

The Church.

"Her Foundations are upon the holy hills."

"Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

TORONTO, CANADA, FEBRUARY 1, 1855.

No. 27

Vol. XVIII.

Poetry.

ALL'S FOR THE BEST.

BY MARTIN F. TUPPER.

All for the best! be sanguine and cheerful,
Trouble and sorrow are friends in disguise,
Noting but folly goes faithless and fearful,
Courage for ever is happy and wise:
All for the best—if a man would but know it
Providence wishes us all to be blest:
This is no dream of the pundit or poet,
Heaven is gracious—and all's for the best.

All for the best: set this on your standard,
Soldier of adobe or pilgrim of love,
Who to the shores of despair may have wandered
A way-wearied swallow, or heart-stricken dove;
All for the best!—be a man, but confiding;
Providence tenderly governs the rest,
And the frail bark of his creature is guiding
Wisely and warily, all for the best.

All for the best! then fling away terrors;
Ne'er all your fears and your foes in the face:
And, in the midst of your dangers and errors,
Trust like a child, while you strive like a man.
All for the best! unbiased, unbending,
Providence reigns from the east to the west:
And, by both wisdom and mercy surrounded,
Be glad, and be happy that all's for the best!

IRVINGISM AND THE APOSTOLATE.

1. *The Church in the Apostolic Age.* By H. W. J. THIERSCH, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology. English translation. London: 1852.
2. A Pamphlet, without date, known as *The Testimony*, addressed to Bishops and Rulers in Christendom. London: Moxes & Barclay.
3. *The True Constitution of the Church, and its Restoration.* Read to the North Association of Litchfield County, Conn., Sept. 28th, 1853, by the Rev. W. W. ANDREWS. New York: J. Moffet, 1854.
4. *The Permanency of the Apostolic Office, as distinct from that of Bishops, with Reasons for Believing that it is now Revived in the Church.* By a Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church. New York: John Wiley, 1853.
5. *Defence of John Campbell Stirling, Presbyter, on his Trial, &c.* New York: John F. Trow, 1851.
6. *The Catholic Apostolic Church.* New York: John Moffet, 1854.
7. *A Few Words about "Irvingism."* London: 1848.

We might, perhaps, to apologize for the first word in our title. We know that those to whom it is applied disdain it. We know how objectionable such appellations often are, and how often they contain, in its most offensive form, the *argumentum ad iridium*. At the same time, we know no other word, which would at once present to the minds of our readers the body of professing Christians of which we are about to speak. We therefore would employ it, if we may, without offence.

Our purpose is, at present, to examine only one question between Irvingism and the Anglican Church. But that is one of such paramount importance, and which so directly underlies the whole controversy, that it takes precedence of all others. It is the question of the Apostolate. Not that we intend to assert or intimate that this is the only question between us. Far from it. If the Irvingite view of the Apostolate is sustained, there are still many points to be discussed and settled before its position is made good. On the other hand, if the view is not sustained, Irvingism has no ground left on which it can stand, and to consider any of its other claims would be a mere waste of time. We esteem it fortunate for all parties that the discussion may thus, in the commencement at least, be narrowed to a single point.

The first thing to be done is to state, as plainly and fairly as we can, the positions respectively of the Anglican Church and Irvingism, in reference to the Apostolate. The Anglican Church has always held that the Apostolate was designed to be a permanent Office, and as matter of fact has been, having been perpetuated and continued in the Episcopate, which is, and was divinely intended to be its successor and continuator in a word, that Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles.

Irvingism, on the other hand, holds that the Apostolate was intended to be a permanent Office; but as a matter of fact has not been, having been suspended after the death of St. John, in consequence of the sins of the Church; that the Episcopate was not intended to be, and is not the successor and continuator of the Apostolate; that Bishops, therefore, are not the Successors of the Apostles, though they have their proper place in the Hierarchy; and finally, that the Apostolate has in our time been re-stated, with its full gifts and powers.

