

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

IS BAPTISM INVARIABLY IMMERSION?

JAN 1 0 1938
125
47
We are not among those who draw into common discourse the sectarian questions of an unspiritual character, "which gender strifes and disputings about words," and which concern mere modes and forms, about which good and wise men differ in opinion. For that ground which has been held on the subject by some good thinkers, may after all have a measure of truth in it, that God has designedly hidden the mode of baptism, by withholding any express scripture on the subject, just as he hid the body of Moses upon Mount Nebo; and for the same reason—that it might not become an ensnaring object of idolatrous worship to those who chain down the power of their own consciences to unimportant rites and ceremonies, and allow themselves to be gradually seduced out of sight of the lofty spirituality of religion.

Yet when persistent efforts are constantly made to change the faith of our people, as if for life and death, in a way which it must be manifest to all is not for the better, to any practical intent or purpose, by the alleged binding force of a form which

VOL. XX., NO. 1—1.

ARTICLE III.

HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

The most formidable opponents of true Christianity are they who, "sitting in the temple of God," claim it as their prerogative to exercise supreme and exclusive dominion over the faith of his people. Confiding in the strength of their position, they speak with authority, and support their assumed *jure divino* right by an array of logical propositions at once "cunningly devised," compact, continuous, and defiant. They aver that the Lord Jesus founded his Church in the persons of his apostles; that he gave them a charter in rites and laws to be administered by them, and a living power and efficiency in the agency of the Holy Spirit annexed to that administration: that he provided for the transmission of these powers, in an adequate degree, to those who were to succeed them; and that by such transmission or delivery alone could the title to minister in the Church be completed, or the revealed conditions of its constitution be satisfied. And to corroborate this compacted series of positions, they employ with effect the powerful auxiliaries of *time and numbers*, claiming it as the unquestioned belief for fifteen hundred years throughout Christendom, and until now as maintained and expressed in the symbolic books, and as constantly applied in the practice of seven-eighths of the Christian world. It is a great mistake, say they, to regard all this as touching upon a mere matter of external order. It touches, in their view, upon the vital union of the Church, as a society, with Christ, its living Head; and it places the witness of that union upon a basis altogether independent of the fluctuations of the individual mind. The conviction of one man, derived through secret channels, however sincere and firm it be, is not a witness available for another: but continuous, external, *historical* testimony is a witness to all, and enables a man intelligibly to answer the solemn question, "By what title do I minister in the Church of Christ?" Not by virtue of my own persuasion, however earnest, nor by

that of others who immediately or who three centuries ago preceded me, but under a warrant transmitted in fixed forms by man to man, from Christ himself, along an outward and historical channel, open to the criticism and palpable to the common perception of mankind.*

Such we conceive to be a condensed but fair statement of the ground occupied by all prelatial Churches, whether Episcopal or Papal. But waiving, at least for the present, the mooted question, whether there has been any such "outward and historical" succession as they all claim—a question to which a negative answer would have to be given from the many broken links discoverable in the chain, and from the want of agreement among themselves how they shall be mended—we propose to submit to the arbitration of history this standing claim of "fifteen hundred years," supported as it has been, and still is, by the suffrages of "seven-eighths of the Christian world." In doing this, we shall aim to confront history with history—history that is genuine, authentic, and divinely inspired, with that which is apocryphal, traditionary, and human: the history of the Christian Church for the first fifty or sixty years, while it was under the administration of the chosen apostles of our Lord, with the history of the Church from the close of the scriptural canon to the present day.

Many seem to lose sight of the great fact that the New Testament is not only a continuous history of the Christian Church for about two ordinary generations, but that in its backward sweep over by-gone ages, it discriminates between that which is transient and temporary under the old economy, and that which is permanent and eternal—between the type and the antitype: and that in its prophetic foreshadowings, there are many sketches of the future designed for the instruction and comfort and warning of all ages, till time shall be no more. Keeping, then, in view the illimitable range of this one history, which as far surpasses all others as heaven is higher than earth, we shall only touch upon some of the salient points in this matter of contro-

* See *Edinburg Review*. December. 1848. No. 167—article "Duke of Argyll on Presbytery."

versy, without any higher aim than merely to indicate that the fortress in which our opponents have entrenched themselves is not altogether impregnable.

The first radical error in the claim of those who would be "apostles, and are not," (Rev. ii. 2,) consists in the allegation that "the Lord Jesus founded his Church in the persons of his apostles." But there is nothing in the history of the primitive Church, nor in the nature of the apostolic office, nor in the words which they uttered, nor in the works which they performed, that gives the slightest countenance to such an allegation. It is disproved by the fact that Christ is every where represented as the sole Head of the Church, and that he has never given his glory or transferred his power to another. Paul affirms that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. iii. 11. And he disclaims any dominion over the faith of the Corinthians; immediately adding, "By faith ye stand." 2 Cor. i. 24. Faith in whom? Not in the apostles, but in Christ. Such a disclaimer could never have been made by the apostle, had he been invested with all the authority which the allegation implies. Who of the pretended successors of the apostles has ever uttered such a disclaimer? And who of them has ever failed to assert and practically to enforce this dominion? The apostles were but *servants of Jesus Christ*, and not "lords over God's heritage." (1 Peter v. 3.) If the apostles were ambassadors, they were simply "ambassadors for Christ," to do his will, to publish his offers of salvation, and had no other authority but that which was purely ministerial—such as a servant renders to his master. And so of the miracles which they performed; they were all wrought in his name and ascribed to his power. The main passage on which the claim of apostolic succession, with apostolic powers, is founded, is in the 16th chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, from the 13th to the 19th verses, inclusive. We need not quote them in full. Let it here suffice to remind the reader that he will find a solution to the great agitating question of that day—"What think ye of Christ?" or "Whom say ye that I am?"—in the answer which Peter gave to this interrogatory, when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son

