

consult Acts i. 21. and in the election of a successor to Judas, you will find *this* an indispensable requisite—and, if necessary to a succession then, why not now? In fact, *successors* in office the Apostles had not, could not have, could not make; it was neither required nor necessary. In the very minutely described qualifications for a Bishop, this one on which the school of Oxford rests all her claims, is never *once* named, see 1 Tim. iii. 1 to 8., and Titus i. 5 to 11. Yet, notwithstanding that this so called succession is neither necessary, or possible, and not being once named in the inspired and Apostolic rules and requirements; it is by both Puseyites and Papists made *vital, indispensable*; and it is by them put forward, in terms, and manner, both arrogant and offensive. "Protestanism, (say they) as might be expected in a false religion, is opposed not less to our perceptions of the beautiful, than of the good and true." British Critic, No. 64, page 393. "Our object" (they continue) "is to unprotestanize the National Church—as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation." Ibid July 1841.

Not only does this system receive neither countenance nor support from the Holy Scriptures, but it is also unsupported by, and contrary to numerous well established facts, in the history of the religion of Jesus—*It is impossible to trace an unbroken succession.* Do we turn to the very *first* century, Bishop Stillingfleet declares, that "here the succession is as muddy as the Tiber itself," there being four different opinions as to the name, even of Peter's immediate successor. When we look to England in later times, where, if anywhere, the succession should be traced with ease, we find periods, in which Archbishops filled the chair, in the see of Canterbury, whose very names are unknown—Inett confesses that "the difficulties of the succession in that see betwixt the year 768 and 800, were invincible" if such be the case in Canterbury itself, what can be expected in less important sees? The same writer acknowledges, with regard to these, that there were "Bishops, some of whose names, and, which is more, there sees are entirely unknown to our historians." When we turn to the first see in Ireland—Armagh—there we find various breaches; for, according to Ware, amongst other irregularities, *eight* persons presided over that diocese, who never were so much as *ordained*,