



THE GIFT OF
THE TAPPAN PRESBY-
TERIAN ASSOCIATION



105

PRELACY DISCUSSED,

OR A

BOOK FOR BATAVIANS.

BY B. SUNDERLAND.

OMNIA EXPLORATE: BONUM TENETE—1st Thess. 5: 21.

BUFFALO:
PRESS OF C. FAXON.
1848.

COPY RIGHT SECURED.

Göft

Tappan Pres. Ass.

12-31-1931

Prelatist. Then you do not think that our Church is "*The Church.*"

Pastor. By no means—the question is rather whether it be *A Church.*

CONVERSATIONS OF THE EVENING.

27-52-1100

BY
670
.S96

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Inscription, - - - - -	7
Preface, - - - - -	9
Introduction, - - - - -	11
Correspondence, - - - - -	35
Chapter I.—Rules of Discussion, - - - - -	169
Chapter II.—Prelatical Mode of Reasoning, - - - - -	170
Chapter III.—Concessions, - - - - -	170
Chapter IV.—Prelatical Orthodoxy, - - - - -	174
Chapter V.—A Boast, - - - - -	175
Chapter VI.—Mosheim's Authority, - - - - -	176
Chapter VII.—The Age of the Episcopal Church, - - - - -	176
Chapter VIII.—Prelacy not Republican but Monarchical, - - - - -	177
Chapter IX.—Alliance of Church and State, - - - - -	178
Chapter X.—A Beautiful Illustration, - - - - -	179
Chapter XI.—Motives for preferring Episcopacy, - - - - -	180
Chapter XII.—“The true Point at Issue,” - - - - -	181
Chapter XIII.—To the Reader, - - - - -	182
Final Note to Mr. Bolles, - - - - -	184

JWB

NOTE.

Perhaps it is but just to myself to say that, save the first few pages of this volume, I have not seen the proof-sheets, which may account for such typographical and other errors as appear in the body of the work. On a cursory survey I find the following

ERRATA.

Page 36, line 8, for "whether" read "what." Line 15, for "what" read "what and why."

Page 40, the list of books although *the same* is not I believe given in the *same order* as sent to Mr. B.

Page 45, line 5, for "deaconate" read "diaconate."

Page 48, line 30, for "at once" read "above."

Pages 59-60. Several mistakes occur in this list of authors and books, owing to the blindness of the manuscript, from which the compositor was unable to detect the orthography of the names. Some alterations were made after a portion of the impressions had been struck off. The errors, however, will easily be corrected by those who are generally familiar with the Prelatical works now extant.

Page 67, line 19, for "outset" read "in the outset."

Page 79, line 34, for "three-fold" read "the three-fold."

Page 81, line 3, for "eactly" read "exactly."

Page 100, line 24, for "will" read "well."

Page 129, line 2, for "such arts. I shall" read "such arts, I shall."

Page 176, line 25, for "obligations," read "oblations."

INSCRIPTION.

To the people of the town and vicinity of Batavia, with their permission, this little volume is most respectfully inscribed, as a partial token of the sincere gratitude and high regard of one who has received so many kindnesses at their hands, and among whom his labors in the cause of Christian truth and charity are, however humbly, still most cordially expended.

The elements in this offering furnished by another well known among us, entitle him to a just mention in this connection. If anything he has done shall contribute to create a livelier interest, in the pages which follow, surely, on this account, let there be awarded to him the laurel and the palm.

B. SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, 1848.

PREFACE.

It can scarcely be necessary, at the present day, to enter into a formal defence of a publication of this kind. Suffice it to say, that to my mind reasons do exist why this volume should be issued. The public, after reading it, *may* come, it is true, to a different conclusion. In that case, as I assume the responsibility, so I must abide the result. There are a few things, however, which appear to me very plain.

1. The *right* to publish a work of this kind will not be denied. The same *right* is accorded to others, whosoever may choose, in like circumstances.

2. The *necessity* as well as the *expediency* of the publication, *may* be differently adjudged by different minds, according to the point of view in which the subject is considered, or the grounds upon which or the spirit in which their opinions may be formed.

3. The *motives* of the publication will doubtless be variously surmised, according to the degree of partizanship felt by different individuals. It is but natural to anticipate such wide extremes of criticism as usually fall on all polemic writings of sufficient consequence to attract the public notice at all. Yet none of these things move me. Pursuing an even course and ready to meet the results of this publication, I hope to be able in every vicissitude to bear myself courteous to all, affable towards those who smile, equable towards those who frown.

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

BATAVIA, 1848.

INTRODUCTION.

A brief narration of the origin and progress of this volume may perhaps here be necessary both to explain the connection of the several parts, and to give an intelligible view of the whole.

In the fore part of December, 1846, the Rev. James A. Bolles, Rector of St. James Church, in this village, sent me through the Postmaster, Capt. Frederick Follet, a copy of the Journal of the ninth annual Convention of the Diocese of Western New York, which Journal contains an *address* of the Bishop of this Diocese to the members of the Convention. To show the spirit and character of this address, I will here make some quotations from it, referring the reader, at the same time, to the published Journal itself.

To exhibit first the *petty distinctions* which the Prelatists love to keep up, I take an extract from the records of Dr. De Lancey's official acts ; p. 24 of the Journal. He says—

“On the 4th, (that is, of June, 1846,) in St. Thomas church, *Bath*, I preached and confirmed *ten* persons.

I preached in the Methodist Chapel at *Hornellsville*, on the afternoon of the 8th, and confirmed *two* persons.

I preached on the 8th at the Presbyterian House at *Cuba*.

On the 9th, in St. Stephen's church, *Olean*.”

And so in several other instances, there is observable a studied carefulness on the part of the Rev. Dr. in the use of the terms “Church,” “house,” “chapel.” I suppose he intends to preserve what he imagines the right application of these terms, at the expense of the courtesy due to the hospitality of the “schismatics.” Rhetoric with some people certainly seems of more consequence than gratitude.

Again, to illustrate the degree of *self-complacency* which Prelatists indulge, as well as to show *their views* of many who oppose their pretensions, I take an extract from Dr. De Lancey's address, p. 39 of the Journal.

"The obvious and deplorable ignorance of many who assail the Church, in regard to some of the most important points of Christian truth and order, and their frequent and indiscriminate mixture of sound Gospel truth and Church doctrine with Romish error, and even infidel sentiment, as the object of attack, should convince the laity of the utter incapacity of many of her assailants to form a right judgment of her position and prospects, should inspire them with a firmer confidence in the long-trying guides by whom they have hitherto been led in the ways of truth and peace."

One would suppose that the charge of "obvious and deplorable ignorance," against any opposer of Prelacy, might have satisfied the Rev. Dr. in his animadversions upon those who are so unfortunate as in any respect to feel themselves obliged to look through a different pair of spectacles from his own. But this is not enough. He must cap the climax by insinuating their "utter incapacity of understanding!" And because these poor people are so blind and imbecile as not even to have a *capacity* to comprehend the position and prospects of "*the Church*," therefore her members ought to put a firmer confidence in their "*long-trying guides*," as much as to say that the *laity* of the P. E. Church are either more intelligent than other men, or else more grossly credulous. But the latter part of the extract, in my judgment, discloses full as much danger to *the laity* from *within*, as any which may be disposed to assail them from *without*. If there is anything really to be feared by the *lay* devotees of Prelacy, it is a blind and passive obedience to the clergy. I heard once of a young lady saying, "I will take care of my body, and my Bishop must take care of my soul!" If this is the idea which "*the laity*" have of religion and Church doctrines, it seems to me to be a great pity that they cannot be better informed. And these "*long-trying guides*," who are they, or what are they? Anything which instructs men differently from the teachings of the Holy Ghost and the word of God, surely cannot be a safe guide for any man in matters of re-

ligion, however long it may have been *tried*. Ministers of the Cross are only to be followed, so long as they preserve a strict conformity to the directions of the word and Spirit of God. It devolves on "the laity," not exactly to cloak themselves up in a fancied security, blindly giving up the keeping of their souls to priests and prelates—but soberly to judge for themselves both in regard to their personal standing before God, and in respect to the soundness of faith, and the holiness of life of their religious teachers. Hence a little space should be allowed for the play of private judgment. Leaving the commandments and ordinances of men, the closer we cling to the Bible, the better.

"Praeclarissimus Liber ! nobis vox Dei !"

Once more to unfold the *peculiar doctrines* of the Prelatists, and the ingenuity and skill, not to say the Jesuitism with which their tenets are put forth, I refer to that part of the Journal, pp. 42–46, where the Rev. Dr. goes on to give an account of what *Puseyism is not*. It occurred to me while reading it, to ask what *Puseyism is*? I suppose Puseyism to be the doctrines which Dr. Pusey teaches. If he teaches such doctrines as

1. Tradition and Scripture for the Rule of Faith.
2. The surrender of private judgment to the Judgment of the Church.
3. The claims of the Church of England, as they hold it, to the Apostolical succession of the ministry.
4. The sole right of their ministers to administer the word and Sacraments of the Church.
5. Veneration of the priests on account of their *office*, whatever may be their *character*.
6. The Sacraments the principal means of salvation.
7. Spiritual Regeneration by water baptism.
8. Justification, Sanctification, and all spiritual blessings communicated in the rite of water baptism.
9. The real presence of Christ in the symbols of the Lord's Supper.
10. The denial of the atonement and righteousness of Christ as a ground of Justification.
11. The sacrifice of the Mass.

12. Purgatory.
13. Veneration for images, relics, &c.
14. Invocation of unseen beings as intercessors.
15. More attention paid to forms and ceremonies, and
16. The mystical interpretation of Scripture.

I say, if Dr. Pusey holds forth such doctrines as these for the adoption of the Church of England, then I think it is fair to combine them together, and dignify them with the name of *Puseyism*.

Nor can I shake at once from my mind the idea of a palpable resemblance between the twenty-two tenets laid down by Dr. DeLancey, and the twenty-two insisted on by the Puseyites. True they are arranged in a somewhat different form, and couched in language more cautious and conciliating; but many fragments of the stubborn skeleton are there, and it requires no very close observation to discern them. For example, how much alike do these articles appear!

PUSEYITES.

TENET I.

“Tradition, primitive and catholic must be connected with Scripture in forming the Rule of Faith.”

TENET II.

“Individuals should make a surrender of their private judgment to the judgment of the Church.”

TENET III.

“The Church of England can claim an apostolical succession of ministers, who receive in ordination Apostolic Grace.”

“The Holy Ghost dwells in the clergy, passing to them in ordination, and this is called Apostolical or Episcopal Grace.”

TENET IV.

“The Episcopal clergy, as ministers of the Apostolical suc-

DE LANCEY.

ARTICLE 8.

“It is *not* Puseyism to maintain that the authority of Holy Scripture is *supreme*, and that in the *interpretation* of it in regard to disputed passages, we are to rely for aid, not on views of modern commentators, or our own private fancies, or the declarations of any branch of the existing church, but on the views of the fathers of the first three centuries, as being nearest to the fountain of truth.”

ARTICLE 1.

“It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate Episcopacy as a Divine institution, obligatory on the conscience of Christian people, as well as eminently expedient and conservative.”

ARTICLE 2.

“It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate the doctrine of an outward commission as well as an inward call to the ministry—

PUSEYITES.

cession, have the sole right to administer the Word and the Sacraments."

TENET V.

"The Episcopal Church, such as is the Church of England, is the only true Apostolical Church."

TENET VI.

"We are not to expect that the Word and Sacraments will be effectual out of the Episcopal Church."

TENET VII.

"The Church has the gift of blessing and hallowing the rites and ceremonies which it has decreed."

TENET VIII.

"To the priests of the Church belongs veneration in their ministration of blessings, prayers, and absolution, on account of their *office as priests*, whatever be their *character as men*."

DE LANCEY.

the outward commission reaching us in this day through a succession of Bishops, commencing with the Apostles, and hence called the Apostolic succession."

ARTICLE 6.

"It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate the Apostolic origin, the scriptural authority, and the primitive sanction of a three-fold ministry in the Church of Christ, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, the unvarying existence of which the preface to the Ordinal declares to be evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors."

ARTICLE 2.

"It is not Puseyism to preach to the people that the Lord Jesus Christ established a Church here on earth, ordained a mode of initiation, appointed a ministry, supplied it with sacraments, enjoined the maintenance of its unity, and declared its perpetuity in the avowal that the gates of Hell should not prevail against it, and to expound faithfully and truly the nature, claims, rights and prerogatives of the Church of Christ."

ARTICLE 19.

"It is not Puseyism in seeking to promote the glory of God and the good of men, to sustain by our patronage, our prayers and our contributions, the institutions of the Church, in preference to amalgamating with our brethren of surrounding sects in such enterprises of benevolence as lead of necessity to a surrender of principle, or the promotion of schism, disunion, and disputes, and hence, that our own missions, seminaries, colleges and schools and various Church

PUSEYITES.

TENET IX.

"The Sacraments are the principal means of salvation, are effectual to salvation, and are generally necessary to it."

TENET X.

"In the baptismal ordinance of water there are communicated also 'the Spirit,' and spiritual regeneration."

TENET XI.

"Justification takes place in Baptism."

TENET XII.

"Sanctification takes place in Baptism."

TENET XIII.

"All spiritual blessings are connected with baptism."

TENET XIV.

"Justification includes *inherent* righteousness as well as *imputed*, and rather depends on the former than the latter."

TENET XV.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper not only shows forth the Lord's death, and is commemorative of it, but actually imparts *life* to the soul."

DE LANCEY.

objects pre-eminently claim all our zeal and liberality."

ARTICLE 4.

"It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate that there is grace in the Christian Sacraments, they being 'outward visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace.'"

ARTICLE 3.

"It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate the doctrine that in baptism 'we are born again of water and of the Spirit,' according to our Lord's declaration, which doctrine is denominated Baptismal Regeneration."

ARTICLE 7.

"It is not Puseyism to maintain and enforce as the truth of God's holy Word, that the sinner is justified *meritoriously* by the merits of Christ, *instrumentally* by faith, *conditionally* by repentance, faith, and obedience and *sacramentally* by baptism, 'which also doth now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' 'in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.'"

ARTICLE 9.

"It is not Puseyism to maintain and inculcate that the spiritual and eternal salvation of men is to be promoted by the faithful and steady, and persevering *use of the means of grace appointed by Christ*, and not by a system of revivals, protracted meetings, and anxious seats, of man's devising and modern origin."

ARTICLE 5.

"It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate that Christ is *spiritually* present in the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,

PUSEYITES.

“Christ’s body and blood are really present in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, though not locally, and so present as to act upon and influence us.”

TENET XVII.

“The sacrifice of the Mass may be used, provided it be only commemorative, and not used for emolument.”

TENET XVIII.

“Purgatory of some kind may be admitted, though not the Romish Purgatory.”

REMARK.

Happily, so far as I know, the Puseyites do not set forth anything similar to the 16th article of Dr. De Lancey.

TENET XIX.

“Veneration for relics and images may be allowed, though not the Romish adoration.”

TENET XX.

“Invocation of unseen beings may be allowed, though not in

DE LANCEY.

in opposition to the Romanist’s doctrine, that he is *corporeally* present, by a change of the substance of the bread and wine into his body and blood.

And on the other hand, that this spiritual presence of Christ is real, though inexplicable, and hence denominated a mystery, in opposition to the views of those who would sink this sacrament into a mere memorial, without accompanying grace to the truly penitent, in which Christ is present only as we think of and pray to him.”

REMARK.

Happily, so far as I know, Dr. De Lancey has not as yet set forth anything similar to the 17th and 18th tenets of the Puseyites.

ARTICLE 16.

“It is not Puseyism to bow at the name of Jesus in the creed, that being a long standing mode of repudiating Socinianism in the recognition of the Scriptural prophecy that unto him every knee (and much more every head) should bow and every tongue confess, though not obligatory upon the clergy or the people.”

ARTICLE 18.

“It is not Puseyism to assert the claim of Protestants to the use of the Cross as an emblem of our holy faith in the ornamenting of our churches or our houses, repudiating the superstitious use of it, as we would the superstitious use of the blessed Bible, or of the Church edifice itself.”

ARTICLE 17.

“It is not Puseyism to open the Church for prayers on

PUSEYITES.

the Roman idolatrous sense.— They may be invoked as interceding though not as giving.”

DE LANCEY.

Wednesdays and Fridays, or Saint's Days, or every day in the week, the prayer-book having supplied us with a daily service for the whole year, as well as special services for holy days to commemorate important events and characters in the Christian History.”

TENET XXI.

“ We are to renew our attention to certain forms and ceremonies that have got into disuse, and consider them *as means of grace.*”

ARTICLE 14.

“ It is not Puseyism to make the interior arrangements of our church edifices, as to the number of aisles, the position of the desk and pulpit, the omission of the one or the other or both, the exclusion of them from the chancel, the location and form of the table or altar, and the situation of the font, comport with the convenience, size, and form of the building, or the means of the parish, or the taste of the people; architectural variety in all these particulars having ever prevailed in the Church.”

ARTICLE 15.

“ It is not Puseyism to use the surplice and gown in the celebration of the respective parts of divine service, as decent and appropriate garments, and to regard the former as more distinctly a Church garment than the latter, which is derived from the English universities.”

ARTICLE 18.

“ It is not Puseyism to observe the seasons of private fasting and prayer during the year, and especially during Lent, as means of subduing the flesh to the Spirit, inasmuch as our blessed Lord has in regard to both fasting and prayer given us an example, that we should follow his steps, and inasmuch as self-control, self-denial and self-sacrifices cannot well be effected without them.

PUSEYITES.

TENET XXII.

“Scripture must be interpreted more as mystical and allegorical.”

DE LANCEY.

REMARK.

A similar sentiment is in my view virtually contained in Article 8th of the Rev. Dr.'s enumeration of his Church doctrines.

Now, after this comparison we would simply suggest that it can make but little difference what names these tenets bear, and if, as the gentleman assures us in regard to his list of doctrines, they are adopted by the Church of England, and “were taught by her long before Dr. Pusey was born,” what matters it by whose authority, or under whose sanction *now* they are sought to be imposed upon the credulity of the people, whether on this or the other side of the Atlantic? The question with us *all* should be, are they supported by the Word of God?

A few further observations upon this portion of the address will complete for the present our exhibition of its character.

1. It will be seen that the Rev. Dr. states that it is *not* Puseyism, but a doctrine of the Church of England that *Episcopacy* is a divine institution. Now there are at least *two* kinds of Episcopacy, *Prelatical* and *Parochial*; which does he mean? If Parochial, that is one thing; if Prelatical, we *deny it to be divinely constituted!*

2. He says again that “a succession of Bishops, commencing with the Apostles, and hence called the Apostolic Succession,” is a doctrine of the Church and not Puseyism. Is this a perfectly true statement? Do not the Puseyites hold to such a succession? Look at their 3d Tenet. But what do they mean by Bishop? The term itself is ambiguous, as applied to the Christian ministry. There are at least *two kinds* of Bishops, Parochial and Prelatical. The question whether Dr. De Lancey's statement about the succession of Bishops is true or not, involves first a clear exposition of the import of the term Bishop, in the different periods of Church history. These bye and large statements amount to nothing except as we attach some specific meaning to them, according to some standard of the use of language.

It is said that this succession reaches down even to the present day, unbroken from the Apostles. But is it the fact

that this succession can be shown never to have been so broken as to destroy the argument which the Church of England employs in support of its exclusiveness? How for instance do they connect themselves with the succession to which they hold from the times of Henry VIII., when the whole Church of England, dignitaries and all, were excommunicated by the Church of Rome, (to which Church they had previously belonged,) and delivered over to perdition and the devil? The power from which they derived their authority, must certainly have been adequate, *on their own showing*, to deprive them of the authority with which they were invested by it. So that upon Prelatical principles of reasoning, the Church of England has been no Church, had no ministry, no ordinances, no sacraments, nothing pertaining to a true Church for the last three hundred years.

3. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as set forth by Dr. De Lancey in his 3d article, has always appeared to me to be a piece of *mysticism*. The passage of Scripture so often quoted from the 3d of John, has in my estimation no reference to the rite of water baptism. "Born of water and of the Spirit;"—there is no more allusion here to the *rite* of water baptism than to the act of individual bathing, washing or ablution. Nothing is said of *baptism*. The term "water" is here used according to a Scripture idiom, or by *metalepsis*, to denote and give intensity to the *one* idea of *cleansing* or *purification*. More than once we find this peculiarity of Holy Writ exemplified. (See Ezek. 36 : 24–27. Zech. 13 : 1. Matt. 3 : 11. Heb. 10 : 22.) Besides, how can the external application of water, *de facto*, have any tendency to cleanse the inward soul. The thing to me is an incongruity; and since we have one agent that is adequate, the Holy Spirit, why seek for another? It is a mere assumption then, to suppose John 3 : 5 to refer to the external rite of water baptism, as administered in the church. And there is no other passage in the Bible which can be relied on to sustain the Prelatical doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, if this cannot. So it must fall to the ground, as an unfounded dogma.

4. The doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist advanced in a succeeding article seems to me to be a *man of*

straw. The Dr. undertakes to steer between the Romanists on the one hand and Protestants on the other, a middle course which loses to him both company and perspicuity. He says Christ is present in the communion, yet *not corporeally* but *spiritually*, and yet *so spiritually* as to be *really* present, "contrary to the views of those who regard Christ as present only as we think of and pray to him." Does he mean that Christ is present in the pieces of bread and the swallows of wine used on that occasion; or what does he mean? Who can tell? Of this ordinance, Christ says, "This do in *remembrance* of me." And in Corinthians it is written, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." This seems to be the design of the communion. It is a *memorial*, and "Christ is present as we think of and pray to him." Were the corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be argued from his words, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," &c. the passage will prove too much and so destroy its force. What, we might ask, did Christ hand out his own body and blood, serving them up as a repast to his disciples, while yet talking with them, and exercising all the bodily functions that they did? Would he teach them to pursue a course so much like the cannibals of the South Seas! Besides, how could they have reconciled with this idea the evidence of their senses. They saw Christ in a bodily shape before them. They witnessed his words and actions, and yet on this interpretation, they were taking his veritable flesh and blood into their mouths! What becomes now of Christ's personal identity? He is *off* the table and *on* the table both at the same time! He is handing himself into the mouths of eleven men who are seated by or reclining at his side in the self-same instant? Now who will believe this? Prelates *may* but I cannot. I know that all the difficulties of the case *may* be referred to the Divine Omnipotence for a solution—but would not such an exercise of Almighty power furnish the strangest miracle ever known in this or any other world! The Son of God destroying his *personal identity*, transmuting his physical framework into bread and wine, and yet to all appearance remaining the same person who had with his friends but just

before taken of the Jewish passover! We think there is a simpler explanation of the passage, which much better answers the purposes of truth. Let it be conceived that the Savior is speaking according to a well known Hebrew idiom by which the symbol or emblem of a thing is often put for the thing itself, and the passage becomes perfectly plain. The import of it then is just this: "This 'bread' and this 'fruit of the vine' are the emblems or symbols of my body and blood." Christ no more means to say that the bread and wine were his veritable body and blood than he meant to say that Herod was a veritable *fox*! Yet this bread and this fruit of the vine are declared, at least by true-blue Papists, to be Christ's body and blood in a literal sense.

5. The doctrine of a three-fold ministry, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, set forth by the Dr. in his 6th article depends for its correctness mainly on what ideas are attached to the offices thus specified. If it is meant that Bishops are Pastors of single Churches or congregations, that Priests are ruling elders, (though I consider the term *priest* in itself a very improper designation for any portion of the Christian ministry, where mere men are concerned, under the Gospel dispensation,) that Deacons are simply those whose business it is to attend to the pecuniary matters of the Church, make provisions for her poor, and such like things, then doubtless such offices are of Apostolic origin, scriptural authority, and primitive sanction. Otherwise, *not*!

6. The article on Justification, while indeed it recognises the atonement of Christ as a meritorious ground of Justification, yet leaves the door open to a dangerous error, by teaching a *sacramental justification*. When people get the notion that all they have to do in order to be justified, is just to be baptised with water baptism, it is easy to put the less for the greater, to become deceived, and grow up and die in a delusion which is eternally fatal. Look at the tendencies of such opinions. See how far the Puseyites have already carried it. How long will it take for men this side the Atlantic to overtake their British brethren.

