

ing disposition he maintained through life. "In lowliness of mind he was ever ready to esteem others better than himself."

As to his meekness, it is his grace consisted in bearing injuries patiently; and particularly affronts, reproaches, oppressions, and unjust censures, he possessed it in more than an ordinary degree. Even worldly people were often constrained to esteem him a man of God. One, in particular, a man of more than ordinary understanding after carefully watching him for several years, bore testimony to the fact, that he could find no fault in him. But he was what he was by the grace of God; and, as he himself says, through the divine mercy, enjoys the blessedness of them who "die in the Lord," so to his family and Christian friends has he left an example of true piety of more than ordinary value.

Review.

A CRITIQUE ON THE HON. AND REV. MR. PERCEVAL'S APOLOGY FOR THE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION: BY THE REV. THOMAS POWELL.

Concluded.

To the objection made in the Essay, that the high church doctrine "was unknown to, or unheeded by, our protestant forefathers, [i. e. the divines who in the sixteenth century opposed the Church of Rome] and therefore we Protestants need not concern ourselves about it," pp. 71-72; he properly replies, "The divines of the sixteenth century were neither the founders of the Christian church, nor the writers of the Sacred Scriptures; and, therefore, neither the Scriptures nor the Church are to be tried by them, but they and their doctrines are to be tried by the testimony of the Scriptures and by the voice of the church." That the Reformers' doctrine, and the doctrine of all uninspired teachers is to be tried by the Scriptures, and not the Scriptures by their doctrine, we glory to maintain, as the great distinguishing principle of Protestantism, in opposition to an Popery and semi-popery. But the reader must not suppose that Mr. Perceval and his party maintain it; they hate it with a perfect hatred. The "Voice of the Church,"—the Voice of the Church! Here is their hiding place and their glory. However, should the reader wish to know what is meant by "the voice of the church," he might as soon expect to know where infallibility resides in the popish church, as to know what these persons mean by "the voice of the church," and where he is to find it. The best illustration of the case, that strikes me, is the reported conversation said to have taken place between two distinguished statesmen on the subject of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. "What is the difference between orthodoxy and heterodoxy," said one to the other. "Orthodoxy," the reply was, "is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy." Ask Mr. Perceval, or any papist or semi-papist, what is "the voice of the church?" the answer would substantially be, "that it is the voice of the church which says as we say; and all which the Fathers say contrary to this, we explain away either as heresy, particular opinion, or not of faith." There is no more common sophism amongst such writers than this play upon the term church, always assuming that their particular party is the "catholic church." As to the authority of the Fathers, Bishop Taylor himself says,—"It is not honest for either side to press the authority of the Fathers, as a concluding argument in matters of dispute, unless themselves will be content to submit in all things to the testimony of an equal number of them, which I am certain neither side will do." Bishop Jewel, an incomparably better authority, says,—"There is no way so easy to beguile the simple, as the name and countenance of the Fathers." "I see plainly," said the renowned Chillingworth, "and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against the consent of Fathers of another age: the Church of one age against the church of another age: Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, and may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in

such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficiency but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon." But these high churchmen are pretty good imitators of their popish brethren, who, above all things, love "a packed jury." When any of the Fathers will speak for them, or any thing like it, they pack them in the Court as though the Pope were not able; they will even bring acknowledged forgeries into court as true witnesses, as Bellarmine and others have done with the Decretal Epistles; but if the Fathers say a word against them, they kick them out of court as individual testimonies, private opinions, not of fact, and the like. Mr. Perceval and his party smart nobly under the correction of the great English Reformers. Dr. Hook, indeed, has the boldness to assert, that by the Reformers the "Episcopal succession was assumed as a necessary doctrine of the Church of England," and that "some of the falsehoods propagated in these modern days, that the Reformers did not hold the divine right of Episcopacy,"—is that queer thing, "A call to Union on the Principles of the Reformation, a Visitation Sermon, by the Rev. W. P. Hook, D.D., page 38-61. Appendix, pp. 110, 111. "The principles of the church," says he, "as we have seen, form an insurmountable barrier between us and the Dissenters, and render union with those parties impossible." p. 11. A glorious call to union! It is a call, indeed, to churchmen to unite to persecute dissenters; i. e. all who presume to differ from these lordly priests. Did the Reformers proclaim such sentiments to Calvin, to Peter Martyr, Bucer, John Knox, &c.? Let the reader carefully examine section 7th of the Essay, especially in the second edition, for a refutation of all such foels on the Reformers.

