

Cletus, and Clement, Bishops of Rome; and the Apostolic Succession was regularly continued from them" (i. e., from Linus, Cletus, and Clement) "to Celestine, Gregory, and Vitalianus, who ordained Patrick, Bishop for the Irish, and Augustine and Theodore for the English. *And from these times an uninterrupted series of valid ordinations has carried down the Apostolic Succession in our churches, to the present day.*"

Dr. Hook evidently thinks the *ordinations* in the Church of England came through Rome, by Augustine and Theodore, and apparently boasts of the fact. And if so, there must have been some consultation with the See of Rome as to "rites, discipline, government and consecration." We now have Dr. Hook on one side of the question and Mr. Partridge on the other. As they both pull in the same boat, but in opposite directions, we leave this point for their further consideration, hoping a more thorough knowledge of this question will bring their theological oars into greater harmony. There are many other considerations which shew that this claim of "identity" is a creation of the imagination. The opinion of Dr. Hook clearly shews that. The Church sketched by Mr. Partridge has three distinct orders—Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. Such was not the case in early Apostolic times. Wickliffe says: "I boldly assert one thing, viz.: that in the primitive church, or in the time of St. Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient, that is, a Priest and a Deacon. In like manner I affirm that in the time of Paul the *Presbyter* and the *Bishop* were names of the *same office*. This appears from the third chapter of the first Epistle of Timothy, and in the first chapter of the Epistle of Titus. And the same is testified by that profound Theologian, Jerome." The same views were entertained by Erasmus, Cranmer, Grotius, Mosheim, Lord King, the Latin Fathers, and a host of other eminent divines. What *identity* then can there be between the early British Church and the Church of England of to-day? None whatever.

Dr. Holland, King's Professor of Divinity at Oxford says, "that to affirm the office of Bishop to be different from that of Presbyter, and superior to it is most false." We readily admit the office of Bishop, as now existing, to be of great antiquity, but one called into being as a matter of convenience for Church government, and not by *divine right*. The modern Anglican Bishop of the High Church type holds himself, not only in degree, but in *order*,