7. But the doctrine in reference to the interpretation of Scripture set forth in the 8th article is a little more than I

was prepared to find in any Journal published by Americans. Several ideas occurred to me on reading it. The Dr. under cover of a very skillful term virtually denies the right of private judgment. He defines the Scriptures to be the "fountain of truth," knows that we have the Bible in our hands, and the writings of learned historians to aid us, and still asserts that the fathers of the first three centuries were nearer this "fountain of truth" than ourselves. He tells us we must be governed by the opinions of "these fathers," while they are inaccessible to a large portion of the people, written in an unknown tongue, do not agree among themselves, were uninspired men, and on some accounts more liable to be mistaken than we are, and were only designed to be used by us as we would employ any other witness, with such abatement of their credibility as the circumstances demand. These counsels will never be followed but by such as are ready to surrender their self-respect, as rational, thinking and accountable beings.

8. It is somewhat amusing, after the side-long sneer, thrown out by the Rev. Dr. in his 9th article against "revivals, protracted meetings, and anxious seats," to compare with this his formal announcement in the 17th and 18th articles respecting opening the church on Saints' Days, and indeed every day in the week throughout the year, and especially during the season of Lent, for fasting and prayer. Here is a protracted meeting the year round, at least forty days in every year, receiving the high official sanction of a prelate, and yet when people of a different name assemble for religious purposes, the affair is termed "of man's devising and modern origin!" The devotees of Prelacy may give up every week (the Prayer Book makes provision for it as the Dr. tells us) to the recital of prayers and chaunts, to genuflexions and to diurnal sittings on *seats* which whether "anxious" or not, must certainly be very *laborious*, and prove a great "weariness to the flesh;" but when any arrangements out of the pale of "*the Church*," are made for those who are in mourning for their sins, a leer comes over the grave features of priests and prelates, and sinister and knowing glances play on the countenances of "*the laity*," as if they have too much wit and wisdom to be caught with godly sorrow in their hearts, upon an "anxious seat."

But to be a little more in earnest—by what authority does the Rev. Dr. speak of “revivals” as being of “man’s devising and of modern origin?” By what authority does he separate “revivals” from “the means of grace appointed by Christ?” Has he never read of the great revival under Ezra and Nehemiah—of the great revival at the day of Pentecost—of the great revivals in the times of the Apostles—of the great revival in the days of the Reformers—and of the great revivals in different parts of the world during the last three centuries? Has he never seen the prayer of David, Ps. 85 : 6, or that of Habakkuk 3 : 2, or the saying of Peter, Acts 3 : 19? Why does he scout then at “revivals,” as being “of man’s devising and modern origin?” Or has he no just appreciation of the dispensation of the Spirit, no clear apprehension of that glorious Agent by whom the kingdom of Christ is set up in this world? These are questions of solemn import, and he who will speak of *revivals of religion* as being “of man’s devising and modern origin,” betrays either gross ignorance or something worse.

Strictures might be drawn on several other items contained in the Address, as well as other matters in the Journal itself; but sufficient has been exhibited to show the nature of the document, and the likelihood of its raising the spirit of inquiry in my mind. I perused it with some care. It was the first article of the kind that had ever passed between Mr. Bolles and myself. Mr. Bolles afterwards, as will be seen in its proper place, insinuated that *I was offended* at his sending it. That I had some *cause* for *offence* is a proposition open to debate. But that *I was so in fact* is a very mistaken idea. On the contrary, I regarded it as *designed* to be an act of courtesy on the part of my Rev. friend, although perhaps exhibiting a little want of *genuine taste*, induced through either *ignorance* or *carelessness* as to what might be truly acceptable in our mutual relations. I was also pleased that now a proper occasion was afforded me, as I thought, to make some inquiries in regard to Prelatical tenets, and perhaps to obtain some information concerning *two or three dark places*, which with all my searching, I had never been able to obtain, and which I am compelled to say, painful as it is, after all the

efforts of Mr. Bolles to enlighten me, I do not now possess.

One thing was—

I never could see how the Prelatists could clearly and consistently maintain the doctrine of Prelatical Episcopacy. This has always been a *dark spot* to me.

Another thing was—

I never could see how the Prelatists could maintain by the authority of the Bible their exclusive ideas of the three-fold orders of the Christian ministry, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. This was always another *dark spot to me*.

And one more thing was—

I never had seen an unbroken list or catalogue of Ordainers from any Episcopal clergyman of this day, step by step, and man by man, in a direct line back to the Apostles, sustained by well authenticated history. This was what I wanted much to see, and because I never had been able to find it, the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, as held forth by the Prelatists, was always a *very dark spot to me*.

Furthermore, I had heard Mr. Bolles in conversation, observe that they were often misrepresented—that people frequently perverted their doctrines, and I thought it but fair to give him an opportunity to speak for himself. I wished him to explain his own doctrines in his own words. I thought this the likeliest way of preventing the misrepresentation of which he complained. I was bound too to acknowledge the reception of the Journal, and the written note which conveyed this usual expression of my obligations contained also three inquiries on the subjects to which allusion has already been made. I thought the language in Dr. De Lancey's address touching these three points, to be in itself ambiguous, although, of course, it is not to be supposed that I was entirely ignorant of the ideas which are commonly attached by Prelatists to the terms "Episcopacy," "Bishop," "Apostolic Succession."

To explain this ambiguity, as well as to obtain the long wanted information respecting the three aforesaid topics, and also to have the direct language of Mr. Bolles, I was induced to send the note already mentioned. Mr. Bolles seems to have treated me, as I have no doubt will be evident to my

one reading the correspondence, just as if I had previously to this time, (Dec. 15, 1846) known scarcely anything about either the doctrines or the defences of his Church. He might have been *honest* in this opinion, but certainly was *mistaken*. A person who has been through a regular course of Collegiate and Theological instruction, certainly ought not to be entirely ignorant of the general questions of Polemical Theology, or the outlines of Ecclesiastical History. All these he might understand and yet never have seen such a *list* as has been just before described. It was to find out then what I did not understand and not what I did—what I did not know and not what I did—what I had *not* seen and not what I had in regard to the three above-mentioned subjects, that I saw fit also to apply to Mr. Bolles.

Another mistake into which he finally fell was that he appeared to regard me as a kind of *pupil at large*, to be instructed by him on any or every subject which he might think best to introduce. This idea I resisted, as of course in duty bound, and it was on this point of difference between us that our correspondence upon the whole subject, both verbal and written, was finally closed.

In the continuation of this narrative, it will be proper to remark, that soon after sending my first note, and before receiving any written reply, Mr. Bolles sent me also through the post office, a copy of his educational address pronounced in the Court House of Genesee County, before an educational meeting called by the County Superintendant of Common Schools, and then just published by request. This pamphlet I read, and was generally much pleased with it. One paragraph in it, p. 13, attracted my particular attention, because of its peculiar aspect as uttered by one who claims that his Church is the only true Church of Christ in this land, (unless he might perhaps except the Romish Church) while he looks upon all other Churches around him as mere *sects*, no part of the Church of Christ. And this same idea, we have already seen, is most clearly conveyed in the 19th article of Dr. De Lancey's Address.

The paragraph in question occurring in the pamphlet of Mr. Bolles, is as follows: after making a quotation from one of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in

which the phrase "*general Christianity*," occurs, Mr. Bolles says in a note upon this phrase that "he acknowledges the difficulty in understanding what is meant by '*general Christianity*.' He denies the right of any body of men to separate the truths of God's holy word from each other, pronouncing some essential and others not, and extracting such parts as may suit their fancies ; he believes that the whole of this evil may be traced to the existence of *sects*, and that the blessings of a true Christian education can never be experienced in the world excepting to a limited degree, until *sectarianism* is renounced. But for so much of Christianity in our schools as this detestable 'ism' has left us he earnestly pleads."

Such an announcement with regard to *sects* and *sectarianism* comes with ill grace in my judgment from one who being as much the advocate of a sect as any in the community, if not more so, nevertheless talks of the detestable "ism" and of its removal from among us. "Oh consistency, thou art a jewel!" Let my Rev. friend see to it that the sectarian canons of his denomination, by which he pretends he is prevented from exchanging ministerial courtesies with other clergymen are abolished. Let him at least enter his solemn protest against them, and then he may begin, with some show of reason, to talk of the removal of *sectarianism*. However, the pamphlet being received and read, I as before felt bound to acknowledge it in a written note, in doing which I called the attention of Mr. Bolles to the aforesaid paragraph, making such comments on it as I judged appropriate.

Then came his first written communication to me, comprising an answer to my two notes, and accompanied also by a small package of books, among which was a Prayer Book, designed as a present, with my name written on the fly-leaf, "with the regards of my sincere friend, James A. Bolles." The leaves of this Prayer Book were turned down in several places, inviting my attention to those particular pages.

To this communication, or rather these two notes, both being on the same sheet of paper, I returned a reply dated Dec. 18th. 1846, sending Mr. Bolles, in consideration of his gift, a small copy of the Bible in the English version, commonly called King James' version, styling it for the time being,

"The Presbyterian Book of Prayer." And here I must do Mr. Bolles the justice to say, that he met the little incident with a *jeu de esprit* which showed a no small vein of humor in the man whenever he has an opportunity to open it.

His reply to my letter of Dec. 18th came dated Dec. 21st, 1846. From that time the correspondence went on regularly till Mr. Bolles, in his letter of Dec. 29th, saw fit to *decline all written discussion* with me upon the subject. He suggested instead, that I should come to him in person, as he would be willing to devote a half day in every week to the business of giving me instruction. To this proposition, I replied under date of Dec. 21st, that I could not yet give up the idea of writing to him, but should at the same time be glad to avail myself of his offer to give me oral lectures on the three questions I had already proposed to him.

In his reply, under date of Jan. 1st, 1847, he fixed the time for our first interview, which was to be Tuesday, Jan. 5th, 1847, in his study, at 9 o'clock, A. M. The subject to be investigated at that time was the office of "Deacons."

Immediately on the reception of the above, I sent him a note dated Jan 2d, acquiescing in this general arrangement as to the oral lectures on the three aforesaid questions, but still reserving to myself the privilege of sending him written communications on the main subject of the correspondence.

Accordingly, before the first personal interview, I prepared and sent a letter under date of Jan. 4th, which will be found in its proper place.

Mr. Bolles tells me he did not receive this letter till after the interview was held as appointed above. He had some doubts about opening it at all, but finally concluded to do so.

Here it may be as well to state that the interview was held on Tuesday as aforesaid and the subject of "Deacons" was investigated. The substance of my conclusions from that interview, are stated in a letter dated Jan. 18th, 1847, and sent to Mr. Bolles, but refused by him, which letter will appear in its proper place. At the close of our first interview, it was suggested that the next should be on the Tuesday of the next week at the same hour, and that the subject should be "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," a tract written by one

of the Onderdonks. With this understanding, the interview of Jan. 5th was closed.

The next day, Wednesday the 6th, Mr. Bolles sought an interview with me at my boarding-house, and on our being alone in my room, he took from his pocket my letter bearing date Jan 4th, 1847, which he had received since our interview of the day before, and read it through, commenting on its various parts, and telling me somewhat how he should treat it on the supposition that he should prepare a written reply at all. At this interview, we had considerable conversation upon the condition of matters as they stood between us. Among other things, Mr. Bolles desired me not to send him any more written communications, said he was willing to instruct me in his study, and still if I was determined to pursue the matter, he had a proposition to make, which was this, that *we should consult two gentlemen of this village, both of whom he named, and if they thought best we would enter into a public discussion.* I replied in substance that I for myself was well pleased with matters as they were now going on. I was content to write him as often as I could, and also to listen to his oral lectures on Tuesdays. But nevertheless, as he had hinted the possibility of a public discussion, it seemed to place me in a somewhat new position. I would think of it, and before anything farther was done, I would see him again. This was for substance the nature of the interview of Jan. 6th.

On Saturday morning, Jan. 9th, I called on Mr. Bolles, according to promise—told him I had considered the matter of our conversation on Wednesday, and as I preferred this part of our correspondence especially should be in a permanent form, I would write him a note informing him what I had concluded under all the circumstances to do. He asked me particularly if I had concluded to give up the Tuesday morning interviews. I told him if I did so conclude, I would state it in the note I was about to send him. This was for substance the nature of the interview of Jan. 9th.

I went immediately home, prepared and sent my note of Jan. 9th, 1847, which will be found in its proper place, and from the nature of which it will be seen, as well as from the whole circumstances of the case, that I supposed Mr. Bolles

would not expect me at his study on Tuesday morning, Jan. 12th. Accordingly, I did not go. On the other hand, I waited a reply to my challenge of the 9th, but *no such reply came*. Instead of it, however, Mr. Bolles sent me his letter of Jan. 15th, 1847, which also will be found in its proper place, and will speak for itself.

To this letter, I sent a reply under date of Jan. 16th, 1847, which was returned by the bearer unopened. Mr. Bolles *would not receive it*. But it will nevertheless appear in its proper place. It contained, suffice it to say, an expression of a determination on my part to renew the personal interviews, the next of which was to occur on Tuesday, Jan. 19th.

Feeling myself again at liberty to address Mr. Bolles by written communication on the main subject of our intercourse, on Monday, Jan. 18th, I prepared another letter. It was sent him, and like its fellow returned unopened. Mr. Bolles *would not receive it*. Nevertheless, this also will appear in its proper place, and will speak for itself.

At the appointed time, on Tuesday the 19th, I visited Mr. Bolles study for the purpose of listening to his second oral lecture. The subject of it was the first part of Dr. Onderdonk's tract on "Episcopacy tested by Scripture." During the interview, Mr. Bolles insisted on my answering categorically certain questions which he propounded to me. I interposed that it was not proper to answer them now, but that in due time I would answer them, as I intended to do it in writing; whereupon, quite a spirited discussion arose upon the rules which ought to be observed by us respectively and upon other matters involved in the general discussion. The result was that Mr. Bolles gave me a written paper, to which I was to reply in writing, having obtained a promise from him that if I handed my reply to him myself he would not refuse it. Both these documents will be found in their proper places.

Perhaps it may be as well to state here for the benefit of the reader, what were the questions which Mr. Bolles insisted I should answer.

1. Do you deny that the Apostles and Elders are fairly distinguished from each other in several places of the Acts of the Apostles as distinct and separate orders?

2. Do you deny that the Apostles were not distinguished from the elders simply because they were appointed by Christ personally?

3. Do you deny that the Apostles were not distinguished from the elders merely because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection?

4. Do you deny that the Apostles *were* distinguished from the elders in consequence of their superiority in ministerial power and rights?

To these questions Mr. Bolles insisted that I should say "yes" or "no" upon the spot. I declined doing this for the reason that I was there to hear him in his oral lectures, and in due time I would furnish a full written reply to these questions. The reader can judge for himself whether I have kept my promise, when he has read my letter bearing date Feb. 10th, 1847. After some further discussion, Mr. Bolles said he would go on with his instructions, the subject for the next interview being the remainder of Dr. Onderdonk's tract. Nevertheless, the proposition he had made to me in writing should stand the same, and he would receive from me a written answer.

See the two documents.

During this interview of Jan. 19th, Mr. Bolles referred also to "the communication of some length" spoken of in his note of Jan. 15th, and said "he would *now read* it to me." I objected that "I could *not hear it*, for the reason that he had now already positively refused *two* of my letters, and for him to read me *there* a long epistle which was to "be an answer to my interrogatories and to all my last communications," and thus make it a part of the *written* correspondence without giving me an opportunity to reply to it in writing, was indeed a strange way of proceeding, and I could not submit to it." At the same time, I told him that if he chose to send it to me, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to receive it, provided I could have the privilege of answering it. He said if he concluded to send it he would let me know.

The interview of the 19th terminated, and a day or two after I met Mr. Bolles in the street, whereupon he asked me if my reply was ready for him in regard to the written paper he

had given me in his study the Tuesday before? I immediately handed it to him and we separated.

On Tuesday, the 26th, the next interview was held, the principal subject of which was still the tract of Dr. Onderdonk.

On the next day, Wednesday the 27th, just as I was going to my evening prayer-meeting, Mr. Bolles met me in the street, and said he had concluded to send the letter he had been preparing. I replied, "very well, I am glad you have concluded to do so." He passed on, and when I returned from my meeting, his letter had already arrived. It bore date Jan. 11th, 1847. I received it Jan. 27th. It is a long communication, as will be seen by a reference to it. I immediately sat down even before reading it, and wrote my short note bearing date Jan. 27th. But judge of my astonishment when on reading his communication, I found he positively refused to *receive a written answer!* Surely thought I, he will not be so uncivil as *now* to reject my note. But in this I was mistaken. He sent it back unopened, as he had done aforetime!

And I would here remark that this note, which will appear in the proper place, being as it were the herald of the letter I was preparing in reply to that of Mr. Bolles, under date of Jan. 11th, I considered the whole as virtually refused by him, so that my communication of Feb. 10th, 1847 will appear in its place, like some of its comrades, a *jilted document*.

It ought to be stated also, that a good portion of Mr. Bolles' letter of Jan. 11th should have been very much modified, had the Rev. gentleman allowed himself the opportunity of being better informed. The two letters which he had previously refused, would in my judgment have given him some notions hard to reconcile with just the kind of epistle which he chose to send me. The epistle itself, however, has received its answer in another place.

Then came the interview of Tuesday, Feb. 2d. The lecture at this time was upon Episcopacy as set forth in Chapin's Primitive Church. I gave Mr. Bolles an abstract of what Chapin had said upon the offices of the ministry. I suppose also, by this time my Rev. instructor fancied he had subdued

me into the character of a quiet and docile pupil, having some hopes of now making me what he thinks I ought to be, a true son of "*the Church*." I did, however, at this interview even venture to urge upon his reception my little note of Jan. 27th, which I carried with me. At first he was unwilling, but finally concluded to take it; and I parted with him at this time light of heart at the thought that his sense of propriety was returning, and that now I should certainly have an opportunity to send him a reply to his mammoth epistle.

Things remained thus till Tuesday, Feb. 9th, when I visited my Rev. Instructor again. The subject this time was a continuation of Chapin. I gave in my abstract as before. Mr. B. read me a long essay, as he said, to clear away my prejudices against the Episcopal Church, and finally concluded the interview by handing me back my poor little note of Jan. 27th, *unopened!* He had kept it a week, and would not look in it! I did begin to think it was treating the paper with great disrespect. However, I took the wee-bit missive home, pretty much resolved that Mr. Bolles should hear from it again.

Tuesday, Feb. 16th, soon came round, and found me once more in Mr. Bolles' study. The subject was still Chapin, and the offices of the Christian Ministry. I gave in, for the third time, my abstract. Mr. Bolles filled up the hour, as well as he could, by remarks of his own, and reading from books. We had now finished that part of Chapin which especially related to my first two enquiries. We were about to come to an investigation of the *third*, touching the *Apostolical Succession*. He insisted for the next interview that the subject should be, *the permanency of the Christian Church*. I objected that I had no doubts upon that subject, that I had never sought instruction from him upon it, and that he was bound to instruct me, if at all, in regard to the unbroken list of ordainers, after which I had so anxiously inquired. Whereupon he declared, in so many words, that he could instruct me no longer, if he could not direct what books and subjects I should study. I still urged that I was there for the special purpose of finding the unbroken list of ordainers, and that I should be glad to continue under his instruction, if he would

only furnish me a proper *text-book*. He declared that I was bound to recite to him in such manner as he directed, and that he should expect me, the next Tuesday morning, to give in my abstract on the permanency of the Christian Church. I told him whenever he would procure me a proper text-book, I should be most happy to continue with him. He then repeated, in words to this effect: "I shall not instruct you, unless I can direct the books you are to read." "Very well," said I, "if you will not instruct, then your oral lectures are ended." This was, substantially, the amount of our last interview, in the relation of Teacher and Pupil.

In order to show Mr. Bolles, however, that I was still willing to act fairly, on the same day, Feb. 16th, I wrote him another note, which will also be found in its proper place. This note, unsealed, I left for Mr. B. myself at his house, he at the time not being at home. A day or two afterwards, it was sent back to me in an envelope, through the Post Office. Whether it was read by my Rev. friend or not, I am unable to say.

Fearing, however, that by some means, he had failed to discover its import, I concluded to try, *once more*, and see if I could bring him out. For this purpose, my note, under date of Feb. 20th, was sent to him through the Post Office, and in a day or two returned unopened! Thus five different documents were sent back by the courteous Mr. B., the last of which will, in its proper place, close the written correspondence, and make way for such other chapters and observations as may in their time be deemed advisable.

On the subject of episcopacy, as treated by Chapin, and examined by us in the Tuesday interviews, I have simply now to remark that my letter of Feb. 10th contains what I deem a sufficient exposition.

From that ever memorable Tuesday, Feb. 16th, 1847, I believe Mr. Bolles and myself have not exchanged a word of conversation, up to the present time, respecting the manner in which our correspondence and our interviews were conducted, and finally concluded.

Mr. Bolles sent for his books, Jan., 1848, and they were returned without note or comment, with the exception of two

or three, which, when sent back, will convey also my acknowledgments to my Rev. friend and instructor, according to the circumstances of the case.

I have endeavored, in this narrative, to give all the essential facts and statements, substantially, as they occurred, without pretending to observe the exact language, in every instance. I am not conscious of deviating from a true and fair statement of the whole transaction; if I have, in any instance, done so, none will regret it more than myself.

It is but just to add that I have met Mr. Bolles many times since, under various circumstances, and in different conditions, and I believe that, personally and socially, no two men in the community are on better terms than we are. I have even recently invited him into my pulpit, and to lead in prayer on a public occasion; and though doubtless he would not do so by me, still, while I earnestly contend against the exclusive bigotry, and I may add, the arrogance of his doctrines, I am resolved to vie with him to the last, in the exercise of the courtesies of life.

We may now consider as fairly open, the door to the

CORRESPONDENCE.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir:—I embrace the earliest convenience to return you my acknowledgments for the copy of the Journal of the Ninth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Western New York, which I was informed by Capt. Follett, you desired him to present me.

I have read with some care, the address of Rev. Dr. De Lancey, wherein he undertakes to define, What Puseyism is not. I discover he speaks of "Episcopacy" as being of divine institution, and obligatory on the conscience of Christian people; he also speaks of the Apostolical succession; and of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, as constituting the three-fold ministry of apostolic origin, scriptural authority, and primitive sanction.

Now, my dear Sir, will you allow me to ask what you understand to be the doctrine of your Church, in reference to

the "episcopacy," that is, whether you hold to Parochial or to Prelatical episcopacy, as being of scriptural authority and primitive sanction? Also, whether or not you mean by Bishop a Pastor of a single congregation,—by Priest, a simple Presbyter or Elder, and by Deacon, merely one whose office it is to attend to the pecuniary concerns of the Church, particularly the provisions for her poor?

Also, whether you mean by the Apostolical Succession, that is, do you mean by it such a succession as that *you* yourself, for example, can trace your own line of ordination, step by step, and man by man, in a direct unbroken chain, back to the Apostles?

And will you please to add, also, some of the chief proofs of the positions which you take in reference to each of these topics, that I may be informed, precisely, *what you*, for one, do believe and teach respecting them.

If you can, consistently with your various duties, do me the favor to reply to this, I shall be happy to receive from you a communication of this nature. You may think it strange that I should ask the above questions.—I have been prompted to it by a desire to know the truth: by some suggestions in Dr. DeLancey's Address, p. 39, where he speaks of "the deplorable ignorance of many who oppose the Church," and of their utter incapacity to understand her position and prospects:—and by a belief that as you have been so kind as to forward me the Journal itself, you will stand ready to give me any further light I may desire on the subject of which it treats.

Truly yours,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Dec. 15th, 1846.

To the Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir:—I received this morning from your hand, through the Post Office, a copy of your Educational Address. I have before heard of it, and have just now had the pleasure of perusing it.

I much admire the general tenor and spirit of the Address. I think it concise, chaste, and practical; and as such I hope it may have a wide circulation.

I was particularly struck with what you have observed on the head of morality in the public schools.

The only thing about which I have my doubts as to its effect upon the public mind, is what you were pleased to say about "sectarianism." Perhaps I do not regard this point as you do; but has it ever occurred to my friend that he might be as deeply implicated as any in the evils of sectarianism (whatever those evils may be thought to be)? If this is the feeling you cherish, and if you mourn over the part which your own Church has, in your view, taken in the unhappy feuds that have distracted Christendom, surely I should most heartily sympathise. There are, doubtless, evils in all our churches which cannot fail to be lamented by those who pray for the peace and glory of Zion.

