

which he alludes, proves most distinctly that it was furnished bearing a resemblance, and all satisfaction of its merits, but if you are applying the indiscriminately, the time *Bishops*. In one paragraph though the *succession* affirming that in the *succession*lian proves that right of administration of the pastor of an assembly and of like himself to his testimony as called a Bishop, the Church in the communion conventicles or Theodore's commentary on "The Apostles" we expounded he also learned to Bishops, he. But as I said *Presbyters*."—here it not that when he wrote his most full, ex-presbytery from your leisure.—partial extract expresses

expresses himself more fully thus, "The Apostles having discoursed concerning the Bishops, and described them, declaring what they ought to be, and from what they ought to abstain, omitting the order of Presbyters, descends to the Deacons; and why so, but because between Bishop and Presbyter there is scarcely any difference; and to them is committed both the instruction and the Presidency of the Church; and whatever he said of Bishops agrees also to Presbyters."* But the evidence afforded by Tertullian, Cyprian, Theodoret, and Chrysostom, would not affect my views on the subject, as even in *their* age, the Church began to be corrupted by an admixture of human institutions. This is fully attested by Jerome, and it is a strong proof of the weakness of your side of the question, that almost all the witnesses in its favour, lived *after* the two first centuries. I have studiously avoided bringing forward testimony in favor of Presbyterian parity, which is afforded by almost all the earliest Fathers whose works are extant, because I am acting wholly on the defensive—repelling the most wanton attacks.

I am at a loss to know in what terms to characterize your remark regarding the General Assembly. It resembles *distilled water*. By comparing that court to the deliberative Assembly of the ancients, the learned Professor only alluded to its *forms*, and could that justify your most childish and invidious animadversion? Paul and Demosthenes have often been compared, but *eloquence* is always understood to be the point of comparison, and no one views it as conveying a censure on the Apostle, or implying that he was a *heathen*. When you speak of the Confession of Faith as Calvinistic, and *rigidly* so, you forget that Calvin's authority was not without its influence in drawing up the Articles of the Church of England. The Seventeenth Article, which relates to Predestination, bears the most unquestionable internal evidence of its connection with that Reformer. The qualifying clause toward the end of it, is nearly copied from Calvin's Institutes, and the latter part of it is a *literal translation* of his caution against the abuse of that doctrine. For evidence of the former, see his Institutes III. 2, 4, 5, compared with the article.

For

* In 1 Epist. ad Tim. Hom. 11.