Now this question, with its several branch issues, is one which cannot be settled on any grounds of abstract reason, imagined necessity, or supposed desirability. It is a question of fact—the testimony of Scripture and Christian history. Mere speculation must go for nothing in connection with it. The appeal can be only to the Law, and to the Testimony. Let it be remembered, too, that we are concerned here with the question of the Apostolate, only as it exists between us and Irvingism. We are at issue on it in its connection with Popery and Purity in all its forms. But at present we are not taking these opponents into the account.

Both parties agree, then, in this position, that the Apostolate is a permanent office in the Church. We agree in considering the words of our Lord in St. Matthew's Gospel, "Lo, I am with you always, even

unto the end of the world," as the sufficient Scriptural ground for the assertion of this permanency. We both appeal, indeed, to other passages,* but this is the one which in importance supercedes all others. But now the Irvingite theory, that the Apostolate fell into abeyance at the death of St. John, and has only just been revived, utterly contradicts the proper exposition of these words of Christ, and is self-contradictory besides. Our Version fails to convey the full sense of the original declaration, *Kai hoos ephe meo iudon eis adeos ras hupous tis eph' aurasdas vos adeos*; and it therefore fails to exhibit the impossibility of reconciling it with the theory in question. The use of the present tense, *ephe*, is noticeable; though were there nothing more, no argument could be grounded on it. But the expression, *adeos ras hupous*, settles the true exposition of the passage. It matters little for our present purposes whether *adeos* has here a collective or a distributive force. Analogy and the law of use, however, show that its force is in this case distributive, and therefore that the *always* of our Version might better be read, as in fact Dr. Clarke translates it, *every day*. Still, even if it be translated *all the days*, such a form of the collective implies and carries with it what is tantamount to a distribution. Neither does it matter whether we consider the words *adeos ras hupous*, as referring to the end of the world, or to the end of the Christian dispensation. The two periods, in point of fact, synchronize; and it is hardly worth while to take into account the utterly unsupported notion, that the words imply the end of the Jewish Dispensation. Fully brought out, then, the sense of the passage is this: Behold I am with you *all the days, and every day*, until the close of the Christian Dispensation, and the end of the world. No words can be needed to show how utterly inconsistent all this is with the Irvingite theory. But the theory is also self-contradictory. How can that be called a permanent office which has been in abeyance for nearly seventeen and a-half centuries out of the whole period of the Church's existence? We enter, then, on the Scriptural and historical examination of this question, with a strong pre-emption, to say the least, against the theory under consideration. For it is plain that the view which holds to the continuity of the Apostolate in the Episcopate, satisfies the conditions of the Redeemer's solemn promise: the view which advocates the abeyance of the Apostolate does not.

We proceed to consider the evidence of Scripture and History for the position of Irvingism, observing again that the question between it and us is, not whether there are Bishops in the Church, but whether the Apostolate was intended to, and did, pass into the first episcopate.

Our first step is to examine into the number of the Apostles. Our readers are of course aware of the superstitious literalism with which the advocates of party have always regarded the number twelve in connection with the Apostolate. Irvingism evinces the same weakness. But it does not appear to see how it involves itself in an inconsistency which party avoids. Regarding the number twelve as a personal literalism, and not as the symbol of complete Apostolicity, parity is consistent with itself in denying the existence of other Apostles than the original twelve. Assuming the same ground, Irvingism falls into the inconsistency of being compelled to admit the existence, up to this time, of at least twenty-six Apostles, with the possibility of any indefinite increase of their number; and is obliged, moreover, to invent a theory to account for the extra Apostleship of St. Paul and St. Barnabas, which parity disposes of by ignoring Matthias and Barnabas, and thus making room for an additional Apostle. Nor will it avail to say, that there were never to be more than twelve Apostles at any one time in the Church; or perhaps twelve in the Apostolate of the Circumcision, and twelve in that of the Uncircumcision, because this immediately removes the number from a literal personal application, and changes it to an official symbol. And when this is done, there is no underlying and excluding reasons why it may not, if evidence of probability be adduced, be applied to the Episcopate in all its multitude of members, as well to the imagined duodecental Apostolate. Either way, then, Irvingism loses the power of employing the number for its purposes.