Willing ever to hear from you, either through the Press which you so fairly represent, and so justly eulogize, or by written communications from your own hand,

I remain, dear Sir, truly yours,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Dec. 16th, 1846.

Batavia, Dec. 16, 1846.

Rev'd and Dear Sir,—I take great pleasure in acknowledging your favor of the 15th inst.

The Journals of our Convention are sent to every clergyman and to every vestryman in the diocese: and having a few more copies than I wished to distribute among the vestrymen here, I thought I would send one to you as a matter of courtesy and respect, presuming that the statistical facts would be interesting, and also that you would be pleased to read Bishop DeLancey's Address. But I did not suppose that you would find anything in it, which would lead you to an examination of the distinctive doctrines and principles of the Episcopal Church, or, as I should prefer to say, the Church Catholic.

As to my own views, they are in accordance with those of Bishop DeLancey, as expressed in his address, and generally with the standard writers of our Church. I send for your perusal, therefore, a few volumes, which you will find

much more satisfactory than anything which I could say, especially in the short space of a single letter.

On the three points embraced in your questions, viz: the kind of Episcopacy which we hold to, the meaning of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, as distinguished from each other, and the nature of the Apostolic Succession, you will find full explanations in the articles where I have turned down the leaves, with the proof of the positions taken.

In the Prayer Book which I send, and of which I ask your kind acceptance, you will find under the "form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," such information as you may wish, in relation to the difference in these orders.

I also send a few pamphlets which I ask you to accept, and I beg to assure you that I shall be most happy to read any books or pamphlets, which at any time you may be pleased to send for my perusal.

With the assurance of my sincere respect and esteem,

I am, truly and affectionately, yours,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To Rev. B. Sunderland.

My Dear Sir,—I had but just written the foregoing when I received your kind note in relation to my educational address. I am right glad to learn that you think so well of it, and am only sorry that we cannot "see eye to eye" on the subject of "sectarianism." Sect is from "seco," to cut off, and of course is strictly applicable only to those who are cut off, or have cut themselves off, from the Church of Christ. And "sectarianism" being a disposition to sects, is undoubtedly one of the greatest evils of the present day; and, perhaps, the greatest of its evils is, that it cripples the energies of the Church, identifies her in the public mind with that which she is not, and confounds the names of things, putting "light for darkness, and darkness for light." The only way to remedy this evil is to begin to call things by their right names. The Church of Christ is not, and cannot be, a sect; and, therefore, so far as we are faithful members of that Church, we cannot be sectarians. Allow me to express the

hope that the time may speedily come when we shall "see eye to eye."

Truly, &c.,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir:—I was delighted to receive from you, the day before yesterday, a package of books and pamphlets, together with the communication which accompanied them. On examination, I found some of them you designed to loan for my perusal, and some you had sent me as presents. The latter are, your own work, a copy of which I already have, a pamphlet entitled, "Reasons why I am a Churchman," and a Prayer Book.

For these manifestations of your regard, be pleased, dear sir, to receive my sincere and grateful acknowledgments.

The other works (except Percival on the Succession, a copy of which I own, and therefore with this I will return the one you sent) I shall carefully preserve, and when I have perused them, I will return them in safety.

For the Prayer Book I am particularly obliged, since I had at this time only a borrowed copy, and it is always convenient to have it for reference on any question in which it is concerned. But as I should not feel it quite courteous to accept a gift of this kind without presenting you one in return, I accordingly send you a small copy of "the Presbyterian Book of Prayer," which I beg you to accept with my most sincere regards. You will find in it, the Litany, Collects, Psalms, Rubric, and all, as they are used in our Church; and as it contains also the authority on which we rely for our views of the officers of the Christian Church, I have taken the liberty to refer you, by turning down the leaves at the places which speak most clearly and conclusively on this subject, adding short notes on small strips of paper which you will find in connection with the references themselves. (See notes at the conclusion of this letter.)

On the general subject of Church Order, &c., the few works which I have you doubtless either own or have read. I have

1. Whately's Kingdom of Christ, an invaluable work,

2. **Mason's Review of Episcopacy.**
3. **Life and Institutes of Calvin.**
4. **Cheever's Lectures.**
5. **Apostolic Church, by Albert Barnes.**
6. **Epistles of the Christian Fathers.**
7. **Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.**
8. **Snodgrass on the Apostolical Succession.**
9. **Powel on Succession.**
10. **Rule of Faith, by Dr. Peck.**
11. **Bang's Original Church of Christ ; and**
12. **A Treatise on the Presbyterian form of Church Government.**

Should you, however, desire to see any of these works, I will forward them to you with the greatest pleasure. Meantime if you have the works of Archbishop Usher, or of the venerable Bede, you would do me a great favor by loaning me them for my perusal. If you have, too, any history of the Culdees of North Britain, or of the Waldenses of Piedmont, I would be happy to read these also.

You observe in your letter, that your "own views are in accordance with those of Bishop DeLancey, as expressed in his address." But you do not say, neither does he, as I discover, whether you hold to Prelatical or Parochial Episcopacy,—or what is the precise office of a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon,—or whether you teach such an Apostolical Succession as that you yourself, for example, can trace back your line of ordination in the manner described in my previous communication. It is on this very point that I am yet in the dark. I shall keep searching, however, and perhaps my difficulty will be solved by some of the books you have sent me. But if I do not get light here, I shall be obliged to recur again to you as a living teacher on this topic.

On the subject of "sectarianism" perhaps we shall not find ourselves so widely apart, when we come to understand each other's views and feelings. I was pleased with your etymological signification of the term "sectarianism;" and could not help thinking how it is that you can "prefer" to call your Church "the Church Catholic," when she was cut off from the Church of Rome in the days of Henry VIII, and

has never since been restored. Is she not then a sect according to your own definition of the term?

Hoping indeed that the time may speedily come, when all evangelical Christians, and all Protestant Ministers of the Gospel shall "see eye to eye," and toil and pray together for the advancement of that Kingdom of God, which "is not in word, but in power," and praying ever for the welfare of you and yours, I remain, dear sir,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Dec. 18th, 1846.

N. B. The truth is, the Prayer Book I sent Mr. Bolles was nothing more or less than our common English version of the Bible. The first place where I turned down a leaf, was I think at the 6th chapter of Acts. On that passage I sent the following note or comment:—

There appears to be a little discrepancy between your Prayer Book and mine on the subject of Deacons. Your Prayer Book says that the martyr Stephen was chosen to the office of deacon, whereas my Prayer Book says no such thing, as you will see by reading the 6th of Acts, where the word deacon is not even mentioned. A certain office is here instituted, I admit, and seven men are appointed to fill it; but what authority have we to call them "deacons," save the general meaning of the term, which signifies "servants," and which in this sense might be properly applied to any one who performs a service for the Church. But names aside, let us ask what is the office here instituted? Is it precisely the same in the 6th of Acts as it is described to be in your Prayer Book? Is there anything said of this office as described in Acts, "that it confers on its subject the right, and enjoins on him the duty, to read Holy Scriptures and homilies in the Church, to instruct the youth in the catechism, to baptize infants, and to preach?" Where is the authority for all this as belonging to the office to which the seven were chosen, as related in the 6th of Acts? Is it in any other part of the Bible? Or do you put it simply on the ground of expediency? If the latter, then of course the views you hold, and which

are taught in your Prayer Book, so far as they transcend the express or fairly implied warrant of scripture in reference to the office of deacon, are not of such divine obligation as to bind the conscience.

Another passage at which I turned down a leaf, was, 1st Timothy, 3: 8. My comment on this place was as follows:—

On the subject of what was the exact office of deacons as a distinctive order of officers in the Church, it seems to me that this place, Tim. 3: 8, et seq., does not inform us. It cannot, therefore, be used as a proof-text in reference to the office described in the 6th of Acts. If we choose to *assume* that this was the office of the deacons, I suppose we may; but if others differ from us, they would have a right to do so. Suppose it be said that the passage in Tim. has no reference to the office described in Acts, how can we refute this assertion? What ground can we rest upon for our application of the term “deacon” to the office of the *seven*, save the general meaning of the term, and the general law of expediency?

NOTE 3D.

Your Prayer Book speaks of an order of Priests in the Gospel Ministry. I find no such order of officers in the Christian Church described in mine. The nearest thing I find to it is in 1st Pet. 2: 5, where the whole body of believers are styled “a holy Priesthood.” Jesus Christ is called, it is true, “the High Priest of our profession; but we have only to consider the peculiar office of a Priest, as one who offers up sacrifices, in order to see that no such term can be strictly applicable to any portion of the Gospel Ministry, thereby denoting a distinctive order of officers in the Christian Church. If it is so applied, it must be by a figure of speech and by human consent, and not by any well-grounded warrant in the word of God. So far as I know the scriptures, or have examined them, in reference to this particular point, I find nothing that agrees with or supports your ideas of the order of Priests in the Christian Church, or, with what I suppose to be your ideas of it.

NOTE 4.

On the subject of Bishops I find nothing certainly in my

Prayer Book, and really see nothing in yours, which goes to support the idea that Prelatical Bishops, and not Parochial, have the sanction of God's word. I refer to Matt. 18th and 20th chapters; Acts 15: 22, and 20th chapter; Phil. 1: 1; 1st Tim. 5: 17, &c.; 1st Peter, 1: 1, &c. From all which nothing, as I can see, appears to support the doctrine that Prelatical Episcopacy is "binding on the conscience of Christian people.

NOTE 5.

I see it stated in your Prayer Book that Matthias was *ordained* to be of the number of the *twelve*, when there is nothing of that kind mentioned in the Sacred Records. We are informed that they prayed, cast lots, and the lot fell on Matthias, and he was *numbered* with the eleven Apostles. No ordination here!

NOTE 6.

As for the Apostolic Succession, I do not find any thing which either strictly defines, or in any way supports that description of it to which my question had reference. Perhaps you can still help to the proofs upon this point.

Batavia, Dec. 21st, 1846.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—Your kind favor of the 18th inst. was duly received, and for your invaluable present I ask you to accept my sincere thanks. Much to my surprise, I found on examination that it was the *Holy Bible* which you had sent to me—the most precious of all books—and translated into English by the venerable compilers of the "Book of Common Prayer."

But judge of my astonishment when I ascertained from your letter that you had actually changed the name of this Holy Book, and had entitled it the "Presbyterian Book of Prayer"!!! Can it be possible (I could not but exclaim to myself) that our Presbyterian brethren, having changed almost every thing else which the Reformers established, are now disposed to change even the name of the Bible itself, that only book for which they have hitherto professed the highest regard! Can it be possible! Where will they stop in their strange career of innovation and demolition! Is there

nothing which is too sacred and venerable for them to destroy!! Alas! alas! We could bear this change with some degree of calmness and composure, did we suppose that it manifested on their part, any disposition to pay a higher regard to the authority of the Bible, or any determination to read more of its sacred pages in their families and places of public concourse. But we fear that it arises more from the love of novelty and change than anything else, and therefore we cannot but regard it as another sad development of the inevitable tendency of their peculiar system. So much for my soliloquy—the reflections of my own mind—and, you observe, said to myself.

However, I sincerely thank you for the gift, and notwithstanding your new and extraordinary nomenclature, I shall still continue to call it by its old name—the Bible, and shall not confound it even with the Church Book of Common Prayer, though I am quite sure that the latter is founded upon the former, and is the best exponent of its meaning now extant in the world.

In one respect, my dear Sir, I derive from your letter peculiar delight, for I see that you are determined to enter upon a thorough examination of Church principles, and therefore I send a few other works which no doubt you will be pleased to peruse.

In the 2d vol. Burnet, p. 115, where I have turned down the leaf, you will find an important fact in relation to the Reformers, and those sudden and extemporaneous heats which some have called since that time, the “worshipping by the spirit.”

In the 1st vol. Bowden, pp. 222–3, you may find an account of the Waldenses, which may possibly give you entire satisfaction, and on p. 273, you will see something about the Picts, or “Culdees of North Britain,” as you call them. On pp. 229–40, you will find the opinions of Archbishop Usher and Bishop Stillingfleet. On pp. 313–19, the unbroken succession is demonstrated, by a sort of mathematical process which you will understand; and on pp. 323–8, you will see an illustration of sectarian fairness and honesty, which neither of us can admire.

In 2d vol. Bowden, p. 72, you will find the subject of "Deacons" slightly touched upon, though more fully expounded in Chapin, p. 142, and when you have read them both, I have no doubt you will be happy to acknowledge that St. Stephen was only in the deaconate when he suffered martyrdom. On pp. 136-41, you will find some opinions of Calvin, which you can verify by a reference to his works. On pp. 156-62, you will find a further account of the Waldenses, much more minute and satisfactory than the former. And then you will find in the same book, an "Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination," by Dr. Cooke, which you will perceive to be unanswerable.

In Chapin's "Primitive Church," pp. 142-9, you will find what we mean by "*Deacons*"—pp. 150-69, what we mean by *Priests*—pp. 169-243, what we mean by *Bishops*; and you will be pointed to that text of scripture, Acts 1: 22, where St. Peter gives us to understand that Matthias was actually "*ordained*." On pp. 280-354, you will find the Apostolic Succession so fully unfolded and explained, and traced, man by man, that I am quite sure you will be forced to acknowledge it never was, and never can be broken. On pp. 359-381, you will find the independence of the English Church so well established, long before the time of Henry VIII, that you will no longer wonder at the little regard which we pay to Papal Bulls and excommunications, however much they may trouble and alarm our Presbyterian brethren.

In Buel's reply to Whately, you will find a masterly refutation of that "invaluable book." In Hobart's Apology, you will find that candid and eloquent exposition of "Gospel Truth and Apostolic Order," which led to the downfall of Dr. Mason, and which drew from Mason himself this remarkable declaration, that "if he were to entrust the destinies of his country to the hands of any one man, that man should be John Henry Hobart."

Now, my dear Sir, I am sorry that I cannot send to you either Usher or the venerable Bede; but if the works which I do send are not sufficient to remove your doubts and satisfy your mind, then I have a host of others which I shall be glad to supply you with, and I am quite sure if you persevere in

the investigation, you will be led to embrace the Catholic Truth. But I beg you to remember that sometimes

“A man convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still.”

And therefore I hope you will endeavour to carry your will along with your judgement, and be ready to make that sacrifice of feeling and inclination which the truth may demand.

Most of the works in your list I have read, excepting “Snodgrass on the Succession,” which I have some curiosity to see, and also the “Presbyterian Confession of Faith,” which I suppose you have, though not enumerated.

And now that all who profess and call themselves Christians, whether Protestants, or Catholics, or Romanists, may hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life, is the humble prayer of

Your sincere friend and brother in Christ,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To Rev. B. Sunderland.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir :—Much to my delight and gratification, I received from you this morning another epistle, accompanied by another package of books, treating as I suppose, upon the interesting and important subject of Church organization, and which I shall be glad to find full of light and instruction on a theme so absorbing. I discover on a cursory survey of their titles, they are volumes I shall read with great interest, and therefore I must express myself in terms of the most heartfelt gratitude for your kindness.

I am sorry you were so discomposed at the simple fact of my having styled the “Holy Bible,” the “Presbyterian Book of Prayer.” Surely we have no other, we confess no other. It belongs to all Christians, as well as to ourselves, We do not pretend to monopolize it ; but we do mean to characterize it above all other books as the standard of supreme authority—and of authority so incomparable that in our own Church (the Presbyterian) we could not think of introducing any other, either as its substitute or rival, in any part of our religious worship. We call it the “Holy Bible”

as you justly say, "most precious of all books." We do not mutilate or garble it; we do not destroy its titles or change its form, but we simply say that it is our Book of Prayer—the treasury of the divine truth and promises—the fountain of spiritual instruction, sufficient for us in all matters of doctrine and of duty, without the help of a separate Liturgy, Prayer Book, or any other such like assistance, instituted and issued by uninspired and fallible man. It is for the candid then to judge who have mutilated and garbled "the form of sound words,"—those who hold it entire and unaltered as it came to us from the pen of inspiration: or those who, with great expressed veneration for it, have yet divided and cast into another mould, in which are mingled also merely human suggestions, opinions, and directions, many of the most important passages of Holy Writ.

However, you may be assured I do not desire to contend with you about this "nomenclature," as you call it. If it is offensive to you; if it injures your feelings, my friend, or is repugnant to your taste, why of course on a question so trivial as the mere choice of a name, written as this is in a connection which can do no harm, I would not wantonly wound you by persisting in the use of the appellation that caused your mournful soliloquy and most grave lamentation.

In reference to the substance of your "remarks to yourself," I am glad to see that they *were* "the reflections of your own mind, said only to yourself!" There never was, in my opinion, an instance of more prudence and caution on the part of any one—for you know, my friend, that a man may say a *great many things* to himself that he will never, at least in this world, be called upon either to prove or abandon.

On the subject of your joy arising from a manifestation on my part, of a desire to understand more thoroughly the distinctive claims of your Church, and your caution to me about "being convinced against my will," I have simply to observe that if in the prosecution of my design I thus contribute to your happiness, I trust you will feel it a duty on your part to do all you can as a living teacher on this great subject, to afford me assistance, to explain, if possible, what appears to me obscure and contradictory, and to lead me along in that

sure path of Christian truth and doctrine, which it is the privilege of all of us to pursue. And in connection with this thought, let me suggest whether it might not expedite business if you should in your next just give a simple and direct answer in clear and concise language to those three former questions:

A. Do you hold to Prelatical or Parochial Episcopacy ?

B. Do you mean by Bishop a pastor of a single congregation ?

C. Do you mean by Apostolical Succession *such* a succession as that you yourself, for example, can trace back your line of ordination, step by step, and man by man, to the Apostles ?

The more I read and reflect, the more I am inclined to the opinion that upon the definition or solution of these three questions, the whole discussion is suspended. I have perused now a great many writers in favor of your Church, and several of those you sent me; and I have thus far invariably found that they do not throw any clear and satisfactory light upon this primary and as I regard it, this principal branch of the subject. I find enough of general vapping, and vague, indefinite assertion, about there being a Christian Ministry appointed—its unbroken continuance in the world, and the necessity of supposing this, that, and the other thing connected with the Church. I find a great deal of talk about Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, without any clear and precise definition of these respective offices, as warranted by the Word of God. Now all this as it seems to me is to be regarded as material for subsequent consideration, when we shall have first settled the questions at once proposed. We can then proceed intelligently and with precise despatch. However, as I am only an inquirer, perhaps you will not be disposed to pursue the course I suggest, and give me first of all the important information which I desire, on the three points specified within.

I ought not indeed to overlook what is said in your Book of Common Prayer, in reference to Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. There the offices come as near to being defined as in anything I have yet seen. But the question at once arises,

Do these offices so far as they are therein defined with precision, agree with the representations of the word of God? Or have they any such warrant in the scriptures as to make them binding on the conscience of Christian people, to the exclusion of those ideas of these offices which are held in others than your own denomination? On this head I have not yet found satisfaction, either in your written communications or in the books you have sent me. Upon what I pointed out to you in my notes accompanying a former letter, as discrepancies between your Prayer Book and the Bible (or as I then called it, my Prayer Book) you have been pleased to say nothing of any precise and particular nature. Now, my friend, what on this head am I to conclude? Do you confess that these discrepancies do exist, and that in so far as these offices, as they are described in your Prayer Book, differ from the representations of Holy Scripture respecting them, they are to be regarded merely as matters of human expediency? Or what would you have me to believe on a point like this?

I have not forgotten the single instance connected with this branch of the subject wherein you have sought to correct me in the statement I made, to the effect that there is no account of the ordination of Matthias. 'You point me to Chapin's "Primitive Church," pp. 169-243, in which you say "I shall find that text of Scripture, Acts 1: 22, where St. Peter gives us to understand that Matthias was actually ordained." Now, dear Sir, I have consulted Chapin, and find as you intimate, that he *has quoted Peter* as saying, "One must be ordained, &c." But on consulting Peter's own words as they stand in the original text, I find that he *neither says nor intimates any such thing*. In Acts 1: 21, 22, the terms "ordained," "ordination," (or anything like them) *are not recorded*. You have simply mistaken the *English* version for the *Greek*; but it becomes those who would dispel the "deplorable ignorance" of their fellow-men to be very critical on questions of this kind. So that for anything I yet discover, the discrepancy I pointed out between your Prayer Book and the Bible, in reference to the ordination of Matthias, remains in all its force.

And there is another thing which I would just here observe, since it is an object with me to maintain as much accuracy as

possible, that you appear to have stated (on what authority I know not, and it is for the purpose of enlightening my ignorance that I mention it) that "the translators of the present English version of the Bible, commonly known as King James' version, were also the venerable compilers of the Book of Common Prayer!" Where is the evidence of this? You will not now understand me to contradict your statement, but simply to ask your authority for making it. I have some general ideas about certain things that are said to have been done in the reign of James I, but I do not now remember to have seen, or if I have seen it, cannot now recall the testimony on which your assertion is grounded. But however this may be, certain it is that the translators of our present English version, though they gave on the whole a very splendid translation of the Sacred Word, nevertheless were fallible men, and sometimes did not cause the original text to be the most happily rendered. Witness for example, Acts 1: 22, where the word "ordained" is inserted in the English, while it does not occur in the Greek. So that we are to receive what these men, as well as all others have done aside from divine inspiration, with critical care and caution, lest we be "entangled in foolish and unlearned questions which do gender strife."

The matter you mention as recorded in Burnet, about the "sudden and extraordinary heats, &c.," answers very well as a piece of historical philosophizing, in which the Rev. Dr. would seem to maintain pretty strongly that "all which has not the authority of Scripture and primitive sanction" can very well be changed or dispensed with in any age of the Christian Church, even in our own age, without implying that odious spirit of Vandalism which has so terrified my friend. And I am happy also to discover a similar sentiment expressed in the preface of your Prayer Book. According to these authorities, the work of demolition has now and then gone on very briskly even in your own Church; and certainly in the times of Gilbert Burnet, if we are to rely on the records he has left us, although they strove to guard against the "extraordinary heats," they nevertheless could offer nothing rational against what we denominate *extempore prayer*, while

in many other particulars they did cut and prune most furiously. I do not see therefore any peculiar importance attached to the fact you speak of, only as it reveals a mere matter of taste and of human opinion.

In reference to Bowden's Letters, I will here simply state that I have them, and have read them all with great care, and as yet I find nothing that I here need to speak of. His information concerning the Waldenses, the Bohemians, the Picts, and various other bodies of Christians, appears to be gathered up piecemeal, and to be put forth entirely through an *ex parte* channel. He does not give, as I now remember, any fair view either of the Waldenses, the Wickliffites, the Hussites or Bohemians, the Scots, the Churches of Wales, or the Culdees, whose principal seat was the Island of Iona. And altogether I must say, after wading and wandering over so much time and space, I think he is the weakest argumentative writer I have read in some time. I do not mean by this to deny him some shrewdness, and on points trivial or indifferent, he will sometimes strike out a vein of much common sense reasoning, but on all the great points which he has to grapple in the discussion, I regard him as displaying more dogmatism and arrogance than sound logic or candid criticism. He seems evidently trying either to produce *an effect*, or to remove the impressions left upon the public mind by his opponent in the investigation of the question, by means of inuendoes, insinuations, and divers other such like things. If I cannot find something more impartial and conclusive than the letters of the Rev. John Bowden, I am certain I shall never be converted to the distinctive tenets of your Church. Perhaps you will think I have severely judged the Professor of Columbia College, and if you will undertake to show me wherein I have done so, my mind shall certainly be open to the consideration of your arguments. Whatever others may have shown of fairness or unfairness, I surely desire to act honestly and sincerely in all this matter, although I do not at this time regard myself as a sectarian in any odious sense of that term.

