

What reason is there for it?

Do they not, with the Episcopal orders, acknowledge *One God*?

Do they not possess the same Saviour; and do they not believe in the same Spirit?

Do they not receive the same Scriptures as the word of God, and declare their belief in the same conditions of salvation; viz., repentance and faith, with fruits worthy of them?

Why, then, should we say that they are not truly religious?

But in favor of whom are we urged to make this concession?

In favor of those who have *more of the Spirit of Christ*? In favor of those who attend more devoutly divine worship; who exercise a more extensive charity, and whose system of doctrines and government is more free from human forms and ceremonies? If the Anglican Communion be not superior to some others in either of these respects, to deny that the others are truly Christian is to give up the power of religion to the form of it. If we give heed to the practice of religion, the evidences of piety are as conspicuous in various other denominations as in that of the Episcopacy. The person, therefore, who calls the practice of such dissenters *hypocrisy*, and their sentiments a delusion, must contradict the truth of religion, and sin against the light of heaven.

The argument from this point is, if the various denominations in the Church which do not enjoy, *as ministers, pretended successors of the Apostles*, exhibit an evidence of Christianity, and if, in this, they act consistently with their ministry, then their ministry has received ordination, and consequently, there are *no successors* of the Apostles.

Again: That the Apostles have no successors, will be fully proved if we reflect that there has been a necessity for persons to receive *ordination from others* besides those who pretend to be the successors of the Apostles.

Was there not a necessity for the Church of England to dissent from the Papal?

Doubtless there was.

Happily for the Anglican Church there were several