of the living God." This *confession* of Peter, this open avowal of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah of whom the prophets had written, in conjunction with a like avowal of him as "the Son of the living God," which included his essential deity and equality with the Father, is the confession of faith which true Christianity has ever taught and enjoined. And this is the rock on which the Church of Christ is founded.* Again we may remark that Christ never said that Peter was the rock upon which he will build his Church. How could he, when he himself is the only rock, the only foundation? How could he, when "all power in heaven and on earth" is needed to save one lost sinner, intrust the keeping of the whole Church to a frail mortal like Peter? We will freely admit that the Lord Jesus conferred extraordinary powers upon Peter and upon his other apostles. But we have no intimation whatever that they did not all possess these powers in an equal degree, no intimation that Peter was the prince of the apostles, and no intimation that either he or any of the other apostles had the power of transmitting their extraordinary gifts to others, much less their entire apostolate to successors. It is not so written, and we shall see in the sequel that the credibility of such an assumption lacks the evidence necessary to support it.

As to "the charter in rites and laws" which the Lord Jesus originally gave to his Church by the ministry of his apostles, we hold it to be just as valid, just as obligatory now, as it was in the primitive Church, and accompanied with like blessings when administered and observed with like dependence upon the Holy Spirit and in the exercise of a like faith upon the power and grace of Christ. But the question in dispute relates not to "the charter in rites and laws," but to the power which is claimed by those in the assumed succession, to dispense with those rites and laws, to abridge or amend them, to substitute others in their place, to increase their number, to give them a mystical inter-

* If we admit that *πέτρος* and *πέτρα* both mean stone or rock, it is passing strange that if Peter was the rock on which Christ promised to build his Church, that he should change his gender from masculine to feminine.

pretation, and differing from their plain and obvious import; in a word, whether the power is claimed in so important a matter as rites and laws to legislate where Christ has not legislated, or in any way contravening the charter which he has given, either by additions or evasions, is a usurpation of his authority upon which the apostles never ventured. For they, like the prophets of old, received the law from his lips, and proclaimed it to all as his unalterable word—adding nothing of their own and keeping nothing back.

But the advocates of the apostolic succession—at least in our day—do not regard themselves as under any such restriction. “Never,” says De Maitre, a prominent continental theologian of the progressive or development school, “never has any important institution resulted from a law; and the greater the institution is, the less does it deal in parchment and writing; it springs insensibly with the growth of ages. Had St. Peter a distinct conception of his prerogative, and of the questions to which it would give birth? That I cannot tell.” Great institutions, then, such as the Papal Church, have not their charter in the Scriptures, and this the whole body practically confessed long before De Maitre took up his pen in her defence—practically confessed it, we say, by excluding the Scriptures from the people. And for a like reason, as there is nothing in the character or conduct or language of St. Peter, as delineated in the Scriptures, at all resembling the prerogative claimed by the Papal chair, the Bible must be a dangerous book for the people to read. The prerogative in question, like all other parts of this “great institution,” has been “the growth of ages.”

Take another witness, no less prominent than the one already quoted. From Hurter we learn that “to try to establish primitive Christianity as the rule and type of all Christian institutions, is an attempt as absurd as if one would have the Emperor of Austria model his court on that of the old counts of Hapsburg, his ancestors.” Just as absurd, all will admit, who would lay side by side the chaste simplicity of the one and the gorgeous display of the other.

But there is another witness still more prominent, or at least

better known to the readers of this REVIEW than either of the two whose testimony has been already given. We refer to Newman, who, in his "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," has laid down the rule upon which this growth or these variations proceed. He says: "The view on which this essay is written has, perhaps, at all times been impliedly adopted, but, I believe, has recently been illustrated by several distinguished writers of the Continent, such as De Maitre and Mohler, viz., that the increase and expansion of the Christian creed and ritual, and the variations which have attended the process in the case of individual writers and churches, are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart, and has had any wide or extended dominion. But, from the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas." Again, he says: "Here is but the germ. What the gospel reveals, be it doctrine, or church, or worship, or various observances, all should now be modified and become complete." And again: "If Christianity be a universal religion, suited not to one locality or period, but to all times and places, it cannot but vary in its relations and dealings towards the world around it. Principles require a very varied application, according to persons and circumstances." "I am not aware that most Tridentine writers deny that the whole Catholic faith may be proved from Scripture, though they would certainly maintain that it cannot be found on the surface of it."

But, lest it should be said that these are only the speculations of individual writers, and not the voice of the Church, it will be sufficient to reply, that the development theory of De Maitre and Hurter and Newman has been applied in a notable instance by the now reigning Pope. The theory of "the immaculate conception" was once but a "germ," and for ages it was a much-disputed question among their theologians, whether or no it had any signs of life, till it was vitalized and brought forth in full maturity, not a dozen years ago, by the fiat of his Holiness. So that now it is an established Catholic truth—an infallible article of faith, which none but heretics will venture from hence-

forth to deny. And how many such articles are in embryo, to be brought forth in due time, it is impossible to predict. But from the amazing "variations" from primitive Christianity to which the Catholic Church has already attained, we may form some approximating conception of what will be in the progressive future, when the "great ideas" of Mr. Newman shall be fully realised.