But there is really nothing more childish, vulgar, and narrow in excess than this sort of numerical literalism. It lay at the foundation of the Millenarian Heresy; and wherever it has gone, it has carried with it a spirit and a character indicative of its Jewish origin and its heretical tendencies. If spiritualism has allegorized awful facts and sublime doctrines into wild and licentious parables, so has this Judaizing literalism been the source of carnal fancies and puerile conceits. While, whatever we may say of the spiritual significations which orthodox Fathers, like St. Augustine, for instance, found in the numbers seven, twelve, forty, and on, it is clear that they never for a moment fell into this Jewish slough of literalism.

Taking, then, the number twelve for what it really is, the symbol of Apostolicity, involving also the idea of completeness, we see at once that it can be applied to the multitudinous Apostolate as well as to any other. Just as well and as properly, indeed, as the number a hundred and forty-four thousand can to that "great multitude, which no man can number," the Apostolic Church, in all times and every land. The disproportion of the symbolic to the actual number would in all probability be no greater in the former than in the latter case.

We proceed, then, to the Irvingite theory as to the number of the Apostles; for it really involves the whole question, and if it fails there, case is lost. Irvingism admits the Apostolate of Matthias, and also that of Paul and Barnabas. And then, in connection with these admissions, it presents, as we have gathered from Mr. Andrews and others,—the following extraordinary theory.

The original Twelve,—including Matthias and Judas,—were the Apostles of the Circumcision. But the Jews rejected this Apostolate, and God, in consequence, determined to transfer it to the Gentiles. Thus was brought out the Apostleship of the Uncircumcision; while that of the Circumcision was confined to the Twelve, and ended in St. John. This Apostolate of Uncircumcision, which was a higher development of the purpose of God than the Gospel to the Circumcision, was committed to Paul and Barnabas, but received no others as Apostles, and was never filled up. It failed, partly from the fault of the Jews, but mainly from the sin of the Gentiles, fell into abeyance, and is just now restored to the Church in the twelve Apostles of Irvingism.

Now, be it observed, leaving out of view for the present the restored Apostolate, which will be considered by and by, that four points must be made good before this theory can be sustained: first, that all the original Twelve were Apostles of the Circumcision; secondly, that none but the original Twelve were so; thirdly, that the Apostleship of the Gentiles began as a fact after the supposed rejection of the Apostolate of the Circumcision by the Jews, Paul and Barnabas being the first Apostles; and fourthly, that, besides Paul and Barnabas, there were no Apostles of the Uncircumcision. We believe that not one of these opinions can be sustained by the facts and sequences of the Apostolic History, and that the ingenious theory which includes them is the baseless figment of a Judaizing fancy.

(1.) Were, then, all the original Twelve Apostles of the Circumcision? The question is not, let it be noted, did they all preach to the Jews; but did they preach to them, and labour among them, if not to the exclusion of the Gentiles, at least so that their great spheres of labor and conquest were among the Jews? In a passage from which we gain our chief knowledge of the Apostolate of the Circumcision, so far as Scripture is concerned, three persons only are mentioned as being such Apostles—namely, James, Cephas, and John.† Only two of these, however, as Dr. Thiersch admits, were of the original Twelve. Now, is it not fair to conclude that the Apostolate of the Circumcision was specially, not exclusively, committed to them, as that of the Uncircumcision was specially—as we shall presently see—not exclusively—to Paul and Barnabas, who are named in the same manner that they are? And this conclusion is sustained by what we learn, not from Scripture indeed, but still as a matter of history, concerning the labors and lives of others of the original Twelve. Without going into unnumbered details, let any one consider the regions, and the people in and among which St. Matthew, St. Philip, St. Andrew, and St. Thomas labored and died, and he will see how utterly groundless is the notion that they were, even specially, Apostles of the Circumcision.‡

