



17-6


1-2
23

* THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *
* Princeton, N. J. *
* * * * *
* * * * *

1-2
23

BX 5995 .C3 H6 1844
Hopkins, John Henry, 1792-
1868.

The novelties which disturb



Vertical line of dots and dashes, possibly a barcode or scanning artifact.

Small vertical cluster of dots.

Small cluster of dots at the bottom left.

Vertical line of text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to the quality of the scan and the orientation of the page.

Vertical line of text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to the quality of the scan and the orientation of the page.

Vertical line of text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to the quality of the scan and the orientation of the page.

THE
NOVELTIES WHICH DISTURB OUR PEACE.

A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY, AND LAITY

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

BY JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.,

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT.

~~~~~  
"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."—Ps. 133.  
~~~~~

PHILADELPHIA:
HERMAN HOOKER.

1844.

[Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by HERMAN HOOKER, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania]

GIBSON, FAIRCHILD & Co., PRINTERS,
South East corner of Seventh and Market Streets.

A L E T T E R, & c.

RESPECTED AND BELOVED BRETHREN IN CHRIST:—

The sacred office of the Episcopate is confessedly invested with the most awful responsibility, even in its ordinary administration. When the Church is at peace in all her borders, and her bishops are only called upon to oversee their respective dioceses in the regular routine of accustomed duty,—even then, how few can feel that they have acquitted themselves of their solemn trust with entire fidelity! How ready must we all be to supplicate forgiveness at the hands of the great Bishop and Shepherd of our souls, and to acknowledge the force of the apostle's declaration, that the treasure of the gospel is indeed committed to earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of God, and not of us!

But far more delicate and difficult does our task become, when the peace of the Church is disturbed by intestine agitation. Scattered at distant points over our vast continent, meeting together only once in three years, and then during a period quite too short for an intimate and thorough understanding of our respective opinions, we are deprived of the power of mutual consultation, when those peculiar occasions arise, on which that consultation would be most desirable. Meanwhile, the irresponsible autocracy of the Press takes hold of the opportunity. Error and novelty gain ground. The clergy and the people choose their editorial leaders; and when at last, the sentiments of the bishops are declared, they are merely used as the complements of parties already formed, and are praised or blamed, just as the prejudice of party may dictate. The bishops, *in theory*, are indeed, the governors of the Church. *In practical effect*, however, on the minds of the majority, the editorial chair stands far above them; and as the inconsistency, how-

ever gross, belongs to the *spirit of the age*, I doubt much whether it admits of any effectual remedy.

Under such circumstances, the inquiry, *What can, and what ought to be done by each individual bishop*, becomes a grave and serious question. The apostolic precept, *Be not partaker of other men's sins*, seems, of itself, to require our public attestation against error. And when we join to this the solemn promise of our consecration vow to *banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word; and both privately and openly to CALL UPON AND ENCOURAGE OTHERS to do the same*, it would surely be a false interpretation that we could be justified in doing nothing. If the relaxed discipline of these latter days allows us to exercise only the common liberty of speech, our very silence, in times of trouble, becomes reprehensible. And just in proportion to the doubts and difficulties which involve our brethren, should be the force and distinctness of our warning voice. Whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear, is not for us to determine; but we cannot avoid the responsibility of the ultimate evil result, if we see them walking towards an unsuspected snare, without earnestly beseeching them to pause and consider, before it be too late.

I freely acknowledge, however, that wisdom demands our utmost care, lest we *create* difficulty, by too hasty an adoption of the cry that the CHURCH IS IN DANGER. And I am by no means disposed to sympathize in that popular alarm, or to strengthen the fears of those who maintain it. In one respect, indeed, the assertion may well be granted, for the Church militant can never be free from danger, until her warfare is accomplished, and the final victory is won. But I would hope that the agitation which now pervades our communion, on both sides of the Atlantic, is not an argument of *danger* to the Church, so much as it is a proof of her sensitive vitality, and her zealous love for the pure and unadulterated doctrines of the gospel. Hence arises our jealousy of the least approximation to error. Hence our suspicions and our fears, lest the new school of Tractarian theology should conflict with our

standards of religious truth. And hence, following the counsel of the wise son of Sirach, to *take physic when we are well*, it seems our duty to arise BEFORE the Church is *in danger*, attack the appearance of disorder in its first and lightest symptoms, and thus, so far as in us lies, under the guidance and by the power of the divine Physician, transmit her constitution, in health and vigour, even to the end of the world.

With these views, my respected and beloved brethren, bishops, clergy, and laity, I beg leave to address myself to you upon the present interesting stage of our ecclesiastical history. I do it under the conviction, that the *Church has a right to know the sentiments of every bishop*, upon questions which concern her principles and doctrine, especially at a time of agitation, which threatens—may God avert it!—to be the herald of strife. I do it in the hope, that when all our bishops shall have spoken distinctly, we shall find this agitation gradually subside. I do it as a lover of peace and unity, as a friend to the Reformation, and as an uncompromising adversary to every form and shape of Romanism. I do it as a brother, addressing brethren, without the fear of being misapprehended by those who understand, with Jerome, that “wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, he is of the same excellency, of the same episcopate. The power of wealth, or the lowliness of poverty does not make a bishop either less or greater.” And I do it in this particular form, on purpose to express the more plainly, that I hold myself under correction, especially from each and all of my brethren in the episcopate, if any thing which I conceive it my duty to say, should seem, to their better judgments, unsound or objectionable.

My design is to set forth, distinctly, my own position, as one of the college of bishops, (although, it may be, the least,) in reference to those important topics in which innovation is beginning to be manifest; on the admitted maxim, *Obsta principiis*. The first subject which I shall present is that of Lay Baptism, inasmuch as the novel practice of re-baptizing those who have received baptism at

the hands of our non-episcopal brethren, is openly defended, and is on the increase. My motives for placing this matter at the commencement, have arisen out of my official sphere of duty. The public allowance of re-baptization in the case of some students of the General Seminary in A. D. 1841, has given me trouble in my own diocese. Bound, as I conceive, by the strongest ecclesiastical arguments, to deny the lawfulness of such re-baptization, I have promised to publish my reasons; and I address them to you with the desire, that when the next General Convention meets together, under the favour of divine Providence, this may be one of the points on which I may have the counsel of my colleagues.

Another novelty which I regret to see, is the systematic refusal of the term Church, to the various orthodox communities of our non-episcopal brethren, on the alleged ground, that since Episcopacy is manifestly of divine institution, there can be no Church where there are no bishops.

A third novelty to which I cannot assent, is the view of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, as set forth in the Oxford Tracts, and presented in the late sermon of the Rev. Dr. Pusey. In connexion with this stands the general scope of what is called *the sacramental theology*, and the theory of priestly power.

A fourth novelty, which has produced a more serious fermentation than all the rest, in consequence of the recent ordination of Mr. Carey, is the theological notion that the tenets of the Council of Trent may be reconciled to sound Catholic (or orthodox and primitive) doctrine. And along with this, I am compelled to classify the apparent favour exhibited towards the extraordinary assault of a Transatlantic periodical, the British Critic, upon the cardinal doctrine of *Justification by faith*, and the *Protestant character* of the Church of England.

I have called these things '*Novelties*,' not because the notions themselves were never heard before, but because they have never been presented, until lately, in such a form and under such peculiar circumstances, as

to *disturb our peace* by their *practical influence*. That in this respect they are the fruits of the Tractarian theory, is doubted by no one. And while I entertain none but the kindest feelings of personal regard and affection towards the distinguished advocates of that theory, whether in our mother Church, or in our own, I have already, (in my Charge of 1842,) been obliged to dissent from their system; and now propose to act on the same principle, under the vast increase of responsibility, which has arisen from the unexpected developments of the past year. Perfectly persuaded, however, that all my brethren, with one heart, “desire the prosperity of our holy apostolic Church,” and are ready, “with one mouth, to profess the faith once delivered to the saints,” I cannot consent to prosecute a warfare against their piety, the purity of their motives, or the rectitude of their intentions, even when I am compelled to oppose what I conscientiously believe to be serious errors in judgment. For if charity, as the apostle saith, “rejoiceth in the truth,” it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that truth rejoiceth no less in charity.

On the first of the topics specified, viz., the validity of Lay-Baptism, I must ask your indulgence to a long array of argument and evidence, not only because it has been made the subject of several able publications on the other side, (the last of which, by my highly esteemed brother and friend, Professor Ogilby, I have not yet seen,*) but also because of its great *practical* importance to our parochial clergy. There are constant accessions to the Church from the various Christian communities around us, and the very first question to be settled in all such cases is, whether the persons concerned have been already baptized or not. It is plainly, therefore, of the most absolute necessity to have fixed and definite views upon this matter; and I have accordingly devoted considerable time and labour, in order to exhibit what I conceive to be the doctrine of the Church, along with the proofs on which it is founded.

* I have been informed by an intelligent clergyman, that the Professor has taken the same line of argument as Waterland, whose work I have kept chiefly before me in preparing the following pages.

To this end, I shall first consider the question as it stands in our mother Church of England since the Reformation, and in our own Church, as derived from her. Next, I shall bring the doctrine to the test of Scripture, and Christian antiquity; and lastly, I shall point out some of the difficulties which encumber the contrary opinion.

It is universally known, not only that Lay-Baptism was the prevalent practice of the whole Western Church, in cases of extremity, but that it was expressly approved by the Church of England at the time of the Reformation; for the Prayer-Book established in the reign of Edward VI., gave directions for the mode in which a layman might perform the ordinance. The familiar maxim in theology had long been settled, that *the minister was not of the ESSENCE, but only of the ORDER of the sacrament*; and therefore, although as a point of sacred *order*, a priest was required when he could be obtained, yet the *essence* of baptism might be had under a lay-administration.

The first man of note who laid down the contrary doctrine was the celebrated John Calvin, (1) "We judge that baptism to be adulterated or vitiated," saith he, "which is administered by a private man, and this temerity, in a well-ordered Church, ought not to be tolerated. But because this thing happened among you in the beginning of the Reformation, before the order of the Church was well restored, and while things were yet in confu-

(1) "Adulterinum baptismum censemus, qui administratus est a privato homine. Ac in ecclesia, recte composita, tolerabilis non esset hæc temeritas. Sed quia id apud vos inter principia contigit, ante restitutum Ecclesiæ ordinem, et rebus adhuc confusis; non tantum errori danda est venia, sed ferendus est qualiscunque baptismus: modo ne in exemplum trahatur, quod semel perperam gestum est. Nam in Ecclesiæ dissipatione multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in Ecclesiam bene ordinatam. Olim cum vitiosa esset religio, haud dubie multis vitiis et corruptelis implicita circumcisio fuit; quam tamen iteratam fuisse non legimus, quum revocaretur populus ad purum cultum. Ergo anxie disquirere necesse non est, ac ne expedit quidem, in omnes circumstantias, quæ innumeros scrupulos gignerent. Proinde quod ignovit Deus sub Papatu, nos quoque sepeliamus. Nunc ubi de vero baptismi usu admonita fuerit Ecclesia, quod pugnet cum Christi institutione, pro nihilo ducendum esset; ac de integro baptizandus, qui pollutus fuerit profana aspersione." Calv. Ep. p. 209. Ed. Amstel. 1667. See App. to Bingham's Scholastic Hist. of Lay-Baptism, § 8, to which I am indebted for the passage.

sion, this error is not only to be pardoned, but any baptism is to be admitted, provided the irregularity of what was once done, be not drawn into precedent for the future. For, in the dissipation of the Church, God pardons many things that are not to be admitted of in a well-ordered Church. Heretofore, when religion was corrupted, no doubt many faults and corruptions had crept into circumcision: yet we do not read that it was repeated, when the people were brought back to a pure worship. It is therefore neither necessary nor expedient to be over anxious in our inquiries into all circumstances, which may raise innumerable scruples. And therefore, what God pardoned under the Papacy, let us also bury. Only now, that the Church is instructed in the true use of baptism, what is repugnant to Christ's institution is to be accounted as nothing; *and he is to be baptized again, who has been polluted by a profane washing.*"

The Rubric of the Church of England, however, continued the same through the long reign of Elizabeth, notwithstanding the influence of Calvin's authority; nor was it altered until the famous conference at Hampton Court; and then it was done to gratify King James, who had been educated a thorough Presbyterian. But still there was no condemnation nor prohibition of Lay-Baptism. The bishops merely consented that it should not be *enjoined*, as it had been previously; while they had no idea of adopting the rule of Calvin, by treating it as a nullity. Nay, more than a century after this, viz. A. D. 1712, there was a formal meeting of the archbishops with the bishops, in consequence of Mr. Lawrence's publications on the subject; and they unanimously resolved, that "Lay-Baptism should be discouraged as much as possible, *but if the essentials had been preserved in a baptism by a lay hand, it was not to be repeated.*"* In full accordance with this, Bishop Fleetwood, cited as authority in the last edition of Burns' Ecclesiastical Law, expressly asserts, that "Lay-Baptism is not declared invalid by any of the offices or rubrics, nor in any public act hath the Church ever ordered such as have been baptized by

*See Bishop White's Memoirs of the Prot. Ep. Church, p. 280-294 of first edition.

lay hands to be baptized by a lawful minister, though at the time of the Restoration there were supposed to be 2 or 300,000 souls baptized by such as are called lay hands."

A glance at the chronology of this matter may aid the force of the argument. The Book of Common Prayer which positively enjoined Lay-Baptism, was first published in the reign of Edward VI., A. D. 1548, revised and confirmed in 1552, and again revised and established under Elizabeth, in 1559. The Hampton Court Conference which altered the rubric concerning Lay-Baptism, at the instance of James I., took place in A. D. 1603. The Restoration of Charles II., after such vast numbers had been baptized by lay hands, Independents and others, was in A. D. 1660. The resolution of the bishops, occasioned by Mr. Lawrence's book, was in 1712, and Bishop Fleetwood, (who was probably present, since he was consecrated to the see of St. Asaph in 1706) died in 1723, precisely one hundred and twenty years after the Conference at Hampton Court, and sixty-three years after the question of Lay-Baptism must have been pressed upon the conscience of the Church of England with such peculiar force, by the state of the kingdom, at the accession of the second Charles. Hence we see that the time and the circumstances stamp the most absolute confirmation upon the doctrine maintained by the ecclesiastical law of England, viz.: that Baptism, administered by lay hands, though irregular, and unauthorized by any express Rubric since the year 1603, is nevertheless *valid*, and therefore NOT TO BE REPEATED. That the judgment of our mother Church continues the same, has been fully proved by the late case of Mastin vs. Escott, in which one of her clergymen was sentenced to a suspension from the ministry during three months, for having refused to bury the body of a child who had been baptized by a Methodist preacher, under the plea that such baptism was a mere nullity; being performed, not by a 'lawful minister,' but by a layman. The Ecclesiastical Court went largely into the authorities, and condemned the clergyman on the ground that Lay-Baptism, administered with water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, *was valid and sufficient by the doctrine of the Church of England.* And this

decision, after an obstinate and zealous contest, was confirmed, A. D. 1841, upon an appeal to the highest tribunal of the English Ecclesiastical law, with the general approbation of the Episcopal Bench. At least such approbation must in fairness be inferred from the fact, that no attempt has been made to alter the legal state of the question.

Such being the clear and harmonious action of our mother Church upon this important subject, we have next to examine the matter as respects ourselves since the year 1789, when our branch of the Church became possessed of a complete and independent organization. And here I presume that there can be but one opinion, since it is familiar to all, that our system on the doctrine and administration of baptism is precisely the same with that of England. Our House of Bishops have further adopted and recommended, as theological text-books, those authors who expressly sustain the validity of Lay-Baptism, such as Hooker, Burnet, and Potter. Our late venerable Bishop White, who presided over that House for half a century, has published his mature decision in favour of the same views; and it is only since his decease that any other doctrine has been openly advocated amongst us: so that up to the present hour, nothing has been done on this subject by the authority of our Church, which changes our position one jot from that of the Church of England. Our principles and our practice were both derived from her, and for the first fifty years of our ecclesiastical independence, our concord on this point was unbroken. A few cases, indeed, of individual dissatisfaction occurred from time to time; but they were disposed of in a corner, with as little publicity and observation as possible, and were generally regarded, not as a vindication of the *doctrine of the Church*, but rather as a private and special indulgence to over-scrupulous minds, about which, the less that was said, the better.

But I have now to examine the consistency of all this with the truth of Scripture, and the doctrine of Christian antiquity; in order to test the allegation so confidently made by the writers on the other side, that the Word of

God and the example of the primitive Church stand opposed to it.

First, then, if we turn to the Old Testament, we shall find that those sacramental rites which were afterwards committed to the Aaronic priesthood, were exercised from the beginning without restriction. Thus, Abel brought his sacrifice, the firstlings of his flock. Thus Noah built an altar and offered sacrifices. Thus, Abraham fulfilled the same sacred function; and to him was committed the sacramental rite of Circumcision, which ordinance held the same place with his posterity, as Baptism held with the spiritual Israel. I am well aware, indeed, of the distinction which the ancient fathers generally maintained, between those sacramental rites and the proper Christian sacraments, calling the first the *types* of those blessings which the latter *actually conferred*. But in whatever light we may regard this point of controversy, the analogy is sufficiently strong. The strict propriety of arguing from Circumcision to Baptism, from Sacrifices to the Eucharist, and from the Aaronic priesthood to the apostolic ministry, is an axiom amongst all sound theologians, the authority of which is settled and unquestionable.

On this very ground of analogy, it has always been held most reasonable to cite the law which required infant Circumcision, as a primary evidence in favour of infant Baptism; enough of itself to justify the Baptism of infants, unless there were some prohibition in the New Testament to prevent the application of the principle. But assuredly, if it be right to assume this analogy in the *subjects* of the two ordinances, it must be equally right to claim the same analogy in the *authority of the administrator*. And hence it becomes important to observe, that Circumcision was instituted long before the Aaronic priesthood; that even women, as in the remarkable instance of Zipporah, (Exod. iv. 25,) performed it in cases of extremity, and that notwithstanding the institution of the Levitical law of priesthood, this initiatory rite continued free to every Israelite; although, through respect for their office, a Levite was always employed when

practicable. Nor is this the full extent to which the principle was applied in the Mosaic dispensation. For, as is well observed by Isidore of Pelusium, even sacrifice was not so strictly confined to the order of the priesthood, but that every man was still allowed to be a priest to himself and to his family, in the sacrifice of the Passover; thus verifying the declaration of the Almighty to the very letter, that Israel was *a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.* (2.)

Now here there seems to be a fair demonstration of the theological maxim, that the priest is not of the *essence*, but only of the *order* of the sacraments. For the sacramental rites of ancient Israel were these two, Sacrifice and Circumcision. But although sacrifice was formally committed to the Aaronic priesthood, yet it is most manifest that this could not change its *essence*, since it was *in esse*, or in existence, since the period of the fall. It would be a waste of words to prove, what is evident *ex vi termini*, that the *essence* or *essential* element of a thing, must needs be *that without which it cannot exist*. And therefore, as the ordinance of sacrifice was in existence from the time of Adam's expulsion from paradise, and continued through every variety of the patriarchal

(2) *Isid. Pelus. Lib. iii. Theodosio Episcopo, 75, p. 251.* "Pulcherrima victima est, piam mentem et carnem castam habere.—Non enim ad sacerdotes solos scribens, ut ipse estimas, hæc ipsis mandabat, (sc. apostolus) sed universæ Ecclesiæ. Unumquemque enim ipsorum hæc in parte sacerdotem esse jussit. Quod si castitas et pudicitia subditos sacerdotes creat, libido proculdubio ac lascivia sacerdotibus dignitatem abrogat.—Ut enim in Veteri Testamento sacerdotii munere fungi exceptis sacerdotibus nemini licebat, Paschæ tamen tempore omnes sacerdotii honore afficiebantur, (unusquisque enim pecudem immolabat,) sic etiam in novo ac successionis experte, sejunctim quidem, ac velut prærogativæ nomine, incruentæ victimæ sacrificium ii habent, quibus illud offerre concessum est: at interim unusquisque corporis sui sacerdos creatus est; non ut citra ordinationem et institutionem subditorum imperium arripiat, sed ut vitiis imperans, corpus suum castitatis delubrum aut templum efficiat." This beautiful idea, that every man is created the priest of his own body, which is designed to be a living temple of the Holy Spirit, occurs in many of the fathers; and it is not only important to explain the true ground of the maxim that the instituted official priesthood is a matter of *order* and not of *essence*, but it is of still higher value as the guard of personal piety.

dispensation, it is plain that the institution of the Levitical law of priesthood could not be designed to affect its *essential elements*, but merely to fix, in a higher and more solemn form, the *order of its administration*. Hence if, after this divine appointment, some Israelite who was not of the priesthood had undertaken to offer sacrifice, it would seem absurd to say that his act was a *nullity*, and that his offering was no sacrifice at all. For in truth, the act itself which was a real sacrifice anterior to the priesthood of Aaron, must be a real sacrifice afterwards; although the offerer would now be guilty of a sacrilege in violating the *order* appointed by the Almighty, and for this sin, he would of course deserve condemnation.

An example, fully in point, occurs in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; who, contumaciously setting themselves up against the priesthood of Aaron, claimed equal rights for every Israelite. “*Ye take too much upon you,*” said they to Moses and Aaron, (Num. xvi. 3,) “*seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them: wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?*” In reply to this rebellious assumption, Moses charges them plainly with seeking the priesthood; and tells them to take censers and put fire therein, and put incense on them before the Lord to-morrow, while Aaron should do the same; and then the Almighty himself would shew who were his priests, and whom he had chosen. Korah and his company, accordingly, amounting to two hundred and fifty men, took their censers and offered incense, standing in the door of the tabernacle with Moses and Aaron. And God caused Korah, Dathan and Abiram to be swallowed up alive, by the earth cleaving asunder that was under them. Nor was this awful punishment of the ring-leaders all that the divine judgment thought necessary to vindicate the priesthood. For we read further, that *there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense.*

It is here that we meet with an important fact, directly applicable to our subject; because it shews that although

these bold schismatics were thus dreadfully visited for their wilful contumacy, yet THEIR OFFERING WAS NOT TREATED AS A NULLITY. For the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, *Speak unto Eleazer the son of Aaron the priest, that he take up the censers out of the burning, and scatter thou the fire yonder, for they are hallowed. The censers of these sinners against their own souls, let them make them broad plates for a covering of the altar,* FOR THEY OFFERED THEM BEFORE THE LORD, THEREFORE THEY ARE HALLOWED. (Ib. 38.) No language could more distinctly prove that the condescension of the Deity attaches a consecrated character to whatever may be offered to his service, however rebellious the spirit of the offerer. The subject of the offering is accepted as a hallowed thing, while the sacrilegious usurpers are cut off in their iniquity.

Now if such a principle appears in the instance of those most atrocious schismatics, Korah and his company, and with respect to the brazen censers on which they performed their act of usurpation, it would seem quite preposterous to deny the application of the rule by the All-merciful Redeemer, to the case of laymen, exercising their ministry in good faith, though erroneously, when the subject to be consecrated by their priestly acts is not an insensible piece of metal, but an immortal soul, for whom Christ died—God over all, blessed for ever! If then the offering of Korah's company had the effect of hallowing the censers, notwithstanding the sinful usurpation of the offerers, much more may we believe that the individual offered to the Lord in Baptism, and every other subject of religious dedication, is *hallowed by the act*, however the agents may expose themselves to the wrath of God, by their invasion of the priesthood without authority.

I may have occasion, however, to resume this part of the argument, for a different purpose, hereafter; and therefore I shall pass on to the New Testament, where some interesting proofs occur of the same merciful principle, that deviations from the appointed order are not suffered to destroy the validity of the acts of men, in the

performance of religious functions. For example, our Lord, on a certain occasion, saith to the people; "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not." (Matt. xxiii. 2.) Now it is certain, that before our Saviour's day, the succession of the high-priesthood in the line of Aaron had been shamefully disregarded and virtually lost. (3) Yet our Lord would have the priesthood *de facto* respected notwithstanding, and even bestowed on one of these illegal High Priests, Caiaphas, the gift of prophecy.

Again, we read that the apostles saw a man casting out devils in the name of Christ; *and we forbid him*, saith St. John, *because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, FORBID HIM NOT, for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part.* (Mark ix. 38.) Now it seems manifest that this individual was acting schismatically, for he was not only using the authority of the great Redeemer without permission, but even kept himself separate from the society of our Lord and his disciples at the very time. But the compassionate Saviour could make allowances, where men could see nothing but ground for censure. From the mere fact that the devils were cast out by this stranger in the name of Christ, we may be sure that the principle of faith must have been active; and our Lord, kindly accepting this, overlooks his want of a regular commission, and saith,

(3) Thus Josephus expressly informs us. "Primus Antiochus Epiphanes eam legem violavit, pro Jesu subrogato in hoc sacerdotium fratre ipsius Onia. Secundò Aristobulus ab Hyrcano fratre eum honorem in se transtulit. Tertius Herodes Aristobulum adolescentem vivo adhuc pontifice successorem dedit, &c. Antiquit. Jud. Lib. XV., Cap. III. p. 513. In the 20th Book, 8th Chapter, and 18th section, he further gives an historical list of the high-priests from Aaron down to the destruction of Jerusalem, towards the close of which, after adverting to the murder of the youthful Aristobulus, the last of the rightful succession, he adds, (p. 701, F.) "Neque postea ulli ex Asamonæorum posteritate hoc sacerdotium committere voluit. Idem fecit in ordinandis pontificibus Archelans ejus filius, (sc. Herodis) et Romani, qui post illum potestate præfuerunt provinciæ."

FORBID HIM NOT. I confess that I have always regarded this affecting incident as pregnant with instruction, on the subject of *unauthorized ministrations*. For when we see so many varieties of our Christian brethren, who hold themselves aloof, not *purposely*, like the individual mentioned in the gospel, but *ignorantly*, from the fellowship of the apostolic ministry, and who yet cast out devils in the name of Christ, by the power which attends their preaching of his truth, it seems to me, that if I had the power to do so, I dare not forbid them, *though they follow not with us*. Nor can I doubt, on the strength of the Evangelist's narrative, that the Lord accepts their work, notwithstanding their schismatic mode of performing it. And I desire cordially to thank Him for the kind indulgence with which He blesses the efforts of their faith, even when accompanied by the sin of disregarding his appointed ministerial order.

Once more, I find the great apostle declaring that *some preach Christ, even of envy and strife*, and some of good will: *The one*, saith he, *preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel. What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.* (Phil. i. 15.) Assuredly, there is here another exhibition of the principle, that God will give efficiency to every part of his own divine system, however defectively it may be administered by men. The apostle did not rejoice on account of the unrighteousness of these unsanctified proclaimers of the gospel, for he knew that if they repented not, they must perish in their sin. But he rejoiced that the gospel was proclaimed, for that would save those who received the message of celestial love in faith, notwithstanding the destruction of the messenger.

It is more directly to my present purpose, however, to speak of the rule which appears to have governed the administration of Baptism. And here it may be well to observe, that the ordinance of Baptism had been familiar

to the Jews under the Mosaic dispensation, and had been long used, together with Circumcision, as a regular part of the ceremonial, by which *proselytes* were admitted to the Church of ancient Israel. For this reason, it had become naturally associated in their minds with the commencement of a religious course of life, in connexion with some change of religious principle; and therefore they were prepared to expect it when Elias should come, and especially when the Messiah should appear. Hence their question to John the Baptist, *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, neither Elias, neither that prophet?* The peculiarity of Christian Baptism, therefore, lay not in the application of water as marking a new religious profession, for this had been used long before; but in the spiritual efficacy with which it was to be accompanied, by virtue of our Lord's atoning sacrifice and infinite merits, when administered in the name of the blessed Trinity, and in the power of a living faith. And hence, John the Baptist stated the distinction most accurately when he said; *I have baptized you with water unto repentance, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.*

It is indeed true, that the commission to administer Baptism in this new and sublime aspect, was given to the apostles, after our Lord's resurrection, and by his own divine command. And therefore it is a plain and obvious principle of *apostolic order*, that the *regular* exercise of this commission can only be found in the ministry which they instituted; since none other can formally claim the benefit of the Redeemer's promise; "*Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*" Most manifest it is, that this promise involves the necessity of what we call **THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION**. For as the apostles themselves died in a few years, the oldest of them, St. John, not having survived the close of the first century, it seems preposterous to suppose that the Saviour intended to be with them, *even to the end of the world*, in any other than an *official sense*. As *individual men*, he well knew that they would soon close their mortal career; but as the *ruling and ordaining officers of the Kingdom of Christ*, they would *continue to live*

in their successors ; and therefore it seems as demonstrably certain that they were intended to have successors, as it is certain that the word of Christ cannot pass away. It is our sacred privilege to know that we stand in the line of that apostolic succession, that we have the complete and formal title to all its benefits, and that we have a correspondent account to render for its fearful responsibilities. On this topic, however, I shall not enlarge ; for my object is not so much to dwell on those familiar truths which are zealously and constantly repeated, as to assert and illustrate those doctrines which are less acceptable, and therefore more liable to be not simply forgotten, but sometimes even denied.

It belongs, therefore, to my proposed course of argument, to observe, that the commission to baptize, although given by our Lord to his apostles, was not considered by them as intended to be confined to their own order. For we do not find them treating it like the higher powers of confirmation, ordination, and government, which were transmitted, (as in the cases of Timothy, the first bishop of Ephesus, and Titus, the first bishop of Crete,) to chosen individuals, of tried experience and high qualifications. So far is this from the facts of the Sacred History, that on the day of Pentecost, when three thousand men were baptized between the delivery of St. Peter's sermon and the setting of the sun, it is demonstrably evident that the apostles must have availed themselves of other hands beside their own; for twelve men could not, by any physical possibility, have baptized so great a multitude in that short interval, and at that time, there was not a deacon ordained to assist them. Hence Bishop Bilson, at the famous Hampton-Court conference, cited this transaction as a Scriptural proof that laymen might administer baptism, judging that the apostles must have called in the aid of the laity on this solemn occasion.* A little

*I do not, for my own part, adopt this view of Bishop Bilson, because I prefer the idea that the seventy disciples held a permanent commission under the apostles, and therefore that there was no such necessity for the ministry of laymen, as he supposes, on that day. Where there was a reasonable necessity, however, I have no doubt of their being so employed, as must have been especially the case, for some years, amongst the gentile churches.

further on in the Sacred History, we find the deacon Philip preaching to the Samaritans and baptizing them; while two of the apostles, Peter and John, are sent from Jerusalem to confirm these new disciples, by the laying on of hands and the invocation of the Holy Ghost. Nor is this all. For in the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, we see a state of things allowed, for the time then being, which strongly reminds one of the simplicity of the patriarchal dispensation; every worshipper being permitted to speak in their public assemblies, and even to have the Eucharist administered by the hands of each other, until the period should arrive when they could have the regular order of the ministry established amongst them.

To those who have not reflected maturely upon the subject, this idea is apt to appear extravagant; and yet nothing seems to my mind more evident than the proof that it must have been so, during the first years of gentile conversion. For it is to be remembered, that the evangelizing of the whole world was committed to the thirteen apostles; and a specimen of their labours is recorded in the travels of St. Paul. From city to city, he went in the power of the Spirit; and in every place, a company of believers, more or less numerous, gathered around him. But how were they to be supplied with an ordained ministry, when the apostle was driven away by persecution, or appointed to some other sphere of effort by his divine Master? Most manifest it is, that no one amongst a set of newly converted heathen could be ready to discharge the pastoral function. Men whose minds had been, from infancy, filled with the debasing fables of the pagan mythology—who had been, but a little time before, bowing down before stocks and stones, and to whom the Scriptures were, as yet, an unknown book,—surely, amongst such as these, the apostle could not, by any moral possibility, find persons fit to be ordained, as authorized teachers, rulers, and priests to their brethren, until some years, at least, had been spent in a course of study and preparation. And therefore it seems plain, that Churches must have grown

up in every quarter of the Gentile world, before there could have been pastors ready for them; and hence it became absolutely necessary to allow Christians to meet together, and edify and minister to one another as well as they could, in the beginning of the work; until, by degrees, the ranks of the ministry could be regularly supplied; and then the license which necessity alone could justify, would gradually disappear when the necessity had ceased. (4)

This, therefore, must be granted to the argument of our Congregational brethren, when viewed in the light of apostolic license, as a matter of reasonable necessity, during the era of extraordinary gifts and graces, and for the sake of building up the walls of the spiritual temple in the desolate wastes of heathen idolatry. Unhappily, however, they mistake a temporary *license*, called for by

(4) There is nothing new in the foregoing hypothesis, since it will be found to agree in substance with many of the fathers; especially, with the precise words of the early commentator on the epistles, whose work is published along with that of Ambrose, bishop of Milan, and is commonly set down to A. D. 355. (Ambrosii Opp. in App. Com. in Ep. ad Ephesios. Cap. 4, v. 12. p. 241.) "In episcopo omnes ordines sunt; quia primus sacerdos est, hoc est, princeps est sacerdotum, et propheta, et evangelista, et cætera adimplenda officia Ecclesiæ in ministro fidelium. *Tamen postquam in omnibus locis Ecclesiæ sunt constitutæ et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est, quam cæperat. PRIMUM enim OMNES DOCEBANT, ET OMNES BAPTIZABANT, quibuscumque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio*"—" *Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, OMNIBUS INTER INITIA CONCESSUM EST ET EVANGELIZARE, ET BAPTIZARE, ET SCRIPTURAS IN ECCLESIA EXPLANARE.* At ubi omnia loca circumplexa est Ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores, et cætera officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata; ut nullus de clericis auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Et cæpit alio ordine et providentia gubernari Ecclesia, quia si omnes eadem possent, irrationabile esset, ut vulgaris res, et vilissima videretur. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant, neque quocumque die credentes tinguntur nisi ægri, &c.

And again, the same author, (Com. in 1. Epist. ad Corinth. C. II., v. 19, ib. p. 148) saith, "*Quia adhuc rectores Ecclesiis non omnibus locis fuerant constituti.*" Many coincidences will appear in the course of the subsequent notes, as where the fathers consider that the priesthood, in a certain sense, belongs to all; and that Baptism is the priesthood of the laity.

necessity, for a permanent *system*, designed for the Church of God to the end of time; as if the liberty allowed in the *erection* of an edifice could furnish *a rule for its occupancy and government* after it was *finished and complete*. But LICENSE is one thing, and SYSTEM is another: and while each may be right in its proper place, no sound and reflecting mind can confound them together. Still, in this very license, I cannot avoid recognizing the same principle which has already been proved from the Old Testament, namely, the *essence* or existence of the sacraments, without the priestly *order* of their administration. For just as Sacrifice and Circumcision existed anterior to, and therefore independent upon the Aaronic priesthood, so Baptism and the Holy Eucharist appear to have existed in the newly converted Churches of the Gentiles, although administered by the hands of laymen, anterior to the period when the apostolic priesthood could be established among them.

How long this license continued, it would be impossible to decide. It may have been from three or four to ten years, before the apostles were able to set the whole system in order. But from the Scriptural evidence furnished by the epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, we know that the Episcopal or Apostolic form of ecclesiastical government must have been perfectly established some time before his death; and the uniformity of the arrangement may be considered as proved by superabundant testimony, since it meets the student of the Scriptures in the angels (or bishops) of the seven churches of Asia, mentioned in the Book of Revelation, and appears in the constant statements of all ecclesiastical history. Nor indeed is it possible to conceive how the apostles could have set up the kingdom of Christ throughout the world, during a ministry which averaged nearly forty years, without having fixed upon *some* definite plan of ecclesiastical government. And surely, as they were all instructed by the same Holy Spirit, it requires no argument to prove, that the system of ONE must have been the system of ALL.

It is quite evident, however, that the license given to the laity to baptize, or even to exercise the higher functions of the ministry, in the absence of the regular and ordained priesthood, may or may not have been engrafted into the permanent episcopal system, in whole or in part. Whether it was so engrafted, and to what extent, we can only learn from the testimony of Christian antiquity. To this, therefore, I shall next appeal, availing myself of the Latin versions in the case of the Greek fathers and Councils, as a matter of greater ease to readers in general, and giving the substance in an English dress, without confining myself, except in some particular cases, to the stiffness of a close and literal translation.

The oldest witness upon the subject is Tertullian, who, in his book concerning Baptism, lays down the principle in these words: "The chief priest," saith he, "that is, the bishop, has power to give Baptism, and next to him, the presbyters and deacons; but not without the authority of the bishop, on account of the honour of the Church; which being guarded, peace is preserved. For otherwise, *it is lawful for laymen to administer it*; since that which is rightfully received, may be rightfully given." (5) Elsewhere the same author asserts the *inherent priesthood of the laity*, in general terms, and extends it to *both the sacraments*; he saith that *wherever there are three, even although they be laymen, there is the Church*; and assigns as a reason, that *every one lives by his own faith*. (6)

The next early testimony involving the principle, oc-

(5) *Tertul. Lib. de Baptismo, Cap. 17.* Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos qui est episcopus. Dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est. Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest, &c.

(6) *Tertul. de Exhort. Castit. § VII., p. 522.* Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis concessum sanctificatus, adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici; unusquisque enim sua fide vivit.

curs in the famous controversy which arose about A. D. 250, concerning the validity of heretical baptisms; in which Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, asserted their absolute nullity, while, on the contrary, Stephen, the bishop of Rome, maintained that those who had been baptized by heretics and afterwards came to the Catholic Church, should not be baptized again, but should be received with the imposition of hands, or, as we now call it, *Confirmation*. (7) It is worthy of observation that Stephen insisted on this as the proper course, on the strength of *apostolical tradition*; which argument Cyprian opposed by demanding plain Scriptural proof; denying that any thing could be properly termed apostolical tradition, unless it were expressly set down in the writings of the apostles.

(7) *Cypriani Epist. ad Pomp. contra Epist. Stephani*, p. 152. “Quamquam plene ea quæ de hæreticis baptizandis dicenda sunt, complexi sumus in epistolis, quarum ad te exempla transmisimus, frater carissime, tamen quia desiderasti in notitiam tuam perferri, quæ mihi ad litteras nostras Stephanus frater noster rescripserit, nisi tibi rescripti ejus exemplum, quo lecto magis ac magis ejus errorem denotabis, qui hæreticorum causam contra Christianos, et contra Ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur. Nam inter cætera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria, quæ imperitè atque improvidè scripsit, etiam illud adjunxerit, ut diceret: *Si quis ergo a quacunq; hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in pœnitentiam*: &c. Unde est ista traditio? Utrumne de dominica et evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens?—Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in apostolorum epistolis, aut Actibus continetur, ut a quacunq; hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponantur in pœnitentiam, observet divina hæc et sancta traditio.—Quæ ista obstinatio est, quæve præsumptio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponeere,” &c.

It is altogether probable that Cyprian, whose veneration for Tertullian was so great, that he commonly called this writer his master, derived his opinion against the validity of heretical Baptisms from the authority of that eminent and extraordinary man. But on a careful examination of Tertullian's language, I think it will be apparent that he only rejected the Baptisms of those heretics who had depraved the fundamental doctrines of the faith, and, in consequence, had adulterated the form of the Sacrament. And if so, his sentiments were in accordance with the decrees which the councils passed more than a century after his departure. His words are these: (Tertul. de Baptismo, C. XV. p. 230, A. B.) “Sed circa hæreticos sane quid custodien-

The third testimony in the order of time, is that of the Council of Elvira, in Spain, held about A. D. 313; the thirty-eighth canon of which expressly approves the administration of Baptism by a layman, provided it be done in cases of necessity, and that the baptizer himself be free from bigamy, and of pure life and conversation. (8)

The fourth evidence is of higher dignity, because it is furnished by the great Council of Arles, at which hundreds of bishops from distant quarters of the Church, especially from Britain, assembled together at the call of the Emperor Constantine, A. D. 314. It was here that the old controversial question between Cyprian and Stephen received its determination; for the eighth canon of the Council decreed, that if any one leaves a heresy, and returns to the Church, he shall be interrogated concerning the creed; and if it be known that he was baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, imposition of hands only shall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Spirit, but if he does not confess that Trinity, let him be baptized. (9) This solemn decision was universally received, and from that early day, no Council of the Church has delivered any other doctrine.

In A. D. 325, only eleven years later, the General Council of Nice assembled by the command of the same emperor, and two of the canons of this most important of the Councils bear directly on the ques-

dum sit, digne quis retractet, ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. Non deo in illis cognoscere quod mihi est præceptum, *quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis, nec unus Christus, id est, idem, ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem, quem cum ritè non habeant, sine dubio non habent.*

(8) *Concil. Eliberitanum, Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 1. p. 254.* "Peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum Catechumenum; ita ut si supervixerit, ad episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit."

(9) *Concil. Arelat. Ib. p. 265.* De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum.

tion. The eighth canon (10) decreed that the Novatian clergy who returned to the Catholic Church should continue to hold their official rank, without re-baptization or re-ordination. While the nineteenth canon, (11) on the other hand, commanded that the Paulianists should be rebaptized, and that their clergy should not retain their ministerial station, without a regular ordination by the bishop of the Catholic Church. Now these canons evidently prove that the decision of the Council of Arles was adopted and confirmed by the Nicene Council. For the Paulianists had so corrupted the faith, as to omit the name of the Trinity, even in the form of Baptism, while the Novatians had preserved the pure doctrine of Christ; and therefore the difference of the treatment which their respective Baptisms and ordinations received at the hand of the Council, is plainly to be referred to this distinction. It is indeed insisted on the other side, that

(10) *Concil. Nic. Gen. Hard. Tom. I. p. 326, Can. VIII.* De his qui se nominant Catharos, id est, mundos, si aliquando venerint ad ecclesiam catholicam, placuit sancto et magno concilio, ut impositionem manus accipientes, sic in clero permaneant. Hæc autem præ omnibus eos scriptis convenit profiteri, quod catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ dogmata suscipiant et sequantur; id est, et bigamis se communicare, et his qui in persecutione prolapsi sunt, erga quos et spatia constituta sunt, et tempora definita: ita ut ecclesiæ catholicæ et apostolicæ placita sequantur in omnibus. Ubi cumque vero, sive in vicis, sive in civitatibus ipsi soli reperti fuerint ordinati; qui inveniuntur in clero, in eodem habitu perseverent. Ubi autem catholicæ ecclesiæ episcopo vel presbytero constituto, quidam ex illis adveniunt, certum est quod episcopus ecclesiæ habeat episcopi dignitatem. Is autem qui nominatur apud eos episcopus, honorem presbyterii possidebit, nisi placuerit forte episcopo, nominis eum honore censerit. Si vero hoc ei minime placuerit, providebit ei aut chorepiscopatus, aut presbyterii locum, ut in clero prorsus esse videatur; ne in una civitate duo episcopi probentur existere.

(11) *Ib. Can. XIX.* De Paulianistis ad ecclesiam catholicam confugientibus, definitio prolata est, ut baptizentur omnimodis. Si qui autem de his præterito tempore fuerint in clero, siquidem immaculati et irreprehensibiles apparuerint, baptizati ordinentur ab episcopo ecclesiæ catholicæ. Quod si discussio incongruos eos invenerit, abjici tales convenit. Similiter autem et de diaconissis, et omnino de his qui sub regula versantur, hæc forma servabitur. Meminimus autem de diaconissis, quæ in eodem habitu esse probantur, quod non habeant aliquam manus impositionem, et ideo modis omnibus eas inter laicas deputari.

this difference was owing to quite another matter: viz. that the Novatians had a regular episcopal ordination, which the Paulianists had not. But this assertion is peculiarly unfortunate, being directly contrary to the facts of history: for Novatian, the author of the Novatianism, had procured himself to be consecrated through fraud and impiety, and was never admitted by the Church to be anything better than a false and counterfeit bishop.* Whereas Paul of Samosata, the father of the Paulianists, was an undoubted bishop of the Catholic Church, at the time when the Council of Antioch proceeded to depose him. The truth is, that strictly considered, neither of these sects had anything more than the empty form of ordination. Novatian never had the reality by reason of his schism, and Paul lost what he once had, by reason of his heresy. The ecclesiastical defect of the Novatians, however, was cured by the consent of the whole Church in the Nicene Council; the grace of the Holy Spirit being invoked by repentance and prayer, and sealed in the act of Confirmation.

My next reference is to the Council of Carthage, held A. D. 348, in which the question was put to the assembled bishops, Whether he who has once been baptized with water in the name of the blessed Trinity, could be lawfully baptized again. "And all the bishops answered; Far, far, be it from us. We adjudge all re-baptizations to be unlawful, and hostile to the true faith, and Catholic discipline." (12)

The well-known narrative of Ruffinus, Socrates, and Sozomen, concerning the Baptism of some boys in play,

* This is largely proved by Bingham, in his *Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism*, Part 2, p. 431, 452, &c. of last English edition.

(12) *Concil. Carth. in Appen. Optati Milev. p. 201.* "Ergo, si vobis placet, consideremus primum titulum rebaptizationis: unde sanctitatem vestram postulo, ut mentis vestræ placita producatis ad descendantem in aquam et interrogatum in Trinitate secundum Evangelii fidem et apostolorum doctrinam, et confessam bonam conscientiam in Deum, de resurrectione Jesu Christi, si liceat iterum interrogari in eadem fide, et in aqua iterum intingi. Universi episcopi dixerunt: Absit, absit. Illicitas esse sancimus rebaptizationes, et satis esse alienum a sincera fide et catholica disciplina.

may next be mentioned, since whatever pains Dr. Waterland and others may have taken to ridicule it, there is no legitimate mode of displacing it from the authentic facts of ecclesiastical history. (13) It seems that the celebrated Athanasius, when a boy, engaged with a company of his young associates in a representation of divine worship. The part of the bishop was performed by Athanasius himself, in the course of which he undertook to administer Baptism to several children. The place which they had chosen was on the sea shore, in full view of the residence of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria; who, happening to look towards the sea at the time, soon became interested in watching their operations. He then sent for them, examined minutely, in the presence of his clergy, all that had been said and done; and finding that every part of the sacred office had been correctly used, and with the simplicity of good intention, both he and his presbyters agreed that the children should not be

(13) *Sozom. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 2, C. 17, p. 381.* Publicum ac solemne festum ingente pompa quotannis celebrant Alexandrini, eo die quo Petrus ipsorum olim episcopus martyrium consummavit. Hunc igitur diem festum aliquando celebrans Alexander, qui tunc ipsorum erat episcopus, peractis missarum solemnibus; (Gr. τὴν λειτουργίαν) expectabat eos qui unâ cum ipso pransuri erant. Cumque solus esset, oculos convertit ad mare. Illic visis eminus pueris, qui in littore ludentes episcopi officium sacrosque ecclesiæ ritus exprimebant, quamdiu quidem scenam illam absque periculo esse animadvertit, delectabatur spectaculo, nec mediocrem ex ea re capiebat voluptatem. Postquam vero arcana quoque mysteria exprimere cœperunt, perturbatus est animo, vocatisque ad se primoribus Cleri, pueros ostendit. Cumque eos comprehensos adduci jussisset, sciscitatus est ex iis, quisnam lusus ipsorum esset, et quid in eo dicerent, quidve agerent. Illi metu percussi, initio quidem negarunt. Sed cum Alexander quæstioni instaret, confessi sunt episcopum ac præsulem fuisse ipsis Athanasium; et quosdam pueros qui nondum mysteriis initiati fuissent, ab illo esse baptizatos. Hos Alexander accuratè interrogavit, quidnam ipsis dixisset fecissetve ludi illius episcopus; et quid ipsi respondissent, quidve edocti essent. Cumque omnia juxta ordinem ecclesiasticum exactè in illis servata esseprehendisset, communicato consilio cum sacerdotibus quos circa se habebat, censuit non rebaptizandos esse eos, qui in simplicitate divinam gratiam semel percipere meruissent. Reliqua vero quæ a solis sacerdotibus baptismum tradentibus administrari fas est, in illis supplevit.

rebaptized, but should have the work perfected in Confirmation.

About A. D. 368, Epiphanius, the bishop of Cyprus, complains strongly of some "audacious men, who, under the pretext of zeal for the Catholics, having raised up a private faction to themselves, presume to rebaptize those who come to them from the Arians, contrary to the custom of the Church, and the decree of a General Council."

(14) It is a short rebuke, but full of instruction.

I pass next to Basil, the bishop of Cesarea, A. D. 370, whose authority, strangely enough, is claimed by Dr. Waterland and others, although I think it sufficiently manifest that it belongs, of right, to our own side. (15) "The heretics called Encratitæ," saith he, "the Saccophori and the Apoctitæ, are not under the same rule as the Novatians, because a canon has been established concerning these, while the others have been passed by in silence. But we rebaptize those heretics. And if, with you, rebaptization is forbidden, as it is among the Romans, by reason of a certain economy, let our argument at least be acknowledged sound. For the heresy of these sects is the offspring of the Marcionites, who abhor marriage, and refuse wine, and say that the creature of God is corrupt; therefore we do not admit them into the

(14) *Epiph. adv. Hæres. Lib III. Tom. II. C. XIII. (p. 1095)* "Alii qui audaciores videntur, ex Catholicorum partibus, privata sibi factione conflata, præter Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, ac citra generalis Concilii decretum, eos, qui ab Arianis ad suas partes transeunt, iterum baptizare nihil verentur.

(15) *Basil. Opp. Tom. 3. p. 296, Ep. 199. Can. 2.* Encratitæ, et Saccophori, et Apotactitæ non subjiciuntur eidem rationi cui et Novatiani, quia de illis editus Canon, etsi varius; quæ autem ad istos pertinent, silentio sunt prætermissa. Nos autem una ratione tales rebaptizamus. Quod si apud vos prohibita est rebaptizatio, sicut et apud Romanos, œconomix alicujus gratia, nostra tamen ratio vim obtineat. Quoniam enim veluti germen Marcionistarum est eorum hæresis ut qui nuptias abhorreant, et vinum aversentur, ac dicant Dei creaturam inquinatam esse, idcirco ipsos in ecclesiam non admittimus, nisi in nostrum baptismum fuerint baptizati. Etenim ne dicant: In Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum baptizati sumus, qui videlicet Deum esse malorum effectorem existimant, exemplo Marcionis et relinquantur hæresum."

Church until they are baptized with our Baptism. For they cannot say, We are baptized in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who believe that God is the Author of evils, according to Marcion and the other heretics." Here it is evident that Basil admitted the Novatians without rebaptization, on the ground of the canons, and that he rejected the heretics who had departed from the outer form of Baptism, thus putting the difference where it ought to be placed, on the confession of the Holy Trinity, in the sacred words dictated by our Lord himself for its rightful administration.

But there is another passage in this author, from which very opposite conclusions have been drawn: (16) Where

(16) *Ibid. Ep. 188, Canon. Primi, Amphilochio. Tom. 3, p. 268.* "Antiqui enim illud baptismum suscipiendum putavere, quod nihil a fide recedit; unde alias quidem hæreses, alia schismata, alias parasynagogas appellarunt. Hæreses quidem eos, qui penitus resecti sunt, et in ipsa fide abalienati; schismata vero, eos, qui propter ecclesiasticas quasdam causas et quæstiones inter utramque partem non insanabiles dissident; parasynagogas autem, conventus illos qui ab immorigeris presbyteris aut episcopis et a populis disciplinæ expertibus fiunt: velut si quis in delicto deprehensus, a ministerio arceatur, nec se canonibus summittat, sed sibi principatum et ministerium vendicet, ad nonnulli una cum eo, relicta catholica Ecclesia, discedant; hoc dicitur parasynagoga. Schisma autem est, de pœnitentia ab iis qui ex Ecclesia sunt, dissentire.—Visum est ergo antiquis hæreticorum quidem baptismum penitus rejicere, schismaticorum vero, ut adhuc ex Ecclesia existentium, admittere; eos tandem qui sunt in parasynagogis, justa pœnitentia et animadversione emendatos rursus Ecclesiæ conjungere; adeo ut sæpe et ii qui in gradu collocati unà cum rebellibus abierant, postquam pœnitentiam egerint, in eundem ordinem admittantur.—Cæterum antiquis visum est, Cypriano dico, et nostro Firmiliano, hos omnes uni calculo subicere, Catharos, et Encratitas, et Hydroparastatas, propterea quod principium quidem separationis per schisma factum fuerat: qui autem ab Ecclesia se separaverant, non amplius habebant in se gratiam Spiritus Sancti: defecerat enim communicatio, interrupta continuatione. Qui enim primi recesserant, ordinationem a patribus habebant, et per manuum eorum inpositionem habebant donum spirituale; qui autem resecti sunt, laici effecti, nec baptizandi nec ordinandi habebant potestatem, ut qui non possent amplius Spiritus sancti gratiam aliis præbere, a qua ipsi exciderant. Quare eos, qui ab ipsorum partibus stabant, tanquam a laicis baptizatos, jusserunt vero Ecclesiæ baptismate ad Ecclesiam venientes expurgari. *Sed quoniam nonnullis Asiaticis omnino visum est eorum baptismum, pluribus consulendi causa, suscipiendum esse, suscipiatur.*—Encratarum autem

after laying down the general rule of the Church to be in favour of rejecting the Baptism of Heretics, while that of schismatics and separatists was admitted, he proceeds to speak of the opinions of Cyprian and Firmilian, and seems to consider that they repudiated the Baptisms of all who were not in the Church, because such persons had lost the grace of the Holy Spirit, *had become laymen*, and therefore could not offer to others the grace which they had lost themselves. The writers who deny the validity of Lay-Baptism take this passage as full proof, that the real point of dispute between Stephen and Cyprian turned not upon the effect of heresy and schism in annulling Baptism, but upon the question of *orders*, as it affected the claims of the clergy who are supposed to have administered the sacrament; and therefore they deny that the validity of Lay-Baptism was involved either in that controversy, or in the subsequent canons of Arles and Nice.

All this, however, seems to my mind to be nothing better than a piece of ingenious speculation. For it cannot be said that Basil pretends to any special or peculiar knowledge of the controversy between Cyprian and Stephen. He lived one hundred and twenty years too late for that; and as no such reasoning appears in the writings of Cyprian, or of Firmilian, or of any other of the fathers when speaking of them, and as Basil does not profess to give

facinus oportet nos intelligere—Existimo itaque, quoniam nihil de illis aperti dictum est, eorum baptisma a nobis rejiciendum esse: ac si quis ab eis acceperit, accedentem ad Ecclesiam baptizandum. Quod si hoc generali œconomix impedimento erit, rursus consuetudine utendum est, et sequi oportet patres, qui quæ ad nos pertinent, dispensaverunt. Vereor enim, ne, dum eos volumus ad baptizandum tardos facere, impedimento propter sententiæ severitatem simus iis qui salvantur. Quod si illi nostrum baptismum servant, hoc nos non moveat; neque enim debemus par pari referre, sed accuratæ canonum observationi servire. Omni autem ratione statuatur, ut ii qui ab illorum baptismo veniunt, ungantur coram fidelibus videlicet, et ita demum ad mysteria accedant. Scio autem, fratres Izoinum et Saturninum, qui erant ex illorum ordine, in episcoporum cathedram a nobis esse susceptos. Quare eos qui illorum ordini conjuncti sunt, non possumus amplius ab Ecclesia separare: qui scilicet communionis cum ipsis quasi canonem quemdam, episcopus suscipiendo, ediderimus.

any new view of their sentiments, we can only, in common justice, suppose him to be delivering his own opinion.

Now while I freely admit that he here intimates his personal judgment, in terms favourable to the other side, yet this only adds strength to our argument when it is observed that *he yields this judgment to the decision of the Church*, for he proceeds to say, in the plainest language, that since the Asiatics thought fit to receive such Baptisms, *the canon and the custom must be respected*. He then adds that although, in his opinion, the Encratitæ ought not to be received without rebaptization, being heretics, yet even in their case he was willing to follow the custom of the fathers, and this the more readily, inasmuch as two of that very sect had been admitted into the chair of the bishops; which admission he regarded as a sort of canon on the subject. On the whole, therefore, the testimony of Basil is conclusive to prove, not, indeed, his own individual conviction in favour of Lay-Baptism, but, what is much more important, his resolution to abide, in action, by the custom of the Church. If such were the disposition of all men in our own age, there would be no inducement to revive so old a controversy.

Next after Basil, the order of chronology brings us to Optatus, the bishop of Milevi, A. D. 370, whose work upon the schism of the Donatists, contains many positive declarations in support of the principle, that the minister is of the *order* and not of the *essence* of Baptism, and hence he insists on the unlawfulness and impiety of rebaptization. Thus for example, (17) after quoting the

(17.) *Optat, de Schism. Donat. Lib. V. C. III. p. 82.* Sic enim ipse Dominus præcepit dicendo; *Ite, baptizate omnes gentes, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* De hoc lavacro dixit: *Qui semel lotus est, non habet necessitatem iterum lavandi.*—Absit enim, ut unquam exorcizemus sanum fidelem; absit, ut jam lotum revocemus ad fontem: absit, ut in Spiritum sanctum peccemus; cui facinori in præsentem et futuro sæculo indulgentia denegatur: absit, ut iteremus quod semel est, aut duplicemus quod unum est: sic enim scriptum est, Apostolo dicente: *Unus Deus, unus Christus, una fides, una tinctio.*

declaration of our Lord to the apostle Peter: *He that is washed hath no need of being washed again*, (for so it is rendered by Optatus,) he expressly asserts that the Saviour spake in reference to Baptism. "Far be it from us," continues he, "that we should exorcise a true believer. Far be it from us that he who is already washed should be called again to the fountain. Far be it from us that we should sin against the Holy Ghost, for which crime there is no forgiveness, either here or hereafter. Far be it from us to repeat what can be but once, or to reduplicate what is alone; for thus it is written, *One God, One Christ, one Faith, one Baptism.*"

Again, (18) he argues strongly against the idea that the privilege of baptism, which is divine, can be given by man. "God cleanses, not the minister. The Psalmist does not say to the Almighty, *Appoint a person by whom I may be washed*, but *Wash thou me*. None can cleanse away the stains of the mind, but He who created it."