It may not be out of place here briefly to notice the external state of that "institution" which seems to have given rise to the "great ideas" whereby have been expanded the intellects and the hearts of its admirers. "The Prince of the Apostles," as he is called, has a temporal dominion, not so extensive as formerly, but still embracing twenty states, with a population of nearly three and a quarter millions. St. Peter of old had no such dominion; and we further conclude that he was poor in this world's goods, but rich in faith. For on one occasion he publicly said, "Silver and gold have I none." (Acts iii. 6.) The comparison of Hurter falls far below the mark; for there is a much wider difference between St. Peter of the primitive Church and the present St. Peter of the "Catholic" Church, than between the counts of Hapsburg and the court of the Emperor of Austria. But not to dwell upon temporal dominions and palaces and thrones, if we turn to the spiritual dominion of his Holiness, he has under him seventy-two cardinals, eleven patriarchates, one hundred and fifty-four archepiscopal and six hundred and eighty-six episcopal sees, and one hundred and one apostolic vicariates. Of his episcopal sees, fifty of them are in the United States, and the Papal population of this country is estimated at four millions. In Europe alone, he has six hundred and three dioceses, and affects to bear sole spiritual rule over a population of one hundred and forty-seven millions. Add to all this his spiritual dominion over other portions of the world—in Asia, in Africa and America; and over the immense host in clerical "orders"—priests, deacons, exorcists, acolytes—all, all yielding him implicit obedience—(such is the law;—when all this is duly considered, it ceases to be a matter of wonder that the occupants of the Papal throne, and that they who rank highest in

its favor, should fail in the grace of humility which was a peculiar characteristic of the primitive Church, and no less a characteristic of the apostles themselves.

Newman is right in saying that philosophy and polity have had much to do in developing this "great institution." It was at first the philosophy of the Stoics and the Epicureans and the Peripatetics which bewildered and perplexed and corrupted the minds of many of the apostolic or early fathers of the Church. In the middle ages, the Philosophy of Aristotle was the fascinating study of all ranks, and was interwoven with all their habits of thought; and to be familiar with his categories was deemed a much higher attainment than to be familiar with the oracles of God. But as neither of the philosophies referred to may be the one which Mr. Newman has embraced or would recommend, we venture to ask him what Philosophy is that with which Christianity must be found identical, in order to its being acknowledged as true and divine? Is it Deism or Pantheism? Is it the philosophy of Descartes or of Bacon? of Leibnitz or of Locke? of Condillac or of M. Cousin? Even in the great round of German philosophy, which is it? Is it that of Kant, or of Fichte, or of Schelling, or of Jacobi, or of Hegel, or of Fries, or of so many others less known, who have made changes in the thoughts of their masters, or tried new paths for themselves? Which of all these philosophies is *the* philosophy? Which is the one eternal truth which is to serve as a type, a criterion and standard, for Christian truth? Each of the scientific explanations of Christianity only lasts as long as the theory or metaphysical hypothesis from which it springs. A special theological school and a peculiar view of Christian doctrine is attached to each new view which philosophy assumes. What reliance, then, can be placed on it? It was not philosophy which the apostles taught. All the systems of philosophy then extant, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, they regarded as utterly worthless and false—esteeming the wisdom of this world as foolishness, not to be admitted to a comparison with the wisdom of God as revealed in the gospel. Instead, then, of the philosophy which has modelled the "Catholic Church" into its present form.

what we simply want to know is, how to distinguish between the human and the divine. Tell us what *rites* Christ Jesus instituted, and by what *laws* his kingdom was originally governed, and we can ask nothing more. This, indeed, is the only true practical philosophy suited to all ages of the world, to all conditions and classes of society, and to all the relations which man sustains to his fellow-man, and to God his maker. And these rites and these laws were framed by infinite wisdom, with a perfect knowledge of the human heart, and with a perfect adaptation to the good of the Church and the glory of God.

Akin to the influence of philosophy in moulding the Church into a form so unlike the primitive model, is the *polity* which has actuated and controlled her proceedings. The germ of this great error is seen in the conduct of one of the apostles—even Peter, who exposed himself to the reproof of Paul for his dissembling or compromising polity. (See Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*) And if the intrepid Peter dissembled through fear on this occasion, how great must have been the temptation to men less bold than he to pursue a similar policy, rather than to expose themselves to the loss and the peril which a steadfast adherence to “the truth of the gospel” would expose them. In the early persecutions of the Church, similar compliances with Jewish prejudices and Gentile customs from the same motive were not uncommon. But other motives—and these motives are many—had also their influence in later days, corrupting the purity of Christian doctrine and the simplicity of Christian worship, by engrafting upon the Church, as articles of faith and as ceremonies to be observed, many opinions and many rites which could lay no claim to a divine origin. And thus, little by little, the great institution which claims to be *the* Church has its form and shape much less “in parchment and writing” than in the accretions from foreign sources; and De Maitre is right when he speaks of it as “the insensible growth of ages.” To what extent the polity of the court of Rome may be modelled after that of the Cæsars, may perhaps be approximately shown by comparing the one with the other—both supreme, both universal.