(2.) Were more but the original Twelve the Apostles of the Circumcision? The case of James of Jerusalem settles the question. Dr. Thiersch and others admit that he was neither of those among the original Twelve who bore that name, and that he "stood *almot*" on an equal footing with the Apostles.¶ Though he was not an Apostle, it requires some hardihood to make this last assertion. Taking the admission, however—for it asserts an unquestionable fact—we ask, Was the man who, in the Council of Jerusalem, presided over Apostles, and declared sentence in the words *hoos ephe, inferior to Apostles? Was he, of whom St. Paul said, "other of the Apostles say I none, save James, the Lord's brother," not an Apostle? Was he who, in the naming of the Apostles of the Circumcision, takes precedence of St. Peter and St. John, not an Apostle? And yet it is to this man, admitted not to be one of the original Twelve, that Irvingism, with its wonted inconsistency, denies the Apostolate! While his Apostolate being proved, we find one Apostle at least of the Circumcision besides the Twelve.*

(3.) Is that view of historical facts correct which asserts the non-existence of the Apostolate of the Gentiles, except in the divine intention, until it was given to Barnabas and Paul, on account of the rejection by the Jews of the Apostolate of the Circumcision? St. Peter, in the Council of Jerusalem, answers this question, when he says, "a good while ago, God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe."‡‡ He utters these words in the hearing of both Paul and Barnabas; thus claiming, uncontradicted, for himself an Apostolate to the Gentiles as a thing of long standing, and still in his possession. At this time, then, that Apostolate was in existence; and though Paul and Barnabas were Apostles, it was not yet specifically committed to them. Nor does Scripture leave us in doubt how the transference of this Apostolate from Peter to the other two took place. The account is given in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. Here is certainly the place where, if this notion of Irvingism had any foundation, we should look to find some traces of

it. But there are none. The reason which is given for the transference goes directly to the teeth of the Irvingite supposition. Not a word is said of the failure of the Apostolate of the Circumcision, and a change consequent thereon in its relations. On the contrary, God is said to have wrought "effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the Circumcision," and to have been "mighty" in Paul towards the Gentiles.‡‡ Moved by these manifest tokens—not of failure, but of effectual working—the three Apostles, James, Cephas, and John, arrange and decide that the Apostleship of the Uncircumcision shall be transferred to Paul and Barnabas, while they assume that of the Circumcision. The fact, then, of the previous existence of the Apostolate of the Uncircumcision in the person of Peter, the reason given for its transference to Paul and Barnabas, and the mode in which the transfer was effected, are all fatal to the Irvingite theory. Of course we do not deny that in rejecting the Gospel, the Jews rejected also the institutions of the Gospel, and among them the Apostolate; we know, too, that their fall is the riches of the Gentiles. But that is clearly an entirely different thing from the position now under consideration, though the latter has probably arisen from confused notions on this mysterious subject.

(4.) Were Paul and Barnabas the only Apostles of the Uncircumcision? We admit, momentarily, for the sake of argument, the Irvingite theory, that none of the Twelve were so, and that none but the Twelve were Apostles of the Circumcision; and we leave to one side the case of St. James. If, then, there are any other Apostles named in Scripture, they, of course, on the Irvingite theory, must be Apostles of the Uncircumcision. But Ananias, Junia, and Epaphroditus are distinctly called Apostles in the New Testament.‡‡ And if we choose to turn to the testimony of Christian Antiquity, for which Irvingism professes so great a reverence, we shall find that Timothy, Titus, Silas, Luke, Mark, and many others, are also named as Apostles; while not the least direct ground from their nomination can in either case be adduced for calling them, as Irvingism does, Apostolic Delegates. This appellation is merely a make-shift to get rid of the necessary result of allowing them to be Apostles; since Irvingite writers admit that they appear in history as *Diocesan Bishops*; and of course, unless their Apostolate is denied, the conclusion as to who are the successors of the Apostles is tolerably obvious.