Mr. Perceval comes to the objection that "there is no sufficient historic evidence of a personal succession of valid episcopal ordinations;" we have noticed his reply before—see the place. But after "yielding at once" that this is the case, he thinks that "if it be a moral impossibility that any man, who had not been duly consecrated, could be accounted a Bishop of the Church of England at the present time, then the onus rests upon the objector to say how that which is morally impossible now, could have been morally possible at any other period," p. 59. That is, what is morally impossible now, in times of order, is, according to Mr. Perceval, by the same rule, morally possible in times of confusion; that, what is morally impossible in the light is, by the same rule, morally impossible in the dark! Fine reasoning! But facts are stubborn things. And though it is a mere subterfuge to pretend that the onus of proof lies upon us; yet, as these boasters of the proof of their scheme being "evident" to every one, were chary of their production of that evidence, we have done what our argument needed not, we have produced proofs from unexceptionable testimony against the validity of the episcopal consecrations through which these men trace their succession. Mr. Perceval has invalidated none of them; see sections 10 and 13 of the Essay. Indeed Mr. Perceval himself furnishes us with proofs of the same kind. He says, at p. 110 of the Appendix, that there are "many instances to be found in Church history of persons consecrated to the Episcopate from the last." Now we shall be glad to see Mr. Perceval prove that these were "duly consecrated Bishops." On his principles he never can. On scriptural principles, which admit that Bishops and Presbyters are one and the same office, there is no difficulty; but then this cannot help Mr. Perceval, as he rejects these principles. Mr. Perceval's "moral impossibility," therefore, is contradicted by plain facts, and, on his own showing, "many instances are to be found in church history" of persons NOT "duly consecrated to the episcopate." For "a Bishop ordained per salutem" (i. e.) "that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate and administer the Sacrament of the Lord's body, nor excommunicate a presbyter." Historic evidence failing, and moral impossibility failing, we see something of the "utter failure" for which Mr. Perceval ominously provided.

He thinks, p. 52, that the fact of the contradictions of history about the succes-

sion of the first ministers of the church of Rome is of no importance, it is enough, he supposes, that the church was then governed by Bishops; but what kind of Bishops? Ironical addresses them by the title of "Presbyters;" Clement, who is supposed to have been one of them, writing to the church at Corinth, knows nothing about any Bishop but what was identical with, and more distinguished by, the title of "Presbyter." That, in the second century, the chief presbyter acted as a superintendent by the consent and authority of other presbyters, may be granted; nothing more can be proved. But what will this Episcopacy do for Mr. Perceval and his party? Nothing!

As a "forlorn hope," he takes to the case of Judas, the traitor, the reader will find this case settled to Mr. Perceval's satisfaction at page 250 of the Essay, second edition.

Mr. Perceval, having cleared his system of the objections above noticed, as exhibited in this review, now comes to display the full glory of evidence for his scheme of Episcopacy. In noticing congregationalism and presbyterianism, his method was to place what he represents as their scriptural evidence first; and then, in the second place, the ecclesiastical evidence, in displaying the evidence for Episcopacy, he reverses this order, and places ecclesiastical antiquity first; and then, in the second place, the evidence from the scriptures. Thus in Mr. Perceval's consistent "Papist's and high churchmen place the word of God under the authority, subject to the interpretation, of what they call the church." However, after all, the reader who may not have the privilege of seeing Mr. Perceval's Apology, can hardly conceive what a meagre, miserable display, he makes of the evidence of ecclesiastical antiquity. A few trite passages from the Fathers, Clements Romanus, Ignatius, &c. are strung together, without hardly a single line to prove that they support his scheme. It should be said that their evidence for his scheme is so clear as to need no explanation, we believe many of those who have candidly read the Essay, will not be of this opinion. A complete answer to that work from such men as Dr. Hook and his party, should by all means have answered this part of it. But no; Mr. Perceval is afraid of "irring his readers' patience," p. 96. Very well; Mr. Perceval's kindness to his readers may pass, only he does not forget that he has not answered the question.

In the conclusion of this chapter, after quoting what are called Apostolical Canons—a number of canons or regulations collected nobody knows when, nor by whom—he says "the Nicene Council universally treats of Bishops, and Bishops only, as having power to ordain." That the canons of the Nicene council speak only about Bishops ordaining Bishops, we grant; but if Mr. Perceval intends his readers to understand that that council gave any decision that presbyters had not power to ordain presbyters, or even bishops, he misleads his reader, that council made no such decision. Perhaps the reader may recollect that the Epistle of this council to the church of Alexandria, was quoted section 6 of the Essay. In this Epistle, the council speaks of certain clergymen who "should have power to ordain," &c. Some reasoning is there employed against Valens to prove that these clergymen were presbyters—he supposing that they were bishops. That reasoning is established as correct by the express statement of Athanasius, Opp. vol. 1. p. 732, a. c. edit. Paris, 1627. Here, then, this point of the power of Presbyters to ordain, is established by the Council of Nice. They say that these Presbyters were to have, that is, to continue to have, power to ordain; which ordaining by presbyters, the Epistle states, was "according to the ecclesiastical law and sanction." So much for the council of Nice treating "of bishops only having power to ordain." The only difficulty in the passage is in the rendering of the word *procheirizomai*. It sometimes seems to mean to propose for ordination, or to elect: this I admit. But then it also means to ordain; and, what is important, it is indisputably used in the sense of ordaining in this Epistle only a few lines before, as to the Bishop of Alexandria. The two acts of ordaining and electing are several times spoken of in this Epistle in varied phraseology—*crucians electis clericis, procheirizomai—crucians procheirizomai, et apostolice onomata—crucians electis procheirizomai, ha-*