There are several little things which you seem to think will take place on my perusal of Bowden and Cooke:

First, that I will understand the mathematical demonstration of the Apostolical Succession. Now my dear Sir, you have either overrated my mathematical powers, or else you have misnamed the process which you call "mathematical." I have seen in Whately's "Kingdom of Christ" what I call a truly logico-mathematical process on p. 185 of that work, which tells tremendously against the idea of Bowden, who seems to have been more of an adept in the department of Belles Lettres than in that of Logic or the exact sciences. The question, however, that is here brought to view is one on which I have much reflected, though it cannot now be taken up in detail. Suffice it to say that the reasoning of many of your writers on the Apostolical Succession appears to me vague and sophistical. They do not at all seem to touch the real gist and merits of the case. They figure copiously, it is true, about the necessity of supposing an unbroken succession of the Christian ministry from the Apostles, but when you come to the part of practical application of their reasonings to an individual case you find them utterly at fault. For instance, how can you, my friend, who upon the principles of your own Church, must regard yourself as the only scripturally authorized minister in this place, how can you connect yourself or show your connection with this wonderful "succession" of which your writers so gravely speak. Your case, as it seems to me, is precisely like one who should assert his pretensions to the throne of England on the general ground that there have always been kings in the world, while yet he should not be able to produce a single iota of evidence to show his own personal connection with the regal line. For it will not do simply to say that you can trace your line of genealogy up to a certain period by the light of authentic history, and then from that period back entrust yourself to the uncertain guidance of conjecture and blind faith. On this principle the whole fabric of the "succession" which your writers appear to contend for, will inevitably be destroyed. This much might be said by an objector against the many writers of your Church which I have already perused, and it is for the purpose of seeing how you would answer this point that I here bring it forward, although

it would please me first to receive your answer to the three questions on which, I think, the whole discussion hangs.

Secondly, you think, after reading Bowden and Cooke I will be happy to acknowledge that St. Stephen was only in the deaconate when he suffered martyrdom. If you had told me precisely what the "deaconate" is, and then proved from the Bible that this was the exact office of the martyr at his death, you would have given me satisfaction on this point, and I should have been happy to "acknowledge, &c." But as it is, I am as much in the dark as ever.

Thirdly, you say "I will find in the same book an Essay on the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination, by Dr. Cooke, which I will perceive to be unanswerable." I would simply observe on this point I am glad you sent me Dr. Cooke, and when I have more leisure than at present I shall examine his writings; but as they treat of a *subject* which I am not now investigating, it is proper that at present we should lay them aside. The old maxim which I learned of my schoolmaster is I think a good one, "one thing at a time, a place for every thing, and every thing in its place!"

In Chapin, pp. 280-354, I find indeed a long list of names set down as links in the Apostolic chain; but it occurs to me to ask how the *breaks* in this succession, which *the record shows on its own face* are to be filled up or accounted for? And again, what were the kinds of Bishops here set down for at least the first and second centuries? Were they Parochial or Prelatical Bishops? Besides, where is the clear and authentic evidence that these names set down by Chapin are indeed arranged according to historical truth and verity? Your writers must be aware for instance that there are many contradictory statements in the ecclesiastical histories now extant, and a mere general assertion that these are "the veritable lines of genealogy, &c.," cannot pass as sufficient with those who desire to place themselves in respect of this question on a firm and immoveable foundation.

It has suggested itself to me to ask you *if you could not send me a paper containing the names of those who stand in your own line of ordination back to the Apostles.*" It cannot consume much time, as I suppose you have all the materials

and such a document would be highly interesting to me.

On the subject of what is said in Chapin about the independence of the English Church long before the time of Henry VIII, I have now but a few questions to propound. You will remember I alluded to the fact of the English Church being excommunicated in the days of that king, simply in illustration of your definition of "sects" or "sectarianism," and I asked you if your Church, *on your own showing*, was not a "sect," being thus excommunicated from the Church of Rome? It seems now that you claim independence of the Church of Rome, long prior to the Papal Bull. Now my friend, where is the evidence of this independency? Do you assert that the Church of England, as it now is, existed in all its essential forms and features before the arrival of Austin in Britain, in the end of the sixth century? Where are the records of this? And here I regret with you that we have not the entire writings of Usher and of Bede. It seems to me that from them we might gain some light on this interesting question. And my present impression is that we should find an entirely different state of things in the churches of Britain, and especially of Wales, from what appears to be vaguely hinted in the general remark in your communication about not fearing the thunders of the Vatican. But this aside, was Romanism ever universally established in England, so as to become the national religion, and either absorb or exterminate the Churches existing previously there, or else drive them from the land? Or did this independent English Church of which you speak continue in the country still independent of the Romish Church, never indeed being subject to it until the present time? But if this were so, how came the excommunication act to exist at all?—how could those be cut off from the body of Rome who never belonged to, or formed any part of her? Besides, if the Church of England and the Church of Rome were independent of each other, were they not both sects? Or has Christ had two separate and distinct Churches thus in the world? Again, how came Henry VIII to quarrel with the Pope, withdraw from his connection, set up for himself, and take the titles of Defender of the Faith, and *supremé* earthly

Head of the Church of England?— These are small items we should like to see explained, and we rather expect of those whose courage enables them “to pay so little regard to Papal Bulls and excommunications,” at least to give us a little insight into the mysteries of these things, and the source whence they derive their composure.

As for the other books you have been so kind as to send me, I have not yet perused them, namely, Buel’s Reply to Whately, and Hobart’s Apology. They are books I desire much to read, because I expect to find the subject which at present occupies my thoughts, in them, treated as you say, “in a masterly manner.” When I have read them I shall then be able to make up my mind as to their merits.

You speak of “the downfall of Dr. Mason,” and of his remark in reference to John Henry Hobart. Why, my friend, I have never heard of his “downfall” before! I had always supposed you might as well speak of the “downfall” of the Egyptian pyramids, or of the everlasting hills! And then about “the remark” he made, it is no more than one great and generous man might entertain in respect to another. It certainly does not prove either that the “Apology” is unanswerable, or that Mason believed it so. It were right for that most eloquent and venerable man, in his day at the very head of the American pulpit, to eulogize another than himself; but how many thousands are there in whose opinion John M. Mason might have said to John Henry Hobart, as Alexander to Diogenes, “if I were not *Mason*, I would be *Hobart*.”

I like much your kind intimation that there are still other authors behind that you will be ready to send me if I desire them, and trust that this open and friendly way of communication may still be continued. With pleasure I send you herewith “Snodgrass on the Succession,” and an old copy of our “Confession of Faith,” the only one I now have; but I intend to procure you a new one, and will forward it as soon as possible.

It is with sentiments of the most sincere friendship and regard that I now subscribe myself

Your friend and brother in Christ,

Batavia, Dec. 22d, 1846.

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Dec. 29th, 1846.

Rev'd and Dear Sir,—There are times when the old Yankee method of replying to some questions by asking others is very philosophical ; and therefore I hope you will allow me to pursue this method in paying my respects to your last communication. Some of my questions will be personal. Some theological and some historical.

PERSONAL.

1. What did you mean by saying that you desired to know the truth ?
2. Why do you wish to know *my* particular opinions on the subjects of Episcopacy and the Apostolical Succession ?
3. How is it possible that the whole discussion hangs upon *my* answer to your three questions ?
4. What "discussion" do you refer to ?
5. Have you not been furnished with the doctrines of the Church on those subjects ?
6. Have you not been furnished with a Succession of Bishops from the time of the Apostles down to the American branch of the Catholic Church ?
7. If your reverence is so small for the opinions of the Reformers, as contained in the Prayer Book, and for such men as Bishop Burnet and Dr. Bowden, can you expect to be enlightened by me ?
8. In what light do you regard the testimony of the Christian Fathers ?
9. Do you not perceive that your kingly illustration exactly describes the position of the Presbyterians—a class of men who claim to be Ministers of Christ, not because they are in the line of succession, but because Christ has always had his Ministers in the world ?
10. Are you in the line of the Presbyterian Succession ?
11. Can you trace that Succession man by man up to the time of the Apostles ?

THEOLOGICAL.

1. Is it the fact that the Presbyterians introduce nothing but the Bible into their public worship ?
2. Is it a fact that they subscribe to nothing but the Scriptures ?

3. What is the Confession of Faith?
4. How much of the Bible is read every Sunday in the Presbyterian Churches without note or comment?
5. Have the people any authority in selecting the portions to be read?
6. What do you mean by *extempore prayer*?
7. Is it or is it not a form to the people?
8. What are the disadvantages of this mode of worship?
9. Are your people well instructed in the Apostles' creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten commandments, as contained in your Confession of Faith?
10. Is the Church a divine or human institution?
11. Is it an aggregate or corporate body?
12. Is it *essentially* a visible or an invisible Society?
13. What is meant by the Unity of the Church?
14. Is some kind of a ministry essential to the Church?
15. Has such an essential ministry always existed?
16. Has it been perpetuated by any outward act?
17. Can a man be a Minister of God without being authorized by God?
18. Is an internal vocation alone sufficient to make a Minister of God?
19. Is popular election alone sufficient to make a Minister of God?
20. If anything more is necessary, what is it?
21. Do the Presbyterians hold to some kind of succession?
22. Is it a broken or unbroken succession?
23. If an unbroken succession, can it be traced man by man?
24. If it cannot be traced, what is it good for?
25. Is there such an office as that of deacons in the Presbyterian Church?
26. Do the Deacons preach and baptize?
27. If Matthias was not ordained, how did he become an Apostle?
28. Have not the Socinians as much right to say that the recorded birth of our Saviour is a mistake as the Presbyterians have to say that the Apostles made a mistake in the election of Matthias?
29. Is not the principle of interpretation adopted by Dr.

Snodgrass and others essentially erroneous? And may not the infidel employ the same principle against any of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity?

HISTORICAL.

1. When was the Christian Church first planted in England?
2. Was it then under the dominion of the Bishop of Rome?
3. What is meant by Reformation?
4. When did the first separation take place from the Church in England, and who were the leaders?
5. What were the principles of Brown and Cartwright? And what became of Brown?
6. What is the testimony of history as to the first establishment of the Presbyterian Church?
7. When did the Presbyterians first lay claim to an exclusive divine right?
8. When was *extempore prayer* first introduced into the public worship of God in England, and by whom?
9. What is the origin of Liturgies?
10. If our Saviour's promise to the Apostles does imply an Apostolic Succession, as it plainly does, then *when, where, and how* was it broken?
11. Was Calvin ever ordained?
12. Has the divine institution of Diocesan Episcopacy ever been acknowledged by any learned men among the Presbyterians and Independents?
13. Does not Mosheim acknowledge and prove the three orders of the Christian Ministry in the Primitive Church?
14. Is there any ecclesiastical historian who does not acknowledge the same fact?

PERSONAL AGAIN.

1. Are you a new or an old school Presbyterian?
2. What in your opinion is the difference?
3. Do you believe in Presbyterian ordination?
4. Can you find a record of such an ordination in the Primitive Church?
5. Do you preach the doctrines of predestination and election as they are set forth in your Confession of Faith?

Now my dear friend, I beg you to understand that I have not drawn up the above questions because I wish you to reply

to them, or because I have any doubts about them myself, but being in the position of an instructor as you have acknowledged, I think you would do well to be guided by them in your investigations. You will find that they contain some important suggestions.

I am rather inclined to think from your last communication that you do not exactly understand our position, and therefore it seems best to define it. If you intend to have a written *discussion* with me on any of the subjects involved in your present studies, then you have fallen into a slight mistake which I desire you to correct. I have too many things to attend to, too much experience of the evils of such a discussion, and too high a regard for your friendship, and for the harmony of our respective congregations, to allow myself to be drawn into it. I propose therefore that all written communications now cease, and that you come to me in "propria persona." I acknowledge myself a living teacher on these subjects, and I am willing to devote one afternoon or morning in every week to the business of giving you instruction. If, however, you prefer to investigate the matter by yourself, then my library is at your service, and I herewith enclose a list of books, other than those which I have sent, any of which you can have with the greatest pleasure. With the assurance of my sincere regard, I am,

Truly and affectionately yours, &c.,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To the Rev. B. Sunderland.

LIST OF CHURCH BOOKS.

(Sent in the above letter.)

Palmer on the Church, (invaluable book); Maurice on the Kingdom of Christ, (do.); Manning on the Unity of the Church; Archbishop Potter on Church Government, (lent); Hooker's Works; Pearson on the Creed, "Holy Catholic Church;" Bishop Bull on the Church of England; Bishop Jeremy Taylor on Episcopacy; Chillingworth do.; James of Nayland on the Church (lent); Leslie on Episcopacy; Law's Letters, (capital); Apostolical Canons; Stater's

Draught—reply to Lord King ; **Chapman's Sermons on the Ministry** ; Do. to Presbyterians ; **The true Catholic no Romanist**—Odenheimer ; **Cave's Lives of the Fathers** ; **Carmichael's Christian Fathers** ; **What is the Church?**—Bishop Whittingham ; **The Apostolical Succession**—an argument for Christianity—Johnson ; **Companion to the Temple**—Dean Comber ; **Wheatly on the Prayer Book** ; **Bishop Brownell on the Prayer Book** ; **Windsor on the Ministerial Commission** ; **Windsor's Reply to Wisner** ; **Bishop Henshaw on the Apostolical Succession** ; Do. on the construction of priest, sacrifice, and altar ; **Bishop Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances** ; **Whewell on Christian Ministers** ; **Elements of Morality** ; **Buchanan's Christian Researches** ; **Bishop Southgate on the Syrian Churches** ; **Bishop White on Episcopacy** ; **How's Vindication** ; **The practical developement of religious systems**—Chapin ; **Onderdonk and Barnes' controversy**, (lent) ; **Colton's Reasons** ; **Britain's Apology** ; **Gresley's Works** ; **Churchman's Manual** ; **Church Dictionary**—Staunton & Hook ; **Potts and Wainwright Controversy**, with notes ; **Dr. Lathrop's Warning to the Churches** ; **Succession** ; **Sewell**, (capital) ; **Waddington's Church History** ; **Burton's History of the Church** ; **Palmer's Church History** ; **Chinton's Early English Church** ; **Eusebias** ; **Ogilby on the Reformation** ; **Southey's Book of the Church** ; **The English Reformation**—Massingberd ; **Episcopal Tracts**, bound volumes, (lent) ; **Faber on Election** ; Do. on Romanism ; **Whitby on the five points**.

Books sent.

Kip's Double Witness ; **Apostle's Doctrine and Fellowship** ; **Bishop Ives** ; **Romanism and Dissent** ; **Churchman's Faith and Practice** ; **Sewell on the Evidences** ; **Burnet**, 2d vol. ; **Bishop Hobart's Apology**, and **Albany Controversy** in 1 vol. ; **Bowden**, **Cooke**, and **Onderdonk**, 2 vols. ; **Buel's reply to Whately** ; **Marshall's Notes**.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir :—Having been absent from town two days, I was exceedingly delighted to find another package from you awaiting my return. I at once commenced perusing

its contents, but what was my disappointment when I found you proposed that "all written communications now cease." I did not suppose, my friend, you would be so easily discouraged from going on with me in the way we had set out. From the promptness with which you sent me packages of books and communications containing references to them, with suggestions as to what I should find in them, and from your manifest desire that I should be led to embrace, as you expressed it, "the Catholic truth," I readily believed that as you had furnished me the occasion for my mind to be called to an examination of the distinctive claims of your Church, by first sending me the journal, of the reception of which my first note to you contained the acknowledgment, you would also be happy to correspond with me in reference to the important subjects of which that journal treats. I had accordingly entered upon the investigation, as I imagined, with the fairest prospects of at least having a brave and indefatigable guide to keep me company. And I supposed that like Roderic and Fitz James, we should pursue our course through the wilds of Church History and Church Reasoning, and if at times you put my courage to the proof, by rousing at your whistle, "a host" of authors, armed, around me, starting from "the bracken bush" and "shingles gray" of antiquity, I was resolved to plant myself against the Bible as the Rock of my defence, and cry,—

"Come one, come all, this Rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I!"

And if at last (to keep up the allusion) you were still disposed to insist on those principles which appear to me to place your Church in an attitude of hostility towards other evangelical denominations, I had entertained the welcome hope of * * * * you can apply as you think best the sequel of the story. However, whatever course you may think proper on your part to pursue, in reference to communicating with me by writing, I trust you will hardly go so far in our present circumstances as to *forbid* my writing to you. I have yet several things to say respecting the instructions of the books you have sent me, and on other points also; and I can only regret that there should have been from you the slightest

intimation that the correspondence is not in your view desirable.

But I am somewhat relieved by your kind intimation that you will be "ready to devote one afternoon or morning in every week, to the business of giving me instruction," and with a great sense of obligation to you for your generosity, I eagerly avail myself of the assistance you thus proffer me, and now await your answer fixing the day and the hour in which you will be ready to attend to my case. I suppose of course I can have the privilege of taking notes on your oral lectures, in order to assist my memory. And if so be that you make any statements which at first I do not comprehend, I trust I may be permitted to interrupt you long enough to receive their explanation.

I thank you very much for the list of questions you sent me, and think your advice to me concerning them *just at this time*, in some respects very excellent.

I am also obliged for the "List of Church Books" you sent me, and presume that I may wish in future to consult them accordingly, as I have leisure to do so.

Your last communication has opened up to my mind many rich veins of reflection, and in this particular I think it transcends either of your former letters. But as you have placed me now rather in a state of suspense as to the details of the mode of instruction which you are about to adopt for me, I will patiently wait and withhold any further comments upon it until you have an opportunity to disclose the time when you will give me your first oral lecture on those three former questions :—

1. Do you hold to Prelatical or Parochial Episcopacy ?
2. Do you mean by Bishop a Pastor of a single congregation ?
8. Do you mean by Apostolical Succession *such* a succession as that you yourself for example can trace your own line of ordination, step by step and man by man in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles ?

Remaining still ready to receive any light from you on these interesting topics, whether by written communi-

cation, or "in propria persona," I again subscribe myself
Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Dec. 31st, 1846.

Batavia, Jan. 1st, 1847.

Rev'd and Dear Sir,—I am happy to hear that you are disposed to fall in with the proposition contained in my last communication. In accordance with your implied request, therefore, I mention every Tuesday morning at 9 o'clock, as "the day and the hour" when I shall be at home and ready to attend to the business of giving you instruction. For your first recitation you may take if you please the subject of "Deacons" as unfolded in Chapin, pp. 142-9; examining in connection therewith those passages of Scripture which refer to the same matter.

Wishing you a happy new year, and anticipating the pleasure of seeing you at my study on Tuesday morning next,

I am, truly and affectionately yours, &c.,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To Rev. B. Sunderland.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—I have just read your kind note fixing "the day and the hour" when you will "devote yourself to the business of giving me instruction." And as the subject which you mention for the first lecture appears to me to fall within the compass of the three original questions on which I desired information, I can have no objection to your taking that up first. I shall endeavour to be prompt at the appointed time, and will also consult the references to Chapin and the Bible which you mention, as well as other sources of information, so as to be as well prepared as possible to understand your lecture on this interesting topic.

I suppose you mean by "the recitation" that you speak of nothing more than that I am to make myself acquainted with the references which you mention, so as to be able to give to you if you require it, an abstract of them. But you do not intend, I imagine, that the whole exercise will be taken up in

simply hearing me recite from memory what I have read in Chapin and the Bible on the subject of Deacons. This as it seems to me, would in fact be exchanging our positions. I should either be instructing *you*, or at least telling you what and how much I know, whereas, your proposition was that *you* would instruct *me*. It is necessary to add this little explanation that the way may be entirely open for you to commence your first lecture next Tuesday morning.

Meantime having now settled the preliminaries for your Oral Lectures, I shall feel myself at liberty to continue my letters to you, and as soon as may be I shall send you a more full answer to your communication of Dec. 29th, 1846. This however, need not interfere with your lecture on the subject of Deacons next week.

Hoping to see you then, and to have the pleasure of listening to your eloquent and able instruction, I remain as ever,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 2d, 1847.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir :—Having received no express prohibition from you, I proceed as I intimated to reply more fully to your communication of Dec. 29th, 1846. The larger portion of that document is taken up in propounding to me questions which you characterize as *Personal*, *Theological*, and *Historical*. Now of course it does not become me here to consider them in detail, because you expressly stated “you did not wish me to reply to them,” and I could not at present for another reason, namely, that while most of them relate entirely to another subject than that which I am now investigating, I do not know of a single one of them which will assist me in getting a definite answer from *you* to my three original questions.

I desired an insight into what *you*, for *one* believe and teach on those fundamental topics. Was not my desire reasonable? There are some important considerations which may be urged in its vindication :

1st. If you are the only scripturally authorized minister of

God in this place, I for one, and all of us ought to know it.

2nd. If you alone of all others in this community can trace your own line of ordination step by step and man by man in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles—and if this is indispensably necessary to constitute a scripturally authorized Minister of God, I for one and all of us ought to know it.

3rd. If the ideas of the orders of officers in the Christian Church, as you hold and teach them are the only correct ideas as warranted by the word of God, I for one and all others ought to know it.

4th. If the kind of Episcopacy which you hold to and teach is the only divinely instituted Episcopacy of Apostolic order and primitive sanction—and if all who do not submit to it when they might do so, are disobeying God, and rejecting the only form of Church organization and order which He has established, and thus bringing down upon themselves his displeasure, and if ordinarily there is no salvation to those out of the pale of your Church, then certainly I for one and all men ought to know it.

Now my friend I think you will agree with me that it was becoming in me to set myself to the serious and searching examination of the distinctive claims of your Church—particularly to seek as the first and foremost of what I ought to know, information on those three fundamental questions, because they furnish the key of all subsequent investigation. And as you were here on the spot, a “living teacher” as you profess yourself to be, and especially as you had furnished me the occasion, by sending me the journal before referred to, what more natural than that I should turn to you for light.

I found on applying to you that you at first were willing to correspond with me ; but instead of replying directly to my inquiries and giving me at once the information I desired, you left the whole matter upon the general statement that your views were in accordance with those of Bishop de Lancey as expressed in his Address, and generally with the standard writers of your Church, and then turned me over to find out as best I might from the authors you sent me, what your views were.

And when after you had sent me your first and second epistles, together with the books which accompanied them, I

informed you that you had not yet satisfied me in regard to my three original inquiries, and still besought you to do so, you saw fit to reply that "there are times when the old Yankee method of answering some questions by asking others is very philosophical," and then instead of even attempting a logical *expose* of my letter of Dec. 22nd, 1846, you proceeded to dot down for me a long list of questions having no necessary connection whatever with the information which in the outstart I desired you to give me. Now my friend, let the candid and impartial judge whether your course in this respect has been logical? Suppose indeed that I cannot answer a single one of the questions that you have originated for me (a supposition surely which in the proper place I should be very sorry to be compelled to acknowledge true,) still for the time being suppose that I cannot answer a single one of those questions, how can this fact relieve you or at all aid you in escaping from the true and legitimate issue implied in the three interrogations I put you. If you had declined that issue in your first communication I could not have objected: You did not so decline it, but impliedly set out to give me the information I desired. And though not doing it save through the books you sent me, you forthwith introduced to my attention under the form of interrogations, other subjects altogether different and foreign from the subject matter in hand: Now, in this respect, you might as well in my estimation have propounded to me a series of inquiries on Astronomy of Philosophy, and then told me that you had not drawn them up because you wished me to reply to them, or because you yourself had any doubts about them, but being in the position of my instructor, you would advise me to be guided by them in my examination of the distinctive claims of your Church.

Now I may be altogether mistaken on this branch of the subject, but it does appear to me from your letter now under review, that you must know, my friend, that you cannot show yourself entitled to be regarded by the people of this community as the only scripturally authorized minister of God among them. And would not the course you have thus far taken rather have this bearing to the view of an impartial spectator? Would he not regard the plain import of your letter of Dec.

29th, 1846, as representing Mr. B. saying to Mr. S., "True I cannot answer your questions; I cannot show your reasoning to be false; I confess myself unable to support my pretensions, and I wish you to consider that you are in the same predicament!" So much for the Yankee method.

Now in regard to my letter of Dec. 22nd, 1846. To this you have not pretended a reply save by your catalogue of questions, the logical consistency of which with the objects of the correspondence, I am ready to leave to the decision of any intelligent and impartial person. Yet there are points in that letter which seem to me to be of some importance in settling the distinctive claims of your Church—such for instance as my three questions there repeated, and also the questions concerning the history of the English Church, to say nothing of other incidental topics there brought out—to all which I think you will yourself acknowledge you have given me no answer, save by your "Yankee method." Still you pretend to be a living teacher on these subjects, and commenced the outset with apparently a great deal of zeal to convert me to "the Catholic truth," as you call it—sent me packages of books—wrote letters—gave references—told me where and what others had spoken—warned me about not being convinced against my will—hoped I would carry my will along with my judgment, and be prepared as you said, "to make that sacrifice of feeling and inclination which the truth may demand!" But with all your professions of being a teacher, and with all your seeming effort to enlighten me, I have yet to find the first sentence of yours which specifically and in your own words answers the questions I have put you. I may be mistaken, but I do not now remember a single instance where I have as yet derived a particle of essential information from yourself! In this particular your instructions have been peculiar *thus far*. Perhaps, however, you have reserved your main strength for your oral lectures, and I wait to prove you there.