Not one of these, however, is to be taken. And we are compelled to reject the theory which rests on them as of the slightest worth, however ingeniously it may be framed to justify a foregone conclusion; while we cannot but feel that had one-half the mental labor which has been expended on it been devoted to an unbiased, honest, straightforward search after truth, the result would have been widely different. The discussion might, we think, be fairly terminated here. But we prefer to go on to the statement and consideration of certain general arguments on which Irvingism lays great weight, bearing on the Anglican doctrine of the Episcopate.

The first we shall notice relates to spiritual gifts, or *Charismata*. The Irvingite writers, as a body, reject the division which from time immemorial has been made by Theologians of these gifts into ordinary and extraordinary, or permanent and temporary. It alleges that they are all necessary to the Church, and that therefore the division just mentioned is a mere theory to explain their absence since the Apostolic age. But we may ask, is the Irvingite view, that these gifts have been withdrawn with the Apostolate in consequence of the sins of the Church, anything more than a theory to account for the same absence. One of the works before us declares that "these *Charismata* have, as a general thing, disappeared since the disappearance of Apostles."‡‡ The disappearance, then, is admitted. We account for it in one way, Irvingism in another. Previous to any evidence, therefore, one theory is no more a theory than the other; while all the weight which arises from antiquity and general consent is in favor of our view, for which we therefore claim an *a priori* probability greater than attaches to the opposing one.

To bring the matter to a distinct issue, let us take two of the *Charismata*, to which Irvingism attaches especial importance; it is its views cannot be sustained in connection with these, it is evidently good for nothing. These *Charismata* are Prophecy and the Gift of Tongues. We hold that neither of these is needful for a normal condition of the Church; Irvingism declares, unless we have entirely mis-understood its advocates, that they are.

We do not here enter into the question, precisely what is meant by Prophecy and Prophecies; we are willing to leave the exposition of them as Irvingism sets it forth, not because we accept it, but because it is not essential to our argument to examine it. Now St. Paul most plainly declares in the thirteenth chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, that these Prophecies are temporary; "whether these be Prophecies they shall fail." He uses the same word, and evidently has the same thing in view, as in several previous chapters. The first question, therefore, is, Does St. Paul, in this passage, speak of this removal as something which is to occur in the natural course of things, as we may say, or in consequence of great sins, and as a great punishment? Clearly, we think the former. Indeed, how any one can read the context, with its direct statements and comparisons, and come to any other

conclusion, we cannot imagine. And Christian antiquity testifies that Prophecy did so fail. It did not cease, indeed, immediately, as is proved by several passages which Mr. Andrews adduces;—as well as by other testimony. The brief account by which the Fathers despatched the Montanists in the latter part of the second century was, that Prophecy had ceased in the Church, and that they therefore were dissemblers.‡‡

Much the same line of remark applies to the Gift of Tongues. Of that, too, St. Paul says "they shall cease."‡‡ And the conclusion from the context, that they are to cease in the natural course of things, is as direct in this case as in the former. Nor should we fail to observe, as bearing on the subject, that St. Paul puts a far lower estimate on this gift than Irvingism. But, in truth, it is the unfolding characteristic of a sect to exalt a gift which contains a *taboo* or wonder over those which belong to the regular and vital processes of the Lord's Mystical Body.

But, it may be said, after all, the Apostle is all along looking on to another life, and it is in connection with that life that he alleges the failure of prophecies and the cessation of tongues; so that no argument for their failure and cessation in the Church in this world can be grounded on his words. In the Church triumphant they will indeed have no place; but it is not so in the Church militant here on earth. We have put the objection to its strongest form, but specious as it may seem, it is groundless.