And again, (19) Optatus observes, that "the Saviour commanded *in what* the nations should be baptized, but *by whom* they should be baptized, he left discretionary. He did not say to the apostles, *Let no one baptize but yourselves only*. And therefore whoever baptizes in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, fulfils the work of the apostles."

(18) Ib. 84. Concedite Deo præstare quæ sua sunt. Non enim potest id munus ab homine dari, quod divinum est. Si sic putatis, prophetarum voces, et Dei promissa inanire contenditis, quibus probatur quia Deus lavat, non homo. Adest contra vos David propheta, qui ait in Psalmo L. *Lavabis me et super nivem dealbabor*: item in eodem psalmo: *Deus lava me ab injustitia mea, et a delicto meo munda me: Lava me*, dixit; non dixit, *Elige per quem laver*.—Dignamini ut vel prophetæ vos vincant, vel sic agnoscite quia non lavat homo, sed Deus. Quamdiu dicitis: *Qui non habet quod det, quomodo dat?* Videte Dominum esse datorem, videte Deum unumquemque mundare: sordes enim et maculas mentis lavare non potest, nisi Deus qui ejusdem fabricator est mentis.

(19) Ib. 86. Nam in quo baptizarentur gentes, a Salvatore mandatum est: per quem baptizarentur, nulla exceptione discretum est. Non dixit apostolis: *Vos facite, alii non faciant*: quisquis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, apostolorum opus implevit.

One passage more shall close my references to this author, in which (20) he considers St. Paul as disclaiming any part in the power of baptizing, and attributing the whole to the Lord; where the apostle saith, *So then neither is he that planteth, anything, neither he that watereth, but God who giveth the increase.*

About the same time with Optatus, flourished Ambrose, bishop of Milan, who clearly adopts and sanctions the idea so often occurring amongst the fathers, that in a certain sense, the laity are priests. Thus, in answer to the question, (21) why David not only ate the shewbread himself, but also gave it to those that were with him, (which, as our Saviour remarked, it was not lawful to eat but for the priests alone) Ambrose saith, that "it may have been because we ought all to imitate the life of the priesthood, or because *all the sons of the Church are priests, since we offer ourselves to God a spiritual sacrifice.*" It is obvious to the slightest reflection, that this idea lies at the foundation of all lay administrations, so that he who consistently applies it can hardly doubt their *validity*, however defective they may be in *regularity* or *order*.

The year 372 is assigned as the date of the Council of Laodicea, in which some additional specifications were laid down upon the subject. Thus, (22) the converts

(20) *Optat. de Schism. Donat. Lib. 5, Chap. VII., p. 87.* Denique beatus apostolus Paulus, ut vestram præsumptionem tumoremque compesce- ret, ne se æstimet operarius baptismatis, aut habere dominium, aut de tanto isto munere particulam sibi aliquam vindicare, indicans quia totum Dei est, sic ait: *Neque qui plantat, neque qui rigat, est aliquid; sed solus Deus, qui ad incrementa perducit.*

(21) *S. Ambrosii Expos. Evang. secundum Luc. L. 5, § 33, Opp. Tom. 1, p. 1364.* Quomodo autem ille observator Legis atque defensor, panes et ipse manducavit, et dedit iis qui secum erant, quos non licebat manducare nisi tantummodo sacerdotibus, nisi ut per illam demonstraret figuram, sacerdotalem cibum ad usum transiturum esse populorum? Sive quod omnes vitam sacerdotalem debemus imitari: sive quia omnes filii Ecclesiæ sacerdotes sunt, offerentes nosmetipsos Deo hostias spirituales.

(22) *Concil. Laod. Can. 7 and 8. Concil. Gen. Hard. tom. 1. p. 782.* Novatianos vel etiam Quartodecimanos, quos Græci Tessaradecatites appellant,—sed et catechumenos illorum vel fideles non recipi, priusquam

from the Novatians and Quartodecimans are ordered to be received with the acknowledgement of their error, by the imposition of hands; while those from the Cataphrygians are directed to be baptized, even though they might have been previously reckoned among their chief clergy. Now the two sects first mentioned were orthodox in their administration of Baptism; while the Cataphrygians were a multifarious tribe of heretics, who had depraved the form of the sacrament, in obedience to the blasphemous absurdities of Montanus and Maximilla.*

A name of high authority amongst the fathers, is that of the celebrated Jerome, whose judgment upon the canon of Scripture is adopted in one of the Articles of the Church. The year currently assigned to him, is A. D. 374. Nothing is more express than his decision upon the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity, (23) which he considers conferred, as it were, in their Baptism. He also asserts distinctly, the legality of laymen baptizing, in cases of necessity, justifying it on the ground, that what a man receives, he can give to another. (24) And he defends elaborately the custom of the Church in admitting the converts from heresy without rebaptization, saying that in the controversy between Cyprian and Stephen, the bishop of Carthage was in error. (25)

condemnerent omnem hæresim plenissimè, ante omnia autem, eam in qua detinebantur. Et nunc qui apud eos fideles dicuntur, symbolum fidei doceantur, atque ita unctos sancto chrismate, divino sacramento communicare conveniet.

Ejusdam Concil. Can. 8. Eos qui convertuntur ab hæresi, quæ dicitur Cataphrygarum, seque in cleris constitutos existimant, quamvis magni dicantur, hujusmodi cum omni diligentia catechizari oportet, et baptizari ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ episcopis et presbyteris.

* Epiph. de Hæres. Tom. 1, Lib. 2, p. 402.

(23) *S. Hieron. adv. Lucifer. Opp. Tom. 2, p. 94.* A. Sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma,—scriptum est enim: Regnum quippe nos et sacerdotes Deo Patri suo fecit: et iterum, Gentem sanctam, regale sacerdotium, populum acquisitum.

(24) *Ib. p. 96, D.* Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et episcopi jussione, neque presbyter, neque diaconus, jus habet baptizandi. Quod frequenter si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita ut dare potest.

(26) *Ib. p. 100, D.* Conatus est beatus Cyprianus contritos lacus fugere

He then proceeds to say that the custom and law of the Church on this subject were derived from tradition. And he connects this tradition with the apostles by referring to the numerous heresies which already existed in their own day, of which the Epistles and the Book of Revelations bore abundant testimony; and yet there is no instance in which we read of their being rebaptized. It seems to my mind a singular instance of the force of prejudice, that after all this, and much more evidence of Jerome's sentiments, Dr. Waterland, following the example of his leaders on the same side, should question the character of his judgment, merely on account of a doubtful passage occurring in the same part of his works. That passage admits of two interpretations. The one, which makes Jerome consistent with himself, explains the words as not expressing his own opinion, but simply as opposing the Luciferian schismatics by an *argumentum ad hominem*, which proved that they were wrong, even on their own principle. The other meaning, for which these writers so strenuously contend, would make Jerome contradict himself; and therefore, especially in the case of an author so distinguished for his acuteness, this consideration alone should be conclusive against it, with every mind of ordinary candour.

nec bibere de aqua aliena, et idcirco hæreticorum baptismum reprobans, ad Stephanum tunc Romanæ urbis episcopum, qui a beato Petro vigesimus sextus fuit, super hac re Africanam Synodum direxit; sed conatus ejus frustra fuit. Denique illi ipsi episcopi, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos cum eo statuerant, ad antiquam consuetudinem revoluti, novum emisere decretum. Quid facimus? Ita et nobis majores nostri, et illis sui tradidere majores. Sed quid de posterioribus loquar? Apostolis adhuc in seculo superstitionibus, adhuc apud Judæam Christi sanguine recenti, phantasma Domini corpus asserebatur. Galatas ad observationem legis traductos apostolus iterum parturit: Corinthios resurrectionem carnis non credentes, pluribus argumentis ad verum iter trahere conatur, &c.—Ad eos venio hæreticos, qui Evangelia laniant. Saturninum quendam et Ophitas et Choitam et Carpocratem et cæteras pestes, quorum plurimi vivente adhuc Joanne Apostolo eruperunt, et tamen nullum eorum legimus rebaptizatum. Quoniam autem talis viri fecimus mentionem, de Apocalypsi quoque ejus approbemus, hæreticis sine baptismo debere pœnitentiam concedi, &c.

I pass from Jerome, however, to the celebrated Augustin (26) whose authority is cited in another of our Articles, and whose judgment in favour of the validity of heretical, schismatical, and lay baptism, is admitted, even by the most determined of its adversaries, to be decided and plain. Thus in one place he asserts, that those men are much mistaken who accuse the Church Catholic of receiving heretics *as heretics*, because she does not rebaptize them; since, in entering the Church, they become Catholics. And then he lays down the maxim, that the sacraments which should only be given once, cannot lawfully be re-iterated.

Again, (27) he saith, that although it was granted that heretics had the Baptism of Christ, yet neither heretics nor schismatics could receive the Holy Spirit, until they adhered to unity and charity. The same judgment he repeats more largely in another place, where he extends it to the Eucharist also, and with the same limitation. (28)

Again, (29) Augustin maintains the validity of lay-Baptism, even when administered without necessity, and therefore unlawfully, and against the canons of the

(26) *S. August. ad Dulcit. §4. Opp. Tom. 2, p. 583.* Multumque illos falli qui putant a nobis tales istos (sc. hæreticos) suscipi, quales sunt, quia non eos rebaptizamus. Quomodo enim tales suscipiuntur quales sunt, cum sint hæretici, et ad nos transeundo fiant Catholici? Neque enim propterea corda depravata non licet corrigi, quia *sacramenta semel data non licet iterari.*

(27) *S. August. Sermo 269, Opp. Tom. 5, p. 762, D.* Nec immerito recte intelligitur, quamvis ipsos baptismum Christi fateamur, hæreticos non accipere vel schismaticos Spiritum Sanctum, nisi dum compagini adhæserint unitatis per consortium caritatis.

(28) *Ib. De civitat. Dei, C. 25, § 2. Tom. 7, p. 488.* Hi sunt autem qui hanc liberationem, nec omnibus habentibus sacramentum baptismatis et corporis Christi, sed solis Catholicis, quamvis male viventibus pollicentur: quia non solo, inquit, sacramento, sed re ipsa manducaverunt corpus Christi, &c. Ac per hoc hæretici et schismatici, ab hujus unitate corporis separati, possunt idem percipere sacramentum, sed non sibi utile, imo vero etiam noxium, quo judicentur gravius quam vel tardiùs liberentur. Non sunt quippe in vinculo pacis, quod illo exprimitur sacramento.

(29) *Ib. Contra Parmen. Lib. 2, § 29, Tom. 9, p. 29.* Quamquam etsi laicus aliquis pereunti dederit necessitate compulsus quod cum

Church. His words are these : "for although even a layman should give it (Baptism) to a person in extremity, I know not whether any one could say religiously that it ought to be repeated. If he does it without any necessity, it is an usurpation of another's office ; but if necessity urges, it is either no fault, or a very pardonable one. But if it be usurped without any necessity, and be given by any one to any one, that which is given can never be said not to have been given, however truly it may be said that it was given unlawfully. The unlawful usurpation is corrected by recollection and repentance. If not corrected, however, the thing given will remain to the punishment of the usurper, either of him who unlawfully gave, or of him who unlawfully received it, *but it can never be accounted as not given.*"

One more passage from this eminent father shall close his testimony for the present. (30) "There is yet another question," saith he, "viz. Whether Baptism can be given by those who were never Christians ; nor is anything to be rashly affirmed upon this point, without the authority of a council sufficient to pronounce concerning so weighty a matter. But of those who are separated from the uni-

ipse acciperet, quomodo dandum esset addidicit, nescio an piè quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nulla enim cogente necessitate si fiat alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est. Sed et si nulla necessitate usurpetur, et a quolibet cui libet detur, quod datum fuerit non potest dici non datum, quamvis rectè dici possit illicitè datum. Illicitam autem usurpationem corrigit reminiscentis et pœnitentis affectus. Quod si non correxerit, manebit ad pœnam usurpatoris quod datum est, vel ejus qui illicitè dedit, vel ejus qui illicitè accepit; non tamen pro non dato habebitur.

(30) *Ib.* § 30. Et hæc quidem alia quæstio est, utrum et ab iis qui numquam fuerunt Christiani possit baptismus dari: nec aliquid temere inde affirmandum est sine auctoritate tanti concilii quantum tantæ rei sufficit. De iis vero qui ab Ecclesiæ unitate separati sunt, nulla jam quæstio est, quin et habeant et dare possint, et quin perniciosè habeant perniciosè que tradant extra vinculum pacis. Hoc enim jam in ipsa totius orbis unitate discussum, consideratum, perfectum atque firmatum est.

That Augustin agreed with Jerome in blaming the error of Cyprian, is plain from his Book *De unico Baptismo, Opp. Tom. 9, p. 359, § 22.* Some other extracts from his admirable writings will be given in the subsequent quotations from authors of a later date.

ty of the Church, there is no question but that *they may and can give it*, and that they hold it and give it injuriously, without the bond of peace. For this has been long *discussed, considered, perfected and established, by the unity of the whole world.*"

Next to the high authority of St. Augustin, I shall mention the eminent Chrysostom, whose fame, nevertheless, is rather to be attributed to his oratorical powers, than to his skill in theological casuistry, since his works, voluminous as they are, consist, for the most part, of *popular* sermons or Homilies, which were probably delivered *extempore*, and taken down by an amanuensis, as we believe was the case with the catechetical and mystagogic discourses of Cyril of Jerusalem, and with many other relics of antiquity. This fact would account, to a considerable extent, for their energy, their inartificial construction, their lively illustrations, and their occasional extravagance; in which respects there is much to praise, and sometimes not a little to censure. Plainly, however, it would be unreasonable to look to such productions for accurate statements on those points which could not conduce to popular edification; however the author might have been obliged to decide, if consulted by the clergy. The writers on the other side, claim Chrysostom notwithstanding, as if he had unequivocally declared himself against the decisions of the councils, and the allowance of the Church. But this he has not done, nor can I see anything in his works which touches the precise point, viz. whether Baptism, administered in the proper form by a heretic or by a layman, without absolute necessity, and therefore administered rather *against* than *by* the authority of the Church, is so far null and void, that it may lawfully be administered again: or, in other words, whether the minister is of the *essence*, or only of the *order* of the sacrament. I shall make a few extracts to shew the general views of this distinguished father, by which it will appear (31) that he

(31) *Opp. S. Chrysost. Tom. 5, p. 333, D. Hom. LX. De sumentibus indignè divina Mysteria.* "Verùm et tu laice, cum sacerdotem videris offerentem, nec ut sacerdotem esse putes hoc facientem, sed Christi

maintains the following doctrines: First, that the actual administrator of the sacraments is not the visible priest, but the invisible Deity,—secondly, (32) that as the merit of the priesthood can add nothing to the efficacy of the sacraments, so neither can the sins of the priesthood take anything away—thirdly, (33) that it is not the man who baptizes, but the great name in which we are baptized, which is worthy to be enquired of; since the efficacy of Baptism, which is the remission of sins, is of God; and the work of preaching the gospel, so far as human agency is concerned, is therefore a greater work than that of Baptism,—and fourthly, (34) that a repetition of Baptism is utterly inadmissible, being liable to the reproach, symbolically, of crucifying Christ a second time. Now in all this, the sentiments of our author are in no respect peculiar. But the last passage which I have quoted (35) is directly hostile to the scheme of Dr. Waterland and his

manum invisibiliter extensam. Sicut enim cum baptizaris, ipse te non baptizat, sed Deus est qui tuum caput invisibile potentia continet, et nec angelus, nec archangelus, nec ullus alius accedere et tangere audeat; ita nunc quoque cum Deus regenerat, ipsius est solius donum.

(32) *Ib.* Tom. 4, 334, Hom. VIII. in *Epist. ad Corinth. I.* cap. ii. Nunc autem per indignos consuevit Deus operari, et nihil propter sacerdotis vitam baptismatis gratia læditur.—Hæc dico, ne quis præsentium sacerdotis vitam pensiculando circa religionis nostræ doctrinam scandalizetur. Nihil enim homo his quæ sibi proponuntur, ex se addit: sed id omne divinæ virtutis opus est, et ipse Deus, qui nos erudit.

(33) *Ib.* p. 297, Hom. III. in *Epist. ad Corinth. I.* Cap. i. Nunquid in nomine Pauli baptizati estis? Ac si diceret, Noli mihi dicere, quis baptizavit, sed in cuius nomine. Nec enim qui baptizat, sed quem in baptisinate invocamus, inquiritur. Hic enim est qui dimittit peccata.—Et profecto magnum quiddam baptismum est, sed ejus magnitudinem non qui baptizat, sed qui invocatur, in baptisinate efficit. Nam baptizare nihil est, si humanus labor consideretur, sed longe minus quam evangelizare.

(34) *Ib.* p. 1536, *B. Com. Chrysost. in Epist. Pauli ad Hebræos, cap. VI. Hom. LX.* Proinde qui secundo seipsum baptizat, secundo eum crucifigit,—Sicut enim mortuus est Christus in cruce, sic et nos in baptisinate, non carni, sed peccato.—Si ergo necesse est baptizare iterum, necesse est rursus eundem ipsum mori. Baptisma enim nihil aliud est, quam interitus ejus qui baptizatur, et resurrectio illius.

(35) *Ib.* Tom. 2. p. 766, *In Cap. Matthæi VII. Hom. XIX.* Speaking of heretics, Chrysostom says, “Sed forte dicis, Quomodo dicere illum possum non esse Christianum, quem video Christum confitentem, al-

ingenious coadjutors. For their theory requires us to believe, that the reason why the primitive Church allowed the validity of heretical Baptisms, was because the heretics had a true and regular priesthood, by succession and ordination; which priestly authority was indelible. And since they claim St. Chrysostom as a witness on their side, it is with rather more interest than the passage would otherwise deserve that I have transcribed the following part of his testimony.

“Perhaps thou wilt say, How can I deny a man to be a Christian, when I behold him confessing Christ, having an altar, offering the sacrifice of bread and wine, baptizing, reading the Scriptures of the saints, and *having every order of the priesthood?* O wise man! if he does not confess Christ, his heathenism is manifest, and if thou art seduced by that, it was insanity which seduced thee: but if he does confess Christ, and yet not as Christ himself commanded, then it is thine own negligence if thou art seduced by him. For he who falls into a hidden pit, is called negligent, because he did not look carefully before him: while he who falls into an open pit, is not called negligent but insane. As to what thou hast said concerning the similitude of the ecclesiastical mysteries, hear this answer. *The ape has the members of a man, and imitates man in all his actions, but wouldst thou on that ground judge that it should be called a man? In like manner heresy has all the members of the Church, and imitates her mysteries, but they are not of the Church notwithstanding.*”

tare habentem, sacrificium panis et vini offerentem, baptizantem, scripturas sanctorum legentem, omnem ordinem sacerdotii habentem? Vir sapiens, si non confitetur Christum, et manifesta esset gentilitas illius, et si seducebaris per eam, insania erat, qua seducebaris: nunc autem qui confitetur Christum, sed non sic quemadmodum mandavit Christus, negligentia tua est, si ab eo seduceris. Qui enim in occultam foveam cadit, negligens esse dicitur, quia non cautè prospexit: qui autem in manifestam foveam cadit, non negligens dicitur, sed insanus. Quod autem de similitudine ecclesiasticorum mysteriorum dixisti, hæc audi responsum. Quoniam et simia hominis habet membra, et per omnia hominem imitatur, nunquid propterea dicenda est homo? Sic et hæresis omnia Ecclesiæ habet et imitatur mysteria, sed non sunt Ecclesiæ.

Here, then, St. Chrysostom, expressly reckoning the orders of the priesthood amongst the several particulars in which the heretics resembled the Church, plainly denies that there was any more identity between the priesthood of the one and the priesthood of the other, than there is between the members of the ape and those of the man. Now if this be sound doctrine,—which I by no means assert, but give it for the benefit of the other side, as the doctrine of their own favorite witness—it surely destroys the whole ingenious theory by which they think they can account for the admission of heretical Baptisms, without being obliged to acknowledge the validity of Lay-Baptism. For how could the ordinance derive any additional efficacy, in the judgment of Chrysostom, from a ministry, whose acts he held in the same esteem as the imitations of a monkey?

But my next witness is, on every account, much more important. Innocent, the first bishop of Rome who bore that name, was contemporary with Chrysostom, for his accession is placed by Baronius in A. D. 402. And in the passage which I shall cite, we have, not the loose and vague language of a Homily *ad populum*, but a precise statement on the very point, addressed to a bishop. In this epistle, (36) the pontiff saith, that although the laymen who were converts from the Arians, and other heretics of the same kind, should be received upon a profession of

(36.) *Inn. epist. XVIII. Alexandro Episcopo, Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 1. p. 1013. C.* Arianos præterea, ceterasque hujusmodi pestes, quia eorum laicos conversos ad Dominum, sub imagine pœnitentiæ ac Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus impositionem suscipimus; non videtur, clericos eorum cum sacerdotii aut ministerii cujuscumque suscipi debere dignitate: quoniam quibus solum baptismum ratum esse permittimus, quod utique in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti perficitur, nec Spiritum Sanctum eos habere ex illo baptismo illisque mysteriis arbitramur: quoniam cum a Catholica fide eorum auctores desciscerent, perfectionem Spiritus quam acceperant, amiserunt. Nec dare ejus plenitudinem possunt, quæ maxime in ordinationibus operatur, quam per impietatis suæ perfidiam potius quam per fidem, dixerim, perdiderunt. Quomodo fieri potest, ut eorum profanos sacerdotes, dignos Christi honoribus arbitremur, quorum laicos imperfectos, ut dixi, ad Sancti Spiritus percipiendam gratiam, cum pœnitentiæ imagine recipiamus?

repentance, with the imposition of hands, yet it would not follow that their clergy ought to be allowed the dignity of any ministerial or sacerdotal power. For nothing of theirs was admitted but their Baptism, which was administered in the true form of the ordinance, by the invocation of the sacred Trinity. Nor was their Baptism to be supposed endowed with any spiritual grace, for when the authors of heresy departed from the catholic faith, they lost the perfection of the Spirit which they had received. Hence they could not give the plenitude of that grace which *chiefly operates in ordinations*, for they had *forfeited it by their perfidy*. And the pontiff asks, in conclusion, how it was possible that those profane priests could be thought worthy of the honours of Christ, whose imperfect laymen could not be admitted to the grace of the Holy Spirit, without repentance? Now this testimony directly disproves the theory on the other side; for it shows most clearly that instead of the ancient Church admitting the Baptisms of heretics on the ground that those who administered them were priests, validly ordained, it was on the very different ground that the sacrament had been administered in the orthodox form; since the *Baptisms* of the Arians are here *expressly allowed*, while their *ordinations* are as *expressly rejected*.

In harmony with the same doctrine, the first Leo, who occupied the See of Rome, A. D. 440, lays down the rule, (37) that Baptism received from heretics *must not be repeated*; but that, since the form of the sacrament only could be had amongst heretics, the converted penitent must have confirmation in the catholic Church, in order that he may receive the sanctification of the Holy Spirit.

(37) *Ib. p. 1771. D. Leonis Papæ 1. Epistola Nicetæ Aquil. Episcopo.*
 § VII. Nam hi qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, cum baptizati antea non fuissent, sola invocatione Spiritus sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt. Et hanc regulam (ut scitis) servandam omnibus Ecclesiis predicamus; ut lavacrum semel initum nulla iteratione violetur; dicente Apostolo, Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptismum. Cujus ablutio nulla iteratione temeranda est, sed (ut diximus) sola sanctificatio Spiritus sancti invocanda est: ut quod ab hæreticis nemo accipit, a catholicis sacerdotibus consequatur.

The next assertion of the point occurs in the fourteenth canon of the General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. And here it is decreed, (38) that whereas readers and singers were allowed to marry, nevertheless they should not be permitted to marry amongst heretics: that if, however, there were any who had children by such marriages, and these children were already baptized amongst heretics, their fathers should bring them to the communion of the Catholic Church; but such among them as were still unbaptized, should not be baptized amongst heretics, nor should it be lawful thenceforth to marry a heretic, a Jew, or a pagan.

One year after this General Council, we have the testimony of the second council of Arles, in its sixteenth or seventeenth canons, (39) where the Photinians or Paulianists are ordered to be baptized, according to the decrees of the fathers; while the Arians, and the Bonosiaci, being baptized in the name of the Trinity, are directed to be received into the Church, with chrism and the imposition of hands.

An interesting record upon this subject occurs in the acts of a Roman council, held under the pontificate of Felix III, A. D. 484; in consequence of the lapse of many African clergy, whom the Vandals had prevailed upon, by persuasion and threats, to accept Arian Baptism.* “It is a subject of general grief and lamentation,”

(38) *Con. Gen. Hard. Tom. 2. p. 607. B.* Quoniam in quibusdam provinciis concessum est lectoribus et psalmistis uxores ducere, statuit sancta Synodus, non licere cuiquam ex his accipere sectæ alterius uxorem. Qui vero ex hujusmodi conjugio jam filios susceperunt, si quidem præventi sunt, ut ex se geniti apud hæreticos baptizarentur; offerre eos Ecclesie catholice communioni conveniet: non baptizatos autem, non posse eos ulterius apud hæreticos baptizare: sed neque copulari debet nuptura hæretico, aut Iudæo, vel pagano, &c.

(39) *Ib. p. 774. Concil. Arelat. 11, canones XVI & XVII.* Photinianos, sive Paulianistas, secundum patrum statuta, baptizari oportere. Bonosiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes, quos sicut Arrianos baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est, si interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, cum chrismate et manus impositione in Ecclesia recipi sufficit.

* *Baron. Annal. A. D. 487. § 11, Tom. 6. p. 482.*

saieth the pontiff in his Address, (40) "that in Africa we have known even bishops, priests, and deacons, to be re-baptized." In the second canon of the Council it is strongly argued (41) that no one can come a second time to baptism without casting the grace of salvation away, since it amounts to an open denial of Christ, and a profession that the individual had been a pagan,—a sin to be execrated in all, but much more horrible to be committed by bishops, priests, and deacons. And therefore this canon orders all such of the clergy as had been re-baptized, to be placed in the order of penitents all their days, and to be allowed lay-communication only at the hour of death. Now this passage of Church history may not, indeed, seem directly applicable to the question in which we are concerned; since it is obvious that contempt for the Baptisms of heretics and schismatics, is a very different matter from despising the Baptisms of the Church. But yet, upon thorough examination of the theology involved in the case, the distinction will be seen to be in degree only. For the Church herself, as we have found by the multiplied decisions of her councils and doctors, had so revered Baptism as the ordinance of Christ, that she forbade its repetition, even when it had been administered by her worst enemies. And therefore we must regard it,

(40) *Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 2. p. 878. Concil. Rom. sub Felice III. Felix episcopus Ecclesiæ urbis Romæ dixit: Communis dolor, et generalis est gemitus, quod intra Africam rebaptizatos etiam episcopos, presbyteros diaconosque cognovimus.*

(41) *Ib. p. 833. Ut ergo ab Ecclesiæ summitatibus inchoemus, eos quos episcopos, presbyteros, vel diaconos fuisse constiterit; et seu optantes forsitan, seu coactos lavaeri illius unici salutarisque claruerit fecisse jacturam; et Christum, quem non solum dono regenerationis, verum etiam gratia percepti honoris induerant, exuisse; cum constet, neminem ad secundam tinctionem venire potuisse, nisi se palam Christianum negaverit, et professus fuerit se esse paganum. Quod cum generaliter sit in omnibus execrandum, multo magis in episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus auditu saltem dictuque probatur horrendum. Sed quia idem Dominus atque Salvator clementissimus est, et neminem vult perire; usque ad exitus sui diem, in pœnitentia (si resipiscunt,) jacere conveniet; nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est.*

I presume, according to the judgment of the great Augustin, where, expostulating with a Donatist bishop for having re-baptized a deacon, he says, (42) "*To re-baptize a heretic is truly a sin, but to re-baptize a Catholic is a most enormous wickedness.*"

The fourteenth canon of the council of Ilerda, A. D. 524, follows up the subject, by decreeing, (43) that "no religious communicant should participate, even at meals, with those who had been re-baptized."

The third Council of Toledo, A. D. 589, next claims attention, by taking a further step towards the suppression of re-baptization. For in the fifteenth canon it is thus decreed: (44) "*Whoever believes or shall believe the sacrilegious work of re-baptizing to be good, and either performs or shall perform it, let him be accursed.*"

The doctrine of the Church is set forth with great perspicuity by Isidore, the bishop of Hispala, who flourished about this time. He states in plain terms, (45) that Baptism was delivered to the priests, that even the deacons could not lawfully administer it without the bishops or

(42) *Augustin. Opp. Tom. 2. p. 23. Epist. XXIII.* Rebaptizare igitur hæreticum hominem qui hæc sanctitatis signa perceperit quæ Christiana tradidit disciplina, omnino peccatum est: rebaptizare autem Catholicum, immanissimum scelus est.

(43) *Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 2. p. 1066. Concil. Ilerdense, Can. XIV.* Cum rebaptizatis fideles religiosi, nec in cibo, participant.

(44) *Ib. Tom. 3. p. 475. Concil. Toletanum III. Can. XV.* Quicumque rebaptizandi sacrilegum opus bonum esse credit aut crediderit, agit aut egerit, *anathema sit.*

(45) *Isidori Hispal. Episcop. de Offic. Ecclesiast. Lib. II. C. XXIV. p. 411, G. H.* Unde constat baptismum solis sacerdotibus esse traditum, ejusque mysterium nec ipsis diaconibus explere licitum absque episcopis, vel presbyteris, nisi illis procul absentibus ultima languoris cogat necessitas; quod et laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, ne quisquam sine remedio salutari de sæculo evocetur. Hæretici autem, si tamen in Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti attestazione docentur baptismum suscepisse, non iterum sunt baptizandi, sed sola chrismate et manus impositione purgandi. Baptismus enim non est hominis meritum, sed Christi: ideoque nihil interest, hæreticus an fidelis baptizet. Quod sacramentum tam sanctum est, ut nec homicida ministrante polluitur. Habet quidem hæreticus baptismum Christi; sed quia extra unitatem fidei est, nihil ei prodest. At ubi ingressus fuerit, statim baptismum quod habuerat foris ad perniciem, incipit illi jam prodesse ad salutem.

the presbyters, unless when they are far away, and death is approaching, in which case *faithful laymen are generally allowed to administer it*, lest any one should depart without the salutary remedy. That *heretics also*, provided only they baptize *in the name of the Trinity*, are admitted, nor, in such case, is Baptism administered again, but they are cleansed by chrism and the imposition of hands only. For Baptism is not the merit of man but of Christ, and therefore it is of no importance whether the faithful or the heretic baptizes. And of such sanctity is this sacrament, that it cannot be polluted even by a homicide. The heretic, then, has indeed the Baptism of Christ, but because he is without the unity of the faith, it profits him nothing. But when he has entered this unity, immediately the Baptism which he previously had to his hurt, begins to be profitable to his salvation."

I shall now refer, in chronological order, to the great Council of Trullo, called the Quinisextan, held A. D. 681, in the ninety-fifth canon of which the subject is treated with all the exactness of detail. (46) Of those heretics who were to be admitted without re-baptization, this canon specifies the Arians, the Macedonians, the Novatians, &c., while the Eunomians, the Montanists, the Sabellians, with many others, who, like them, had changed the very form of Baptism, are directed to be re-baptized.

The year 688 brings us to the chapters of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the sixth of which we read as follows: (47) "Those who have been twice baptized

(46) *Hard. Con. Gen. Tom. 3. p. 1695. Concil. Quinisext. Can. XCV.* Eos qui ex hæreticis ad rectam fidem accedunt, et parti eorum qui salvantur, subjecta consequentia et consuetudine recipientes, Arianos quidem et Macedonianos, et Novatianos, qui se Puros appellant, et Aristeros, et Tessarescaidecatitas, seu Tetraditas, et Apollinaristas, recipimus, dantes libellos, et omnem hæresim anathematizantes,—sancto primum chrismate inungentes et frontem, et oculos, et nares, et os, et aures; consignantes autem dicimus: Signaculum doni Spiritus sancti. De Paulianis autem a Catholica Ecclesia statutum est, ut ii omnino rebaptizentur, Eunomianos quoque, qui in unam demersionem baptizant, et Montanistas, qui hic dicuntur Phryges, et Sabellianos, &c.

(47) *Ib. p. 1772, Theodori Cantuar. Archiepiscopi Capitula. VI. Qui*

through ignorance, do not need penance ; but they cannot be ordained according to the canons, unless under great necessity. But those who cannot plead ignorance, forasmuch as they have as it were crucified Christ afresh, must do penance for seven years.”

In A. D. 774, Charles the Great received an Epitome of the various canons from the Apostles down, as a present from pope Adrian. And it is worthy of observation that in this collection the rule appears imperative, by which those who had been re-baptized should not be admitted to holy orders. (48) Those canons of the African Church are also retained, (49) in which it was decreed not only that the Donatist clergy should be received into the Church in their sacerdotal order, but still further, that the Catholic bishops should divide their dioceses with the Donatists. True, these concessions are placed upon the ground of expediency. Nevertheless, when we remember that the origin of that pernicious sect was in schism, that they maintained their hostile position against the Church with the most furious obstinacy, notwithstanding the decision of the great council of Arles against them, that they indirectly encouraged and doubtless inflamed the sanguinary cruelties of the Circumcelliones, in order to sustain their cause by violence and blood, and that their first bishop, being consecrated by a factious minority when the see was regularly filled, and therefore in utter contempt of the canons, was not entitled to the character of a true bishop, but was rather a wolf than a shepherd—when all this is fully considered, those canons of the African church must needs be regarded as a beautiful and affecting monument of her moderation and love

bis baptizati sunt ignorantés, non indigent pœnitentia, nisi quod secundum canones non possunt ordinari, nisi pro magna necessitate. Qui vero non ignorant, quasi iterum Christum crucifixerunt, pœniteant septem annis, &c.

(48) *Ib. p. 2047, A.* Ne rebaptizati, clerici fiant.

(49) *Ib. p. 2049.* Ut clerici Donatistarum in catholicam Ecclesiam recipiantur cum ordine pro tempore et necessitate. *And again, p. 2051.* Ut Catholici episcopi et ex Donatistis conversi, dioceseos illas æqualiter dividant, in quibus tam Donatistæ quam Catholici jam ante commiserant.

of peace in the days of Augustin; and they might serve as an edifying lesson, even now, to many a devoted admirer of Christian antiquity.

But I crave pardon for this digression, and hasten to resume the direct line of my argument. And this, perhaps, will be the place for an interesting question which is often mooted by the writers on the other side, viz. Whether the Eastern branch of the Church was equally liberal with the Western, in the admission of heretical, schismatical, and lay-Baptism. Now the answer to this might well be considered as sufficiently given already, not only because the greater Councils which I have cited were of universal authority, but also because there was no separation of the Church into Eastern and Western, until after this period; and therefore the unity of the universal or catholic body affords the strongest presumption, at least in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that the doctrine of one portion was the doctrine of the whole. It may be well, however, as a sort of cumulative evidence, to transcribe a very direct passage from the canons of the Greek patriarch Nicephorus, who flourished in the ninth century, in which it is declared, (50) that if there be any infants unbaptized in a place where there is no priest, it is fitting that they should be baptized notwithstanding. And in such case, *if the father himself, or any other person who is a Christian*, should administer the ordinance, *he commits no sin.*

A little further on in the history of this same ninth century, we meet with an occurrence which illustrates still more the prevailing doctrine of the Church on the subject of lay-Baptism. Pope Nicholas I., who attained the Papal chair, A. D. 853, was consulted by the Bulgarians under the following circumstances. (51) A certain Greek

(50) *Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 4. p. 1053, Nicephori Confessoris aliquot canones. can. XVI.* Infantes non baptizatos oportet, si quo loco reperiat quis, ubi non sit sacerdos, baptizari. Quod si vel pater, aut quilibet alius modo sit Christianus, baptizet, peccatum non committit.

(51) *Con. Gen. Hard. Tom. 5, p. 359. Nicholai Papæ Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum § XIV.* Præterea indicatis, quod quidam Græcus mentiens fateretur se presbyterum esse, cum non esset, ac per hoc plurimos

impostor, who had pretended to be a priest without any just title to the office, under that assumed character had converted and baptized a large number of men. Discovering the cheat, however, his former disciples became enraged, and punished him by cutting off his nose and ears, scourging him severely, and banishing him. The Pope, in his answer, praises their zeal, but utterly condemns their cruelty. And while he admits that the Greek did wrong in feigning himself to be a priest, he cites the apostle, who rejoiced that the gospel was preached, even although it was done by many out of envy and strife, and not sincerely. With respect to the persons who had received Baptism from the impostor, however, the Pontiff replies, that if they were baptized in the name of the Holy and undivided Trinity, they were truly Christians, and ought not to be baptized again. He then proceeds to show that the work of Baptism was Christ's, no matter by whom administered, although even by an adulterer or by a thief. And again he refers to Scripture, where John the Baptist, pointing to the Saviour, saith,

in vestra patria baptizasset. Cum ergo vos inspiratione Dei cognoviseris, quod non esset presbyter, judicaveritis, ut amitteret aures et nares, et acerrimis verberibus cæderetur, et ex patria vestra pelleretur. Ecce impletum est in vobis, ignoscite nobis, quod de quibusdam Apostolus clamat, quod habent zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam. Nam licet ille male fecerit, si mentitus est, vos tamen in hoc zelum quidem pium, sed minus cautum habuistis: quoniam quamvis ipse se sacerdotem esse simulaverit, simulatio tamen ejus salutem plurimis contulit. Siquidem diversi fuere qui diverso modo Christum, sed non propter Christum annuntiabant: sed sive occasione, sive quomodocumque hunc annuntiarent, hos tantum non prohibebat Apostolus, qui solum ut Christus annuntiaretur, plurimum satagebat, &c.

Ib. § XV. Porro interrogatis, utrum homines illi qui hoc ab illo baptisma receperunt, Christiani sunt, an iterum baptizari debeant. Sed si in nomine summæ ac individuæ Trinitatis baptizati fuere, Christiani profecto sunt, et eos a quocumque Christiano baptizati sunt, iterato baptizare non convenit;—et baptismum quod procul sit ab Ecclesia, sive ab adultero, vel a fure fuerit datum, ad percipientem munus pervenit illabatum; quia vox illa quæ sonuit per Columbam, omnem maculam humanæ pollutionis excludit, qua declaratur, ac dicitur: *Hic est qui baptizat.*—Quod itaque numerosa Scripturarum testatur instructio, et revera quia secundum famosissimum Apostolum: *Neque qui plantat, id est, catechizat, neque qui irrigat, id est baptizat, est aliquid, sed qui incrementum dat Deus.*

HE shall baptize you, and quotes St. Paul saying, "Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God who giveth the increase."

A similar instance occurred in France, before the close of the ninth century, within the jurisdiction of the celebrated Archbishop Rabanus, who, being consulted by one of his suffragans upon the course proper to be pursued, enters largely into the whole subject, as follows :

"With respect to the man," saith the Archbishop, (52)

(52) Cencil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 5, p. 1415. Rabani Responsa Canonica, § VI. De illo vero qui presbyterum se esse finxerit, cum non esset ordinatus, et baptismi officium exercuit, requirendum est utrum ipse baptizans baptizatus esset, et utrum in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis sub trina mersione baptizaverit. Quod si ita erat, non est iterum baptizandus, sed per impositionem manus episcopalis, et unctionem sacri chrismatis, id quod factum est confirmandum. Quia quod semel est in sacramento baptismatis effectum non licet iterari : quoniam unus est Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma. Attamen ille qui præsumptuose egit, et non pro necessitate aliqua, canonica disciplina est coercendus. Igitur ut beatus Ambrosius testatur, postquam omnibus locis Ecclesiæ sunt constitutæ, et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est quam cœperat. Primum enim omnes docebant et baptizabant, quibuscumque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio.—At ubi omnia loca circumplexa est Ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores, et cetera officia Ecclesiis sunt ordinata: ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum; et cœpit alio ordine et providentia gubernari Ecclesia. Quod si omnes eadem possent, irrationabile esset, et vulgaris res et vilissima videretur. Hinc ergo est unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque ceteri clerici vel laici baptizant, &c.—Quod autem unum sit Christi baptisma, et licet a diversis ministretur, non debet iterari vel mutari, sacrum Evangelium ostendit, ubi verba Johannis Baptistæ posita sunt ita dicentis : *Quia vidi Spiritum descendentem quasi Columbam de cælo, et manentem super eum, et ego nesciebam. Sed qui misit me baptizare in aqua, ille mihi dixit : Super quem videris Spiritum descendentem et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto.*—Quam sententiam beatus Augustinus ita exposuit. Quid ergo per Columbam didicit Johannes; nisi quandam proprietatem in Christo futuram? Ut quamvis multi ministri baptizaturi essent, sive justis, sive injustis, non tribueretur sanctitas baptismi nisi illi super quem descendit Columba, de quo dictum: *Hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto.* Petrus baptizet, hic est qui baptizat : Paulus baptizet, hic est qui baptizat : Judas baptizet, hic est qui baptizat. Nam si pro diversitate meritorum baptismus esset, quia diversa sunt merita, diversa essent baptismata. Sed unum est baptisma, et solus est Christus, qui per diversos ministros suos baptisate baptizat in remissio-

“ who pretended to be a presbyter when he was not ordained, and in this assumed character administered the ordinance of Baptism, it must first be ascertained whether he had been baptized himself, and whether he baptized others with the trine immersion in the name of the Holy Trinity. If this be so, the Baptisms are not to be repeated, but by the laying on of the bishop’s hands, and the anointing with holy chrism, that which has been done must be confirmed. For that which is once effected in the sacrament of Baptism, it is not lawful to repeat, since there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. Nevertheless, he who has acted presumptuously and not by any necessity, should be punished by canonical discipline. Therefore, as blessed Ambrose testifies, after Churches were erected, and offices ordained in every place, the order of ecclesiastical matters was arranged differently from the beginning. For at first, all taught and all baptized, whenever there was occasion. But when the Church became established, places of worship were erected, and rectors and the other officers were ordained, that no one might presume to exercise any other functions than those which were conceded to him. Hence it is that now deacons do not preach to the people, nor do the inferior clergy nor the laity baptize. But that the Baptism of Christ is one, and ought not to be repeated nor changed although variously administered, the holy gospel shews, where John the Baptist declares: *I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and abiding upon him; and I knew him not. But he who sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me: Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.* Which sentence is thus expounded by blessed Augustin. What then did John learn through the holy Dove, unless a certain prerogative to be exercised by Christ?

nem omnium peccatorum. Ideo sacri canones præcipiunt, ut qui ab hæreticis baptizati sunt, non rebaptizentur; sed per impositionem manus sola Sancti Spiritus invocatione, quem ab hæreticis nemo accipit, a Catholicis sacerdotibus Ecclesiæ securitatem consequantur.

That although many ministers should henceforward baptize, whether righteous or unrighteous, yet the holiness of Baptism could only be attributed to him, upon whom the Dove descended; and of whom it was said: *This is HE that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.* Peter may baptize; *this is HE that baptizeth.* Paul may baptize; *this is HE that baptizeth.* Judas may baptize; *this is HE that baptizeth.* For if Baptism depended upon the diversity of human qualifications, since these are various, there must be various Baptisms. But Baptism is one, and it is Christ alone, who, through his various ministers, baptizes with the Baptism of remission of sins. Therefore the sacred canons order that *those who have been baptized by heretics shall not be baptized again,* but by the imposition of hands and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, whom no one receives from heretics, may be assured of their security by the catholic priests of the Church." These extracts are long, and perhaps burdensome. But yet I have thought it best to give them at large, as presenting the fairest view of the doctrine of the ancient Church, which seems to have undergone no serious modification from a very early day.

The next testimony which I shall adduce, like the last, embraces a double attestation, since it consists of the statement of the venerable Bede, the well-known presbyter of the Church of England in the early part of the seventh century, adopted by Herveius the Metropolitan of Rheims, near the eleventh century. (53) "According to the saving and firmly established doctrine of the catholic faith," saith our English divine, quoted with approbation by the Rhemish Archbishop, "observed unanimously

(53) *Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 6, Pars 1, p. 475. Epistola Herivei Rem. Archiepis. Cap. X. Verba Domini Bedæ.*

Juxta salutiferam, et firmissimam fidei catholicæ doctrinam, in toto terrarum orbe unanimiter ac fideliter ab omnibus observandam; quod de carnali, hoc etiam de spiritali est generatione sentiendum: nequaquam videlicet eam, postquam semel expleta fuerit, posse repeti. Sive enim hæreticus, sive schismaticus, sive facinorosus quisque in confessione Sanctæ Trinitatis baptizatus; non valet illo qui ita baptizatus est, a bonis Catholicis rebaptizari, ne confessio, vel exhibitio tanti nominis videatur annullari."

and faithfully by all throughout the whole world; we must think concerning the spiritual birth, even as we do concerning the carnal birth, namely, that after it is once done, it can by no means be repeated. For whether a heretic or a schismatic, or any wicked wretch whatever, baptizes in the confession of the Holy Trinity, it avails not that he who is thus baptized, should be re-baptized by good catholics, lest the confession or manifestation of such a name should seem to be annulled."

From the synodical constitutions of Odo, bishop of Paris, in the twelfth century, I shall make a brief extract, confirmatory of the doctrine. "*Let the priests frequently teach the laity,*" saith this document, (54) "*that they ought to baptize children in case of necessity.*"

The thirteenth century brings us again to an English theologian, Richard Poor, the Bishop of Sarum, in whose "Constitutions," we read as follows: (55) "The layman, when in case of necessity he has baptized a child, shall always be diligently questioned by the priest concerning what he did and what he said. And if the priest shall find that the layman has administered the Baptism distinctly and in the form of the Church, either in French or in Latin, it shall be approved."

The same century furnishes us with a list of authorities which are set down in Bishop Gibson's learned and elaborate folios upon the Ecclesiastical law of the Church of England, of which I shall cite a few in order to bring my series of proofs to the period of the reformation.

Thus the "Constitutions" of Peccham, Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 1279, contains the following passage: (56) "If it so happen that children are baptized by lay-

(54) *Concil. Gen. Hard. Tom. 6, Pars 2, p. 1939, Cap. III.* Et in Romano sub eadem forma doceant frequenter sacerdotes, laicos baptizare debere pueros in necessitate.

(55) *Ib. Tom. 7, p. 95, Constitutiones Ric. Poore, Sarum Epis. § 18.* Semper sacerdos interroget diligenter laicum, cum in necessitate baptizaverit puerum, quid dixerit, et quid fecerit. Et si invenerit laicum discrete et in forma Ecclesiæ baptizasse, sive in Gallico, sive in Latino, approbetur.

(56) *Gibson's Codex, vol. 1, p. 445, Johannes Peccham.* Si forte con-

men, on account of the danger of death, let the priests beware how they presume to repeat such Baptism when properly done." And again, another "Constitution" of the same prelate authorises not only laymen, but even women to baptize, in cases of extremity, and expressly forbids such Baptisms to be repeated; calling those priests "*stolid*" who re-baptize; and charging them with doing, not good, but injury. The Archbishop then proceeds to say, that the form of the sacrament in the vulgar tongue, consists not only in the signs, but also in the order of the same words with which the sacrament itself was divinely instituted, in which order our Lord Christ, by those very words as they stand in the Latin tongue, conferred the regenerative power. But if the priest reasonably doubts whether the infant was baptized in the prescribed form, let him say according to the Decretals: *If thou art baptized, I do not rebaptize thee; but if thou art not yet baptized, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" And thus this matter stood, throughout the whole Western Church, until the sixteenth century.

I have now traced the various expressions of doctrine on the subject of heretical, schismatical, and lay-Baptisms, from the writings of Tertullian, in the next age after the apostles, to the period of the Reformation. And it must

tingat pueros propter mortis periculum a laicis baptizari, caveant sacerdotes ne baptismum legitime factum audeant iterari.

(57) *Ib. p. 446.* Cum enim periclitantibus parvulis in necessitatis inevitabili articulo, quibuscumque laicis vel mulieribus sit concessum, in casibus hujusmodi periclitantes taliter baptizare, et hujusmodi baptismum constet ad salutem sufficere, si forma debita teneatur, nec debere taliter baptizatos iterum baptizari. Quidam tamen stolidi sacerdotes sic baptizatos parvulos non sine sacramenti injuria rebaptizant; quod, ne de cætero fiat, firmiter inhibemus.—Forma autem sacramenti in vulgari lingua, consistit non solum in signis, verum etiam in ordine eorundem verborum, quibus ipsum est divinitus sacramentum institutum, quo Christus Dominus illis verbis et taliter ordinatis, ut sunt in lingua Latina, regenerativam contulit potestatem.—Quod si sacerdos rationabiliter dubitet, an parvulus in forma debita baptizatus sit, tenens modum Decretalis, cum Exorcismis et Catechismo dicat: *Si baptizatus, ego non rebaptizo te; sis nondum baptizatus es, ego baptizo te, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*

have been obvious, as I proceeded, that the whole formed one continuous chain, completely sustaining the last decision of the Church of England, and utterly subversive of the claims so confidently put forth by the writers on the other side, to any positive ecclesiastical authority.

It has been already stated, that the first name of note which could be adduced against the ancient and established practice of the Church, was that of the celebrated Calvin. And it is well known that his followers in the Church of England, the Puritans in the days of Queen Elizabeth, singled out this very allowance of lay-Baptism as one point of accusation against the Church. It may be well, therefore, that I should add a few extracts from Whitgift, Hooker, Bancroft, &c., to show how their cavils were answered.

Thus Archbishop Whitgift addresses Cartwright,* "Whereas you say that the minister is one of the chief parts, and as it were of the life of the sacrament, in so weighty a cause and great a matter, it had been well if you had used some authority of Scripture or testimony of learned authors: for so far as I can read, the opinion of all learned men is, that the essential form, and, as it were, the life of Baptism, is to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; which form being observed, the sacrament remaineth in full force and strength, by whomsoever it be ministered.—And certainly, if the being of the sacrament depended upon man in any respect, we were but in a miserable case; for we should always be in doubt whether we were rightly baptized or no: but it is most true that the force or strength of the sacrament is not in the man, *be he minister or not minister*, be he good or evil, but in God himself, &c. This I speak, not to bring confusion into the Church, (for as I said before, *let men take heed that they usurp not an office whereunto they be not called*, for God will call them to an account for so doing,) but to teach a truth, to take a yoke of doubtfulness from men's con-

* Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, Tract ix, Ch. 5, p. 519.

sciences, and to *resist an error not much differing from Donatism and Anabaptism.*"

The judgment of the justly celebrated Hooker was the same. **"If, therefore,"* saith he, addressing the same objector, Cartwright, "it come to pass, that in teaching publicly or privately, or in delivering this blessed sacrament of regeneration, some unsanctified hand, contrary to Christ's supposed ordinance, do intrude itself to execute that, whereunto the laws of God and his Church have deputed others, which of these two opinions seemeth more agreeable with equity, ours that disallow what is done amiss, yet make not the force of the word and the sacraments, much less their very nature, to depend on the minister's authority and calling; or else their's which defeat, disannul and annihilate both, in respect of that one only personal defect, there being not any law of God which saith, that if the minister be incompetent, his word shall be no word, his Baptism no Baptism." "He which teacheth, and is not sent, loseth the reward, but yet retaineth the name of a teacher; his usurped actions have in him the same nature which they have in others, although they yield him not the same comfort. And if these two cases be peers, the case of doctrine and the case of Baptism, both alike, sith no defect in their vocation that teach the truth is able to take away the benefit thereof from him which heareth, *wherefore should the want of a lawful calling in them that baptize, make Baptism to be vain?*"

"In the conference at Hampton Court, Bishop Bilson declared, that to deny private persons to baptize in case of necessity were *to cross all antiquity and the common practice of the Church, it being a rule agreed on among divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament.* To this Archbishop Bancroft fully assented, and further declared that the compilers of the English Liturgy *expressly intended a permission of private persons to baptize in case of necessity; in proof of which asser-*

* Eccles. Pol. B. 5. § 62.

tion he produced some of their letters. Even king James himself, at whose suggestion the rubric was altered, declared his *utter dislike of all rebaptizations of those whom women or laics had baptized.*"* So that although the passage was altered in the Prayer Book, by which lay-Baptism had previously been recommended, yet the settled judgment in favour of its validity was not designed to be changed, even by the monarch who procured the alteration. To impute any such change to the Church of England on such insufficient ground, (as I am truly sorry to say, is currently done by the writers on the other side,) has always appeared to me a most unwarrantable attack upon her character. From the time of Edward VI, to that of the Scottish king who had been brought up in the school of Calvin, she enjoined lay-Baptism in necessity, as the whole catholic Church had done from the primitive day. And when, at the Hampton-Court conference, her bishops reluctantly consented to withdraw the public allowance of lay-Baptism, by ordering that a *lawful minister* should be called, they approved, instead of condemning, the doctrine of the previous ages. Indeed, Dr. Waterland himself confesses † that the *whole stream of her divines* have been of one consent upon the subject, and therefore it seems worse than idle to deny that the theological doctrine of the Church has continued precisely the same. I am aware of no one among her bishops, from the reformation down, who has pronounced lay-Baptism invalid, unless it be Bishop Taylor,‡ and surely a single exception, amongst so large a number, may well be said to prove the rule.

In concurrence with the Church of England on the point, the learned Bingham states, that the Greek Church, the Russian Church, the Lutheran Church, the Helvetic Churches,—in a word, the whole Christian world, with the solitary exception of the followers of Calvin—hold the same doctrine. The Church of Rome, indeed, has gone beyond

* See Rev. E. Kelsall's answer to Waterland.

† Waterland's Works, Vol. X. p. 185, last edition.

‡ Bingham, Schol. History of Lay-Baptism, Ch. iii. § 5.

it, maintaining that Baptism is valid not only when administered by those who have been baptized themselves, but also even if administered by an utter alien from the Christian covenant, a Jew, Turk, or Pagan. This gross corruption, however, is novel, and does not appear to have received any official sanction until it was decreed, towards the close of the eleventh century, by pope Urban the Second.*

I now turn to the difficulties which encumber the opposite doctrine. And these appear to my mind to be neither few nor trifling. For, in the first place, it is acknowledged on all hands that the prevalence of lay-Baptism throughout Christendom, for many successive centuries, was great, and almost universal. In England, especially, the Baptisms of the Independents, and other dissenters from Episcopacy, have been, and still continue to be, exceedingly numerous. So that if lay-Baptism be invalid, it is doubtful whether there be any baptized persons upon earth at the present day, and especially it is doubtful whether the succession of the ministry has not failed altogether.

To this very serious difficulty, the writers on the other side have given no better answer than a supposition, that ordination would continue the ministry whether men were baptized or no. But the objections to this ingenious hypothesis seem to my mind perfectly insuperable. For in the first place, the proposition is at open war with all tradition, that a man *unbaptized* could possibly be a subject of ordination. Next, it is confessedly an hypothesis devised to meet the difficulty, and does not profess to state what *is*, but what *may be*; as if the very existence of the Christian Church should be left dependent on conjectural possibilities. Thirdly, it asks us to sweep away the whole consentaneous judgment of the catholic Church from the earliest ages, and be content with this modern fancy in its stead. But this is not the whole of the difficulty. For it is granted on all sides, that it is in Baptism we are *formally* born of water and the Spirit,

* Ib. Bingham's Schol. Hist. ch. i. § 24, and Sequel, and Potter on Church Gov.

born into the Church, the Commonwealth of Israel, and made capable, ecclesiastically, of receiving Confirmation and the Eucharist, as members of the body of Christ. And therefore these writers ask us to believe, that men can be ordained as officers of a commonwealth to which they do not belong, and ministers of a society into which they are not authorized to enter; that they can dispense the sacraments to others which they have not received themselves, and that they can be appointed ecclesiastical rulers and teachers, before they are ecclesiastically born! It is not my province to question the sincerity with which this novel idea has been pressed; but I should be deficient in sincerity myself if I did not frankly say, that it seems to involve a tissue of absurdities.