There are some other points which I will here offer for your consideration, after you shall have satisfied me on my three original questions.

I. You say in your letter of Dec. 21st, 1846, that "you

are quite sure your Book of Common Prayer is founded on the Bible, and is the best exponent of its meaning now extant in the world." Again in your letter of Dec. 16th, 1846, you say, "as to my own views they are in accordance with those of Bishop de Lancey as expressed in his Address." He says in his Address, p. 48, of the journal, "It is not Puseyism to hold and inculcate that the authority of Holy Scripture is supreme, and that in the interpretation of it in regard to disputed passages, we are to rely for aid not on views of modern commentators, or our own private fancies, or the declarations of any branch of the existing Church, but on the views of the fathers of the first three centuries, as being nearest to the fountain of truth." Now my friend, perhaps I do not fully understand this matter, and I will simply say that I should like you to explain the above statements so that I may see their consistency with each other.

II. You say in your letter of Dec. 16th, 1846, "the Church of Christ is not, and cannot be, a sect." And in your letter of Dec. 21st, 1846, you clearly intimate that the "English Church" as you call it, was independent of the Romish Church long before the time of Henry VIII. Do you then regard the Romish Church as always having been a sect, or what is the same thing, no part of the Church of Christ? Or do you think on the other hand, that the English Church was and is the sect, and the Romish Church the Church of Christ?

III. You say in your letter of Dec. 21st, 1846, that "in the 1st vol. Bowden, pp. 222-3, you will find an account of the Waldenses, which may possibly give you entire satisfaction." On this reference to Bowden I have simply to say that I have just now particularly consulted it, and am prepared to take the following stand: If Mr. Bolles is pleased to assert on the evidence contained in this reference, that the Church of the Waldenses has anything which supports Prelatical Episcopacy, while it disproves Parochial Episcopacy, I will formally deny it, and put him to the proof of his assertion.

IV. Again you say, "on page 273 you will see something about the Picts, or 'Culdees of North Britain,' as you call them." In reference to this passage in Bowden I have only to remark, that if you will undertake to show that Prelatical

Episcopacy was the form of Church order established among the Culdees from the earliest period of their history, I will take the negative, and will discuss this point also.

There are other points in your communication of Dec. 19th, 1846, which in due time will be brought under review, either in your oral lectures or in my future letters. I turn once more to your epistle of Dec. 29th, 1846.

You seem to think "I do not exactly understand our position." I have regarded it in the light of a good natured correspondence concerning the distinctive claims of your Church, carried on between two friends, the main question being,—

1. Do you hold to Prelatical or Parochial Episcopacy?
2. Do you mean by Bishop a Pastor of a single congregation?
3. Do you mean by Apostolical Succession, such a succession as that yourself for example can trace your own line of ordination step by step and man by man, back to the Apostles?

You undertaking the task of Instructor, and myself assuming the character simply of an inquirer after truth. Am I wrong then in my ideas of our position?

You appear to speak as if it would break up our friendship and disturb the harmony of our congregations if this correspondence be continued. Why should it? Ought we not to search for truth without growing angry about it? I am glad, nevertheless, that you manifest so much regard for my friendship and for the peace of our respective congregations. I can assure you, my dear friend, that your desires in this respect are heartily reciprocated; and since you propose to promote them by avoiding a written discussion with me on fundamental questions, I think you will allow me, without compromising any of the essential truths to which we respectively give in our adherence, to suggest another mode in which we may both of us give a practical demonstration to our people of the truly Catholic feeling which we entertain towards each other—and now formally propose to you that if it suit your convenience, a week from next sabbath we exchange pulpits. I on my part should have no hesitation to do it, and I sincerely believe that one such act as this on our part would do more towards uniting all true believers in this place than almost anything else in our power.

Reserving further observations for the future—hoping soon to send you a new copy of the Confession of Faith—anticipating much delight in listening to your lecture on the subject of “Deacons” tomorrow morning, and praying ever for you and yours, I again subscribe myself,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 4th, 1847.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—In accordance with your request, I have concluded to suspend for the present *writing* to you on the subject of our past correspondence, although I think you have fairly no right, under the circumstances, to insist that I should do so.

I will also relieve you from the labor to which you stand pledged of giving me instruction on Tuesday morning.

At the same time, not knowing what circumstances may arise, and conceiving that every man has rights which must be reserved for his own protection, I make no pledges for the future, either as to the resumption or the publication of the correspondence.

Yet I consider the subject which has occupied our attention too grave to be disposed of by the mere workings of human sympathy, and now formally tender to you the following:

Either that you exchange pulpits with me on some Sabbath not far distant ;

Or that you publicly show, at such time as shall hereafter be selected by us, that you are the only scripturally authorized minister of God in this place.

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 9th, 1847.

Batavia, Jan. 15th, 1847.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—I beg leave, with all due deference and humility, to give you “formal notice” that I hold you in honour bound to fulfil your engagement with me as a stu-

dent under my instructions. You agreed to take for your next recitation, the subject of "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," and I shall certainly expect to see you again at my study, and prepared to go on as you have commenced.

No written reply is expected to this, nor can I consent to receive one, for the reasons already given and explained by "word of mouth," and nothing but your personal attendance as you "stand pledged" (unless providentially hindered) will satisfy me that you have intended to deal fairly with me, and that you really desire to "know the truth" as you have professed.

Having now formally stated what I have to say on the above subject, a kind of formality, however, which I do not like as between us, whatever I may think of it elsewhere, but in which I have followed your example, I desire to add that I am ready and anxious to assist you in the investigations which you have commenced, and do believe that the result will be happy, harmonious, and successful, and that your only true course is to go on.

I may also add that I have a written communication of some length, in answer to your interrogatories, and to all your last communications, which I will read to you on the occasion of your next recitation.

Truly and affectionately yours, &c.

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To the Rev. B. Sunderland.

NOTE.

The two following letters were sent to Mr. Bolles during the interval between the reception of his note above and our next personal interview. He saw fit to return them by the bearer unopened. It is proper, however, that they should be here inserted, as they will serve to throw light on our respective positions at this stage of the proceedings, and also to give the reasons of the interruption of one lecture in Mr. Bolles's study. The reader will perceive that the whole of this interruption is traceable not to any desire on my part to get rid of the Tuesday morning interviews, as seems to be pretty strongly intimated in Mr. Bolles's communication, but rather

to his own suggestions made in the interview he sought with me on Wednesday, Jan. 6th :

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir : Hoping you will not be displeased to receive a short note from me this morning, conveying wishes for your welfare, and assurances of a desire on my part to keep up the friendly correspondence which has existed heretofore, I take the liberty for this purpose of sending you this communication, which is also to inform you that I have been led to believe that *you fully and positively decline both parts of the proposition I made you in my last :*

Either, that you exchange pulpits with me on some Sabbath not far distant ;

Or, that you publicly show at such time as shall hereafter be selected by us, that you are the only scripturally authorized minister of God, in this place.

And accordingly until I hear from you by written communication, to the contrary, I know of no other way than to return to the old course, and shall continue my communications to you, from time to time, as I have leisure to do so. I shall also expect to listen to your second oral lecture on "Episcopacy as tested by scripture," at your study, next Tuesday morning, at 9 o'clock, at which time I trust you will commence to answer my three original questions :

1. Do you hold to Prelatical or Parochial Episcopacy, &c.

Anticipating much pleasure at seeing you then, and begging the privilege of bringing along with me a friend or two, who, I have no doubt, will be equally edified with myself, if I can only once bring them within the sound of your voice, I again subscribe myself,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Jan. 16th, 1847.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir : Since I have been led to suppose that you have virtually declined the proposition I made you in my note of Jan. 9th, in which communication I also offered

“to relieve you from the labor to which you stand pledged, of giving me instruction every Tuesday morning,” for the express purpose of affording you an opportunity to accept the one part or the other of the proposal, and since you have been entirely silent in regard to it, I feel at liberty to go on with our correspondence as usual.

And here allow me to make a statement, which I think is due, both to you, my friend, and also to myself. From the tenor of the private interview which you sought with me, in my chamber, on Wednesday, the 6th inst., I had been led to believe,—although you desired me to dispense with any further written communications to you, inasmuch as you intimated, if you received them you would feel bound to answer them, from the fact that if you *did* not, it might be construed that you *could* not—and although you proposed the idea of a public discussion, provided certain gentlemen in this village, on being consulted, should advise us to it,—nevertheless, that your chief desire was to continue the Tuesday morning interviews, and these alone. And this began to appear to me (I may be altogether mistaken, it is true, in my construction of the matter) but it began to appear to me just as much as saying, “I prefer to have you at my study, alone, where no one will hear or know what is said or done, and then if you get the better of me, I shall not be mortified, by having it go to the world!” And certainly my friend, I trust it will not be saying too much to declare to you, that your course, subsequently to that interview of the 6th inst., has confirmed my opinion. But perhaps I am mistaken; if you desire to correct me in this matter, by written communication, I shall be most happy to receive it. In this one thing, I believe I can truly say, that I desire, for your own sake, that *you*, as well as myself, should appear manly and open before the world. Hence, instead of leaving it to any others to decide for us, I made you the proposition out and out in my note of the 9th inst:—either, that the whole matter might be closed by a public act of brotherly kindness and recognition, or, that the issue for a public discussion, therein named, might be joined with me, by you, if you so felt disposed. In order to this, I was willing, for the time, (and because also you desired it,) to suspend the

correspondence I was conducting with you, and to waive, likewise, the privilege of listening to your oral lectures, that your way might be perfectly clear and unembarrassed, to accept the public form of disposing of the whole matter, which I then tendered you. And I desire you now to consider that at any time hereafter, when you may wish to accept either part of the proposition in my note of Jan. 9th, if you will so inform me by writing, I shall be most happy to accede to your wishes, reserving of course the rights which would belong to me, in arranging and conducting a public debate.

Now in regard to the remaining points in your communication of Dec. 21st, 1846.

1. You say, "on pp. 239-40 (of 1st vol. Bowden) you will find the opinions of Archbishop Usher and Bishop Stillingfleet."

I have consulted the reference, and until you disclose to me your object in doing so, can only wonder that you should have mentioned it.

2. You say, "On pp. 136-41, (2d vol. Bowden,) you will find some opinions of Calvin, which you can verify by a reference to his works."

I have attentively perused this reference, and have only to say, that whenever you see fit to assert that Calvin was in favor of Prelatical Episcopacy, and is supported in that opinion by the Word of God, I will be ready also to discuss this point with you.

And here I trust you will allow me to make a general remark. I see you have referred me to the *opinions* of this, that, and the other great man. Now I demur at the idea of your attempting to support your cause by the *mere opinions* of any great man, uninspired. Perhaps these opinions may be well enough in their place, but if they are not sustained by the Word of God, what are they good for in establishing a divinely exclusive claim?

3. You say, "in 2d vol. Bowden, p. 72, you will find the subject of 'Deacons' slightly touched upon, though more fully expounded in Chapin, p. 142." Again you say, "In Chapin's Primitive Church, pp. 142-9, you will find what we mean by 'Deacons.'"

Here then I find *you* endorsing, as I suppose, what is said in these references, with respect to the order of "Deacons," and as the reference in Bowden substantially agrees with that in Chapin pp. 142-9, and as this subject of "Deacons," as unfolded in Chapin, was taken up in your first oral lecture, to which I had the pleasure of listening, in your study, on Tuesday morning, the 5th inst., I propose to consider now, briefly, what I suppose to be a *summary* of your teaching on this interesting topic.

A. You state first, that there is such an office as that of "Deacons" in the Christian Church. Agreed.

B. You then assert that the *seven*, as recorded in Acts 6, were elected to the office of "Deacons." Proof?

C. You say that the very purpose for which the *seven* were chosen, was to take care of the poor, or more specifically, "to serve tables," and as one form of the Greek word is here employed, from which the word "Deacon" comes, you think it is fair to call the *seven* "Deacons." Agreed. The name Deacon then is applied to the *seven* from the very proper circumstance of the *duty* of their office, namely, "to serve tables," and to look after the poor, "in the daily ministration," and this was the sole business for which they were appointed—"this business."

D. You say the seven Deacons then were ordained. Agreed—so the record stands.

E. You say their business was to take care of the poor, or to serve tables. Agreed—this was the sole occasion and object of their appointment, as, I think, is clearly shown in Acts 6, 1-4.

F. You say further, it was a part of their office to *preach* and *baptize*. *This is denied.* Now for your proof?

You say that Stephen and Philip both preached and baptized, and they were of the *seven*.

Is this so? Did Stephen baptize? There is no account of it. Did Stephen preach? No. Any one who will attentively read Acts 6th and 7th chapters, ought, we think, readily to perceive that he *did not preach*, but only made his defence on his trial before the Council; which Council condemned and executed him, according to the forms of the Jewish law.

You might as well conclude from the speech of Gamaliel, recorded in Acts 5th, that *he* was authorized to *preach*, as a duly appointed Minister of the Gospel. There is no scriptural evidence whatever that in this sense, Stephen *preached*.

Well, you may say, Philip *did* both *preach* and *baptize*. Certainly. But was it by virtue of his office as Deacon, or by virtue of some other office? We read in Acts 21: 8, that this Philip was an *Evangelist*. It was doubtless by virtue of his office as Evangelist that he preached and baptized, and *not* by virtue of his office as a Deacon. Certainly, he could not preach and baptize by virtue of his office as "Deacon," without transcending the functions of that office. This is plain from Acts 6: 1-4.

This is all, I believe, that strictly appertains to the subject; as I do not now recollect any other passages of Scripture on which you will pretend to rely for the support of your ideas of the office of "Deacons."

It is plain to be seen *hence*, that the office, as defined in Chapin and in your Prayer Book, is *not* warranted by the word of God, in *two* important particulars. Deacons (I mean by virtue of their office *as* Deacons) have no right either to preach or baptize. These are the facts, and facts are stubborn things!

I will write to you again as soon as possible. Meantime, wishing your welfare, and hoping to obtain some light from your next lecture, on "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," as unfolded by Dr. Onderdonk, I remain as ever,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 18th, 1847.

PROPOSITION GIVEN ME BY MR. BOLLES IN HIS STUDY, TUESDAY MORNING, JAN. 19TH, 1847, WHICH I WAS TO ANSWER IN WRITING.

I propose to submit to two individuals, one to be selected by each, the following:—

1. Whether the above questions are proper to be put and answered, under the circumstances.

2. What rules and regulations should be adhered to by the respective parties, the one in giving; and the other in receiving instruction.

3. Whether it will conduce to the benefit of religion; and the harmony of our respective congregations for Mr. S. and myself to have a public discussion on the distinctive claims of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE PROPOSITION.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—It is with unfeigned satisfaction that I take pen in hand to answer your written proposal, handed me by yourself in your study, last Tuesday morning, Jan. 19th; since I had the assurance from you at the time that you would not refuse a written reply to your proposition, if handed you by myself in person.

You “propose to submit to two individuals, one to be selected by each, the following:—

“1. Whether the above questions (what questions you do not say) are proper to be put and answered, under the circumstances.

“2. What rules and regulations should be adhered to by the respective parties, the one in giving, and the other in receiving instruction.

“3. Whether it will conduce to the benefit of religion and the harmony of our respective congregations for Mr. S. and myself to have a public discussion on the distinctive claims of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches.”

Now, in regard to this course, I have to say, on reflection, that I think it entirely unnecessary. We are competent, I imagine, to decide these matters without calling in the help of our neighbours. You say you will go on with your instructions whether I answer the questions proposed by you or not. This disposes of your first difficulty.

You and I know well enough what rules and regulations ought to be adhered to in giving and receiving instruction, and I trust we are willing to observe them. And this disposes of your second difficulty.

In regard to your *third point*, whether it will conduce to the benefit of religion, &c., I have simply to say, that as no

mere man can decide that question beforehand, so it would be utterly idle to ask such a thing of any friend of either of us.

If the public discussion were conducted with becoming dignity, candor, and kindness, and with a sincere and sole desire to examine the truth, who is prepared to pronounce against it?

So again hereby I formally tender to you the following:—

Either that you exchange pulpits with me on some Sabbath not far distant;

● Or that you publicly show at such times as shall be selected by us, that you are the only scripturally authorized minister of God in this place.

I shall expect, “unless providentially hindered,” to be at your study next Tuesday morning, to listen to your third lecture on “Episcopacy tested by Scripture,”—Text Book, the Tract of Dr. Onderdank.

I am sorry you will not permit me the privilege of inviting a few gentlemen of the village to listen to your interesting instructions. Yet I remain as ever your much obliged friend and brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 20th, 1847.

N. B. I consider the above a sufficient reply to your proposition, unless you positively refuse to go on with your instructions, and so state to me by written communication.

B. SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Jan. 11th, 1847.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—The singular character of some of your last communications, and the intimations therein contained of the publication of our correspondence, seem to require of me a plain review. Indeed the correspondence would not be complete without it; the public would have just reason to complain; and besides, as it was commenced by you, there is an evident propriety in its being closed by me.

What I have to say I will endeavour to arrange in order, a little after the fashion of an authorized parson, and in such language as cannot well be misunderstood, so that the people

when they come to read it, will have the whole matter before them.

First, as to my "logic." Simply in consequence of my *acknowledged* courtesy in sending to you a Journal of our Convention, and a copy of my Educational Address, you seem to have been offended, and immediately opened upon me with two letters succeeding each other. In the first you *professed* yourself a sincere enquirer after the truth, and desired information in relation to the "three-fold Ministry" of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the second, after a suitable number of compliments, you not only criticised a word in my address, but made a personal application of your criticism to myself. To both these letters I replied in such a way as to avoid a controversy, and at the same time to satisfy your *professed* desire for information. I sent to you a number of books, on the very subjects to which your questions related; and about which you wished to be informed; and I also endeavored to explain the meaning of the objectionable word. So far there was no want of logic; for your questions either did relate to the Ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church or they did not. If they did relate to that subject as "the truth" which you wanted to "know," then my books contained a logical reply, as every Episcopalian knows who has read the Prayer Book, or the "Churchman's Faith and Practice," or "Kip's Double Witness," or Bishop Ives on the "Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship." And by sending you these books, and stating my agreement with these "standard writers of the Church," I gave you precisely my own views and a logical reply to your questions. If, however, your questions did not relate to that subject, then they were merely personal, and had nothing to do with what appeared to be the object of your letter, and your *professed* desire, nor with the extracts which you made from Bishop de Lancey's Address about "three-fold ministry" and the "deplorable ignorance of many who oppose the Church." Of course I put the best interpretation both upon your letter and your professions, and answered accordingly. So much for the logic of my first reply, and here I supposed the correspondence would end.

Then came your third epistle, accompanied with the present of a "Presbyterian Book of Prayer," which turned out to be a Bible with a new name, (and by the way; there was never a greater misnomer, judging from the prayers which I have sometimes heard) and containing sundry notes and remarks about the case of Matthias and the deaconship of St. Stephen, and on the subject of prayer, and the authority of the Presbyterian Ministry, and the effect of Romish excommunications on the English Church. At the same time you desired information about the Waldenses and the Cuddees of North Britain. You also repeated your three famous, most original, and remarkable questions, assuring me that you had not been able to obtain an answer to them in the books which I had sent, and appealing to me as a "living teacher" to give you light.

In answer to this communication I sent you more books, all relating to the very subjects which seemed to trouble and perplex your mind; and that there might be no mistake as to the logical character of this reply, I referred to the pages of the books and turned down the leaves, and expressly said that between such and such pages you will find what we mean by Deacons, what we mean by Priests, and what we mean by Bishops, and between such and such pages you will find the Apostolic Succession unfolded and traced; and I have no doubt when you come to publish the correspondence, with the matters so expressly referred to, (for this constitutes an essential part of it) the public will perceive that I gave you a great deal of light, and exactly logical and relevant to the case. And here again I supposed the correspondence would end.

But then came your fourth epistle, longer than any of the others, asking me a great number of questions besides the original and remarkable three—setting yourself up as an instructor, and forgetting your position as a pupil, finding fault not only with Burnet and Bowden, but even with the English version of the Bible, and altogether exhibiting yourself in a new light—in the light of a catechist and controversialist, and not of a sincere enquirer after the truth.

In my reply to this communication therefore I determined to set you right, to assume my own position as the catechist

and instructor, and to keep you where you had placed yourself, in the position of a pupil. Hence my letter of questions most logical to the purpose, and producing exactly the effect which I desired. And hence my proposition that all written communications cease, and that you come to me, "in propria persona," and my offer to devote one afternoon or morning in every week, to the business of giving you instruction. At the same time, however, I neither urged or even invited you to this course, but said expressly that if you preferred to investigate the matter by yourself, then my library was at your service, and presuming that you would so prefer, I sent you a list of books. So much for the logic of my third reply.

Then came your fifth epistle, revealing more fully the real object which you had in view, declaring your intention "to plant yourself *against* the Bible," which you certainly have done in planting yourself against the Church, manifesting no little uneasiness at the uncomfortable fix in which you had placed yourself, and repeating your three wonderful questions. However, you desired me to state "the day and the hour" when I would be able "to attend to your case." In reply I mentioned every Tuesday morning at 9 o'clock as "the day and the hour" when I would be at home and ready to give you instruction, and I requested you to take for your first recitation the subject of "Deacons." So much for the logic of my fourth reply.

Then came your 6th, 7th, and 8th epistles, to all of which I intend this as my final reply, the logical character of which can be judged of by the public when they come to read it.

II. Now I come in the second place, to your three most original and most wonderful questions, invented I suppose entirely by yourself, and intended to be made the grand test questions of orthodoxy for all time to come. Can it be possible, my friend, that you are the sole inventor of this new mode of inquisitorial torture, so admirably calculated to bring out the truth, and at the same time so innocent and harmless to the poor victim on the rack? Who can be surprised, when this sole honor of invention belongs to you that you should repeat them so often, that they should be so constantly in your thoughts, that you should be so sensible of their magical

power and charms, and especially that you should feel such an evident delight and satisfaction at this remarkable display of catechetical skill! But seriously, my dear Sir, and with all due deference I beg leave to say, that in my opinion your three famous questions have been made to appear quite as often as their intrinsic merit deserves. Your paternity of them has led you to over-estimate the original genius and power which they possess, and really I have hitherto neglected directly to answer them, in my own words, more on your account than my own. Any lawyer would have told you (a fact of which you seem not to be aware) that your questions are not only of that leading kind which manifest your fears as to what the witness might say, if interrogated generally in reference to what he does believe and teach on those subjects, but that they admit of a simple yea or nay in full reply and then the burden of proving the contrary would be thrown upon yourself, or else you would be compelled to try your catechetical skill again in order to bring the witness out. However, I will waive the consideration of this point, and will go farther in my reply than your questions justly demand.

Your first question is this:—"Do you hold to parochial or prelatial episcopacy as being of scriptural authority and primitive sanction?"

Now if by this question you mean to profess a real ignorance as to what kind of Episcopacy is held by the Church of which I am a Minister, and a real desire to know the truth on this subject, then I reply that we neither hold to "parochial or prelatial Episcopacy," in the odious sense of the latter term. But the Episcopacy which we do hold is the same which was established by the Apostles, of which they were the first Bishops, which was universally received for fifteen centuries in the Christian Church, as we believe, without an exception;—and if you wish to know anything more in relation to its nature and powers, its scriptural authority and primitive sanction, then I am ready to give you instruction, provided only you will come to me "in propria persona," with the spirit of an honest enquirer after truth, and continue the recitations which you have commenced.

But if by making this question personal, and by connecting an odious name with it, you intend to provoke a discussion with me, and at the same time to escape yourself both from the issue and from an honest investigation into truth, then I have only to say that you have made a mistake, and had better take your question back and try again.

Your second question is this:—“Do you mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation, by Priest a simple Presbyter or Elder, and by Deacon one whose office it is to attend to the pecuniary concerns of the Church?”