The Apostle's argument includes a consideration of the Church and the individual; of the advance of the Church from her earlier years on through her later life; and so to her consummation in heaven; and of the individual from his youth on to his manhood, and to his completion of life in another world.‡‡ As the boy grows up, changes occur; so the things pass away, and others come; but charity remains all through and goes with him to heaven. And so, too, is it in the Church. This being considered and duly weighed, the difficulty vanishes. In fact, it has only arisen from ignoring that St. Paul had in view merely the individual, and was simply contrasting his earthly life with his life hereafter; whereas he really has in view the Church as well as the individual, and is contrasting as well different periods of the earthly life of each as the whole of their lives on earth, with their consummations in eternity. Any other exposition is *frigid and sterile*, and *unintelligible*, and the noble fitness of the passage, and its exalted and wide-reaching idea of Charity; while this exposition leaves the view taken above, of the failure of prophecy and the cessation of tongues, untouched. But, indeed, the objection could only be ad hoc as the *denier resort* of a captious obstructor.

There are, too, important considerations of a general nature connected with this matter of the *Charismata*, which ought not here to be overlooked. They are all of them either necessary to man's salvation, and to the complete work of the ministry in connection with that salvation, or they are not. If they are not, then the division of them into ordinary and extraordinary is real and well founded. If they are, then they have either not been removed—which Irvingism does not claim—or God has taken that away which he gave as essential. We do not see how the necessity of adopting one of these alternatives can be avoided. While those warnings which, in different passages, but especially in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul gives us against setting too high a value on some of these *Charismata*, afford a tolerably clear indication as to which alternative should be adopted.

This is not the place to enter into an extended examination of the *Charismata*. We may, however, say, in the way of explanation, that by the terms permanent and temporary, or ordinary and extraordinary, we do not mean to imply any difference in their essence, but only in their temporary form. The former is permanent; the latter is not so. The essence of all *Charismata* is supernatural and divine; but why may it not manifest itself differently in different periods of the Church's progress, according to the varying necessities and conditions of successive ages? It would be a narrow view that would deny this; and a narrower still that would magnify the external *taboo*, which, when the Holy Ghost began its Pentecostal work, so powerfully attracted attention, above the *essence* and the *power*, which ever attend the Spirit's workings. We believe that St. Chrysostom gives the sufficient reason for the cessation of these peculiar forms of outworking of that Divine Energy which always animates the Church when he says that their necessity is superseded by the great standing miracle of the Church itself,—conquering heathenism; taking up into herself the thought, the life, the whole being of humanity; raising the natural to a nearer proximity to the supernatural; and in her victorious progress laying aside some weapons which her earlier needs required.

After all, in this case as in many others, Irvingism reverses completely a legitimate logical process. The proper method would be to establish on distinct grounds the abeyance of the Apostolate, and then, with some show of reason, it could be alleged that the *Charismata* had ceased because of that abeyance. But when it has been foretold by St. Paul that the two *Charismata* on which especial stress is laid—namely, prophecy and the gift of tongues—should cease, it is the weakest of all illicit processes

to reason from their cessation to the abeyance of the Apostolate. It is, moreover, a patent instance of reasoning in a circle to prove the abeyance of the Apostolate by the absence of the *Charismata*; and then to sustain and account for the absence of the *Charismata* by alleging the abeyance of the Apostolate. But Irvingism is not remarkable for logical consistency.

We do not propose here to consider in detail the Irvingite theory of a fourfold ministry, in Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Pastors. This theory is set forth distinctly in the Testimony, and is grounded on well-known passages in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians.‡‡ It is also urged, with several modifications, by Mr. Andrews and others. No direct argument, however, for the abeyance of the Apostolate is, so far as we can find, drawn from it, and it therefore lies to one side of our track. We allude to it for the sake of making a general observation or two, which, as relating to the whole controversy in all quarters on the subject of the Ministry, appear to us important.