My second difficulty arises out of the very argument which, in the minds of some, would doubtless constitute a recommendation. Every consistent Churchman is obliged to deny that the ministry of the non-episcopal Churches is a *regular, apostolic ministry*. For we all, with very few exceptions, maintain the apostolic and divine institution of episcopacy; we all maintain that the work of ordination belongs, *of right*, to none but bishops, who, as ordainers and governors in chief over the Church, were appointed to succeed the apostles. It results, of course, that we cannot regard the non-episcopal ministry as men *regularly ordained*, but rather as *laymen, exercising ministerial functions according to a rule of human, instead of divine, of modern instead of apostolic institution*. In other words, we are compelled to regard them as ministers *de facto*, but not *de jure*. Hence their Baptisms are *lay Baptisms*. They are also liable to the charge of schism, and some are not free from the more grievous infection of heresy. Now it is altogether in reference to this multi-form portion of our Christian brethren that the real practical difficulty has arisen. Lay Baptism within ourselves is not an evil, simply because it does not exist. The doctrine concerning it is important solely in reference to those around us; with respect to whom there is, truly, a wide difference of opinion. For while some, conceiving episcopacy to be *essential to the very being* of a Church,

regard our non-episcopal brethren as having neither ministry, nor sacraments, nor part nor lot in the Church catholic, there are others, (and I trust that they form the great body of our communion,) who hold a very opposite doctrine; believing, indeed, that the want of the apostolic ministry is a *defect*, and a *most serious defect*, in their ecclesiastical constitution, but gladly allowing, notwithstanding this, that they belong to the Church catholic by reason of the COMMON FAITH, that they have the sacraments in their *essence*, though not in their *order*, and that just so far as they have retained the important features of the gospel system of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, they constitute a *true*, though *irregular* portion of his people.

On the first of these two theories, it is easy to account for the peculiar favour which some of my respected and beloved brethren have shown towards the doctrine, that Baptisms administered by the non-episcopal ministry, are, in strictness, no Baptisms at all. But when first preached in our mother Church, this theory found small acceptance amongst her clergy. Nor would it possess any stronger influence now, as I conceive, if it were not connected with the Oxford Tracts, which have been, from the beginning, peculiarly hostile to the English Dissenters. A kindred spirit has been active amongst ourselves. To discredit the claims of every non-episcopal society as much as possible, to deny them all the characteristics of a true Church, to set Rome in advantageous contrast with their disunion, and treat them with bitterness, contempt, and even ridicule, has been, unhappily, for some years past, the favorite work of many gifted minds, on both sides of the Atlantic. And hence, the time and the circumstances do not permit me to doubt, that the zeal so successfully displayed of late in favour of re-baptization at our own highest seat of theological learning, and spreading from thence into my own diocese, is the legitimate child of the Tractarian theology.

Now this, to me, is another source of difficulty. I learned Divinity from the books of men who felt kindly towards every branch of the reformed Churches, and ac-

knowledged them, notwithstanding those defects which prevented their full inter-communion, as Christian brethren, beloved for the sake of the common faith, and confessed to be of the same great Household, of which Christ is Lord and Master. I have already proved, I trust, that the repetition of Baptisms administered by such as these, *is not lawful*, since the primitive Church forbade it, and the Church of England, as well before as since the reformation, has done the same; and we, as derived from her, are bound by the laws which she derived from the Church universal. But to this I add the further objection, that in my humble judgment, it is hostile to the best interests of Christian charity and peace; calculated to excite the worst feelings of sectarian animosity, and therefore likely to inflame and irritate, rather than to heal, the wounds of the daughter of Zion.

But I shall not dwell longer upon this part of the question, since it is designed to be the theme of my next communication. I proceed, therefore, to the third and last difficulty, with respect to which I am sure that I can calculate on your serious reflection, if not on your concurrence.

Look, then, beloved brethren, at the startling results of this doctrine of re-baptization. In order to adopt it, we must violate our adherence to the earliest councils of the primitive Church, and openly repudiate the best settled maxims of catholic antiquity. We must contradict the universal sense of Christendom at the present day, with the single exception of those who maintain the peculiar notions of Calvin. We must set up a standard of doctrine and practice for which we can adduce no real or positive authority. We must condemn the whole teaching of the great divines of England, and that of our own first race of bishops, but just passed away. We must brand with error the repeated decisions of ecclesiastical courts in our mother Church, and bring shame upon our claims to ecclesiastical unity; since a clergyman *shall be suspended three months on the other side of the water* for acting on an opinion, which *here* he shall be *encouraged to maintain as publicly as he can*. And while we are constantly reminding

others of the rule of Vincent, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, we shall be taking this novel course for the sake of a notion which was confined to a fraction of the Church, even in the days of Cyprian; which was never broached again until the Reformation, which was repudiated both in theory and practice, by our forefathers; and which, amongst ourselves, has only begun to find open and decided favour since our last General Convention. Now it is not possible that we can have peace and unanimity, even throughout our own borders, in the encouragement of an innovation like this. The only maxim which can, under God, preserve us from distraction, is the fundamental principle of episcopacy, *Stare super antiquas vias*. We shall agree harmoniously in maintaining our old and established doctrines, but we never shall agree in new ones, unless, indeed, we were ready to adopt the Roman policy of making some one diocese the *Mater Ecclesie*, and submitting to her dictates, as to the voice of infallibility.

I am aware, however, that there is another mode of regarding this very serious matter, which I confess myself quite unable to reconcile with any theological principle. I have heard it said, and seen it printed, that a man who has received Baptism from some non-episcopal minister, and afterwards desires to become an episcopalian, should be considered as sufficiently baptized *if he be himself satisfied with his Baptism*. But that *if he has become dissatisfied*, he is to be indulged with a repetition of Baptism, either in the hypothetical form or otherwise, in order to satisfy his scruples and set his mind at rest.

Now here, I apprehend, is a course of argument, which no ingenuity can place on a solid ground. The hypothetical form was never designed for such a purpose as the satisfying a scruple concerning the essential elements of a valid Baptism. It was a form introduced many centuries before the Reformation, when the system of the Church was perfectly settled, and no man was at liberty to depart from it. And the sole purpose to which it was applied was not to satisfy doubts about *doctrine*, which did not then, and ought not now to exist; but to satisfy

doubts about *the fact* whether the person had ever received Baptism at all. The clergyman, therefore, as I conceive, has no right to use the hypothetical form, when *he himself is perfectly satisfied* that the applicant has already been validly baptized. For in the whole devotional part of that solemn office, the minister would be trifling with the Deity, if he believed in his heart that God had done already, *in the first Baptism*, what he knows *can only be done once*, and yet should gravely beseech the Almighty *to do the same spiritual work again*, merely to gratify the presumption or obstinacy of the ignorant party. The individual may come in his simplicity indeed, and state his difficulties; but it is his duty to be satisfied with his Baptism, if the Church which he desires to enter considers it sufficient. And if he refuses to practise this first lesson in churchmanship, namely, the submitting his private notions to the decision of the Church, I should hold it to be the clergyman's duty not to humour his waywardness by committing a species of sacrilege, and taking God's holy name in vain; but to counsel and pray for him, that the Lord might grant him the grace of humility, and bring him to a better mind. If this course failed, after due time, to satisfy the party, I should advise the minister to let him go without hesitation; fully persuaded that he was not yet prepared to devote himself to that Redeemer who said: *If he hear not the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.*

It is impossible for me, therefore, to justify the administering of Baptism, when the minister has one opinion about its propriety, and the candidate has another. For if either party lacks *faith* in the act, he commits an awful profanation. And especially if the ordained servant of the sanctuary, who is bound to obey the Church, and not to encourage, but drive away all strange doctrines—if he lends himself to a delusion, and even performs a solemn service addressed to the Almighty in which he can himself have no faith at the time—I have no language strong enough to express my sense of such a sacrilege, nor my apprehensions for the result, if the

Church could be induced to stamp it with her formal approbation. That good, and pious, and intelligent men have done this thing themselves, and have recommended it to others, may perhaps be quite true. But this is no argument in the settlement of any theological question.

And now, my beloved and respected brethren, before I close this first of my communications, allow me to solicit your attention to a few remarks on the propriety of the course which I have adopted—remarks which I should not have conceived necessary, if I had not seen, with the deepest regret, the censures published in some of our periodicals, upon the notice which our venerable presiding Bishop and the Bishop of Ohio have thought fit to take, of one of the subjects contemplated in my own proposed series. These well-known and approved members of our episcopal college have been styled Dictators, and have been charged with interfering uncanonically with the Bishop of New York, because they have presumed to dissent, in print, from his opinion. Doubtless I shall be exposed to the same censure, unless I shall be so fortunate as to convince the brethren concerned, that neither the bishops first named, nor myself, nor any other member of the episcopal body, can be rightfully blamed, for publishing our sentiments upon all or any subject involved in the *official* acts of each other, provided it be done in a proper spirit of Christian courtesy and affection.

In order to set this important matter in its proper light, I shall first quote from No. 78 of the Oxford Tracts, an admirable extract from the learned Bingham,* in which I shall have the satisfaction of combining, in one, the authority of that excellent writer, with that of our Tractarian friends which some might deem preferable, upon the true rule of episcopal unity.

“To maintain the unity of faith entire,” says Bingham, speaking of the primitive system, “every Church was ready to give each other their mutual assistance, to op-

* Tracts for the Times, Vol. 3, p. 506 of Am. Ed. Also Bing. Orig. Ecc. Vol. ii. pp. 2, 14.

pose all fundamental errors, and beat down heresy at its first appearance among them. The whole world in this respect was but one common diocese, the episcopate was an universal thing, and every bishop had his share in it in such a manner as to have an equal interest in the whole; as I have more fully showed in another place, where I observed, that in things not appertaining to the faith, bishops were not to meddle with other men's diocese, but only to mind the business of their own: but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule of their being but one episcopacy, every other diocese was as much their diocese as their own, and no human laws or canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of the episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of faith and religion. This was the ground of their meeting in Synods, Provincial or National, and sending their joint opinions and advice from one Church to another. The greatest part of Church History is made up of such acts as these, so that it were next to impertinent to refer to any particulars. I only observe one thing farther upon this head, that the intermeddling with other men's concerns, which would have been accounted a real breach of unity in many other cases, was in this case thought so necessary, that there was no certain way to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church and Faith without it. And as an instance of this, I have noted in the fore-cited book, that though it was against the ordinary rule of the Church for any bishop to ordain in another man's diocese, yet in case a bishop turned heretic, and persecuted the orthodox, and would ordain none but heretical men to establish heresy in the diocese, in that case any orthodox bishop was not only authorized, but obliged, as opportunity served, and the needs of the Church required, to ordain Catholic teachers in such a diocese, to oppose the malignant designs of the enemy, and stop the growth of heresy, which might otherwise take deep root, and spread and overrun the Church. Thus Athanasius and the famous Eusebius of Samosata went about the world

in the prevalency of the Arian heresy, ordaining in every Church where they came, such clergy as were necessary to support the orthodox cause in such a time of distress and desolation. And this was so far from being reckoned a breach of the Church's unity, though against the letter of a canon in ordinary cases, that it was necessary to be done, in such a state of affairs, to maintain the unity of the Catholic Faith, which every bishop was obliged to defend, not only in his own diocese, but in all parts of the world, by virtue of that rule which obliges bishops in weighty affairs to take care of the Catholic Church, and requires all Churches in time of danger to give mutual aid and assistance to one another."

Now here, beloved brethren, is the true rule of episcopal unity, stated fairly and indisputably from the maxims of the primitive Church. By it the bishops are bound, in the sight of God, and in the fulfilment of their solemn consecration vows, not to except those mistakes which are committed by each other; for otherwise, how, I beseech you, could we attempt the duty of "*banishing and driving away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines,*" if the fact that one of our own body had patronized, or seemed inclined to patronize them, were to cover them with the mantle of protection? Nay, on the contrary, does not the high office of a bishop give a proportionate importance to those errors in judgment, to which the best men are liable? And if he errs, since all are fallible, from whom ought he to desire the correction of his misjudgment, if not from those who must needs appreciate most fairly the difficulties of his office, feel most tenderly for the mistakes to which themselves are equally exposed, and guard most carefully the sacred rights of the order to which they belong? Most distinctly and emphatically, therefore, do I unite in the declaration of Bingham, that without this fraternal watchfulness of the bishops over each other, in all matters which involve the general doctrines and faith of the Church, *there is no way of preserving unity.* And I must, for myself, affectionately recommend my editorial brethren to study the "*first principles*" of episcopal order, before they

again attach to a duty like this, the terms of popery, officiousness, and dictation.

Even in our own branch of the Church, young as it is with respect to its distinct organization, the same thing, in substance, has occurred repeatedly. When our present venerable Presiding Bishop commenced the enterprise which resulted, by the singular blessing of Christ, in the erection of Kenyon College with its attached Theological Seminary, did not the excellent Bishop Hobart exercise, as an undoubted right, the power of open opposition? Nay, did he not carry that opposition across the broad Atlantic, and display the painful spectacle before the eyes of our English brethren? And yet the *doctrines and the faith of the Church* were not, by any one, supposed to be involved on that occasion, but simply the interests of the General Theological Seminary, which that conscientious and high-minded bishop, honestly (although, as I believe, quite erroneously,) conceived to be in danger, if each diocese were allowed to set up a separate institution.

A second instance occurred, when the same distinguished individual, whose memory our whole Church has so much delighted to honour, thought himself obliged to refuse Holy Orders to one who has long been a well known presbyter of Pennsylvania. The candidate removed to Massachusetts, and was ordained by Bishop Griswold. Did not Bishop Hobart censure, openly and strongly, this act of his episcopal colleague? And who could question his right to censure, if he believed conscientiously, that an error had been committed, which menaced, *not the doctrines or faith of the Church*, but the confidence and mutual comity of the bishops towards each other?

Again, when it pleased a few of our body to adopt a different opinion from the received judgment of the Council of Ephesus, touching the heresy of Nestorius, and to acknowledge Mar-Yohanna, the Nestorian bishop, as an orthodox prelate of the Church catholic, did not our brethren, the bishops of the venerable Church of Scotland, direct an epistle to one of our number, complaining of

the act, on the ground that it appeared to them utterly inconsistent with the acknowledged authority of the first four General Councils, by which all questions of heresy are to be tried according to the express words of the English Canon Law?

But I pass from these modern and recent instances to a far more illustrious example. When St. Peter, by divine direction, had extended the privileges of the gospel to the heathen convert, Cornelius, we read that on his return to Jerusalem, *They of the circumcision contended with him, saying: Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them.* (Acts xi. 2.) It does not seem that any man thought this bold remonstrance was an officious intermeddling with the rights of St. Peter; nor did he, for a moment, disclaim the power of his brethren to call him to account, whenever they supposed that he had acted inconsistently. On the contrary, he received the accusation meekly, and *rehearsed the matter from the beginning*, informing them of the special revelation by which he had been guided throughout, and concluding with that beautiful sentence of pious humility: *What was I, that I should withstand God?*

Once more. When the same great Apostle was led away by his fear of giving offence to his Jewish brethren, (Gal. ii. 11–14,) and withdrew himself from his former social intercourse with the Gentile converts, St. Paul saith to the Galatians: *“I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.”* And this act of open rebuke was not only done publicly, *“before them all,”* (v. 14) but it was placed on record for our instruction by the inspiration of the Most High.

Manifest, then, it must surely be, from every principle of primitive order, of modern precedent, nay—more than all—of apostolic example, that the bishops stand in no need of apology when they feel obliged openly to dissent from the official acts and opinions of each other. Nor is there any difficulty in sustaining the propriety of such a course, even by an appeal to judicial and legislative analogy. For we all know that it is the duty of our civil tribunals

to pronounce upon the official decrees of every co-ordinate jurisdiction ; and there is scarcely a Governor or a Legislature in the Union, that has not occasionally rebuked those acts of other independent States, or of Congress itself, which have seemed, in their judgment, to conflict with the paramount Articles of the Constitution.

I confess that I could not help smiling at the new proof which this editorial objurcation has afforded, of the *majesty of the Periodical Press*. A presbyter sharply denounces two bishops, because they have presumed to dissent, publickly, from the official course of one of their own order; without appearing at all conscious that *he* was transcending his limits as a presbyter, far more widely, by publishing *his* censure upon *them*. He considers himself secure in the fact, that he was acting IN HIS EDITORIAL CAPACITY ; and doubtless, in the general mind of our community, this would be deemed a perfect justification. The simple, but irresistible inference is the following : that the modern dignity of editorial government, must have something of the ancient *Patriarchate* about it, which is quite superior to the bishops of the Church ; teaching with a more efficient influence, censuring with a more commanding authority, and yet, so far, as I have yet seen, *beyond even the Patriarchs* in this ; that is wholly irresponsible to any earthly tribunal, unless it be the vague and undefinable phantom called PUBLIC OPINION. May the Lord give a triple portion of his wisdom to those who wield the dangerous energies of such a power, for they need it all !

But it is time that I should close this first part of my labour, trusting that I shall be enabled to complete the circle of subjects proposed, as God may prosper me. With my earnest supplications to the throne of grace, that the Almighty Prince of peace may have you in his holy keeping, and make you of one heart, and one mind in all things, I commit my humble work, in full and affectionate confidence, to your fraternal judgment, and to your prayers. For the result of the present agitation, I have no fears. Bishops, Clergy, and Laity—each in our several offices, and all severally gifted according to the Lord's

good pleasure,—yet are we all *one body in Christ*, and every one “*members one of another.*” In the spirit of this unity, I am persuaded that we shall stand fast in the *old paths*, RESISTING INNOVATION. Even those of my beloved brethren in the Episcopate, from whom I may be compelled to differ, will be of one accord with me in the great *practical* result, however we may reason diversely upon the several links of the theory. For after all our theological discussions, we shall prove, in the main, to be thoroughly convinced, that the efforts of our Tractarian friends to *reform the Reformation*, can only lead to endless confusion and strife; while the sacred resolve to *keep the doctrines of divine truth*, AS WE HAVE RECEIVED THEM FROM OUR FATHERS, will, under the good hand of God, preserve and perpetuate our peace; and, if carried out with unwavering faith in his love and power, secure, for his Church and for ourselves, a rich and abundant blessing.

I remain,

With all fraternal affection and esteem,

Your brother and servant in Christ,

JOHN H. HOPKINS,

Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.

Burlington, Vt., October 19th, 1843.

THE
NOVELTIES WHICH DISTURB OUR PEACE.

A SECOND LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY, AND LAITY

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT.

PHILADELPHIA:
HERMAN HOOKER,—178, CHESTNUT STREET.

1844.

Entered according to the act of congress, in the year 1844, by HERMAN
HOOKER, in the clerk's office of the district court of the eastern
district of Pennsylvania.

A SECOND LETTER, &c.

RESPECTED AND BELOVED BRETHREN:

According to the arrangement proposed in my first Letter, I proceed to offer some observations on another subject, which I cannot help considering an innovation—and by no means an unimportant one—upon our old, and fraternal mode of regarding the various orthodox churches of our non-episcopal brethren, called, in England, THE DISSENTERS. In that country, this term was adopted with acknowledged correctness, to signify those who had thought fit, for whatever reason, to *dissent* from the Church, *as by law established*. It was, therefore, considered a *legal*, rather than a *theological* name, and as it conveyed no reproach on the one side, it was accepted without offence on the other. It followed, of course, as we have all, *until quite recently*, admitted, that in this country, where the law of the land gives equal sanction and support to every nominally Christian system, *there could be no Dissenters*, for the very plain reason, that *there is no Establishment*. And it seemed, as we have been accustomed to regard the matter, that nothing could be gained by introducing a new application of the term to signify those who *dissented from Episcopacy*; because, in this mode of using the word, it is manifest that it must either be totally confined to our own vocabulary, or else have a distinct meaning in every division of Christendom. For just as the Episcopalian might employ it to signify a dissenter from episcopacy, so the Presbyterian might employ it to signify

a dissenter from presbyterianism; and thus, it would *change its signification* in the dialect of every party, and end in having no meaning at all.

This used to be considered sound common sense, and quite consistent with churchmanship. But now, some of our most highly esteemed brethren have adopted a theory which calls for a *restricted* application of the word CHURCH, and an extended use of the word DISSENTER. According to this hypothesis, there is no Church except the episcopal, because episcopacy is of the very *essence* of the Church, without which it can have no being. Hence it is said to result, that whatever portion of the great family of Christ has retained episcopacy, along with an orthodox creed, is an unquestionable part of the true Church, while those portions that have lost episcopacy, have thereby ceased to be Churches altogether. And inasmuch as the word *Dissenter* has long been fixed to represent those classes of Christian professors who dissent from episcopacy as *established by the law of England*, much more is it thought to be applicable to those who dissent from episcopacy, as *established by the law of God*.

Now this is, undoubtedly, an ingenious statement of the case, but the difficulties in the way of its adoption, are serious, and, as it seems to my mind, insurmountable. In the first place, if I understand the doctrine of the Church, episcopacy is not of its *essence*, but only of its *order*. Secondly, those portions of Christendom which retain the fundamental verities of the Christian *faith*, are entitled, for the faith's sake, to be called Churches, although they have lost the apostolic order of the ministry. And therefore, in my humble judgment, the new restriction of the term *Church*, as well as the new extension of the term *Dissenter*, ought to be altogether let alone, in obedience to the better standards of theological truth; to say nothing, at present, of the virtue of Christian discretion.

But as I claim no authority for my individual opinions, I am bound to prove that these assertions are in accordance with the doctrine of the Church; on which ground alone I should think myself at liberty to advocate them. For every priest ordained amongst us is under a solemn promise, that he will give his "*faithful diligence, always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and AS THIS CHURCH HATH RECEIVED THE SAME,*"* and therefore, if I could believe that the CHURCH had RECEIVED the new opinions, I should be the last to gainsay them. This I am quite sure she has not done. It is very certain, however, that she is not a little disturbed by the good and learned men who have received them, without waiting for her consent or approbation.

I shall proceed, accordingly, as in the question of Lay Baptism, discussed in my first Letter, to state the declarations of the standards of the Church of England and of our own Church, in relation to the point; and I shall next recur to the Scriptures, appending, for the gratification of such as desire them, the commentary of the Fathers. It will then, I trust, be sufficiently evident, that the theory so much encouraged, of late, amongst us with regard to our non-episcopal brethren, is opposed to the real doctrine of our Church. And connected as it now stands with an alarming novelty, which the last few years have transplanted from the modern school of Tractarian divinity, the topic will be found worthy, if I mistake not, of our serious attention.

The first question to be settled, is this, namely: Whether Episcopacy is *essential* to the very *being* of the Church of Christ, so that there can be *no Church* where there is *no Episcopacy*? And here I beg leave to be understood as distinctly maintaining that the institution of the episcopal

* See the second interrogatory of the ordinal, for the office of Priests.

government is *Divine*, because Apostolic. In the words of the venerable Hooker, I would say, without the slightest reservation, "Let us not fear to be herein bold and pe-remptory, that if any thing in the Church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, was even from God; the Holy Ghost was the author of it."* But it does not necessarily follow from this, that the loss of episcopacy destroys the very *being* of the Church. It destroys its apostolic *order*, undoubtedly; but as I have already shown, in the question of the sacraments, that their *essence* may be had, when their *order* is wanting, so is it in the question of the Church. Hence I am compelled to admit, that although the episcopal government be, indeed, of divine institution, and although the want of this be the want of the *order* appointed by the authority of Christ, yet the Church, in its *essential* elements, may subsist notwithstanding. The *completeness* or *perfection* of the Church requires both the apostolic *doctrine* and the apostolic *government*. The *faith* of the Church, and the *ministry* of the Church should, doubtless, go together. The first is the jewel, the second is the casket: "*We have this treasure,*" saith St. Paul, "*in earthen vessels.*" But the loss of the one does not necessarily involve the loss of the other; even as the destruction of the body does not necessarily involve the destruction of the soul.

Let me proceed, however, to the proof proposed, that while our mother Church provided for the strictest adherence to apostolic order in her own case, she yet granted both the name and character of Churches, to the various Christian seats which sprang up in the difficulties and struggles of the Reformation.

I shall commence with the well known work of Bishop Burnet, on the Thirty-nine Articles, because he wrote at a period when the first feeling of fellowship with the Calvin-

* Ecc. Pol. B. 7, § 5, London Ed. of 1825. Vol. 2, p. 275.

istic, Helvetian, and Lutheran Churches of the continent, had long died away. It has, indeed, been said, that he was liable to other influences, both national and political; because he was a Scotchman, and a supporter of King William III., which circumstances would concur in drawing him towards the same system of Presbyterianism, from the double motives of birth and interest. In truth, however, I cannot see the fairness of arguments like these, not only because they assume, what we do not possess,—the power of reading the heart; but because they cannot be urged without positively sinning against the precept; *“Judge not, that ye be not judged; for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.”* Besides which, there is a peculiar ground of confidence in the book of Bishop Burnet, derived from the fact stated in the preface, that he was induced to undertake it by the Archbishop of Canterbury, that it was read with great care by many of the other bishops and several learned divines, and that it was published with the strongest expressions of their approbation.

Speaking of the 23d Article, on the very point of a lawful calling of the ministry, this author saith as follows: * *“I come in the next place to consider the second part of this Article, which is the definition here given of those that are lawfully called and sent; this is put in very general words, far from that magisterial stiffness in which some have taken upon them to dictate in this matter. The Article does not resolve this into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large for such accidents as had happened, and such as might still happen. They who drew it had the state of the several Churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten track than any other, yet they knew that all things among them-*

* Burnet on the 39th Article, London Ed. of 1827, p. 257.

selves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times: necessity has no law, and is a law unto itself."

We need be at no loss to understand these last expressions of Bishop Burnet, when we remember the dependence of the Church of England upon the State, as well in the mode of electing their bishops, as in the secular influence of their immense Lay-patronage, and the miserable subjection of the Ecclesiastical Convocation, which may not even speak the sentiments of the Church without the royal license. These and similar evils, however, belong not to the Church herself, because her Articles, Homilies and Canons do nowhere justify them. They are rather the bondage arising from her peculiar political connexion, which she endures rather than approves, and for which she does not hold herself accountable.

But to proceed with the exposition of our author: "If a company of Christians," continues he, "find the public worship where they live to be so defiled, that they cannot with a good conscience join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conscientiously go, where they may worship God purely, and in a regular way; if, I say, such a body, finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct, or finding none of these, should, by a common consent, desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things, and should upon that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, though we are very sure that this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin unless the necessity were great and apparent, yet if the necessity is real and not feigned, this is not condemned nor annulled by the Article; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a body, who are supposed to have authority in such an extraordinary case, whatever

some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of this Church for about half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches so constituted, to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the Article is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.”

Now here, Bishop Burnet asserts not only his own judgment, nor only that of the Church of England in his day, but further undertakes to deliver the judgment of the body of the Church for half a century after the era of the Reformation. If, in this, he was in error, it would be the easiest of all things to show it. But the farther we examine into the sentiments and conduct of the Church at that period, the more we shall be obliged to acknowledge that he represented them fairly. As the most unimpeachable witness on this point, I shall next turn to Hooker, whose position in the Church during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, concurred with his acknowledged learning and profound judgment to give him every qualification for the decision of such a question. First, therefore, let us attend to his definition of the word CHURCH, in general, and afterwards to his opinion on the precise point of our inquiry.

“Church,” saith this admirable author,* “is a word which art hath devised, thereby to sever and distinguish that society of men which professeth the true religion, from the rest which profess it not. There have been in the world, from the very first foundation thereof, but three religions. Paganism, which lived in the blindness of corrupt and depraved nature; Judaism, embracing the law which reformed

* Ecc. Pol. B. 5, § 68, vol. 2d of Lond. Ed. of 1825, p. 17.

heathenish impieties, and taught salvation to be looked for through One whom God in the last days would send and exalt to be Lord of all; finally, Christian belief, which yieldeth obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and acknowledgeth him the Saviour whom God did promise. Seeing then that the Church is a name, which art hath given to professors of true religion; as they that will define a man are to pass by those qualities wherein one man doth excel another, and to take only those essential properties, whereby man doth differ from creatures of other kinds, so he that will teach what the Church is, shall never rightly perform the work whereabout he goeth, till in matter of religion he touch that difference which severeth the Church's religion from theirs who are not the Church. Religion being therefore a matter partly of contemplation, partly of action, we must define the Church, which is a religious society, by such differences as do perfectly explain the essence of such things; that is to say, by the object or matter whereabout the contemplation and actions of the Church are properly conversant; for so all knowledge and all virtues are defined. Wherefore, because the only object which separateth ours from other religions, is Jesus Christ, in whom none but the Church doth believe, and whom none but the Church doth worship; we find that accordingly the apostles do every where distinguish hereby the Church from infidels and Jews, accounting them which call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to be *his Church*. If we go lower, we shall but add unto this certain casual and variable accidents, which are not properly *of the being*, but make only for the *happier and better being* of the Church of God, either in deed, or in men's opinions and conceits. This is the error of all popish definitions that hitherto have been brought. They define not the Church by that which the Church *essentially* is, but by that wherein they imagine their own *more perfect than the rest are*."

Again, (ib. p. 19,) "That which separateth therefore utterly," continues Hooker, "that which cutteth off clean from the visible Church of Christ, is plain apostacy, direct denial, utter rejection of the *whole Christian faith*, as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity. *Heretics*, as touching those points of doctrine wherein they fail; *Schismatics*, as touching the quarrels for which, or the duties wherein they divide themselves from their brethren; *loose, licentious and wicked persons*, as touching their several offences or crimes, have all forsaken the true Church of God: the Church which is sound and sincere in the doctrine which they corrupt; the Church that keepeth the bond of unity which they violate; the Church that walketh in the laws of righteousness which they transgress; this very true Church of Christ they have left, *howbeit not altogether left*, nor forsaken simply *the Church*; upon the main foundation whereof *they continue built, notwithstanding those breaches whereby they are rent at the top asunder.*"

And to show his meaning yet more clearly, this eminent writer saith again, (ib. B. 3, Sec. 1, vol. i. p. 276,) "We must acknowledge even *heretics themselves* to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church."—"Heretics are not utterly cut off from the visible Church of Christ. If the Fathers do any where, as oftentimes they do, make the true visible Church of Christ and heretical companies opposite; they are to be construed as separating heretics, not altogether from the company of believers, but from the fellowship of sound believers. For where professed unbelief is, there can be no visible Church of Christ: there may be, where sound belief wanteth. Infidels being clean without the Church, deny directly, and utterly reject, the very principles of Christianity, which *heretics embrace, and err only by misconstruction.*"

Now these principles, it must be confessed, are large and comprehensive. And yet I suspect that those who most

dislike them in one respect, may be most dependent upon them in another, for certain it seems, that nothing short of this will justify the opposite modes in which our Oxford friends speak in their celebrated Tracts of the Church of Rome. Thus, in one place they very truly say, "the Roman Church is infected with heresy, we are bound to flee it as a pestilence." While in other parts of their work they call her "Our elder sister," and speak with great feeling of our supposed obligations to her. On Hooker's hypothesis, however, there is no inconsistency in maintaining that the Church of Rome has become heretical, schismatical, and awfully corrupt, while, nevertheless, so long as she professes the fundamental principles of Christian faith, she must be granted a place in the comprehensive circle of the Church universal. But it will not be just to claim the benefit of his theory when it operates in favour of Rome, and yet reject it as soon as it is applied to Presbyterianism.

Let me once more recur to this venerated author, therefore, and hear his judgment in reference to those Churches which had lost episcopacy: (ib. B. 7, § 14, 2 Vol. p. 304.) "There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reasons," saith he, "to allow ordination made without a bishop." "Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any, whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens himself from heaven. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the *exigence of necessity* doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, and *neither hath, nor can have possibly*, a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath oftentimes and may

give place. And therefore, we are not, simply without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles, by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. *These cases of inevitable necessity excepted*, none may ordain but only bishops.”

These principles, Hooker himself applies to the very case of the presbyterian Churches, in the following passage: (ib. B. 3, § 2, Vol. 1, p. 330.) “In which respect,” saith he, “for mine own part, although I see that certain reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scriptures, I mean the government that is by bishops; inasmuch as both these Churches are fallen under a different kind of regimen; which to remedy, it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during their present affliction and trouble: yet this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such a case than exaggerate: considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best: and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.”

Here, then, I behold the opinion which fairly presents the views of our mother Church on the true character of those reformed Churches which had unhappily been obliged, as they honestly supposed, to dispense with the apostolic order of episcopacy. It was a *defect*, a defect to be sorely lamented, but yet it did not destroy them as *Churches*. The title of *Churches* was plainly and constantly applied to them not only by Hooker, but by *all the English episcopalians of that and long subsequent times*. And although the comprehensive definition of the *essential* elements of the Church, allowed Hooker to embrace the Church of Rome along with the reformed Churches of France and Scotland, within the great circle of the *Church universal*, yet there can be

no question in any unprejudiced mind as to the sentiment entertained concerning their comparative affinity to the primitive Apostolic system. Even our brethren of Oxford, in one place, speak of Rome in the nineteenth century, as of "*a demoniac, beside herself, ruled within by an inexorable spirit.*" How much more must she have been so esteemed in the days of Hooker, in the days of Elizabeth, when men were but just relieved from her darkest empire of superstition and cruelty? And hence, is it not manifest, that the Church of England, at that period, could not have faltered for an instant in their judgment between Rome and Geneva? That if, in the latter case, they might have been obliged to regard their reformed sister, as one who had, indeed, with respect to episcopacy, lost the right hand of her strength, yet was she, in every thing else, of sound mind and fair proportions, while Rome, though possessing every member of the body, was covered with excrescencies and corruption from head to foot, and was, moreover, "beside herself"—a maniac, though, happily, in chains.

Let me next state the judgment of our mother Church upon this point, as it appeared in the following century, under the first Charles and his successor. Mede, Chillingworth, Usher, and Bramhall, will furnish sufficient proof in favour of the same allowance of the name Church, to our non-episcopal brethren.

Commencing with Chillingworth, (see his Works, London edition of 1820, volume 2, p. 253,) I find him thus summing up, in his celebrated answer to his Jesuitical antagonist, the differences between the various branches of the Reformation. "Some," saith our author, "taking their direction only from the Scriptures, others from the writings of the fathers and the decrees of councils of the first five ages, certainly it is no great marvel that there was, as you say, disagreement between them, in the particulars of their reformation; nay, morally speaking, it was impossible it

should be otherwise. Yet let me tell you, the difference between them, (especially in comparison of your Church and religion,) is not the difference between good and bad; but between good and better; and they did best that followed the Scripture, interpreted by catholic written tradition; which rule the reformers of the Church of England proposed to themselves to follow."

The prevailing sentiment of his day may be gathered from this distinguished writer on another point, which belongs to this subject; for there are many amongst ourselves who do not see any difference between the sin of *originating* a schism, and that of *maintaining* it, after time and long consent have given it a species of sacred prescription in the feelings and prejudices of a multitude, who could not, by any possibility, be turned away from it, without putting many schisms in the place of one. "You say," saith Chillingworth, (ib. p. 189,) "that supposing Luther and they which did first separate from the Roman Church, were guilty of schism, it is certainly consequent that all who persist in this division must be so likewise; which is not so certain as you pretend. For they which alter, without necessary cause, the present government of any State, civil or ecclesiastical, do commit a great fault; whereof, notwithstanding, they may be innocent, who continue this alteration, and to the utmost of their power, oppose a change, though to the former state, when continuance of time hath settled the present." This is, indeed, the very same apology which the learned Le Clerc, an ardent lover of Episcopacy, although professedly a Presbyterian, assigned at a later day, for not encouraging a change. "The Presbyterian form," saith he, "is settled in most places, which being once done, it was a matter of so much interest to those who presided over the civil government, (sc. of Holland,) and is still of so much consequence to the public peace to avoid all causes of disturbance, that at this day it must of neces-

sity be suffered to remain.”—“Therefore prudent men, although they ardently long for that form of Church administration which was apostolic, or like it, yet they think it best now to leave matters as they are.”* The difference in judgment, motive, principle and feeling, between men who talk thus, and the *originators* of a needless schism, is too plain to require either argument or illustration.

With some of my esteemed Oxford brethren, however, I am aware that Chillingworth is no favourite. My other citations will please them better, I trust, inasmuch as they are taken from the Oxford Tracts, and therefore *ought* to be invested, in strict consistency, with the sanction of their own commendation.

I proceed, therefore, to observe, that the famous Mede, (Oxford Tracts, 3d vol. of Am. Ed. p. 440) had no scruples about granting to the non-episcopal branches of the Reformation the title of Churches. “Our Church,” saith he, “goes upon differing principles from the rest of the reformed, and so steers her course by another rule than they do. We look after the form, rites, and discipline of antiquity, and endeavour to bring our own as near as we can to that pattern. We suppose the *Reformed Churches* have departed farther therefrom than is needed, and so we are not very solicitous to comply with them; yea, we are jealous of such of our own as we see over-zealously addicted to them, lest it be a sign they prefer them before their mother.” Now here is a man, distinguished for his learning and his zeal for primitive catholicism, who yet, in all the freedom of a private letter to a friend, calls these non-episcopal communions *Reformed Churches*, as if he considered it a matter of course that they were entitled to that character.

My next citation bears the honoured name of Archbishop Usher. (ib. p. 443-4.) “If at this day,” saith this

* See the author’s volume on the Primitive Church, 9th Lecture, p. 263 of 2d Ed. where the original is quoted.

eminent scholar and divine, “we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, as of the religion of the *Roman and the Reformed Churches in our quarters*, of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians in the south, of the Grecians and other Christians in the eastern parts, and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they did all generally agree, we should find, that in those propositions which without controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained, as, being joined with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that as many as do walk according to this rule, (neither overthrowing that which they have builded by superinducing any *damnable heresies* thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith with a lewd and wicked conversation,) *peace shall be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.*”

This noble paragraph, conceived in the true spirit of an enlightened judgment and an enlarged heart, is worthy of being transcribed in letters of gold, and hung up as a constant memorial in the study of every controversialist. The special point for which I have cited it, appears in the commencement, where this profoundly learned author speaks of the “*Roman and Reformed Churches in our quarters.*” The inference from such language as this is obvious to the slightest reflection.

Let me now turn to Bramhall, another archbishop of Armagh, who occupied the see immediately after the restoration, A. D. 1660, not long after the decease of his illustrious predecessor. I shall not dispute with my tractarian brethren, the propriety of calling him a *Confessor*, nor the justice of applying the name of *Martyr* to Archbishop Laud, although I certainly think that their claims

to these distinctions are more than doubtful. But be this as it may, the inexpediency of such epithets, when their inflammatory influence upon the Church of our own day might have been so easily anticipated, should have led to the omission of titles, which were likely to injure the living, without profiting the dead. It is indeed true, that Bramhall was impeached in 1640, by the Irish House of Commons, when bishop of Londonderry, as one of the coadjutors of the unfortunate Earl of Strafford. It is true that he was imprisoned, and after he obtained his liberty through the royal influence, he became a voluntary exile. But the difficulty in such cases is to separate the *religious* from the *political* antipathy, which armed the hand of persecution, so as to demonstrate, that if the individual had confined himself strictly within the limits of a *Christian Bishop*, instead of making himself actively obnoxious as a *political adviser*, the same measure of odium and of suffering would have been meted out to him. For in order to entitle a man to those venerable distinctions of *Confessor* and *Martyr* in the Church of God, it is incontrovertible that he must have suffered purely on account of his *Christian fidelity*.

But this by the way: his testimony is none the less conclusive on the point before us, if it be not rather the more so. These are his words, as cited by our Oxford brethren, (Tracts, vol. 3, p. 140.) "Episcopal divines do not deny those Churches to be true Churches, wherein salvation may be had." We advise them, as it is our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and not to put it to more question whether they have ordination or not, or desert the general practice of the universal Church for nothing, when they may clear it if they please. Their case is not the same with those who labour under invincible necessity."—"Episcopal divines will readily subscribe to the determination of the learned Bishop of Winchester," (sc. the eminent

Bishop Andrews,) “in his answer to the second epistle of Molineus. ‘Nevertheless, if our form (of Episcopacy,) be of divine right, it doth not follow from thence, that there is not salvation without it, or that a Church cannot consist without it. He is blind who does not see Churches consisting without it: he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation. We are none of those hard-hearted persons, we put a great difference between these things. There may be something absent in the exterior regiment which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be had.’ “This mistake,” continues Bramhall, “proceedeth from not distinguishing between the *true nature and essence of a Church*, WHICH WE DO READILY GRANT THEM, and the *integrity or perfection of a Church* WHICH WE CANNOT GRANT THEM, without swerving from the judgment of the catholic Church.” To this let me add a short extract from Scott, a learned cotemporary of Bishop Burnet,* who expressly asserts the same principle, (ib. p. 152,) that although this instituted government of episcopacy “*is necessary to the perfection of a Church*, yet it doth not follow that it is *therefore necessary to the being of it.*”

Now here, the testimony of the Church of England is brought down to the time of William III.—to the time of Bishop Burnet; and it is impossible to deny that his statement, with which I commenced my proofs, is completely sustained by all that went before him, our Oxford brethren themselves being judges. It is perfectly idle, therefore, to make light of his evidence, by talking of his prejudices on account of birth and education, or his political interest in the service of the house of Orange. Christian writers should blush to use such arguments in disparagement of any theological author, unless they are prepared to *prove him* guilty of fraud or falsehood. For what is it but an

* Bishop Burnet was born in 1643, and Scott in 1633, there was therefore only five years between them.

open proclaiming to the world that clergymen themselves have no confidence in the honesty and candour of each other, but are ready to slander the motives and principles of the most eminent divines, even of their own Church, when they can find no other way to gain a polemic victory?

If, however, it be still doubted, whether the Church of England, *as a Church*, would have assented to this doctrine, I have no difficulty in pointing to her ecclesiastical action in the most direct form. For to say nothing of the fact, that some of her most distinguished divines acted as delegates in the famous Presbyterian Synod of Dort; nor of the fact that she assented, without difficulty, to the terms of the union by which the Presbyterian Church became the established religion of Scotland, we have two ecclesiastical declarations upon the point, which are beyond all fair exception. The first to which I refer is the language of the address on the accession of William III., in which both the Houses of Convocation agreed in thanking the king for his zeal in behalf of the Church of England, anticipating that thereby “the interest of the Protestant religion *in all other Protestant Churches* would be better secured.” (Oxford Tracts, vol. iii. p. 27.) The other declaration is found in the 55th canon of the Church of England, in which the clergy are required to “pray for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland, as parts of CHRIST’S Holy Catholic Church, which is dispersed throughout the world.”* In all the forms, therefore, in which our mother Church could assert her doctrine, she has constantly maintained the principle that the Order of the Apostolic ministry which she was careful to preserve for herself, as a high and sacred privilege, was yet not held essential to the *being* of a Church, and that the Reformed Christian communions which had it

* See this fact treated by Bowden, in his 15th Letter to Miller, Standard Works, vol. i. p. 211.

not, were, notwithstanding, *true Churches*, although imperfect. The same judgment, as we all know, has been maintained in England to our own day, nor am I aware that it has been openly impugned by any bishop on that side of the ocean.

It remains that I should say a few words on the question, whether our own branch of the Church has been less liberal in her doctrine. And but few can be required to settle this point in the discussion, since, in the very preface to our book of Common Prayer, we read as follows:

“When, in the course of Divine Providence, these American States became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included; and the different religious denominations of Christians in these States were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their *respective Churches* and forms of worship, and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistently with the constitution and laws of their country.” And in the last paragraph but one, it is further stated that “this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or farther than local circumstances require.”

Now this document, being the voice of the American Episcopal Church in general convention, and that, too, uttered at the very time when we were to consummate our separate stand as an independent Church, must be considered decisive upon the subject, at least until an equally authoritative expression shall have done it away. For here, in our collective capacity, and in connexion with our standard book, we have given the name of Churches to the different religious denominations in the United States as then existing, and have declared our agreement with the Church of England in all essential points of doctrine, &c. The evidences which might be collected from the language of our

bishops and clergy, since that important era in our history, would fill a volume. I would only refer to the well known work of Bowden's Letters to Miller, in which he admits, repeatedly, that the doctrine which I have stated is the received doctrine. Thus, for example, (p. 235 of Standard Works,) he saith, "No doubt he (Archbishop Whitgift) maintained, even with respect to episcopacy, what *every episcopal writer that I have ever met with maintains*, that this government is *not absolutely necessary* to the very salvation of the Church, but that it is *so necessary*, that the Church cannot be in a *sound and perfect state* without it."

Having thus shown, beloved brethren, what I cannot otherwise regard than as the settled doctrine of our mother Church and of our own in relation to this matter, I proceed to sustain the proposition that the apostolic ministry is not of the *essence* but of the *order* of the Church, by a brief reference to the Scriptures.

That the word 'Church,' which, in the original Greek, is *ἐκκλησία*, signifies the *called assembly* or *congregation*, is known to every scholar. And accordingly it occurs in this sense nearly one hundred times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, being currently applied to the people of Israel.

That the same word is used in the New Testament to signify the congregation of Israel before the period of the Aaronic priesthood, is plain from the language of the martyr Stephen, (Acts vii. 30,) "This is he that was in the CHURCH in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, who received the lively oracles to give unto us. To whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt, saying unto Aaron, Make us gods to go before us; for as for this Moses which brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." Here we see the term applied to the chosen people, anterior to the in-

stitution of the regular priesthood, distinctly proving that the *Church may exist* without the *order* of the priesthood, since it is spoken of as existing, before that order was established.

We find the word used again by our great Redeemer, (Mat. xviii. 17,) in reference to the then existing Jewish polity, although the Aaronic succession, which was the only *lawful* priesthood, had long been lost. "Tell it unto the *Church*," saith our Lord: "if he refuse to hear the *Church*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a publican." Here we see the term used, not only while the Jewish polity was yet standing, but also at a time when the lawful Aaronic succession had been notoriously set aside; proving again, that the Church in its *essential* elements was regarded as still in being, although the appointed *order* of its priesthood was openly destroyed.

Again, we find St. Paul saying, (1 Cor. xii. 27, 28,) "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God *hath set some in the Church*, first apostles, secondarily prophets; thirdly teachers; after that miracles," &c. Here the inspired writer applies the terms first and second, not to the point of time, but to the rank of authority; regarding the Church as already subsisting, and the apostolic ministry as *set* or *placed in it*.

Now the favourite hypothesis of many in our day is quite opposed to this, for it contemplates the Church as *subsequent to and dependent upon the ministry*, on the plausible ground that the Church is the body *called*, and as they cannot be called without some agency commissioned to call them, and this agency, according to the plain appointment of Christ, is the apostolic ministry, therefore *this ministry comes first, and the Church comes afterwards*; and hence the notion is naturally supposed to be quite demonstrated, that the apostolic ministry is *essential* to the Church, since there can, in the necessary connexion and dependence of things, be no Church without it. A little reflection may be required,

and but a little, I trust, to show the error of this argument, to any unprejudiced and ordinary understanding.

The Church, then, as the Scriptures present it to us, consists of all those who, lost by the fall, and doomed to death in the first Adam, are called to redemption and salvation by the second Adam, our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence it is a mistake to date its rise after the apostolic commission, since, judging by the testimony of St. Paul, it includes the righteous Abel; by that of St. Jude, it includes the patriarchs Enoch and Noah; and, by the express words of Christ himself, we know that its final glory is described as a *sitting down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.*

Precisely in accordance with this, is the aspect in which the apostle presents the calling of the Gentiles. They are told that the Church was already existing,—the good olive tree; that some of the branches were broken off in order that they might be grafted in; and that they must not therefore magnify themselves on their privileges, since *they* did not bear the root, but the *root them.*

Bearing this comprehensive, but Scriptural view of the term Church in mind, there will be no difficulty in understanding the argument. The first call from which the Church took its rise, was the voice of God himself in Paradise, when he graciously promised that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and instituted, thereupon, the rite of sacrifice. In obedience to that call, Abel brought his lamb, and was accepted, because, as saith the apostle, he offered it by faith. The divine call descended from the patriarchs, renewed from time to time by the immediate communications of the Deity, and proclaimed by the agency of prophets, such as Enoch and Noah, before the flood, and Abraham and his posterity after it. This distinguished patriarch was chosen to be the father of the faithful; and the peculiar privileges of the Church—the called and chosen covenant people of God—were solemnly

granted to him and to his seed for ever. And the system of mercy went on until the Lord brought this favoured Church of Israel, his peculiar people, out of Egypt, and gave them, for the first time, the visible sanctuary as a pledge of his presence, and an instituted order of priests, and a written record of his Holy Law, to teach and direct them. Soon after this gracious dispensation, the Almighty planted them in Canaan, to be a glorious witness to the whole world, and to call all men, by the spectacle of their privileges, and the communication of His truth, to acknowledge the God of Abraham.

Presently, however, we behold the rebellion of the Church of Israel against the government appointed by the Lord. First, in the days of Samuel, when they grew weary of their judges and desired a king. "*They have not rejected thee,*" saith the Almighty to his prophet, "*but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.*" But did their compassionate God cast them off for this? Nay, he condescended to indulge their waywardness, and even appointed their king, and promised them, if they would but be faithful to the divine law, that they should still experience his blessing. Again, in the reign of Rehoboam, ten tribes revolted from the house of David, and chose for themselves Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, to govern them. And now was consummated the formal schism of Israel in their religion; for they forsook Jerusalem under this new political temptation, deserted the ark of the covenant and the priesthood appointed by the Lord in the midst of mighty signs and wonders, and accepted the wretched substitutes of the calves of Dan and Bethel, with the priests which Jeroboam made of the lowest of the people, instead of the glorious temple of Solomon, and the sacred line of the holy Aaron.*

* It may be thought, perhaps, that this separation of the ten tribes cannot be called a schism, because it was commanded by the Deity. But,

We might well suppose that the Most High would avenge this atrocious contempt of his own solemn order, by a total abandonment of his rebellious people. And doubtless he would have done so, if his thoughts were as our thoughts, or his ways as our ways. But though the schismatic tribes of Israel had wilfully deserted all the external means of grace, on a mere secular apology, yet their merciful God did not desert them. When they forsook his chosen priesthood, he gave them prophets. The pre-eminent Elijah and Elisha were sent to proclaim the word of the Lord, and keep his people from idolatry. And strange it is to mark how perfectly silent those prophets are upon the sin of schism. They say nothing to heal the breach, or bring the revolters back to Judah. Nay, they seem to yield to the evil circumstances of the time, and instead of endeavouring to obtain help from the Levites or the Priests of Sion, they accommodate themselves to the difficulty, and train up their *schools of the prophets* to do the same work, as well as they might, in another way. Still the Church was not extinct. Still the Word of the Lord was heard and obeyed in Israel. And still, in the darkest hour of Elijah's despondency, when he complained that he was left alone, and they sought his life, his heart was cheered by the divine assurance that his work had not been in vain. "For

as St. Augustin well argues, the Almighty ordered this separation, not for the purpose of dividing religion, but in order to divide the kingdom, as a judgment upon Judah. For God never commands a schism or a heresy. Nor does it follow that because the kingdoms of the world are now divided, therefore Christian unity must be divided, instead of the same Universal Church being found in them all. *S. Augustin de Unitate Ecclesiæ, Opp. Tom. ix. p. 245, D. Deus enim easdem tribus jusserat separari, non ut religio, sed ut regnum divideretur, et hoc modo vindicaretur in regnum Judæ. Deus autem nunquam jubet schisma vel hæresim fieri. Neque enim quia et in orbe terrarum plerumque regna dividuntur, ideo et unitas Christiana dividitur, enim in utraque parte catholica inveniatur Ecclesia.*

yet," saith the Most High, "*I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men in Israel that have not bowed the knee to Baal.*"

The iniquity and idolatry of Israel, however, at last provoke their long-suffering Lord to send them into captivity. Judah, notwithstanding their admirable system of religious polity, follows the sad example, and shares the same fate. Their temple is profaned, their sacrifices are forbidden, and yet their compassionate God does not abandon them. In their dispersion he still makes them his chosen witnesses. The principles of his holy Word are scattered amongst the nations, and in ten thousand ways which no human eye can trace, they are rendered available, as a seed of truth amongst the falsehoods of paganism, prompting the purer breathings of heathen philosophy, counteracting the arts and influence of Satan, insensibly preparing the way for the future progress of the gospel, and thus subserving the will of that All-wise, and All-gracious God, who accomplishes his ultimate purposes in material things, not only by the orderly instruments of the dew and the sunshine, but by the equally appointed agency of the earthquake and the storm.

In due time, however, a fragment of the Church of Judah, which had retained the order of the priesthood, is permitted to return and restore the walls and the temple of Jerusalem. But how inferior to their former glory do they appear! Where is the ark? Where are the tables of the law? Where the Urim and Thummim, the LIGHTS and PERFECTIONS of the first sanctuary? Where the strength, the superhuman power, with which the army of the living God once went forth, conquering and to conquer? Departed and gone! Sustained by the capricious allowance of a heathen despot, taunted by their enemies on every side, they labour under every discouragement; but still their faith is upheld by the divine promise that the *glory of the latter*

house should yet exceed the glory of the former, and trusting in that hope, they persevere.

And when the fulness of the time arrives, the star from heaven announces to the eastern magi the birth of him who was the King of the Jews, and the angels proclaim to the shepherds of Judea, "To you is born the Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." He comes, indeed, to his temple, the Shepherd to his flock, the Master to his household, the Church. His personal ministry is given to them who were emphatically the called, the chosen. His twelve apostles are sent with the express command to confine their preaching, as yet, to the cities of Israel. And although, when he came unto his own, his own received him not,—although they fulfilled, unconsciously, the designs of God, by wickedly crucifying the Lord of life and glory,—yet was it in the temple that the Holy Ghost manifested his power to an extent far more stupendous than under any former dispensation; thousands of the ancient covenant people bowed down in adoration before their glorified Redeemer, a great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith, and thus, it was a part of the literal Israel which first acknowledged their spiritual King, in obedience to the very principle on which alone they had a right to be called the children of Abraham. For in the sight of God, he was not a Jew which was one outwardly, neither was that circumcision which was outward in the flesh, but he was a Jew which was one inwardly, and circumcision was of the heart; not of the letter, but of the Spirit.*

Hence it seems manifest that God did indeed *set the apostles in the Church* before his mighty power was manifested on the day of Pentecost, and consequently this was not the *commencement* of his CHURCH, but rather the *commencement or development of the NEW DISPENSATION* which the prophets had foretold. And therefore the true Israel became the

* Romans ii. 28—9.

proclaimers of salvation to the ends of the earth, the apostles' commission being expressly intended not to *originate a distinct Church among the Gentiles*, but to GRAFF THEM UPON THE OLD STOCK OF ISRAEL, and thus *add* to that ONE CHURCH, the spouse and Bride of Christ, *such as should be saved*.

The same principle of the divine order governed St. Paul himself; for although designed to be a chosen vessel to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, yet he, like the rest, was *set in the Church of Israel*. Therefore we find him beginning his ministry amongst his brethren on the declared ground of this divine economy. At Antioch, for instance, he and Barnabas went into the synagogue, and preached the gospel, (Acts, xiii.) and when the Jews contradicted and blasphemed, (ver. 46,) the apostles "waxed bold, and said, *It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.*" The same course is taken throughout the whole history of his apostleship, and in the last chapter of the book, when at Rome, where his condition as a prisoner confined him to his own hired house with the soldier that kept him, still he pursues the same principle by sending for the Jews, and giving them, as a matter of acknowledged right, the first tidings of the gospel.

Viewed, therefore, in the light of Scripture, there is but one holy and universal (or catholic) Church, from the fall to the end of the world. That Church, according to the wisdom of God, has passed through many dispensations, of which the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Apostolic are the chief. These various dispensations mark the divine *order* appointed for the Church, but none of them are of its *essence* or being; for this took its rise from the first act of faith in the Covenant of Grace announced by the Almighty himself in paradise, and from that hour the Church, in its *essential* principle, has never been extinct.

And as we see that the Church passed on, at first, without any fixed order, afterwards with a strictly appointed priesthood, often troubled with the grievous sin of idolatry, and distracted by heresy and schism, which brought upon her many chastisements from the hand of God, while, nevertheless, sustained by his mercy, she survived the whole, so we must admit, that although every wilful departure from the apostolic order must be more or less injurious to the purity and welfare of the Church, yet it never can be fatal, while the *substance of the faith remains*. If men who truly believe, mistakenly reject the priests of God, we may trust that his mercy will send them prophets, sooner than abandon them, as he did to the ten tribes which revolted from Judah. Only let them take heed lest they hasten, by this grievous fault, the time of their captivity to error, and lest that captivity be one from whence there can be no return. The Lord is gracious and long-suffering, slow to anger, and of great goodness. But a *wilful* departure from his divine order, in any respect, is at least a tempting him. And we know who it was that said, *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God*.

It is possible, however, that this view of the subject, to some minds, may involve an apparent contradiction to the language of St. Paul, who contrasts so strongly the Mosaic with the Christian dispensation, especially throughout his epistle to the Hebrews. The difficulty, I trust, will vanish, when it is remembered, that the apostle is not speaking of the Church with respect to its *essential principle*, but only with respect to its change of *formal development*. The distinction may be readily illustrated from the language of the same inspired writer concerning himself. "When I was a child," saith he, "I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." Here is a familiar and marked contrast, which every one admits, between childhood and maturity. Form, faculties, intelligence, duties,

relations,—all are changed for a new, more comprehensive, more elevated, and incomparably more effective condition. And yet, who does not perceive that in every thing which is of the *essence* of humanity, the child and the man are one and the same?

In order that this view of the subject may lack no evidence which can serve to establish it, I proceed to show how well it accords with the sentiments of the Fathers, adding the originals below for the satisfaction of those who may prefer consulting them, and stating only their substance in English, for the sake of brevity.