But we turn now from the general to more specific views of

our subject. What philosophy and polity have done, may be seen, for example, by adverting to the Lord's Supper—an ordinance remarkably simple and remarkably significant, and remarkably instructive and comforting to the people of God. But how from this "germ" the sacrifice of the mass could spring, is a mystery transcending the reach of any but a mystical philosophy which adopts as its motto, "The greater the impossibility, the easier believed." But it has been so transformed; and there is nothing like it in the Jewish ritual, nor any where else, save in the unbloody sacrifice of Numa Pompilius or in the offering of Cain.

Springing out of this great "variation," we take leave to notice a minor variation of sufficient importance to attract attention. It is generally known that the Tridentine Council decided that laymen should communicate in only one of the elements—the bread. But Pope Leo (A. D. 443) is reported to have said that "the sacrilegious unbelievers who desire to communicate in the bread only are Manicheans." And he ordered the "expulsion of such by sacerdotal authority from the society of Christians."* Pope Gelasius (A. D. 495) denounced the division of one and the same mystery as a "great sacrilege."** Pope Urban, (A. D. 1095,) presiding in the Council of Clermont, determined that the communicant must partake of the bread and wine "separately." This was in opposition to the practice of dipping the bread in the wine and so partaking of it. And Pope Pascal (A. D. 1118) says: "Our Lord himself dispensed the bread and the wine each by itself; and this usage is always to be observed in the Church." † But without going far

* Sanguinem redemptionis nostrae haurire omnino declinent. Deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et prodi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali autoritate pellantur. Leo, Serm. 4. Bin. 3, 618. Labb. 6, 283.

** Divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire. Gelasius in Pithou, 454. Aquin. III. 80, XI., P. 393. Baron. 496, XX. Bruy. I. 265.

† Corpus Dominicum et sanguis Dominicus singulatim accipatur. Urban in Oderic. VI. Labb. 12, 897, 896, 905. Mabillon, 6, 13.

‡ Novimus per se panem, per se vinum ab ipso Domino traditum, quem morem sic semper in sancta ecclesia conservandum docemus et precipimus. Pascal, Ep. 32. Labb. 12, 999. Mabillon 6, 13. Il ordonne de donner a la communion les deux especes separement. Bruy. 2, 593.

out of our way for authorities to prove this "variation," let us refer to one well known to us all in these later times. The late Bishop England, in his little work on the "Ceremonies of the Mass," says (p. 130) that "decrees have been made by the Popes of the fifth century, that those who refuse to receive under the appearance of wine should be altogether denied communion." Here, then, is a direct issue between Popes of the fifth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, and the Council of Trent; both infallable, and the one contradicting the other in a matter of essential importance. And there is a still further issue between the Council of Trent and the injunction of our Lord—the latter saying, "Drink ye all of it;" and the former, "Ye shall not drink it at all."

While upon the mass, as it would occupy much more space than we can spare to discuss it ever so cursorily, we shall touch only upon one point where there is a palpable variance between the teaching of Rome and the teaching of the gospel. The "unbloody sacrifice" of the mass, according to Bishop England's definition of it, is in part "offered to the Almighty as a propitiation for the sins of mankind." But from the Epistle to the Hebrews we learn that "this he (Christ) did once when he offered up himself." (Heb. vii. 27.) "Nor yet that he should offer himself often," [the mass is often offered,] "as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix. 25, 26.) "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 14.) So all along it is one, once, one offering for sin, and no more, according to the gospel. But, according to Rome, it is a repeated offering as often as the mass is celebrated.

We turn now to one of the appendages of the mass. Passing by the *edifice* in which it is celebrated, with the symbolic meaning of its various fixtures and ceremonies, we simply refer to the fact that in the history of the primitive Church no reference whatever is made to a clerical costume. The apostles and evan-

gelists and elders and deacons, all seem to have been clothed in the ordinary attire of that age. But, in the work of Bishop England, already quoted, some pages are devoted to a description of the peculiar dress of the officiating "orders." On reading it, the thought occurred—and we hope to be pardoned if we offend in expressing it—that Monsieur Godey, who furnishes the ladies every month with the newest fashions, might find some capital hints, blending the antique with the Parisian, by a perusal of this part of the work. But we have not much reason to fear, as the *Taxa Cancellariorum Apostolicarum* can grant *indulgentes* for the gravest offence.

As in the primitive Church there was no clerical costume, so neither were there any clerical orders. But in the Church of Rome, there is a hierarchy made up of a dozen or more orders, rising one above another till they culminate in the Pope. How wonderful the development! And here it may be pertinent to remark, that it is altogether irrelevant to appeal to the Old Testament ritual to sanction a corresponding ritual under the gospel dispensation. For the Jewish ritual had fully answered the typical and symbolical purposes for which it was instituted when Christ, our great High Priest, had finished his work on earth. As the ceremonial law was then abolished, of which we have abundant proof in the gospel; and as neither Christ nor his apostles instituted any other ceremonial law in its place, any attempt to engraft such a law upon the simple institutions of the gospel is a flagrant act of disobedience, is an act of presumptuous disloyalty to the great Head of the Church.

