

Church is the only one which has them both in their integrity. We have them undoubtedly."*

This startled my friend a little, and he said he should like to belong to the true church whoever she was; but when he came to reflect upon the claim of the Episcopacy, *jure divino*, he found that institution and the idea had all grown up in and after the patristic times. And as to the Fathers themselves he became thoroughly satisfied that even they were very uncertain authority for any doctrine or ecclesiastical usage. His own private examination brought him, early in life, to the same conclusion as the one here so neatly expressed by the Rev. Dr. Hodge:—"Such is the diversity of opinion among the Fathers themselves—such the vagueness of their doctrinal statements—and such the unsettledness of their *usus loquendi*, as to important words, that the authority of the Fathers may be quoted on either side of any disputed doctrine. There is no view, for example, of the Lord's Supper, which has ever been held in the church, for which the authority of some father cannot be adduced. And often the same father presents one view at one time, and another at another time."

He also found that the further on down the stream of ecclesiastical history he went, the further usages drifted from the simplicity of apostolic times—the more arrogant bishops became in their claims, until one of their number, the one at the capital of Imperial Rome, claimed to be Universal Bishop, with jurisdiction over all the rest; and before he had done, claiming the right to raise up and put down earthly rulers, to discharge their subjects from their allegiance, or to transfer that allegiance to other Sovereigns. But as to these Popes, through whom all episcopal ordina-

* See Dr. Dewart's tract on "HIGH CHURCH PRETENSIONS," for sale at the Book Room.