[1] Irenæus, (A. D. 170,) writing in opposition to the

[1] (*S. Irenæi, Lib. iv. contra Hæreses. c. vii. § 3 & 4. p. 235—6.*) Unus igitur et idem Deus qui advocavit Abraham, et repromissionem ei dedit.—Revelat autem omnibus Filius, quibus velit cognosci, Patrem, et neque sine bona voluntate Patris, neque sine administratione Filii cognoscet quisquam Deum. Et propter hoc dicebat discipulis Dominus: *Ego sum via, veritas, et vita. Et nemo venit ad Patrem, nisi per me.*—Propter hoc Judæi excesserunt a Deo, Verbum ejus non recipientes, sed putantes per seipsum Patrem sine Verbo, id est, sine Filio, posse cognoscere Deum, nescientes eum qui in figura loquutus est humana ad Abraham, et iterum ad Moysen, dicentem: *Videns vidi vexationem populi mei in Ægypto, et descendi liberare eos.*—Ministrat enim ad omnia sua, progenies et figuratio sua, id est Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, Verbum et Sapientia. (*ib. c. viii. § 1.*) Vanus autem et Marcion, et qui ab eo, expellentes ab hæreditate Abraham,—frustrantes et blasphemantes Deum, qui in Regno cælorum introducit Abraham, et semen ejus, quod est Ecclesia, per Jesum Christum, cui et adoptio redditur, et hæreditas quæ Abrahamæ promissa est. *ib. c. ix. § 1. p. 237.* Unius igitur et ejusdem substantiæ sunt omnia, hoc est, ab uno et eodem Deo, quemadmodum et Dominus ait discipulis; *Propterea omnis scriba doctus in Regno cælorum similis est homini patrifamilias, qui profert de thesauro suo nova et vetera.* Non alterum quidem vetera, alterum vero proferentem nova docuit, sed unum et eundem. Paterfamilias enim Dominus est, qui universæ domui paternæ dominatur: et servis quidem, et adhuc indisciplinatis condignam tradens legem; liberis autem, et fide justificatis congruentia dans præcepta, et filiis adaperiens suam hereditatem.—Utraque autem Testamenta unus et idem Paterfamilias produxit, Verbum Dei, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui et Abrahamæ et Moysi colloquutus est, et nobis in novitate restituit libertatem, et multiplicavit eam, quæ ab ipso est, gratiam.

Gnostics, who denied, that the same Deity could be the author of the Old and New Testaments, saith "that no one can know God without the revelation of the Son, that Christ spake in a human form with Abraham, and again with Moses, that the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Word and the Wisdom, minister to all, that God introduced Abraham and his seed which is the Church, into the kingdom of heaven, that one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, the Master of the household, produced both the Testaments, who spake with Abraham and Moses, and gave us new liberty, and multiplied that grace which is from him only."

So, too, Clement of Alexandria, (A. D. 195,) declares, [2] "that as the will of God is work, which is called the world, so his will is the salvation of men, and this is called the Church, that all are neighbours who participate in the Spirit, that Abraham is the father not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles, that God was with one people, namely the Jews, bearing the law; then calling the Gentiles, he gathered a second people, that these two united form one new man, in whom he dwells, namely the Church: for it is not the place which I call the Church," saith Clement, "but the congregation of the chosen."

Origen, (A. D. 248,) writes as follows: [3] "But since

[2] (*Clementis Alexan. Pædag. L. 1. p. 93.*) Numquam est Deus imbecillus. Quemadmodum enim ejus voluntas est opus, et id mundus nominatur; ita etiam ejus voluntas est hominum salus, et ea vocata est Ecclesia. (*Ib. Stromata. L. 3. p. 430. B.*) Quomodo autem non propinquus, qui potest spiritus esse particeps? Non solum enim Hebræorum, sed etiam Gentium pater est Abraham. (*Ib. p. 455.*) Fuerit autem multorum quoque concordia ex tribus numerata, cum quibus est Dominus, una Ecclesia, unus homo, genus unum. An non cum uno quidem Judæo erat Dominus legem ferens. Jam autem prophetans, et Hieremiam mittens Babylonem, quinetiam eos qui erant ex gentibus vocans per prophetiam, congregavit duos populos. Tertius autem est unus, qui ex duobus creatur in novum hominem, quo inambulatur et inhabitatur in ipsa Ecclesia. (*Ib. L. VII. p. 715.*) Non enim nunc locum, sed electorum congregationem appello Ecclesiam.

[3] (*Origenis Com. in Mat. Tom. 1. p. 357.*) Sed quoniam Apostolus de Christo et Ecclesia id dictum esse vult; *Et erunt duo in carne uno,*

the apostle applies to Christ and the Church the saying that *they two shall be one flesh*, we may understand that Christ did not put away his first spouse, the synagogue, (faithfully observing the rule, *those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder*,) until she became an adulteress, being corrupted by the wicked one, and with him laying snares for her Lord, delivering him to be killed and saying, *Take this man away from the earth, crucify him, crucify him*. Therefore it may be said that she departed from him, rather than that he put her away as one divorced. Hence he speaks of this divorce in Isaiah, saying, *Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, by which I put her away?*" And again, this eminent father saith, "See, therefore, how the saying (of St. Paul,) *I am crucified with Christ*, may belong, not only to the saints who lived after the coming of Christ, but also, and equally, to those who lived before it, lest we should say that the saints who were after his coming, differed from Moses and the Patriarchs. Therefore that text, *I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*, may be said of the saints who were before as well as those who were since his coming. For we maintain and teach, that

dicendum est non aliam ob causam, priorem, ut ita appellem, conjugem ipsius, priorem nempe Synagogam, fuisse repudiatam a Christo, illud servante: *Quos Deus conjunxit homo non separet*, quam quod a Malo vitata hæc mulier fornicata est, et cum eo insidias viro suo struxit, eumque neci dedit dicens: *Tolle ejusmodi hominem de terra, crucifige, crucifige eum*. Illa igitur discessit potius quam vir eam repudiatam dimisit. Idcirco ipsius divortium huic in Isaia exprobrans ait: *Quis est hic liber repudii matris vestrae, quo dimisi eam?*" This idea is fully and largely treated in the two following pages.

(*Ib. Com. in Ioannem, Tom. 2. p. 298-9.*) Vide vero, an non tantum sanctorum, qui post Christi adventum fuere, sit vox illa: *Cum Christo crucifixus sum*, sed æquè ad priores etiam pertineat, ne differre dicamus sanctos, qui post Christi adventum fuere, a Moyse, et Patriarchis. Vox illa quoque: *Vivo ego, non amplius ego, sed vivit in me Christus*, æque etiam dicatur non solum de sanctis, qui post Christi adventum fuere, verum etiam de his, qui antea.—Tradimus enim et docemus, numquam defuisse sanctis spiritualementem Jesu adventum, atque dispensationem.

at no time were the advent and dispensation of Christ wanting to his saints."

The same doctrine is laid down by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, where he saith, [4] that, "those who conform to Abraham in faith and in good works, are said to rest in his bosom." Again he saith, that "Jesus came to the snare, that he might set Adam free." In still plainer language he declares, that "the *Holy Church*, which in the beginning of the world *was betrothed in Paradise*, prefigured in the deluge, announced by the law, and called by the prophets, *for a long time expected* the coming of her beloved, the redemption of men, and the glory of the gospel," &c.

Elsewhere the same author saith, [5] that "the Church is bound together, when hope has gone before, and faith is

[4] *S. Ambrosii, In Ps. 38, Énar. Tom. 1. p. 846. § 11.* Unde et justi in Abrahamæ sinu requiescere leguntur, quod in ejus gratia, in ejus requie, in ejus placiditate requiescant, qui conformem ei induerint fidem, et eandem in bonis operibus fecerint voluntatem.

(*Ib. in Ps. 118, En. p. 1039, § 22.*) Quot vitia, tot retia; quot peccata, tot laquei; hereditarii jam te nexus tenebant. Venit ad laqueos Jesus, ut Adam solveret; venit liberare quod perierat.

(*Ib. Sermo primus, p. 974, § 4.*) Ita ergo et SANCTA ECCLESIA QUÆ IN PRIMORDIIS MUNDI DESPONSATA IN PARADISO, præfigurata in diluvio, annuntiata per Legem, vocata per prophetas, diu redemptionem hominum, Evangelii decorem, dilecti expectasset adventum, &c.

(*Ib. Expos. Evang. secundum Luc. L. 3, p. 1316, § 7.*) Prior Abraham qui ante Moysi legem, et ante populum Judæorum propria derelinquens, et cognoscens Deum, meruit fidei testimonium; *quia credidit Deo, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam*:—Vides igitur congregationes gentium, et sacrosanctum Ecclesiæ cœtum oraculo divino huic esse primò promissum. Et ideo is auctor generis debuit designari, qui instaurandæ Ecclesiæ sponsionem primus emeruit.

[5.] (*Ib. Tom. 2, p. 226, § 53, De Virg.*) Cum spes præcesserit, fides fundata fuerit, ordinatur caritas, Ecclesia copulatur.

(*Ib. De Inc. Dom. Sacram. C. v. § 34, p. 711.*) Fides ergo est Ecclesiæ fundamentum: non enim de carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est, quia portæ mortis ei non prævalebunt: sed confessio vicit infernum.

(*Ib. de obit. Theod. Orat. § 8, & 9, p. 1200.*) Quid enim est fides, nisi rerum earum, quæ sperantur, substantia? Ergo si substantia eorum quæ sperantur, fides est; quanto magis eorum quæ videntur? Bona

established, and charity is ordained. Faith is the foundation of the Church; for it was not of the flesh but of the faith of Peter, that it was said: 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it:' the confession of faith overcame hell." And again, saith he, "that faith is good, of which it is written, 'The just shall live by faith.' Our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, gave their testimony in this warfare of faith, and therefore they have left to us the inheritance of faith."

Jerome presents another view of the extent to which the word Church was properly used, in his commentary on St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians. [6] "The apostle addresses," saith he, "the Churches of Galatia, and thus it is to be observed that here only he writes not to the Church of a single city, but to the Churches of a whole province, and he calls them Churches, which afterwards he reproveth as depraved by error. From which we may learn, that the word Church has a twofold meaning; that which has neither spot nor wrinkle, and is truly the body of Christ, and that which is gathered in the name of Christ, but without full and perfect virtues."

From the great Augustin, however, on this, as on most other subjects, we may obtain the most distinct and accurate ideas. Thus in one place he saith, [7] "the Church was

fides, de qua scriptum est: Justus autem ex fide vivit.—§ 9. Quoniam in hac fidei militia testimonium consequuti sunt seniores nostri Abraham, Isaac et Jacob. Et ideo hereditatem nobis fidei reliquerunt.

[6] (*S. Hieron. Com. in Epist. ad Gal. C. 1, Tom. 4, L. ix. p. 124.*) Quod autem ait: Ecclesiis Galatiæ, et hoc notandum, quia hic tantum generaliter non ad unam Ecclesiam unius urbis, sed ad totius provinciæ scribat Ecclesias, et Ecclesias vocet, quas postea errore arguat depravatas. Ex quo noscendum dupliciter Ecclesiam posse dici, et eam quæ non habet maculam aut rugam, et vere corpus Christi sit, et eam quæ in Christi nomine absque plenis perfectisque virtutibus congregetur.

[7] (*S. Augustini, In Ps. 128, Enar. § 2. Tom. 4, p. 1083.*) Olim est Ecclesia: ex quo vocantur sancti, est Ecclesia in terra. Aliquando in solo Abel Ecclesia erat, et expugnatus est a fratre malo et perduto Cain.

in old time; for that in which the saints are called, is the Church in the earth. At one period the Church was in Abel alone, and he was assaulted by his reprobate brother Cain. Sometimes the Church was in Enoch alone, and he was translated from among the wicked. Sometimes the Church was only in the house of Noah, and he suffered from all those who perished in the deluge, and the ark alone floated on the waves, and came forth on dry ground. Sometimes the Church was in Abraham alone, and we know how much he suffered from the wicked. The Church was in his nephew Lot, and in his house in Sodom, and he suffered the iniquities and perverseness of the Sodomites, until God delivered him from the midst of them. The Church began to be among the people of Israel, and suffered from Pharaoh and the Egyptians. A number of holy men began to be in the Church herself, that is, in the people of Israel, and Moses and the other saints suffered from the wicked Jews. Therefore let not the Church be surprised, nor let any one who wishes to be a good member of the Church be surprised, when he hears his mother the Church saying to him, *Wonder not at this, my son, for they have often fought against me from my youth.*”

Again, saith the same distinguished father: [8] “For who

Aliquando in solo Enoch Ecclesia erat, et translatus est ab iniquis. Aliquando in sola domo Noë Ecclesia erat, et pertulit omnes qui diluvio perierunt, et sola arca natavit in fluctibus, et evasit ad siccum. Aliquando in solo Abraham Ecclesia erat, et quanta pertulit ab iniquis, novimus. In solo filio fratris ejus Lot, et in domo ejus in Sodomis Ecclesia erat, et pertulit Sodomorum iniquitates et perversitates, quo usque Deus eum de medio ipsorum liberavit. Cæpit esse et in populo Israel Ecclesia, pertulit Pharaonem et Ægyptios. Cæpit et in ipsa Ecclesia, id est, in populo Israel, numerus esse sanctorum; Moyses et ceteri sancti pertulerunt iniquos Judæos populum Israel.—Ideo ne miraretur modò Ecclesia, vel ne quisquam miraretur in Ecclesia, volens esse membrum bonum Ecclesiæ, audiat et ipsam Ecclesiam matrem suam dicentem sibi: *Noli mirari ad ista, fili; Sæpè expugnaverunt me a juventute mea.*

[8] (*Ib. in Psal. 50, p. 352, § 17.*) Quis enim sine illo (sc. Christo)

can be healed without Christ? Since before he was born of Mary, in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: and thus the dispensation in which he was to take our flesh upon him, was believed as future, just as we believe it as past. The *periods* are changed, *but not the faith.*”

Elsewhere Augustin saith: [9] “Consider that the whole Church is in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, yea the whole seed of Israel; not only that which is according to the flesh, but according to the faith. For the apostle, speaking to the gentiles, saith, If ye are of Christ, then are ye the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise. Therefore we are all blessed in the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Truly he blessed a certain tree, and made it an olive, as saith the apostle, namely, Those holy Patriarchs, from whom flourished the people of God; but from thence the proud branches were broken off, that is, the impious and blaspheming people of the Jews. Nevertheless the good and useful branches remained, for from them are the

sanari potuit? Quia et antequam de Maria nasceretur, in principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum: et ita a sanctis patribus dispensatio susceptæ carnis futura credebatur, sicut a nobis facta creditur. *TEMPORA VARIATA SUNT, NON FIDES.*” See, on the same subject, page 610 of same vol. § 2.

[9] (Ib. 1118. § 7. Enar. in Psal. 134.) In Abraham, et Isaac et Jacob totam Ecclesiam ejus cogitate, omne semen Israël cogitate; omnem autem semen Israel, non solum quod est ex carne, sed etiam quod est ex fide. Apostolus enim Gentibus loquebatur, quibus dicebat, Si ergo vos Christi, ergo semen Abrahæ estis, secundum promissionem hæredes. Benedicimur ergo omnes in Deo Abraham et Isaac et Jacob. Arborem quidem benedixit quamdam, eamque olivam creavit, sicut dixit Apostolus, ipsos Patriarchas sanctos, unde effloruit populus Dei; sed hæc arbor olivæ putata est, non amputata, et inde superbi rami fracta sunt: ipse est blasphemus et impius populus Judæorum. Manserunt tamen rami boni et utiles; nam inde apostoli, et cùm ibi rami utiles relictis essent, per Dei misericordiam insertus est et oleaster Gentium, &c. Hæc una arbor est pertinens ad Abraham et Isaac et Jacob, &c.

apostles. And along with them, by the mercy of God, the wild olive of the gentiles was inserted. Therefore this one tree belongs to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

In another place he uses this language: [10] “Understand the Church, brethren, as not being in those alone who began to be saints after the advent and birth of our Lord, but all who were holy belong to the same Church. For our father Abraham belongs also to us, although he lived before Christ was born of the virgin.”

Copious as these extracts from this admirable writer are, I cannot refuse myself the pleasure of adding one passage more, [11] “Certainly,” saith Augustin, “the saying is manifest that we must be in the Church within and without, and it is to be understood as respects the *heart*, and *not the body*; wherefore all who in heart are in the Church, are saved in the unity of the ark by the same water, by which all who *in heart are without*, whether they are *bodily without or not*, shall perish as the enemies of unity.”

A similar idea is well expressed by the celebrated Chrysostom, where he saith: [12] “The Church is nothing else but the house constructed of our souls.”

I pass on to another of the fathers, Prosper, of Aquitaine, who speaks of the Church as follows: [13] “This truly is to

[10] *Ib. Tom. 5, p. 11, F.*) Ecclesiam autem accipite, Fratres, non in his solis qui post Domini adventum et nativitatem esse cœperunt sancti, sed omnes quotquot fuerunt sancti, ad ipsam Ecclesiam pertinent. Non enim non ad nos pertinet pater Abraham, quia ille fuit antequam Christus nasceretur de Virgine, &c.

[11] (*Aug. de Baptismo contra Donat. L. v. § 39. Tom. 9. p. 108.*) Certè manifestum est, id quod dicitur, in Ecclesia intus et foris, in corde, non in corpore cogitandum; quandoquidem omnes, qui corde sunt intus, in aræ unitate per eandem aquam salvi fiunt, per quam omnes qui corde sunt foris, sive etiam corpore foris sint, sive non sint, tamquam unitatis adversarii moriuntur.

[12] (*S. Chrysostomi, Ad Ephes. C. 4, Hom. x. Tom. 4, p. 921.*) Nam nihil aliud est Ecclesia, quam ex nostris animabus constructa domus.

[13] (*S. Prosper. Expos. in Ps. 124, 5 & 6, p. 474, A*) Quod utique de tota Ecclesia intelligendum est, quæ est Jerusalem, in omnium compage

be understood of the whole Church, which is Jerusalem, one house in the connexion of all the saints, and one temple, and one city, whose construction, the Lord being the builder, rises from the beginning even to the end: without whose grace nothing is solid, nothing firm, but all is vain and sure to go to ruin."

Again, [14] "He speaks in these words to the Church, which having arisen from the beginning of the human race, was absent from no generation."

And elsewhere saith the same writer, [15] "When our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob inhabited the land of Canaan, they were strangers there, before they should receive it for a heritage. But God permitted no one to hurt them, so that the protection of God seemed to say, *Touch not mine anointed*, &c. We see, therefore, that they were already called *anointed*, although the holy anointing oil (Chrism) was not yet in use, because they lived in that faith, which was to be revealed in the last days. For from the beginning, the justification of all the saints was in Christ alone."

I shall next quote Leo the Great, (A. D. 450,) who is clear and express upon the same doctrine. [16] "Finally,"

sanctorum una domus, et unum templum, et una civitas, cujus extractio ab initio usque ad finem, Domino ædificante, consurgit: sine cujus gratia nihil est solidum, nihil firmum, sed vana omnia atque ruitura.

[14] (*Ib. Expos. in Ps. 118, p. 461, A.*) *Verbis Ecclesiæ loquitur, quæ ab initio humani generis exorta, nullis generationibus deficit.*

[15] (*Ib. Expos. in Ps. 104, p. 393 E. & 394 A.*) *Quando in terra Chanaan habitaverunt patres Abraham, et Isaac, et Jacob, peregrini erant illic, priùsqum illam acciperent in hereditatem. Non enim permisit Deus ut quisquam illis noceret; ita ut ipsa protectio Dei dicere videretur: Nolite tangere Christos meos, et cetera.—Qui ideo jam tunc Christi dicti sunt, cum adhuc in usu Chrisma non esset; quia et ipsi in ea vivebant fide, quæ erat novissimis temporibus revelanda. Ab initio enim omnibus sanctis non nisi in Christo, justificatio fuit.*

[16] (*S. Leonis Mag. De Vocat. om. gent. L. 11, c. x. p. 23.*) *Denique si ad ipsa mundi exordia recurramus, inveniemus omnium sanctorum qui*

saith he, “if we recur to the very beginning of the world, we shall find that the Spirit of God was the ruler of all the saints who were before the deluge, on which account they are called the sons of God: for so saith the apostle expressly: ‘As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.’”

[17] “That first people of God,” saith Leo, elsewhere, “was ruled by the Spirit of God, and, by the instruction of the Holy Spirit, abstained from the society and customs of the accursed and reprobate.”

And again saith our author, [18] “This faith, before the coming of the Seed concerning whom it was said to Abraham: ‘*In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,*’ was contained within the people of a single stock, the hope of our redemption flourishing among the true Israelites.”

But Gregory the Great is much more copious and express upon the subject. [19] “Truly,” saith this famous

diluvium præcesserunt, Dei Spiritum fuisse rectorem, propter quod et filii Dei nominati sunt. quoniam, sicut ait Apostolus; *Quicumque Spiritu Dei aguntur hi filii sunt Dei.*

[17.] (*Ib.* p. 24. c. xiii.) Regebatur ergo primus ille populus Dei Spiritu Dei, et a maledicti hac prædamnati populi societate ac moribus per eruditionem Sancti Spiritus abstinebat.

[18.] (*Ib.* p. 25. c. xiv.) Hæc autem fides, antequam veniret hoc semen, de quo Abrahæ dictum est: *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes terræ;* intra unius stirpis populum continebatur, vigente apud veros Israelitas spe redemptionis nostræ.

[19.] (*S. Gregorii Mag. In Ezech. L. 11. Hom. 111. Opp. Tom. 1. p. 1336, A.*) Et quidem ab Abel sanguine, passio jam coepit Ecclesiæ, et una est Ecclesia electorum præcedentium atque sequentium.

(*Ib. Hom. viii. p. 1391.*) Sciendum nobis est, quia una est Ecclesia in prædicatoribus Testamenti veteris ac novi.

(*Ib. in Evang. L. 1. Hom. xix. p. 1510.*) Dominus—qui habet vineam, universalem scilicet Ecclesiam, quæ ab Abel justo usque ad ultimum electum qui in fine mundi nasciturus est, quot sanctos protulit, quasi tot palmites misit.

(*Ib. Tom. 2. Ep. Jo. Episc. Constant. p. 743.*) Atque ut cuncta brevi cingulo locutionis astringam, Sancti ante Legem, Sancti sub Lege, Sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus Domini, in membris sunt Ecclesiæ constituti.

Pontiff, “the suffering of the Church began from the blood of Abel, and it is all one Church of the elect whether before or after.” “We must acknowledge that the Church is one, in the preachers of both the Old and New Testaments.” “The Lord—who has a vine, namely the Universal Church, which is from the righteous Abel to the last of the elect who shall be born in the end of the world,” &c.—“And that I may conclude all with a short speech, the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace, all filling up the body of the Lord, are constituted members of his Church.”

The same idea meets us in the language of a Collect in the old Romish Liturgy, [20] “Which Church, thou, (O Lord) hast founded in the patriarchs, hast prepared in the prophets, hast built up in the apostles.”

[21] “The house of the Lord,” saith Gregory, elsewhere, “is rightly understood to be his holy Church, which is said to have been seated in Shiloh. For Shiloh is the place where the ark of God remained. What, therefore, does Shiloh in this place signify, but the tradition of the Old Testament? For as it contains the ark of God, so doth the Old Testament exhibit the carnal letter externally, which holds spiritual knowledge shut up in its secret place. What is it, therefore, that the house of the Lord is said to be

[20.] (*Scholia in Lib. Sac. S. Greg. Papæ. opp. Tom. 3, p. 605.*) Quam (scilicet Ecclesiam) in Patriarchis fundasti, in Prophetis præparasti, in Apostolis condidisti.

[21.] (*S. Greg. Papæ Opp. Tom. 3. Pars Secunda, L. 1, in Prim. Reg. c. 1, p. 27. B.*) Domus Domini Sancta Ecclesia rectè intelligitur, quæ nimirum in Silo sita esse perhibetur. Silo autem locus est, in quo arca Dei mansisse perhibetur. Quid ergo aliud Silo isto in loco significat, quàm veteris Legis traditionem. Nam velut arcam Dei continet, dum carnalem litteram foris exhibet, quæ in suis secretis spiritalem scientiam clausam tenet. Quid est ergo, quod domus Domini in Silo sita esse perhibetur, nisi quia sancta Ecclesia in sacramento Scripturarum, velut in loco fundata, cognoscitur? Illuc Samuel adductus asseritur, illic oblatum; quia præter sanctam Ecclesiam locus non est, ubi merita virtutum crescant, et ad culmen perfectionis veniant.

placed in Shiloh, unless that the holy Church is known in the sacraments of the Scriptures, as in its established place? Thither Samuel is related to have been brought up, and there offered, because there is no place besides the holy Church, where the merits of the virtues grow, and come to the height of perfection."

And again, saith the same author: [22] "Let us place before our eyes the whole human race, from the beginning of the world, even to the end, namely, the whole Church, as being one spouse, which received her pledges in a spiritual gift by the law; but nevertheless sought the presence of her bridegroom, saying: *Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth.* For here the holy Church, sighing for the coming of the Mediator, God and Man, for the coming of her redemption, addresses her prayer to the Father, that he would send the Son, and enlighten her with his presence; that he might speak to her not only by the prophets, but with his own mouth."

With all this corresponds the doctrine of Bernard, in the ninth century, who says, [23] that "The body of Christ is the universal Church as well of the Old as of the New Testament."

Lastly, let me close our patristical evidence with the sentence of Thomas Aquinas, to prove the continuity of the idea. [24] "The holy fathers," saith this master of school-

[22] (*Ib. super Cantica Cant. Expos. c. 1, p. 402.*) Ponamus ante oculos omne genus humanum ab exordio mundi usque ad finem mundi, totam videlicet Ecclesiam, unam esse sponsam quæ arrhas spirituali dono per Legem perceperat: sed tamen sponsi sui præsentiam quærebat, quæ dicit: *Osculetur me osculo oris sui.* Suspirans enim sancta Ecclesia pro adventu Mediatoris Dei et hominum, pro adventu Redemptionis sui, ad Patrem orationem facit, ut filium dirigat, et sua illam præsentia illustret; ut eidem Ecclesiæ non jam prophetarum, sed suo ore allocutionem, faciat.

[23] (*S. Bernardi, De nat. et dig. Amor. Div. c. 10, p. 275, D.*) Corpus Christi universa est Ecclesia tam veteris quam novi Testamenti.

[24] (*S. Thomæ Aquin. Summa Tot. Theol. P. 3, Q. 8. Art. 3. Con. p. 22.*) Ad tertium dicendum, quod sancti Patres non insistebant sacramentis

divinity, “did not regard the sacraments of the Law as being things, so much as the images and shadows of future things. But the motive which regards the image, considered as an image, is the same with the motive which regards the thing. Consequently the ancient fathers, in observing the legal sacraments, were united to Christ by the same faith and love, which unite ourselves to him. And, therefore, they belonged to the same body of the Church to which we belong.”

The foregoing authorities, from Irenæus to Thomas Aquinas, are more than sufficient to sustain the doctrine, which I shall further enforce by the words of our Seventh Article.

“The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.”

Let us next hear the venerable Hooker, as the best representative of the sense of the Church before the end of the sixteenth century.* “*This visible Church,*” saith he, “in like sort *is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end.* Which company being divided into two moities, the one before, the other since the coming of Christ; that part, which since the coming of Christ partly hath embraced and partly shall hereafter embrace the Christian religion, we term as by a more proper name, the Church

legalibus tanquam quibusdam rebus, sed sicut imaginibus et umbris futurorum. Idem autem est motus in imaginem, in quantum est imago, et in rem.—Et ideo antiqui Patres servando legalia sacramenta, ferebantur in Christum per fidem et dilectionem eandem, qua et nos in ipsum ferimur, Et ita Patres antiqui pertinebant ad idem corpus Ecclesie ad quod nos pertinemus.

* Ecc. Pol. B. 3, Ch. I. § 3, vol. I, p. 427, Keble's ed. See, also, Barrow on the Unity of the Church. (Works, vol. VI., p. 497.)

of Christ." Here the idea is clearly and strongly expressed, *two moities, but ONE CHURCH.*

And lastly, Archbishop Potter, in his well known and very elaborate Discourse of Church Government, (Ch. I. p. 2,) plainly saith, that the "Jewish and Christian Churches, though they differ in their outward polity, are the *same in substance*: the Jews believed in Christ to come, and *drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them*; and the Christians are saved by Christ already come; but both Jews and Christians are members of the *same Church of Christ*. Whence St. Paul compares the Church to a tree, in which there are two sorts of branches, one natural, which are the Jews; the other ingrafted, which are the Christian converts from Gentilism; but *both of them belong to the same stock.*"

The inference from the whole, seems to me undeniable. If the Church, in its *essential* character, existed *before* the appointment of the Aaronic priesthood, then that priesthood could not be of the *essence*, but only of the *order* of the Church. The abandonment of that order, on a light pretext, would indeed be a grievous sin, and would surely bring down its appropriate punishment. Still it would not, of itself, destroy the being of the Church, nor utterly prevent the manifestations of the divine mercy, as we see in the case of Israel. In like manner, since the Church existed so long *before* the appointment of the apostles, their ministry also was not of the *essence* but only of the *order* of the Church. And although a wilful rebellion against their authority, like that of Korah and his company against Aaron, would probably have involved the utter destruction of the transgressors, yet the case stands on very different ground in the later ages of the Church's history; when the despotism and corruption of Rome rendered a reformation necessary, and the awful abuses of priestly power created a natural prejudice against the whole hierarchy, which made it easy for the most conscientious judgment to be led astray.

Under such circumstances, the unnecessary abandonment of the apostolic ministry, although still a sin, would be greatly mitigated in the judgment of reason as well as charity; and the indulgent allowance of our merciful Redeemer might well be supposed to pardon the deviation, and still bestow his blessing, as he did in the far less excusable case of Israel, desiring to cast off the government of Samuel that they might have a king. And thus we are led to the precise conclusion of our Church, which freely allows the name and character of Churches to our non-episcopal brethren, while she laments their want of the apostolic ministry as a grievous defect, and takes care to secure its perpetuity within her own pale.

I am almost ashamed, beloved brethren, to labour so plain and hitherto unquestioned a point in our system of theology. But the favour which has been shown of late to the contrary doctrine, and the very serious practical consequences which, in my humble judgment, are likely to result, seem to have laid this necessity upon me. In proof both of the contrariety and its consequences, I cannot appeal to a more unexceptionable testimony than the new treatise of Mr. Palmer on the Church; a work of very extraordinary merit for method, ingenuity, and erudition; and therefore one to which I should willingly bow, in deferential submission, if it were possible for me to reconcile his argument with the standard of divine truth, or the rule of Christian responsibility. It will require some time and attention to estimate the force of the objections which I am bound to advance, but not more, I trust, than their importance will be found to deserve.

The work of this distinguished author sets out with a proposition which cannot be controverted, namely, that the Church of Christ, being his body, salvation is only promised to those who belong to it. He proves satisfactorily, from their own standards, that this solemn truth has been pro-

fessed not only by the primitive writers, but by all denominations of Christians since the Reformation; and therefore, whatever secret method may be reserved in the wisdom of God for those who have never heard the gospel, it is universally admitted, that, "all men to whom the gospel is preached must be members of this Church, *when sufficiently proposed to them*, on pain of being excluded from the favour of God for ever."

The *essential* characteristics of this Church of Christ, are next laid down. Its visibility, its unity in communion, its unity in faith, the sins of heresy and schism, and the effects of excommunication, are all ably and learnedly treated. But I have no intention of reviewing each specific link in the chain of his argument. I pass on, therefore, to the conclusions which seem to me so hostile to correct principle.

The eighth chapter of the first part is devoted to the proposition, that the *apostolical succession of episcopal ordinations to the ministry is essential to the Church*. The twelfth chapter and fourth section advocates the necessary result, that the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zuinglians "*could not be considered as Churches of Christ, properly speaking; though they might have been called so in a general and popular way, as being internally united to the Church.*" And the thirteenth chapter, treating the position of the English Dissenters, affirms that "*they are no part of the Church of Christ.*" Many subordinate arguments are urged for this conclusion, but the leading one is derived from the alleged principle, "that separation from a Christian Church is incapable of excuse, that no reason can possibly justify it, and that *the society so formed by such an act of separation is entirely cut off from Christian unity and from the true Church of Christ.*" (p. 402.) The same arguments are applied with the same result (p. 576-7) to the Presbyterians of Scotland.

On the other hand, the Church of Rome is maintained to

be a branch of the true Church of Christ, in common with every other Church which can trace its descent from the apostles, and retains the original Christian creeds, &c. But it is ingeniously insisted that in England, the Romanists themselves are in the position of dissenters and schismatics, because they separated from the Reformed Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. (p. 305.) And inasmuch as "schismatics do not cease to be so by a mere change of country, therefore the papists who went from England to establish colonies in the United States of North America, were schismatics when they arrived there; and always remaining separated from that branch of the Catholic apostolic Church which was established there, they only perpetuated their schism. In fine," continues our author, "when America received bishops from our Churches, the schismatics constituted a rival episcopacy, and so remain to this day, separated from the true Church."

It is very obvious that on these principles, the Church of England would seem to be entirely abandoned to the charge which the Romanists have always made their chief point of accusation, namely, that the Reformers committed a schism by separating from what is acknowledged to be a true and apostolic branch of the Church universal, and thereby cut themselves off from the Church of Christ. But from this consequence our author thinks his theory perfectly protected, by denying that the Church of England separated herself from the Church of Rome in the act of reformation, and by charging the separation upon Rome, as well through the sentence of excommunication fulminated against Elizabeth and her adherents, as through her formally withdrawing the English Romanists from their union with the established Church, and setting up a rival priesthood, in the eleventh year of that sovereign's reign.

The practical working of these principles next demands our attention, as stated in our author's own words,

“When Roman Churches,” saith he, (p. 304,) “were founded in South America, Canada, the Philippines, &c., by the Europeans who first colonized or subdued those countries, such Churches are altogether free from schism, and are invested with the original rights of Catholic Churches, so that no one has a right to establish rival communities among them, with a view to oppose their authority or draw proselytes from them. If in Canada, the English community united to our Catholic Churches, have bishops and priests, it is only as a matter of necessity, because the Church there refuses them communion, and they are properly for the English only. *The arrangement must be considered only provisional in a certain measure, and not designed to interfere with the prior claims of the Roman Churches there, within their proper districts.* The same may be observed of our clergy on the continent of Europe.”

Again, in answer to the objection that upon his principles, “it must be unlawful for any one to separate himself from the Church of Rome, and become a Protestant in France, Germany, &c.” our author replies: “It is always right to embrace the *truth*, and if, in consequence of maintaining the truth, any one should be excommunicated by those who are misled by the authority of their Church, erroneously supposed infallible, he is not in schism, and may lawfully consort with those *who are not themselves in schism*, and by whom the truth is maintained. But he OUGHT NOT TO FORSAKE HIS CHURCH VOLUNTARILY, but rather remain in its communion, and endeavour with prudence and humility to edify his brethren.” (p. 316.)

In answer to the further objection, that upon his principles “it is unlawful to send missionaries among the Roman Churches, to establish any rival worship, seek for converts among them, &c.,—our author replies, (p. 317,) “The rule of fraternal charity encourages different parts of the Church, to aid, if possible, in the dissemination of perfect

Christianity among all their brethren. Therefore whatever can be done by writings and conferences, managed without acerbity, and *without intrusion on the appointed sphere of others*, may be lawfully resorted to. BUT IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE TRUE PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLIC UNITY, FOR ANY BRANCH OF THE CHURCH TO SEND MISSIONARIES TO RAISE A RIVAL WORSHIP, AND SEEK FOR CONVERTS IN THE BOSOM OF ANOTHER."

One citation more seems necessary to a full view of Mr. Palmer's rule of Christian duty with respect to Rome. He states very fairly the objection, that, according to his principles, since "it is not necessary to institute an examination into particular doctrines, but we are to be guided in a great measure by the Church; it follows, that if an Englishman were resident in France or Spain, he ought to join in communion with the Roman Churches there; and in order to do so, ought to subscribe the creed of Pius IV." &c. To this our author answers, that "the LAW OF UNITY REQUIRES THAT HE SHOULD BE WILLING TO COMMUNICATE WITH THOSE CHURCHES; but he cannot lawfully subscribe or profess the creed of Pius IV., for the following reasons. First, this creed is proposed to him as a *heretic*. It is designed to exact from him *a condemnation of his own Church*, and this he could not pronounce with truth. Secondly, the Roman Church, in exacting the profession of this creed, evidently expects an *explicit* profession, *after examination*, for otherwise she would only have required a *general* adhesion to all her doctrines. But this cannot be made consistently with truth, for several of the doctrines of this creed are disputed and erroneous," &c. Now Mr. Palmer assigns no other reason than these two, why an Englishman proposing to commune with the Church of Rome, should refuse to subscribe the creed of Pius IV. If, therefore, he were told, that as his own Church was not mentioned in that formulary, he was under no obligation to apply the

anathema to her, the first argument would lose its force; and if he were assured that he was not required to make any examination, but that a *general adhesion* to the doctrines of that creed would perfectly satisfy the Roman priesthood, the second argument would be set aside with equal facility. But suppose, what undoubtedly would be the fact, in a majority of instances, that the priest should receive the English Protestant to communion in the most accommodating spirit, and, for the sake of securing a future proselyte, or, at least, of weakening the English Church by the appearance of disaffection, should consent to waive the subscription of the creed of Pope Pius IV. altogether. In such a case Mr. Palmer's LAW OF UNITY REQUIRES THAT THE ENGLISH PROTESTANT SHOULD BE WILLING TO COMMUNE WITH THE ROMAN CHURCHES, in Italy, Spain, or any other country where they are *free from schism*. Our author, therefore, would condemn the communing with Rome in England. He would also condemn the communing with her in the United States, as they were constituted before the purchase of Louisiana. But his LAW OF UNITY REQUIRES our willingness to commune with Rome, (if she will excuse our subscribing to the creed of Pope Pius IV.) in every part of the world where that Church has had a previous and regular possession. And therefore we are bound to exhibit this willingness, in all those states of the Union which have been formed out of the old province of Louisiana, as purchased from the French under the administration of Jefferson: in the Floridas, in the Canadas, in the Philippine Islands, in South America, in many parts of the East Indies, throughout the continent of Europe in general, in a word, *wherever Rome has had a prior peaceable possession*: for the question of communion with Rome, according to this system, is made to depend, not, as hitherto, upon her reforming her dangerous and unchristian doctrines, but on the ground of a legal right, to be determined by GEOGRA-

PHICAL LINES AND DATES OF SETTLEMENT! And this is the principle which, in the opinion of some of our beloved and respected brethren, deserves to be received amongst us with the most absolute confidence and even fervent admiration!

This astounding law of unity, however, is far from including the whole practical results of Mr. Palmer's ecclesiastical polity; since he maintains that *no one has a right to establish rival communities*, where the Church of Rome has acquired a quiet prior possession. RIVAL COMMUNITIES! not CHURCHES, because the Author's principles oblige him to consider these communities as *schismatics*, and therefore "*separated from the true Church.*" Hence he finds himself obliged to devise an excuse for the Church of England in Canada, &c. by informing us that "*the arrangement is only provisional in a certain measure, and not designed to interfere with the prior claims of the Roman Churches there, within their proper districts.*" It is perfectly obvious that our own branch of the Church stands in precisely the same attitude throughout the whole valley of the Mississippi. And therefore the information here given to us is a matter of very serious importance, and *quite unexpected*, I may safely say, either by the Church of England, or by ourselves.

The British Parliament will learn from this new school of theology, that in legislating for the establishment and maintenance of bishops and Churches throughout the Canadas, &c., they have only been making a *provisional arrangement*; and the *proviso* is, that there shall be *no interference* with the prior claims of the Roman Churches, within their *proper districts*. But it unfortunately happens that the *whole* of these countries are the *proper districts* covered by the prior claims of the Church of Rome. And I am quite at a loss to conceive how the Parliament of England could '*interfere*' with these prior claims more effectually, than by sending their bishops, and erecting Cathedrals, and sustain-

ing missionaries in every city, and throughout the whole land, for the express purpose of proclaiming the Gospel of Christ in its Protestant aspect as opposed to the Church of Rome. It is indeed said, in order to reconcile this monstrous incongruity, that the arrangement was properly intended for the *English only*, and even *of necessity*, because the Roman Churches refused them communion. But this statement, to my mind, is totally incomprehensible. For surely it must be manifest to any ordinary understanding, that those Roman Churches would have rejoiced to extend their communion to every Englishman in Canada, on the easiest possible terms, sooner than have an English establishment planted amongst them. The difficulty was altogether of another character. The British nation had not *then* been asked to believe, that the LAW OF UNITY *required* an English Protestant, resident in a popish country, to desire communion with the Church of Rome. For want of proper knowledge, therefore, according to Mr. Palmer's argument, the Parliament of England committed a manifold absurdity. They passed laws for a '*provisional*' arrangement, but quite forgot the *Proviso!* They did the very thing which most directly interfered with the '*prior rights*' of the Roman Churches, without intending to interfere with them at all! They established bishops, missionaries, and Churches, in the *proper districts* of the Roman Churches, merely on the principle of *necessity*, because the Romish priests *refused* to give the communion to the resident English; without the slightest evidence either of the *refusal* or of the *necessity!* For certain it is, that the Parliament itself has totally omitted the reasons which Mr. Palmer has ventured to assign, as their *sole justification*, as if they were profoundly ignorant of the LAW OF UNITY, which would have saved them all the expense and trouble of their provincial establishments. But can any one seriously doubt, that in those days, they would probably have thought

that man unworthy of the name of an English Protestant, who should have talked of a LAW OF UNITY, *requiring* him to desire communion at the hands of Rome?

If the Parliament of England, however, according to Mr. Palmer's argument, was thus far astray, it is perfectly obvious that the Church of England was equally blameworthy. Her "Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," have been violating the *law of unity*, without the least idea of their transgression, making vast efforts, and expending immense sums, in what they conceived to be a work of the highest Christian duty, but what—according to this new System of Theology—proves to be nothing better than the establishment of schism. Her bishops in the provinces where the Church of Rome had prior peaceable possession, have been *committing sin*, in the very labours and sacrifices which they ignorantly supposed to be acceptable. They were only thinking of reverencing the holy claims of divine truth, when they should have been paying due regard to the *prior rights* of Romanism. They were only striving to gather men into a pure communion, when they should have sent them first, in obedience to the LAW OF UNITY, to ask admission to the Communion of Rome. They were acting upon the old doctrine, that theological truth in England must be theological truth every where, when they should have known the *legal consequence* of prior possession, by which the same Roman Communion which it was a duty to *denounce* at home, it was equally a duty to *seek* abroad, since the grace of the sacrament depended on the district in which it was administered, and therefore the *wrong*, in England, became the *right*, in Canada!

No wonder, truly, that our own Church has gotten herself involved in the same difficulty, according to the maxims of this novel doctrine. We have organized dioceses, appointed bishops, sent missionaries, and erected a college, in

the very midst of those States, in which the Church of Rome had peaceable prior possession, under the same profound ignorance of Mr. Palmer's ecclesiastical system. He tells us that no Romanist ought '*voluntarily to leave his Church,*' and, therefore, it must be wrong in us to offer arguments intended to convert them. He further lays it down in the most positive terms, that it is "*inconsistent with the true principles of Catholic unity for any branch of the Church to send missionaries, to raise a rival worship and seek for converts in the bosom of another.*" So that we, too, are openly and directly implicated in this species of transgression; our supposed works of piety become sin, our favourite good is all converted into evil; and where we hoped, that through the blessing of the Almighty, we had planted true Churches of Christ, in the midst of Roman corruption, we are to discover that we have only organized *schismatical COMMUNITIES* which are altogether *separated from the true Church* of Christ. Nor is even this the whole of the mischief which we have effected. For our author assures us, as if it were an undoubted Canon of ecclesiastical polity, that '*schismatics do not cease to be so by a mere change of country,*' and hence, the same rule which so ingeniously proves the Roman schismatics of England to be still schismatics in the United States, has a far more extensive and fatal influence upon the missionary work of Protestants. We not only plant schismatical '*communities*' in the first instance, but all who belong to those *communities* continue schismatics wherever they may go, and from generation to generation! And as, in the present condition of the world, the numbers and superior advantages of Rome have necessarily given her the priority throughout the whole missionary field, it is easy to see that Mr. Palmer's system, while it *promises* to have a useful influence against the *Roman schism* in England and the United States, must certainly, in almost the whole world besides, annihilate our own claims completely.

But I am exceedingly sorry to say, that our learned and ingenious author's idea on the subject of this *Roman schism*, (with which some of my beloved and respected brethren have been so much pleased, as to re-iterate it to the exclusion of much safer arguments,) appears to my mind nothing better than a betrayal of the whole cause of the Reformation. Very far, indeed, should I be from suspecting Mr. Palmer or his friends of the slightest consciousness of such a result. I have no doubt that they have honestly persuaded themselves to confide in their doctrine, and that many others are induced to confide in it, as the best mode of defending the reformers of our mother Church. But just as little do I doubt the perilous insufficiency of their defence, and the imminent probability that a consistent adoption of their entire system would eventually bring us all under the **LAW OF UNITY**, which, practically considered, would prove to be only a more agreeable synonym for the **LAW OF ROME**.

I should be most reluctant to make so serious an assertion as this, if I did not believe that I could prove its truth. Let me, then, proceed to show my reasons, and then, beloved brethren, if you think them insufficient, I shall submit to be condemned.

Our author states, very fully, the objections which the Romanist makes against the English reformation: that it was effected by Henry VIII. in revenge for the refusal of the Pope to sanction his marriage with Anna Boleyn: that it was carried by false arguments, that the pope's jurisdiction having existed since the foundation of Christianity in England, it was schismatical to remove it, and that the Church of England then separated herself from the Catholic Church, and from Christian unity.

Now the only answer which Mr. Palmer gives to the latter allegation, consists of an absolute and unqualified denial. After a considerable display of such evidence as he

thinks sufficient, he concludes as follows: "It is evident then, that the whole separation or schism was originated and effected by the Roman Pontiffs and their adherents, not by the Churches among us. I repeat it," he continues, "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, thus bearing what is, as Bossuet well observes, the invariable mark of schism and heresy in every age; Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a nobis recesserunt." (Vol. I. p. 458.)

These are the emphatical words of our author, and the capitals are also his own. The following inference appears to my mind to be the fair and inevitable result.

If it be true that the Church of England has never separated from the Church of Rome, and that the separation was the work of Rome alone, it seems manifest, that so far as the Church of England was concerned, she would have *continued in communion with Rome still, and of course would renew that communion now, if Rome would consent*, as an act of Christian duty, on the same principle already recommended by our author, namely, the *law of unity*.

Now this, to me, is a novel and alarming proposition, even when it concerns only a private member of our communion: much more when it is asserted of the whole Church. For myself, I reject it with all my heart, as totally and positively erroneous. Mr. Palmer's evidence is utterly insufficient to establish it, because it consists of nothing beyond the words of Henry VIII., and one of his bishops, Tunstall. But it is notorious that the English reformation was not the work of that reign. Henry lived and died a complete Romanist in almost every thing, save the destruction of the papal supremacy and the spoliation of the monasteries. His was the task of pulling down the ramparts which guarded the citadel of superstition. The cleansing and purifying the citadel itself, was reserved for

a very different instrumentality, namely, that of the bishops under the reign of his son, Edward VI., an acknowledged prodigy of youthful piety and wisdom. As in the instance of the famous temple of Jerusalem, David was allowed to prepare the materials, but because he had been 'a man of wars' the building of the sacred edifice was committed to his successor Solomon, even so was it in the reformation of the English Church, to be the resting place of the original sanctuary. Henry's office was to prepare the ground and the materials; it was Edward's part to have the fabric put together. Nor was the work fully accomplished until the reign of Elizabeth, when the thirty-nine Articles and the Homilies completed the whole design, in substantial accordance with the primitive pattern, under the paramount authority of the Word of God.

In distinct contrariety, therefore, to Mr. Palmer's emphatic assertion, I must maintain that the Church of England *did* separate from the Church of Rome by the act of reformation: that although that separation was the work of the Church of England, yet the sin and the responsibility rested wholly upon the Church of Rome: that while the separation was indeed consummated in defiance of the laws of the papal system, it was nevertheless in conformity to the higher laws of the primitive Church universal, and in strict accordance with the divine law of unity declared by our Lord himself; and that, by necessary consequence, no act of the Church of Rome could bring our mother Church or ourselves into communion with her, *unless the corruptions of her unchristian doctrines were first done away*, and no member of our Churches could seek to hold communion with her, until she is reformed, *without a virtual condemning of our own reformation*.

The highest evidence of the judgment of our mother Church upon these points, may be found in the celebrated 'Apology' of Bishop Jewel. And the character of this

document is set forth with equal truth and ability in the preface, published in the third volume of 'The Standard Works,' a few years ago; which, (together with the notes,) are from the gifted pen of the present Bishop of the diocese of Maryland. Some extracts from this admirable preface may be advisable, in order to justify the importance which I cannot but attribute to the "Apology," as furnishing conclusive testimony upon the subject in question.

"Few works," saith the learned author of this Preface, "possess stronger claims to regard than that which is now introduced to the American public." (sc. Bishop Jewel's Apology for the Church of England.) "Apart from its intrinsic merits, it comes down to us from the golden age of the reformation, with the stamp of national sanction at the time of its publication, and recommended by the undivided suffrages of the learned and pious of every intervening age. It is the production of an individual, it is true; but that individual confessedly pre-eminent for learning and eloquence in a learned age, and expressing, with mature deliberation, the avowed sense of all his brethren, under their revision, and with their unqualified approbation. It may, therefore, justly pretend to all the consideration due to the combined wisdom, learning, and piety of the Church of England in one of its brightest periods—the age of the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer." Elsewhere the preface states that the work was published as "set forth by Queen Elizabeth's authority," and appealed to as "an authentic statement of the principles of the Church of England, offered to Christendom by that Church as a hostage for its adherence to the common faith." In further proof of its standard excellence, it is quoted as *authority*, in the 30th canon of the English Church.

Here, then, we have a witness, in every way unexceptionable: living at the time, appointed for the purpose, the accredited representative of the whole Church of England;

and his work acknowledged and approved by the Church, the sovereign, and the nation. I shall proceed to quote his testimony, therefore, as absolute and final upon the question, Whether, in the act of reformation, the Church of England proclaimed herself to have separated from the Church of Rome, and for what cause?

In the 13th chapter of this masterly work, under the head of the "Grounds of the Reformation," (Am. ed. p. 229,) we read as follows:

"Verily, we for our parts, as we have said, have done nothing in altering religion, upon either rashness, or arrogancy: nor nothing, but with good leisure, and great consideration. Neither had we ever intended to do it, except both the manifest and most assured *Will of God*, opened to us in his *Holy Scriptures*, and the regard of our own salvation, had even constrained us thereunto. For *though we have departed from that Church which these men call Catholic*, and by that means get us envy amongst them that want skill to judge; yet is this enough for us—and it ought to be enough for every wise and good man, and one that maketh account of everlasting life—that we *have gone from that Church* which hath power to err; which CHRIST, who cannot err, told, so long before, that it should err; and which we ourselves did evidently see with our eyes to have gone from the old *holy fathers*, and from *the apostles*, and from CHRIST himself, and from the *primitive and Catholic Church of God*: and we are come, as near as we possibly could, to the Church of the apostles and of the old Catholic bishops and fathers—which Church, we know, was sound and perfect, and as Tertullian termeth it, 'a pure virgin,' spotted as then with no idolatry, nor with any foul and shameful fault.

Again, (p. 186) our author, in the name of the Church of England, saith, "Indeed we *have renounced that Church*, wherein we could neither have the word of GOD sincerely

taught, nor the sacraments rightly administered, nor the name of God duly called upon: which Church also themselves confess to be faulty in many points; and wherein was nothing able to stay any wise man, or one that hath consideration of his own safety. To conclude, we *have forsaken the Church as it is now*, not as it was in old times past; and *have so gone from it*, as Daniel went out of the lion's den, and the three children out of the furnace: and to say the truth, we have been cast out by these men (being cursed of them, as they use to say, with book, bell, and candle) rather than have gone away from them of ourselves. And we are come to that Church, wherein they themselves cannot deny, (if they will say truly, and as they think in their own conscience,) but all things be governed purely and reverently, and, as much as we possibly could, very near to the order used in old times. Let them compare our Church and theirs together, and they shall see, that themselves *have most shamefully gone from the apostles*, and we *most justly have gone from them.*"

Again, (p. 254) "We so have *gotten ourselves away from that Church* which they had made a den of thieves, and wherein nothing was in good frame, or once like to the Church of God, even as Lot in times past got him out of Sodom, or Abraham out of Chaldea, not upon a desire of contention, but by the warning of God himself: and we have searched out of the Holy Bible, which we are sure cannot deceive us, one sure form of religion; and have returned again unto the *primitive Church* of the ancient fathers and apostles."

Once more, our Author uses, towards the close of his defence, (p. 255) the following just and pertinent language. "Neither do we eschew *concord* and *peace*. But to have peace with man, we may not be at war with God. 'The name of *peace* is a sweet and pleasant thing,' saith Hilary; 'but yet beware,' saith he; '*peace* is one thing, and *bondage*

is another.’ For if it should be so, as they seek to have it, that CHRIST should be commanded to keep silence, that the truth of the Gospel should be betrayed, that horrible errors should be cloaked, that Christian men’s eyes should be bleared, and that they might be suffered to conspire openly against GOD, this were not a *peace*, but a most ungodly covenant of servitude. ‘There is a peace,’ said Nazianzen, ‘that is unprofitable: there is a discord that is profitable.’ For we must conditionally desire peace, so far as is lawful before GOD and so far as we may conveniently. For otherwise CHRIST himself brought not peace into the world, but a sword. Wherefore, if the Pope will have us to be reconciled unto him, his duty is first to be reconciled to God.”

Now with this plain, positive and re-iterated evidence before my eyes, I must acknowledge myself totally unable to admit the assertion of Mr. Palmer, where he saith, (vol. 1, p. 445,) “It is obvious that the *sole intention*” (sc. of the Reformation,) “was to suppress the novel and usurped *jurisdiction* of the *Roman bishop*, not to separate from his *communion* or from that of the Western Churches.” I willingly grant, indeed, that Henry VIII. may have adopted this limited notion of the matter at the beginning; but we should deal most unfairly by the real Reformers of our mother Church, in judging their work by his intentions. Looking at the whole as it stood after the reign of the persecuting Mary, when the liturgy was revised, the 39 Articles adopted, the apology of Bishop Jewel put forth as the open and authoritative statement of the Church of England—for this is the form in which it has properly descended to our day—there was, and there could have been no possible communion between that Church and the Church of Rome. It is very true, as Mr. Palmer remarks, that our mother Church published no anathemas against her adversary. Surely, however, this affords no proof of her desire of communion, since, (thank God!) she pronounced no curses against any.

That awful assumption she left to the Pope and his Council of Trent, where no less than one hundred and twenty-six of these terrible maledictions were solemnly recorded; in agreement, truly, with abundance of ancient precedents, but in total abandonment of the higher rule of scripture, 'BLESS AND CURSE NOT,' which our mother Church most wisely resolved to follow. Nor did the *primitive Church* set any other example, since it is certain that she pronounced no anathemas except when men presumed to deny the very foundations of the Christian faith, in those articles which concerned the doctrine of the blessed Trinity and the Person of our Lord and Saviour.*

* It is worthy of observation, however, that our learned author himself furnishes an unanswerable argument against his view of this important question; for in the account he gives of the Jansenists of Holland, he tells us (vol. 1. p. 339) that "they alone seem to be out of the Communion of the Roman Church, but they exhibit every wish to be connected with it, and profess themselves some of its best members They always pretend to be united with the Roman Church," saith he on the next page, "duly informing the Pontiff of their elections, &c., in a most fraternal manner, and occasionally addressing epistles to him; to all which they receive no other reply than bulls of excommunication, deposition, censure, &c., which they do not seem much to regard." On page 320 he clearly proves that Jansenism is held by the Roman Church to be a damnable heresy, and yet saith he, "notwithstanding all this, it is a matter of absolute certainty that this very Jansenist heresy has, in opposition to all these anathemas and condemnations, and in spite of the persecution of the temporal powers, continued to exist for nearly two hundred years, and what is more, that it has existed all along in the very heart of the Church of Rome itself."

Now here is a fair example of a case where men, professing to be reformers in principle, and really much purer in their doctrines than the Roman Church, refuse to be cast off in spite of all that she can say and do to the contrary. Of such as these it is consistent to say that they never separated from the Church of Rome, since even in Holland, where they are actually out of her communion, they do every thing in their power to show that they desire to maintain a fraternal intercourse. But when has the Church of England shown this desire? What fraternal intercourse has she attempted? What indication, however slight, has ever escaped her to prove Mr. Palmer's assertion that she never intended

In this point, therefore, as I apprehend, lies the incurable vice of the defence, learned, elaborate, and ingenious as it otherwise is, which Mr. Palmer sets forth in behalf of the British Reformation. For on his principles of *Catholic unity* the question immediately arises, Why talk of a Reformation at all? If the only difficulty, as he maintains, consisted in the usurped jurisdiction of the Pope, why did not our mother Church stop at that point, with Henry VIII? Why did her Reformers attack every other corruption, the idolatrous worship of the Virgin and the saints, of relics, images, crosses; the priestly tribunal of auricular confession, absolution, and penance; works of supererogation, pardons and indulgences; clerical celibacy, with its attendant licentiousness; the doctrine of the sacraments, with their perilous principle of grace *ex opere operato*; the communion in one kind, with its correlative impieties in the Sacrament of the altar; and, above all, that most dangerous notion of reliance on the merit of man's works, and his own inherent righteousness, which had superseded the Scriptural and primitive justification by faith? Are we supposed to have forgotten that Henry VIII. made no difficulty about any of these grave subjects, on which our Articles are so clear and definite?* Has Mr. Palmer

to leave the *communion* of the pope? Surely it is wonderful that this learned writer should not have been convinced of the contrast, thus unconsciously recorded by his own pen, between those Jansenist reformers who are determined to cling to Rome, and those English reformers who at once resolved, in the words of Jewel, to "renounce" her. Whenever he finds our Mother Church, or our own, acting like the Jansenist Church of Holland, *duly informing the pontiff of their elections, &c. in a most fraternal manner, and occasionally addressing epistles to him, or doing any thing else which comes within the established rules for the communion of churches*, it will be time enough for him to proclaim his hypothesis as a matter of fact. But until then, I cannot but consider it a most unfounded and unjust imputation.

