

emed more like
than the result
going into the
t to say that the
diocesan Bishops
the church, lay
Mr. Leach from
ere immediately
nself,—that they
sonally testify to
ach of them was
rld,”—that after
them, on the day
they were moved
power of working
arned,—that they
—that they could
dissimulation and
judgments on the
communicate the
aying on of their
es, the Committee
d, or ever were to
fice, or otherwise
ne proof could he
le, or ever will be
concentrated to a
of an apostle” “in
und claims to be
fidence.

ns charged against
d schismatical, the
or two, however,
e opinions. They
there is not in the
h personage as a
seer, and Presbyter
. And it has often
the Presbyterianism
se of offence with
equently, possessing
f God's Holy Spirit,
in the souls of her

These opinions were unknown in the Church of England, during the earlier part of her existence as a Reformed Church ; and the most pious and distinguished of her Divines, from the Reformation downwards, have always cordially acknowledged the Church of Scotland and the other Presbyterian churches of the Reformation, as true churches of Christ, and their Ministers as lawfully and validly ordained. For example, I make the following extracts from Professor Miller's work on the Christian Ministry, page 29, where he is arranging Episcopalians in classes according to their several opinions with regard to church government :—“The first consists of those who believe that neither Christ nor his Apostles laid down any particular form of ecclesiastical government to which the church is bound to adhere in all ages. That every church is free, consistently with Divine will, to frame her constitution agreeably to her own views, to the state of society, and to the exigencies of particular times. These prefer the Episcopal government, and some of them believe that it was the primitive form; but they consider it as resting on the ground of human expediency alone, and not of Divine appointment. This is well known to have been the opinion of Archbishops Cranmer and Grindal ; of Bishop Leighton, of Bishop Jewel, of Dr. Whitaker, of Bishop Reynolds, of Archbishop Tillotson, of Bishop Burnet, of Bishop Croft, of Dr. Stillingfleet, and of a long list of the most learned and pious Divines of the Church of England, from the Reformation down to the present day.” * * * “Another class of Episcopalians go further. They suppose that the government of the church by Bishops, as a superior order to Presbyters was sanctioned by Apostolic example, and that it is the duty of all churches to imitate this example. But, while they consider Episcopacy as necessary to the perfection of the church, they grant that it is by no means necessary to her existence ; and accordingly, without hesitation, acknowledged as true Churches of Christ, many in which the Episcopal doctrine is rejected, and Presbyterian principles made the basis of ecclesiastical government. The advocates of this opinion, also, have been numerous and respectable, both among the clerical and lay members of the Episcopal Churches in England and the United States. In this list appear the venerable names of Bishop Hall, Bishop Downham, Bishop Bancroft, Bishop Andrews, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Forbes, the learned Chillingworth, Archbishop Wake, Bishop Hoadley, and many more.”

As an instance of the same Christian spirit, and its practical effects in leading to charity and Christian fellowship between the different branches, of the Church of Christ, it may be mentioned that Dr. Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff, and several other English Divines, some of whom were afterwards Bishops, as, for instance, Bishop Hall and Bishop Davenant, sat as members in the Synod of Dort, which, with the exception of themselves,