

of the conviction, that it was his duty to prepare himself to suffer and to die. It was on one occasion, said to him by a friend, that, by paying attention to his health, he might probably live several years; but he replied, "I believe that my days are numbered;" and, placing his hand on his breast, he said, "I think I have received a mortal wound here; and it is very likely that at last I shall go suddenly. But sudden death will be sudden glory. I am a worthless worm; but

"His blood for me did on a cross,  
And still it pleads before the throne."

From this time his "numbered days" were few indeed. By the rapid progress of disease, he was rendered unable to attend even to that limited measure of ministerial duty which now devolved on him. Sometimes, when he has left home with the intention of paying a few pastoral visits, he has been compelled to return by extreme pain. Mr. Arnett felt that it was a trial to be laid aside from all public labour. He only valued life as it afforded the opportunity of usefulness, and would sometimes repeat the verse—

"If in this feeble flesh I may  
A while show forth thy praise,  
Jesus, support the tottering clay,  
And lengthen out my days."

A few days before his death he received from a Christian friend an offer of a situation for his oldest son, which appeared likely to be very favourable both to the piety and to the interests of the young man. This act of kindness was prompted by respect for the father, as a Christian and Wesleyan Minister. The proposal was very cheering to him. He said, on receiving it, "How good the Lord is!" and immediately, on replying to it, exclaimed, "Now I am at rest." This was the last secular concern in which he was engaged.

The day before he died he was invited out to take tea with the Minister who was expected to preach that evening. Though very unwell, he wished so much to be in the company of his esteemed brother in the ministry, that he made the effort. He subsequently went to the chapel, and met his class; and, on returning home, though he was evidently labouring under strong pain, he spoke of the pleasure and profit he had derived from the services in which he had been engaged. After reading the Scriptures, and praying, he retired to rest.

About three in the morning, he awoke in great agony; and though several means for relieving him were tried, they were all in vain. Medical help was then sent for; and it was observed, that, though the violence of the pain was so excessive, yet, whenever the paroxysm partly subsided, and allowed him a little ease, he sank down on his knees, and poured out his heart before the Lord. Generally, however, during the brief period between his awaking at three o'clock, and the moment when he fell into his last sleep, the suffering was so intense as scarcely to admit of thought or speech. But his work had been done before. His confidence in Christ was habitual. He lived in the spirit of devotion, expecting a sudden death, and resolving, by the grace of God, to be prepared for it. After brief but acute pain, and before medical help arrived, he was delivered from the burden of the flesh, and departed hence in the Lord. He died on the 13th of December, 1838, in the fifty-third year of his age.

Review.

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

On Saturday, September 21, 1839, the following announcement appeared in the Leeds Intelligencer:—"An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, with an Appendix on the English Orders, by the Honourable and Reverend A. P. Perceval, B.C.L., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. This work, as the Preface states, has been written at the request of the Vicar of Leeds, and with the assistance of several Prelates and Divines of the Church of England. It is a complete answer to a Pamphlet lately published by a Mr. Powell."

The Leeds Intelligencer is, in Church matters, under the influence of Dr. Hook and his party. The above statement, therefore, seems to demand that the author of the Essay on Apostolical Succession should give his readers an account of this Answer

to his Work. The writer of the notice of Mr. Perceval's Apology evidently felt himself in an awkward predicament. A dissenting teacher, a Mr. Powell, had published something on Apostolical Succession, a subject dear as life to every high church priest. Of course, Dr. Hook, the Vicar of Leeds, a spiritual descendant of Pope Vitalian, Alexander III., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Nicholas III., &c. &c., knew his superiority too well to disregard the notice of a pamphlet by a Mr. Powell. He was, therefore, obliged to do so, and about 2000 copies were sold in little more than a twelvemonth. Many persons, as from a high opinion of the work, or from a love of controversy, and desirous to be confirmed in the superiority of their own ministry.

Dr. Hook is not unconscious of these things. He, therefore, partly in reply to his tract, the Honourable and Reverend A. P. Perceval, brother Chaplain to the Queen, to prepare an apology. This is undertaken; several Prelates and Divines assist in the work, and it is dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury. "A pamphlet by a Mr. Powell" is greatly honored by all this. However, this Mr. Powell is such a strange sort of creature, that he feels no gratitude when so favourably intended; and what he does not feel, he despises to affect. Yet certainly this "complete answer" to this work shall be examined.

The Apology of Mr. Perceval presents one difficulty, which, I hope, few dissenting productions exhibit. The difficulty is this: Mr. Perceval generally answers his opponents by assertions, and not by proofs of their mistakes. But this is probably one of the advantages possessed by gentlemen of the succession, that they have authority to be believed without proofs; and dissenters have not. We have learnt from a very old dissenter from these gentlemen, to "prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good."