Now if you mean by this question to profess a real ignorance as to what the Church of which I am a Minister understands by the three-fold ministry of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, and if your ignorance has not been relieved by the Bible or Prayer Book, or any of the Books which I have sent to you, and you continue to press the question only because you sincerely “desire to know the truth,” then I reply that the Church does *not* mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation, she does mean by Priest a simple Presbyter or Elder, and she does *not* mean by Deacon merely one whose office it is to attend to the pecuniary concerns of the Church, &c.

But if, by also making this question personal, and pretending to an ignorance, which we can scarcely suppose it possible for you to possess, you intend to provoke a discussion with me, and at the same time to escape yourself from the true issue, then I reply that you have made another mistake as great as the former, and already you must begin to feel yourself in an awkward predicament. Already you must have discovered that I am determined to have no such discussion with you, and that I have no *peculiar* views or opinions upon any of these subjects. What I believe and teach respecting them is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as contained in the Bible, as unfolded in the Prayer Book, as explained by the authors already sent to you, and as universally received and practised by the Primitive Christians. And I have no doubt if you will continue to investigate the subject under my tuition, not in the spirit of a controversialist, but in that of a sincere inquirer after truth, then you will find that your individual notions are wrong, and that the doctrine of the Church is true.

Your third question is this :—“Do you mean by the Apostolic Succession such a succession as that you yourself can trace your own line of ordination step by step and man by man in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles?”

Now if by this question you mean to profess your ignorance as to the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, and your sincere desire to know the truth, then I reply—that our Saviour ordained the Apostles and commissioned them to ordain others, and the Apostles did ordain others, and commissioned them to ordain others, and thus from that time to the present there has been a succession of ordainers—of men ordained themselves, and having authority to ordain others—and this succession of ordainers has never and can never be broken, having the promise of Christ for its continuance and perpetuity to the end of the world ; and we call it an Apostolical Succession both because it has come down from the Apostles, and has been continued in that order of Ministers who have succeeded to the office of the Apostles.

But if, by making this question personal, and by raising some *historical* doubts as to the validity of my own line of ordination, you intend to provoke a discussion with me, and at the same time to escape yourself from the true issue, then I have only to say in direct reply that you have made another mistake, and I am afraid I shall have to give you up as the most luckless student I have ever had under my tuition.

But more than this. Your question is an evidence to my own mind that you know the doctrine of the Apostolic succession to be true—that simply and by itself considered, you dare not deny it, and that the only way in which you hope to escape from its consequences to yourself, is by raising some *historical* doubts as to the validity of my own line of ordination. In other words, you fancy that by some *historical confusion of dates and names*, you can possibly prevail upon your friends to think that I am in the same category with yourself.

On the whole, in reference to all your questions, I beg leave to say that in my humble opinion you have studiously evaded the true points at issue between the Episcopal Church and her opposers ; you have endeavoured to draw me into a discussion with you, not about great questions of truth or

error, but about myself, what I teach, and say, and do, and am, and not what is truth. If such questions are courteous, or noble, or magnanimous, then I am no judge; and if the public do not perceive that they betray a great want of confidence in your own cause, then I have no discernment.

The same want of confidence in your own cause is betrayed by your propositions in relation to the Waldenses and Culdees of North Britain; for they show how hardly you must be pushed when you are obliged to appeal to them as the only examples of Presbyterian ordination—examples which we not only deny, but which we have proved over and over again are entirely without foundation.

III. I come now to speak, in the third place, of your defence of these questions. You say as follows:—

“1st. If you are the only scripturally authorized Minister of God in this place then I for one and all of us ought to know it.”

“2d. If you alone of all others can trace your own line, &c., * * * then I for one and all of us ought to know it.”

“3rd. If the ideas, &c., * * * as you hold and teach them, * * * then I for one and all others ought to know it.”

“4th. If the kind of Episcopacy which you hold and teach, &c., * * * I for one and all others ought to know it.”

Now if by the above statement you mean to say or intimate that I have made any *personal* or *peculiar* claims to public favour, or that I have ever spoken of myself as “the only scripturally authorised minister of God in this place” or any other, and “alone able to trace my line of ordination,” then I deny the charge. I do indeed believe and teach as the Prayer Book says, that “It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. * * * And therefore to the intent that these orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to discharge any of the said functions, unless he hath had episcopal ordination or consecration.”

Such is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as declared in the Prayer Book, in the very language of the English Reformers, and as well known to every intelligent gentleman like yourself. And if this doctrine gives me any advantage over you, then I beg you to understand, it does not arise from any personal claims or considerations—the fault, if fault there be, is not mine but yours, and you have no one to blame but yourself and the erroneous system under which you act.

But if by the above statement you mean to say or intimate that I am accountable to you for anything which I say, or do, or teach in my capacity as God's Minister, or that I am bound to render to you an account of my stewardship, and to let you know my doctrine and manner of life in any other way than they are publicly known to all men, then I humbly presume to question your authority, and I ask who hath made you a judge over me?

But if by the above statement you mean only to say that you ought to examine into *your own credentials* as God's Minister, and not into mine—that you ought to know the ground on which you stand, and the authority by which you act, that these are grave and important matters, demanding of you the most “serious and searching examination,” then I perfectly agree with you and I will help you; and I have no doubt if you continue a *faithful* student with me, as you have commenced, you will be entirely successful in coming to a knowledge of the truth. But I must advise you that I shall hold you to *recitations* and *instructions*, as implying a rigid course of study, and you must not think to satisfy your conscience by talking about “oral lectures,” “taking notes,” &c., and thus endeavouring to get up a controversy with me, for such a course (under the circumstances of your engagement) is unworthy of you, and the subject which you are professing to investigate, and neither can you expect that such a course will be blessed of God, either to the removal of your doubts, or to your perception of the truth. So much for what you have been pleased to say in vindication of your questions.

IV. I come now to speak in the fourth place, of your proposition for an exchange of pulpits, already twice made; and

considering that you have repeated the proposition after the matter had been explained to you, you must expect me to use some plainness of speech.

1st. If you made this proposition in good faith, not merely to show your liberality, and to produce an effect on the minds of weak men and silly women, but really in good faith as expecting a favorable response, or as imagining that such a response could be honestly made by me, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church of which I am a Minister, then you have certainly betrayed an ignorance which surprises me much, and which makes me more and more confident of my ability to give you instruction.

2. If you made this proposition to exchange in good faith, and under the impression that my people would be pleased with it; in consequence of their personal regard for you, then I beg leave to tell you that you have fallen into another mistake. The great majority of the members of my congregation are Episcopallians from principle—they are not Presbyterians, they are honest and conscientious men and women; they do not come to Church for the sake of the Minister, to please him, or to applaud him, but to worship God as the members of the body of Christ, and in accordance with the dictates of their own enlightened consciences, and no considerations of love and affection for any man, can induce them to sacrifice their principles, or change the Church of God into a Presbyterian meeting-house. You might as well, therefore, request me to leave the town at once, for such would be the result of your proposition if I were to accede to it. I may also add that however much my people may desire the union of all who profess and call themselves Christians, they have no idea of such a union excepting upon principle, and they know full well that any union which is produced by the sacrifice of principle, and by the combination of discordant elements, must eventually be destroyed.

3. If you made your proposition to exchange only to show your liberality, and to find out what I would say to it, then I reply that I have no objections to your occupying my pulpit in full canonicals, with gown and bands, provided only you can satisfy me that you have renounced your errors, and

have been sufficiently instructed, and have had Episcopal ordination or consecration. Then I will gladly stand aside and you may preach to your heart's content, on any text you please, though I would respectfully suggest the following for your introductory sermon:—"*Whereas I was blind, now I see.*"

Having now fully answered your proposition for an exchange of pulpits, suppose we turn the tables, and you let me make a proposition, not for a mere temporary exchange of pulpits, but for a real and substantial union, founded upon principle, and one that cannot be broken or destroyed. Your Presbyterian fathers separated from the Church for objections which are now regarded as frivolous and nonsensical, relating to the surplice and the sign of the Cross in baptism, and the use of chaunts and organs. Now my proposition is that you repent of this sin of separation, and come back to the Church from which your fathers separated, and then we shall have a union indeed, and such as God has commanded, and will undoubtedly bless. I beg you to understand that I make this proposition in good faith, not as thinking that you will accede to it, but as knowing that you can, and that you ought, and that your conscience will never be satisfied until you do. If in reply to this proposition you say that we separated from the Church of Rome, then I deny the fact, and tell you not only that reformation is not separation, but that you have made a Romish objection which is unworthy of a Protestant, and which the English Reformers fully considered and fully answered. "Where was your Church before Luther?" was the Romish question, and in reply to it one of the master spirits of England asked another, "Where was your face before it was washed?" And so says Dr. Hook, in allusion to this anecdote, "the Church in England was no more a new Church after the reformation, than a man is a new man who has washed his face." It is the old Church reformed. But the Presbyterians did not stop at Reformation, but went on to an actual separation, which they acknowledged and tried to defend, and therefore my proposition that you renounce their error is right and reasonable, especially when it is considered that you have already confessed our reforma-

tion, and signified your willingness to use our forms and ceremonies. But as a farther illustration of my meaning, I append to this letter a criticism on some remarks in the Presbyterian, and commend it to your attentive perusal.

V. I come now to speak of the *alternative* of your proposition for an exchange. You say that you now formally tender to me the following :—

“Either that you exchange pulpits with me on some Sabbath not far distant ; or that you publicly show at such time as shall hereafter be selected by us, that you are the only scripturally authorised Minister of God in this place.”

Now in reply to this alternative, so formally tendered, and as though you intended to compel me to it, I have to say that I suppose I may be allowed to act my own pleasure—to exchange when and with whom I please, and to select for my public discourses any subject which I may think best. This is a Christian liberty which I have heretofore enjoyed, and of which I should be very sorry to be deprived at the present time ; and therefore I humbly beg the gracious permission of my Presbyterian brother to allow me to do as I please, and would respectfully remind him that the “Barebone’s Parliament” is not in session.

But more than this, and in all seriousness and sobriety, I do think that I am a “scripturally authorised Minister of God,” and so far as I am informed, there is no individual who has any doubts on this subject ; and whatever the good people of this neighborhood may think of my abilities, or talents, or personal character, and however much they may differ with each other on all these points, still I believe there is but one opinion as to my authority to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. At all events, I am quite sure that my own people are satisfied on this point, and therefore I do not see the necessity for the alternative imposed. When that necessity arises, I shall take up the subject in my own pulpit, and shall select my own time.

But in as much as there is a serious doubt in relation to the validity of Presbyterian ordination, and the authority of the Presbyterian Ministry—in as much as many of the best and wisest men who have ever lived and are now living, have not

only doubted, but actually denied the validity of that kind of ordination, and the authority of that kind of Ministry, and in as much as you have some doubts about it yourself, I therefore most respectfully suggest that it is more important for you to establish your authority than it is for me to establish mine. In other words I think you had better let my authority alone, and attend to your own; and instead of agitating the question as to whether I am the "only scripturally authorised Minister of God in this place," you had better agitate that other question, more important to yourself, as to whether you are a scripturally authorised Minister of God at all. I beg you not to misunderstand me. I have not here denied your authority. I only suggest in reply to your extraordinary *alternative* that this is *the* subject which concerns you much more than it does me, which demands of you the most "serious and searching examination," and having "put your hand to the plough," having commenced the investigation under my tuition, I think it your duty now not to draw back. At the same time, however, you must not expect success unless you honestly desire to know the truth, and pursue your investigations in a becoming spirit of meekness and humility.

VI. I come now to speak of the following statement in your last epistle:—"I make no pledges for the future either as to the resumption or the publication of the correspondence."

You of course understand that it generally takes two to make a bargain, and therefore in relation to "the resumption of the correspondence," I do make a pledge. I pledge myself, with all the firmness which I can command, not to have any more written correspondence with you on any of these subjects. I am sure that such a correspondence, intended especially for the public, will have an injurious influence on the impartiality of your mind, in pursuing your studies under my tuition. I do not altogether relish the idea of being drawn into a written discussion with one of my own students of divinity, nor that you should succeed in forcing me into such a discussion "nolens, volens," and therefore I see no other way than to be "right up and down" about it; and so I tell you I shall not receive any more letters, and whatever you have to say to me on *any of these subjects*, you must say by

“word of mouth,” at any time to suit your convenience, or in course of my private instructions.

As to the publication of the correspondence, I take the same ground with yourself. I hold myself *now* at liberty to publish it or not as I please. If I do publish it, I shall of course expect to put in an appendix all the matters which you referred to by page, and made any remarks about, and I consider you bound in fairness and honor to do the same with the matters referred to in the same way by me. You will not misunderstand me. I maintain that the matters so referred to, did contain the amplest instructions and the most full and complete replies to all your questions, and by sending them to you in the way I did, I made them as much an essential part of my communications as if I had taken the trouble to copy them out. With this understanding, I have no objection to the publication of the correspondence, excepting that the good people of our respective congregations might get a very erroneous idea as to our personal relations to each other. They might think us enemies, when in fact we have only been having “a friendly correspondence ;” and they might imagine that you had presumed to act as an instructor to me, when in fact you are only a pupil.

Will you allow me to suggest a suitable title to the forthcoming volume? Suppose you christen it :—

“The Presbyterian on the anxious seat.”

And then in the preface you might represent the gentleman having the following soliloquy :—“Am I ordained or not? That’s the question. Some say I am—more say I am not. What shall I do? If brother B. is the “only scripturally authorised minister of God in this place,” then I am not ordained. If he is not, then *perhaps* I am ordained. If he cannot trace his own line of ordination, man by man, wont that satisfy my conscience? Possibly he cannot. Possibly I may be able to show that his chain is rusty somewhere. History is a strange thing. Few people know much about it. True the chain cannot be broken now, but who knows what might have happened in the dark ages? True I cannot trace the manuscripts of Scripture manuscript by manuscript, and therefore I cannot prove in this way that

we have the veritable Gospel which St. Matthew wrote. But some how or other God must have preserved his word uncorrupt even in the dark ages—one manuscript must have been a correct transcript of the other. If He established a succession of ordainers, may He not have preserved it unbroken? But I am getting off the track. How shall I compel brother B. to prove his own line of ordination, and how shall I confuse him, and how shall I persuade the people that there is no line or chain at all? Alas! he stands in my way. If it was not for him, nobody would trouble themselves about my authority, all would acknowledge it, and perhaps I should not be troubled myself. Ah! I have it. In the kindness of his heart he sent me a journal of his convention—Bishop de Lancey's Address. Can I not pretend that this was the commencement of a fight—the first shot! And then whilst I am fighting his ordination, wont the people forget mine? But what a blunder I have made! I have acknowledged my doubts. Nay, I have commenced recitations to the very man who stands in my way. What shall I do? What will my people say? How can I get out of this fix? All these points the reader will find unfolded in the following pages."

VII. I come now to speak of the following statement in your last communication:—"I will also relieve you from the labour to which you stand pledged, of giving me instructions on Tuesday morning."

Now my dear Sir, it does seem to me that your ideas are very crooked. You seem to think you can do with me pretty much as you please. You can force me into a discussion and correspondence whether I will or no—you can lay down your alternatives and require my submission, and you can break your engagements with me without even asking my consent. But surely if it requires two to make a bargain, it ought to require two at least to break one, and sometimes it does require more. And though I am quite willing to be hauled about a little, and know that I am and have been very forbearing, still I have some strong objections to the sudden termination of that relationship which we have so happily formed, and to which you "stand pledged," and therefore I cannot *now* consent to it. I think you quite too promising a

student to give you up ; and I am sure I shall be able to make something of a Churchman of you, provided only you will stand to your engagement, and cultivate and manifest the true spirit of an honest enquirer. Every Tuesday morning, therefore, until we mutually agree to the contrary, I shall expect to see you at my study, and prepared with your recitations.

Finally, the conclusion of the whole matter is, that in reference to yourself, I won't fight, I won't run, but I will *instruct*.

Truly and affectionately yours, &c.,

JAMES A. BOLLES.

To the Rev. B. Sunderland.

NOTE FROM "THE CHURCHMAN."

A correspondent of the Presbyterian writes to its editor as follows :

"The great error of the church in every branch of her organization, appears to me to be, a proneness to concession, and I think I may, with all the force of a received truth in ecclesiastical history say, that she has never made a concession which has not been more or less downward in its tendency.

"Our church, distinctive in her doctrines and polity, maintaining the whole scriptural system in its entireness and integrity, is looked down upon by the mere worldling who dislikes its home-thrusting truths as too rigid and her sons as narrow minded and bigoted and is hence oftenest called upon to make concession and the call has been alas too often responded to, resulting as in the nature of the case it ever must, in creating new demands and mediately or immediately greater dissatisfaction.

"The question between the church and the world is, not how much of the error of the latter the former may receive, and still maintain her character in an *outside* distinctiveness and half made up integrity. It is simply this. Is a given course or proposition right in God's sight, that is, can we by the light of nature and revelation, when that light is directed by the distinguishing grace of God, say that the given case is clearly right or clearly wrong? If it is the one or the other—and it must be one—there is no middle ground on which truth and error may repose in concert."

To which the editor thus responds :

"DISTINCTIVE PRESBYTERIANISM.—Although our correspondent S. A. B. may over-estimate the manner in which we have referred to this subject, he does not over-estimate the importance of the subject itself. He undoubtedly speaks the sentiments of a large body in the Church, yet we fear not of ail. Many good men have been so far led astray by the spirit of the times as to be almost afraid to let it be known that they hold distinctive views on doctrine and church polity. It requires some little courage to encounter the sneers of those who from interested motives, are accustomed so to magnify Christianity as to render all its outlines indistinct, and who profess abhorrence for the narrow minded bigotry, as they are pleased to term it, which looks at the system as a "body fitly framed together," in all the niceness of its proportions and beauty of its symmetry. The longer we live, the more firmly are we persuaded that no one doctrine of the Calvinistic system can be waived or compromised, without endangering the whole system. Each part is necessary to the whole. It is of the nature of truth to be consistent. The power of the chain is destroyed by

the loss of a single link. It is therefore asking too much for the sake of seeming fellowship, that we should be called upon to conceal any one doctrine which God has made to occupy its place in that glorious scheme of life and salvation which he has revealed."

It is gratifying to a parent to hear from his children a confession, however tardy, of the wisdom of the maxims by which he sought to restrain their youthful forwardness; and such a confession the Church has from the Presbyterian, though not quite so direct and ingenuous as could be desired. No sooner had the church shaken off the Papal usurpation, and reformed her liturgy than the Presbyterians, then in the hey-day of youthful blood, began to rail at the commemoration of the faithful departed, and other primitive customs, as no better than "tolerable fool-ries," and the Church, like an indulgent mother, conceded to their clamor and struck them from her Prayer Book. These concessions whetted the appetite for more; the Presbyterians became noisy and turbulent, and demanded that the cross in baptism, and other innocent usages should be discontinued, that the surplice and other vestments should be abolished, and that the XXXIX Articles should be made Calvinistic. This was a little too much; and the Church refused to make the required concessions. But the refusal came too late; the "great error" had been committed, and the "downward tendency" commenced; the Presbyterians, who had waxed wanton on concessions, were exasperated by the refusal, and plotted the destruction of the Church. They succeeded beyond not only their expectations but their wishes; and anarchy succeeded. When the Church was restored, she naturally enough turned a deaf ear to the clamors for concession, and seeing that her indulgence had been abused, took back much that she had before granted. The Presbyterians complained sadly of the oppression of tender consciences, forsook their hard-hearted mother, and made a church for themselves. And now who so happy as the Presbyterians? Without a hierarchy, without a liturgy, and without a visible worship, with nothing but a "scriptural discipline," and a most consistent scheme of doctrine, who could anticipate a demand for concession, where apparently there was nothing to concede? But so it fell out, that they who left the church began to wrangle among themselves; the laymen, who were at first pleased to be made ruling elders begin to think that they ought as well to be preaching elders, and many who were willing enough to believe that true doctrine is always consistent, began to see that all consistent doctrine is not necessarily true. In fine, the Calvinistic Discipline and the Calvinistic system of doctrine found enemies in the Calvinistic family; and thus the Presbyterians, after having fondled the children of their brains, began to quarrel with the children of their bodies. The latter, some of them at least, became refractory; but the mother, who became such after a law and fashion of her own, and is a church in the same sense that she is a mother, gravely points to "ecclesiastical history," and declares that "the great error of the Church (*sol*) has been a proneness to concession," and that the Church "has never made a concession which has not been more or less downward in its tendency." Verily *Wisdom is justified of all her children.*

But let us hear the editor again:

"We have said, with due deliberation, that interested motives actuated those who are the loudest declaimers against sectarianism, and the most enthusiastic applauders of charity. They have an interest in lowering a high standard, because they can lay no claim to a high standard themselves. We do not say this is universally the case; some are really beguiled by the seeming loveliness of the object presented to them; but very many others are influenced by strong dislike to rigid doctrine, and aim to bring it into discredit. They with great promptness are willing to sacrifice the truth, in which they do not believe; but they cling tenaciously to their errors. If the Unitarian, Universalist or Arminian, will sacrifice their errors, we shall be zealous for a union with them all; but if the union depends on our giving up the truth which they deny, we must unhesitatingly refuse."

Now this is rather unkind in the Presbyterians, to charge their more fractious

brethren, some with bad motives, and others with aversion to sound doctrine. It is not the wicked tempers of the children, but the false premises of the parent that have opened the door for Unitarians, Universalists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Quakers, &c. While the Presbyterians were yet in the Church, the good Archbishop Sanderson did not charge them with bad motives and hatred of truth, but he calmly pointed out to them their errors, and the evil consequences that would necessarily flow from them. Perhaps the Presbyterians of this day would like to have the Archbishop's address to their forefathers. "I beseech them to consider," he says, "what scandal is given, and what advantage to the Anabaptists, Familists, Quakers, and the whole crew of our modern sectaries, by what other name or title soever they are called or distinguished. When this gap [what command have you in Scripture, or what example for this or that?] was once opened *Una Eurusque Notusque*; it was like the opening of Pandora's box or the Trojan horse. As if all had been let loose, swarms of sectaries of all sorts broke in, and (as the frogs and locusts of Egypt) overspread the face of the land. Nor so only, but (as often it happeneth,) these young striplings soon outstript their leaders, and that upon their own ground; leaving them many parasangs behind them, who had first showed them the way and made entrance for them. For as those said to others, What command or example have you for kneeling at the Communion? for wearing a surplice, &c.? for lord bishops? for a penned liturgie? for keeping holy days, &c.—and there stopped: so these to them; where are your Lay-Presbyters, your Classes, &c. to be found in Scripture? Where your steeple-houses, your National Church?—your tithes and mortuaries!—your infant sprinklings? Nay, where your metre psalms!—your two sacraments!—your observing a weekly sabbath? (for so far I find they are gone, *already*; and how much farther they will hereafter go, for *erranti nullus terminus*, God only knoweth;) show us, say they, a command or example for them in Scripture.

Fugerunt trepidi vera et manifesta loquentem
Stoicidæ.

Thus do these pay them home in their own metal; and how the pay can be honestly refused, till they order their mintage better, I yet understand not. If any of them shall say with him in the Satyrst—

hæc ego nunquam
Mandavi (dices olim) nec talia suasi;

[The time will come when you will say, I never imposed these commands, nor advised them.]

The reply is ready in the next verse there—

Mentis causa malæ tamen est, et origo penes te.

[The cause of the froward temper, and the source of the mischief lies with yourself.]

I doubt not that those that made a stand sooner, are highly displeas'd with those that rush on headlong and adventured farther; yea, and it may be declaim against them with some vehemency, both in the pulpit and the press. But truly no great reason, if they lent them their premises, to fall out with them about the conclusion. The master in the fable did not well to beat his maid for serving him with *thin milk* when it was his *own cow* that gave it. For why should he that *giveth* another scandal be angry with him for taking it? Or he that helpeth to set it on tumbling down the hill, blame the stone if it tumble on still, *æ virtute impressa*, and do not stop just where he would have it. So mischievous a thing is it, as Aristotle often observeth,—not to lay the foundation on a firm bottom at the first. It had been best if this had been looked to sooner and from the beginning; but better than not at all if it would be well considered yet, and some remedy thought on to help it as much as may be, before it grows past all hope of recovery."