But of all the "variations" between the primitive and the Roman Church, none are so important as those which relate to the gospel itself—the way of salvation which God has revealed. Salvation by grace or salvation by works—which is it? The primitive Church believed—for so they were taught—that "by grace they were saved through faith; and that not of themselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8, 9.) The Roman Church, on the contrary, believes and teaches that man is saved partly by faith and partly by works—works bearing the most prominent part in their scheme of salva-

tion, the *merit* of works meeting you every where; and so great are these merits, and so great is the ability of fallen human nature to keep and more than keep the divine law, that some succeed in amassing a treasure of good works which far more than cancels the claims of God upon their obedience and services; a treasure which, by a strange figment, the Church can use for the benefit of those whose works fall short of the divine requirements. If this be the gospel, Christ died in vain. And if the justification of the sinner is by works, then the apostles were false witnesses, for they every where testify that it is not by works, but freely through the grace of Christ that we are saved.

Again, the primitive Church was taught and believed that their acceptance with God was solely through the mediation of Christ, through whom alone they had access by one Spirit unto the Father. Rome, on the contrary, interposes a multitude of mediators between the sinner and the Saviour, on whose advocacy her people are taught to place an implicit reliance, and whose good offices and loving favor they are taught to invoke, paying them the worship which is due only to God. As the first is true, as an acceptance with God is solely through Christ, the last is false.

Then again: In the primitive Church, the doctrine of the new birth, or regeneration by the Holy Spirit, was taught and believed. The new creature was God's own workmanship, in which he replaced on the subject of it his own lost image. And the external rite of baptism was but a symbol or type of the effectual working of the Holy Spirit in this new creation. Rome, on the contrary, believes and teaches that the external rite of baptism is but a synonym of the new creation, and that, when duly administered, it is effectual in cleansing all those to whom it is applied from their original guilt and from their actual transgressions. The *opus operatum* principle, the merest materialistic figment that vain man ever imagined, secures this result, not only as to baptism, but as to any other ordinance of God's house, and confers on her priesthood the power of transmitting to their successors the authority which they claim for themselves. But

the Holy Spirit has revealed that his children—his sons—are “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” (John i. 13.) Here is taught a doctrine as widely variant from that of Rome as it is possible for the mind to conceive.

In like manner, we might pass in review a multitude of other variations from “the rites and laws” of the primitive Church; but, as their “name is legion,” these, for the present, must suffice as specimens of the rest. If we turn now to the prophetic history, as given by Christ and his apostles, we shall find “the growth,” “the development,” to correspond, in every particular, with the foreshadowings of divine inspiration. In the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, fourth chapter, we are told that “the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith;” and this departure has been shown in the specimens already exhibited. Another specification of this departure is their “forbidding to marry:” the prophecy fulfilled in the enforced celibacy of the clergy. Another is their “commanding to abstain from meats:” of which every Friday and every Lent in the Papal communion is proof. Timothy was further warned “to refuse profane and old wives’ fables.” And of such fables the “developed” Church has been exceedingly prolific. In the First Epistle of John, second chapter, he speaks of that antichrist that shall come, and “even now,” he says, “are there many antichrists;” v. xviii. It cannot be expected that Rome will remain at ease when she is designated as the antichrist of the Scriptures, and with an air of triumph she replies that the antichrist of the Scriptures is described as “denying the Father and the Son,” (v. 22.,) which cannot apply to her, as she recognises in her creed the trinity in unity. While this is true, she may practically deny the Father and the Son in their relations in the plan of redemption. Holding, as we do, the equality of the Son to the Father, it has still ever sounded in our ears rather like Sabellianism than orthodoxy, when the mother of our Saviour is called “the mother of God,” or when it is said that “God died for our sins.” But this is the common language of Romanists, applying it even to the bread of the

eucharist, calling it "the body of God." If in these expressions there be not a virtual denial of the Father and the Son, there is a denial of both Father and Son by usurping the authority of God—countermanding what he has enjoined, and enjoining what he has positively forbidden. The first illustration is in her prohibiting the Scriptures from being read, and the next in her nullifying the second commandment. And who but antichrist could do either the one or the other?

We come now to the prophetic history in Second Thessalonians, second chapter, which foretells that the coming of Christ—that second coming "without sin unto salvation," which is the Christian's hope—will not occur, "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition," etc., etc. As reviewers, we need only indicate the chapter, deeming it unnecessary to refer to the commentators—for they are many—who have illustrated it by showing an exact correspondence between the graphic delineations of the apostle and the Papal hierarchy.

But, as we have much matter to be disposed of before we conclude this essay, we must defer any further notice of the prophetic developments, which were in their "germ," even in the days of the apostles. Most of the variations which we have noticed are admitted by the advocates of Rome, but they are much more significant than they may suppose. For they include plain and palpable departures from the gospel—departures from its order, its discipline, its rites, its doctrines, and its ordinances; and hence it is preposterous that we, who totally eschew all such variations, should derive our "title to minister to Christians' souls" from such a source. Let her demand it, if she will. Let her insist that we must have her "continuous, external, historical" testimony from the days of the apostles, with her seal of approval affixed to it—what, we ask, is that testimony worth? What continuity can there be in a Church which has so far departed from the faith? Even could the continuity be established beyond a doubt, were there no broken links in the chain from St. Peter to Pope Pius the IX., we ask again, what is this historical testimony worth, passing, as it must, through Liberius

and Vigilius and Honorius, and a multitude of other Popes equally infamous? It is, in fact, of no greater value than traditional testimony from apocryphal sources, which the overcredulous may receive as unquestionable, because they have neither the means, nor the capacity, nor the disposition to test it.

But we have a much better witness at hand, always open, always accessible, always giving the same utterances, never varying, never contradicting itself—a witness which the weakest and the wisest can hear and understand alike. It is God's own infallible word, which testifies that "if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine,"—*i. e.*, the gospel in its purity and truth,—“receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.” (2 John 10, 11.) Here we find an express prohibition to give any countenance to the corrupters of the gospel; and much more does it prohibit us from receiving ordination at their hands.