* I design to take up Mr. Palmer's notions of the Reformation effected by Henry VIII. in my next letter.

himself forgotten that the favourite test questions which the Romanists, in the days of Queen Mary, used in order to convict the Reformers of heresy, turned on these points, and chiefly on the gross corruption of *Transubstantiation*? And can he really persuade himself, that those holy men who abjured the tenets of Romanism in the fires of Smithfield and Oxford itself, were all the time disposed to COMMUNE WITH ROME, without regard to any of her most false and dangerous doctrines, if only the usurped jurisdiction of the Pope over the Church of England were done away?

Utterly erroneous, therefore,—utterly ineffectual, do I consider the mode of defending the Reformation which has come amongst us in this novel guise; although it be, indeed, worked up into a specious, and, in some respects, a highly imposing system. Its central principle, the duty of ecclesiastical unity, and the destructive effects of schism, are stated in such a manner, as to be easily turned to the service of Rome and against the Church of England. For it is impossible to deny, that the whole system of Popery had gained the ascendancy in England for centuries before the Reformation, and that all the prelates of the Church were bound to the Pope by the most solemn vows of ecclesiastical obligation. Granting, then, that the Popedom was an usurpation, as it assuredly was, yet no reflecting Christian, steadfastly regarding the strife, the wars, the persecutions, the martyrdoms, and the endless dissensions which the Reformation necessarily brought along with it, could have thought himself justified in urging such a measure, if the evil had been nothing worse than the jurisdiction of the foreign pontiff. But when the eyes of the Reformers were opened to the true issue between the Religion of God, and the Religion of man,—“when,” to use the language of Bishop Jewel, the state of the Church was such, that “CHRIST must keep silence, and the truth of the

Gospel be betrayed, and horrible errors be cloaked, and Christian men's eyes be bleared, and a conspiracy against God be openly carried on," and all this in the very name of CHRIST himself, and under the seal of his abused authority, —then was the cause of the Reformation identified with the supremacy of the Scriptures and the eternal hopes of the world; and the blessed instruments who were strengthened to become its champions went forth to the work, under the full power of the conviction that the Church of Rome was the seat of Antichrist. Not that by this term they denied her to be, in a certain sense, a true Church. She was apostolic in her foundation, sound in her ancient creeds which she had never cast away, and regular in the succession of her ministry. Planted in the truth as the spouse of Christ in the beginning, she remained his spouse still, by the old covenant of her first profession. But she had become an adulteress, the *mother of harlots*, in their esteem; and just as a wife, the most devoted of friends while faithful, becomes the most dangerous of enemies when her affections are transferred to another, so, in the judgment of those glorious men, the Church of Rome was at the same time the spouse of Christ by her original faith, and the worst enemy of Christ by her idolatry, her man-worship, her indulgences, her superstitions, her licentiousness. And as no honest man who felt himself called upon to expose the crimes of an adulteress, could possibly sit down with her in brotherly communion at the same table, without forfeiting his own character for sincerity and consistency for ever, so, and MUCH MORE, are we sure that the Reformers, divinely raised up for the exposure of the multiplied spiritual adulteries of the Church of Rome, must have revolted from the idea of remaining in communion with her, as from an act of open treason against the majesty of God, and the honour of their Redeemer.

The duty of unity with the Holy Catholic Church, they understood most thoroughly, and they practised upon the

theory of that unity, as they saw it laid down by the only infallible authority of Scripture. That was the principle of the Church's unity which bound the body to the *Head*; —not the visible head which had become established by the successful ambition of the Popedom, but the invisible **HEAD** which had declared; *My kingdom is not of this world*. They knew well that the only unity which their Lord had commanded was that of which he spake, when, addressing his Father, according to the Gospel of St. John, (Ch. xvii. 20,) he said, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, *that they also may be one in us*: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” The unity here set forth was unity in the blessed Trinity, unity in Christ, unity in the way, the truth, and the life; in a word, the unity of a living faith in the everlasting Gospel. But the Church of Rome had destroyed this unity herself, by making void the word of God that she might keep her own traditions; and the very reason why the Reformers left their communion with the Pope, was because they could not otherwise secure their communion with the Saviour. They acted, therefore, in strict accordance with the duty of spiritual unity, when they applied to their position with respect to Rome, the language of Isaiah: (lii. 11.) “*Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord.*” Or the still stronger warning of the Book of Revelation, (xviii. 4.) “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins.”

Surely, then, beloved brethren, I cannot err in pronouncing this new system of ecclesiastical polity to be utterly foreign to the principles, and hostile to the spirit of the English Reformation. Set the Church of Rome upon the one side, and the Church of Luther, Zuinglius, or Calvin upon the other, and let our martyred Reformers

be supposed to answer the question: *On which side is the Church of Christ which you hold to be the purest, the safest, the best entitled to the name of his spouse and his body, and with which would you prefer to cast in your lot, if you were compelled to choose between them?* And is it possible for any Protestant Episcopalian to doubt what would be the reply? Or imagine that the dioceses of our Mother Church were now filled with the same men who shone in the days of Edward VI., and embraced the stake sooner than unity with Rome, in the reign of Mary; or with their like-minded and true-hearted successors, when the eloquent pen of *Jewel* set forth the "Apology for the Church of England" in the time of Elizabeth; and what can we suppose would be their judgment on Mr. Palmer's system? How would they regard his statements concerning the *essential* attributes of the Church, and the *law of unity*, and the *provisional* establishment of the English Episcopate in Canada, and the sin of interfering with the *prior rights* of Rome, and the duty of an English Churchman to *commune with her*, if resident in any part of the world where she had peaceably gained the first possession? But truly our Oxford brethren have answered these questions indirectly already, by their frequent efforts to disparage the work and the character of the Reformers. They are too learned and too acute to suppose, that we can cordially maintain the old standards of English theology, in harmony with their novel doctrine. I thank God, however, that the successors of the Reformers, the English bishops of our own day, have given no other judgment, as yet; but have faithfully preserved, in conjunction with the prelates of the Irish Church, the precious legacy of Gospel truth, which was dyed in the blood of their fathers.* The same, I feel confident, is the

* It gives me pleasure to refer to the late sermons of the Bishop of London, the Charges of the Bishop of Chester, Winchester, Llandaff and Salisbury, and the elaborate Charge of the Bishop of Ossory.

settled sentiment amongst ourselves; for however the learning, the talent, and the ingenuity of our Oxford brethren, have combined with their personal worth and the peculiar character of the age, to give their novel opinions a certain influence for a season, it is impossible to reflect upon them long and candidly without a perfect conviction, that they belong, in their origin, to the system of Rome, and must operate, so far as they are received, against the true spirit of the Reformation.

But while I am thus compelled, with sorrow and regret, to point out the erroneous tendencies of this novel system, and to vindicate the old distinction between the *essence* of the Church, which is its *faith*, and the *ORDER* of the Church, which includes its *ministry*, I beg to be distinctly understood as intending neither to conceal nor to palliate the *SIN OF SCHISM*, of which all are guilty, to a greater or a less degree, who *needlessly* originate, or *knowingly* defend, a departure from the rule of apostolic unity. Such men destroy the concord for which the Redeemer prayed to his Father. They advocate the fearful work of dissension and strife in the Church universal, which ought to be at peace within itself, if only that it may conduct, with full assurance of victory, the sacred warfare against a world that lieth in wickedness. Therefore it can only be on grounds of the most solemn importance to the integrity of *the faith* itself, that the evils of separation can ever be justified. Such was the case of the blessed Reformation. It was not the usurpation of the pope, nor his unlawful power of appeals and dispensations, nor his tribute money in the shape of Peter pence, and other exactions, nay, nor even his pretended right to dispose of crowns and sceptres, which would, in my mind, have justified the attempt to break his despotic yoke, after the acquiescence of centuries had fastened it upon the contented necks of millions. It was the corruption of the *faith* of the gospel, by leading the Church of God to worship the

Virgin Mary as the queen of heaven, and a mediatrix more merciful than Jesus Christ; to bow down before a host of inferior saints who occupied the foreground of the thoughts and the confidence of Christians; to trust in the official work of the priesthood,—absolution, indulgences, penances, sacraments,—more than in judgment, mercy and faith; to look to the priest for all spiritual knowledge, in total negligence of the written Word of God; to exalt the Church and the pope, in practical effect, above their Lord and Master; to claim for them the infallibility which properly belongs to Deity alone; to bestow on human righteousness the merits of the Saviour's cross and passion; to magnify a false and superstitious sanctity, composed of outward acts of bodily suffering, above the works of true faith; in a word, to bring down the majesty of the glorious Redeemer; and place his mercies and rewards at the disposal of the saints, in perfect accordance with the idea of their favourite pictures, where Christ is set forth, surrounded by the hosts of heaven, but in the form of a child in the arms of the Virgin, while the deluded worshippers are taught to pray to her, that *she may use over him the AUTHORITY OF A MOTHER!*

These, and things like these, not only justified, but loudly demanded an abandonment of that corrupt Church, because they poisoned the very fountains of truth, and infected every rank and order in the Christian Commonwealth. It was no contemptible anxiety to save their pence; it was no miserable struggle whether the king or the pope should be supreme, which enabled the reformers to bring the question of the Reformation home to the consciences of *the people*. Neither was it, amongst the divines of that age, any of the paltry and puerile strifes which have since been thought sufficient to authorize an open breach amongst the professed followers of the Prince of peace; when a linen surplice, or a prayer-book, or the name of a bishop, was made a plenary justification for the awful evils of hatred amongst brethren.

And hence, while I maintain that the *essence* of the Church may remain amongst the worst schismatics, so long as they hold the fundamental doctrines of *the faith*,—while I deny that their schism, however causeless, destroys their *being* as a portion of the Church universal—while I consider that my argument is sustained by the Scriptures; that the primitive Church held the same *substantial* views, (as may be plainly proved, especially, by their conduct towards the Donatists,) and that they are, moreover, in accordance with the best school of English theology—yet God forbid that I should be supposed to defend, or in anywise extenuate, the *sin of* SCHISM. For what is schism, amongst Christians, holding the same general views of gospel truth, but the immediate offspring of the evil spirit, bearing, in every feature, the marks of its parentage? Like Satan, schism appears like an angel of light. Like Satan, its favourite work is to be an accuser of the brethren. Like Satan, it puffs up the heart with pride and self-confidence. Like Satan, it delights in rebellion against all constituted authority, and sets itself in open and systematic opposition to the will of the Saviour, by following strife rather than peace, discord rather than union, and hatred rather than that brotherly love, which should be cherished, both as a privilege and a duty, towards all the children of our Father in heaven.

But however fearful and odious in itself the sin of schism must appear, it is quite another question how far our non-episcopal brethren are actually involved in it. For separation from the existing Church may be a duty, as it was in the case of the Reformation; and in such case there is no transgression, since it would be absurd to say that the same act can be, at once, a duty and a sin. Perhaps the fairest mode of dealing with the subject would be to apply to it the maxim of human justice; namely, that it is the criminal intention of the actor which constitutes the crime. In the language of the civil law: *Non est reus, nisi mens sit rea.*

According to the motive, for example, the killing of another man may be justifiable homicide, or manslaughter, or murder. The act is the same, the motive makes the difference. On the same principle, a separation from the Church may be variously characterized; and hence the following considerations seem worthy of attention.

First, then, I conceive that we are bound, as a simple matter of justice, but much more as the dictate of charity, to make the largest possible allowances for the mistaken judgment of our non-episcopal brethren. They receive as we do, for the most part, the fundamental doctrines of the faith. They agree with us in an anxious desire to follow the teaching of the Bible. And if they hold unscriptural and unapostolical notions about episcopacy and forms of worship, we should remember that they framed their erroneous ideas under circumstances of peculiar temptation and difficulty. Once roused to the necessity of contending against the corruptions of the Church of Rome, it was natural, and, indeed, unavoidable, that men of ardent temperament would be unable to draw the line with accuracy between the various principles of right and wrong, which her system for so many centuries had confounded together. The Pope was a bishop, and was commonly holden to be Antichrist. Under him were hundreds of bishops all over Europe, bitter against the Reformers, and set against the truth. In England alone were any bishops found willing to take part against the papacy, while every where else, they were sustaining its despotism with all their power. How easy then was it for the common mind to conclude, that the office of bishop was part and parcel of popery? How ready to believe, that where so much was evil, there could be nothing good? Above all, when they discovered their long hidden treasure, the Holy Scriptures, and became accustomed to sit in judgment on the false doctrines of their former teachers, how obvious is it to see, that they

would cast aside all respect for authority, and take their own interpretations for their standard, investing them, on all occasions, with the majesty of revelation—that instead of wisely retrenching and purifying the existing forms, they would prefer the shorter and more thorough work of abolishing forms altogether—that from venerating the priesthood as if they were super-human, they would fall into the opposite error of distrust and contempt—that from a superstitious awe towards the altar, and the sanctuary, and the cross, and the shrines of images or relics, they would rush into the contrary extreme of light familiarity and irreverence? Who that knows any thing of human nature can wonder at the variety of errors that must, under such circumstances, have attended the restoration of Scriptural truth? And what humble and affectionate heart can refuse the offering of praise and gratitude to the Almighty **FATHER OF LIGHTS**, that the main doctrines of a saving faith were, notwithstanding, professed with so much clearness among them?

But secondly, our non-episcopal brethren are entitled to much tender allowance from the fact, that they did not, at their first rise, separate themselves from our mother Church, by any deliberate or wilful act of schismatic opposition. A brief reference to the chronology of the matter will make this assertion plain. Thus England has an undoubted right to claim the beginning of the Reformation, through the efforts of the famous Wickliff, in the latter part of the fourteenth century. At that time, however, the power of Rome prevailed to put down his followers, and although his translation of the Bible was extensively read, and his writings against the corruptions of popery were scattered far and wide, (producing, amongst other fruits, the eminent testimony of Huss and Jeremie, the martyrs of Bohemia,) yet it is certain that the first movement which took a successful hold upon the public mind of Europe began A. D.

1517, with the celebrated Luther, of Saxony. Zuinglius followed A. D. 1519, in Switzerland. Olaus Petri, in Sweden, Martin Reinard in Denmark, and other divines in Hungary, commenced A. D. 1522. Prussia welcomed the truth, the year afterwards, in the person of John Brisman; and France, under the favour of Margaret, queen of Navarre, had even churches erected about the same time, for the preaching of the Reformation. But at this period England was opposing, instead of assisting the work of truth. Henry VIII. earned the papal title of *Defender of the Faith*, by writing a book against Luther; nor was it until 1534, after the movement had been going on successfully for seventeen years, that the English monarch was led to take his stand against the pope's supremacy. The distinguished Calvin commenced his career as a reformer about the same time, and the following year beheld the publication of his famous 'Institutions,' which placed him amongst the master spirits of the age; when the English Church was only beginning, cautiously and gradually, to prepare the way for her subsequent system.

King Henry died in 1547, and at this time but little progress had been made in the restoration of the spiritual fabric, although the chief obstacles had been effectually beaten down. The short reign of his successor terminated in 1553, during which, indeed, the work went on with vigour, and a considerable measure of success. But the reign of the persecuting Mary followed, and destroyed the whole; saving only the salutary and deep impression which the mass of the nation received, under God, from the cruelty of the Roman priests, and the glorious constancy of the English martyrs. In A. D. 1558, the sun shone out once more upon the Reformation, for Mary was removed to make way for Elizabeth; and in A. D. 1559, the Church of England was placed upon a solid basis, although three years more elapsed, before her Articles &c. were completed.

Now these dates prove, conclusively, that the reformed Churches on the continent, who had not the *power* of retaining episcopacy, however sincerely they desired it, were first in the field; and had been compelled to give a positive form to their respective communities long before our Mother Church was in a condition to assist them. A new generation had risen up under the influence of these various ecclesiastical systems; hundreds of thousands were interested and ardent in their support; cities, states, and kingdoms, had incorporated them into their habits, and even into their laws; and hence, when they were afterwards advocated in England, we may well believe that it was not from the wantonness of a schismatic spirit, so much as from a sincere conviction, formed on the continent by the exiles during Mary's reign, that it would improve the purity and enlarge the influence of the Church of England, if her system could be so modified as to differ less from the rest of the reformed. Surely, separations arising under such peculiar circumstances, deserve the kindest temper of charitable allowance. They are plainly of a totally different spirit from the schisms which troubled the primitive Church; for during the first ages of the Christian dispensation, there was no serious corruption to reform, and no apology, much less necessity, for departing, in any respect, from the apostolic platform. And therefore whatever the defects of our modern separatists may be, with respect to ministerial order and worship, we should much rather, in the language of Hooker, '*lament than exaggerate them.*' Doubtless, if it had pleased God to establish the Church of England in the first place, and a set of pious and devoted bishops, with their clergy and the nation to co-operate with them, had been enabled to exhibit the spiritual benefits of the apostolic system before any other kind of polity had become fixed, we may feel reasonably assured that all the reformed would have rejoiced to unite in the same sacred orders of the mi-

nistry, and the same general mode of worship. For we have the most unquestionable evidence that Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, were decided friends of episcopal government and a Liturgy; and therefore the unhappy position which their Churches assumed, and caused others to assume, in respect to our mother Church, has every claim upon our Christian compassion, as having arisen, not from any schismatic intention, but from the force of circumstances beyond all human control.

It is worthy, in the third place, of our most serious consideration, whether the schismatic character of those Churches can be properly extended beyond the specific errors in which they have departed from the apostolic system. For it is well laid down by the eminent St. Augustin, that those who had separated themselves from the society of the Church, breaking the bands of charity, were *altogether* separate, if they had cast aside, in *all respects*, the ordinances of the Church. But that if they continued to do some things as the Church herself did, they were not separated in those particulars; and hence they retained their place in the substance of the Church in some respects, while in others they were cut off from her.* If such a kindly sentiment could be uttered in his day, when schism had comparatively so little excuse or apology, how much more does it become us now? For not only do the Orthodox Churches of our non-episcopal brethren agree with us in the

* *S. Augustini de Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. I. Cap. VIII. Opp. Tom. IX. p. 57, E.* Sic etiam qui se ipsos a societate cæterorum separantes, caritate violata, unitatis vinculum rumpunt, si nihil faciunt eorum quæ in illa societate acceperunt, in omnibus separati sunt: et ideo quem sibi sociaverint, si venire ad Ecclesiam voluerit, debet omnia quæ non accepit accipere. Si verò nonnulla eadem faciunt, non se in eis separaverunt; et ex ea parte in texturæ compage detinentur, in cætera scissi sunt. Proinde si quem sibi sociaverint, ex ea parte nectitur Ecclesiæ, in qua nec illi separati sunt: et ideo si venire ad Ecclesiam voluerit, in eo sanatur ubi laniatus errabat, ubi vero sanus connectebatur, non curatur, sed agnoscitur, &c.

general truths and ordinances of the gospel, but we know that a certain measure of fraternal association has always existed amongst the members; nor is there to this hour, a single act, law, or rule, either on their part or on ours, which forbids their ministry or people from sharing, as often as they will, in our communion. I confess myself, therefore, by no means sure, that SCHISM, strictly speaking, can be affirmed, of the relation in which these Churches stand to us. None of them have denounced us, nor have we denounced them, as cut off from the body of the Church Universal. Our Christian fellowship has been less or more, according to times and circumstances, but it has not been severed by any sentence of anathema. And if the good old churchmen Hall and Wilkins, who deliberated, and voted, and communed together with the Presbyterians at the Synod of Dort, were set before us on trial, although they went farther than I should think it expedient to follow them, yet I profess myself totally ignorant of any ecclesiastical right or power, by which we could justly pronounce their condemnation.

Lastly, however, it seems our duty to exercise this fraternal feeling towards our non-episcopal brethren, as the only way, under the divine blessing, whereby we can expect to do them good. It may be said, indeed, that they will not thank us for it, that their spirit towards us is hostile and acrimonious, that they treat our claims with ridicule and bitterness, and cannot prevail upon themselves to approach their discussion without the strongest display of prejudice and dislike. And much of this, alas! is but too true. But surely, it affords no excuse for our unkindness, or asperity, or ridicule in return. Our divine Master has commanded us even to bless those that curse us,* to do good

* "Hos autem inimicos," says Augustin, (Enar. in Psal. cxxx. § 3, 7, 4, p. 1101.) "Ecclesia debellat. Et quomodo debellat? Mansuetudine. Mansuetudine enim ipse Rex noster vicit diabolum."

to them that hate us, to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us, if we would indeed be the children of our Father in heaven. For if we only love them that love us, what reward have we? *Do not even the publicans the same?* Elsewhere we are told that *in meekness* we must instruct those that oppose themselves; and certain it is that religious discussion, conducted without regard to those celestial rules, *has no promise of the divine blessing*, but is likely to do more harm than good, by convincing our adversaries that we have not the Spirit of Christ, and therefore can be none of his. O which of us, in these unhappy days of polemic acrimony, can wash his hands of this too common transgression against the temper of the Gospel! When shall we learn to prepare ourselves for controversy, by first trying the spirit which animates us, to discover whether it is of God! When shall we cast aside the sarcasm, and the bitterness, and the ridicule, and the scorn; and speak and write with continual prayer for the wisdom which cometh from above, and under the influence of that awful declaration, "*Whosoever shall say unto his brother, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire.*"

I mean not, by these remarks, to discourage the firm maintenance of the truth, as it seems to us, on every topic of religious importance; without any regard to the fear of man which bringeth a snare, or the praise of man, which bringeth a greater snare. We are bound to "*contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints;*" and being harnessed by the hand of God for his warfare, we may not, like the rebellious Ephraim, "*turn ourselves back in the day of battle.*" But yet our weapons must be drawn from our divine Master's armory, and be suited to that Gospel which is the religion of love. Especially when contending with our fellow Christians, must we put a guard upon our lips and upon our pen; since far better is it that we should forever hold our peace, than publish aught, on which we cannot ask His blessing.

But it is time, my beloved brethren, that I should bring this letter to a close. My next topic will call for some remarks on the Eucharistic controversy, in connexion with the late sermon of Rev. Dr. Pusey, and with the general views of our eminent Oxford divines on the subject of priestly power. In full faith that the more these subjects are discussed, in a frank and affectionate temper, the more we shall find ourselves united and strengthened to stand in the old paths, I ask the benefit of your prayers, that I may be enabled to contribute my humble share to that blessed end. And may the Lord God Almighty grant us, through his only Son, wisdom and grace, that we may all "*follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.*"

Your faithful brother,

And servant in Christ,

JOHN H. HOPKINS.

Burlington, Vermont,

January 10, 1844.

THE
NOVELTIES WHICH DISTURB OUR PEACE.

A THIRD LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY, AND LAITY

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D.D.

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT.

PHILADELPHIA:
HERMAN HOOKER,—178, CHESTNUT STREET.

1844.

Entered according to the act of congress, in the year 1844, by HERMAN
HOOKER, in the clerk's office of the district court of the eastern
district of Pennsylvania.

THIRD LETTER, &c.

RESPECTED AND BELOVED BRETHREN:

The subject to which I have now to solicit your attention, involves one of the most important and warmly contested points, in the whole circle of Christian theology; viz. the doctrine of the holy Eucharist, or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A very peculiar interest has been lately given to this topic, on account of the extraordinary fact, that the Rev. Dr. Pusey of Oxford has been suspended by the Vice-Chancellor, for preaching a sermon on the Eucharist, which was supposed to be unsound, and of dangerous tendency. The discourse has been printed with extensive notes. Its learned author maintains that it is in precise accordance with the doctrine of our mother Church, and some amongst our own divines have published their decided approval of it. But being myself of the number of those who do not approve, and believing that the views presented in that discourse, though by no means identical with Transubstantiation, are, nevertheless, almost equally objectionable, I have found myself compelled to reckon the public adoption of them amongst the "*Novellies which disturb our peace,*" and beg your kind and patient examination of my reasons.

For the purpose of stating the question with all reasonable clearness, I shall first mention, briefly, the principal varieties of doctrine existing amongst Christian divines with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; next

show which amongst them is the chosen doctrine of the new Oxford theology; thirdly, point out the objections to it, from the Standards of our mother Church, the writing of the fathers, and, above all, the Scriptures; and, fourthly, explain my meaning in saying, that it is but little less open to animadversion than Transubstantiation itself.

The lowest view of the Holy Eucharist, (passing over the Socinians,) is that which owes its origin to Zuinglius, the celebrated Reformer of Switzerland. He taught that the consecrated Bread and Wine were merely symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, intended to be received in memorial of his death and sacrifice, but without any peculiar sacramental efficacy beyond the divine grace which is accorded to every act of pious devotion.

The opposite extreme to this is the doctrine of the Romanists, so familiarly known by the name of *Transubstantiation*. They maintain that the Bread and Wine, by virtue of the priestly act of consecration, is converted into the natural, real and material Body and Blood of the blessed Redeemer, nothing of their former substance remaining, but only the outward appearance, which they style, the *species*. From the conversion of the substance of the elements into the substance of our Lord's Body and Blood, they significantly derive their term *Transubstantiation*. They further hold, that this is now the living Body of the Saviour, which is inseparable from his Soul and his Divinity, and hence the act of adoration is, of course, due to it. In the service of the Roman *Mass*, therefore, as the language is Latin, a little bell is rung to give the people notice that the consecration is complete; and then the priest lifts up the bread, and all bow down to it in worship, as to the very person of Christ. The term *Hostia* (or Host,) which signifies the sacrifice, is now appropriated to it, and in those countries where the papal religion prevails, and the *Host* is carried through the streets, (either to be given to the sick,

or else in procession, on the day which they call *Corpus Christi*,) every one without exception is compelled to kneel down as it passes; and thus the consecrated bread or wafer is regarded, not as a figure or emblem, but as an actual Deity. The priest, accordingly, holds in his hands, as they suppose, the incarnate Creator and Redeemer. When he breaks the Bread or wafer, each separate piece or even crumb, becomes the whole Body, Soul and Godhead of the Saviour; and when he puts the particle into the mouth of the communicants, each one receives it as being the actual, entire, and glorified Humanity and Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. I need not say to you, my brethren, that our Church holds this to be formal idolatry, and that sooner than acknowledge it, the reformers of England welcomed the flames of martyrdom.

A third doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is that of the Lutheran Church, which adopted the tenet of *Consubstantiation*. Their great leader Luther maintained, that on the act of Consecration, the material Flesh and Blood of the blessed Redeemer become united with the bread and wine. He agreed with the Romanists, therefore, in the notion of a real, carnal or corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament; he differed from them, however, in holding that the bread and wine did not become converted into the Body and Blood of the Saviour, but remained as they were before; and hence the term *consubstantiation*, which was appropriated to his doctrine. Nevertheless he discarded the Romish practice of adoring the *Host*, and to show more plainly that no worship was intended, he directed that the Communicants should receive it standing.

The fourth view of the Eucharist is that which I have received as the doctrine of our mother Church and of our own. According to this interpretation, the elements of bread and wine, by virtue of the act of Consecration, become the holy SYMBOLS of the Body and Blood of our cru-

fied Lord, being appointed to bear this emblematic character by his own express commandment, in solemn remembrance of his Cross and Passion for the redemption of mankind. Thus far, we hold the same view with Zuiniglius. But in the more important question of the *inward and spiritual grace* received in the Sacrament, we go incomparably farther; believing that in the due reception of the *representative* Body and Blood, the faithful Communicant is made, by the Holy Spirit, a partaker, *verily and indeed*, of the Body and Blood of Christ, after a heavenly and Spiritual manner, so as to become mystically one with his Divine Lord, and to strengthen the bands of that glorious incorporation more and more, with each repetition of the Holy Communion; provided he approach with genuine repentance, lively faith, and fervent charity, and thus “*come holy and clean to the heavenly feast, in the marriage garment required by God in Holy Scripture.*”

This view of the sacred Eucharist, however, does not satisfy our Tractarian brethren. For they contend that the power of priestly consecration converts the elements, not merely into the emblematic, symbolical, figurative, or representative Body and Blood of Christ, but into his actual and real Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity. They do, indeed, carefully refuse to define the mode of this presence, so as to differ, in terms, from the Church of England, and they condemn the attempt at such definition, whether it be according to the tenet of *Transubstantiation*, or that of *Consubstantiation*. But although they censure these doctrines, yet they seem to accord with the Romanists in many important particulars, believing that the Body and Blood of Christ, (after a heavenly and spiritual manner) together with his soul and divinity, become present on the altar by virtue of the prayer of Consecration, that the Redeemer is there offered up by the priest as a real though unbloody sacrifice, and that the Lord is received, whole and entire,

(although still uncorporeally) by every faithful communicant, *from the hands of the officiating minister.*

Now it will be easily perceived that if this doctrine be true, there would be no idolatry whatever in adoring the consecrated elements, because the Lord Jesus Christ is supposed to be actually in those elements, *locally present* under the sacramental veils, *in all respects except the material or carnal one of Flesh and Blood*, included in the theory of Transubstantiation. It is evident, however, that this difference could not affect the question of *worship*, because it was not on account of his flesh and blood that our blessed Redeemer was worshipped when he was on earth, but on account of his essential Deity as the co-eternal Son of God: and, therefore, if the priest is able to cause that the Deity of Christ be present in the elements, it would not be idolatry, but true piety, to prostrate ourselves before him. As manifest it must surely be, that every particle of the sacred Eucharist becomes as divine, upon the Tractarian, as upon the Roman theory; the same fear of awful profanation if a crumb or a drop should fall, the same solemn reverence for the holiness of the altar and the vessels, the same genuflexions on approaching them, the same veneration for the priesthood to which such a marvellous prerogative is given, and—if the express law of the Church did not forbid it—the same reservation in the consecrated Pyx, and the same homage to the *Corpus Christi*, in public procession, would consistently follow. Nor am I able to discern what there would be left worth contending for, between the doctrine of Rome and our own; for assuredly, after granting that the eucharistic bread and wine contain the *present Deity of Christ*, it would be very idle to quarrel about the question, whether they were not transubstantiated into the very substance of his flesh and blood also.

But I proceed to the duty of showing the evidence on which I rest the statement of the new Tractarian doctrine.

And I shall commence with Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church, quoted in my last Letter, because there is at least a comparative clearness in his views, demanded by the character of his learned work, which will materially aid in settling the meaning of the Oxford Tracts and Rev. Dr. Pusey's sermon; although in no part of these several productions that I have seen, is the doctrine exhibited with such perspicuity, as might save us from a close and attentive examination:

Our author professes (vol. i. p. 526,) to set forth the doctrine of the Church, in the following words:

“Taking for her immovable foundation the words of Jesus Christ: ‘This is my body . . . This is my blood of the New Covenant;’ and ‘Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life;’” “She” (sc. the Church of England, according to Mr. Palmer,) “believes, that *the body or flesh, and the blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one person, are verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper, under the outward sign or form of bread (and wine,) which is, on this account, the ‘partaking or communion of the body and blood of Christ.’* She believes that the Eucharist is not the sign of an *absent* body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure or shadow or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist, *not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, both God and man.*”

“Resting on these words, ‘The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?’ and again, ‘I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine,’ she holds that the nature of the bread and wine continues after consecration, and therefore rejects Transubstantiation, or

‘*the change of the substance*’ which supposes the nature of bread entirely to cease by consecration.”

“As a necessary consequence of the preceding truths, and admonished by Christ himself, ‘It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life,’ she holds that the presence (and therefore the eating) of Christ’s body and blood, though true, is altogether heavenly and spiritual, of a kind which is inexplicable by any carnal or earthly experience or imagination: even as the Sonship of the Eternal Word of God, and His incarnation, and the procession of the Holy Spirit are immeasurable by human understandings.”

“Believing, according to the Scriptures, that Christ ascended in his natural body into heaven, and shall only come from thence at the end of the world; she rejects, for this reason, as well as the last, any such real presence of Christ’s body and blood as is ‘*corporeal*’ or ‘*organical*’; that is, according to the known and earthly mode of existence of a body.”

“Resting on the divine promise, ‘Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life,’ she regards it as the *more pious and probable opinion*, that the wicked, and those who are totally devoid of true and living faith, do not partake of the holy flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, GOD WITHDRAWING FROM THEM SO ‘DIVINE’ A GIFT, and not permitting his enemies to partake of it. And hence she holds, that such a faith is ‘the means by which the body of Christ is received and eaten,’ a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies;’ because it is the essential qualification on our parts, without which that body is not received.”

“Following the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the apostles, and supported by their authority, she believes that ‘the blessing,’ or ‘consecration’ of the bread and wine is not without effect, but that it operates a real change: for when the sacrament is thus perfected, she regards it as so

‘divine a thing,’ so ‘heavenly a food,’ that we must not ‘*presume*’ to approach it with unprepared minds, and that sinners, although they only partake of the bread and wine, partake of them to their own condemnation, because they *impiously disregard the Lord’s body, which is truly present in that sacrament.* Hence it is that the Church, believing firmly in the real presence of the ‘precious and blessed body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ,’ speaks of the Eucharist, as ‘high and holy mysteries,’ exhorts us to consider the ‘dignity of that holy mystery,’ that ‘heavenly feast,’ ‘that holy table,’ ‘the banquet of that most heavenly food,’ even the ‘King of kings’ table.’ ”

To render our author’s meaning yet more clear, he says that even our (Roman) “adversaries are compelled by the force of truth to clear the Church of England from the imputation of disbelieving the sublime mysteries of this holy sacrament;” and he cites, in a note, the declarations of three Romanists, to prove his assertion. “Milner,” saith he, is obliged to confess that the genuine doctrine of the Church of England is that of the real presence. . . . Hornyhold, another of their titular bishops, admits that the doctrine of the Church of England in the Catechism expresses the real and substantial presence of Christ’s body and blood in the sacrament, as fully as any Catholic can do And Bossuet affirms that even the declaration against Transubstantiation leaves the English at liberty to believe, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are really and substantially present in the bread and in the wine, immediately after consecration.”

I turn next to the Oxford Tract, No. 10, (vol. i. p. 55.) where the writer, in the person of the English ministry, addresses the laity in these words: “Then you will honour us with a purer honour than you do now, namely, as those who are intrusted with the keys of heaven and hell, as the heralds of mercy, as the denouncers of wo to wicked

men, as intrusted with the *awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood*, as far greater than the most powerful and wealthiest of men in our unseen strength and our heavenly riches."

Again, in the celebrated Tract No. 90, the ingenious author finds himself opposed by the language of the English Prayer-Book, where the posture of kneeling in order to receive the sacrament, is explained in these words: "It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of CHRIST's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substance, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of CHRIST's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

In plain contrariety to this assertion, that the natural body and blood of Christ are not here, the author of the Tract devotes several pages to prove that the Prayer-Book meant only that the body and blood of the blessed Redeemer were not present *locally*, but that they *might be present in the sacrament and at the right hand of God*, at the same time, notwithstanding!

I come next, however, to the discourse of Rev. Dr. Pusey, in which it will be sufficiently evident that he supposes the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Lord to be united to the bread and wine *in the hands of the priest and on the altar by virtue of the prayer of consecration*. The inconsistency of this, with what we have hitherto regarded as the doctrine of the Church, will be shown, as I trust, sufficiently, by and by.

"The Holy Eucharist," saith our author, "*imparteth not life only, spiritual strength and oneness with Christ, and his*

indwelling and participation of Him, but, in its degree, *remission of sins also* It augments life, or death; gives immortality to the living; to the dead it gives not life but death, it is a savour of life or death, is received to salvation or damnation The Lord, with unwearied patience, bringeth this one truth before us in so many different forms, as meaning to inculcate that *life in Him is his chief gift in his sacrament*, and to make a reverent longing for it an incentive to our faith He answers not the strivings of the Jews, ‘How can this man give us his flesh to eat?’ Such an ‘How can these things be?’ he never answereth; and we, if we are wise, shall never ask how they can be *elements of this world, and yet his very Body and Blood* Such is undoubted Catholic teaching, and the most literal import of Holy Scripture, and the mystery of the sacrament, that the Eternal Word, who is God, hath taken to him our flesh and joined it indissolubly with Himself, and so, *where his Flesh is, there He is, and we receiving it, receive Him, and receiving Him are joined on to Him through his Flesh to the Father*, and He dwelling in us, we dwell in Him, and with Him in God He, by *the truth of the sacrament*, dwelleth in us, in whom by nature, all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth, and lowest is joined on with highest, earth with heaven, corruption with incorruption, man with God And this may have been another truth, which our Lord intended to convey to us, when he pronounced the words as the form which consecrates the elements into his Body and Blood, that *that precious Blood is still, in continuance and application of his one oblation once made upon the Cross, poured out for us now*, conveying to our souls, as being His Blood, with the other benefits of his Passion, the remission of our sins also That which is in the cup, St. Chrysostom paraphrases, ‘*is that which flowed from his side, and of that do we partake.*’ How should we approach his sacred side, and remain leprous still? Touching with our *very lips that cleansing Blood*, how may we

not, with the Ancient Church, confess, ‘Lo, this hath touched my lips, and shall take away mine iniquities and cleanse my sins.’”

Again, saith our author, “This is (if we may reverently so speak,) the order of the mystery of the Incarnation, that the Eternal Word so took our flesh into Himself, as to impart to it His own inherent life; so then we, partaking of it, that life is transmitted on to us also, and not to our souls only, but our bodies also, since we become flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, and He who is wholly life is imparted to us wholly. The Life which He is, spreads around, first giving its own vitality to that sinless flesh which He united indissolubly with Himself, and in it encircling and vivifying our whole nature, and *then through that bread which is His flesh, finding an entrance to us individually*, penetrating us, soul and body and spirit, and irradiating and transforming into His own light and life.” . . . And elsewhere, quoting from one of the fathers, he saith, “We come to bear Christ in us, His Body and Blood being diffused through our members, whence, saith St. Peter, we become partakers of the divine nature.”

One citation more may suffice to give a fair view of the leading doctrine of this sermon. “Yet,” saith Dr. Pusey, “although most which is spoken belongs to Christians as belonging already to the household of saints, and the family of heaven, and the communion of angels, and unity with God, still here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, there is a subordinate and subdued notion of sin; and what wraps the saint already in the third heaven, may yet uphold us sinners, that the pit shut not her mouth upon us. *The same reality of the Divine Gift, makes it angel’s food to the saint, the ransom to the sinner.*”

Now it is perfectly manifest that all this, and much more in the same sermon, accords most thoroughly with the Romish doctrine of the Real Presence. Nor is there one

word in the whole discourse of Dr. Pusey which could rescue his meaning from the Roman sense, or remind the hearer that there was any difference between them. To demonstrate conclusively, however, the sentiments entertained by our brethren of Oxford on this important subject, I must ask your special attention to a part of Mr. Palmer's learned treatise, (Vol. I. p. 508, &c.) where he expressly asserts that the doctrine of the Church of England has not undergone any "*material change*" from the formulary established by Henry VIII., especially in the point of the Real Presence. The standard which he assumes is the book called 'THE NECESSARY DOCTRINE AND ERUDITION,' set forth by the Convocation under that sovereign, A. D. 1543. He assures his readers, (p. 524,) that the Articles as now existing, do "not condemn absolutely all change of substance in *any sense*, but the particular change called by the Romanists, 'Transubstantiation,' which supposes the bread to cease to exist." And after touching upon various points in which the two formularies seem to differ, he concludes in these remarkable words: (p. 526,) "*Altogether I see not that there is any great contradiction between these two formularies,*" (sc. The Necessary Doctrine of Henry VIII., and the Thirty-nine Articles,) "*in matters of doctrine. I dispute not that several of those who composed the one, differed in some points from several of those who composed the other; but their formularies are not so worded as to evince any great or irreconcilable opposition between the public and authorized faith of the Church of England in the reign of Henry VIII., and in that of Elizabeth.*"

Here is an allegation, beloved brethren, of immense importance, not only because it serves as a key to the reasoning of the Oxford Tract, No. 90, and to the whole strain of this new theology, but because it overthrows the general sense of history, and presents the entire system of our Church under a different aspect. Let us, therefore, test the

correctness of Mr. Palmer in the fairest manner, by setting the doctrine of the Eucharist, as settled in the time of Henry VIII., side by side with that of our present Articles, which, as you know, were established in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, A. D. 1562.

DOCTRINE OF A. D. 1543, UNDER
HENRY VIII.

“As touching the sacrament of the Altar, We will that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us into their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, *that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by our outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really, contained and comprehended, the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered upon the cross for our Redemption, and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed and received of all them which receive the said sacrament, and that therefore the said sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour, &c.* (Burnet’s History of Reformation, Lond. Ed. of 1825, 2 vol. p. 381.)

I subjoin the abstract given by Bishop Burnet of the famous law of the six Articles, passed A. D. 1539 of King Henry’s reign, and not repealed until the second year of Edward VI., which is more precise on two points connected with our subject. (Ib. 1 vol. p. 335.)

DOCTRINE OF THE ARTICLES, A. D.
1562, UNDER ELIZABETH.

“The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death; insomuch that *to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ: and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.*

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, *cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.*

The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith,*

The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Article XXIX. Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do

First, *That in the sacrament of the Altar, after the consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine; but under these forms, the natural body and blood of Christ are present. Secondly, that communion in both kinds is not necessary to salvation to all persons by the law of God, but that both the flesh and blood of Christ are together in each of the kinds.*"

carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

Article XXX. Of both kinds.

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people; for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

Now to any man of plain and ordinary understanding, the doctrines of these two formularies are utterly irreconcilable. It is true, indeed, that the system of Henry's day did not use the term Transubstantiation, but the idea conveyed by that term is as strongly and distinctly expressed as words can set it forth; and I need not, surely, spend time in proving that the doctrine does not depend upon the technical word, but may be taught just as distinctly without it. Thus, therefore, as I apprehend the matter, stands the contrast between them.

In the first place, then, the sacrament of the Eucharist, in King Henry's formulary, is defined in precise accordance with the Church of Rome. The conversion of the elements is so complete, that, according to this formulary, there "*remains no substance of Bread and Wine, but under these forms the natural Body and Blood.*" . . . "*the very self-same body and blood which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered upon the cross.*"

On the other hand, the Article asserts, that "*Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and has occasioned many superstitions.*" Is there no material change of doctrine in this? No serious

contradiction? Mr. Palmer assures us that he does not see any.

In the second place, King Henry's formulary asserts a *corporal, substantial* presence of the Body and Blood of the Saviour, in the strongest terms; while the Article expressly asserts that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.*" Is there no great contradiction here? Mr. Palmer assures us that he does not see any.

In the third place, King Henry's formulary asserts that "the Body and Blood of our Saviour are "*corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and RECEIVED OF ALL THEM WHICH RECEIVE THE SAID SACRAMENT.*" But the Article limits the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, to those who receive the sacrament *rightly, worthily and with faith*; and again, it expressly declares, that the "MEAN whereby the sacred Body is received and eaten, IS FAITH," and yet again, the following article, quoting St. Augustine, is devoted to the assertion of the important doctrine, that "the wicked, and they that be void of a lively faith, may press with their teeth the sign or Sacrament, but are in no wise partakers of Christ." Is there no material difference here? Our learned and ingenious author does not see any.

In the fourth place, King Henry's formulary asserts that the communion of the cup is "not necessary to salvation to all persons by the law of God, since the flesh and the blood of Christ are together in either kind." This is the well known Romish doctrine of *Concomitancy*, by which they defended the gross abuse of taking the cup from the Laity. But in plain opposition to this, our thirtieth Article declares, that "the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people, for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by *Christ's ordinance and commandment*, ought to be ministered to *all Christian men alike.*" Is there no great contra-

diction here? Mr. Palmer tells us that he does not see any.

Wonderful, wonderful capacity of the human mind! which thus, at times, casts us into amazement and perplexity. When that which the whole Church of England supposed to be a total change of this most important doctrine—which the persecutors in the reign of Mary conceived to be worthy of the stake—which the martyred Reformers conscientiously regarded as a difference so material, a contrariety so great, that life and death should depend upon the distinction,—which the foreign churches of the Reformation esteemed to be a glorious victory over the old superstition, which Rome (notwithstanding the occasional “admissions” of her Jesuits,) has always regarded as one of the surest tests by which to convict us of what she calls heresy; and which the whole body of our Church, with few and trifling exceptions, conceived, until lately, to be a clear and marked example of irreconcilable opposition, should yet seem, to a man so gifted as Mr. Palmer, and to his circle of pious, learned, and talented colleagues, to involve no “*material change,*” no “*very great contradiction!*”

Doubtless, our Tractarian brethren are perfectly sincere. I have no right, and assuredly not the slightest disposition, to question their candour; and their intellectual power and the affluence of their theological treasury are equally rare and admirable. But after all, Mr. Palmer, whose Treatise on the Church may be justly regarded as their System, appears to me to need a most indispensable requisite for the work which he has undertaken. He offers himself as a guide, and evidently possesses many high qualifications for the office. Nevertheless, he assures us that ‘*he does not see*’ the difference which all Europe and the United States have seen—which every historian has noted—which every tyro in ecclesiastical affairs has professed to understand—viz. the “*material change*” from the doctrine of the Sacraments

in the reign of Henry VIII. to the Articles under queen Elizabeth. Cranmer himself bore witness to that change, by plainly professing that Ridley had opened his eyes to his former error. The martyr Latimer resigned his bishopric for no other reason than the passing of the law of the six articles. It is surely, therefore, a serious question to those who desire to take Mr. Palmer for a guide, whether any other qualification can supply his singular lack of vision. For my own part, I deeply regret the necessity which obliges me to animadvert upon the statements of a man for whose research and ability I have so high a regard. But this same incapacity to see the ‘*great*’ or ‘*material*’ difference between Rome and England, will present itself in some other particulars, before I close.

I shall now proceed to prove that the doctrine of our Oxford brethren concerning the Real Presence, is not the true doctrine of our mother Church or of our own, by a few plain authorities, commencing with the Homily on this subject, written in the reign of Edward VI., if not by the hand, yet certainly with the entire concurrence of Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Ridley, his most efficient colleague.

“Three things,” saith this excellent Homily, “be requisite in him which would seemly, as becometh such high mysteries, resort to the Lord’s table. That is, first, a right and worthy estimation and understanding of this mystery. Secondly, to come in a sure faith. And thirdly, to have newness or pureness of life to succeed the receiving of the same.”

“But before all other things, this we must be sure of especially, that this supper be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done, as his holy Apostles used it, and the good fathers in the primitive Church frequented it. For (as that worthy man St. Ambrose saith) he is unworthy of the Lord, that

otherwise doth celebrate that mystery, than it was delivered by Him. Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the Author. *We must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts, we have but one; lest, applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive.* Neither need we to think that such exact knowledge is required of every man, that he be able to discuss all high points in the doctrine thereof, (Matt. xxvi.,) but thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, *no untrue figure of a thing absent;* but, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, **YEA, THE COMMUNION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD, IN A MARVELLOUS INCORPORATION,** which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is, *through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful,* whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.” (1 Cor. xi.)

“Now it followeth to have with this knowledge a *sure and constant faith,* not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins and reconciliation with God the Father; *but also that he hath made upon his cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, Redeemer, Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor, but Christ only; and that thou mayest say with the Apostle, that he loved thee, and gave himself for thee.* For this is to stick fast to Christ’s promise made in his institution, to *make Christ thine own,* and to *apply his merits unto thyself.* *Herein thou needest no other man’s help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established*

by man's invention. That faith is a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies, we may thus assure ourselves, 'for that,' as St. Paul saith, 'without faith it is impossible to please God.' (*Heb. xi.*) When a great number of Israelites were overthrown in the wilderness, Moses, Aaron, and Phineas did eat manna, and pleased God, for that they understood, saith St. Augustine, the visible meat spiritually. (*In Johan. Hom. 6.*) Spiritually they hungered it, spiritually they tasted it, that they might be spiritually satisfied. And truly as the bodily meat cannot feed the outward man, unless it be let into a stomach to be digested, which is healthful and sound, *no more can the inward man be fed, except his meat be received into his soul and heart, sound and whole in faith.* Therefore, saith Cyprian, when we do these things, we need not to whet our teeth; but with sincere faith we break and divide that whole bread. (*De coena Domini.*) It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; so that to think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross carnal feeding, basely objecting and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures. Whereas, by the advice of the council of Nicene, *we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and leaving those inferior and earthly things, there seek it, where the Sun of righteousness ever shineth.*" (*Concil. Nic.*)

"Thus we see, beloved, that resorting to this table, we must pluck up all the roots of infidelity, all distrust in God's promises, that we may make ourselves living members of Christ's body. For the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious body. Whereas the faithful have their life, their abiding in him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves, unfeignedly, without flattering

ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body; whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of his gospel, and embracing of his mercies in Christ Jesus; so that at this his table, we receive *not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also, not the figure, but the truth; not the shadow only, but the body*, not to death but to life, not to destruction, but to salvation; which God grant us through the merits of our Lord and Saviour."

Next to this excellent Homily, and also as a sure commentary on it, I shall set down the judgment of the martyr Cranmer, as it is stated in substance in the first page of the Preface of his Answer to Gardiner, (ed. 1551,) only modernizing the orthography.

"Where I use to speak sometimes, (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the Sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter: that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward Sacrament, but sometimes of his *sacramental presence*, and sometimes by this word *sacrament* I mean the WHOLE MINISTRATION AND RECEIVING OF THE SACRAMENTS, either of Baptism or of the Lord's Supper. And so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be *present in the Sacraments*, not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be *present in the water, bread, or wine*, (which be only the *outward visible Sacraments*) but that in the due ministration of the Sacraments, according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed *present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace*, IN ALL THEM THAT WORTHILY RECEIVE THE SAME. Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that

although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them; this is to advertize the reader that I mean no such thing: but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually *present with all them that duly receive the sacraments.* But all this I understand of his spiritual presence, of the which he saith, *I will be with you until the world's end; and wheresoever two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them, and he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. Nor no more truly is he corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of Baptism."*

I must sollicit your attention, here, beloved brethren, to a distinction which it is absolutely necessary to understand, in order to avoid a very erroneous inference from the language of our Catechism, by no means uncommon at the present day. In that familiar and valuable compend of sound instruction, it is declared that a sacrament *consists of two parts*, the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace; and this statement is afterwards applied to Baptism and the Eucharist, by setting forth these sacraments in their forms and elements, and in their spiritual effects respectively, when rightly received; the inward part, or thing signified by the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist being said to be, *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.*

Here it is evident that the outward and visible sign is called only a PART of the Sacrament, whereas it is properly called *the Sacrament* without restriction in the Articles, and is rightly so defined in the Catechism itself, where it is said that a sacrament is an "*outward and visible sign of*

an inward and spiritual grace," &c. In accordance with this more strictly correct meaning of the term, the 28th Article saith that "the *Sacrament* of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped:" and the 29th Article saith, that "the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, (as St. Augustine saith) the *Sacrament* of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the *sign or Sacrament* of so great a thing." In both these places, especially the last, it is quite manifest that the word *Sacrament* is taken as synonymous with the word *Sign*, (or *Symbol*) and is applied to that kind of administration (viz. the communion of the wicked) in which the inward and spiritual grace is confessedly wanting. And this, indeed, is the genuine meaning of the word, according to Patristic and primitive usage, since it was the current statement of the fathers that heretics and schismatics had the *Sacraments*, but received no spiritual grace thereby.

Now the passage which I have extracted from Archbishop Cranmer will be found especially important, because it not only proves the latitude with which the word was used, but also furnishes the true test for its interpretation. In one sense, and that the more ancient one, it signified *the outward and visible Sacrament*, such as the water, and the bread and wine. In the other sense it signified *the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacrament*, which included the inward and spiritual grace bestowed, by the power of the Lord, on the *faith* of the *worthy receiver*. In the first sense, Cranmer held that Christ and the Holy Ghost were *not* present in the Sacrament: in the second sense, he admitted that they *were* present to the *hearts of the faithful*. A want of discrimination between these two modes of using the word *Sacrament*, has led to great confusion of

ideas amongst those who have undertaken to represent the doctrines of the Church. And it is this confusion of ideas, (as I would fain hope, rather than impute a dishonest intention to any of my respected brethren) which has induced Dr. Pusey and his friends to claim authority from Ridley, Hooker, and other eminent writers, whose sentiments, rightly understood, are directly opposed to him.

Let us next, therefore, proceed to the language of the eminent Bishop Ridley, whom Cranmer professed to have been his own instructor on this very subject.* The following passages, taken from his Disputation at Oxford, in full assurance of his approaching martyrdom, are well worthy of our confidence and veneration.

“Christ left his body and flesh,” saith he,† “in mystery to the faithful in the Supper, to be received after a spiritual communication and by grace. *Neither is the same received in the Supper only, but also at other times, by hearing the Gospel and by faith.*”

“I worship Christ in the Sacrament,” saith he elsewhere,‡ “but not because he is included in the Sacrament; like as I worship Christ also in the Scriptures, not because he is really included in them.—The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ’s body in the Lord’s Supper to be communicated to the godly by grace and spiritually, as I have often showed, and by a sacramental signification, but not by the corporal presence of the body of his flesh.”

Again, saith he,§ “The Eucharist, taken for a sign or symbol, is a Sacrament.”

“Inasmuch as the bread and wine are sanctified and made the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, they have a promise of grace annexed to them; namely, of spi-

* Burnet’s History of the Reformation, Vol. III. p. 425.

† Fox’s Acts and Monuments, Vol. VI. p. 485.

‡ Ib. 492.

§ Ib. 493.

ritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine*, but to them which *worthily do receive the Sacraments.*”*

“The Sacrament hath *not* grace *included in it*,† but to those who receive it well, it is turned to grace. After that manner the water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given; *not* that grace is *included in water*, but that grace cometh by water.”

From this testimony of the accomplished Ridley, I turn next to his fellow martyr, the excellent bishop Latimer, whose doctrine accords precisely, and was by himself repeatedly identified, with the book of Archbishop Cranmer. “It appeareth,” saith he,‡ “that the sacrificing priesthood is changed by God’s ordinance into a preaching priesthood, and the sacrificing priesthood should cease utterly, saving inasmuch as all Christian men are sacrificing priests.”—“Christ gave not *his body* to be received with the mouth,§ but he gave the *Sacrament of his body* to be received with the mouth; he gave the SACRAMENT to the MOUTH, his BODY to the MIND.”

In a very faithful summary of the tedious disputations between the papal commissioners and our blessed Reformers, Fox, the martyrologist, himself a divine of no common ability, observes very justly, that the Romanists deceived themselves about the matter of the Holy Eucharist, in a twofold manner. “First,” saith he,|| “that they consider not the nature of a Sacrament, which is, not to *exhibit* the thing indeed which it doth *represent*, but to *represent effectually one thing by another*; for that is the property of a Sacrament to bear a similitude of one thing by another thing; of the which two things the one is *represented*, the other indeed *exhibited*. Secondly, that they consider not

* Fox’s Acts and Monuments, Vol. VI. p. 494.

† Ib.

‡ Ib. 502.

§ Ib. 506,

|| Ib. 521.

the operation of faith, which, penetrating up to heaven, there apprehendeth the real body of Christ no less, yea, and more effectually, than if he were here bodily present to the eye." "Now the papists," continues he, on the following page,* wheresoever they speak or read of the eating of Christ's body, conceive no other eating of him but only of that in the Sacrament, and no otherwise; which is false, and the cause of great error, in that they see not, neither do consider, *how* Christ is eaten, not only *with* the symbols or Sacrament, but also *without* the Sacrament: which eating standeth *inwardly by faith*, and pertaineth to the spirit of man, in apprehending or digesting with the stomach of faith those things which, by the outward Sacrament, are represented. And of this spiritual eating of Christ speaketh the sixth Chapter of St. John."

The same writer has constructed a *Table*, which seems to me well adapted to give clear and distinct ideas of the true doctrine of our Church as held by the Reformers on this highly important subject. With this view, beloved brethren, I present it in full, and I beg leave to recommend it as worthy of careful and repeated perusal. It is as follows: viz.

"The body of Christ is, really, spiritually, and sacramentally, *present, eaten, and united.*"

FIRST.

The Body of Christ is *really present*.

"So was the body of Christ once present here on earth with us, and shall be again at the day of his coming. Otherwise it is not here really present, but only to our faith, really, that is to say truly, apprehending his body in heaven, and here feeding upon the same in earth. And thus is he present only to good men, whether with the symbols or without the symbols.

* Fox's Acts and Monuments, Vol. VI. p. 522.