onomata episcopales. Here it will be noted that ordination is always spoken of first, and invariably as the exercise of *suverainia—crucians*, the latter clause of the two referring to the proposing of names, or electing. This *suverainia* of ordaining, is, in two of these passages, accompanied by the word *crucians* rendered to ordain by the Bishop of Alexandria and indisputable. These Presbyters, then, are said to have *crucians procheirizomai*, authority or power to ordain; and this "according to ecclesiastical law and sanction." Such seems to me to be the legitimate meaning of the place. However, I do not wish to be positive, as there is some ambiguity in the language of the Epistle. But I am positive that the council did not deny the power of presbyters to ordain. I think the above are strong reasons to believe that their Epistle affirmed it.

We now come to the Scriptural testimony for Mr. Perceval's scheme of Episcopacy. But, alas! for Dr. Hook, Mr. Perceval, and their party! The Scriptures have so little to help their case, that the champion of their cause occupies nearly as much of his work with Eutychus and Abraham Ecolibantus, as he does with the whole of the testimony of the Scripture in behalf of their system. But it is better to be silent when we have nothing to say. The Scriptural testimonies which he produces, are, the Angels in the Apocalypse, the case of Timothy and Titus, the Apostles' superintendency of the churches which they founded—which nobody ever denied,—the commission of our Lord to his Apostles—these are the principal, and almost the only instances which he notices, but as he does not even attempt an answer to that part of the Essay which treats on these passages, we have a right to conclude that he felt it to be unanswerable. The *high heat*, the *supreme evidence*, the evidence of the Holy Scriptures, against the high church Episcopacy, remains, therefore, in all its integrity and completeness. This is the all-deciding point.

Speaking of the exhortations to unity to be found in our Lord's discourses, Mr. Perceval says, p. 106, "our opponents are ever fond of citing those passages in Tertullian, Jerome, and others, which affirm that Episcopacy was necessarily instituted for the preservation of unity. But if unity be a necessary end in the church, then how can the interference be set aside, that the Lord of glory, who ordained the end, must Himself likewise have ordained the means necessary for attaining that end." This statement is incorrect; those passages in the Essay which speak about the reasons assigned by the Fathers for the institution of Episcopacy, do not say that the Fathers "affirmed that Episcopacy was necessarily instituted for the promotion of unity," but only that the *opinion* was that it was designed to promote this unity. But suppose they had affirmed this necessity for Episcopacy as a means for the promotion of unity, still the argument is false, both the premises are false, the conclusion, therefore, must be false also. The argument in full is as follows:

What the Fathers affirm is necessary as a means to the unity of the church, Christ instituted as a necessary means to the unity of the church.

But the Fathers affirm that Episcopacy is a necessary means to the unity of the church, therefore,

Christ instituted Episcopacy as a necessary means to the unity of the church.

In the first, or major proposition, Mr. Perceval begs the question; it is neither proved nor granted; it is false. The next step with this argument lands us in full grown Popery. The authorities of that church say, that a universal bishop is necessary for the unity of the church; ergo, Christ instituted a universal bishop—the Pope. The second, or minor proposition, is false also, in Mr. Perceval's sense; the Fathers never expressed an opinion, nor affirmed either, that the kind of Episcopacy for which Mr. Perceval, Dr. Hook, and their party, contend, was necessary for the unity of the church. Thus is sufficiently shown in the Essay. The premises failing, the conclusion falls to the ground.

Mr. Perceval concludes his Apology for Apostolical Succession with a long Appendix, employed in proving many things which nobody disputes. This no doubt was much the pleasantest part of the work to Mr. Perceval.

Here we conclude this Critique on Mr.

* Lib. Presbytery, cap. 8. † Preface to his Reply to Harding.

Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants, chapter 7, sec. 24. Dr. Field, "Of the Church," §. 2. chap. 20, p. 122. Ed. ed. 1628.