Dr. Hook proclaimed that the spiritual descent of "every bishop, priest, and deacon, was evident to every one who chose to investigate it." Now what is so evident to every one, must be capable of easy demonstration; but Mr. Perceval, in answer to the objection in the Essay, that there is "no sufficient historic evidence of a perpetual succession of valid episcopal ordinations," says, "If nothing will satisfy men but actual demonstration," (sufficient historical evidence was the question) "I yield at once," p. 79. This pamphlet has done something; the chosen champion of the succession scheme "yields at once," that there is no sufficient historic evidence to support it!

Still Mr. Perceval hugs the scheme, though he "yields at once," that it has no sufficient historic evidence to support it. He considers it to be "an article of this one faith, (of the Bible) and to be the authority for that one baptism" of the Bible, p. 62; and justly concludes, that there is "a consequence springing from these premises if established: in respect, namely, of the paramount and exclusive claim upon the obedience of ALL Christians within the British dioceses which belongs to the Bishops of those dioceses," pp. 237, 238. And he has the courage to denounce the orders of all the Protestant churches of "Germany, Denmark, France, Scotland, England, Ireland, and North America," (the episcopal church excepted in the latter) "pretended orders," and their power of ordination, a "fancied power of ordination," pp. 51, 55.

It is very amusing, too, to learn, that if dissenting teachers dispute this, and tell such gentlemen as Mr. Perceval, that to pronounce such a sentence of excommunication against all these churches, without the clearest, strongest, scriptural proof, is semiprosperous, bigoted, and intolerant,—then Mr. Perceval says, this is persecuting the church of England. Hear him at p. 62: "It is," says he, "I believe chiefly, if not wholly, on account of the *exclusiveness* of the doctrine that we who maintain it are exposed to hatred and reviling; and if we may judge from the language of our rulers, shall have to endure persecution, if it shall be in their power to resist it. If we would be content to teach Episcopacy as one among many schemes equally true or equally doubtful, it should seem, from their latest writings, that we should not be disturbed; but because we teach it, as the Scriptures and the Church have delivered it to us, exclusively, therefore the world

hateth us. Just so, if the early Christians could have been contented to profess their religion, as one of the six hundred tolerated by heathen Rome, and had been liberal enough, according to the modern abuse of the term, to regard all religion as pretty much alike, they would have had no need to endure the cross, the stake, or the teeth of wild beasts; but because they taught in a religion, as the Scriptures and the Church had delivered it to them, exclusively, therefore they *hated* them. Where, therefore, the charge of exclusive-ness is an argument in our favour against what is being urged, seeing that we bear a common witness with the active members, it is an argument against those who are being urged, seeing that they do so in common with the *very* faithful." We have quoted the whole of this paragraph for the purpose, not of other things, but of a serious opinion of Mr. Perceval's views, reasons, and style. He is, in a dreadful night, it seems, "a *very* old man," the *very* old man, a *very* old man! We will relieve him, by assuring him that the only persecution he has to fear from us, is one of either of the following nature, either, 1st, to prove that the Scriptures teach this exclusive doctrine, or, 2dly, to withdraw his denunciations and excommunications of other Protestant churches; or, 3dly, if he will continue them, that *scriptural proofs to support them*, that he be published to the world as a semiprosper, a bigot, a persecutor, and a disturber of the peace of God's Church. So far are we from persecution, that he bears witness to the contrary, by saying, that if high churchmen would be content that their scheme should be allowed "to be one among many," we should not disturb them. When it seems we only want to live and let live. Is this persecution? But what shall be said of men who really and verily maintain, that if they cannot *regulate and extinguish all other churches*, they are injured, reviled, about to be martyrs, and given to the teeth of wild beasts!!

