fore-shadowed the mercilessness with which he should be mangled in the last days again, and the fragments from him torn and made a spectacle to angels and to men. We admit there are fragments of Ignatius; but they are not Ignatius. See how Mr. Powell an English "Wesleyan Minister," as he writes himself on the title-page of his work, thus boldly avowing in the outset the fearful principle, "I of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of *Wesley*," severs member from member of these cut up sentences, and holds them up as the body and soul of Ignatius. The capitals are Mr. Powell's. In the right hand column Mr. Powell's fragments will be found in brackets [ ].

*The mangled fragments.*

I. "The Deacon is *subject* to the *Presbyters*, as to the LAW of JESUS CHRIST."—Ep. to Magn.

*The true Ignatius,*

I. "Seeing then that I have been thought worthy to see you by Damas, your godly and excellent *Bishop*, and by your worthy *Presbyters*, Bassus and Apollonius, and by my fellow-servant, Sotio, [the Deacon] in whom I rejoice, because he [is subject] to his Bishop as unto the grace of God, and [to the Presbyters as to the Law of Jesus Christ]."

The words in brackets [ ] put together, make Mr. Powell's quotation.

This Epistle was written to the Church of Magnesia, in Syria, from Smyrna, where Ignatius was now on his way to a martyr's crown; here he saw "the Apostle Polycarp," and here the neighbouring churches of Asia sent their Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons to take their last farewell of him. The Church of Magnesia sent Damas, their Bishop, Bassus and Appollonius, their Presbyters, and Sotio, their Deacon. Ignatius even *names* them, and the gentlemen at Princeton know it; and in his letter exhorts the Magnesians not to "despise the youth of your Bishop," and to "submit themselves to him, yet not to him but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all." Who could have believed that an *unjesuitized Christian* could have represented the above as being the sense or sentence of Ignatius? Yet this is but the beginning. Let us go on.

*The Mangled Fragments.*

I "The PRESBYTERY preside in the place of the council of the APOSTLES."—Eph. to Magn.

*The true Ignatius.*

I. "Study to do all things in a divine concord; your *Bishop* presiding in the place of *God*, and your [*Presbyters* in the place of the council of the *Apostles*,] and your *Deacons*, who are most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministry of *Jesus Christ*."

This Epistle it is, too, that speaks of "your most worthy Bishop, and the well woven spiritual crown of your Presbytery, and your godly Deacons."

*The Mangled Fragments.*

II.—"Be ye subject to your *Presbyters* as to the *Apostles* of Jesus Christ our hope.—Ep. to Trail.

*The true Ignatius.*

II.—"Do nothing without your *Bishop*, even as ye are wont, and that [ye be also subject to the *Presbyters* as to the *Apostles* of Jesus Christ our hope.] . . . In like manner, let all reverence the *Deacons*."

This Epistle, also, was written from Smyrna, whither the Trallians had sent Polybius, their Bishop, actually named in the Epistles, to greet the martyr on his triumphal way, and the martyr begs them "Remember in your prayers the Church of *Syria*," as in his Epistle to the Romans he calls himself not the pastor of Antioch, but the Bishop of Syria, saying, "Ye can do me no greater favor than to suffer me to be offered up to God, now that the altar is prepared; that when we are gathered together in love, ye may sing praises to the Father of Christ Jesus, that he hath vouchsafed that a *Bishop of Syria* should be found, or to call him from the east unto the west;" and again, "Remember her in your prayers, *the Church of Syria* which now enjoys *God for its shepherd, instead of me*, . . . . Yet neither am I worthy being the least among them." Say, could not the Presbyters of Antioch get another "moderator?"

III.—"Let all remember the *Presbyters*, as the *Sanhedrim of God* and COLLEGE OF APOSTLES."—Ep. to Trall.

III.—["Let all remember] *Deacons* as *Jesus Christ*, and the *Bishop* as the *Father*, and the [*Presbyters* as the *Sanhedrim of God*, and *College of Apostles*.] Without these there is no church." He then speaks of their Bishop Polybius who had come to "rejoice with him in his bonds," whose "mildness" and "love" should provoke their "reverence," for his very "look is instruction and his gentleness is power."

*Mangled Fragments.*

IV.—"Being subject to your Bishop as to the command of God, and so *likewise* to the *Presbytery*."—Same Ep.

*The true Ignatius.*

IV.—This, for once, is a correct quotation, with which we are quite satisfied, especially as it is preceded a few lines before by the words, "It becomes every one, especially the Presbyters, to refresh your Bishops," &c.

V.—“See that ye follow the *Presbyters* as the *Apostles*.”—Ep. to Smyrn.

V.—[“See that ye all follow] your *Bishop*, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, [and the *Presbyters* as the *Apostles*,] and reverence the *Deacons* as the command of God. Let no one do any thing which belongs to the church, separately from the Bishop.”

This Epistle was written<sup>d</sup> after Ignatius had passed through Smyrna and had arrived at Troas, and together with his Epistle to the noble Polycarp their Bishop, is full of indirect allusions to the relative powers of the officers of the Church whom he had seen and known and learned to love.