The Body of Christ is *really eaten*.

“Really, not with our bodily mouth, but with the mouth of faith; apprehending the real body of Christ, who suffered for us, and worketh to us nourishment of life and grace.

The Body of Christ is *really united*.

“Really and corporally the flesh of Christ is united to us, by his incarnation, and the partaking of our flesh.

SECONDLY.

The Body of Christ is *Spiritually present*.

“Spiritually we say his body is present when either the body of Christ is present to our spirit and faith; or when the virtue of his body is present, and redoundeth to our bodies and spirits by grace. And this differeth from the other real presence above in this: that the one hath respect to the body apprehended, the other to the thing that doth apprehend.

The Body of Christ is *Spiritually eaten*.

“Spiritually we eat the body and blood of Christ, not with mouth and teeth, but with faith only, whensoever we believe on the passion of Christ, being the true Bread of Life, and the only food of man’s soul. And thus is he eaten, but only of good men, as well *besides* the Sacrament as *with* the Sacrament; and of this eating speaketh the sixth chapter of John. And so was he eaten in the time also of the old Law.

The Body of Christ is *spiritually united*.

“Spiritually he is united to us, when the properties of his holy body, as its innocence, power, glorification, eternity, beatitude, &c., are united to our bodies and spirits, which cometh by our faith in him, according to his words in John xvii. ‘*I in them, and thou in me,*’ &c. And this

uniting, standing by grace, cometh, as well *besides* the Sacrament, as *with* the sacrament; only to the godly.

THIRDLY.

The Body of Christ is *sacramentally present*.

“Sacramentally his body is present, by representation of another thing which beareth a similitude or memorial of his body; and his sacramental presence, pertaining to the outward mouth of the receiver, is common as well to the good as to the evil. And this sacramental presence ought not to be alone, but to be joined with the spiritual presence, &c.

The Body of Christ is *sacramentally eaten*.

“Sacramentally we eat with our bodily mouth, the mysteries of bread and wine, not being the real body indeed, but representing the real body indeed; *id est, “non panem Dominum, sed panem Domini.”* And this eating, if it be not joined with the other two above, profiteth nothing; and so, is eaten only of the evil. If it be adjoined, then is it eaten of the good, and then it profiteth.

The Body of Christ is *sacramentally united*.

“The sacrament, as it is the real body itself of the Lord, so it causeth not itself any real conjunction betwixt Christ’s real body and ours, but representeth the same, declaring that as the material bread, digested in our bodies, is united to the same, so the body of Christ, being received by faith, changeth our spirits and bodies to the nature of him.

To the sacramental presence, and eating of Christ, pertain two things chiefly to be considered: *Mutation and Operation*.

MUTATION.

First, Mutation *Substantial*.

“Whereby one substance is changed into another: as water into wine; the rod of Aaron into a serpent, &c. And

this “mutation,” which they call “transubstantiation,” belongeth nothing to the Sacrament; for then, accidents of bread should also be changed, as the accidents of Aaron’s rod were changed, with the substance, into a serpent.

Secondly, Mutation *accidental*.

“Of this “mutation” speaketh the doctors, meaning not the change of substance, but of accidents, which standeth in three things; in the *use*, in *name*, and in *honour*.

First, in Use.

“As when the use of common bread is changed into a mystical and heavenly use.

Secondly, in Name.

“When the name of bread and wine passeth away, and is changed into the name of the body and blood of the Lord, and so, is the name changed.

Thirdly, in Honour.

“As when the bread and wine which before were received not with honour, are now received with honour and reverence: not that we honour the bread and wine, but the things represented in them, as, in a king’s letter and seal, we honour the king, and not the seal.

OPERATION.

First, Operation *in* the Sacraments.

“The operation of the word in the Sacraments is this: to change, not the substance of the Sacrament, but that the substance thereof remaining, may be made the body of Christ, that is the *Sacrament* of the body of Christ. And this operation cannot come but by the Holy Ghost. Whereof Augustine saith: “*Panis non sanctificatur in sacramentum tam magnum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.*”

Secondly, Operation *of* the Sacraments.

“The operation of the Sacraments is thought by the papists to give grace, which, in very deed, give not grace of

their own work; but only serve as instruments and means of that grace and life which cometh from God. So St. Peter calleth it “*Verbum vitæ*,” the Word of life; and St. Paul calleth the Gospel of Christ, “the power of God unto salvation.” Not that they themselves give life and salvation, but that they are certain means and instruments of that life and salvation which cometh to us from God.

To the spiritual presence and manducation of Christ, principally belongeth the sixth chapter of St. John; albeit two sorts of bread are there specified, namely, *bodily or sacramental*, and *spiritual* bread.

First, Bodily or Sacramental, of the Old Testament, and also of the New Testament.

“The bodily or sacramental bread of the *Old* Testament signifying Christ to come, as manna, the rock, &c., and the bodily or sacramental bread of the *New* Testament, signifying Christ already come, as the holy Eucharist.

Secondly, Spiritual Bread.

“Spiritual bread, which is Christ himself, born for us and given for the life of the world. John vi. “My flesh is meat indeed,” &c.

A few other passages, from the dying professions of the martyrs of Christ, may be useful to show their entire agreement. Thus, in the examination of the admirable Bradford, before the Archbishop of York and others, we have the following:*

“*York*. You do deny the presence.”

“*Bradford*. I do not, to the faith of the worthy receivers.”

“*York*. Why, what is that to say other than that Christ lieth not on the altar?”

“*Brad*. My lord, I believe no such presence.”

* Fox's Acts and Monuments, 7th vol. p. 176.

“*Chichester*. It seemeth that you have not read Chrysostom, for he proveth it.”

“*Brad*. Hitherto I have been kept well enough without books; howbeit this I do remember of Chrysostom, that he saith that Christ lieth upon the altar, as the seraphim with their tongues do touch our lips with the coals of the altar in heaven; which is a *hyperbolical locution, of which you know Chrysostom is full.*”

Taylor, the excellent Rector of Hadley, and a martyr, writes strongly concerning the same subject.* “Whereas the sixth chapter of John,” saith he, “was alleged to prove that Christ did give his body corporally in the Supper, even as he had promised in the said chapter, it is most untrue. For only he gave his body sacramentally, spiritually, and effectually, in his supper to the faithful apostles, and corporally he gave it in a bloody sacrifice for the life of the world upon the cross once for all.—But the popish mass is another matter. The mass, as it is now, is but one of Antichrist’s youngest daughters, in the which the devil is rather present and received, than our Saviour, the second Person in Trinity, God and man.”

It would be tedious and unprofitable to cite the several testimonies of that noble band of martyrs, for they all agree in asserting the same substantial doctrine. But perhaps there is nothing more satisfactory to the reflecting mind than the language of the Church herself, in the rubric which is at the close of the office for the Communion of the Sick. It is in the following words:

“But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the minister, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ’s Body and Blood, the minister shall instruct him, that if he do

* Fox’s Acts and Monuments, 6th vol. 701.

truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, *he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.*"

In this we have a plain confirmation of the great truth, that the *sacramental* eating of the Body of our Lord is one thing, and the *spiritual* eating is another. The *real presence*, therefore, and the *spiritual uniting* with Christ, as the Table of Fox clearly defines, may be enjoyed by the faithful and godly man, not only *with* the symbols or Sacrament, but also *without* them, since that divine and celestial gift is bestowed, not upon the elements, but upon the believing soul.

Seeing, then, the perfect harmony of the Prayer Book, the Articles and the Catechism, when rightly understood according to the manifest doctrine of those admirable men who conducted the Reformation to its triumph, and then laid down their lives as witnesses to the truth, I pass on to the time of Elizabeth, and shall show how absolute an accordance is exhibited by the learned and judicious Hooker. Dr. Pusey has indeed appealed to him as he did to the martyr Ridley, but in both instances, unfortunately, he has lost sight of the passages which were directly to the point. Very certain it is, that in many parts of Hooker's great work, expressions may be found, which, taken without qualification, seem to be altogether favourable to the new Tractarian doctrine. All that we have to do, however, is to take the *whole* of his statement, and then it will be manifest that he taught no other doctrine than the great Reformers who had gone before him. The following passages furnish conclusive proof of this assertion.

"The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and

blood," saith Hooker, "is *not* therefore to be sought for *in the Sacrament*, but *IN THE WORTHY RECEIVER* of the Sacrament."

"And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first, 'Take and eat;' then 'This is my body which is broken for you: first, 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth, 'This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is his body or the cup his blood, *but only in the heart and soul of him which receiveth them*. As for the Sacraments, *they really exhibit*, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are *not really*, nor do *really contain in themselves that grace*, which with them or by them it pleaseth GOD to bestow."

"If on all sides it be confessed that the grace of Baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it, what should induce men to think that *the grace of the Eucharist* must needs be *in the Eucharist* before it can be *in us that receive it?*"*

Not long after Hooker, viz. A. D. 1601, Dr. William Barlow, afterwards bishop of Rochester, published a treatise entitled, "A Defence of the Articles of the Protestant Religion," which he dedicated to Bancroft, then Bishop of London. From this work I shall give a short extract, which will throw fresh light upon the point before us.

"Great difference there is, (perchance not observed by many) between our *eating* of Christ, and our *uniting* with him."

"We *eat* him as our Passover dead and slain. And so that speech of St. Austin is true, we have him here *in pabulo*, as he was *in patibulo*, torn and rent; as himself ordained the Sacrament *in pane fracto*, not *integro*, the *bread*

* Ecc. Pol. Book V. ch. lxxvii. § 6, Keble's Ed. Vol. 3, p. 540.

broken, not the *whole loaf*; thereby signifying, yea saying, that in doing it we must remember him, not as *living* among us, but as *dying* for us; *ut in cruce, non in caelo*, as he was *crucified*, not as he is *glorified*. Whereby we conclude, first, for his *presence*, that his body is so far forth there, *quatenus editur*, as it is *eaten*: but his body is eaten as *dead* and *slain*; so himself appointed it, *This is my body*, and stayeth not there, but adds withal, which is *given for you*. And his blood is drunk, not as *remaining in his veins*, but as *shed*: so himself speaketh, *This is my blood of the New Testament SHED for many*. Now his body *bruised*, and his blood *poured out*, can no otherwise be *present* in the Eucharist, but by a *representation* thereof in the bread *broken*, and in the wine *effused*, of the one side; and on the communicant's part, by a grateful *recording* of the benefits, a reverent *valuation* of the sacrifice, a faithful *application* of his merits in his whole passion: and therefore his *presence* must be *sacramental*, and our eating *spiritual*; for, *non quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit*, saith St. Austin."

"For the union," continues our author, "we are united to him *ut viventi*, as our living Head, *et nos vivificant*, and making us his lively members. It is true which Christ saith, that *he which eateth my flesh abideth in me, and I in him*. Not that this *union* is first begun in our participation of that holy Supper, (for none can truly *eat* the body of Christ, unless he be first *united* with him, and ingrafted into him: *nec vere edit corpus Christi, qui non est de corpore Christi*, saith St. Austin,) because *primo unio*, saith Aquinas, the *first union* between God and man is begun in Baptism by *one Spirit*, as the apostle speaketh, and continueth by faith, hope, and charity; all these the operation of the same Spirit."

"But if we truly *eat* the body, and *drink* the blood of Christ, then, by the power of the Holy Ghost, and faith cooperating, this *union* is *strengthened*, the vigour and effects

whereof, after a *true* participation, we shall feel within ourselves more *forcible* and *lively*.—Is not Christ as *present* in Baptism, as in the Eucharist? For in them both we communicate with him, *bred anew* in the one, *fed anew* in the other; and yet Christ's *real presence* is not challenged for Baptism. If they say, No, because of the Eucharist it was said, *This is my body and blood*, not so of Baptism; I answer: As much, if not more, was spoken by the Apostle: *They which are baptized have put on Christ*, (Gal. iii. 27.) Put him on we cannot, unless he be *present*: and the *putting him on* is even the very same which he elsewhere calleth, *Christ's dwelling in us*; (Eph. iii. 17,) namely, that in Baptism we are so transformed, as now not we, but Christ alone doth live within us; (Gal. ii. 20.) as near an *unity* as may. And in truth St. Austin is out of doubt, that in Baptism the true member of Christ *corporis et sanguinis Domini particeps fit*: and therefore no reason withstands, but that he should be really present in *both*, or in *neither*."

The same important argument is admirably enforced by Rev. Dr. Aldrich, A. D. 1687. The extract is long, but it is well worthy of an attentive perusal.

"The *natural* body of our blessed Saviour comes under a two-fold consideration in the Eucharist:"

"1. As a *body dead*: under which notion we are said to eat it in the Sacrament, and to *drink* the blood as *shed*; as appears by the words of the institution, *Take and eat; this is my body which is given or broken for you: drink ye all of this; for this is my blood which is shed for you*: in which words, as Mr. Bradford long ago observed, what God has joined, we are not to put asunder."

"2. As a *glorified body*: in which condition it now sits at the right hand of God, and shall there continue till the restitution of all things, imparting grace and influence, and all the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of the dead body, to those that, in the holy Eucharist most especially, are

through faith and the marvellous operation of the Holy Ghost, *incorporated* into *Christ*, and so *united* to him, that they dwell in Christ, and Christ in them; they are one with Christ and Christ with them; they are made *members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones*; and by partaking of the Spirit of him their Head, receive all the graces and benefits purchased for them by his bitter death and passion.”

“Wherefore it is evident, that since the body *broken*, and blood *shed*, neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really *present*, nor literally *eaten* or *drunk*; nor can we really *receive* them, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the body which now exists, whereof we *partake*, and to which we are *united*, is the *glorified* body; which is therefore *verily and indeed* received—and by consequence said to be *really present*, notwithstanding its *local* absence; because a real *participation* and *union* must needs imply a *real* presence, though they do not necessarily imply a *local* one. For it is easy to conceive, how a thing that is locally absent may yet be really *received*,—as we commonly say, a man *receives an estate*, or *inheritance*, when he receives the *deeds* or *conveyances* of it. The reception is confessedly *real*, though the thing itself is not *locally* or *circumscriptively* present, or literally grasped in the arms of the receiver.—The Protestants all agree, that we *spiritually eat* Christ’s body, and *drink* his blood; that we neither eat, nor drink, nor receive the *dead* body, nor the blood *shed*, but only the *benefits* purchased by them; that those benefits are *derived* to us by virtue of our *union* and *communion* with the *glorified body*, and that our *partaking* of it and *union* with it, is effected by the mysterious and ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit.”

“Now though it be easy, as I said before, to conceive how a natural substance may be said to be really *received*, though not locally *present*, it is not so easy to conceive it

really present, when at the same time it is *locally absent*. Therefore the Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of *real presence*, in all the books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's nor Nowell's Catechism. So that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the *Church* directs him: if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him. Yet it must not be denied but the term may be safely used among *scholars*, and seems to be grounded upon Scripture itself."*

"So much for the use of the *word*; which when we of the Church of England use, we mean thus: A thing may be said to be *really received*, which is so *consigned* to us, that we can *really employ* it to all those *purposes* for which it is *useful* in itself, and we have *occasion* to use it. And a thing thus *really received* may be said to be *really present*, two ways, either *physically*, or *morally*, to which we reduce *sacramentally*. In the holy Eucharist, the SACRAMENT is *physically*, the RES SACRAMENTI *morally* present; the elements *antecedently* and *locally*; the very body *consequentially* and *virtually*, but both *really* present. When we say that CHRIST is present in the Sacrament, we do not mean in the *elements*, but in the *celebration*. This doctrine is sufficiently removed from what is called *Zuinglianism*, (how truly, I will not now inquire,) for we do not hold that we barely receive the *effects* and *benefits* of Christ's *body*, but we hold it *really present*, in as much as it is *really received*, and we *actually* put in *possession* of it, though *locally* absent from us."

The observations of Dr. Waterland, to whose elaborate 'Review of the doctrine of the Eucharist' I am indebted for the last two extracts, are valuable. (Works, Vol. vii. p.

* Here the author refers to Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20, 1 Cor. v. 3.

192.) "The sum of all," saith he, "is, that *Sacramental* or *symbolical* feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body *broken* and blood *shed*, under the signs and symbols of *bread* and *wine*: the result of such feeding is, the strengthening or perfecting our *mystical union* with the body *glorified*; and so, properly speaking, we feed upon the body as *dead*, and we *receive* it into closer *union* as *living*, and both in the Eucharist when duly celebrated."

Our learned author proceeds to apply the doctrine to the various parties who contend for a different hypothesis.

"1. To the Romanists," saith he, "who plead warmly for the *very body and blood* in the Eucharist, we make answer, that we do receive the *very body and blood*, in it, and through it, as properly as a man *receives* an *estate*, and becomes *possessed* of an *inheritance*, by any deeds or conveyances: and what would they have more? Will nothing satisfy, except the *wax* and *parchments* be transubstantiated into *terra firma*, or every *instrument* converted into *arable*? Surely this is pressing points too far, and turning things most serious into perfect ridicule."

"2. To the Lutherans, who seem to contend for a *mixture* of the *visible* elements with the body *invisible*, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a *Symbolical* delivery or conveyance of one by the other; which effectually answers every good end and purpose, and also suits extremely well with the Scripture phraseology in those cases. And though we admit not, that our Lord's body is *locally* present in the Sacrament, or any where so *present* but in heaven; yet so long as it is really *united* in *one mystical body* with ours, or rather is considered as the *Head* with the *members*, we think that may suffice; and we need not desire any closer alliance, on this side heaven, than such an *union* amounts to."

"3. To the Calvinists of the ancient stamp, (if any such remain now,) we might reply, that though we *eat* not Christ's *glorified* body in the Eucharist, yet we really re-

ceive it into closer *mystical* union than before: and though we know nothing of the *diffusion* of any *virtue of Christ's flesh* (which would not profit) yet we have the power and presence of his *Godhead* with us, and at the same time, *virtual* or *mystical* union with his *body*, sufficient to make us, in *Divine construction* and *Divine acceptance*, ONE WITH HIM; "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."

"4. To the Zuinglian Sacramentarians, old Anabaptists, Socinians and Remonstrants, who will not admit of any medium between *local corporal* presence, and *no presence* at all as to *beneficial* effects, no *medium* between the *natural* body itself and mere *signs* and *figures*; to them we rejoin, that there is no necessity of falling in with either extreme; because there is a *medium*, a very just one, and where indeed the *truth* lies. For though there is no *corporal presence*, yet there is a *spiritual* one, *exhibitive* of *Divine blessings* and *graces*: and though we *eat* not Christ's *natural* glorified body in the Sacrament or out of it, yet our *mystical union* with that very body is strengthened and perfected in and through the Sacrament, by the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT."—

"5. To those who admit not that the *natural* body of Christ is in any sense received at all, but imagine that the elements, as impregnated or animated with the *Spirit*, are the *only body* received, and are made our *Lord's body* by such union with the *Spirit*; I say, to those we make answer, that the union of the Spirit with the *elements* (rather than with *the persons*) appears to be a *gross* notion and *groundless*: and if it were admitted, yet could it not make the elements, in any just sense, our Lord's body, but the notion would resolve into a kind of *impanation* of the Spirit, for the time."

In a note to this passage, our author states that such "seems to be Mr. Johnson's notion, in the 'Unbloody Sacrifice,' &c., part 1, p. 247. And it is very near akin, so

far, to that of the modern Greek Church, as represented by Mr. Claude in his Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist." According to the best of my judgment, it is the very doctrine intended by our Tractarian brethren. And I doubt not that we should all willingly subscribe to the language of Dr. Waterland, that "the *fundamental* error of this hypothesis (as also of the *Lutheran* and the *Romish*,) is the connecting the *grace* of the Sacrament with the *elements*, instead of looking for it in the *persons* only."

I have deviated somewhat from the order of Chronology, by placing the judgment of Waterland before that of Bishop Burnet, whose well-known work upon the 39 Articles corresponds, in the main, with all that I have cited. A short extract will suffice to show this clearly.

"We assert," saith this important author, speaking for the Church of England, "a *real presence* of the *body* and *blood* of Christ; but not of his *body* as it is now glorified in heaven, but of his *body* as it was *broken* on the cross, when his *blood was shed* and separated from it: that is to say; his death, with the merits and effects of it, are in a visible and federal act offered in this Sacrament to all worthy believers."

"By *real* we understand *true*, in opposition both to fiction and imagination . . . though we are convinced that our first Reformers judged right concerning the use of the phrase *real presence*, that it were better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it, and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptation of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure." (Burnet on the Articles, p. 321.)

The long list of quotations, appended to the sermon of Rev. Dr. Pusey, would inspire considerable respect for the strength and number of his authorities, but unhappily they labour under an imputation of the same unfairness which I

have proved in the cases of Ridley and Hooker. It must indeed, be admitted, in palliation of his course, that it had been followed by others before him, particularly by Archbishop Laud, in his conference with Fisher. This, however, properly understood, seems to my mind a confirmation of the charge, that the doctrine held by our Tractarian brethren inclines strongly towards Romanism. For the powerful influence of his queen Henrietta over the mind of the first Charles, manifestly disposed him, and perhaps, unconsciously, his favourite Archbishop, to make the Church of England as much like the Church of Rome as possible. And there can be little doubt that to his manifest bias towards the ceremonial of Rome, which, under such high influence, spread rapidly through her clergy, was owing, in a great degree, the disgust conceived against the Church, and the consequent outbreak and temporary success of Puritanism.*

On a fair and candid comparison, therefore, of the doctrine of the Church, with the doctrine of our Tractarian brethren, I think it manifest that the Church confines the idea of the *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ to the *faithful receiver* of the Sacrament, while our Tractarian brethren place that Real Presence in the Sacrament itself, that is, in the consecrated elements, on the Communion Table, or Altar. That when the Article declares that the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, the Church teaches us to believe that this divine benefit is communicated by *Christ himself to the faithful soul*, while our Tractarian friends hold that it is already ‘in an ineffable manner’ united to the consecrated Bread, and is thus *given* to the communicant *by the hands of the minister*. That when the Catechism declares the Body and Blood to be *verily and*

* See Hume’s History of England, for a full confirmation of this.

indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, the Church expresses the grace *bestowed by the Redeemer, through his Holy Spirit*, on the *worthy partaker*, while our Tractarian brethren would maintain that this *verily* and *indeed* refers to the consecrated Symbols in the paten and the chalice—that in some *ineffable* manner, but yet *real* and *true*, the glorified Saviour, Body, Soul, and Divinity, are *included* in the bread and wine, by virtue of the act of consecration, handled, broken, poured forth, and finally given to the Communicant *by the priest*, so that the Lord does not fulfil his gracious promise of entering into the faithful heart, except by first, *verily and indeed*, uniting himself to these elements, in order that the *priest* may perform the act which brings the soul into a living union with its Saviour.

Hence Mr. Palmer states it as the Church's doctrine, that the outward Sacrament "is not *a sign* of an *absent body*," misquoting the Homily, which declares, that it is not an *untrue sign* of an absent body, by which unfortunate omission of this word '*untrue*' he changes the whole meaning of the sentence.

Hence he saith that "GOD WITHDRAWS his divine gift" from those who are totally devoid of a true and living faith; taking it for granted, that this divine gift was first placed in the hand of the priest, since it was really present in the elements, and therefore that the unworthy would actually receive it, if the Almighty Redeemer did not *withdraw* himself, by a special and subsequent act, from the touch of the profane.

Hence, too, he pronounces the doctrine of the Church that 'the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith do not receive Christ,' although they take the Sacrament, to be only "THE MORE PIOUS AND PROBABLE OPINION." From which it is to be inferred, that the contrary opinion of the Church of Rome is *pious and probable*, only that the *opinion*

of our article is *more pious and probable*. Where this learned and ingenious theologian discovered that he was at liberty to hold a positive statement of Christian doctrine in the Articles to be no more than an "*opinion*," he has not informed us. But it is evident that the inference which I have supplied may be even more favourable than the true one. For there are *three* degrees of comparison, and our author may place some other opinion in the *Positive*, and the doctrine of Rome in the *Superlative*, if he pleases, without in the least disturbing the arrangement of his System.

It is true, indeed, that Mr. Palmer consents to the Articles in rejecting transubstantiation, and asserting that the nature of the bread and wine remains. But he appears to be in a difficulty about the inevitable consequences, and therefore he admits these propositions under limitations which open a wide door of escape from the true doctrine of the Church.

Hence he defines transubstantiation to be "*the change of the substance which supposes the nature of bread entirely to cease by consecration.*" From this it is sufficiently obvious, that if the nature of bread does not *entirely* cease,—if, for example, the nature of bread continues in the form, colour, weight, smell, and taste, which the Romanists themselves allow under the name of accidents—there seems nothing to prevent Mr. Palmer's hypothesis from reconciling the Article with the doctrine of Rome, only leaving out the mere term *transubstantiation*, as was done in the time of Henry VIII. And that such must be his meaning appears but too evident from his startling assertion, that the doctrine of the Church has undergone no very material change since that day.

Hence too, when he admits that the Church holds the presence, and therefore the eating of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper, according to the Article, to

be "altogether heavenly and spiritual," he exhibits the same kind of skill in defining the words to mean a kind of presence and eating "which is inexplicable by any carnal or earthly experience or imagination; even as the Sonship of the Eternal Word of God, and His incarnation, and the procession of the Holy Spirit, are immeasurable by human understanding." Thus limited, or paraphrased, or rather, as it seems to my mind, *refined away*, it is perfectly manifest that Mr. Palmer finds nothing in the Article which might not be subscribed *ex animo* by a Roman Catholic himself.

And, in perfect consistency with the rest, our ingenious author, when stating, according to the Article, that the Church rejects the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, is careful to call it, "any such real presence of Christ's Body and Blood as is corporal or organical; *that is, according to the known and earthly mode of existence of a body.*" Here again, he reduces the doctrine of the Church to a proposition which no Romanist could censure. The divines of Rome, in her most corrupt days, never pretended to say that the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament was "*according to the known and earthly mode of existence,*" but quite the contrary. Thus it is, that this eminent writer bends his talents and his learning to reduce our theology to a set of *distinctions without a difference*, all agreeing, it must be confessed, with his counsel, that an English Episcopalian ought to desire Communion with Rome, if he were resident in any part of the world where Rome had the prior and peaceable possession; but all sadly variant, in my humble judgment, from the Standards of the Church, and the principles of the Reformation.

I see nothing, therefore, in the elaborate statement concerning the holy Eucharist, which Mr. Palmer has set forth at large, and which Dr. Pusey has appended to his sermon, in any wise restrictive of his first broad proposition, that

“the body or flesh, and the blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one Person, are verily and indeed given, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper, *under the outward sign or form of bread and wine*; which is, on this account, the partaking or Communion of the body and blood of Christ; that the Eucharist is not the sign of an *absent* body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure or shadow of Christ’s body, but the reality itself. And as Christ’s divine and human natures are inseparably united, so we receive in the Eucharist, not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, both God and man.” For after ingeniously refining away, as we have seen, the qualifications of this proposition, which might have reconciled it with the true sense of the reformers, he proceeds to say, that the consecration of the elements “*operates a real change*. For when the Sacrament is **THUS PERFECTED**, the Church regards it as so ‘divine a thing,’ so ‘heavenly a food,’ as that we must not ‘*presume*’ to approach it with unprepared minds, and that sinners, although they only partake of the bread and wine, partake of them to their own *condemnation*, because they impiously disregard the Lord’s Body, which is *truly present in that Sacrament*. Hence it is that the Church, believing firmly in the real presence of the ‘precious and blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ,’ speaks of the Eucharist as ‘high and holy mysteries,’ exhorts us to consider the dignity of that holy ‘mystery,’ that ‘heavenly feast,’ that ‘holy table,’ ‘and banquet of that most heavenly food, even the King of kings’ table.’ And a little farther on, although he admits that the tenet of Transubstantiation “has the fatal defect of being opposed to the plain language of Scripture,” yet he introduces this by the following startling statement: “It is not to be denied that the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation facilitates the mental conception of that mys-

tery," (sc. the Eucharistic doctrine.) O how discordant is all this from the language of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer, and Bradford, and the whole of that blessed army of martyrs! How opposite to the teaching of Jewel and Hooker! How much more sympathy and concord does it plainly manifest with the Church of Rome, than with the Church of England!

But there is yet another aspect of this matter, in which the character of the new Tractarian divinity is discernible. I refer to the passage in which our learned author speaks of the adoration of the Host in the Church of Rome.* "If Christ," saith he, "be in a special and mysterious manner present in these 'holy mysteries,' as the infinite majority of Christians have at all times firmly and fervently believed, according to the more simple and unrestrained interpretation of Holy Scripture; the truly religious man cannot but be profoundly impressed with sentiments of awe and veneration in the more immediate presence of the Divine Saviour of the world. He will feel with the patriarch: 'How dreadful is this place,' 'this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.' Nor will he need the voice of God to say: 'Put off thy shoes from thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' Now there is every reason to believe that of those who intended their worship at the elevation to be directed to Christ, as more immediately present in the holy Eucharist, many directed it simply to *Christ himself*, and not to the external part of the Sacrament, whether substance or species. And such men could not be properly charged with idolatry, because their worship was not directed to an idol, nor to a false god, nor to a creature. *It is clear, however, that others have worshipped the elements themselves with divine honour*, as our writers have shown, and those who did so cannot be excused from the guilt of idolatry. But

* Vol. i. p. 314.

this imputation *cannot justly rest* either on the *whole Western Church before the Reformation*, or on the *Roman Churches in general since*, as bishops Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, &c. have taught."

Now here, at least to my own feelings, is a very painful specimen of paralogism. For I cannot believe *that the elements* were ever worshipped by the Romanists, unless under the erroneous belief that Christ Jesus the Lord *was actually present in them*, and if such was their belief, their worship was *mentally directed to Christ himself*, so far as their *intention* was concerned, and therefore the author's apology would justify them from the guilt of idolatry. But inasmuch as this reasoning would too openly condemn the Church of England, who had repeatedly charged idolatry in this matter upon the Church of Rome, he makes a formal and general statement, without authority, that *some persons in that Church worshipped the elements themselves; which was indeed idolatry*, and under cover of this assertion, he discharges the Church of Rome from all blame, allowing the lawfulness of their prostration before the Host, on the ground that the worship may be directed to Christ himself, "*whom the infinite majority of Christians have at all times firmly and fervently believed to be present in these holy mysteries, in a special and mysterious manner.*"

In no one of these statements, however, do I see how Mr. Palmer can be fairly reconciled to the Church of England. Not in his exoneration of the Church of Rome from idolatry; for this is charged upon her by the Homilies, the Articles, and the Reformers, again and again. Not in his confident assurance that the infinite majority of Christians have *at all times* firmly and fervently believed that Christ himself was present in the holy mysteries, (meaning the consecrated elements,) in a special and mysterious manner. For the Church of England maintains that this mystical presence of Christ is *in the soul of the faithful receiver*, and not in the consecrated sign or symbol, as held up in the

hands of the priest. Not in his notion that the Sacrament cannot be an idol, to those who erroneously worship it, under the belief that Christ is there. Because their error in so believing does not change the real character of the object of their worship. The Israelites committed idolatry when they worshipped the golden calf, although they seem to have intended nothing more than the honouring of the true God; for they said: "*These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.*" The heathen committed idolatry in worshipping the statue of Jupiter, although they erroneously believed that in that statue, after consecration, was actually contained the essential Deity of the almighty Father of gods and men. And according to the main body of English theologians, the Church of Rome is idolatrous in worshipping the Host, notwithstanding the false idea, that it has been transubstantiated into the actual Body of the Redeemer. How far this erroneous notion may palliate their idolatry before the Searcher of hearts, it is not for us to say. But we can certainly say, that as it is idolatry to pay divine worship to any being, other than the only living and true God, the Romanist cannot fairly escape from the imputation of this deadly sin, merely because he falsely attributes to a consecrated wafer, the personal Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ: for this would be to get rid of the idolatry, by virtue of a lie. The other side of the argument would indeed be more agreeable to our feelings of Christian compassion towards our mistaken brethren. But the insurmountable objection to it lies in this: that if the erroneous conception of the worshipper in *supposing his idol to be divine*, be sufficient to sanctify the object of his worship, there never could have been any idolatry since the world began.

There is, however, one aspect of this matter, which has pressed upon my mind with peculiar force, as worthy of grave reflection. It must be granted, I presume, that the

guilt of idolatry rests, in its highest and most awful aspect, upon those who *make* the idol, rather than on those who worship it, confiding in the false assertions of their leaders. Now I would earnestly beseech my respected brethren, who are so indulgent to this perilous error of the Church of Rome, that they would seriously consider whether *they* are not making an idol, by thus exalting the outward symbol of the Saviour's Body into a present Deity. For whether there be any elevation by the Priest, or any prostration by the people, the *idolatry of the heart* may be as surely introduced, and then the evils of superstition will as surely follow.

I am aware, indeed, that the idolatry which our Church charges upon Rome on account of this adoration of the Host, is supposed, by most persons, to be altogether impossible, so long as we reject their doctrine of transubstantiation. But here lies a palpable error. The most important point in the whole eucharistic controversy, according to my humble judgment, does not concern the *absence* of the Bread, but the supposed *presence* of the Saviour's Body. The very reason why the Romanists insisted on the disappearance of the bread, was because they thought they could not otherwise inculcate the presence of the Body, under the not unreasonable notion, that two different substances could not occupy the same place at the same time. And therefore, if our Oxford friends can persuade the Church to believe, that Christ Jesus, in a spiritual Body, together with his Soul and Divinity, is just as really and positively exhibited upon the altar and held in the hands of the priest, and received into the mouth of the worshipper, upon their hypothesis, without transubstantiation, as upon the Roman hypothesis with it, where is the difference in any point which is of importance either to faith or practice?

In the one case, indeed, Christ is supposed to be in the

consecrated elements with a fleshly body. In the other, he is supposed to be in them with a spiritual body. But surely it is not on account of his flesh that we worship him, but by reason of his Deity, which is supposed to be equally present by either doctrine. Of course it results, that since the Sacrament contains the real object of worship as perfectly according to the doctrine of Oxford, as according to the dogma of Rome, the same adoration must be equally due; and the communicant, thus believing, is equally bound to worship it accordingly.

It is likewise granted, that in the one case the sacred presence of the divine Redeemer is supposed to be included under the *substance* of the bread, and in the other case it is supposed to be included under the outward *accidents*, the taste, the form, the colour, &c. But this distinction is of small account in the main doctrine. The miracle is equally great in either case, or rather it is a little greater on the Tractarian theory, because, as Mr. Palmer honestly confesses, transubstantiation “facilitates the mental conception of the mystery.” Nor, indeed, is it at all admissible, in my poor judgment, that while the Church throughout the world has always maintained the inseparable indivisibility of the human from the Divine nature, in the One Person of the adorable Redeemer, theologians should be permitted to inculcate the notion, that He can be really present, in his human and divine nature, in the consecrated elements, and yet not be present in his flesh, or corporally. Our respected friends of Oxford are satisfied with calling this a mystery, ineffable and inexplicable. I fully believe with them that it is ineffable and inexplicable; but instead of a *mystery*, it looks, to my mind, much more like a *palpable contradiction*. And therefore I must frankly say, that if I were compelled to make my election between the doctrine of Rome and the new doctrine of Oxford, I should take transubstantiation as the more rea-

sonable of the two. Thank God! the doctrine of the Church is neither the one nor the other.

If it should still be thought, however, that the substance of the bread, according to the Oxford doctrine, must be a sufficient hinderance to the act of adoration, I beg to ask on what principle? Surely it cannot be doubted, that the *real, local presence* of our Divine Redeemer must be honoured by our adoration, without regard to the material substance under which he becomes manifest to our faith. When he tabernacled with men, his garments formed a far larger mass, and were no more objects of worship in themselves, than the consecrated bread of the Sacrament. Yet who supposes that the presence of those garments caused the adoration of his suppliants to cease?

But our respected brethren would not be satisfied with claiming for their doctrine the sanction of the Church of England: they also challenge on its behalf the clear and unanimous suffrages of the fathers, and I should do injustice to the subject, therefore, if I did not exhibit what seems to my mind a sufficient amount of evidence to confute this error.

Commencing with Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 192, we find him setting forth a very clear and satisfactory account of our subject. He states [1] that "the blood of our

[1] *Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. 11. p. 151. B.* Duplex est autem Sanguis Domini: alter enim est carnalis, quo redempti sumus ab interitu: alter verò spiritualis quo scilicet uncti sumus. Et hoc est bibere Jesu sanguinem, esse participem incorruptionis Domini. Verbi autem virtus est spiritus, quemadmodum sanguis carnis. Aptæ itaque proportionē et convenientiā, vinum quidem aquæ, homini verò Spiritus admiscetur. Ac temperatum quidem vinum ad fidem, convivio excipit: Spiritus autem deducit ad incorruptionem. Amborum autem temperatura, potus scilicet et verbi, dicitur Eucharistia, quæ et laudatur, et bona est gratia: cujus qui per fidem sunt participes, sanctificantur et corpore et anima, cum divinum temperamentum, hominem scilicet, divina voluntas Spiritu et Verbo mysticè contemperaverit. Etenim verè quidem Spiritus animæ quæ ab ipso fertur, conjungitur et familiaris efficitur; caro autem Verbo, propter quam Verbum caro factum est.

Lord is twofold, one carnal, by which we are redeemed from destruction, the other spiritual, with which we are anointed. To drink the blood of Christ is to be a partaker of our Lord's incorruption. But the vigour of the Word is Spirit, as the vigour of the flesh is blood. As the wine in due proportion is added to the water, so is the Spirit to the man. And as the wine, duly administered, is taken in the feast, the Spirit is received to incorruption. The admixture of the wine and the word is called the Eucharist, which is a good gift and praiseworthy, since those who partake of it through faith, are sanctified in body and in soul, when the divine will mystically operates upon the receiver. For truly the Spirit becomes united to the soul, while the flesh is united to the Word, because the Word was made flesh."

Here, all is simple and consistent. The elements are spoken of as consecrated symbols, and the sacred effects are spiritual, the operation of Christ and the Spirit upon the *faithful and worthy* recipient.

From Clement, I pass on to Tertullian, who flourished a little later, A. D. 200. Disputing against the heretic Marcion, who insisted that the senses were not to be believed with regard to the outward appearance of our Lord's human nature, his sufferings and death, Tertullian presses his adversary with the following argument: [2] "If I am deceived with respect to the *outward*, shall I believe him concerning the *inward substance*? How shall he be true in what is concealed, when he is found to be so fallacious in what is open?" Now this argument might have been triumphantly retorted by Marcion and all the Gnostic heretics, if the tenet of our Oxford friends had then been the doctrine of the Church. For what is the testimony of the

[2] *Tertul. adv. Marcion.* p 401. An credam ei de interiore substantia, qui sit de exteriori frustratus? Quomodo verax habebitur in occulto, tam fallax repertus in aperto?

senses worth, if we are to believe, that the consecrated bread, in the hand of the priest, has actually become the present, incarnate, glorified Redeemer?

Again, saith the same Tertullian, directly to the point: [3] "For thus God has revealed it in the Gospel, calling the bread his body, that henceforth you may understand that he *gave to bread the figure of his body*, which body the prophet had in times past spoken of under the *figure of bread*, the Lord himself being about to interpret it in this Sacrament."

Again, [4] "Taking bread, and distributing it to his disciples, he made it his body, by saying, This is my body, *that is, the figure of my body.*"

In like manner, Tertullian interprets the prophet Malachi in a manner totally variant from the hypothesis of our Tractarian brethren, who symbolize with Rome in the notion of the Eucharist being a sacrifice. [5] "From the rising of the sun, saith the prophet, unto the setting of the same, my name is glorified amongst the nations, and in every place sacrifice is offered unto my name, and a clean sacrifice; to wit," saith Tertullian, "*simple prayer from a pure conscience.*"

Origen will next furnish us with a very plain testimony. For he tells us in one place, [6] that "the bread of Jesus

[3] *Ib.* 408. Sic enim Deus in Evangelio revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut et hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit, ipso Domino hoc sacramentum postea interpretaturo.

[4] *Ib.* p. 457, § xl. Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, *id est, figura corporis mei.*

[5] *Ib.* 413. A solis ortu usque ad occasum glorificatum est in nationibus nomen meum, et in omni loco sacrificium nomini meo offertur, et sacrificium mundum, scilicet, *simplex oratio de conscientia pura.*

[6] *Origenis in Jeremiam, Hom. X. Tom. I. p. 103.* Panis Jesu quo nutrimur, *sermo ejus interpretatur.*

with which we are fed *is to be interpreted his Word.*” And elsewhere, commenting on our Lord’s instructions, he saith [7] that “the bread is *consecrated by the Word of God and prayer*, and that through the prayer offered over it, *according to the proportion of faith*, it is useful to purify and clear the mind.” He adds that “he who eats it worthily before God is not helped by the material bread, but by the prayer offered over it, and thus much may suffice,” saith he, “concerning *the typical and symbolical body.*”

From Origen, about the middle of the third century, we may pass to his cotemporary Cyprian, from whom the same doctrine may be gathered without difficulty. For having occasion [8] to reprove the error of some persons who cele-

[7] *Origenis Com. in Mat. Tom. I. p. 254.* Quod si verum id, *omne quod intrat in os, in ventrem vadit, et in secessum emittitur*, et cibus ipse per verbum Dei et orationem consecratus, secundum illud quidem ipsum quod materia constat, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur; secundum orationem autem quæ illi accessit, *juxta proportionem fidei*, utilis fit, efficitque ut perspicax fiat animus, spectans ad id quod prodest; nec panis materia, sed super eum prolata oratio, ea est quæ illum juvat, qui non indigne Deo hunc comedit. Et hæc quidem de typico et symbolico corpore.

[8] *S. Cypriani Ep. LXIII. ad Cæcilium de Sacramento Domini calicis*, p. 118-9. Miror satis unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra Evangelicam et Apostolicam disciplinam quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in Dominico calice, quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere—p. 119. Aquas namque populos significare, in Apocalypsis Scriptura divina declarat dicens: *Aquæ quas vidisti, super quas sedet meretrix illa, populi, et turbæ, et gentes ethnicorum sunt et linguæ.* Quod scilicet perspicimus et in sacramento calicis contineri. Nam quia nos omnes portabat Christus, qui et peccata nostra portabat; videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino verò ostendit sanguinem Christi. Quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur, et credentium plebs, ei in quem credit, copulatur et conjungitur. Quæ copulatio et conjunctio aquæ et vini sic miscetur in calice Domini, ut commixto illa non possit ab invicem separari. Unde Ecclesiam, id est, plebem in Ecclesia constitutam fideliter et firmiter in eo quod credit perseverantem, nulla res separare poterit a Christo, quominus hæreat semper et maneat individua dilectio. Sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest, nam si vinum tantum quis

brated the sacrament with water alone, he explains the custom of the Church in mixing water with wine, saying, that by the water was to be understood the people, while the wine showed the blood of Christ; that when these were mingled together, Christ was joined and united with his people, and that as the wine could not be afterwards separated from the water, so neither could believers, persevering, be separated from their Saviour. He concludes by saying that "in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, it is not proper to offer either water or wine alone, since *if any one offers wine alone, the blood of Christ begins to be without us: but if the water be alone, the people begin to be without Christ; but when each is thoroughly mingled with the other, then the spiritual and celestial sacrament is perfected.*"

Now in this passage of Cyprian, we may plainly perceive that he considered the consecrated wine as a figure of the blood, because he speaks of it precisely as he does of the water, which is manifestly a figurative expression for the people, since no one ever imagined that the *communicants* were *actually present in the chalice*, unless in the sense of an emblematic representation. The necessary inference is, that he considered the eucharistic elements as *sacred symbols* of the spiritual benefits assured to the *faithful and persevering*, in the inseparable union accomplished between Christ and the soul. And yet, while it is demonstrably evident that this was his meaning, he uses such terms as would make him an authority on the other side, if it had not been for the signification of the water, which serves as a key to the whole. From this we may further learn the current usage of the early Christians, who spake and wrote without any fear of misapprehension from the figurative language

offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis: si verò aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo: quando autem utrunque miscetur, et adunatione confusa sibi invicem copulatur, tunc sacramentum spiritale et cœleste perficitur,

which they employed. They would, doubtless, have qualified their statements, on many occasions, if they could have imagined the possibility of such a doctrine as Transubstantiation.

I may next set forth a sentence from Eusebius, who flourished in the early part of the 4th century. He speaks (9) of "the memorial of the Sacrifice of Christ being celebrated at the table, by *certain signs* (or symbols) of his body and saving blood, according to the institution of the New Testament." And after quoting the Psalmist, saying: Thou hast prepared a table before me against them which afflicted me, &c., he then adds, "Plainly therefore the Psalmist signifies, in these, the mystical anointing, and the tremendous sacrifices of the table of Christ, operating with which, we are taught to *offer ourselves unbloody, rational, and acceptable victims in our whole life* to the Supreme God, through that most highly exalted High Priest of our profession." Here again we find the consecrated elements termed *signs* or *symbols*, and the spiritual anointing, and the practical result, are both set forth with force and clearness.

Next to Eusebius, comes the testimony of Athanasius, which is the more interesting on account of his successful zeal in the great Arian controversy. The passage occurs in a comment on part of St. John's Gospel, (10) where our

(9) *Euseb. Dem. Evan L. I. p. 39.* Cum ergo hujus sacrificii memoriam signis quibusdam in mensa celebrandam, corporisque item illius, salutarisque sanguinis, ut novi Testamenti institutum habet, acceperimus: rursus a propheta David instruimur ad dicendum: Parasti in conspectu meo mensam contra eos qui affligunt me. Pingue fecisti in oleo caput meum, et calix tuus inebrians quam præstantissimus. Palam igitur in his mysticam significat unctionem, et horrorem afferentia mensæ Christi sacrificia, quibus operantes, incruentas et rationales, eique suaves victimas, in tota vita supremo Deo offerre, per eminentissimum omnium ipsius Pontificem, edocti sumus.

(10) *S. Athan. in illud Evangelii, Quicumque dixerit. Tom. I. p. 979, B.* Istiusmodi characterem etiam in Johannis Evangelio vidi, ubi de esu

Lord, replying to the cavils of the Jews, (who understood literally what he had declared concerning the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood,) explains himself by saying, *Doth this offend you? What and if you shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken unto you, they are Spirit and they are life.* "In this place," saith Athanasius, "he speaks of both the flesh and the Spirit, and carefully distinguishes one from the other, in order that we, believing not only in that which was apparent to sight, but also in that which was invisible, might learn that the things which he spake were not carnal but spiritual. For how many men would his body have sufficed for food, that it should become the nourishment of the whole world? But for this reason he made mention of his ascension into heaven, that they might be drawn away from this corporal notion, and thus understand that HIS FLESH, about which he had been speaking, WAS CELESTIAL AND SPIRITUAL FOOD FROM HEAVEN, TO BE GIVEN BY HIMSELF. *For those things which I have spoken unto you, saith he, are Spirit and life.*"

Cyril of Jerusalem stands next in the order of our witnesses, and I shall first quote a passage from his comment on the Liturgy of his day.

corporis disputans, ac propterea multos scandalizatos conspiciens, ita locutus est: *Hocine vos scandalizat? Quid si igitur filium hominis spectaveritis ascendentem, ubi prius erat? Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro non prodest quicquam. Verba, quæ ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus sunt et vita. Hic enim de utroque, carne et spiritu suo locutus est, et spiritum a carne discriminavit, ut non solum in eo quod oculis apparebat, sed naturam quoque invisibilem credentes, disceremus ea quæ loqueretur, non carnalia esse, sed spiritualia. Quot enim hominibus corpus ejus suffecisset ad cibum, ut universi mundi alimonia fieret? Sed propterea ascensionis suæ in cælum mentionem fecit, ut eos a corporali intellectu abstraheret, ac deinde carnem suam, de qua locutus erat, cibum e supernis cælestem et spiritualem alimoniam, et ab ipso donandum intelligerent, Quæ enim locutus sum vobis, inquit, Spiritus sunt et vita.*

[11] "Holy are those things," saith he, "which lie upon the altar, the influence of the Holy Spirit being received. Holy are ye also, being endued with the gift of the Holy Ghost. Holy things therefore are suitable for holy persons. —Thou hast heard the voice of the chorister, inviting you as with a divine melody to the communion of the mysteries, and saying: *Taste and see that the Lord is good.* Trust not to your corporeal senses the judgment and estimation of this thing; No, I say, but to your faith, without any doubtfulness. For those who taste, are not commanded to taste bread and wine, but the **ANTITYPE** (or sign and sacrament) **OF THE BODY AND BLOOD** of Christ."

It seems obvious, here, that Cyril considers the power of the Holy Spirit necessary for the change by which the elements, from being common bread and wine, are now, after consecration, to be regarded in faith, as the *antitypes*, figures, signs and sacraments, of the body and blood of the Redeemer. For he represents them as holy things, sanctified, by the word of Christ, to a new and holy signification, so that while *the senses* could behold in them nothing but common bread and wine, as they were before, *faith* beheld in them the solemn *memorials of Christ's passion, showing his death until he come.* But it is equally plain that Cyril did not believe the Roman or the Tractarian doctrine of the Real Presence, else he would have said that the believers tasted, not the *antitypes or figures*, but the *actual body and blood themselves.*

[11] (*Cyrl. Hier. Cat. xxiii. Mystag. v. p. 331.*) Sancta sunt, quæ (in altari) proposita jacent, recepto Spiritus sancti superventu: Sancti vos quoque, Spiritus sancti dono dignati. Sancta igitur sanctis conveniunt. —Audisti deinde vocem psallentis, divina quadam melodia vos ad sanctorum mysteriorum communionem invitantis, ac dicentis: **GUSTATE ET VIDETE, QUOD BONUS EST DOMINUS.** Ne corporeis faucibus hujus rei judicium æstimationemque permittite: non, inquam, sed fidei omnis dubitationis experti. Qui enim gustant, non panem et vinum degustare jubentur, sed antitypum (seu signum et sacramentum) corporis et sanguinis Christi.

This view of the doctrine of Cyril will perhaps be better understood after a careful consideration of the two following passages, in which the Eucharist is compared with other things, about the meaning of which there can be but one opinion. [12] "For in the like manner," saith he, "as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity, are naked bread and wine, but when that invocation is completed, the bread is made the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ, *even thus, in the same way, those meats which belong to the pomp of Satan, although by nature, they are naked and common, are nevertheless made, by the invocation of demons, contaminated and profane.*"

And again, speaking of the Chrism, used to this day in the Greek and Roman Churches, (but laid aside in ours, because it had no Scriptural warrant of the apostles,) Cyril saith, [13] "Beware that you do not regard this as a naked and common ointment. For as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not common bread, but the body of Christ, even thus this holy ointment is no longer naked, nor, if any one prefers so to call it, common ointment after the invocation, but the gift of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, made efficient by the presence of his divinity. With which truly, you are *symboli-*

[12] (*S. Cyrilli Cat. Mystag.* 1, p. 308.) Quemadmodum enim panis et vinum Eucharistiæ ante sanctam adorandæ Trinitatis invocationem, nudus panis et vinum erat, invocatione autem peracta, panis fit corpus Christi, et vinum sanguis Christi, ita et hujusmodi esculenta ad pompam Satanæ pertinentia, quum ex natura sua nuda et communia sint, invocatione dæmonum profana et contaminata redduntur.

[13] (*Ib. Cat. Mystag.* 111, § 111, p. 316.) Cæterum vide ne nudum et vile susciperis unguentum hoc esse. Nam sicut panis Eucharistiæ, post invocationem sancti Spiritus, non est communis panis, sed corpus Christi; ita et sanctum istud unguentum, non amplius nudum, neque si quis ita appellare malit, commune unguentum est post invocationem, sed Christi donarium, et Spiritus sancti, præsentia divinitatis ejus, efficiens factum. Quod quidem symbolicè fronti, aliisque sensibus tuis illinitur. Ac dum unguento visibili inungitur corpus, sancto et vivifico Spiritu anima sanctificatur.

cally anointed on your forehead, and other members. *And whilst the body is anointed with the visible ointment, the soul is sanctified by the holy and quickening Spirit.*”

These comparisons seem clearly to demonstrate the sense in which Cyril and the fathers generally regarded the doctrine of the Real Presence. The consecrated elements acquired a new symbolic character by their dedication to a holy use, just as the meats offered to idols acquired a character of profanation on the one hand, or as the holy Chrism used in Confirmation acquired an emblematic signification of spiritual blessings upon the other. But Cyril appears to have held no more Real Presence of Christ in the consecrated symbols of his sacred body and blood, than of the Holy Spirit in the ointment, or of Satan in the meats offered to idols. The only Real Presence of Christ and the Holy Spirit was in the faithful soul, as, in like manner, there might be a *real presence* of the wicked one, in the heart of the unbeliever.

From Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, I shall next make a brief quotation, where his language may help to explain his meaning in another place, which is much less clear and satisfactory. Commenting on a text of the apostle, Hilary saith: [14] “We are all spiritual, if the Spirit of God be in us. But this Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ. And when the Spirit of Christ is in us, then HIS Spirit is in us who raised Christ from the dead, and he who raised Christ from the dead will also quicken our mortal bodies by the

[14] (*S. Hilar. De Trinitate, L. viii. p. 169.*) Volens enim naturæ unitatem in Patre et Filio docere, ita ait: (Sc. Apostolus Paulus) Vos autem non estis in carne, sed in Spiritu: siquidem Spiritus Dei in vobis est. Si quis autem Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus, &c.—Spiritualis omnes sumus, si in nobis est Spiritus Dei: sed hic Spiritus Dei Spiritus Christi est. Et cum Christi Spiritus in nobis est, ejus tum Spiritus in nobis est, qui Christum suscitavit a mortuis, et qui suscitavit Christum a mortuis, corpora quoque nostra mortalia vivificabit propter habitantem Spiritum ejus in nobis. Vivificamur ergo propter habitantem in nobis Spiritum Christi, per eum qui Christum suscitavit a mortuis.

Spirit that dwelleth in us. Therefore *we are quickened on account of the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us, by him who raised Christ from the dead.*" Now this passage, quoted from the very same treatise cited by Dr. Pusey, may show the real doctrine of this father, taken as a whole, to have been, that our resurrection was the consequence, not of a *literal* incorporation of the body and blood of Christ with our bodies, (for this incorporation is *figurative* and *mystical*,) but of the *indwelling Spirit* of Christ, the TRUE PRESENCE vouchsafed to the faithful soul.

Basil, the bishop of Cesarea, comes next in order. From the Liturgy which bears his name I shall make one extract, and from his epistles another. In both together, his doctrine will sufficiently appear.

After the consecration of the elements, and a collect offered by the priest, and two responses by the people, the following supplication occurs. [15] "We, thy sinful and unworthy servants, pray and beseech thee, O Lover of mankind, good Lord, and we adore thee with a grateful sense of thy goodness, that thy *Holy Spirit may come upon us thy servants*, and upon *these thy gifts* placed before thee, and *may sanctify and make them the holy things of holy persons*. And may He make *this bread to become the holy body of the Lord God himself and our Saviour Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sins and eternal life, to those partaking of it."

The remark which I would make upon the foregoing, is that the illapse of the Holy Spirit is prayed for, *first* on the *communicants* and *secondly* on the *elements*, plainly showing that the answer to the prayer is expected, not upon the

[15] (*S. Basilii Liturgia, Opp. Tom. 2. p. 678-9.*) Rogamus et deprecamur te amator hominum, bone Domine, nos peccatores et indigni servi tui, et adoramus te cum beneplacito bonitatis tuæ; ut veniat Spiritus tuus sanctus super nos servos tuos, et super proposita hæc dona tua, sanctificentque et efficiant ea sancta sanctorum.

Et faciat panem quidem istum, fieri corpus sanctum ipsius Domini Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi in remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam, ex illo participantibus.

elements *anterior* to their reception, when lying on the altar or in the hands of the priest, but *on the communicants and the elements in the act of reception*. The more plainly to demonstrate this, we find that this prayer is offered *after the consecration is completed*, and that the elements are *still called bread*; proving incontrovertibly, that no change is supposed to be wrought by consecration except the conferring upon them the *symbolical or figurative character* which make them *the authorized memorials of the death of Christ*, or, in other words, memorials of his sacred body broken, and his precious blood shed, for our redemption. In this feature of the Basilian Liturgy, we recognize, substantially, the language of our own.

I pass on, however, to the promised specimen of this father's interpretation. [16] "*Whosoever eateth me,*" saith the Saviour, "*liveth by me.*" "For we eat his flesh," continues Basil, "and drink his blood, being made participants, through his incarnation and visible life, of the Word and Wisdom. For his whole mystical life in the flesh, and his constant doctrine in practice, nature, and theology, are what he called his body and blood, by which doctrine the soul is nourished," &c. It is difficult to conceive of a less literal interpretation than this, and yet it is one which may be thoroughly sustained, not only by the paramount language of Scripture, but by a large amount of patristical authority.

From Basil I pass on to Gregory Nazianzen, who speaks in accordance with Cyril, [17] asking how unholy men

[16] (*S. Basil. Ep. viii. Tom. 111, p. 84.*) *Qui manducat me, inquit, vivit propter me.* Edimus enim ipsius carnem, et bibimus ipsius sanguinem, participes facti, per incarnationem et sensibilem vitam, Verbi et sapientiæ. Carnem enim et sanguinem, totam suam mysticam in carne conversationem vocavit, et doctrinam ex practica et naturali et theologica notione constantem declaravit: per quam et nutritur anima, &c.

