

the representatives of the Church of England to the Presbyterian Synod of Dort, wrote, at the request of Archbishop Laud, his work on "Episcopacy." But the positions he maintained were very distasteful to his patron, and in his subsequent "Defence," Hall thus strongly disclaims the conclusions that had been attributed to him, derogatory to the foreign Reformed Churches:—

"The imputation pretended to be cast upon all the Reformed Churches which want this government, I endeavoured so to satisfy, that I might justly decline the envy which is intended thereby to be raised against us; for which cause I professed that we do 'love and honour those our sister Churches as the dear spouse of Christ,' and give zealous testimonies of our well-wishing to them. . . . My just defence is that no such consequent can be drawn from our opinion; forasmuch as the Divine or Apostolical right, which we hold, goes not so high as if there were an express command, that upon an absolute necessity there must be either Episcopacy or no church; but so far only, that it both may and ought to be. How fain would you here find me in a contradiction! While I onewhile reckon Episcopacy among matters essential to the Church; another where deny it to be of the essence thereof! Wherein you willingly hide your eyes, that you may not see the distinction that I make expressly betwixt the being and the well-being of a church; affirming that those churches to whom this faculty is denied lose nothing of the true essence of a Church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection."

Archbishop Bramhall, who took quite high ground as to the claims of Episcopacy, yet, writing against "the Separatists," says:—"I cannot assent to his main proposition that either all or any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in England, do unchurch either all or the most part of the Protestant Churches. . . . *Episcopal divines do not deny those Churches to be true Churches wherein salvation may be had.*" Bishop Andrews and others utter similar sentiments.

Such, then, was the development of the second opinion as to Episcopacy. But even those who took the highest ground on behalf of it, simply regarded it as a form of church government, and did not question the validity of non-Episcopal orders, or the standing of non-Episcopal communions as true Churches of Christ. In fact, English Churchmen were now taking the position before held by the Puritans. As an able student of this question has aptly remarked, in this long conflict Hamlet and Laertes have exchanged rapiers, to the grievous loss of vantage by those who forsook the broad, Scriptural ground upon which the Church of England heretofore stood, and adopted the narrow, un-Biblical and unhistorical ground of their Puritan opponents.

3. The High Church or sacerdotal theory regards episcopacy not as a mode of government, but as the divinely appointed channel of grace and salvation. We have already defined its nature and shown the absurdity of its claims, which are as alien to the Gospel of Christ as they are false to the testimony of history. The first advocate of this theory in the Church of England was Archbishop Laud of unhappy memory, who set it forth in 1604 in the Divinity School at Oxford, and was then and there accused by the Regius Professor of Divinity of supporting a new Popish and dangerous position. And when in the same year he proceeded to his degree of B.D., "he maintained, there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops, for which Dr. Holland, then Doctor of the Chair, openly reprehended him in the schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond seas, and now sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this

novel Popish position" (Prynne's Life of Laud). And ever since Laud's day there have not been wanting those who maintained Laud's position, but it remained for the followers of Pusey and the modern School of Oxford High Churchmanship to develop it to even more extravagant lengths. Even Laud could admit:—"For succession in the general I shall say this. It is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued; and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, and visible succession a necessary sign or mark of the true Church in any one place." How far our modern High Churchmen go beyond even Laud himself appears from the definition of Apostolic succession we have already quoted from Haddon:—"It means, in few words, without bishops no presbyters; without bishops and presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments, without sacraments no mystical union with the mystical Body of Christ, viz., with His Church; without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation." Dean Goode thus sums up the Tractarian teaching upon this subject:—"A Christian community in which there is no regular Episcopal Apostolical succession, has no valid ministry or sacraments; and as the virtue of the sacraments is in ordinary cases held (by the Tractarians) to be the exclusive means to their respective graces, such communities are destitute of any ordinary means of attaining the graces attached to a faithful reception of the sacraments, and are therefore, as it inevitably follows, and as indeed it is expressly maintained, destitute of any communion with Christ, and consequently form no part of the Christian Church." This is a faithful description of the doctrine of our modern sacerdotalists, by one who was a master of the whole subject; could anything be conceived which, under the name of Christianity, was more completely Anti-Christian? Could any teaching more emphatically deserve St. Paul's condemnation, as a reversal and subversion of the Gospel of Christ?