\* \* \* \* \*

But to return to Mr. Powell. After holding up these dismembered fragments to the gaping “Wesleyans,” some of whom may exult as the Romans in the amphitheatre over his bones, adds with all the coolness imaginable, “*all the above passages are from Archbishop Wake’s translation.*” How to deal with such “Protestant Jesuitism” we are entirely at a loss. Yes, they are “*from Archbishop Wake’s translation,*” that is, a few words picked out “*from*” entire sentences; but as we have seen they are not Ignatius! Rather than put forth such spurious things to guide the awakening world to the ancient Church of God, would we lay down upon a chart safe bays and harbors where there were rocks and shoals, or issue coin falling short in weight and quantity. Mr. Powell stamps a *part* of a sentence as its *whole*. We are sorry to see the Methodists re-issuing this book, of which we have given the errors of *but one half-page*! Never mind; enlightened Methodists as well as Presbyterians of other names, are discovering the cheat. Mr. Powell had to say something, (and honest quotations would not suit his purpose;) for the Wesleyans, in a late annual report in England, represent that the number of their ministers and members had actually fallen off the previous year, and a single Bishop, (Salisbury, I believe,) had received applications from some seventy Wesleyans for a better ordination.

## APPENDIX B.

---

[Referred to on Page 184.]

---

### The "Forged Decretal Epistles,"

ISSUED BY THE PAPISTS IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

The following extract from an article on "Canon Law," in the "Church Review" for January, 1851, written by Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, will give the reader a correct idea of this shameless forgery and imposture ushered into existence in the Ninth Century, and actually made the basis of the monstrous assumptions of the Papacy from that time until the revival of Letters in the 16th Century. Could Popery only annihilate the PRINTING PRESS, the way would then be open for a repetition of the lying legends, and abominable impostures that disgraced its history during the middle ages. But it cannot be, and with all its late pretences of new life and vigor, "Ichabod" is written on the walls of its temples. When it has done all the work of the devil, that a wise Providence sees fit to permit, then *Popery will be destroyed*. The bayonets of France and of Europe, will be powerless when "the Lord gives the word." But to the extract:—

"We come, therefore, in the next place, to consider the third, or Papal period, in which the West, still claiming the right of Supremacy over the East, went on towards the culminating point of PONTIFICAL AMBITION. And here we find that the Popes, in the hope of rising above the restraints of the old Canon Law, *introduced a new code of their own devising*. In the commencement of the Ninth Century, a collection of Decretals appeared under the name of ISIDORE, to which Pope Nicholas appealed, with all imaginable confi-

dence, *although, as the most intelligent writers of Rome since the Reformation fully admit, the whole was a GROSS FRAUD, and withal, most clumsily executed.* The same Pope quoted the decision of the Council of SINUESSA, to prove that he could not be judged by any earthly tribunal, which Council never existed at all, the entire story being an *ACKNOWLEDGED LIE*, gotten up in an age of increasing darkness, for the support of Papal Despotism; and many other Councils were also quoted by the Pontiffs of that and the following centuries, which are now abandoned by the Romanists themselves, as pure impositions upon human credulity. \* \* \* \* \*

“ We take the list of the spurious writings thus fraudulently gotten up, from the pages of HARDOUIN, (the Jesuit.) First, we have five long Epistles, purporting to be written by CLEMENT, then Bishop of Rome, of which two are addressed to James, the brother of our Lord, one to his brother Bishops, Presbyters and other Clergy, &c.; one to his disciples, and the nations around; and the last to the Christians dwelling in Jerusalem, under James, his colleague in the Episcopate.

“ Next come three Epistles in the name of ANACLETUS, the Bishop of Rome, from the last of which, two short extracts will show the main doctrine of the whole:—

“ *‘ But this most holy and Apostolic Church of Rome obtained the Primacy, not from the Apostles but from our Lord and Saviour himself, and received the eminence of power over all Churches and over the whole flock of Christ, as He said to the blessed Apostle, Peter; Thou art Peter,’ &c. ‘ If, therefore, there shall have arisen amongst you any of the more difficult controversies, have recourse to the mitre of this Holy Sec, as to the Head, that so they may be decided by the Apostolic judgment; for it is declared by the forementioned testimonials that such is the will and Constitution of the Lord, since this Apostolic See is established by the Lord, and by none other, to be the pole and the Head of all the Churches.’*

“ Then follow the Epistolary Decrees of Evaristus, of Alexander, of Sixtus, of Telesphorus, of Hygenus, of Pius, of Anacletus, of Soter, of Eleutherus, of Victor, of Zephyrinus, of Calixtus, of Urban, of Pontianus, of Anterus, of Fabian, of Cornelius, of Lucius, of Stephen, of Dyonisius, of Felix,

of Eutychianus, of Gaius; all Bishops of Rome, and all maintaining, with more or less force, according to these false documents, the dogma of her Supremacy, and the duty of implicit submission. Here was a *SYSTEMATIC FORGERY* intended to prove that no other doctrine was held from the time of CLEMENT, who was the cotemporary of the Apostles, down to the end of the 3d century.