[17] *Greg. Naz. Apologet. Oratio Prima, p. 33. B.* Hæc igitur cum nossem, illudque insuper, neminem magno, et Deo, et Sacrificio, et Pontifice, dignum esse, nisi qui prius seipsum Deo hostiam viventem sanctam exhi-

could dare to “offer the external sacrifice, the *figure or anti-type of the great mysteries.*”

Optatus, the bishop of Milevi, furnishes another incidental testimony of a similar kind, where, arguing with the Donatists, he says [18] that “the wine which is trodden and pressed by sinful labourers, is nevertheless offered a sacrifice to God, and the oil which is prepared by evil men is also used in the holy Chrism.” A little afterwards, alluding to the violent proceedings of those outrageous schismatics, he asks, “What is more iniquitous than to exorcize the Holy Spirit,” (meaning their custom of re-baptizing, which he regarded as virtually seeking to drive away the Holy Spirit from those who had received him) “to break altars and to cast the Eucharist to dogs?” On the Oxford theory, these expressions would have been quite inadmissible. Optatus could not have written about offering the wine in sacrifice to God, because he would regard it as being the sacred blood of the Redeemer. Nor is it likely that he would have stated the monstrous sacrilege of casting the Eucharist to dogs, immediately after the breaking of the altars, without any amplification or peculiar feeling of indignant astonishment, if he had held the notion, that in the consecrated bread there was actually present, the human and divine Nature of the glorious Redeemer.

But I pass on to a set of witnesses whose testimony is more express, and, from their eminent reputation in the

buerit, ac rationabile obsequium gratum atque acceptum ostenderit, Deoque sacrificium laudis, ac spiritum contritum obtulerit, (quod solum sacrificium, is qui omnia dedit, a nobis exposcit) *quo tandem modo externum illud sacrificium, illud magnorum mysteriorum antitypum ipsi offerre audent, aut quomodo sacerdotis habitum et nomen subire?*

[18] *S. Optat. Mil. Epis. de Schism. Donat. Lib. III. § IV. p. 62.* Nam et vinum a peccatoribus operariis et calcatur et premitur, et sic inde Deo sacrificium offertur: oleum quoque a sordidis et nonnullis malè viventibus et immunda loquentibus conficitur, et tamen in sapore, in lumine, etiam in sancto Chrismate simpliciter erogatur.

Ib. Quid iniquius, quàm exorcizare Spiritum Sanctum, altaria frangere, Eucharistiam animalibus projicere?

ancient Church, far more important; Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustin.

Beginning with Ambrose, let us hear the words of his Liturgy. [19] "The priest saith: Make to us this oblation imputed, established, reasonable, acceptable; which is THE FIGURE of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Perhaps thou sayest," [20] continues Ambrose, elsewhere, "My bread is common bread. But this bread is bread before the sacramental words are spoken, but when consecration is performed, from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ. Let us add this therefore: How can that which is bread be the body of Christ? *By Consecration.* But by what words and by whose command is this consecration? By those of the Lord Jesus.—*Therefore the word of Christ makes this sacrament.*"

[21] "That I may therefore answer thee, it was not the body of Christ before consecration, but after consecration, I say to thee it is the body of Christ. He said, and it was done; he commanded, and it was created. So *thou wert once the old creature: but after thou wert consecrated, thou didst begin to be a new creature.* Wouldst thou know how? *Every man, saith the apostle, in Christ is made a new creature.*"

[19] *S. Ambros. de Sac. Lib. IV. C. V. Tom. 2. p. 371.*

Dicit Sacerdos: Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

[20] *S. Ambros. de Sacramentis, L. IV. C. IV. Tom. 2. p. 368.* Tu fortè dicis: Meus panis est usitatus. Sed panis iste panis est ante verba Sacramentorum: ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. Hoc igitur adstruamus. Quomodo potest qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consecratione. Consecratio autem quibus verbis est, et cujus sermonibus? Domini Jesu.—Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit Sacramentum.

[21] *Ib. p. 369.* Ergo tibi ut respondeam, non erat corpus Christi ante consecrationem: sed post consecrationem dico tibi quia jam corpus est Christi. Ipse dixit, et factum est: ipse mandavit, et creatum est. Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura: postea quam consecratus es, nova creatura esse cœpisti. Vis scire quam nova creatura? *Omnis, inquit, in Christo nova creatura.*

[22] "Wine and water is put into the cup: but it is made blood by the consecration of the heavenly word.—But perhaps thou sayest, I do not see the appearance of blood. Nevertheless *it has a similitude; for as thou hast taken the similitude of death, thus also thou drinkest the similitude of his precious blood, that there might be no horror of blood conceived, and yet the price of thy redemption might operate.*"

Once more, let me add an interesting specimen of the figurative style of our author's interpretations.

[23] "*God will bruise Satan under your feet.* In the first place, bruise thy heart, in which was the character of the dragon, that he may not find a place to dwell in: bruise the flesh of the dragon: his flesh is our sins.—*For as the saints are the body and members of Christ, so sinners who do not abandon sin but adhere to it, are the body and members of the dragon.* THEREFORE WE FEAST UPON THE BODY OF CHRIST; but THEY FEAST UPON THE BODY OF THE DRAGON; we who contend that we may adhere to Christ, *feast upon the daily pardon and remission of sins,* but they who daily add sin to sin, *feast upon the continuance of their crimes and wickedness.*"

Now in all this, it is easy to see the sense in which the consecrated elements were regarded by the Church, in the age of Ambrose, as the body and blood. In the Liturgy,

[22] *Ib.* p. 370. Vinum et aqua in calicem mittitur: sed fit sanguis consecratione verbi cœlestis. § 20. Sed forte dicis: Speciem sanguinis non video. Sed habet similitudinem: sicut enim mortis similitudinem sumpsisti, ita etiam similitudinem preciosi sanguinis bibis, ut nullus horror cruoris sit, et pretium tamen operetur redemptionis.

[23] *S. Ambros. in Ps. xxxvi. Enar. § 9. Tom. 1. p. 819. etc. Conterat, inquit, Deus Satanum sub pedibus vestris.* Contere primo cor tuum, in quo erat draconis cubile, ut non inueniat ubi possit habitare: contere draconis carnes: carnes ejus peccata nostra sunt. Sicut enim sancti, corpus et membra sunt Christi; ita peccatores qui peccatum non deserunt, sed peccato inhærent, corpus draconis et membra sunt. Ideo nos Christi corpus epulamur; illi autem corpus epulantur draconis: nos epulamur qui Christo adhærere contendimus, remissionem quotidianam et veniam peccatorum; illi autem qui peccatis quotidie peccata connectunt, continuationem flagitiorum epulantur et criminum.

for instance, the very prayer supplicates that they may be made, not the *reality*, but the **FIGURE**: corresponding with the *antitype* of Cyril, the *symbolical and typical body* of Origen, and the same word *figure* of Tertullian. Next we see him stating that the elements become the flesh of Christ, not by his *real presence in them*, nor by any infusion of our Lord's spiritual and divine nature into them, but by *consecration*, performed by the word of Christ, namely, his command or express authority. Thirdly, we see the change in the elements by this consecration, compared to the change in the Christian when he is consecrated to the service of God. Fourthly, Ambrose, in answer to the difficulty that the communicant does not see the *appearance* of blood, replies, that granting this, there is, nevertheless, (not the *reality*, but) a **SIMILITUDE**, compares it to the similitude of the Christian being buried by baptism into Christ's death, which is confessedly mystical and symbolical, and then states a reason why it should not be *really* the blood of Christ, that there should be no *horror of blood*, but that it should operate to give us the benefits of the Saviour's death and passion. And lastly, we see him using the very same language in reference to our feeding, by our sins, upon the *body of Satan*, which he uses concerning our feeding, by holiness, *upon the body of Christ*, than which I can conceive of no proof more conclusive to show, that this language concerning the consecrated elements of the Eucharistical feast, was well understood as symbolical and figurative throughout, designed to represent, in the liveliest form, the spiritual effects assured to the faithful partaker.

But I proceed to the next witness on our list, the learned Jerome, who will fully sustain, if I am not much mistaken, the same doctrine.

In one place, for example, he states that our Lord [24] "offered not water, but wine, as a **TYPE OF HIS BLOOD.**"

[24] Hieron. Lib. Seo. adv. Jovinianum, Opp. Tom. 2. p. 52. C. In **TYPUS SANGUINIS SUI non obtulit aquam, sed vinum.**

Again, in his commentary on the institution of the Eucharist in St. Matthew's Gospel, Jerome saith, [25] that "after the typical Passover had been fulfilled, and He had eaten the flesh of the Lamb with his apostles, He took bread, which comforts the heart of man, and proceeded to the true Sacrament of the Passover, that in like manner as Melchisedec, the priest of the most High God, in prefiguration of him, had done, offering bread and wine, He also might REPRESENT the truth of his body and blood."

In the same father's commentary upon the institution, as narrated by St. Mark, we read as follows: [26] "Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake it, transfiguring his body in bread, WHICH (body) IS THE PRESENT CHURCH, accepted in faith, blessed in number, broken in sufferings, given in examples, received in doctrines," &c.

Again, in his commentary on the same transaction in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, Jerome saith, that our Lord, [27] "being about to suffer, left to us this LAST COMMEMORATION, OR MEMORIAL."

And again, on the text which declares that the unworthy communicant shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, Jerome makes this comment, [28] "Because he despised, as a common thing, the SACRAMENT (or sign) of such a mystery."

Now in all of these passages we have distinctly set forth

[25] Hieron. Com. in Mat. Lib. IV. Cap. XXVI. Tom. 9. p. 64. B. *Cœnantibus autem eis, accepit Jesus panem, &c.*] Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum Apostolis comederat, assumit panem, qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum Paschæ transgreditur Sacramentum, ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedec Summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis REPRESENTARET.

[26] *Ib. Com. in Marc. Cap. XIV. Tom. 9. p. 87.* Accepit Jesus panem et benedicens fregit, transfigurans corpus suum in panem QUOD EST ECCLESIA PRÆSENS, quæ accipitur in fide, benedicitur in numero, frangitur in passionibus, datur in exemplis, sumitur in doctrinis, &c.

[27] Hieron. Com. in priorem ad Corinth. cap. xi. 9, p. 255: *accipit panem, et gratias agens, &c.* Hoc est, benedicens etiam passurus, ultimam nobis COMMEMORATIONEM SIVE MEMORIAM dereliquit.

the same idea, viz. that the consecrated elements are the body of Christ, in a figurative or symbolical sense, and nothing more. In one place he calls them expressly *a type*, in another, a *representation*, in a third, an emblem of *the Church*, in a fourth, a *commemoration* or *memorial* of Christ's sufferings, in a fifth, a *sacrament* (or sign) of the great mystery. It is obvious that such language accords precisely with the doctrine of the Eucharist as declared by the Church of England and explained by the Reformers, but can hardly be pressed, by any fair management, into the service of our Tractarian brethren.

The last of the fathers which I propose to cite, is the highly-gifted Augustin, from whom my extracts will be more copious, as they will be, I trust, perfectly conclusive on the point before us.

Illustrating the fundamental maxim of figurative language by the ordinary practice of the Church, this eminent teacher saith as follows. [29] "We often express ourselves in this

[28] (*Reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini.*) Quia tanti mysterii SACRAMENTUM pro vili despexit.

[29] *S. Augustin. ad Bonifac. Ep. 98. Opp. Tom. 11, p. 202, § 9.* Nempe sæpè ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquante dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cùm illa ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. Nempe ipso die dominico dicimus, Hodie Dominus resurrexit, cùm ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundùm illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, similitudinem nuncupamus, ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus: et dicatur illo die fieri, propter sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum est? Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen in Sacramento non solùm per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari? Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est.—Sicut de ipso baptismo Apostolus, *Consepulti*, inquit, *sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem.* Non ait sepultu-

manner, as when Easter is approaching we say, To-morrow or the next day will be the Passion of our Lord, although so many years have passed away since he suffered, nor did he suffer more than once. In like manner we say on the Lord's day, To-day the Lord arose, although the real day of his resurrection was so many years ago. Why is no one so foolish as to accuse us of lying when we talk thus, unless it be because we express a *similitude* to those days on which the events actually occurred? so that it may be called the same day, which is *not in reality* the same, but in the revolution of time, is its *likeness*, just as by reason of the celebration of the Sacrament, that may be called done on that day, which was truly done, not on that day but long before it. Was not Christ once really immolated, and yet in the Sacrament, not only through all the solemnities of Easter, but every day, he is immolated for the people; nor does he speak falsely, who, being interrogated, should reply, that Christ was immolated. For if the Sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things, of which they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from this similitude, they receive, for the most part, the names of the things themselves. As therefore the Sacrament of the body of Christ, after a certain mode, is the body of Christ, and the Sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, even so the Sacrament of faith is faith. Even as the Apostle saith of baptism itself, *We are buried with Christ by baptism into death*. He does not say, We have exhibited the sign of burial, but he saith directly, *We are buried*. Hence he describes the Sacrament (the sign or figure) of such a thing, no otherwise than by the name of the thing itself."

Again, our author, speaking of the schismatic Donatists, saith, [30] "They are not to be despaired of, for they are ram significavimus: sed prorsus ait: *consepulti sumus*. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.

[30] *S. Augustin. de cor. Donat. Lib. ad Bonifacium, § 50. Tom. 2. p.*

yet in the body: but they may not seek the Holy Spirit unless in the body of Christ, of which they have indeed the *Sacrament outwardly*, but they do not hold inwardly the *thing itself of which it is the Sacrament*, and therefore they eat and drink judgment to themselves.”

[31] Elsewhere, Augustin lays down a rule of figurative language in Scripture, which he applies in a very interesting manner to the subject of the Eucharist. “If a text containing a precept,” saith he, “either forbids any baseness or villany, or enjoins utility or beneficence, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command what is criminal or dishonourable, or to forbid what is useful or beneficent, it is figurative. Thus our Lord saith: *Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* He seems to command a wicked and immoral action: therefore it is a figure, directing a participation in our Lord’s Passion, and that we shall sweetly and usefully lay it up in our memory, that for us his flesh was crucified and wounded.”

Commenting on the Book of Genesis, where Joseph, interpreting the baker’s dream, saith, *The three baskets (or dishes,) are three days*, Augustin observes: [32] “He does

504. Non sunt desperandi: adhuc enim sunt in corpore: sed non quærant Spiritum Sanctum, nisi in Christi corpore, cujus habent foris sacramentum, sed rem ipsam non tenent intus cujus est illud sacramentum, et adeo sibi iudicium manducant et bibunt.

[31] *Ib. de Doctrina Christiana, L. iii. § 24. Tom. 3, p. 40.* Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. *Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter reconddendum in memoria, quòd pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.

[32] *Ib. p. 250. Tres fundi, tres dies sunt.* (Gen. xl. 12.) Non dixit, tres dies significant. Et multùm hæc locutio notanda est, ubi aliqua significantia, earum rerum quas significant, nomine appellantur: inde est quod ait Apostolus, *Petra autem erat Christus*, non ait, Petra significabat Christus.

not say, *They signify* three days. And this mode of expression is greatly to be noted, where the *signs* are called by the name of the *things which they signify*: hence the apostle saith: And *the rock* WAS *Christ*, he does not say, *The rock SIGNIFIED Christ.*”

Again saith Augustin, very expressly, [33] “Our Lord did not hesitate to say: *This is my body*, when he gave them **THE SIGN OF HIS BODY.**”

And again, speaking of the very word, [34] “*Sacraments*, that is,” saith Augustin, “**SACRED SIGNS.**” — “Even as we,” continues he, “with faithful heart and mouth, acknowledge the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, giving to us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink; although it may seem more horrible to eat human flesh, and drink human blood, than to perish; and so throughout all the holy Scriptures, whatever is expounded concerning figurative speech or action, should be *according to the rule of a sound faith.*”

From these extracts out of the fathers, I think it abundantly plain, that the doctrine of the primitive Church was fully understood and fairly professed by our great Reformers; that the early Christians did not hold the consecrated elements to be more than a figure or symbol of the body and blood of Christ; that the very term *sacrament* in the primitive ages, (and indeed until the times of the schoolmen) signified, as saith Augustin, a **SACRED SIGN**; the same meaning still retained by us in the Articles: and therefore

[33] *Ib. contra Adimantum, Tom. viii. p. 90, § 3.* Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum: cum signum daret corporis sui.*

[34] *Ib. contra Adversarium Legis et Proph. Lib. ii. p. 425.* Sacramenta, id est, sacra signa. Sicut mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, carnem suam nobis manducandam bibendumque sanguinem dantem, fidei corde atque ore suscipimus; quamvis horribilius videatur humanam carnem manducare quam perimere, et humanum sanguinem potare quam fundere: atque in omnibus sanctis Scripturis, secundum sanæ fidei regulam figuratè dictum vel factum si quid exponitur, de quibuslibet rebus et verbis quæ sacris paginis continentur, expositio illa ducatur, &c.

that heretics, schismatics, and wicked men, might receive the body and blood of Christ *sacramentally*, that is, they might receive the outward signs or consecrated elements which were the appointed *emblems* of Christ's passion, as well as the righteous. But the *Real Presence*, the *spiritual benefit*, could only be received by the faithful and sincere heart, and from Him alone who is the *Searcher* of the heart. Hence the manifest error of placing the *inward grace* in the *outward element*, of committing to the *hand of the minister* that spiritual presence which comes from the *direct agency of God*, and thus raising the external sign, and the human instrument, to a dignity and importance which our Lord reserved for his own heavenly power, his own divine agency. The probable, not to say certain, consequences of such an error, are sufficiently intimated by the words of Christ himself; "*In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,*" with which we may well connect the language of the Almighty by the prophet, "*I will not give my glory to another.*"

Under this aspect of the question, my respected and beloved brethren, I must confess myself altogether opposed to the discourse of Rev. Dr. Pusey. For its language is borrowed from the highest figures of the fathers, quoted without the slightest qualification, and applied in the most literal sense; nay, hardly admitting of a construction short of Transubstantiation itself; as, for instance, the words taken from Chrysostom, "*That which is in the cup is that which flowed from his side,*" to which the preacher adds this comment, "*Touching with our very lips that cleansing blood, how shall we not, with the Ancient Church, confess, Lo, this hath touched my lips, and shall take away my iniquities, and cleanse my sins.*"

I am perfectly aware, indeed, that this distinguished divine has frequently declared, in general terms, his adherence to the Articles, and therefore it has been supposed by some, that the language of his sermon cannot be fairly interpreted

except in accordance with the Church's doctrine. But I would beseech himself and his friends to ask their own good sense and Christian feelings whether such an apology can be admitted in *justification* of this particular discourse? Manifestly not, in my humble judgment, and for the following reasons:

First, because the very object of preaching is to deliver the truth of God to the people who are assembled to hear. If that truth is kept back, if an exaggerated and disproportioned representation of one side of a great doctrine is put forth as the whole, if false views are advanced by the *suppression of essential explanations*, if an apparent agreement with the superstitious and perilous tenets of Rome be inculcated, without the slightest attempt on the part of the preacher to guard his hearers from misapprehension—it is no excuse to say that the congregation can correct the error of the sermon for themselves, by recurring to what the preacher has either said or written on some other occasion. I deny that any minister of Jesus Christ has a right to lay stumbling blocks in the way of his brethren, by preaching on the great doctrines of the Gospel so as to require such explanation. It is his duty to establish, not to unsettle; to clear away the mists of error, not to cloud the minds of his hearers with the fogs of Roman superstition; to ground them thoroughly in the faith as the Church has set it forth, not to throw them into a state of doubtfulness as to her real orthodoxy. And he is bound to remember that each sermon must be viewed as a *whole* in itself, with respect to his congregation, because he cannot expect that the people either will or can rectify its apparent errors from any other source. Some of them may never visit the Church again. The preacher may not live to correct his own mistakes: the same identical assembly may never meet together to give him the opportunity. And therefore it is obvious, that the *sermon cannot be defended by appealing to other statements of its author, extraneous to itself.* The very admission that it

needs such a defence, amounts to a virtual condemnation.

But secondly, the apology is utterly unsatisfactory when it is recollected, that our Tractarian friends had long proclaimed themselves to be in a transition state. The British Critic had published the avowal, that they could not stay where they were, that they must “go back or go forward, and that it *would surely be the latter.*” The famous Tract No. 90 had demonstrated the surprising fact, that the Articles of the Church of England might be so interpreted as to satisfy the consciences of men who were then professedly within her pale, but who were seriously contemplating the abandonment of her communion for that of the Church of Rome. The new system of Tractarian theology was confessedly in a growing condition, and every month was expected to produce some fresh development. At such a time and under such circumstances, it seems perfectly preposterous to my mind, that the hearers of Dr. Pusey should be asked to receive his sermon in that sense only, which he and his friends were universally believed to have repudiated. He could not have so mistaken his position as to believe, that his words would be transmuted into the doctrines of the Reformation. On the contrary, he must have been perfectly aware, that whatever construction they required on the part of his congregation, must needs be supplied from precisely the opposite quarter; that if he spake in language that sounded like Romanism, the fears and the expectations of those who listened to him must make them doubly susceptible of a false impression. And therefore all the peculiarities of his situation,—peculiarities which had been increasing in weight and importance for ten successive years—precluded the correction of error by any ordinary process of implicit faith in the intentions of the preacher; and invested his whole discourse with the most decided character of deliberate and conscious responsibility.

Thirdly, however, the excuse attempted goes no farther than to assert, that Dr. Pusey does not maintain the Roman tenet of *Transubstantiation*. I have already shown, at large, the exceeding skill with which this obnoxious term is explained by our Tractarian friends, so as to leave them at liberty to state the *Real Presence* of Christ in such language as the Romanists themselves approve. And therefore, for my part, I am disposed to do full justice to Dr. Pusey's candour, since I am persuaded that he holds *ex animo* exactly what his sermon expresses; namely, that by virtue of the act of consecration, *the human and divine natures of our LORD JESUS CHRIST become united to the sacramental elements, on the altar and in the hands of the officiating priest*: a doctrine which I believe to be thoroughly inconsistent with Scripture, with the Reformers, with the fathers, and with the standards of our Church—which is, in my opinion, liable to all the objections of *Transubstantiation*, and in no respect to be distinguished from it, except by one of those refined subtleties in theology which make a distinction without a difference. And thus persuaded, I am compelled to say, that I cannot join with those of my respected brethren who have protested against the sentence of the Vice-Chancellor in suspending him. On the contrary, I believe, that if the censures of the Church of England had been formally passed upon all the doctrinal innovations of that school, on the publication of Tract No. 90, neither the interests of Christian truth nor the law of ecclesiastical justice would have had any reason to complain.

I make this statement without having seen any of the publications which this extraordinary act of University discipline has called forth, on the side of the high functionary concerned. But I have seen the elaborate attack upon him and the six doctors of divinity, in defence of Dr. Pusey, which occupies so large a portion of the late British Critic, and in which there is, undoubtedly, a most brilliant display of argument and eloquence; of authority, popular

sense of right, the sanctity of law, the majesty of justice, satire, wit, ridicule, and every element of forensic and rhetorical ability, all mingled together, with a profusion, a keenness, a splendour, and a scorching power, quite above the meed of my humble admiration. It is no part of my province to obtrude an opinion as to the strict, technical accuracy, with which the statutes of the University were enforced on this occasion. I prefer the safer course of leaving the *mode* of such peculiar proceedings to the judgment of those, who have the best opportunity to know whether their course is according to precedent; and who have every possible motive, whether of duty to the Church, duty to the University, duty to the public, or duty to themselves, to prevent their hazarding the obvious consequences of any act, which could deserve the charge of official oppression. But I do consider myself bound, in all Christian honesty, to say, that I cannot see any just ground of complaint, on the part of Dr. Pusey, so far as his sermon is concerned. It appears by the statement of the British Critic, that the legal tribunal, appointed by the statutes of the University, examined it to their own satisfaction; that they sent Dr. Jelf to confer with the Author about the passages which were found objectionable, in order to ascertain whether he would consent to recant, or to modify his doctrine; that he utterly refused to do either the one or the other, and that after allowing him sufficient time to change his determination, the Vice Chancellor suspended him for two years. These are the main facts, as I have gathered them from Dr. Pusey's most accomplished advocate; and he pours the most unsparing rebuke upon the whole transaction, first because there was no public trial, next, because Dr. Pusey was not called upon to make his public defence; and lastly, because the examination of the sermon was held in a private room, over a tea-table.

In the first of these objections, there is, without doubt, great plausibility. We are all accustomed to the idea, that

no man can be condemned without a public trial; and this axiomatic principle of justice is naturally supposed to have a full and fair application to the case in question. In truth, however, I have not been able to discover that it has the slightest connexion with the *examination of published writings* by a Court of heresy. I seriously question whether any *Theological Faculty in Europe*, of any kind or under any circumstances, ever yet held a *public court*, for the purpose of investigating the soundness or orthodoxy of *a book or a sermon*. If the highly gifted Reviewer in the *British Critic* can find a single instance in the history of the Universal Church, where such an examination was ever conducted in any other than a private manner, he will deserve thanks for the discovery. To my humble judgment it would appear, that the deliberate weighing of written theological statements, and comparing them with the standards of religious truth, is a process generically different from the hearing of living witnesses and the ordinary administration of earthly law. Still more peculiar is the guardianship, wisely established, for the sake of peace, over the pulpits of bodies like the English Universities. The irrelevancy, therefore, of this first objection, seems sufficiently plain.

The second is equally plausible, and, as it seems to me, equally nugatory. The Rev. Dr. Pusey had publicly proclaimed what the theological Faculty adjudged to be erroneous and dangerous opinions, concerning one of the cardinal points in controversy between the Churches of England and Rome. His right of defence could only embrace two questions: first, Whether his doctrine was unsound, and secondly, Whether he was the person who delivered it. The latter point, however, was not disputed. No one affected to doubt that the discourse was his discourse, and that he was the writer and the preacher. And as to its orthodoxy, there was the written document of Dr. Pusey on the one side, and the Standards of the Church upon the other, while it was the business of the theological Faculty

to compare them, and judge how far they disagreed. I cannot, therefore, understand what the Reviewer intends, by this right of defending the doctrine, unless he means that Dr. Pusey should have been invited, in the very presence of the Faculty, publicly to oppose the judgment to which they had already arrived, in their official examination of the sermon. But this would have involved an open contempt of their authority. And the legal absurdity would be the same, as if a temporal Court, after sentence was pronounced, should call upon the party condemned to make a public argument, in order to prove that he was in the right, and that his judges were mistaken!

In the case under consideration, however, the objection seems particularly unreasonable, when it is remembered, that the Rev. Dr. Pusey had been publicly defending his doctrines, by himself and his colleagues, for years together, against all opposition; in total disregard of the various censures passed upon his opinions by a large proportion of the English bishops, and in the full view of a most extensive and mischievous agitation, not only within the precincts of the University, but throughout the whole land, which had long been regarded, by thousands of good men, with painful apprehension. The sermon in question, therefore, was not so much a single act, as the last of a series of acts, which had been most pertinaciously and publicly defended already, and about the character and bearing of which, neither Dr. Pusey nor his friends could possibly give the Vice Chancellor and his colleagues, any new light or information. Consequently there was but one call, which could, consistently, be addressed to him, before the final sentence was pronounced; and that was the formal call, to recant or modify his offensive doctrines, if he desired to avoid official censure. The Faculty, doubtless, might have performed this painful duty, in a more public manner. They might have held an open Court; they might have despatched their officer for the offender, who is said to have been suffering,

at the time, under bodily indisposition; they might have brought him from his sick room, before a gazing audience, to proclaim their judgment on his discourse, and put to him the humiliating question, Whether he would confess his error, rather than suffer sentence of suspension to be recorded against him. And if they thought fit to pursue a less public method,—if they indulged a feeling of tenderness towards the sensitive character and infirm health of Dr. Pusey, and therefore deputed his own personal friend, Dr. Jelf, to make the same proposal to him, in his own private chamber, and with all the delicate consideration which affection and esteem could inspire,—I must confess that I cannot see, in this part of the proceeding, any indifference to the rights of Dr. Pusey, nor any defect of courtesy or kindness of which he or his followers could justly complain.

And as to the third objection, that the judgment of the Theological Faculty was made up in a private room and over a tea table, I am sorry that any mind of religious principle and strong sense should lay hold of such a trifle, in order to cover with ridicule an act of serious and solemn duty. If, as I have shown, it be the invariable rule for every Theological Faculty to try the orthodoxy of books and published discourses by a private examination, then, I presume, it must be granted, that there could be no injustice to Dr. Pusey in appropriating a private room to a private meeting. And if, in the course of the evening's labours, the customary beverage of tea was introduced, I am quite at a loss to understand how so innocent a refreshment could prejudice the doctrines of Dr. Pusey's sermon. It has been, indeed, a rule of temporal Courts, that a jury should neither eat nor drink until they had agreed upon their verdict. But it will be something new to learn that the judges must not swallow a cup of tea or coffee, during a short recess, to refresh them in the progress of an exhaust-

ing trial, without exposing their official decisions to public reproach and crimination.

I should not have adverted to this subject at all, if I had not seen, with much regret, that some of my respected and beloved brethren have indulged themselves in a tone of severe rebuke with regard to the officers of that noble University, which I cannot reconcile with the rules of Christian comity towards a foreign institution, nor with the course which we should expect from the clergy of our mother Church, if our own official acts were passed in review before them. It does not argue well for the true interests of Christian peace, that we should be over-hasty in censuring the authorities of England for matters with which we have no direct concern; and it would doubtless be wise in us to pause, before we sacrifice the small remains of real unity which the strifes of past years have left us, to an Utopian scheme of *Catholic* unity, which is probably about as likely to be realized as the *Elixir vitæ* or the Philosopher's stone. But since others have spoken so strongly in defence of Dr. Pusey, I have thought it an act of justice to state my personal opinion on the other side, if only to show, that there are some amongst us who are ready to sustain the rights of wholesome discipline, and to render to the official judgment of our English friends, a fair measure of the same confidence which we should claim from them in turn.

And now, my respected and beloved brethren, as I propose to devote my next Letter to the novel case of the Rev. Mr. Carey's ordination, which has been the occasion of exciting amongst us such an unexampled ferment, I shall add no more to this communication. I trust implicitly to your kind indulgence, if I have bestowed more labour than was necessary upon the present theme. But the well-known fact, that the doctrine of the Eucharist is the great centre of the whole Sacramental theology, fully justifies, in my humble judgment, the best effort in our power,

to place, on firm ground, the true teaching of the Church on that highly important subject. It concerns us most nearly, that Baptism and the Eucharist be kept in their true place, as holy Sacraments, "*outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, given to us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof,*" and to be highly revered and duly used by all who would be the heirs of salvation. We must therefore beware, lest we injure the interests of piety by disparaging the proper rank and dignity of these blessed ordinances. But we are equally bound to beware, lest we dishonour the majesty of Christ, and grieve the Holy Spirit, by an excessive magnifying of their positive effects, or an idolatrous veneration of their outward elements. IRREVERENCE and SUPERSTITION are the *Scylla* and *Charybdis* of religion, and it will profit us little if, in order to avoid being dashed against the rocks upon the one side, we must be engulfed by the whirlpool upon the other. May the Lord, of his infinite mercy, grant us the constant direction of his heavenly wisdom, that his Church may be safely guided between them, to the haven of eternal peace and joy.

Your faithful brother,

And servant in Christ,

JOHN H. HOPKINS.

Burlington, Vermont,
January 16, 1844.

The Novelties which disturb our Peace.

A FOURTH LETTER

ADDRESSED

TO THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY, AND LAITY,

OF THE

Protestant Episcopal Church

IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.,

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT.

PHILADELPHIA:

H. HOOKER, 178 CHESNUT STREET,

(OPPOSITE MASONIC HALL.)

1844.

KING AND BAIRD, PRINTERS.

FOURTH LETTER, &c.

RESPECTED AND BELOVED BRETHREN,—

In this, my fourth and concluding address to you, on the Novelties which disturb our peace, but which—I thank God—have no power to destroy it, I have to solicit your kind indulgence on a variety of topics, which would bear a far more extended investigation. The chief of these, however, is the theological notion, that the tenets of the Council of Trent may be reconciled to Catholic, or in other words, to primitive and orthodox doctrine. This idea has been for the first time eliminated in the recent ordination of Rev. Arthur Carey by my highly esteemed brother, the Bishop of the diocese of New York; and I cannot discharge what appears to be an act of obligation to the Church of God, without discussing the principal points involved in that interesting transaction, and suggesting the best practicable safeguard against future difficulties. A few observations upon the system of Rome compared with Tractarianism, the general scope of the sacramental theology, the theory of priestly power, and the strange attempt made of late to beat down the doctrine of justification by faith, and un-

protestantize the Church of England, will bring these Letters to a close, and relieve my own mind, at least, of what I have long felt to be a most painful and oppressive duty.

In entering upon the questions connected with Mr. Carey's ordination, I beg leave to premise, that there are probably very few men in the Church, or in the world, who have a higher or more affectionate regard for my youthful brother in the ministry, than I profess to cherish. Consigned, by his estimable father, to my care, in A. D. 1833, he remained a constant inmate in my family until 1837, the class-mate of my eldest son, and accounted as one of my own children. In my house, he and his elder brother passed through the studies appropriate to the Freshman year in College, and the larger portion of the Sophomore, under the tuition of thorough and accomplished instructors; and were forthwith received into the Sophomore class of Columbia College, where they earned an honorable rank, and sustained a most pure and elevated character. And when, after graduating with uncommon credit at that excellent institution, I was informed that my young friend and beloved pupil had become a candidate for holy orders, I shall not undertake to describe the gratitude to God which the intelligence inspired, nor the deep interest with which I listened to the best accounts of his consistent piety and remarkable attainments, from time to time.

I should be very reluctant to publish facts of this description, if it were not for the opportunity which it affords me to do justice to Mr. Carey's personal claims, on the one hand, and to assign a reason, on

the other, for my absolute confidence in *himself*, while I shall be compelled to question the consistency of some of his opinions, with the act of his ordination. Whatever may be the error in judgment which the case presents, it can hardly be charged on him with justice or propriety. I take it for granted that he only studied, with all the undoubting confidence of youth, those productions of our Oxford brethren, which were eminently attractive in themselves to a thoughtful and a pious, but inexperienced mind, and which were, moreover, warmly advocated and recommended by many of the best theologians around him. And who can wonder, if, under such circumstances, the very *prestige* connected with the time-honored University of Oxford, awakened the strongest enthusiasm in an English heart, and gave every possible advantage to the lessons of those divines who had already set the Church of his native land in such unwonted commotion? Nor was it strange, independently of all national partiality; for when has the world beheld such a band of intellects, combined in such an enterprise? The startling energy of Froude, the lovely poetry of Keble, the learned mysticism of Pusey, the profound yet simple eloquence of Newman, the tact and directness of Percival, the straightforward and unflinching honesty of Hook, the scholastic exactness and ponderous erudition of Palmer, the varied power and sparkling 'brilliancy of the British Critic, to say nothing of a host of auxiliaries in every form of taste and feeling, operating in every quarter of the vast ecclesiastical field, church music, church painting, church architecture, church history,

church ritual, and, unhappily, church doctrine—in tales for the young, and arguments for the old, in grave truth and amusing fiction, while the whole tended to the same end with marvellous strength and harmony? No, the result is not strange, when we look back upon the wonderful union of capacities, which, for ten successive years, had been laboring to produce it. And no one who has been brought within the influence of that charmed circle, who can reverence the aspect of piety, or honor learning, or sympathize with zeal, or appreciate refined sentiment, or admire the prismatic splendors of an almost universal genius, will be likely to wonder at the strong impression produced upon the minds of others, however thankful he may feel that the overruling Providence of God has said to it, *Thus far shalt thou go, and no further*—however fervently he may supplicate the Almighty Bestower of all good, that not one of that gifted band may be finally lost to the ranks of Christian truth, or be deluded so far as to mistake the Church of Rome for the true Catholic Church of the Redeemer.

Regarding, therefore, the case of Mr. Carey as the natural result of his position, knowing, as I think I do, the peculiar capacities with which the Lord has endowed his intellect, and confident in the rectitude of purpose which I doubt not the grace of God has established in his heart, I am under no anxiety about the ultimate soundness of his theological principles. Nor do I question, in the least, that if it should please the Most High to prolong his life until age and experience, under the divine blessing, have given ripeness

to his powers, he will stand in the front rank of those authors whose writings shall be quoted by future generations in the Church, with confidence and praise.

But all this, however satisfactory with respect to the probable result in this particular instance, has nothing to do, in strictness of argument, with the serious question, whether a candidate, holding the opinions imputed to Mr. Carey at the time, ought to have been ordained at all. I am aware, indeed, that this is said by some to be a question which concerns only the diocese of New York, and her highly esteemed bishop. And therefore it is thought to be an invasion of his peculiar province, if any other bishop should express his disapproval. But I have no hesitation in saying that this is quite a mistaken idea. Nor shall I believe, unless upon his own direct assertion, that the bishop of New York himself holds any such unfraternal and thoroughly anti-episcopal doctrine. On the contrary, I feel quite confident that all our bishops admit the general and common interest which the entire body must take in questions of ordination. For no man can enter the ministry of a separate diocese without becoming, at the same moment, a minister of the whole Church. His letters of orders, accompanied by the usual certificate of dismissal, entitle him to claim his ministerial rights from every other bishop, as perfectly as from him who ordained him. And consequently the grounds and qualifications which are acted upon by any one bishop, concern every part of the Church alike, and must therefore be equally, in every quarter, open to

a candid review, and, if need be, to a frank though affectionate animadversion.

It is further an obvious result from the very object of the sacred office, that there is nothing of such cardinal importance to the interests of the gospel and the welfare of the Church, as the qualifications of the ministry. They are ordained as the guides, the teachers, the authorised examples of the flock of Christ. If the guide does not know the road, how shall he direct the traveller? If the teacher be ignorant, how shall the scholar learn? Or in the emphatic words of our Lord himself, *If the blind lead the blind, shall not both fall into the ditch?* Hence the Church has laid down the rules in her general canons, for the qualifications of candidates for holy orders: from which canons no bishop or diocese is at liberty to depart. But I risk nothing in asserting that the Church does not contain an individual, by whom a serious or wilful contempt of those wholesome laws would be visited with more unsparing reprehension than the bishop of New York himself. His whole ministerial life has been distinguished by a strict and even punctilious regard to every rule of ecclesiastical obligation. And if, therefore, under new and peculiar circumstances, he may seem to have erred in judgment—for who is infallible?—it needs no argument to prove what all will cordially and spontaneously concede, that it must have been an error of the head, and not of the heart.

I pass on, accordingly, to consider the aspect of this novel case, and shall premise a statement of the facts, which I shall endeavor to put into a shape free from every possible objection.

In A. D. 1842, Mr. Carey completed a full course of three years' theological study at the General Seminary in New York, passed his examinations with great credit, and might have been ordained without scruple, or delay, if he had not lacked a year of the age of twenty-one, under which the Canons of the Church allow no one to receive Holy Orders. His habits were those of a devoted student, and as he naturally felt a strong attachment to the associations of the seminary, he resolved to continue there in the character of a resident graduate, until the time of his ordination should arrive. Having attached himself meanwhile to the Church of Rev. Dr. Smith, and become a teacher of his Sunday-school, he applied to him, at the proper period, for the usual certificate. Before the paper was delivered, however, Dr. Smith had reason to apprehend that Mr. Carey had adopted the Tractarian theology, to an extent which he considered inconsistent with the doctrines of the gospel as set forth in the standards of the Church. As a matter of conscientious duty, therefore, and calling to his assistance the Rev. Dr. Anthon; the difficulty was communicated to the bishop, who promptly directed a special examination in the presence of himself, Drs. Smith and Anthon, and six other clergymen, for the purpose of investigating how far there was any real ground for doubting Mr. Carey's soundness in the faith.

The decision of the board, thus constituted, was not unanimous. The bishop and the six presbyters approved of Mr. Carey's theological qualifications. Drs. Smith and Anthon, on the other hand, were

satisfied that he had become a perfect convert to the Tractarian school, and did not hold the true sense of the thirty-nine Articles. Understanding, however, that their objections were over-ruled, and perceiving no other regular mode of preventing, what they regarded as a precedent, fraught with danger to the soundness of our future ministry, they resolved to avail themselves of the opportunity which the ordination service allowed, in the question which the bishop is bound to address to the people; requiring them, if they know of any crime or impediment in the person about to be ordained, to come forth and declare it in the name of God.

Accordingly, having intimated their intention to the bishop, the Rev. Drs. Smith and Anthon repaired to St. Stephen's Church, where the ordination was to be held, on the appointed Sunday, habited as clergymen in our cities usually are on that holy day, and took their place among the congregation. At the proper time, when the bishop addressed the people in the words of the ordinal, they rose and read their objections to Mr. Carey's ordination, in the form of a written protest. The bishop replied that these objections had been already laid before him by the same gentlemen, had been thoroughly investigated, and judged to be not sustained; and therefore he should proceed with the ordination. Immediately after this announcement, Drs. Smith and Anthon withdrew from the Church, and the candidate was ordained. Their conduct was forthwith strongly assailed in the columns of the Churchman, which rendered it proper for them, in self-defence, to publish a statement of their

reasons. This statement called forth a variety of answers, and an unexampled agitation arose throughout the Church, in which the secular press engaged with zealous emulation. The tempest of conflicting feelings and opinions thus unhappily excited, will probably continue long, before it passes into calm and sunshine; but we may well hope in God, beloved brethren, that, like storms in the material world, it will serve to purify the spiritual atmosphere, and brace our whole Church into renewed health and vigor.

A number of novel and important questions have been raised by this deeply interesting occurrence, which I shall now proceed to examine, according to the best light which I have been able to obtain. They may be reduced to three: First, as to the validity of the objections to the ordination of the candidate; secondly, as to the propriety of the course taken by the protesting clergymen; and thirdly, as to the judgment of the bishop.

It is neither pleasant nor necessary to attempt the reconcilment of the apparently conflicting statements with regard to the facts which took place during Mr. Carey's examination. I would merely observe that the contrariety is often more apparent than real, and may be sufficiently accounted for, as I conceive, without the slightest impeachment of veracity on either side, by making due allowance for the particular aspect in which the parties severally regarded the points under discussion, and for the extreme difficulty which the best men experience in doing full and perfect justice to the opinions of an antagonist. Expe-

rience has always proved that this difficulty is not a little increased by theological zeal, and it is usually brought to its utmost height, when the decision affects the personal claims or rights of a third party.

Avoiding, therefore, the whole of this debated ground, it is enough for me to adopt the pamphlet of my friend, Rev. Professor Haight, who was one of the six presbyters in favor of the ordination, and who, of course, must have taken the most kindly view of Mr. Carey's side of the question. And one item of this pamphlet will embrace all that the case seems to me to require, which I shall proceed to quote in the language of its estimable author.

“In regard to the Council of Trent,” saith Professor Haight, “I understood Mr. Carey simply to say, that the doctrinal decrees of that Council, apart from the damnatory clauses (which bind them as articles of faith upon the consciences of Romanists,) taken in their literal sense, and not as interpreted by the writings of Bishops and Doctors of the Romish communion, were not, in his opinion, absolutely irreconcilable with the Catholic faith.”—“Now this is a very different thing from saying that he adopted the decrees of the Council of Trent as *his* confession of Faith, or that he would choose to express his own belief on any given point in their language. He simply gives it as his opinion—let it go for what it is worth—that the naked words of those decrees, with the above limitation, and without reference to the Romish system as generally displayed, and as gathered from the teaching of her divines, are susceptible of an interpretation not inconsistent with the

received doctrines of the Universal Church. It is an exceedingly charitable view of the subject, some may call it a very loose and unsafe view ; still it does not follow as a matter of course, that he who holds it is unsound in the faith.”

In selecting this particular portion from all the rest, I am actuated mainly by the desire to regard the case in the most favorable light of which it is susceptible. And I confess myself most reluctantly compelled to say, that this single opinion, deliberately avowed and defended, is enough, in my mind, to prove a disqualification. Let me endeavor to explain the reasons which have led me to this conclusion.

First then, I hold that nothing but a corruption of the *faith* can justify our glorious Reformation. Corruptions in practice, in morals, in interpretation, in any and every imaginable form, may exist, but while the system of *doctrine* remains pure, there can be no true ground for entire and total separation. This was the argument which not simply excused our mother Church for taking her stand against the papacy, but made it her solemn duty to protest against all the corruptions which the Roman Church had added to the true faith, and to which she claimed absolute adherence from every soul, under the fearful penalties of temporal ruin here, and eternal misery hereafter.

Therefore our 19th Article expressly asserts that the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also *in matters of faith*. And the most important portions of the other Articles are devoted to the protesting against

those several points in which the errors of Rome consisted. In making this assertion, I except, of course, the first five Articles, which treat of the Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the descent of our Lord into the place of departed spirits, and his glorious Resurrection; not because I would depreciate their paramount importance,—God forbid!—but because, if the Articles had said nothing of them, they would still have been secured in the Creeds, the Litany, and the other offices of the Book of Common Prayer. Selecting, however, only a few from the remainder of these admirable documents of religious truth, let us see how the Church and the Council of Trent will agree together.

The 6th Article sets forth the correct Canon of Scripture, asserting that it contains all things necessary to salvation, and denying that any thing which is not contained therein shall be required as an article of faith; thus directly opposing the claims of Tradition, and accounting as Apocryphal no less than fourteen distinct writings, which the Council of Trent commands to be received with as much reverence as any portion of the real Word of God.* Now in this

* *Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.*

Sacro-sancta œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus,—perspicuensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris Scriptis, et *sine scripto traditionibus*, quæ ab ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quàm novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon *traditiones ipsus, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes*, tanquàm vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continuâ successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, *puri pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit, et veneratur.*

single Article there are three distinct propositions, embracing in their details a multitude of questions concerning the authority of Tradition in matters which Rome holds to be *de fide*. So that if there were no other quarrel betwixt us than this alone, it is sufficient to keep us apart for ever.

The 11th Article asserts the cardinal doctrine of Justification by Faith, or, as the Church of England expresses it, *By faith only*, to which the Council of Trent stands strongly opposed, confounding justification with sanctification, making our Baptism the *instrumental* cause of our first justification, our good works the instrumental cause of its subsequent increase, and our inherent righteousness the ground of our final acceptance. So serious and important is the difference here, that the Tractarian divines have made the most determined and persevering attacks upon the doctrine of our Church, not hesitating to brand it as the "*Lutheran heresy*," and even placing it below heathenism itself.*

* Thus the British Critic, (lxiv. 391) does not scruple to use this language, "The very first aggression, then, of those who labour to revive some degree at least of vital Christianity, (in the room of those gross corruptions and superstitions which have, in these latter days among ourselves, overlaid and defaced the primitive and simple truth,) their very first aggression must be upon that strange congeries of notions and practices, of which the Lutheran doctrine of Justification is the origin and representative. Whether any one heresy has ever infested the Church, so hateful and un-Christian as this doctrine, it is perhaps not necessary to determine; none, certainly, has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous."—"We must plainly express our conviction, that a religious heathen, were he really to accept the doctrine which Lutheran language expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss, in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error."

The 12th Article places good works in their true light “as the fruits of faith, and pleasant and acceptable to God, although they cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God’s judgment.” Here is a plain opposition to the Council of Trent declaring,* *that the justified are in no respect deficient, but may be considered as fully satisfying the divine law (as far as is compatible with their present condition) by their works which are wrought in God, and as really deserving eternal life, to be bestowed in due time,—for this is called OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, because WE ARE JUSTIFIED THEREBY, through its indwelling in us.*

The 22d Article is directed against the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Relics, and also the Invocation of Saints, calling this doctrine, “a fond thing, vainly invented, and repugnant to the Word of God.” Now of all these, the Council of Trent treats more or less at large, and a considerable Treatise would be required to point out the detailed corruptions of truth, and sad superstitions in practice, which are virtually condemned by the comprehensive language of the Article. The style of argumentation in which the famous Tract No. 90

* *Decretum de Justificatione, Cap. xvi. De fructu justificationis, hoc est, de merito bonorum operum, &c.*

—*Nihil ipsis justificatis amplius deesse credendum est, quò minùs plene illis quidem operibus, quæ in Deo sunt facta, divinæ legi pro hujus vitæ statu satisfacisse; et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse censeantur, &c. Quæ enim justitia nostra dicitur, quia per eam nobis inhærentem justificamur.*

endeavored to evade this and some other of our doctrines, is so unworthy of its author, and so degrading to the framers of our Articles, that it is one of the standing wonders of the age how an Episcopalian could write, or the Church could endure, such a production.

The 24th Article condemns the Roman doctrine, in holding religious service in the Latin tongue, without any regard to the question whether it can be understood by the people. And here again* is a positive contrariety to the Council of Trent.

The 26th Article denies that five out of the Seven Roman Sacraments ought to be accounted as such; in which list, that most important subject of *Penance* occurs, and the doctrine of Rome concerning it is said to have “*grown out of a corrupt following of the Apostles.*” It is quite incomprehensible to my mind how any one can approve the decrees of Trent upon the *Sacrament of Penance*,† and at the same

* *Doctrina de Sacrificio Missæ. Cap. viii. Missa vulgari lingua non celebretur.*

Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem; non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur, &c.

† *Doctrina de Sanctissimis Pœnitentiæ et Extremæ-Uctionis Sacramentis.*

Cap. I. De necessitate et institutione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ.

Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ, quo lapsis post Baptismum, beneficium mortis Christi applicatur.

—potestatem remittendi et retinendi peccata, ad reconciliandos fideles, post Baptismum lapsos, Apostolis et eorum legitimis successoribus fuisse communicatum, universorum Patrum consensus semper intellexit.

Cap. V. De Confessione.

—Dominus noster Jesus Christus, e terris ascensus ad cœlos,

time approve the doctrine of our Church, for if ever there was a set of plain contrarities, they may be found here. Indeed this Article alone contains more than twelve propositions, in which the two Churches are not to be reconciled by any fair process of reasoning.

The 28th Article expressly condemns the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, and defines the spiritual presence of Christ so as to limit it to the faithful receiver. And here we have corrected a large circle of error, in open contradiction to the Council of Trent,* so that the notion which reconciles that

sacerdotes sui ipsius Vicarios reliquit, tamquám praesides et iudices ; ad quos omnia mortalia crimina deferantur, in quæ Christi fideles ceciderint , quó pro potestate clavium remissionis aut retentionis peccatorum, sententiam pronuntient.

Cap. VI. De ministro hujus Sacramenti, et Absolutione.

—Quamvis autem Absolutio sacerdotis alicui beneficii sit dispensatio ; tamen non est solúm nudum ministerium, vel annuntiandi Evangelium, vel declarandi remissa esse peccata ; sed ad instar actus judicialis ; quo ab ipso, velut a iudice, sententia pronuntiat.

Cap. VII. De Casuum reservatione.

—Undè meritò Pontifices Max. pro suprema potestate sibi in Ecclesia universa tradita, causas aliquas criminum graviore suo potuerunt peculiari iudicio reservare.

Cap. VIII. De satisfactionis necessitate et fructu.

—Debent ergo sacerdotes Domini—pro qualitate criminum, et poenitentium facultate, salutare et convenientes satisfactiones injungere.

* De Sacro-sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento.

Canon 2. Si quis dixerit, in sacro-sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini uná cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, manentibus dumtaxát speciebus panis et vini ; quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissimè Transubstantionem appellat ; Anathema sit.

Council to Catholic antiquity, and at the same time maintains that we are in agreement with the same Catholic antiquity, strikes a plain mind with perfect astonishment.

The 30th Article condemns the Roman doctrine of withholding the cup from the Laity. But the Council of Trent* pronounces a curse upon any one, who shall deny that Christ is whole and entire under the species either of the bread or the wine, and in every particle of the same.

The 31st Article rejects the sacrifice of propitiatory masses, “in which it was said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt,” as being a “blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.” That this doctrine was not, as the Tractarian theologians would persuade themselves, the *vulgar error of Romanists*, but the doctrine of that corrupt Church herself, is manifest from the whole body of her divines for ages before the Reformation, and the Council of Trent was so far from reforming it,† that they expressly confirmed the whole.

* Canon 3. Si quis negaverit, in venerabili Sacramento Eucharistiæ sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri; Anathema sit.

† Doctrina de Sacrificio Missæ.

Cap. II. Sacrificium missæ esse propitiatorium tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis.

Et quoniam in divino hoc sacrificio, quod in missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, et incruentè immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel seipsum cruentè obtulit; docet Sancta Synodus, sacrificium istud verè propitiatorium esse. Quare non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, pœnis, satisfactiõibus, et aliis necessitatibus, sed et pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, ritè, juxta Apostolorum traditionem, offertur.

Cap. VI. De Missa in qua solus sacerdos communicat.

The 32d Article condemns the Roman doctrine of priestly Celibacy, in which also* we stand opposed to the Trentine Council.

Now here are between twenty and thirty dangerous errors in the faith, taught by the Council of Trent, and condemned by our Articles; and yet a candidate shall be thought qualified to be ordained as a minister of our Church, who thinks the decrees of Trent not "*absolutely irreconcilable*" with the Catholic, meaning thereby the pure, apostolic, and primitive doctrine!

"It is," saith Rev. Professor Haight, "an exceedingly charitable view of the subject, some may call it a very loose and unsafe view, *still it does not follow, as a matter of course, that he who holds it is unsound in the faith.*" This remark of my esteemed friend and brother suggests a few observations, which I think have been rather overlooked on that side of the controversy.

There is a certain *official* fitness required on behalf of the candidate for holy orders, which no other quality can supply. A man may not be *unsound in the faith* which is *essential to his own salvation*,

—Nec tamen (Sacro-sancta Synodus) Missas illas in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, ut privatas et illicitas damnat, sed probat, atque adeo commendat.

* De Sacramento Matrimonii.

Can. 9. Si quis dixerit Clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse, quàm damnare matrimonium; posse que omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; Anathema sit.

and yet profess an honest belief in a hundred erroneous notions. He may be a thorough Romanist, like Pascal, or Fenelon, and yield a mental acquiescence to every corruption of their creed, while yet his *heart* clings to Christ, and his actual trust and confidence are neither in the virgin, nor in the saints, nor in the sacraments, nor in his own good works, nor in the power of the priesthood, but in GOD HIS SAVIOUR. Thousands of men, I doubt not, have lived and died in the communion of that corrupt Church of Rome, who were Protestants in their real faith, that is, in the doctrines which *their hearts* have acknowledged. But suppose such persons to be under examination for the ministerial office, and to avow, in plain language, that they believed our thirty-nine Articles, taken in their literal sense, were *not absolutely irreconcilable with Catholic doctrine*, I ask any man of common sense whether the Church of Rome would think them qualified to receive the ministerial commission, merely because they professed, at the same time, their entire consent to the decrees of the Trentine Council, and therefore could not be directly condemned as unsound in the faith? Would not such a notion be taken as decisive evidence, that whether they were sound in their personal faith or not, they could not expect consistently to be authorized to *teach others*; that the Church of Rome wanted men who knew how to proclaim *her* doctrines, and *condemn all that had gone out from her under the pretence of a Reformation*, and that the man who was not ready to *teach as that Council taught*, was

unfitted for her purpose, however great his other merits might confessedly be ?

But if this would be correct reasoning on the part of Rome towards us, is it not equally applicable to our position with respect to Rome? Does it follow, that because we do not condemn the soundness in the faith of a particular individual, we must therefore grant that he is to be trusted as an authorised and commissioned leader? Because we may think it highly probable that Pascal and Fenelon are now in the Paradise of the just, should we, therefore, if they were on earth again, be ready to ordain them? Or if we should marvel at the inconsistency of Rome, in ordaining a candidate who openly declared that he did not think our Articles irreconcilable with sound doctrine, should we not marvel as much at the ordination of one amongst ourselves, who regarded the decrees of Trent with equal complacency?

It is not enough, therefore, in the case of a candidate for holy orders, that he have competent learning and piety, and be *not unsound* in his own faith. He must be, in the language of the canonical certificate, “Apt and meet to exercise the ministry to the glory of God and the edifying of the Church,” and if he is not honestly believed to possess a reasonable measure of *this fitness* for the work, we have no real authority to ordain him. Hence we are obliged to examine him for the very purpose of ascertaining whether the mind, and spirit, and character of the Church are in him. The Church is a *Reformed* Church: Is he prepared to justify her reformation?

The Church is a *Protestant* Church,—emphatically and distinctly such, because her duty to PROTEST against error, is, in the nature of things, inseparable from the right of REFORM. Is he ready to repeat her protest, to defend its duty, and to demonstrate its truth? The Church is a *Catholic* Church, that is, a branch of the ancient, *Universal* Church of Christ, in contradistinction from all heresies and schisms. Is he thoroughly persuaded of this fact, and ready to assert, against all gainsayers, but chiefly and pre-eminently against that corrupt system which would fain be called the *only Catholic Church*, the purity and faithful consistency of her doctrines? If not, let him be put back awhile until he learns to understand the office which the Church expects of him. He may have piety, he may have learning, he may have all high moral and intellectual capacities, he may be sound in the essentials of his individual faith so far as concerns his own salvation. But all this he might be, without any of the *distinctive principles* which can alone *authorize* us to clothe him with the commission of the ministry. Our power to give him this commission is a *solemn trust*, delegated to us on *certain specified conditions*. And if those conditions, or any of them, be *manifestly* wanting, we have, strictly speaking, no legal right to ordain.