The fundamental error in the Puritan appeal to the New Testament, in relation to Church polity in general, and the Ministry in particular, was one which was Judicial in its character. It has been perpetuated in full by all the advocates of Ministerial purity with whom we have ever fallen in, and to a certain extent it seems to be shared in by Irvingism. It consisted in demanding express orders and announcements, solemn legislative acts, as it were, setting forth in so many words just what the Ministry was to be, and precisely how it was to be constituted. Now find it been remembered that the New Testament Scriptures were not delivered contemporaneously with the establishment of the Church and the Ministry, as the Mosiac Law was in connection with the Levitical Polity and Priesthood, the error would have been avoided. The Mosiac Law ordered and enacted the establishment of the Priesthood; they came together.‡‡ But in the New Dispensation it was not so. The institution of the Church and the Ministry preceded. The written Scriptures followed. The Church and the Ministry had both been some time at work when the Scriptures of the New Testament were written. And while this attitude no ground whatever for any disparagement of Holy Scripture, or for any such extinction of the Church as the Romish doctrine of tradition upholds, it does indicate the proper line of appeal in such cases, *the testimony of the Church*, but for plain recognitions; because these Scriptures were not written to give directions concerning a system not yet in existence, and to be established in accordance with such directions, but in view of one already established and at work. The question is not, What system is ordered? but, What system is recognized? What theory of polity and Ministerial arrangements best fits with what we find in the Acts and Epistles? And when this course is adopted, the conclusions to which it leads will, we apprehend, be found as fatal to the fourfold Ministry of Irvingism as to the one or the two Orders of Puritans.

There still remains to be mentioned, among the arguments derived from Scripture for the abeyance of the Apostolate, the extraordinary theory and exposition of Dr. Thiersch in connection with St. John. He understands our Lord's words concerning this Apostle, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" as meaning that with John the Apostolic office was to become dormant, to tarry till just before the end, and then to be revived, for "conquering Antichrist, and completing the yet imperfect preparation of the faithful for the coming again of Christ."‡‡ Our readers, we imagine, will hardly expect us to undertake a serious examination of this preposterous piece of exegesis. It is simply unaccountable, or in fact had any foundation, that no trace of it can be found in any of the Patristic Commentaries or Homilies.

If now we leave the region of Scriptural argument and enter that of the historical testimony of the Church, we shall find that what Irvingism has to allege may be summed up in a very few words. "Indications of a desire in the Church for a higher order than the Episcopal; obscure intimations of a loss; an uncertain passage from Herms; a wrested exposition of Clement; the constant allusion to the historical testimony of the Church, so far as we can find, which Irvingism adduces to support its view of the Apostolate.

It has been our fortune for some years past to hear a good deal about these obscure hints of the Fathers, and we confess we are rather tired of the hearing. Mr. Faber and Mr. Newman made much of these in advocating the claims of the Roman Church, and now it seems they are to be employed for the behoof of Irvingism. The ridiculous part of the matter is, that in all this admiring reverence for obscure hints, their devotees quite forget that there are any such things as plain declarations, and that the rule of a sound logic would be to explain the former by the latter, not the latter by the former. Popery and Irvingism, however, seem to rejoice in a system of dialectics peculiar to themselves, and reversing all ordinary processes of reasoning. But let us take some of these declarations,—for we confess we are accustomed to think more of them than of obscure hints,—and see to what conclusion they conduct us.

Clement, whose name is written in the Book of Life,‡‡ has a passage bearing on this subject, the force of which Dr. Thiersch

vainly endeavors to explain away.—"Christ was sent by God, and the Apostles by Christ. . . . Therefore preaching in countries and cities, they constituted their first fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, Bishops, and Deacons of those who should believe. . . . And what wonder that they who were put in trust with such a work by God, in Christ constituted the aforementioned?" He then quotes the action of Moses in Numbers xvii., which he says was done to settle disputes and contentions about the succession of the Priesthood, and proceeds: "Our Apostles also knew by our Lord Jesus Christ that contention should arise concerning the Episcopate. Wherefore, having received a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforementioned, and in the next place established a rule of succession, that when they fell asleep, other proved men should receive their ministry."