“After this, we have the pretended records of the Council of SINUESSA, under Bishop MARCELLINUS, relating how he was accused before a council of 300 Bishops, A. D. 303, of having offered incense to idols, in the Dioclesian persecution. But, although he was clearly proved to be guilty, yet all these Bishops refused to condemn him, saying that it belonged to his prerogative to be judged only by himself. And, therefore, he did condemn himself, and the decree of the Council accordingly, was drawn up in these words:—  
*‘He has been justly condemned by his own mouth, and from his own mouth he has accepted his sentence of Anathema Maranatha. For, no one ever yet judged the Pontiff, nor a President his Priest; since the first See will not be judged by any.’*

“Following this notable romance we find the Decrees of Pope MARCELLUS, of EUSEBIUS, MELCHIADES, and of SYLVESTER. This last Pope is made to preside over a Council of 284 Bishops, after the baptism of the Emperor CONSTANTINE, of whom 139 from Italy, and the rest from Greece are all expressed by name; and two sessions of the Council are set forth with twenty Canons. Of these, the third Canon pronounces the same dogma as the Council of SINUESSA, with a slight improvement:

“*‘A Bishop shall not be judged unless with seventy-two witnesses, neither shall the Chief Bishop be judged by any one, because it is written, the disciple is not above his master. And a Presbyter shall not be condemned unless by forty-four testimonies,’* &c. But the 20th Canon gives a more rhetorical flourish to this Papal immunity:—*‘For no one shall judge the first See, because all the Sees must desire that justice be regulated by the first See. Neither by the Emperor, nor by all the Clergy, nor by Kings, nor by the People, shall the Judge be judged. And the 284 Bishops subscribed and 45 Presbyters, and 5 Deacons, and two more afterwards, and the Emperor Constantine, and his Mother Helena. Done*

*in the Baths of Trajan, the 30th day of May, in the 3d year of our Lord Constantine, and in the Consulship of Priscus.'*

"A very perfect specimen, beyond all controversy! The place, the time, the names of all the parties set forth with the most minute precision, and yet it was all a **GROSS FABRICATION**, acknowledged and repudiated for nearly two centuries by every Theologian of character in the Church of Rome itself, save a few of the determined partizans of Papal infallibility.

"Another of these confessed forgeries purports to be a Synodical Epistle, addressed by the General Council of NICE to the same Pope SYLVESTER, praying him to *confirm their decrees*, followed by a gracious answer from him, granting their application!

"And we have yet another production of the same unscrupulous counterfeiter, in which there is a bold attempt to foist into the Canons of that Great Council of NICE a large addition of Romish and priestly maxims by this contrivance. The famous ATHANASIUS is made to address a letter to Pope MARCUS, the successor of SYLVESTER, telling him that the Arians had assaulted the Orthodox, and had burned up their copy of the Council of NICE, but carefully adding that he remembered, (as he had been a member of the Council) that there were 70 chapters or Canons in the whole, passed by its action. In consequence of this calamity he begs the Pope to send him a copy from his record, and the Pope graciously accords with the wishes of ATHANASIUS, and transmits a certified copy of what purports to be the Canons of that Council, in which the Supremacy of Rome and an abundance of other matters unknown to the Primitive Church, are interwoven with the twenty Canons really enacted by the Nicene Fathers.

"Thus the testimony of the great ATHANASIUS was fraudulently brought in to sustain the false additions to the Council of Nice, which the Church of Rome still keeps in her code of the Canons and Constitutions, where we read in the tenth Canon, which they attribute to that great Council, that *the Church of Rome shall always hold the Primacy*.

"But enough of this miserable work of gross deception practiced in the name of the God of Truth, by the ambitious

spirit of ecclesiastical domination. All these, and more of the same sort, are in the collection of the spurious Decretals, which were produced in the name of ISIDORE, and openly adopted by Pope NICHOLAS in the 9th Century. And they continued to be upheld by Pope after Pope, until the Monk GRATIAN, A. D. 1151, introduced the most important portions of them into his famous work entitled the Decretal or *Concordantia discordantium Canonum*, his object being to reconcile the most extravagant theory of the Papal power with those authoritative Canons which seemed to contradict it. This elaborate work took precedence of all others in the Church of Rome. It became at once the favorite text book of her Canonists, and it still possesses extensive authority, notwithstanding the most learned Romanists in our age, and for a considerable time before it, with one voice, acknowledge the errors which we have briefly described, and the Jesuit Hardouin himself is compelled to mark them (only in a corner, and with the smallest possible type.) by a note of condemnation.”—“Church Review,” Vol. III. pp. 547—551.

---

#### ERRATA.

1. On pp. 123—125, a discrepancy will be observed between the *numbers* in the *text* and those in the *note*. This would have been obviated, if the Author could have revised the proof. The right numbers are in the *note*, and the reader will correct the text accordingly.

2. On p. 222, 5th line from the top, instead of “*third*” read “*fourth*.”