My esteemed friend and brother, Professor Haight, does himself, indeed, seem to hold the same views, substantially, in the following passage, (p. 167 :) “ That the clergy who consent to the ordination of a candidate, and the bishop who ordains him, are to be held responsible for all his opinions, no Church-

man, I presume, will venture to assert. *If his doctrines are in conformity with the doctrines of our standards*—his honesty, intelligence, piety, and general fitness being granted—nothing more can be demanded of him.” To this I cheerfully subscribe. It is the very ground of my difficulty, that the doctrines of Mr. Carey did not agree with the doctrines of our standards; not with the Homilies, not with the Articles, not with the doctrines of the Reformers who accomplished the blessed work in the midst of every obstacle, and sealed it with their blood. For how could it be inferred from any of those standards, that the decrees of the Council of Trent are *not absolutely irreconcilable* with the truth of the gospel? If not absolutely irreconcilable, they may be reconciled. If not false, they must be true. *He that is not against us, saith our divine Master, is on our part.* And again, HE THAT IS NOT WITH ME IS AGAINST ME. In the things of God, therefore, we know nothing of a *medium* between falsehood and truth. There are confessedly things *indifferent*, about which men may argue to the end of the world, without affecting the character of their Church, or the honor of the gospel. But the mind of a Churchman seems to me under a strange cloud, when he can reckon the merits of the Romish controversy amongst them. For on our having *the truth* with us, in that controversy, depends our very being as a Church, our character as Christ’s ministry, our right to ordain, our power to preach, our justification before men, and, more than all, our justification before the throne of the “**KING ETERNAL, IMMORTAL, and INVISIBLE.**”

I am aware, indeed, that my esteemed brother would claim a distinction here which my argument has overlooked. It is the distinction between *opinions* and *doctrines*; a distinction sometimes very real and tangible, and sometimes very delusive and vain. Perhaps I may be understood more clearly, however, if I illustrate my meaning by a hypothetical example.

Suppose, then, that a candidate for Orders should tell his examiners that he had formed an opinion—only an opinion—that the Koran of the impostor Mahomet was not absolutely irreconcilable with truth; that in some respects Mahomedanism had the advantage over Christianity, and that he could not precisely decide which was the better religion of the two. Now is it possible to believe that such an opinion, declared to his examiners, and therefore perfectly known by them to be really entertained by the candidate, would not be deemed a disqualification? Would it be competent for him to say, “I do not hold this as a *doctrine*, it is only my individual *opinion*. I shall not preach it, nor teach it; and as I hold and subscribe, *ex animo*, if you please, to all the Articles, principles, worship and discipline of the Church, you may rely on my faithfulness and official consistency.” Would not the plain answer to such a statement be, “My friend, we do not question your good intentions, but your scheme of conduct involves an absurdity. Your opinion may be called what you please, but so long as you hold it, you *cannot* preach the doctrines of the gospel, because you do not believe them in your own heart.

You have, indeed, become so mystified upon the subject, that it is plain you do not at present see the gross inconsistencies of your position, else you would not have so frankly avowed it. But we cannot become accessories to such a fearful error. May God give you repentance, and bring you to the knowledge of the truth."

Now here, I admit, is an extreme case; but certainly it suits my purpose in proving, that the distinction between opinions and doctrines cannot save a candidate's consistency, when it so happens that they are diametrically opposed to each other. For not a whit more subversive of Christian faith is the opinion that Mahomedanism may be reconciled to truth, than it is subversive of our Protestant Church to hold the opinion that the Council of Trent may be reconciled to sound primitive doctrine. Nay, on some accounts, the half-way Turk would have a better apology than the half-way Romanist. He might say, and truly, that Mahomet adopted the Scriptures, and admitted the mission of Christ, and considered him the son of God in the Socinian sense, and represented him as occupying a place in the seventh heaven. He might plausibly insist, moreover, that he had a right to think as he pleased about the matter, because it was not mentioned in the Standards of the Church at all, and therefore, it was impossible to show the contrariety except by indirect inference and implication. And he might fairly argue that on all topics of the Bible and the Prayer Book, except a very few, he could preach without difficulty. The authority of Scripture, the unity and attributes of God, the mission of

the prophets and of Christ himself, the day of judgment, the future state, all the moral virtues, the efficacy of prayer, fasting, and good works, would all be left to him as common ground; and the few expressions of the Litany and the Creeds which might produce a difficulty, could be gotten over by the aid of the reasoning in Tract No. 90. Above all, he might say, that there was nothing to prevent a vigorous urging of the doctrines of the Articles so far as the Reformation was concerned; for with all his private leaning towards Mahomedanism, he had not the least doubt of the awful corruption of the Church of Rome.

And yet, all this would not save him from rejection. The case would be too clear for argument, because on this subject, *there has been nothing to lead our minds astray from the simplicity of truth.*

I cannot therefore, consent to tolerate this novel system, which maintains that Romanism, as defined by the Council of Trent, may be reconciled to pure Christianity, merely because it is professed as an *opinion*, and not as a *doctrine*. Because so long as the individual entertains that opinion, it will be absurd to expect him to feel like a true son of the Reformation. He cannot, without violating his conscience, preach plainly and distinctly upon the various corruptions which the Homilies and the Articles detail. He cannot condemn, in strong and decided terms, the idolatrous worship of the Virgin mother, nor the invocation of saints, nor the veneration of images and relics, nor the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nor the merit of our own good works, nor

any other point in controversy. He can, indeed, preach upon a large scope of faith and practice, without recurring to Rome at all; and he may possibly be quite a useful and a respectable man, if he can only contrive to bury this opinion in his own bosom. But he must either have very little conscience, or very extraordinary self-control, to persevere in the effort to conceal it. And if he could, what right have we to ordain men whose opinions are such, that they cannot promulgate them without defeating the very object of their ministry? Is not the fact that the *opinion* must not be openly avowed, sufficient evidence to prove that it ought not to be held at all?

I do not, however, desire to pass by the argument which my respected and beloved brethren seem to think so satisfactory, namely, that the Church has always allowed the most liberal range of sentiment on other subjects, namely, on Calvinism, Arminianism, and Episcopacy; from whence the conclusion is deduced that a correspondent laxity or even contrariety of sentiment must be allowed, with respect to Rome. It may be owing to my own obtuseness that I cannot see the relevancy of this reasoning. But assuredly it was not Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor Episcopacy, which produced the struggles of the Reformation. These were not the questions which filled Germany with slaughter, and brought the martyrs of England to prison and to death. Our candidates may construe the Articles in the Calvinistic or the Arminian sense, and they may think episcopacy a divine or a human institution, and yet leave every important doctrine of the blessed Reformation pre-

cisely as it was before. But if they begin to tolerate the Council of Trent, and fancy its decrees reconcilable with pure primitive Christianity, it appears perfectly incontrovertible to me, that they *virtually* subvert the foundation of our whole reform, and convert our Apostolic Church into a band of Schismatics. Nothing therefore, seems to my mind more obvious, than the paramount importance of this vital question. If Rome can be proved to be *doctrinally* right, we must be *doctrinally* wrong. To prove that we are both right, and yet to admit and defend the principles or the act of the Reformation, is a manifest contradiction.

Such, then, being my own humble judgment on the subject of the qualifications of the candidate, and thus far agreeing with Drs. Smith and Anthon in thinking that he was not, according to the true spirit and meaning of the Ordinal and the Canons, ready to be ordained, the next question arises, namely: Were they right or wrong, in openly protesting against the ordination?

And here, I think it due to those reverend brethren to say, that they plainly sought for a *regular* and *legal* mode of attaining an object of high and important principle. They acted on an established part of the service appointed by the Church, and, as they conceived, in strict conformity to the provisions of the Rubric. What deprived them of a right given to every member of that congregation?

It is said first, that the right is given to the people, that is, the laity; and secondly, that these objectors, being clergymen, had free access to the bishop in

their clerical capacity, and had actually used their privilege already: hence it is deemed absurd that they should use it again.

In answer to the first part of this argument, I must confess myself unable to see that a right, given by the Church to every layman present at an ordination, is lost forever, if such layman becomes a clergyman. Can any other case be shown in which the clergy must no longer presume to use the privileges of the laity? Is it indeed a principle of sound construction, that a layman, having certain rights as such, forfeits them all as soon as he becomes a clergyman? This is, to me, a very novel, and I must needs think, perfectly indefensible idea. The clergyman doubtless acquires certain official rights by his ordination, but he loses no right which he had before, unless it be such as is either incompatible *per se* with the sacred function, or is made incompatible by positive ecclesiastical law. Hence, as neither of these can be alleged, these clergymen had the same right to act on the exhortation which the ordinal addresses to the people, as they had to sit amongst the people, and become, for the time, a part of the congregation.

The second branch of the argument, however, has more apparent force; since it is a very plausible idea that these clergymen had exercised their privilege already, and the Church could not mean to give them two distinct modes of doing the same thing.

At the first view of the transaction, I was inclined to adopt this opinion; but further reflection has led me to doubt, whether the information given to the Bishop, and the private examination held thereupon,

were the thing which the Church intended to insure to the public objection in the Ordinal. Let us look to the language of the Prayer book, which is as follows, viz.

“And if any great crime or impediment be objected, the Bishop shall cease from ordering that person, until such time as the *party accused shall be found clear of that crime.*”

Now an important question arises on these words, viz. By what mode is the party to be *found clear* of the alleged crime or impediment? BY A REGULAR, CANONICAL TRIAL, conducted according to the established laws of the Church, or by an *informal, private examination*? By the first, as it would seem to me; because no accused person can be found “clear” of an alleged crime, without a trial; or at least without an examination conducted according to some known forms of law. And as the language of the rubric embraces not only crimes but impediments, and doctrinal unsoundness is an impediment of the most extensive kind, which may vary from the lightest shades of error, up to the most grievous heresy, it seems plain that the interests of the Church, the character of the candidate, and the rights of the accusers, would all require, that a decision so grave and important should be attained in the most canonical, complete and satisfactory manner.

If this reasoning be correct, the result will be, that Drs. Smith and Anthon had not had the kind of investigation which the Ordinal contemplated. That what they desired was what the rubric had expressly provided for, namely, a canonical, regular, legal

investigation. And it would certainly be a strange anomaly in our system, if a single layman, making public objection according to the Ordinal, should have a right to a more solemn, strict and thorough examination of the charge, than the Church intended to allow, where the same charge was made at the same time and under the same circumstances, by two doctors of divinity.

There is one argument more, however, advanced upon the other side, and that is derived from a new meaning of the word *impediment*; which is ingeniously supposed to exclude all theological unsoundness, and to embrace only acts or habits of vice or immorality. I acknowledge myself quite unable to perceive the authority for this definition. If such were the meaning of the Church, I presume the language would have been the familiar word, *misdemeanour*, instead of the much more comprehensive term, *impediment*. It is not impossible, indeed, that our General Convention may think fit to affix this meaning to the word, for the future; but they cannot extend such a novelty so as to give it a retrospective operation on the past. If Congress cannot create a crime by an *ex post facto* law, it would seem very hard that the Church should make an offence by an *ex post facto* interpretation.

I must frankly say, therefore, that Drs. Anthon and Smith, in my humble judgment, had sufficient ground for their objection, and as that objection was over-ruled in the private examination of the candidate, they had a plain right to make their public protest, in order that the ordination might be sus-

pended, according to the express law of the Church, until the candidate should have been found "clear," by a regular, canonical trial. Their leaving the Church, as soon as they were told that their objection was disregarded, has been severely censured, but I could never perceive the ground of censure. For certainly, they were compelled either to leave the Church, or else to take part in the very ordination against which they had conscientiously protested. It will hardly be thought, I presume, that it would have been reverential on their part to have remained, without uniting in the prayers and responses proper to the occasion. And yet how could they have thus united, when they honestly believed the candidate unfit, and the Bishop mistaken?

The result then, in my mind—and I state it with deep regret—is quite at variance with the decision of my highly-esteemed brother, the Bishop of New York. But he has every possible claim to a favorable construction of what—at worst—can only be considered an error in judgment, to which the best men are liable. The more especially as the case was new, and he must have felt strongly inclined to regard it in the most indulgent light for the candidate. Let me ask a few moments' consideration to what seems to my mind the natural course of his reflections. At least, they would have been my own, on such an occasion; although it would not become me to say, until I am similarly circumstanced, how far they would govern my decision.

Here is a youth of uncommon piety, talent and learning, who is plainly devoted to the Tractarian

school of Oxford. He is but just twenty-one, and is only to be admitted to the diaconate, where he cannot even be allowed to preach without a special license, which can be at any moment withdrawn. His highly respectable connexions, and large circle of friends, will be deeply wounded in their feelings if he is put back; especially as a full year has already elapsed since he had passed most honorably through his Seminary course. He himself will probably be powerfully affected by such a public censure, and his constitution, already enfeebled by severe application, and frail at best, may be crushed under his mental depression. Why should such a dangerous experiment be tried, when the Church can be guarded as surely by passing gently over his extreme opinions upon a scholastic subtlety now, and recommending him to a sounder course of reading and reflection before he applies, three years hence, for ordination to the priesthood? At that time, should he prove unsound, there will be another and a sufficient opportunity for thorough investigation, and he can be withheld from the higher office which includes the cure of souls. Therefore, on the whole, is it not better for the candidate, better in view of his future usefulness to the Church, better for the sake of his estimable friends and connexions, that he should be admitted without further delay, trusting to experience and time, under the influence of divine grace, for the correction of opinions which now seem inconsistent, and at all events keeping a strict guard over his next examination?

Now surely this must be allowed to be a strong

case, on the part of the decision formed by my highly-esteemed brother, the Bishop of New York ; and yet it is far from being the whole of what probably occupied his thoughts, when employed in the serious task of deliberation : for as Drs. Smith and Anthon expressly state that his mind was not made up at the close of the private examination, it may well be supposed that the whole of the intervening day, (Saturday,) was spent in a careful and anxious survey of all the direct and indirect bearings of this new and difficult question.

The next set of inquiries, therefore, which I venture to presume must have passed through his mind, would perhaps be such as the following : How will the rejection of this interesting and most conscientious young man affect the General Theological Seminary, and its valued Professors? Will it not be seized on with avidity by the enemies of the Church, as a manifest proof that this most important institution is infected with a tendency to Popery, when even the Bishop himself, who is already supposed to be somewhat over-friendly to the Oxford Tracts, has been obliged to reject a candidate of the highest merit, for no other reason than his having imbibed the errors of that system? Will not the hue and cry against "Puseyism" be thus raised to such a height, as may seriously injure the future welfare of this school of the prophets, stain the professional character of its worthy and talented instructors, and even extend to those excellent and long experienced men, who have no sympathy whatever with the supposed error? And how can the Bishop repair the evils which an exces-

sive strictness in this matter may make him instrumental in producing? He may inflict the wound, but he cannot heal it. He may open a breach which he cannot close. And why should such a risk be incurred merely on account of a *single* example, a novel case, which never occurred before, which, with proper care, may never occur again, and which cannot produce any imaginable evil, if due attention be paid to the interval which must be spent before the candidate is presented for the priesthood?

There is yet remaining, however, an argument which merits some serious consideration. The bishop might have doubted whether it was *just*, with regard to the candidate himself, to delay his ordination at a stage like this. The canons, in laying down certain requisites for ordination, do *impliedly* authorize, as it were, *a contract* with every candidate, that if he fulfils these requisites, *he shall be ordained*: and therefore Mr. Carey, having done his part to the full extent, and even more than was required by an extra year of study, had a *right to demand* the fulfilment of the covenant on the part of the Church. True, there were opinions charged upon him which were believed to be radically inconsistent with her doctrines. But ought he to suffer for holding such opinions, so long as he evidently could not see their inconsistency, and was not prevented from subscribing, *ex animo*, to all that the Church required? Should a *solemn contract* be thus violated on the strength of a new hypothesis, which had started up without either party having anticipated it, which one party, the candidate, did not believe to belong to the

main question at all, but honestly held it as a private speculation; and which the other party, the Church, had not defined as yet, while her ministers held it differently, some regarding it one way, and some in another? Surely, it might well be said, that contracts may not be avoided on such doubtful grounds as this. The candidates for the ministry have certain *vested* rights, and no new matter, especially when it is of a disputable kind, can be justly suffered to despoil them.

The answer to all this is sufficiently obvious. To the first it may be truly said, that the bishops have received their sacred commission under the solemn pledge to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines, and that their highest function, the power to ordain, may not be lawfully subjected to any arguments of personal regard or expediency. To the second, that the best interests of the General Seminary would be promoted instead of injured, by any act, which proved, to the public satisfaction, a strict and thorough vigilance over sound doctrine, especially where Rome was concerned. And to the third, that the candidate can have no *vested* rights, which, in the reasonable apprehension of his examiners, can possibly expose the Church to danger. His inability to see the inconsistency of his opinions could not alter the *fact*, however it might affect our feelings towards him personally. The ministry is only to be conferred on those who are *qualified*. The qualifications must be judged by others, and the very existence of a reasonable *doubt* whether the candidate possesses them, de-

prives him of all right to complain, because it lies upon him to satisfy the Church that he is fit, and so long as there is ground for *doubt*, the evidence cannot be called *satisfactory*. Finally, it might be said, that the fear of evil consequences can never be admitted in the scale against positive rules of obligation. It is our part to fulfil, so far as in us lies, the *present duty*, and leave the question of *results*, in humble faith, to that overruling Providence, who can cause the very wrath of man to praise him, and make all things, however adverse they may seem to our short-sighted apprehensions, ultimately work together for good to those that love him.

Nevertheless, although, as I have frankly said, my judgment would have differed from that of my respected brother, yet it would be quite unfair to deny that his probable view of the case is a very plausible, amiable, and inviting, if not a very strong one. To a man of warm and generous feelings, I can readily imagine that the appeal on the side of Mr. Carey would be very hard to resist; and I honestly confess, that granting it to be a mistaken decision, it seems impossible for me to regard it with any serious fear or apprehension. It was a novel case, in all respects, and one of considerable difficulty; there was but little time for weighing the objections, and perhaps but little of that preparation of mind which could perceive their force: and if ever there was an error of judgment which could claim our sympathy for its feelings, our respect for its probable motives, our all-but-allowance for its difficulties, I think we may find it in the case of Mr. Carey's ordination.

It needs but small wisdom, after we have made a mistake, to tell how it might have been avoided. We can all see, *now*, that it would have probably saved the Church from this whole intense agitation, if the request of Drs. Smith and Anthon to conduct the examination in writing had been granted, if the previous paper of notes had been admitted in evidence, and if but one week had been allowed to give the candidate time to see the true nature of the difficulty before him. But so far as the published documents would lead one to infer, there was quite too much feeling on the occasion to allow the proper exercise of cool and calm reflection; perhaps too much for the exhibition of that fraternal confidence and Christian courtesy, which clergymen owe to each other, but which, when under the influence of excitement, they, *like other men*, sometimes forget to render. And thus has the whole Church been thrown into an unexampled state of alarm and consternation, by a result, which a little patient allowance for the honest doubts of the objectors, a little kindly attention to their conscientious scruples, a little wholesome self-distrust, and a postponement long enough to give the whole matter the thorough searching which its importance deserved, might, under God, have avoided. But, as I have said, any one can see this *now*, when the painful results are before us. I am far from intending to insinuate that I should have done better, or even as well, under the same circumstances. Nor have I, for myself, the slightest doubt, that *the whole has been ordered most wisely by the Providence of our heavenly Father*, for the better establishment of

his Church, and the furtherance of his blessed gospel, by the opportunity which it holds out for future protection against the inroads of error, for securing, in every suspected case, the fullest inquiry, for clearer and more definite views of doctrine, especially as it regards the Roman controversy, and for the adoption of an arrangement by which the conflicting judgments of our bishops may be regularly submitted to some appellate jurisdiction, instead of being spread in open contrariety before the public eye.

With no desire, therefore,—God forbid!—to encourage strife or promote dissension, but with the hope of aiding, according to my humble capacity, in pointing out the course which our General Convention might wisely adopt, to guard against the possible recurrence of any difficulty hereafter, and thus to turn our past experience to the true account, by making it the ground-work of an improved system, I have frankly considered the main features of the case before us, for the purpose of drawing your attention, in due time, to the best practicable mode of accomplishing an object so desirable to every friend of unity and peace.

In order to give the Church the full benefits of a simple and complete system, three measures seem to me required.

First, that we should have but *one code of canon law*, enacted by the whole Church in General Convention, and superseding, of course, all diocesan legislation.

Secondly, that this code should be administered, in each diocese, by the Bishop, acting as judge, with

the assistance of a certain number of his Presbyters, as assessors.

Thirdly, that from the judgment of each bishop, an appeal should lie, under proper regulations in every case, to a Board or Council, consisting of not less than seven bishops, with from four to six laymen, in the capacity of advisers and assistants, all of whom should be elected by joint ballot at each General Convention, and should hold their sessions at such time and place as the President of the Council should appoint; the necessary expenses of such meeting being provided for by the Church at large, in the same manner as is now done for the meetings of the General Convention.

I shall not here repeat what I have already printed on this subject, in my humble work called "The Primitive Church," the first edition of which was published in the spring of 1835.* It may be well, however, to state briefly, on the present occasion, a few general reasons for some such arrangement as I have proposed.

We have about twenty-seven dioceses in the vast territory of the United States, with one General Theological Seminary, and three or four Diocesan Seminaries. Our Prayer Book, containing the Articles of the Church, the Ordinals, the worship, and a portion of our discipline, is wisely delivered to the General Convention; and no Bishop nor diocese has power over a single word of those inestimable for-

* See the 10th ch. of the Dissertation, p. 378 of second edition, as also the Journal of the House of Bishops, at the General Convention of 1835, p. 88, &c.

mularies. The same body has authority to make Canons which bind the whole Church. So far, all is placed, consistently enough, upon the only practical principles of unity. But the anomaly begins as soon as we leave the language of the law, and come down to the work of interpretation. Here we have no standard of unity at all, no general regulator, no officer of the Church, and no constituted body, to which we can appeal, to remedy the occasional mistakes of judgment to which all are liable. There is no sufficient respect paid to the decisions of any one Bishop, because there are other Bishops, probably, who may think differently, and thus the clergy cannot always be expected to yield with cheerfulness, even when their diocesan may be right. And if he should be wrong, which is certainly a very possible thing, notwithstanding his purest intentions and best efforts, there is no mode of rectifying the error. Hence, of necessity, arise complaints, murmurs, factions, parties; and good men—yea, some of our best men—become perfectly conscientious in the temper and spirit of opposition to their Bishop, on the acknowledged ground, that they have no other mode of preserving their rights, or of guarding the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.

Now it is impossible to justify a condition of things like this, because it has no warrant in the history of the Church, none from the Scriptures, none from our mother Church of England, none from any well-ordered civil commonwealth, none in reason or common sense. In the Church of Israel there was a complete series of appeals. In the early Christian

Church there was an appeal from the Bishop to the Metropolitan, and from him to a Provincial Council. In England there are appeals of a similar kind, although, unhappily, their system is so trammelled by its subordination to the civil courts, that it is of very little use to them. Nay, the Presbyterian and Methodist denominations of our own country, defective as they are in some most important points of apostolic order, have nevertheless a far better provision for unity of judgment than ourselves. Hence it must surely be granted, that in some way or other we ought to supply this manifest defect. And although the shortness of the period since our distinct organization, our scattered population, and the potent conservatism of our principles in other things, have enabled us, under God, to dispense with it thus far, without actual schism: yet as long as our position in this respect presents an anomaly, in plain contradiction to all our acknowledged maxims, we cannot hope that we shall always escape the consequences. Nor have we any right to expect that a continued miracle will keep the Church together, while we refuse to employ the only established instrumentality.

Until some such arrangement is carried into effectual operation, I do not see any hope of discipline or lasting concord; and the recent case in New York may serve as one out of many practical illustrations. Had the decision of the Bishop on that occasion been open to a regular appeal, a few weeks would have settled the question, and would probably have laid down a rule by which he himself would have been

relieved from a painful responsibility, and his clergy from a still more painful opposition. For want of this, those who felt aggrieved, having no other remedy, appeal to the Church and public at large, and set up a new periodical to defend what they honestly believe to be true Church principles. Will any man contend that it is desirable to have an organized division in every considerable diocese, each sustained by an established press, which must again, in the very nature of things, tend to perpetuate and consolidate its own party? Surely not. But it cannot be otherwise, if the judgment of a single Bishop is the only judgment which practically decides the most serious and important questions. For if appeals were allowed in those primitive times, when there was an hundred-fold more respect felt for the office of a Bishop than we shall ever see again, how much more, beloved brethren, must they be required, in the unchecked freedom of the nineteenth century!

It may be thought, indeed, by some, that our General Convention affords an adequate remedy for every episcopal mistake, and by others, that the late Canon for the trial of Bishops secures ample protection. Both of these opinions, however, in my humble judgment, are untenable, for the following reasons:

The first idea, which would bring the mistakes of episcopal decisions to the General Convention, is opposed to all experience and analogy. That assembly is the supreme legislature of the Church, whose business is not so much with *men*, as with *principles*. No such body can advantageously unite

the judicial with the legislative function. The very form of their proceeding, in having two separate Houses, like the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, or, more properly, like the English Convocation, utterly forbids the attempt to hear appeals, or sit in judgment. It might, indeed, be otherwise, if, like the ancient Provincial Synods, they consisted only of bishops, or if, like the Presbyterian General Assembly, they sat together. But constituted as they are, (and, as I believe, most wisely,) nothing like an appellate jurisdiction can be exercised by them. They may correct abuses to a certain extent, by Canons and resolutions; but the full remedial power of an appellate Court demands a distinct examination. There are other reasons which would lead to the same result, but this appears to be conclusive.

As to the other idea, that our late Canon on the trial of Bishops might be applied to the correction of errors in judgment, I apprehend that it is equally inadmissible. For although this Canon does indeed say, that a Bishop may be presented, not only for any crime or immorality, or for heresy, but also for violating the constitution or Canons of the Church, or of his own diocese, so that the whole range of possible offences seems to be included, yet I think it obvious that in sound legal construction, it can only apply to *offences*. That is to say, a *criminal intent* must be attached to the act on which the presentment is founded, and therefore mere *errors in judgment*, to which the best and most conscientious men are liable, can by no means be a proper ground for a present-

ment under that Canon. The answer of the respondent to every such presentment would be, substantially, either *Guilty*, or *Not guilty*. But there is no guilt when the intention is right; and therefore many serious mistakes may be committed, and much opposition may exist between the declared opinions of the bishops, and the official action founded thereupon, which the true spirit of that Canon could never reach at all. The distinction may be readily understood by a recurrence to the familiar analogy of our civil judges. For they may all be subject to *impeachment* for official misconduct; while an illegal opinion, delivered without wilful corruption, and in the execution of their office, must be corrected either by *Writ of Error*, or *Appeal*, and no rebuke nor censure, much less the loss of office, can possibly follow from those honest mistakes of judgment, to which the very exercise of their functions, in the nature of the case, must always expose them. In like manner, as it seems to me, should the Church be provided with some mode for the correction of those errors, which are no proper ground for *impeachment* or *presentment*, since the Canon, which was designed for this latter purpose, cannot, with any legal consistency, be applied to the other.

Independently of these arguments, however, I frankly confess that there is another view of this subject which has long had great influence on my own mind. We are obliged to listen to a vast amount of accusation *without*, and of apprehension *within* our own pale, concerning the dangerous and despotic character of episcopal power, and the terrible abuses

to which it is applicable. Now so long as we have no *appeal* from the judgment of a single Bishop, it is evident that there will be room left for the reiteration of those complaints and lamentations. No change that we can make, indeed, will be likely to satisfy those who are determined to censure episcopacy, right or wrong. But for the sake of some amongst our own brethren, it is surely worth our while to do any thing lawful in itself, by which we may quiet those fears of episcopal tyranny which seem to disturb them. So far as I know our Bishops, they desire the exercise of as little official power, as may consist with the faithful administration of the system committed to their especial oversight and care. And I cannot see any reason to doubt, that they would have cause to rejoice in a measure, which would strengthen their hands by the influence of unity in all that the interests of discipline and order could require, while it would take away all pretext for complaint, and all excuse for opposition.

There is yet one service more, and that of no small importance, which I should desire might be performed by the Board or Council of Appeals, which I have been advocating. It is the *ensorship of the press within the circle of the Church*. I need hardly say to you, my beloved and respected brethren, that this censorship formed a serious part of the duty discharged by the English Convocation, and that no branch of the Church can expect to be long at rest, in which there is not some mode by which it may be faithfully exercised. No reflecting mind can doubt, for instance, that if the Convocation had been in pos-

session of its former powers, the mischievous excitement produced by the objectionable portions of the Oxford Tracts, and especially of the British Critic, would have been effectually arrested in due season. Nor do I see how any sober Christian, who loves to follow the things which make for peace, and who has been an attentive observer of our episcopal press for some years past, can help desiring, that if possible a wholesome curb might be put upon that powerful engine, by which its vast strength could still be used for good, while it should be restrained from evil.

I should feel self-condemned, if, having touched upon this subject, I did not discharge my own conscience, by openly protesting against the sad abuse of *anonymous publications*, written by nobody knows whom, and often replete with a temper and a language, which, it must be confessed, few men who have any character to lose would be willing to appropriate. This pernicious custom, however, seems to me particularly blameworthy, when it is adopted in our Church Periodicals. For at least it must be granted, that the author of a scurrilous *pamphlet* stands alone, and pays for the privilege of printing it. But the writer of as scurrilous a communication in the columns of a religious paper, is put to no cost; and is brought, without their leave, into respectable company. By this convenient vehicle, he is introduced to a thousand eyes to which he would not otherwise have gained access, and is aided in his malevolence or folly by an *implied* approbation, while all real accountability is turned off upon the editorial prerogative of *not being responsible for the sentiments of correspondents*.

The activity of this ingenious management has procured us a succession of invisible and intangible monitors, who reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all authority, at one moment; and jest, and flout, and sneer, with all irreverence, at another. Who the persons may be that thus undertake to illuminate the Church, or flagellate her unhappy officers, is all a mystery. It is a literary masquerade. A young gentleman, perhaps, whose theological studies have but just begun, assumes, with all proper gravity, the cognomen of one of the martyrs; and *Ridley*, or *Latimer*, or *Hooper*, or *Cranmer*, appears in such a guise, that assuredly their best friends would never know them. It may be that some young lady, warmed with a generous emulation, next pens a letter to the editor; and after discussing her ecclesiastical difficulties with a reasonable measure of profundity, subscribes herself, the judicious *Hooker*. All this, however, is but conjecture, for whether the contributors be young or old, male or female, gentle or simple, mere phantoms or substantial realities, is quite a secret to the reader. It is true, nevertheless, that the plan presents a goodly variety, a sort of Protestant Carnival in type. One nobody patronizes the democratic principle, and calls himself, *Vox populi*. Another nobody prefers the honor of the magistrate, and signs himself, *Fiat justitia*. A third nobody contents himself with being an *Observer*, meaning, of course, to be considered an exceedingly shrewd one. A fourth nobody has better ideas of impersonality, and only aspiring to represent a maxim, calls himself, *Suum cuique*. A fifth nobody has a strong

bias towards State rights, and takes the style of *Vermont, Maryland, or Ohio*. A sixth nobody shrinks from such arrogant presumption, modestly contracts himself within the bounds of a single city, and so dubs himself, *New York*. While a seventh disdains such adventitious dignity, and puts upon his mask a solitary letter, as if he felt himself quite above the vulgarity of having any name at all. Meanwhile our host of nobodies display a great deal of spirit, and not a little temper at times. Gross personality, keen asperity, heartless ridicule, fulsome adulation, and downright insult, may be found among their contributions; mingled, indeed, with much better things, sound argument, solid learning, and polished style, which deserve to be found in very different society. But who and what are they? For the most part, nobody knows. Sometimes there may be a private signal for the benefit of friends, or a peculiarity which favors detection, or a long appropriation of the same vizzor, which at last becomes recognized as if it were the man's own countenance. It is very seldom, however, that the more objectionable maskers are known at all, by the bulk of those who peruse the paper. Practically speaking, we only see them in print, under a name assumed to balk our curiosity. Who, then, is responsible? Nobody. If injury be inflicted, who shall repair the wrong? Nobody. If reparation be denied, on whom shall the discipline of the Church descend? Of course, on nobody. But are they not the *Editor's correspondents*? Doubtless; but they are nobody, notwithstanding. Then must not the editor himself be responsible? Yes, truly,

in law; but it may be a difficult point to ascertain whether he holds himself accountable in conscience: and in Church practice he is so far from being responsible for the sayings of his correspondents, that he is not always expected to justify his own.

Now all this is surely preposterous, and ought not to be tolerated by any community which calls itself the Church of God. The truth is, that the model and the license of our religious periodicals have been too much taken from the world, and their editors seem often to have imagined, that there was some tribunal for an avocation like theirs, from which the law of Christian responsibility must be excluded. Honorable exceptions there are, doubtless, to this remark, but, as a whole, we have still to look forward to the time when our editors shall remember that their works do follow them, and that they *are responsible*, whether they declare it or not, for every thing published through their instrumentality. This is a lesson, therefore, which it is the duty of the Church to teach them. Especially does it seem to me, that they should suffer no man to assume the task of advice or reprehension in the Church of Christ, who is ashamed or afraid to do it in his own name. We have a right to know our teachers, and to have a fair opportunity of judging how far they seem entitled to discharge so grave an office. Young persons may doubtless be encouraged to try their skill on moral or religious essays, poetry, &c., with all propriety, and on the score of modesty they may be indulged with a private signature. But to place them

in the seat of the scorner under such a disguise,—to encourage them in the scattering of fire-brands, and counting it sport,—to sustain them in libelling the characters of men who were laboring for the Church before they were born,—and to prostitute the sacred influence of a religious paper in order to gain attention for what the writers *dared* not to have printed in their own person—these are abuses for which I can imagine no apology ; and if there were no other, these alone call loudly for some power to regulate the press. I speak not, of course, with respect to the world. The secular press must manage its own concerns in its own way, subject to the law of the land, and to the tribunal of public opinion. But I speak of the press which is professedly connected with the Church, in the hands of her clergy, the organ of her bishops, commended publicly to her Conventions, and therefore, in theory, subject to her control. Still farther is it from my intention, directly or indirectly, to deprecate the voice of honest censure or reproof, either as it may respect myself, or any of my brethren in the episcopate. On the contrary, I would desire at all times to say, in the words of the Psalmist, *Let the righteous smite me friendly, and rebuke me.* But let me see that my reprover is acting as becomes a Christian and a man, in obedience to his duty, and in the light of day. And let not the Church of the Most High God tolerate the principle of the assassin, who only inflicts the wound when he has his face disguised, and hopes that darkness will shroud him from observation.

Before I close my remarks on the improvement

proposed, however, it is incumbent upon me to notice the objection, that the adoption of but one code of canon law, and the consequent abolition of diocesan legislation, would interfere with the rights of the dioceses themselves, and counteract a plain provision of our existing Constitution.

I freely admit that this argument deserves a serious consideration, and at once concede, that as our Constitution now stands, the improvement suggested would be impracticable. But that instrument can be readily modified or changed at the will of the Church. No one regards it with any other feeling than that of profound respect; but yet no one is so ignorant as to claim for it the reverence due to antiquity, much less the unchangeable authority which alone belongs to inspiration.

The first part of the objection, therefore, is the only one which demands attention, namely, that the plan proposed would interfere with the rights of the dioceses. Now the rights of the dioceses, *under the Constitution*, I grant; but the rights of the dioceses, *as such*, to make Constitutions or canons, *properly so called*, I beg leave to deny utterly. A brief reference to *facts*, as they stand upon the face of the Church's history, will explain this position clearly.

A Constitution, or a canon, is a decree, law, or rule, binding upon the Church, in the highest sense of merely ecclesiastical obligation. And the first example of such decree or canon is in the remarkable instance of the Assembly or Council held by the Apostles at Jerusalem, in order to settle the controversy which had arisen upon the question; Whether

the Gentile Churches were under the ceremonial law of the Mosaic economy. Here the decree was framed by the authority, not of one Apostle, but of all; and from this has been properly derived the great model of all subsequent legislation in the Church of God.

The next example bearing upon the subject, occurs in the venerable code familiarly known by the name of the *Apostolic Canons*, purporting to have been made by the collective authority of the blessed Apostles. I need hardly say that such a claim as this is quite apocryphal. But nevertheless, their great antiquity is unquestionable; and the respect with which they are referred to by the Councils of the primitive Church, is well known to every theologian. I mention them, however, as furnishing the second proof of the principle already stated, namely, that a decree or law, intended to bind the Church with any permanent obligation, was regarded as the work of all the apostles, and not of one alone.

There is yet a third example of the same thing, in the very interesting collection called the *Apostolical Constitutions*. That this title is also apocryphal, or rather, I should say, confessedly supposititious, detracts nothing from the evidence which they afford of the principle: since, like the *Apostolic Canons*, they profess to be the decrees of the whole *Apostolic College*, met together in solemn Council.

It may be as well, perhaps, to notice here a difficulty, which may probably trouble some amongst my readers. How, it might be asked, should the authority of all the Apostles be supposed necessary for the

production of these Canons, when St. Paul, single and alone, claims absolute obedience from the Churches, and plainly saith: "*If any man among you seem to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge what I say to be the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" The answer is: Because the Apostles sometimes spake by *inspiration*, and then their authority was indeed equivalent to the very word of the great Redeemer, since, according to their Lord's own promise, it was not they who spake, but the Holy Ghost who spake in them. But St. Paul himself records some counsels which he declares were not by inspiration; as, for example, where he saith: "*Now concerning virgins, I have received no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful,*" (1 Cor. vii. 25.) It is perfectly plain, too, on the face of the sacred history, that there was no inspiration granted to decide the question whether the Gentiles were free from the ceremonial law; nor did St. Peter speak, nor did St. James deliver his judgment, in the authoritative style which became a divine communication. But after the sentence pronounced by St. James was found to be unanimously acceptable, and the Apostles were persuaded, by a secret consciousness, that the Spirit of God had approved it, they then say in the decree, "*It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.*" From this we may readily understand, that the primitive Church did not esteem the apostolic Canons as actually *inspired*, else they would, doubtless, have reckoned them among the Holy Scriptures. But they understood

them to be the joint result of the Apostles' consultation, without any other divine aid than the ordinary succours of heavenly grace promised to the apostolic ministry. Consequently, although they doubted not that they "seemed good to the Holy Ghost," yet they distinguished between that which was spoken "*by permission,*" and that which was spoken "*by commandment.*" The first was apostolic, the second only was divine.

But to return from this digression: I have next to observe, that the model of these apostolic consultations was followed scrupulously by the Christian Church in every quarter, and, so far as I can find, without a single exception. What the blessed Apostles were known to have done in the Council of Jerusalem, and what they were generally believed to have done in the enactment of the apostolic Canons, was done by the bishops who succeeded them. No single bishop, therefore, with only the clergy and laity belonging to his own jurisdiction around him, ever thought of establishing Constitutions or Canons for his particular diocese; but a whole band of bishops, more or less numerous, met together, as the Apostles had done before them, and Canons were the joint product of their united wisdom, not intended to guide a single district only, but designed to express what they believed to be equally suitable and acceptable for the whole body of the faithful. Nor do I know of any deviation from the rule, until the enterprising spirit of our own Church, smitten with the love of legislation which characterized the country and the time, made the privilege of enacting ecclesiastical

Canons commensurate with the limits of every diocese, past, present, and to come ; so that we not only give to a real diocese, (that is, a district, having a bishop of its own,) the full right of making its own laws, but we even allow every State to be called a diocese prospectively ; and where, as yet, there is no bishop, nor the slightest probability that there will be any for years to come, we nevertheless accept the doings of one or two clergymen and three or four laymen, as an equivalent. We call a fire-side company like this, a Convention : we receive from their assembled wisdom a Constitution and Canons, and thus, we have brought the solemn work of pronouncing laws for the future Church of God to such a point of facility, that it may be fairly compared to any other mechanism of our prolific days.

I should be exceedingly grieved, my beloved brethren, if these remarks were understood to indicate the slightest want of respect and affection for the work of those excellent and admirable men, who were called, by divine Providence, to act as pioneers in the arduous task of Church legislation. They doubtless did all that was at that time possible. They surmounted obstacles which we can scarcely even imagine. And far be it from any of those who have entered into their labors, to pluck one leaf from the wreath of pre-eminent honor, with which the grateful veneration of millions, in England and America, has long since crowned their brows. But the advancement of a mighty work, which could not, in the very nature of the case, be otherwise than imperfect in its beginning, should never be regarded with

jealousy on account of those revered men; for in truth, the argument, rightly applied, would tend the other way.

Imagine, for illustration's sake, the children of a first settler, shedding their tears of filial devotion at the grave of their departed father. They dwell with affectionate remembrance upon his hardships in the wilderness: the Indian tomahawk, the panther's ferocity, the serpent's venom,—all was encountered, and all was overcome. In due time, peace and security rewarded his fortitude and courage, fruitful harvests bore witness to his labours and his toils, hundreds and thousands came thronging around him, a goodly city rose up on the field which his hands first planted, till at length, after reaching to the borders of a century, with praises and honors heaped on his reverend head, he went to his eternal rest, leaving his hard-earned but noble estate to his grateful children. Now what would be the value of their love for their departed sire, if they used it as an apology for refusing to go on in the improvement of the property? Should they be so weak as to say, "Our father built the house, and therefore we will neither add nor alter. The foundation which he laid of timber, we will not rebuild with stone. Some of the tenements were hastily constructed, under the pressure of surrounding difficulties, and the beams are threatening to give way; but our filial piety will suffer them to fall upon our heads, sooner than replace them by a firmer structure." Surely such folly as this could never be mistaken for the true principle of manly and rational affection. Instead

of this, we should charge the sons of such a father, to prove their admiration of his virtues by emulating his energy and perseverance ; to carry forward the work which he had begun in the midst of so many obstacles, and to leave no labor undone, which might make the perfection of the end, worthy of the wisdom and the courage displayed in the beginning.

Precisely under such an aspect, do I desire to regard every effort to supply the existing deficiencies in our ecclesiastical system, as a tribute of the highest practical reverence to the American patriarchs who have gone to their rest. They were the great pioneers in a mighty undertaking. Theirs were the struggles, the dangers, the conflicts, the fears, which we only know in history. Instead of wondering that they left anything for us to do, our only wonder ought to be that they effected so much, and effected it, by the good hand of God upon them, so wisely and so well. And therefore, far from recurring to their venerated names as an argument for doing nothing, I would cite them as a high example, to encourage our ardour, and to stimulate our zeal.

It may be objected, however, that the proposed abolition of all diocesan legislation, and placing all the dioceses under the same code, framed by the same comprehensive authority of the General Convention which already has the sole power over the system of the Church in doctrine and worship, would destroy the interest of our clergy and laity in our diocesan Conventions, and thus work a serious evil.

Such a result, if it were likely to happen, would indeed be an evil of no small magnitude. But I am

quite convinced that the very contrary would be the practical effect of the alteration which I take the liberty of recommending. For all experience proves, that the work of legislation can hardly ever be conducted with perfect unanimity; and therefore it is apt, in small bodies, such as our diocesan Convention, to be attended with strife, heart-burnings, and lasting dissatisfaction, where all ought to be unity and peace. The portion of the diocese who acquiesce reluctantly, are tempted to form a party. Discontent is propagated by uneasy spirits, of whom there are always found more or less, and who, though doubtless with very good intentions, exaggerate alike the supposed existing evil, and the importance of the contemplated change; and thus a feeling of opposition and division is kept up, which of all things proves most thoroughly hostile to the work of the ministry, and often grieves the Holy Spirit, if it does not deprive the whole diocese of the blessing of God. The inevitable disadvantages of the existing system have been exemplified by almost every diocese in the Union. Their Constitutions and Canons, so called, are subjected to revisions as often as decency can allow. Matters of the smallest possible importance become the subject of serious and lasting difficulty, and a wound is inflicted upon the feelings of unity and brotherly affection, which may possibly be never healed again.

Another, and perhaps a much greater evil, however, is connected with this diocesan legislation; namely, the general indifference or contempt towards the Canons of the diocese, which every experienced

observer must have noticed. Nor is this a subject of surprise to a reflecting mind. For how, I beseech you, brethren, can there be any solemnity of obligation felt towards a set of laws, passed by one bishop, and perhaps a dozen clergymen, with their attendant parochial laymen, and with more or less opposition, when every one knows that they rest on no higher authority than their own will, and can be altered as soon as the minority, by a few changes in the ministry of the diocese, can become the majority? What Churchman can be expected to obey, in religious matters, what he cannot reverence? And what reverence is he likely to cherish for any thing so mutable, so slight, so easily set up, and so easily cast down, as this diocesan legislation?

But all this vexatious, uncertain, and troublesome set of subjects, only interrupts and deranges the proper objects for which the Convention of the diocese meet annually together. The hearing the statement of their bishop's labors, and the parochial reports, the raising and paying in the various contributions for missionary and other purposes, the settling of any doubts or difficulties which might be proposed touching the meaning of the ecclesiastical system, the listening to the wants of the weaker Churches, and consulting how to supply them, the *mutual encouragement* derived from *mutual intercourse*, and the multiplying and strengthening those bands of Christian love, which ought to bind the members of every diocese together, as, indeed, one family in Christ,—these are the true and important objects of these annual meetings. And so far would they be from

suffering, if the provocations and temptations which arise out of this vice of legislation were removed, that, in my humble judgment, they would flourish and prosper incomparably more than ever. As the matter now stands, these legislative topics, in their relation to our Diocesan Conventions, are like the suckers of a valuable tree, which drain the trunk of its proper vigor. And hence, one of the most certain means, under God, to improve the quality of the fruit, would be to prune them utterly away.

All these objections, however, to diocesan legislation, vanish, when we consider the action of the General Convention. For the strifes and difficulties which sometimes attend the task of legislation, are never dangerous in a body gathered from every diocese in the Union, at longer periods, the members of which scarcely know each other, who may never have met together before, and most probably will never meet together again. There is here, therefore, more solemnity, more dignity, more courtesy, more self-restraint, more thoughtful deliberation. Even if dissension should arise, there is no opportunity for renewing or extending it, and therefore it soon dies away. In all respects, indeed, it is an assembly of an incomparably higher character. Then there is the whole College of our bishops, met together with every advantage, which the knowledge, wisdom, experience and piety of each, can bring to the common work of deliberation. Then there is more than ten times the period, during which their labors continue; and can we reasonably doubt that there is an increase, proportionate to all this, in the essential work of faith-

ful prayer, and earnest supplication to that blessed Spirit, who alone *maketh men to be of one mind in a house?*—a proportionate realizing of the insignificance of each individual man,—a proportionate feeling of entire dependence on the *wisdom which cometh from above?* Then there is the necessity of an united judgment in favor of each canon enacted, securing the benefits of a revision by either House, of the acts proposed by the other. So that you have the principle of the primitive councils in the House of bishops, along with the safeguard of the clergy's assent, as in the British Convocation system; and superadded to both, a principle, to which every year's observation and experience has more and more attached me, namely, the *distinct approbation of our laity*. Everything, therefore, is here combined, which exhibits the *ideal* of the Church's admirable unity. Some of our brethren, indeed, have been induced to apply to our system the term, *VETO*, which seems, to my mind, exceedingly ill-judged, and totally inapplicable; since neither the bishops, nor the clergy, nor the laity, can be truly said to *forbid* the action of the rest. But the correct rationale of the matter is simply this: that the Church is *ONE BODY*, and for that simple reason, it *must move together, or it cannot move at all*. The bishops cannot take one step without the clergy and laity, nor these, again, without the bishops, merely because they are "*every one members one of another:*" for just as the human body cannot act efficiently without the harmonious consent of every limb, even so the Church cannot act efficiently without the concurrence of all her members.

In canons pronounced by the General Convention, therefore, and in *none other*, shall we find the attributes properly belonging to the work of ecclesiastical legislation. These would form an authoritative rule to each diocese. Every bishop could be sure of universal concurrence when he enforced them, and men could never find encouragement in an attempt to charge their diocesan with tyranny, or partiality, or the love of power, so long as he was only doing his manifest duty in claiming conformity to the *law of the whole Church*, and a regular appeal was allowed to every complaining party.

Having thus, my respected and beloved brethren, gone over the principal topics proposed in my first Letter, it only remains that I should present to your indulgence a few concluding remarks, upon the characteristic features of the Tractarian system, and the general aspect which it wears to a reflecting mind.

I am compelled, with deep regret, to avow my own entire conviction, that the fundamental error of this system is one and the same with the theory of Romanism. For both seem perfectly agreed in the idea, that the Church militant on earth is a vast CORPORATION, whose members have no individual rights under the Charter, except as *parts of the great whole*. From this they derive the principle, that the visible Church is the reservoir of all spiritual influence; that grace is given by her, and *only through her instrumentality*. In a word, they invest her with a SUBSTANTIVE PERSONALITY, dispensing through her officers, by the very appointment of Christ, all the

powers, gifts, rights, and privileges, belonging to the kingdom of heaven.

This view is grand, sublime, and imposing; but I believe it to be thoroughly unscriptural in principle, false in fact, and dangerous in operation. My reasons are briefly as follows.

I hold this notion of the Church to be unscriptural, first, because all the promises of Christ are made to the *individual believer*, conditioned on his *personal repentance and faith*; secondly, because the only clear promises made to the *Church*, as the Spouse of Christ, and possessing the kingdom, are made in connection with his second advent; and thirdly, because our Lord, speaking of the present dispensation, especially saith, *My kingdom is not of this world*.

I hold this theory to be false, in fact; because the eighteen centuries of the Christian era have not yet witnessed its successful application. This mighty unit has never been without more or less division in its outward government, and the papacy, which was indeed a wonderful *attempt* to make the kingdom of Christ of this world, has only proved to be a splendid failure.

I believe the notion to be dangerous in operation, because its inevitable tendency seems to be, to sink the individual responsibility of each conscience in a blind reliance on the privileges of the whole; to cherish an excessive and superstitious dependence on the Sacraments, to attach an extreme and absurd faith to the supposed teaching of tradition, to invest the Church with the authority which belongs solely to her divine Lord and Master, to rest our whole justifi-

cation upon *ordinances rightly administered*, rather than on the living principle of faith, and to lead each believer, instead of using, with humble confidence, the rights of his adoption, by *coming boldly to the throne of grace in every time of need*, rather to lean upon the priesthood, as a class of *appointed mediators* between Christ and the soul.

The true aspect of the Church, therefore, as I apprehend it, is not so much CORPORATE as *aggregate*. Its living principle is faith, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, in the soul of each individual man. Its essential unity is inward, having fellowship with the Father and the Son, through the Spirit that dwelleth in the temple of the renewed heart. Its outward or formal unity follows after this, as a privilege and a duty, so far as it consists with truth; but its *life* depends not on that unity. Hence, the fathers speak of the Church as *essentially* existing in Abel, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham. Hence all who are united with God as their Father, through faith in Christ, become necessarily the *brethren of each other*, and members of the heavenly household; although they may not have the power to congregate together upon earth. Hence, too, there is a sense in which the saying of Cyprian is true, that "he cannot have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother"; but *that* Church, rightly understood, is "JERUSALEM ABOVE," which, as saith the inspired Apostle, "IS THE MOTHER OF US ALL."

The congeniality of Tractarianism with Rome has been painfully manifested during the last two years, by a variety of publications; but especially by the

whole course of the *British Critic*, in an open assault upon the doctrine of justification by faith, which its editor has boldly denounced as the Lutheran heresy;—in frequent advocacy of the Romish principle of development, of the sacramental power and grace attributed to the external unity of the Church, of auricular confession and private absolution by the priest,—in high praises of the Romish formularies of devotion, veneration for the saints, and especially for the Virgin Mary, laws of clerical celibacy, and monastic institutions,—in a plain preference for the theology and practical piety of the middleages,—in an injurious and subtle strain of palliation towards all the superstitions of Rome,—in an undisguised contempt for the characters of our great Reformers, and in a studied opposition to the name and spirit of Protestantism. Several of those points it was my intention to have discussed at large; but I am rejoiced to find that I have been superseded by other and far abler hands, and therefore I consider myself relieved from the duty of pursuing the painful subject any farther.

I cannot conclude, however, in justice to my own feelings, without again recording my belief, that on many points of ecclesiastical order and discipline, the writings of my Tractarian brethren have been highly useful. Nor would I omit the opportunity of renewing my cordial acknowledgments to such of those eminently gifted men, especially Mr. Newman himself, whose personal intercourse, when at Oxford, I esteemed as a peculiar privilege, and to whose liberal kindness, hospitality and attention, I was, in various ways, so much indebted. The highest compliment

that I can pay them is to express my conviction, that they would be amongst the last to suffer acts of courtesy or friendship to interfere with the conscientious expression of religious truth. "*He that loveth father or mother more than me,*" saith the blessed Redeemer, "*is not worthy of me.*" But although even the most sacred of all personal relations may not be suffered to stand in the way of our allegiance to Christ, and our fidelity to his Gospel; yet we can hardly fail to regard it as a real affliction, when admiration of the men must be united with hostility to their doctrine.

It may be proper that I should add another remark, in order to account for the fact, that while I have been occupied with opposing some of the errors of Tractarianism, I have made my chief quotations, not from the Oxford Tracts, but from Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church. My reason is, because I regard that work as being the most authoritative exponent of the system, which is likely to abide, with considerable influence and honor, long after the Tracts, and the transient publications which have grown out of them, shall have passed away; and therefore any error of principle or of application, in a treatise so eminent for its scholastic method and its immense research, deserves, and indeed demands, the most thorough examination. I have seen, with the liveliest satisfaction, that this distinguished writer has himself become a declared opponent to the extravagances of the school with which he has been so long identified. And I earnestly hope that the next edition of his great work will exhibit the results in such a form, as shall leave no further ground for animadversion.

I stated, in the first of these Letters, that my object was not so much to consider the whole Tractarian controversy, simply with regard to its precise measure of theological soundness, as to examine those *novelties which disturbed our own peace*. And I selected the points which I thought most important to my object, under the full conviction, that so long as we retained our established doctrines on the Sacrament of Baptism, on the true idea of the Church, on the Holy Eucharist, and on the essential antagonism of the Roman system as set forth in the Council of Trent, there would be small danger of our being led astray on any other topic. I have called the Tractarian system *new*, not because I was ignorant that it is indeed very old, inasmuch as it is mainly taken from the *later fathers*, as interpreted by the Church of Rome; nor yet because I was not aware that it may be found, scattered here and there, amongst the writings of English divines, especially in those of Laud, Montague and Thorndike, but because it is *new* in its *aggressive, combined, and sustained character*, even in England, and *new in all respects* amongst ourselves. No other writers of our mother Church have ever dared to *stigmatize the Reformers*, to call the doctrine of justification by faith, *a heresy*, to attack the epithet of *Protestant*, to concede a *high superiority to Rome*, to mourn over our separation from her corrupt communion, and to display their sympathies with her enormous superstition. And the indignant spirit aroused against them, throughout the length and breadth of the Church of England, notwithstanding the acknowledged learning, and talent,

and personal worth of the individuals concerned, together with the unparalleled excitement which has marked the first instance, in which our own Church has had reason to mark their influence in the recent ordination, bear a testimony, not to be mistaken by any candid mind, that small indeed is the number on either side of the Atlantic, who are deeply infected by this novel system. Still, although I had no fears of the ultimate result,—nay, although I doubted not that the whole would be gloriously over-ruled, in the gracious order of divine Providence, for the purification and advancement of the Church of God in general, and of our own branch of it in particular, yet I felt it incumbent on me, as one of her bishops, however inferior to the rest, to state, frankly, on what side our dangers seemed to lie, and by what measures, through the blessing of our Redeemer, we might be most surely protected against them.

And now that my proposed work is done, I beg leave to repeat my conviction, that we have nothing, under God, to dread; since I doubt not that the bishops, the clergy, *and especially the laity*, will arouse themselves to a careful and prayerful examination of the whole merits of the question; resolving that so far as in them lies, the Church which was restored to her primitive purity in the flames of the Reformation, shall be transmitted to future ages, without any infusion of Romanism, or deterioration of Scriptural truth. If, in the execution of my own share of the common duty, I have in any respect trespassed against the laws of fraternal affection or of Christian courtesy, I beg my respected and beloved

brethren to believe that nothing could be farther from my intention. It is indeed written that *Faithful are the wounds of a friend*; but I have labored in the hope that my friendly efforts could inflict no *wound*, because I had no errors to mention that were not notorious already, and none for which I was not anxious to make the largest allowance in my power. Abundantly conscious, nevertheless, of my own manifold defects, and aware, that in suggesting any improvement in our ecclesiastical polity, I have undertaken what is always an invidious and unpopular task, I commit the whole to your indulgence, with my fervent prayer to our Almighty Father, that the defects of the advocate may not lessen the influence of truth, and that my humble work may contribute, in some degree, to promote the welfare of his Church, and the extension of his glory.

Your faithful brother,

And servant in Christ,

JOHN H. HOPKINS.

Burlington, Vt., Jan'y. 19th, 1844.





Princeton Theological Seminary Speer Library



1 1012 01013 6432