But we must treat our readers to one more extract from the Presbyterian :

"The schism which occurred in the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, and

which resulted in the organization of the Cumberland Presbyterians, has become a matter of history. The pretences of the Separatists were zeal for the glory of God and a more extended charity for man. Many were seduced by them; but, as the result showed, their great difficulty was their dislike to Calvinism. They pretended to cast away all creeds as enslaving, and yet they adopted an unsound one, and used their zealous endeavors to propagate it. Their reply to certain queries proposed by a Committee of the General Assembly, appointed for the purpose, and which is to be found in the Minutes of that body for 1805, is not without its uses. It may at least serve to show that just in proportion as they renounced the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, they multiplied their professions of universal charity. Thus they endeavored to cover up their delinquencies. They had charity for all except the sound body from which they had separated. But we will give a brief extract in their own words, as these minutes are accessible but to a few. "When we withdrew," they say, "we considered ourselves freed from all creeds but the Bible; and since that time, by constant application to it we are led further from the idea of adopting creeds and confessions as standards, than we were at first. We feel ourselves citizens of the world; God our common father; all men our brethren by nature, and all Christians our brethren in Christ. This principle of universal love to Christians gains ground in our hearts in proportion as we get clear of particular attachments to party. We therefore cannot put ourselves in a situation which would check the growth of so benign a temper, and make us fight under a party standard." Although these men had just denied the faith, rent the church, and set up a party standard, yet, with this high-sounding language, they attempted to beguile the public, and said to the Assembly, "let us pray for more of the uniting, cementing spirit, and treat differences in lesser matters with Christian charity." They were ready for a reunion, but only on the terms that the whole Church should give up its creed and descend to their level. Thus it was upwards of forty years ago in our own Church; let the Church now as then, stand up for the maintenance and defence of its precious distinctive doctrines."

Change the name, says the poet and take the story to yourself. The schism which occurred in the Church in England, and which resulted in the organization of the English Presbyterians, has become matter of history. The pretences of the Separatists were zeal for the glory of God, and a more extended charity for man. Many were seduced by them; but as the result showed, their great difficulty was their dislike to the Church. They attempted to cast away the ancient creeds as enslaving, and yet they adopted an unsound one, and used their zealous endeavors to propagate it. Their reply to certain queries proposed at the Hampton and Savoy Conferences, which may be found in Collier, &c., proves their utter inability to sustain their objections to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church, on grounds of reason, Scripture and antiquity. It serves, moreover, to show that just in proportion as they renounced the doctrines and usages of the Church, they multiplied their professions of universal charity. Thus they endeavored to cover up their delinquencies. They had charity for all except the sound body from which they had separated. But we will give a brief extract from the epistle prefixed to the Supplication to Parliament, as such records are accessible to few; "The practices of the adversaries, I mean of our Bishops, show manifestly, that these relics of cursed Babylon, which they maintain among us, must needs go away with a noise, as the rest was overthrown. They will not yield to the truth, however it hath gotten the upper hand of them. The Lord must use violence to throw them out as he did against the caterpillars, their forefathers. Rev. xviii. 19." Although these men were undermining the Church with art and violence, yet at the same time they were full of professions that their only weapons were "sighs and tears," and could mix threats even with their prayers. Thus they had before said in the preface to their famous Admonition, "Let us with more earnest prayer than we are wont, earnestly recommend it to God's blessing; and namely, that it will please Him by His Spirit to lighten the heart of our most gracious Sovereign, and the rest in authority, to the benefit of his *small flock*, and the overthrow of their proud enemies, that godliness may by them proceed

in peace." And by those "proud enemies," they say soon after, "we mean the *archbishops, bishops,*" &c. "whose kingdom," they add, "must down." They were ready enough for a reunion in "godliness and peace," but only on the terms that the Church should be overthrown and brought down to their level. Men that breed such cows, must, as Sanderson says, expect thin milk. Thus it was upwards of two hundred years ago; and how it was before may be learned from honest Heylyn, who concludes the ninth chapter of the first book of his "History of the Presbyterians," in words with which we suppose we shall never be forgiven for concluding this article: "and so we have the true beginning of the Geneva discipline, begotten in rebellion, born in sedition, and nursed up by faction."

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—This is to inform you that I have received your long communication of Jan. 11th, and as soon as my multiplied duties and avocations will permit, I shall take great pleasure in answering it.

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Jan. 15th, 1847.

I ought perhaps here to remark that both the above note and the following letter were never read by Mr. Bolles, for the very good reason that he positively refused to receive from me any more written communications.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—Your communication of Jan. 11th has interested me still more than any which have preceded it, and the only thing I fear is the effect which it may ultimately produce upon yourself. That you have in some way been made to feel very "uncomfortable" there is abundant evidence in your letter now before me. It seems I have put a cup to your lips too bitter for you to drink, and you have cast up your accounts in a very unexpected manner. Perhaps the potion has been too powerful for you; perhaps you are naturally more sensitive than I was aware, and have taken some things very *hard* which I supposed as a matter of course you would receive in a *manly* way. And yet if I had reflected a little more perhaps I should have seen that it would necessarily prove very annoying to you,

1. To be caught *blundering* as you were, in Greek and ecclesiastical history;

2. To be invited to an exchange of pulpits;

3. To be challenged to a public discussion ;

4. To be inquired of for the document containing your own line of ordination, step by step, back to the Apostles ;

5. To be held to the answer, in your own words, of my "three original questions ;" and

6. To be told of the slightest prospect that all this *might* be published to the world. Now if in any of these things I have *unnecessarily* given you pain, I exceedingly regret it. And if the various resorts to which you have betaken yourself in this your time of need, have brought you any consolation, no man will rejoice in it more than myself. You seem to have required some such *treatment* ; and now you have had it, you are, I imagine, very much in the condition of Peter Hodgson after the turning of his disease. A friend inquiring how he felt, "Oh," quoth Peter, "I am *powerful weak* but *cruel easy* !" There are several items in your epistle which must I think have left you after writing them, very much in the situation of Peter. As they have no appreciable bearing upon the great questions whose "issue" you are evidently striving to avoid, it would scarcely be worth while to notice them, were it not to show you that your *jocularity* is as easy of exposure as your *ecclesiastical pretensions*. Perhaps, however, a passing commentary may do you good, and then we shall have more important matters in hand.

1. Your placing the correspondence in a proper light to be published ; which you have effectually done by resorting to ridicule and thus betraying the weakness of your own cause. It is a bad defence, my friend, which rests simply upon the arts of a clown. After this there will not be absent from the publication passages of "a singular character," and "the public will have" no "right to complain" of the want of the usual quantity of gasconade. Your attempt has been quite successful, and "the correspondence will now be complete."

2. Your logic ; which has consisted chiefly of the partizan products of the brains of other men, several pounds of paste-board, impressed paper, and calf skin. Your logic comes in the mass, unchopped, swaddled in cotton strings and brown paper. I respectfully propound you questions. To answer

them you in return send me books, in not one of which is to be found a direct and logical reply "to my three original questions"—you propose and send me a long list of interrogations on extrinsic matters, whose only "effect" whether "desired" by you or not, is to plunge you into a still more "awkward predicament"—you *volunteer* to become my personal instructor—you tell me that your "opinions are in accordance with the standard writers of your Church," and again that you "have *no peculiar* views on any of these subjects,"—and finally when every mode of evasion has been tried, you freely confess that "*you have never heretofore answered my first three questions!*" Is this logic? I have been led to suspect, my friend, that you may not know what a strictly logical answer would be, and therefore, with all due deference to you as my professor of divinity, I will lay down a form for you to sign, and then you will see the difference between the course you have pursued and a logical one.

FORM.

- 1st. I, James A. Bolles, *do* hold to Prelatical Episcopacy.
 - 2nd. I, James A. Bolles, *do not* mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation.
 - 3rd. I, James A. Bolles, *do* mean by Apostolic Succession *such* a succession as that I myself can trace my own line of ordination step by step and man by man, in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles; and
 - 4th. I, James A. Bolles, will now proceed to give, in my own words, the chief proofs of the above positions.
- How easy it would have been for you thus to have answered in the first place. And how idle it is for you *now*, after your own confession, to talk about having answered me in a logical manner. What does your "Prayer Book" or the "Churchman's Faith and Practice" or the "Apostle's Doctrine and Fellowship," or "Kip's Double Witness," or "Chapin's Primitive Church," or "Bowden's Letters" teach me in regard to the precise manner and point of my inquiries? What purpose has been met by your manifold references and turning down of leaves? Why contend that you *did*, in the outstart, answer my questions by saying "you

agreed with the standard writers of your Church," and sending me a parcel of books? Put your finger upon the first passage in them all which contains a logical reply to "my three original questions." *I venture to say it cannot be found!* You direct me to *your standard works* for *your own belief and teaching*, and in the very first to which I turn ("the Primitive Church") I find the *author* admitting what *you deny!* Chapin allows that *bishops* are *pastors* of single congregations, while you do not!! If you say I take advantage of the *ambiguity* of the term "bishop," I reply this is the very thing I desire you to explain, which you cannot do by referring me to Chapin, since he will be found either flatly to contradict you, or else to leave the subject in a still greater ambiguity. How then could you make such an ado about your "light and instruction?" "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness?" Besides I had no security against being misled in reference to your *personal belief and teaching*, in consulting the "standard writers of your Church." Knowing that there are in your Church various juntos, factions, and divisions, how could I tell which you would have me follow, the High Church or Low Church, the school of Leighton or the school of Laud, Dr. Scott or Dr. Pusey, Lord King or Mr. Newman, Archbishop Whately or Bishop Onderdonk. You will know, my friend, that these "standard writers of your Church" are contrary the one to the other, and that it must be a mere evasion for you to say that you agree with them. Such blowing hot and blowing cold is anything but "logic." But your own *confession* is decisive. You frankly acknowledge that "*you have hitherto neglected directly to answer my questions in your own words.*" I'll take your confession, and you may take your "logic."

3. Your *acknowledged* courtesy. Certainly your *courtesy* would have been acknowledged if, instead of the journal, you had sent me a Bull of Excommunication, or the story of Pope Joan; though your character as a gentleman of taste might have slightly suffered.

4. Your way to avoid a controversy. You should have thought of that before. But why afraid of a controversy if you have truth on your side? Or why, if you did not wish

a controversy, did you not formally decline it in the beginning? Why enter upon the correspondence, and after trying your strength a few times draw back under the plea that you were all the while endeavoring to avoid a controversy? Was it a want of apprehension, or an excess of apprehension? Either supposition will afford an adequate explanation.

5. Your other fling at my Presbyterian Book of Prayer. This would have been well enough if you had not stumbled so on the threshold of the joke. Your statements about "the translators" of the Bible and the ordination of Matthias render your merriment over it exceedingly "awkward." Any man who will make such gross mistakes of ignorance, and betray such a palpable want of knowledge of the Bible and its history, has surely a right if he chooses to laugh at me for calling it "my Book of Prayer."

6. Your view of me as your pupil. You seem to take it as an offence that I should presume to correct you. You appear to be attended with a kind of hallucination remarkably pleasing to yourself, in the idea that you are now *de facto* a Professor of Divinity, and that you are empowered with these prerogatives to all intents and purposes—visions of advancement are doubtless before you. You have written a book—you are D. D. *sine titulo*—one step more and you will have a Bishopric. With such prospects you seem to look down upon me as rather a humble individual—you dole out to me a great deal of advice and counsel, sometimes warning and sometimes flattering me in the course of your communication, but always *snapping me up* after having *yourself made a blunder*.

Now when the Professor betrays open deficiency in the qualifications suitable to his office and pretensions, why may not the pupil detect his errors without any great impropriety? Of course I should not set myself up in any "new light," or deny your claim to be a "living teacher," or break the charming dream which your fresh functions appear to have woven around you. You are my Professor still! I deprecate the dissolution of this valuable relation. Let no man put violent hands on it; or attempt to deprive you of its honors and emoluments. No! No!! Yet sometimes, unluckily, even Profes-

sors of Divinity will lay themselves open to criticism, and I am sorry to see that you, my friend, have been overtaken by this misfortune. It is indeed calamitous for a man to *assume so high a station* in this land of republicans, when both nature and education have left him without the titles by which he can maintain in it, the common respect of men! Yet you are fruitful in resources; and although your long letter of questions could not and did not save you from the difficulties in which you were involved, still it showed you had grown more cunning, and had deliberately come to the conclusion that upon the subject of Prelacy it was easier to *ask* questions than to *answer* them. Your "Yankee method" is a beautiful invention to preserve you from future mortification, and rising in your dignity as Instructor, you command submission where you should have produced "light." Most remarkably shrewd and logical you have been, and very forcibly does your exhortation to sincerity and conscientiousness strike me. I suppose you did it to show your power. It was a great stroke of policy, and vindicates your right to sit in the Chair of Theology by virtue of a grave countenance, if nothing more.

7. Your play upon the phrases, "against the Bible," and "my three original questions"—"a paltry *play* which is not worth the candle." Your petty perversion of those phrases argues in your case the truth of the old maxim, "the wounded bird always flutters." I might have known that those three questions would prove very troublesome to you. Your oration over them inclines me to fancy that you must have paid great attention to the art of *logomachy*. You have added to my expressions as much extravagance as the redoubtable Sancho Panza did to the letter of his master, which having left behind, he attempted to repeat from memory. You seriously think then that they are *no uncommon questions*! I fully agree with you, and if ordinary enquiries give you such a start, pray would you not faint with affright, were I to put you some still sharper ones?

8. Your intimation about consulting a lawyer. While I respect as much as you can the profession of the Law, I must confess I have not as yet taken advice of any of these gentlemen—a thing which, I presume, from what you told me

the other day about your instituting legal proceedings in case I published these letters, &c.,—you cannot say. If, as you observe, the questions admit of a single “yea” or “nay” in full reply, and if this would thus throw the burden of proof upon myself, why did you not at first so answer, and take the advantage to yourself? I have noticed your writers are not generally above taking the advantage whenever it comes in their way. But do you really, my friend, conceive me so simple as not to know how to put a question? I rather imagine that the interrogations with which I have plied you will bear inspection upon the severest principles of Law, and that so the respectable and learned lawyers of this or any other place will tell you. As to my fears about what the witness *may state generally*, leave them to me, only let the witness be subjected to a proper cross-examination. His credibility on the great question of your distinctive Church claims might soon be brought to an end. Since you have thus appealed to the legal profession, I will suggest to you a little experiment for your diversion. Suppose you submit my first note to you to the lawyers of this village, and ascertain whether they will agree with you in opinion about its import.

9. Your supposition that I meant to be personal. As there are hints and charges of this in various portions of your communication, perhaps I may as well answer them here once for all. The difficulty of which you complain seems to be that under cover of a merely personal attack, and an effort to draw you into a discussion with me about your own personal claims as a Minister of God, I design to evade the “true issue” upon great questions. Why my friend, how *could* you think so? Have we not in our personal and social relations been on the most friendly and courteous terms? And could you suppose that I would maliciously set to work to hunt you down, like a partridge on the mountain, merely for the purpose of making your *person* odious in the eyes of men? I do protest I have had no such design. That you are in “an awkward predicament,” attempting to support your ecclesiastical pretensions, will be evident to all thinking people. That you are hemmed in, embarrassed and perplexed by your Church canons and doctrines, and that you often feel

the real odium of your position, I cannot doubt. That you must wince when the real "point at issue" is exposed, is but a natural result. Charge this not upon my attempt to be personal, but upon the true nature of the case, which you have evidently misapprehended. I have narrowed down the subject, as it were to a single point, and this it is which troubles you. I have no doubt the public will understand it, and be able to make the proper distinction between a mere "personality" and "the true point at issue." The principle which explains it is this: If you *personally* as a Minister of the P. E. Church of these U. S., can trace your own line of ordination, step by step, and man by man, in a direct unbroken line back to the Apostles, then can every Minister of your Church in this land do the same, and upon your principles of reasoning, the claims of Prelacy will be incontrovertibly established. But if you cannot so trace it, then none of your Ministers can, and so the whole doctrine of your Apostolic Succession will fall to the ground. The entire subject of your Church polity is, I maintain, clearly involved in the single question whether you yourself can trace your ministerial genealogy. I disclaim, then, a "mere personality," I invite you to "great questions of truth," certainly with as much "courtesy, nobleness, and magnanimity," as the character of your doctrines will permit. I have selected this method for you, so that the people may see just what is really the neat strength of your side of the controversy. Be assured they will see it and appreciate it, notwithstanding all your cries of distress about "personality," and "odium," and "historical confusion." And I beg to inform you that if this clear and concise statement of the question gives me any advantage over you in the argument, that it does not arise from any desire on my part to render you any more odious than your own positions have made you.

10. You speak of a great want of confidence in my own cause. As though I had any cause to maintain, while I am simply inquiring into the claims of your Church and Ministry. This is the only "cause" I have in hand at present, and I confess I feel some "want of confidence" in it.

11. You assume that I appeal to the Culdees and Waldenses

as the only examples of Presbyterian ordination. This is not so. Your allusion to them appeared to imply that you would claim them in support of Prelacy. I merely gave you an opportunity to go into a thorough investigation of their Church polity, which it seems you have declined. If you are in any way troubled to find Presbyterian ordination even in the Apostolic Church, I would commend you to read Acts 14: 23, together with Tit. 1: 5. This, however, is a subject which you have attempted to draw in, by no request of mine, and I leave you at present to settle it as best you can. The vague assertion that you "have proved the ordinations among the Culdees and Waldenses over and over again to be without foundation," will pass for nothing. I deny it, and put you upon your proof afresh.

12. You deny having made any peculiar claims. Ah, my friend, can it be possible! Here you disclose the full point and pertinency of my questions. They force you to a dilemma, one horn or the other of which you must take. If you make "no peculiar claims," why refuse ministerial correspondence with clergymen of evangelical churches, as well accredited as yourself? If you *make* "peculiar claims," why not boldly assert and attempt to prove them? You are inevitably driven to the one or the other of these points. Your professed inability to comprehend the import of my expressions on this subject, and your far-fetched suppositions about it, cannot help you. You cannot raise a cloud of dust in this way, or smoke the eyes of the people to blindness, and so effect your retreat. There is no escape for you. Either you must throw down your sectarian bars, or take up the glove of ecclesiastical controversy. This is the alternative which is set before you, and you may cry "peace, peace," for a time, but "the issue" will be forced upon you at length, and you shall meet it as best you can. If you are so skilful as to avoid it through life, yet in death it will overtake you, and you shall find, if haply you ever arrive in heaven, that gowns and bands and prelatical dignities afford you "no peculiar" recommendation to the blessed company of the just.

In your quotation from the Prayer Book, and your comment thereon, you neither prove nor define anything. You

assert a truth or a falsity, just according to the ideas which are attached to the terms "Bishop," "Priest," "Deacon," &c. Besides, what is the origin of your "Ordinal?" Is it divine or human? And how do you regard its Preface? It looks to me more like a flourish of rhetoric than any thing else. It states a palpable untruth in the assertion that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading, &c." This declaration is falsified by all the anti-prelatical churches in Christendom, as well as by multitudes of non-professing people, in many communities and countries. But what is your "Ordinal" or its Preface, or your own belief or teaching respecting it good for, unless fully warranted by the word of God? And while you have yet to show that you have *such a warrant*, and this is the special business you have taken in hand, of what avail is it for you to talk of "blaming myself, and the erroneous system under which I act?" I beg you to remember that the question is not about myself or my system. These are foreign matters, having no necessary connection with the subject of my present investigations, but which you have repeatedly endeavored to thrust in, I must think for purposes unworthy of your Chair as my Professor of Divinity. Now the true question is, are you the only authorized Minister of God in this place, and can you prove it? It is not a question of comparative advantages as between you and me, but of a single and positive fact, and so the public will regard it.

13. You question my right to call you to an account for your pretensions. This looks to me like an *after thought*, invented to deliver you from the web in which you are entangled. Let us try your *sentiment* a little, and see how it will bear investigation. You set up certain peculiar claims as a Minister of God. Suppose any member of the community wherein you reside desires to know what those claims are, and the grounds on which you support them, I maintain you are bound by every obligation to meet the requisition. Nothing but "providential circumstances" will excuse you. On this principle, you are accountable to me not only, but to every member of this community; and if you fail to recognize this responsibility, you do it at the peril of all the inter-

ests which you are sworn to defend. The same sentiment is fully implied in the introduction to one of the pamphlets you sent me, in which language to this effect is employed,— “The Churchman at the present day must be able ‘to give to every man that asketh a reason for the hope that is in him.’” (1st Pet. 3, 15.) This language from the manner of its application, I think clearly teaches that you must not only *possess* your reasons, but are also solemnly bound to give to “him that asketh” them. Shrink, then, from this responsibility if you can. Men will hold your claims as arrogant and unfounded as you would have them to believe *you* harmless and irresponsible.

14. Your intimation of doubts about my own credentials, and your repeated proffer of light and instruction. It does seem a little strange, my dear friend, after all my efforts to get you to understand your true position, that you will continue to meddle with matters that have no connection with the present investigation. Is it because you are really stupid, or because you have that perversity of will which constitutes the most obstinate kind of blindness? I have continually to repeat to you that while canvassing *your credentials*, mine will take care of themselves. And I hope you will in future try to bear it in mind that until your “help” is requested about Presbyterian ordination, you will do better to employ it in defending your own. This is the precise work to which I have put you at present. You are the most uneasy workman I ever knew. You have a constant itching to leave the business in hand, and go at something else. But I must hold you to it. “The public will have a just reason to complain,” if I do not.

You professed to set out with the purpose of giving me instruction about the claims of your own Church and Ministry; you are now almost in a frenzy to instruct me about the Presbyterians! And *such instruction* too!! I should think you had attended the *Normal School* of “Chaos and Old Night.” If I had asked you in the language of Milton, “Which way the nearest coast of darkness lies, bordering on light,” the course of your tuition would, I deem, have been exactly suitable; for this question is pretty much all that

your teaching has answered hitherto. Still I live in hopes, for I see you are fully determined on the solitary "instructions and recitations" in your study, where you will allow no spectators, as if this were the only mode your ingenuity could devise for relieving yourself from "an awkward predicament."

But after all your hypotheses and exhortations and exactions and impositions of rules and appeals to my conscience, how much of a mist do you suppose you have thrown over the eyes of the people as to the justness and pertinency of "the vindication" which I set up in my letter of Jan. 4th, 1847? It is only an expression of the common sense and the common feeling of mankind. If your exclusive doctrines—your distinctive claims—can be fully supported, then all men ought to know it, and subscribe to them. If they cannot be supported, then they ought to be exposed, and you ought frankly to abandon them. Why then undertake to evade or cover up "the true issue" either through a pretence of not understanding it, or by diverting the discussion to foreign subjects? If you persist in this course you must bring disgrace either upon your head or your heart.

15. Your remarks about the exchange of pulpits. This part of your letter decidedly grows rich. You evidently feel the odium which attaches to your position. Your pseudo "charity, professed friendship, and solicitude for the harmony of our respective congregations," vanish at once when brought to this true touchstone of Christian brotherhood and liberality. If my proposition has had no other effect, it will expose your arrogant and bigoted positions to the view of those whom you in your condescension have been pleased to denominate "*weak-headed men and silly women!*" What a pity it would be if the whole community should turn out to be just such persons as you have described—precisely "weak" and "silly" enough to discover your want of ministerial courtesy!

Here however, you draw yourself up with great affected dignity, and gravely tell me "that as I had repeated the invitation after the matter had been explained to me, I must expect you to use some plainness of speech." And how did you explain the matter? Why, you feared the discipline of

your Church! And what was my reply? Why, that you were bound to show good and substantial reasons why your Church should presume to discipline you for such an act, or else quit her communion as soon as possible, to which you answered not. Unless you show proofs such as I have not seen, I warn you that you have no right, under the circumstances, to stay in a denomination that will discipline you for promoting "friendship and harmony" in the way proposed. What does your explanation then amount to? Is it not a polite method of asserting what you pretend never to have asserted, namely, that you regard yourself as the only scripturally authorized Minister of God in this place!

16. Your supposition about my making the proposition in good faith, and about my ignorance, &c. You have had a great deal to say about my ignorance, and your probable ability to instruct me. I am inclined to think this a favorite topic with your advocates of Prelacy. Your Episcopal master has dwelt very eloquently upon this theme in his address which you sent me. I suppose you deem it sufficient for yourself humbly to imitate his example! Enjoy the illusion my friend, as long as it will comfort you, but think at the same time of those formidable blunders wherein you have stumbled much more than is expedient for a Professor of Divinity. Such recollection will give you great confidence for the future no doubt.