We have now traced the development within our borders, of a dogma utterly alien to the spirit of our Church and the faith of all its noblest and truest sons. In conclusion, we invite the attention of Dr. Carry and those who hold with him to the very remarkable "Historical Essay," by "Cantab," entitled "Apostolic Succession not a Doctrine of the Church of England." The author was an advanced High Churchman, a man who held that:—"A communion which does not before all things maintain absolutely the doctrine of apostolical succession cannot be sound in doctrines which involve and imply the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood. For that doctrine is the centre of the circle. If it goes, all goes. It is the key of the position. Take it and you take all. Let a Tractarian once doubt whether the Church of England holds it, and his confidence in her is imperilled; once prove that she does not hold it, and you have proved to him that she is not a portion of the One Holy Catholic Church of God, that—independently of her schism—her heresy has damned her!" This Tractarian did doubt: he investigated; he gives us here the process and results of his investigation:—"Be it so or be it not, that the Anglican communion has actual historical bishops, so far she is, or she is not, like the Arians, the Novatians, and the Donatists. But granted that she has the

fact—and the very possibility of a doubt should make you tremble—even so she has not the doctrine. I defy you to find the doctrine in one of her formularies; and I defy you to reconcile her tradition, her public and notorious acts, with any doctrine in any way resembling the Catholic doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Her history and her tradition show that the doctrine was thrown overboard, lost and gone, and not a trace left of it for generations after the schism and during the whole period which witnessed the successive alterations of her formularies under Edward, Elizabeth, James I. and Charles I., and at the settlement which followed the Restoration." Such was the conclusion which this High Churchman painfully reached in the teeth of his former belief and he was an honest man. Driven by conscientious convictions, and constrained by what he believed to be truth, he abandoned the Church of his fathers, convinced that she did not hold this, to him, essential truth, and entered the communion that maintained it, and which, consequently, he believed to be the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God—the Church of Rome. The moral of this history we leave to those who are vainly attempting to fasten upon the Church of England a theology which her formularies and her history alike discredit.

The Sunday School.

SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON.

5TH SUNDAY IN LENT, MARCH 30, 1884.

Mr. M. C. Hazard in the *Sunday School Times* suggests the following:

LINES OF REVIEW.

I. *The Books.*—Lesson 1 was in Acts. Lessons 2-4 were in James. Lessons 5-10 were in Acts. Lesson 11 was in 1 Thessalonians, and Lesson 12 was in 2 Thessalonians. The lessons in Acts were *historical*, and the lessons in the epistles were *doctrinal*.

II. *The Places.*—This portion of the review should be made geographical, and, as the places are mentioned, they should be pointed out upon the map. It will take only a little drill to fix the various localities in their proper order in the memories of the scholars. Our lessons began at Antioch. In the first lesson we were taken up to Jerusalem to the conference that was held there. In Lesson 5 was the beginning of the second missionary journey. While Barnabas and Mark went to Cyprus, Paul and Silas went through Syria and Cilicia. The latter two, after passing through Derbe, came to Lystra, where Paul was stoned upon his first missionary tour, and here they found Timothy. Taking him with them, Paul and Silas went into Phrygia and Galatia, the letter to the Galatians showing that their mission in the latter region, at least, was not unsuccessful. The Holy Spirit would not suffer them to preach the gospel in Asia, nor would he allow them to go into Bithynia. At Troas, Paul beheld the vision of the man, who cried: "Come over into Macedonia, and help us." Regarding this as a voice from the Lord, the little band of missionaries immediately set sail for Macedonia, touching at the island of Samothrace on their way, and landing at Neapolis. They began their work in Philippi, where they laid the foundations of a church. Besought by the magistrates to leave Philippi, the missionaries went next to Thessalonica, where another church was the result of their efforts. Driven out from Thessalonica, they took up their work in Berea, where they found those who were willing to accept any truth which had for it the authority of the Scriptures. Compelled to leave Berea because of the persecution of the Jews who had followed them from Thessalonica, Paul's next field of labor was Athens, where he tried to show the Athenians that "the unknown God" whom they ignorantly worshipped, was the real and only true God. Silas and Timothy had remained in Berea, but rejoined Paul in Corinth, where, though at the outset he encountered much opposition, yet he accomplished a great work, and es-

tablishe
Acts, w
III.
will be
topics.
topics
groups.
the gro

1. Its
stances
of our
from Ju
be circ
could n
declare
salvatio
cleansin
any rig
ciples.

2. Its
should
that he
of wick
of the w
the fath

3. Its
change
The nat
iniquity
religion
"peace
mercy a
hypocri

4. Its
upon m
him, to
To the
judge tl
one wer
but to s
do this

5. Pr
Paul an
places v
they mi
After ce
unconve
with bu
tained a
Silas di
to new f
That ca
land th

6. Su
not only
suffer fo
out the
were tal
then he
beating
magistr
the char
shows h
ing to d

7. Be
their fai
at midn
prison.
the resc
with his
how cha
How ter
and min
of the ja
why God
of the m
might se
age of s

8. Pr
searched
Paul tol
thing to
the prop
the life
they exa
the one
wish to

9. Th
us as ou
(2) He l
"the off
nations