Let it be remembered that the great Head of the Church, who, after his resurrection, called Paul to the apostolate, has never remitted, never laid aside, never intrusted to man his supreme authority, but has continued to call by his word and Spirit his ministering servants and to assign them their work to do. And when has the Spirit ever failed to bear his testimony to those whom he has thus called—his testimony to themselves and his testimony to others, by making them instrumental in “the perfecting of the saints,” and in “edifying the body of Christ,” which is the Church? As tests and as a matter of external order, nothing is more proper or becoming than that they should be examined and tried as to their experimental knowledge of the gospel, as to their motives, their moral character, their intellectual qualifications, and their aptness to teach; and that this examination be conducted by approved members of the Church. And if satisfaction is given on all these points, nothing is more proper than that they should be set apart to their work publicly and by appropriate rites. But these external rites are by no means the channels of grace. What can be more simple than ordination conducted in this form? What can be more in accordance

with the institutions of the gospel? And if the ordained be worthy of the office which they bear, they will commend themselves to the consciences of God's people by their fruits—"For by their fruits ye shall know them." What if they cannot trace their lineage, through channels of deep corruption and apostasy, backward to some remote past, where the severed chain cannot be mended? They have a better title, a far better, in the witness of the Spirit bearing testimony with their spirits, and in the seals which he gives to their ministry. This is the witness of their being sent to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the higher the office, the nearer heaven; that

"A saint in crape is twice a saint in lawn:"

that the authority to minister in holy things, to be valid, must pass in succession through channels unknown to the gospel—through popes, cardinals, metropolitans, patriarchs, or priests, who have not themselves even a *titular* right, from anything which the gospel reveals, to the offices which they severally bear. Neither by the teachings of the Saviour, nor by the practice of the apostles, nor by the spirit of primitive Christianity, is there furnished the slightest ground for such a claim. The claim is preposterous. Look for a moment at the occupants of the Papal throne, and especially upon those who, in the pride of their hearts, have set their feet upon the necks of kings and claimed for themselves universal dominion. How unlike to the meek and lowly Jesus! How unlike Peter or Paul! And must we derive from them our authority to preach the gospel? Is this the historical testimony which either the Church or the world demands to impart validity to the ministerial office? "Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon!"

There is, besides, more than ordinary significance in the injunction, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins." (Rev. xviii. 3.) The context of this historico-prophetic command clearly implies that there would arise a catholic or universal Church, so exceedingly corrupt as to imperil the spiritual life of God's people who were in the midst of

her. "All nations have drunk of the wine," etc., shows its universality, its corruption, and its doom. And when it is said, "Come out of her, my people," it implies that in this universal fold, embracing "all nations," some were left who had not departed from the faith, as Lot in Sodom, and as the seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, when the prophet thought that he was the only witness for God among all that people. If, then, the command be obeyed, as it was more than three centuries ago by not a few, it is preposterous to require her signature to the warrant of those who are called to the ministry. And it is just as futile as it is preposterous. For she will not recognise her own signature to the warrant of those who have departed from her communion. If she confers any gifts or any rights by her ordination or her induction into the ministerial office, she annuls and obliterates them all, when she excommunicates; and as she excommunicates all Protestants, the successionists of the Anglo-Catholic Church have no better title than their fellow-Protestants of other communions. And therefore we hold her blessing and her curse, her ordination and excommunication, equally nugatory. The Pope had no more authority to excommunicate Luther than had Luther to excommunicate the Pope.

The great conflict of Christianity from the beginning has been a conflict with error, and this conflict has turned chiefly upon principles. If the principles of any man, or of any body of men, be not in accordance with the revealed will of God, and more especially if their principles are subversive of the gospel, we are solemnly bound, on all fitting occasions, to bear our testimony against them. Nor is it any departure from true Christian charity to give publicity to this testimony, to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It matters not what may be the semblance of piety in those whose principles we know to be false; what the devotion, the zeal, the works—all good in their place when rightly directed and in the right spirit, but insuring heaven to none whose principles are essentially wrong. Who more regular or more fervent in their devotions than the Pharisees of old, or who more zealous than

they, or who could boast of more works of benevolence? And yet none of these things withheld the meek and lowly Jesus from a public exposure of their principles and of their hypocrisy, the fruit of their principles. But we need not argue this point, which it would be easy to establish by a thousand familiar examples. Such, indeed, is the tendency of corrupt human nature, that the exposure of wrong principles leads to one or another of two results: either their abandonment, to be replaced by right principles,—and this gives to the gospel its fruit as “a savor of life unto life;” or their exposure rivets these principles more firmly upon the heart, becoming worse instead of better, and ending in proving “a savor of death unto death.” The Provincial Letters of Pascal, for example, in which he exposed the principles of Jesuit morality, may have had both of these effects. It may have been one of the instruments which led to their expulsion from the main kingdoms of Europe, and to the temporary suppression of the Order. But we have never learned that these Letters had any effect upon the Order itself of a reformatory character, terminating in the disavowal of their false principles, or in the laying aside of their enmity to the doctrines of grace. The reinstated Order is perhaps more bitter and uncompromising and erroneous than ever. Many a time Rome has seen the necessity of reform, and has labored hard to effect it, but without success. In the Tridentine Council, much the larger part of its records are occupied with this general subject; but as she struck not at the root, as her principles were retained, unaltered and unalterable—*semper et ubique*—save in a further development of her antagonism to the principles of the gospel, she stands now where she stood then, only a little more mature in her errors than she was when the Reformers of the sixteenth century uttered and maintained their solemn protest against her.