While noticing miscellaneous matters, it may not be improper to make a brief observation or two on a note at p. 25, in which he charges me with "*denying* that the Apostles had any sole jurisdiction" and concludes it by observing that they who "*carp* at the authority of Bishops, presently proceed to carp at that of the Apostles, and will probably not be deterred from carping at that of our Lord himself." Now as to what he calls "*denying* that the Apostles had any sole jurisdiction," my language, as quoted by himself, is this: "There is no *very* clear evidence"—And again, "I think we find no declared authority *solely* belonging to them as Apostles, to call any Ministers to account, or to depose them." Is this "*denying*" the thing, by merely expressing a *thought* *dubiously*?—or, by saying, if there be any evidence, it is not "*very* clear evidence!"—One might have thought," says Mr. Perceval, "that the sentence concerning certain false teachers whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme," 1 Tim. i. 20, had been proof sufficient of such authority, and of the exercise of it." What Mr. Perceval might have thought, and what is "*very* clear evidence," may be different things. Now let us examine a little the only parallel case mentioned in the New Testament, agreeing to the statement made in the Essay, viz. in churches already planted, having ministers already appointed over them—the case is found 1 Cor. v. 1—19. In this case, though the church had neglected its duty, yet the Apostle does not proceed to excommunicate, even this *private* member, on his *sole* authority. He directs a church court to be formed, or called together. Paul, in his synopsis, quotes Est us thus describing the composition of this court: "The Apostle directs the calling of a public assembly, that all, understanding the greatness of the crime, might acknowledge the justice of the punishment. It does not follow, indeed, from this place, that the multitude have the power of excommunication, yet the multitude in some sense excommunicate, namely by their approbation and suffrage in favour of the excommunication, and by avoiding the excommunicated person. The minister performed the act of excommunication in the direction of St Paul." Thus, also, Calvin the place: "It is to be observed that St. Paul, though an Apostle, did not proceed alone to excommunicate according to

his own views and feelings, but he consulted with the church, that the thing might be done by the authority of all." Bishop Fell on the place, says, "The approbation and consent of the church was used in the Apostle's time in excommunicating censures." Erasmus, also, considers the matter was to be done in "a public assembly." The language of the chapter is decided in proof of this. Here, then, we see it is not "*very* clear" that the Apostles did this by his *sole* authority, unless it is clear he did not. And if he did it in the case of a *private* member, much less, we presume, did he do it in the case of a *minister*. There is one more passage which I have for Mr. Perceval to make "very clear" as evidence that the Apostles could at any time, on his *sole* authority, depose ministers: "I would they were cut off from the world," Gal. v. 12. "If the Apostles would it, and could by his *sole* power do this, why were they not cut off?" See Dr. H. on the supremacy of the Pope, Supp. 5, Sect. II. p. 187, 4th ed. 1680.

Mr. Perceval's charitable supposition, that they "who carp at the authority of Bishops, will probably not be deterred from carping at that of our Lord himself," shall be illustrated by that of another Oxford Tract advocate. In a work styled "The Oxford Tracts, the Public Press and the Evangelical Party," by G. P. (G. Perceval) *de Sancta Trinitate*, the author says, "The Evangelical party in the Church are only restrained from the accident of their position from the destructive power of Rationalistic and Socinian principles: the spirit is already there, only its full development is restrained." If such be their charity towards their brethren, what can a heathenish dissenting teacher expect?

Having made these miscellaneous remarks on things of which it seemed probable we should find no more convenient place, we now proceed to a more regular examination of Mr. Perceval's Apology.

He begins by laying it down as a fundamental position, that none are to minister in holy things, "in the name of God, without express warrant and commission from Him, or from those whom he has empowered to grant such commission," p. 3. This we fully concede. But when he says "nineteen-twentieths of the Christian world" hold this to be by "*Episcopal Succession*"—that "none who have not received Episcopal ordination are lawful ministers of the church, or warranted to perform any acts in the name and with the authority of God," p. 4 and 5, we deny it. Even Mr. Perceval shall disprove it. At p. 7 and 8, he says, the power of Presbyters to confer orders "equally with Bishops" is both the "*doctrine and practice* of the Lutherans in Germany and Holland, the Presbyterians in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and North America; and the Wesleyan Methodists."

Mr. Perceval has the confidence to assert that the Church of England maintains his scheme, p. 9; but he that reads the 7th Section of the Essay will require something more than assertion on this subject.

His first chapter he entitles "Congregationalism," and professes to examine the Scriptural evidence alleged to support it. He has amused himself with imputing to the Congregationalists certain scriptural precedents as "*urged* in behalf of Congregationalism," p. 11. I believe Mr. Perceval is conscious that the Congregationalists have more sense than to "*urgo*" any such things as he mentions "*in behalf*" of their scheme. He himself intends the introduction of several of these instances as a caricature of Congregationalism. But what honesty is there in such a misrepresentation of facts? However, the instance of Jeroboam will find its best parallel in the conduct of Henry the VIII. The case of the seven sons of Sceva, (Acts x. 14,) would rather belong to Mr. Perceval, as they were sons of "a chief of the priests." Probably, as being in the succession, they were invited to see the heretic and schismatic Paul cast out devils, and supposed that surely they were the only divinely commissioned persons for such a work. He makes little out of the matter of Apollus, of Aquila and Priscilla. They were, indeed, all *lay* persons; Apollus was an eminent *lay* preacher of the gospel, and Aquila and Priscilla were *lay* "fellow helpers" of the Apostles. Such proceedings now would shock our high priests. On the case of the man mentioned, Luke ix. 30, Mr. Perceval assumes that he who opposes the succession scheme,