

their hearts content, to sit in the easy chair of apostolical succession; we should be forced to say of them with the great Milton, that they were but WOODEN BISHOPS after all\* It is an easy thing for the Oxford fellows, in learned leisure, to pen dissertations, that the Bishops are the genuine successors of the Apostles; doubtless the toil will not go unrewarded, but we say, it is a base thing in men, who have subscribed the testimony which the Church of England, in her articles at least, bears to the truth of the Protestant faith, to say that they hate the reformation, and to speak contemptuously of the confessors and martyrs, who, under God, accomplished a work that is glorious, so far as it goes. That we do not misrepresent their opinions, the sequel will shew:—"I hate," says Froude, in one of his letters published by the Oxford faction, "*I hate the reformation more and more. Why do you praise Ridley?*" And again, speaking of Dr. Jewell, 'one of the brightest names of the reformation,' "*Jewell was what you would call, in these days, an irreverent dissenter.*" We

\* The Church of England, after the example of Rome, has raised a class of men above their fellows. They have the power of ordination while the Presbyters have not. We contend that there is no warrant for the distinction. It is a piece of "will worship," a "tradition of men," and continued "for the sake of advantage." Presbyters and Bishops are one and the same in the scriptures. Had there been such a difference, as that one class of men were to ordain, and the other were not, though possessing the power to preach, and dispense the sacraments, this difference would have been clearly marked in the word of God. To suppose that Bishop and Presbyter should be used indiscriminately, while such a distinction existed in the offices, is absurd. And yet, how stands the matter? Presbyter and Bishop are convertible terms; that is, a Presbyter is a Bishop, and a Bishop is a Presbyter. Every one knows that the German critics are of greatly superior scholarship to the Oxford Papists, and what says Neander, 'the prince of living theologians,' "BISHOP, Episcopos, (Overseer or Superintendent.) This was the title which the Apostles gave to those office-bearers whom they appointed as the presidents of the newly appointed christian church, to whom they delivered the temporal, as well as the scriptural superintendence of her affairs and interests. (Compare Acts 11—30, with Acts 20—23; Philipians 1—1; Titus 1—7.) They are also figuratively called *Poineres*, (shepherds, or pastors.) AT THE FIRST, BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS WERE THE SAME AND IDENTICAL." The re-appropriation, therefore, we say of the divine right of ordination, by the reformers Knox and others, (who were Presbyters), was sanctioned by scripture, and no practise to the contrary, however long continued, could deprive them of that right, any more than the discontinuance for ages, of giving the cup to the laity could prevent them from re-appropriating what was their own. For a very compendious exposition that Bishop is only another name for the Presbytery, see volume 2 of the *Canadian Christian Examiner*, page 241, section XIX.—EDITOR.

have only to add, that we entreat the attention of our readers, who have heard of the doings of these men, to the following paper. We have been obliged to keep out all the writer's notes, and to abridge a few passages, to bring the whole within the limits of our journal:—

"It is a well known historical fact that in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Roman Catholic priests took orders in the Church of England for the purpose of undermining the Protestant faith: and it is not less well known that the same Jesuitical plan, and for the same purpose, was resorted to in the reign of Charles I., during the disputes between him and his parliament. But it may not be equally known, that the Church of England has never been free of men of Popish spirit, creed and sentiments; that such have ministered at her 'altars,' yea, have sat upon her episcopal thrones; and yet that is also a fact. What was bishop Wilson, but a Papist? What was bishop Ken, and indeed the whole body of the Non-Jurors, but Papists in every thing essential to the name? Which of the dogmas of Romanism did Laud, Primate of all England, abjure?" And how thoroughly were his principles understood, and his services to her cause appreciated by Rome, when he was offered a cardinal's hat? It is but a few years ago since priest Gandolph wrote bishop Marsh, urging, in all simplicity, that now since the bishop of Peterborough had in his avowed works abjured the distinguishing doctrines of Protestantism, and embraced those of Romanism, he ought, were it from no other motive, even out of consistency, to leave the Church of England and join the Church of Rome. The Hon. and Rev. Arthur Spencer, brother to the Right Hon. Earl Spencer, formerly Lord Althorp, when from being a priest of the Anglican, he became a priest of the Roman Church, took but one step, and that neither a wide nor a violent step, from the position he had been taught to occupy by his tutor, the Rev. Mr. Vaughan of Leicester: in fact, to drop the figure, he but carried out the principles in which he had been nurtured in the English Church.

"Nor have we any great cause to wonder at the Popery of the Church of England in her liturgy, rubrics, canons, vestments, rites, and in what may be termed her *traditional*, as distinguished from her *symbolical* theology; that is, (for the subject is of importance, although we dwell upon it,) the doctrines which are currently taught orally in her pulpits, especially collegiate and cathedral pulpits, and the professors' chairs at the universities. It is well known that her constitution, ritual, and liturgy, were never reformed to the extent which her Cranmers, and her Latimers, and even her Sancrofts and Stillingfleets desired. Leo X.

\* Laud was a persecutor of the Covenanters. He had slain them with the sword, and he was himself slain with the sword during the usurpation of Cromwell.—Editor.