But what of Protestantism? Is it what it was in by-gone days? what it was in its youth and vigor and early manhood, when it marshalled its forces to battle with consummate skill, never surrendering its ground, and, though comparatively weak in numbers, achieving remarkable victories over her most puissant foe? What is it now? It is in a sad, a hopeless plight, if

we may believe a late distinguished prelate of the Papal Church. Let us remember that *fas est et ab hoste doceri*; and as we read, let us look well to our armor, and resolve, as our fathers did, to trust alone to "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

"Protestantism," says Archbishop Hughes, "is drifting, or rather has drifted, in all directions from its primeval and central moorings. True, it still professes to cling to the Bible as its anchor; but thread by thread and twist by twist, its friends have been rending the cable by the strength of which it supposed itself riding in safety. The Bible among Protestants has been a common anchor for religious error, as well as for religious truth. Accordingly, when we reflect on the success with which Mormonism, Millerism, and other extravagances, have recently appealed to Protestantism for sympathy and sustenance, we are forced to conclude that, so far as the truth of revelation and religion are concerned, the Protestant mind has been weakened by the successive shocks which it has had to undergo, and is wearing down by the daily abrasions and attritions to which it is exposed between the bold enunciation of religious error, claiming a biblical sanction, on one side, and the ambiguous, timid, and stammering defence of religious truth, on the other. It began its own unhappy career by rejecting "the cloud by day;" and having thus violated the condition on which the privilege of guidance was vouchsafed to man by pitying heaven, the 'pillar of fire by night' has equally disappeared from its vision. If the Protestant mind be itself thus debilitated and defenceless, how can it protect Christianity against the stealthy and subtle approaches of the passion-god which the spirit of error is now introducing among men—to be worshipped under the name of 'Humanity?'"*

We introduce our comments upon this extract by sincerely thanking the Archbishop for manifesting a much juster discrimination than writers of his school are wont to exhibit. He has not, as they generally do, made Protestantism answerable for the errors of "Mormonism and Millerism, and other extravagances."

* See Introduction to "Religion in Society, by Abbe Martinet," vol. i., p. 6.

He has only represented these errorists as appealing to Protestantism "for sympathy and sustenance." And again we thank him for the implied admission that Protestantism is the defender of religious truth, with this single exception, that it has rejected "the cloud by day"—the Catholic Church—under whose guidance alone there is safety. And we thank him once more for the graphic sketch which he has given us of the Charybdis through which our *weakened* craft is still *drifting*, with its perils on the right hand and its perils on the left. And being thus forewarned by one of the most vigilant and skilful of our opponents, it will be our own fault if we do not return at once to our original moorings.

There is a familiar optical illusion which may serve to illustrate the actual position both of the observed and the observer. As in a drifting craft the observer may be insensible of his own progress, while he fancies all he sees to be moving in a contrary direction, so may it be with Protestantism. It may be drifting fast and far, while its friends think it firm as the everlasting hills. So possibly, from the archbishop's point of view, himself on a craft which has drifted to an immense distance from the primeval harbor, and is still drifting with amazing rapidity, as the *variations* and *developments* already noticed abundantly prove, he may imagine his faith a fixture, stable as the rock of ages, and Protestantism as floating, while the reverse may be true. But let not Protestantism be tempted to remissness by this illustration; let it rather correct its illusions by a steadfast and uncompromising adherence to its principles.

That religious error should "claim a biblical sanction," is "no new thing under the sun." The arch-tempter himself resorted to that artifice in his assault upon the "Son of Man," and was completely foiled by the same weapon in the hands of his victor. The Pharisees and the Sadducees relied constantly upon Scripture to sustain them in their opposition to the teaching and claims of the Saviour; and it was always by Scripture that they were discomfited and finally silenced. And who were they but the advocates of "religious error," who, in the days of the apostles, "wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction?" The Judaiz-

ing teachers all did it. And though the Bible is a proscribed book in the "Catholic Church," we have never yet met a layman of that communion who had not Scripture at command to support his faith. We never once heard them appeal to "the authority of the Church," but always to "the authority of God." Their obedience to the authority of the Church was always the result of what they had been taught to believe was scriptural authority. But when these authorities conflict, as they often do, what umpire is to decide the questions between them? Is it reason? Is it philosophy? Is it common sense? All these, like the witnesses at the trial of the Saviour, as they cannot agree among themselves, compel us to look elsewhere for an authority which is supreme and infallible. And as the authority of Rome is, at the best, a very questionable matter, though she claims it for herself; and as she has not yet drifted so far as positively to deny the authority of Scripture, there remains no other umpire—no other umpire that is supreme and infallible—but the Bible itself, in the conflict between truth and error.