Now the question here turns first on this point: "Who are alluded to in the expression 'when they fell asleep'?" Dr. Thiersch would confine it to those called "the aforementioned"—that is, those whom the Apostles constituted from their first fruits, Bishops, &c.‡‡ But there is no reason in the construction of the passage for this restriction. It may just as well include also the Apostles themselves, unless reasons from outside to show why it cannot be alleged; and until such reasons are alleged—and it will be difficult to find them—we hold the passage to be conclusive for the continuance, and against the abeyance, of the Apostolate.

Let us take next the testimony of Irenaeus. It is of very great weight, and more especially in this case; for in his letter to Florinus he declares that he was instructed by Polycarp, who "would often speak of the conversations which he had held with John, and others who saw the Lord."‡‡ Now, considering the position which Irvingism assigns St. John, the testimony of one taught by his own pupil is specially important; and that testimony is distinct. In a work written, at the latest, not more than seventy five years after the death of St. John, he says, "we are able to enumerate those who were appointed Bishops in the Churches by the Apostles, and their successors even to ourselves, who never taught or knew what is madly dreamed by these"—i. e., the heretics. And then, replying to the answer of the heretics to this, that the Apostles had taught some hidden mysteries to the perfect, he adds: "these mysteries were made to whom they committed the Churches themselves; for they desired those whom they left as their successors, delivering to them their own place of government, to be perfect and irreprehensible."‡‡ Had Polycarp ever taught Irenaeus, or had St. John ever taught Polycarp, that the Apostolate ended in him, and that Bishops were not successors of the Apostles?

To the same purpose speaks Tertullian, and his statements are also of peculiar value, inasmuch as he professes to found what he puts forth on the authority of Justin Martyr. In his treatise *De Prescriptione Haereticorum*, written, it should be remembered, before he became infected with Montanism, he says: "In this manner the Apostolic Churches produce their successors; as the Church of Smyrna produces Polycarp, placed by John; as that of the Romans Clement, ordained by Peter; as also in the same way others exhibit those who were constituted Bishops by the Apostles, to deliver down the Apostolic seed, *Apostolicis seminibus tradentes*."‡‡

So, too, Cyprian, *eminently* holding the identity of the Apostolic and Episcopal Office, says "that the Church is founded upon Bishops."‡‡ And again, "the Lord appointed Apostles, that is, Bishops."‡‡ And St. Jerome asserts, "Bishops occupy the place of Apostles," and "They are all the successors of the Apostles."‡‡ We might go on multiplying quotations to the same purpose indefinitely; but it cannot be necessary. All antiquity testifies, with no hesitating tongue, but with a voice as clear as a trumpet, to the identity of the Episcopate and the Apostolate; to the position set forth by an ancient Father, that the name of Bishop was transferred to those who had formerly been called Apostles.

And now what are obscure hints and doubtful passages against such an array of testimony as this? That it should not be estimated by those who have gone over to Irvingism from communion, where they were never taught the value or the use of Christian testimony, might not perhaps surprise us; but that Presbyters of our own Church should have passed it by, is incomprehensible: for in these passages, and hundreds like them, prove the existence of Bishops, they also prove that they are the successors of the Apostles. If they do not prove the latter assertion, so neither do they the former.

In neither Scripture, then, nor Antiquity does there appear the slightest foundation for that theory of the Apostolate which Irvingism has put forth, and put forth, we must say, with such assuming pretension. It being set aside, there remain two views of the continuance of the Apostolate to choose between: the one is the Anglican view, that the Apostolate has been continued in the Episcopate, the other is the view advocated by Dr. Schaff in his *Apostolic Church*, that it is continued in the whole Ministry. In a certain sense, this last view may be held conjointly with the former; but if held by itself, it is clear that it denies the continuance of the Apostolate as a peculiar and proper Office; and this, we should imagine, would be fatal to it

* Mark. xvi. 7; Luke. x. 11-12. † Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.

† Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.

† Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.

† Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.

† Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.

† Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2. ‡‡ Acts. xiii. 1, 2.