The archbishop well knew that this was the umpire to which the Protestantism of the sixteenth century constantly appealed in its contest with Rome; and he well knew that it was by these appeals to the authority of Scripture alone that it gained many conquests over principalities and powers and prejudices, and prescription and pride and self-interest, and the customs and usages of many generations. And it would have been a wonder passing strange, if, in all things, it had strictly adhered to the Protestant principle: for the Reformers were but men, naturally fallible as other men, subject to like passions and prejudices. And it was no easy task for them to throw off at once all rites, all laws, all doctrines, all customs and usages, for which they could not find an explicit warrant in the word of God, and to substitute in their place the simple rites and ordinances of the gospel. Amid all the temptations, both from within and without, to swerve from the faith, we look back with wonder and gratitude at their achievements—so great, so scriptural in most respects, and presenting in so remarkable a degree "the marrow and the fatness of the gospel," not only the letter but the

spirit of primitive Christianity. It was the inner life, more than the outward work, that gave to the Reformation its distinctive and exalted character—the faith, the hope, the peace, the joy, both living and dying, so widely extended, proving it to be pre-eminently the work of God.

But the Protestantism of the Reformation had its imperfections—imperfections which have cleaved to it until now. In the primitive Church, there was a complete severance between the Church and the world. “Come out from among them, and be ye separate,” was an injunction which was literally obeyed by the churches which the apostles planted. But as in the Roman, so in Protestant Churches—the severance between the Church and the world, if made at all, was very incomplete. And under national establishments, the Protestantism, especially of Europe, has been groaning, shorn of its chief strength from that day to this. And even in this land, where no such unnatural and unscriptural union legally exists, the influence of this false principle is seen in the truckling subserviency which the courts of the Church have sometimes paid to “the powers that be.” To honor them is right, to obey them is right, when this obedience violates no law of God. But Christ never gave to his Church any politico-ecclesiastical authority to decide for his people to whom civil allegiance is due, and to punish them for disobedience to their behests. *

The slightest glance at the history of Protestantism clearly shows the sad effects of such a union. The Protestantism of the Anglican Church, with her papal liturgy, is but half Protestant—if it can claim as much as half. The Protestantism of the continental Churches, relying, as its ministry do, upon State patronage for their support, is but a weak and decrepid offspring of

* It would not be difficult for the Northern General Assembly to find precedents in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the acts to which we of the South have objected. For “there are recorded in its books,” says the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1849, p. 473, “several prosecutions of parties suspected of rebellion, or of harboring rebels in 1715; and on many public occasions it assumed much more the tone of an estate of the realm than merely a court of the Church.”

its hale and sturdy progenitors. And even the Protestantism of Scotland is less vigorous and manly than it would have been but for the *regium donum*,—"the loaves and the fishes,"—after which the Free Church even has had a hankering ever since it severed its connexion with the State in 1843.* And we very much question whether Protestantism in France has not lost more, much more, than it has gained by the edict of Napoleon I., which gave the same right to Protestant as to Roman Catholic ministers to draw upon the public treasury. Prior to the revocation of the edict of Nantes, Protestantism, though oppressed and persecuted, was a power in France which it has never since been; and from some recent reports we fear that it is on the decline.

But, instead of being discouraged by such a survey, let us return at once to our original moorings, and if "thread by thread and twist by twist" of the cable which was our security in past times has been undone or broken, we may take consolation in the belief that they are not undone and broken beyond repair. We may still "hope in God's word." But hope implies desire, expectation, patience, and joy. With this anchor sure and steadfast, and with "the word of God" as its foundation, drift who may and when they may, Protestantism, if true to its principles, is safe. But it is bastard and not true Protestantism

*The General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland is opened by the Queen's Commissioner, and as it cannot sit but about a week, it appoints a Commission to complete its unfinished business. In our General Assembly of 1855, a strenuous effort was made to engraft this feature of the Scotch Church upon ours, for the trial of judicial cases; but it was put to rest by the report of the Judicial Committee, and has never been heard of since. The *regium donum* is a Crown gift of £2,000 a year, which the Assembly of the Established Church very thankfully receives; and for this and other favors from the State, she suffers the civil tribunals to interfere in her ecclesiastical affairs—such as the induction of ministers into churches whom the people would exclude. The Free Church, though protesting against this interference and separating from the Establishment on that ground, has shown a strong desire, notwithstanding, to participate in the royal bounty. But if they should receive it, would they be any longer free? Governmental interference has invariably followed, sooner or later, governmental gifts.

which extends either sympathy or sustenance to religious error, though it comes clothed as "an angel of light." And here is our great danger. It is the great danger which true Christianity has always had to encounter. The march of the foe is always stealthy and subtle, whenever he would tempt us by art, or by music, or by philosophy, or by reason, or by humanity, or by any of his thousand other devices, to give place for a moment to any substitute for the only "lamp to our feet" and the only "light to our path" which "pitying heaven has vouchsafed to man." We have said that our hope is in God's word; but this word, to avail us, must be sealed to the understanding and the heart by the power of the Holy Ghost. This word, thus applied, though the "Protestant mind" may seem now weakened, and its defences of the truth "ambiguous and timid and stammering," will yet grind into powder every authority that exalteth itself against it, be it the "passion-god," or be it the power—"the growth of ages"—which affects to hold at its disposal the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN STUDY.

Bishop Butler maintains "that *the present world is peculiarly fit to be a state of discipline for our improvement in virtue and piety.*" He frankly admits, however, that very few avail themselves of the opportunities it affords. "Indeed," says he, "the present state is so far from proving, in event, a discipline of virtue to the generality of men, that, on the contrary, they seem to make it a discipline of vice." Here is a grave difficulty. He removes it in the following way: "But that the present world does not actually become a state of moral discipline to many, even to the generality—*i. e.*, that they do not improve or grow better in it—cannot be urged as a proof that it was not intended