Respecting my motive in proposing to exchange pulpits, I observe I did it "to show my liberality," and "to produce an effect." I did it to reveal to you what mere mummery and cant in your mouth are all your professions of "friendship and harmony" so far as your ministerial relations are concerned. This is exactly the effect which I desired to produce. That I have been successful your treatment of my invitation fully shows. I think all men and all women who may read this correspondence, will see how awkwardly you have been situated in this affair, and will know how to appreciate your compliment, "weak headed men and silly women!" "I am distressed for thee my brother!" How could you speak so of those who have clothed and fed, nursed and tended, followed and defended you here in sickness and in health,

through evil as well as through good report, for the last fifteen years?

“Weak headed men and silly women!”

Think of that,

But what after all, my friend, is the reason you assign for not exchanging with me? “The fundamental principles of your Church!” Is this a *reason* or an *evasion*? What are those principles? Have they any warrant from the word of God? If they have not, you have no right to believe or teach or practice by them. Your excuse is a mere *petitio principii*. You might as well have assigned “the principles” of the Koran as a bar to the exchange, for in fact you assign no *reason*, you merely *evade* the point under a volley of words. Besides, my proposition was distinctly qualified by the remark that such an act should not be regarded by us as compromising any of the essential principles of truth, to which we respectively give in our adherence. What then could you fear if you had never claimed to be the only authorized Minister of God in this place? Or did you think an exchange would “*compromit the essential point?*” The truth is, you have no satisfactory reason to give, and so you content yourself with abusing every body as “weak and silly,” who forsooth, will not believe you without a reason.

17. As I have already told you why I invited you to an exchange of pulpits, I will notice your second supposition about pleasing your people, &c., merely for its own sake. I presume your people can speak for themselves on a question of this kind. There are indeed, I trust, intelligent men and women among them, and I have been very much affected by the eulogy you have paid them. It is no more than you owe them to exhibit towards them every token of your gratitude. They have made every sacrifice for you; they have stood by you in all your troubles, and are no doubt ready to do it again. But when you talk about “the great majority of your people coming to Church to worship God, as the members of the body of Christ,” &c., it seems to me you do nothing to raise you in the estimation of your friends. You indulge in a fulsome flattery at the expense of violating their consciences and sacrificing the truth. “The great majority

of your people members of the body of Christ!" when you told me yourself that you had only about twenty male communicants? If these are "a great majority of your people," then your parish is much smaller than I thought it was. I think, however, I know many members of your congregation who would be really shocked if you were to tell them they are true Christians; and if this is the way you deceive them, —if you flatter them to believe they have a good estate, when their own consciences tell them they have not, you are certainly "a blind leader of the blind," and both will be in danger of falling into the ditch. Most of your congregation have not been so taught in their earlier days, and they are not, be assured, so bigoted as you would have it imagined. And from my understanding of their feelings and views, I am willing to risk the assertion here, that you may go to the most candid and intelligent among them and they will frankly tell you that *they do not believe the distinctive claims of your Church to be supported by any exclusive divine right!* You cannot make them think there is any peculiar sanctity in a house built of stone over one built of wood, and many of them I have no doubt would blush to be caught pronouncing the sentiment you have had the discourtesy to impute to them. I heartily respond to all you have said about your people, so far as the eulogy is merited and just. There are many among them who, though kind and generous, nevertheless feel and acknowledge that they are not Christians, for whom I sincerely hope that God may appear, by giving "them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." And I do, moreover, most sincerely wish that you, my friend, may not be found tampering with their moral sensibilities, persuading them of safety, while it is afar off, teaching them that water-baptism is regeneration—that the Bishop will take care of their souls, and they have nothing to do but to take care of their bodies, deceiving them with your notions of the right of private judgment, the Apostolical Succession, the nature of the Lord's Supper, and all your High Church Puseyite and Papal dogmas! In such a course you will find everything in the kingdom of Christ rebuking you, both in heaven and on earth. Have a care then, how you discharge your responsibilities to

your flock, and be not found at the last, with the blood of their souls in your skirts!

18. In your third supposition you speak of my making the proposition to find out what you would say to it, &c. It is true I desired to hear what you would say to it, because I knew it would either reveal your true feelings and position, or throw you into a quandary from which you could not extricate yourself at all. You have at length fallen into the very snare which your own doctrines exactly furnish you. While attempting to flounder from an "awkward predicament," you plunge into another more "awkward" still. You say you have no objections to your pulpit being occupied by me "in full canonicals, with gown and bands!" This then appears to be an essential element of your devotion. Truth would not be truth, worship would not be worship, without I were bandaged up like an Egyptian mummy, or a wight from Lapland! I suppose you must of course lay great stress on this old trumpery of hoary colleges, and the man of sin!

But there are three conditions which I must fulfil before I can attain to this felicity. I must satisfy you that I have renounced my errors—that I have had sufficient instruction, and that I have been episcopally ordained. My dear friend, why will you be so cruelly exacting? "Errors!" How know you that I have any, save those which are comprised in the imperfections of our common humanity! I hope you do not intend, in addition to all your other pretensions, to assume towards me the relation of a *father confessor!* And if not, why insist on your first condition before exchanging with me? In regard to being "sufficiently instructed," it strikes me that your oral lectures will decide this point. If you are ordinarily faithful and do not wander from the subject in hand, I should judge you might bring the thing about in a reasonable space of time. But I admonish you that you must preserve your dignity as my Professor. You must not fly into pets, and get excited, and run off on foreign and irrelevant subjects, and then refuse to instruct me if I do not feel inclined to follow you to Botany Bay or the Man in the Moon, or wherever else in this universe you may deem it

desirable to betake yourself. So when you have played this comedy long enough you will probably say you are satisfied, and insist no more on your second condition. Touching my "ordination," I don't know but I shall have to say I shall take no pains to ease your mind on this point. I rather think it will be better for me to make a stand here, and tell you right out that I don't think that your "episcopal ordination or consecration" is any better than that of some other denominations that I have heard of. So if you exchange with me you will be obliged to waive your third condition, and exchange with me as I now am, on your own responsibility. What say you to this? You must do it, or else acknowledge what you profess to deny, namely, that you regard yourself as the only scripturally authorized Minister of God in this place. Give me, I demand of you, another reason for your refusal, which may not be regarded as arrant trifling, and I will yield the point. Until then I shall make no scruple to press home upon you the offensive and odious dogma of your ministerial assumption.

18. Then comes your text on blindness, to which I have ventured to add the heads of a discourse that I am ready to deliver in your pulpit, to your people, whenever you will stand aside.

I. Whereas I was blind, or partially so, I now see much more clearly the bigotry and dogmatism of Prelatical Episcopacy.

II. Whereas I was blind or partially so, I now see how idle is the dream of Prelatists about their Apostolic Succession.

III. Whereas I was blind or partially so, I now clearly see how fast they are tending towards Romanism.

IV. Whereas I was blind or partially so, I now see the utter inadequacy of my instructor to give me the information I desired.

INFERENCES.

1. We see from this subject what a *painful sight* has been opened up before me:

2. We see that blindness is sometimes more desirable than vision.

3. We see how unhappy it is for the teachers of prelacy to uncover its deformity to the light.

4. The dictate of wisdom is to eschew it altogether.

5. All discreet persons are desired to have nothing to do with it.

Don't you think I have kept close by my text?

Now having shown you to what advantage your *protege* will appear in his opening discourse to your people, and also what a recommendation it will be to yourself as an instructor, I beg leave to assure you that I have no *personal interests* to promote. I do not stand in any supplicating mood at your pulpit door, begging you to let me in, or supposing that my fortunes would be made were you to admit me. There are other places in the world besides "your pulpit." It was not for vanity, or ambition, or a desire for display that my invitation was given. Many of your people, if not all of them, have already heard me. If it is any consolation to you, you may know that they are not afraid of the "Presbyterian Meeting House," as their frequent presence at my services fully indicates. The attentions they have paid me are certainly gratifying; and though I do not suppose they think either of us the greatest of men, still I have much mistaken them if they would not be most happy to see us preaching in each other's pulpits, as a public act of brotherly recognition. Again, in my invitation I desired to promote and carry out what you have professed to be so anxious about yourself. You have manifested great solicitude for the benefit of religion, and for the harmony of our respective congregations, and also for our mutual friendship. How much do you suppose your letter of Jan. 11th will contribute to these objects? But my proposal is precisely adapted to accomplish them. Had you been really sincere, would you not have acquiesced in the arrangement instead of setting your wits to work to see how much contempt you could cast upon the whole subject?

Besides, an exchange would tend to revive in your people the associations of other days—associations now I fear sought to be destroyed by your unwise and unworthy efforts to obliterate from their recollections the instructions of their

childhood. You must remember that most of your people were not once Episcopalians, and from *whatever* causes they have been gathered around you, they have not, I trust, altogether lost the memories of other times, and the hallowed influence of a Puritan instruction. You must remember, too, that you yourself have not always possessed that haughty, supercilious spirit which leads you now to talk to me of "renouncing my errors" on the subject of Church polity. Consider that this is only so much evidence of your departure from that simple and humble temper which ought to characterize you as a Gospel minister. These airs of dogmatism exhibit only so many mile-stones which mark your rapid flight to Rome. And if you should ever be brought to your senses—if you should ever return from your wanderings—if you should ever know again the luxury of a true Christian liberality—if you should ever lay aside your mask of Prelatical assumption, and appear in the character of an humble, evangelical minister of God, willing to fellowship those who have as much authority as yourself, then perhaps the happy exchange will be effected. We "shall see eye to eye," and you will enter into a "Presbyterian Meeting House," not indeed as I am informed you have recently done, receiving courtesies which you are too bigoted to return, but as into a house of worship and a House of God, where you can preach the Gospel of the ever blessed Redeemer, free from the trammels of a usurping Hierarchy, and without losing the favor of your own people, or being driven from the town! When that time arrives, as you have taken the lead in suggesting texts, will you allow me to select a passage for your first discourse?

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

But if you will still persist in your exclusiveness and arrogance—if you will insist upon it that I am blind, and that you must instruct me a little more before you will exchange with me, then there are some items which are quite important to be understood, and that you may dispatch the miracle of restoring me to sight as soon as possible, I will here add some passages of Scripture on which it would suit me

amazingly, if you would deliver a series of discourses at your earliest convenience.

For the introductory you might take the passage in Rev. 2: 2,—“Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them *liars*,”—under which you might show that your Bishops pretend to be the successors of the Apostles, and that although they say they are Apostles *and are not*, still they are not *liars*, as the sacred writer asserts them to be. I am informed that you are peculiarly skilful in subjects of this nature, and it would furnish a fine field for hair-splitting casuistry.

For the second sermon you might take 1st Tim, 1: 4, in connection with Tit. 2: 9,—“neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions.—But avoid foolish questions and genealogies.” Under which you might show that although the Apostle expressly deprecates the idea of a lineal succession, and tells you you will be likely to have questions asked you about it which you cannot satisfactorily answer, still your doctrine of Apostolic Succession, wherein you pretend to trace your own line of ordination, step by step, and man by man, back to the Apostles, and *yet can not do it*, is an exceedingly comely and profitable thing, and is to be foisted in upon every occasion.

For the third discourse you might preach from Mark 9: 38,—“Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because *he followeth not with us*.” Under which you can expatiate at large on the delightful theme of *Church exclusiveness!*

These little items, if they could be cleared up to my mind, would indeed afford me “a great deal of light and instruction,” and help the miracle of my restoration to sight astoundingly.

One word before parting with this branch of the subject. You seem to think it is excuse enough for not exchanging with me, that you belong to such a Church as you do. You say I might as well have asked you to walk out of town, for neither your people nor your Bishop would tolerate it a moment. Why then do you stay in such a Church? I would advise you to quit it as soon as possible. Come, act

like a man once in your life. Come out and embrace the true freedom of the Gospel. You have a great many acquaintances that will respect you for it. Come out at once, my friend. Don't be bound up any longer with your feet fast in the stocks of Prelacy, and your back exposed to the lashes of Diocesan ire! Come out into the free air and glad sunshine of true Christian liberality and Catholicism!

19. Then comes your sneer at the "Presbyterian Fathers;" from whose ancient faith you have departed, as a wayward and rebellious son, having arrived at such a pitch of Prelatical hardihood that you can now stand over their ashes, and unblushingly deliver addresses and homilies in dishonor of the Puritans.

" Thus traitors to their native creed,
For rank apostate dogmas plead,
With upstart zeal abuse *the old*
Their *new religion* to uphold!"

I much fear it is with you as a divine of this country once said in reply to the insolence of his High Church son: "Young man, if when in your boyhood I had given you more *correction* and less *reproof*, you would not have lived to insult your father to his face!" You facetiously charge the Presbyterians with having separated from the Church on inadequate grounds, and call on me to repent of their sin! This is capital!! Dear Professor, where did you get this information? Can you not be witty but at the expense of historical accuracy? A joke not founded in fact is little worth, and I shall have to set down what you have been pleased to say about "the separation of the Presbyterians," and "permanent union on principle," and my "repenting of their sin," and my feeling a kind of remorse until I do, by the side of your *blunders* about the translators of the Bible, and Matthias and your Prayer Book, and the early history of the English Church. You talk of "*the separation*" of the Presbyterians, and their defence of the same. What do you conceive the transaction which gave birth to your Church [to] have been? Was it *separation* or *reformation*? Have you ever read the history of the times of Henry VIII? Was it not a *separation* when that villainous monarch, baffled in his passion by Clement VII, maliciously tore from the body of Rome her Eng-

lish limb, and assumed the ecclesiastical sovereignty himself, with the countenance of the parliament and people? Was it not a *separation*, when for this act of the implacable Henry, there went forth at length from the Vatican, the voice of excommunication, and the thunders of the Pope doomed the island of Britain to perpetual destruction? If you will go to facts, you shall see that your Church was an egg hatched in the nest of a libertine's lusts, many years after the light of the real reformation dawned upon the continent. Yet you pretend that your Church did not *separate* but only *reformed*! I leave you to draw afresh your distinctions between *separation* and *reformation*. Here too allow me to give you a little piece of advice,—never exhort any man to repent of the sin of not being a member of your Church till you can get rid of your old god-father, Henry VIII, and prove distinctly that your Church polity is more than three hundred years old!

In connection with this subject you have been pleased to add a stupid newspaper article, whose chief merits are its length and its latin. It contains in fact a Romish argument, and I should not much wonder if the author of it might soon be in the embraces of the harlot herself! All that kind of patronage and supervision which the upstart Church of England may affect in her vanity and self-conceit to cast over Protestant denominations, may be applied to her *a fortiori* by the Church of Rome. So all I say at present upon the printed scandal appended to your epistle is, *nomine mutante*, take the story to yourself.

20. Then comes that portion of your letter which is intended as a reply to my public challenge. I think you have here confessed your difficulties, and retreated from the position to which I have driven you, in the most ingenious manner possible for a man in your "awkward" circumstances. You have then it seems, in former times, been allowed to make exclusive pretensions, without being called upon to sustain them, and you hope that your privileges may be continued. Doubtless it is almost too presumptuous for any man to question your assumptions, or put you upon the task of proving them. It must of course be a great deal easier for you to make merry with your friends over your own wit in evading

it, than to meet and publicly settle the question I put you. Upon this point, however, the utmost stretch of your ingenuity will not relieve you a single iota. All your subsequent glorification over the "one opinion about your authority to preach," &c.—about your own serious and sober opinion to this effect, &c., can do you no good whatever. It is not in ~~this~~ way that you, my good friend, are to be allowed to cover up "the true point at issue." For first, upon the question of fact, Are you a truly authorized Minister at all? The people may think, and you may think that you are, and yet it may be a great mistake. You must remember that this appeal to the popular opinion is often employed to hide the grossest fallacies; you must consider that the fact of your being a duly authorized Minister of the Gospel is not to be determined by public rumor, but by the proper credentials. But in the second place, suppose the people do believe you to be a Minister, *on what grounds do they entertain this belief?* On the same grounds on which your own belief rests, or on others more rational and consistent? This is *the question*, and it brings you right back again to "the uncomfortable position" in which you were placed at the beginning. You not only assume to be a Minister of God, but you assume also that the grounds on which you rest your authority are the only grounds warranted by the Word of God—that the grounds on which other denominations base their ideas of ministerial authority are not supported by the Bible—that your ideas alone are the only proper ideas of what should constitute the credentials of a Gospel Minister. You claim to be such a Minister. The people in their charity recognize your office, and then you turn about and attempt to take advantage of this admission to prove your *exclusive title* to this office! Now will it be conceded that because you claim to be a Minister *at all*, therefore you have a right to claim that you are *the only* Minister in this place? This is the broad distinction at which the people are to look. The question plainly is, Are you the only scripturally authorized Minister of God among us? I have given you an opportunity to meet it before the public. Do you think your delinquency can be covered up by the trickery of a sentence "full of sound sig-

nifying nothing?" Your allusion to the "Barebone's Parliament" was unfortunate, there being no appropriateness in it as I can discover, unless you meant to say that were it "now in session," you should, being a legitimate member of it, introduce a bill upon the subject of our public discussion, which if it succeeded, would determine you to accept my challenge. I am somewhat suspicious that in this historical reference you have been about as happy as you were in your statements of the history of the English Church previous to the times of Henry VIII. Do you really know, my friend, what the "Barebone's Parliament" was, or have you confounded it with the Long Parliament?

21. Then there is your statement of doubts about Presbyterian ordination, particularly my doubts about it, and your advice that I should let your authority alone, and attend to my own. What! are you weary of instructing me already? My questions seem to have had some such effect upon you as the three bowls of tepid water produced upon the verdant Congress man. He thought it better that somebody else should drink the remainder, and sent the fourth bowl to a gentleman across the way. Your "ideas on this subject seem to be very crooked." You are the most singular teacher I ever knew. Every now and then you will be thrusting into your instructions some foreign and irrelevant matter. Is it because the subject of Prelacy is so intrinsically *barren*, or because you have fallen into a *doze*, and are muttering dreamily a confused jargon of old impressions made upon your youthful mind, mingled with those later notions which you have imbibed and cherished, to the shame of your manhood? Did you not set out with a promise to instruct me as to the grounds of your own ministerial authority? Did you not in every way express your desire that I might be led to embrace "the Catholic truth," as you call it? Why then suddenly vault away to something else? Why wish to direct my attention from the "true point at issue?" This is a piece of legerdemain truly worthy of a Jesuit! But my dear Professor, it will not succeed. Your arts are discovered. *You must keep to the original subject*, or "the public will have just reason to complain."

22. Your gracious and prudent resolution to have no more written correspondence with me on any of these subjects. This sounds very odd after the express understanding that you were to receive a reply to your letter of Jan. 11th. However you have the power; you have made "a pledge with all the firmness you can command;" and though it ought "to take two to break a bargain;" still you will on this point doubtless do as you like. I reluctantly submit, because I think a little further "friendly correspondence" would be of great service to you. But if you will refuse, *then you will*. I attribute this not so much to the reason you have assigned about its effect on the impartiality of my mind, as to your *conscious inability* to maintain yourself in a written correspondence. It is on this account doubtless a discreet "pledge" that you have made. Blunders in black and white do not appear as well as when simply uttered *viva voce*, in the privacy of your study!

23. Your remarks about the publication of the correspondence. Certainly you have a right to publish it, with proper explanations, at any time and in any manner you may think best, and I shall lay "no legal injunctions" upon you. I claim the same right, and since you by your own confession, "did not take the trouble to write out all the references to your books," I do not think that labor "in honor" belongs to me. Books already published need not be published over again. "The references" shall be accurately published, and then the public can consult them at leisure.

You seem still to stickle for the relation of Instructor and pupil, as though this would make a vast difference with the public in their judgment of the real merits of our discussion. Good Professor, do not be alarmed! You shall be duly recognized as *such*, and I as your scholar within all proper limits. No one may dispute the *nominal* relation. Which of us has been *really* instructed, "the public" must judge from what has passed between us.

24. Your last paragraph about my relieving you from your duties, &c., might have been wholly spared if you had been courteous enough to have received my letter of Jan. 16th. I have no disposition to give you up. I have challenged you.

to a public discussion—I have invited you to an exchange of pulpits—I have urged you to continue the written correspondence—I have attended upon your oral lectures—I have driven you into every corner, and from every subterfuge—I have redeemed all my pledges with you—and I still stand pledged to give you no ordinary task so long as you have strength, time, or materials for the work whereto I have summoned you. I am glad, therefore, that you think me so “promising,” and I have no doubt I shall be able to sustain my reputation to the last.

25. I will here notice some of your “special pleadings.”

A. Your intimation that I commenced the correspondence, as if the journal you sent me had nothing to do with it.

B. Your imputation that “I was offended.” This will scarcely agree with the *sugar* you put in your first communications. Then you seemed to think me quite an amiable person.

C. Your ideas of nobleness and magnanimity. You cannot gain anything to your cause upon this score. People will have very little sympathy for you so long as you set up in this community to have exclusive ministerial authority—deny official courtesy to others as well accredited as yourself—look upon other Churches as “schismatics,” and their ordinances and services as “unwarranted.” If this is *your* nobleness and magnanimity, is it for *you* thus to cry out in distress, when you are pressed for the proofs of your commission so to lord it over the Christian heritage! *Proh pudor!!*

D. The exhortation to meekness and docility! Ay, you have me there! by which you intend I suppose nothing more or less than a perfect stupor of intellect, a complete swallowing up into your own mind and will. Thus everything you say, whether proved or not, is to be received without examination, as the unquestionable truth. This is no doubt a happy qualification in all the pupils of Prelatists. It is the grand principle of the society of the Jesuits, and makes it very easy for the Instructor. All he has to do is to open his mouth in the parables of the Hierarchy, and his disciple must be enlightened and instructed as a matter of course.

E. Then there is your man with "his face washed,"—by which if you mean the Church of England, I should not think it would hurt her *to wash her face again*, at least till the stains of Prelacy are gone. Does it destroy "your face" as you call it, to wash it *twice*, first from the crock of Papacy, and then from that of Prelacy? "The face" would be there still, and look more, I opine, as it did in apostolic times! The illustration is a capital one!

F. Then there is your "turning the Church of God into a Presbyterian Meeting House!" Ah, whence this folly? You remember the ancient maxim, "*Quem vult Deus,*" &c.? How could you my friend, in all matters of Christian charity and ministerial courtesy, and especially after your loud professions of these things, so condemn yourself in a single sentence? The expression is too barefaced to leave a doubt upon the insincerity of your apparent respect for other denominations, *as such*. So long as this invidious remark, which has not even the recommendation of wit to redeem it, remains against you, you need expect but little regard from this community whom you have been pleased to honor with the complimentary sentiment, "weak headed men and silly women!" You really think then, that Church edifices consecrated by your Priesthood, have such eminent grace that it would not do to let a Presbyterian clergyman into them, for fear the grace should vanish from the walls, and the sanctuary become a plain building of timbers and mason work, like others around it! And why will not the grace work the other way as well? May not a *priest* who should venture to preach in a "Presbyterian Meeting House," lose all the charm with which he was endowed by the Prelate who ordained him? If so you will be obliged to get re-charged with the Prelatical virus before you can be prepared lawfully to exercise your ministerial functions.

G. You mention your unwillingness to discuss with one of your own students of Divinity! What! afraid of your pupil, when you first suggested to him the idea of a public discussion? Did ever master stand in such awe of his scholar before? You do me honor overmuch, or else you have small confidence in your own pretensions.

H. Then comes your putting my hand to the plough; by which you mean I suppose, that I have put the plough in so deep that it is rather hard for Onderdonk and yourself to start it.

I. Then your final promise not to fight nor run, but still to instruct. Whatever your conduct may be in future, certain it is that you *have* both *fought and run*, going I fancy on the safe principle that

“He who fights and runs away,
Will live to fight another day!”

You still adhere to the oral lectures, as in your judgment affording a fine *ruse* through which to retrieve all your other failures. Indeed you seem to look upon them as the very *chef d'œuvre* of your polemical tactics! Long live the Oral Lectures!!!

26. I now come to your Presbyterian portrait and soliloquy. To your undoubted talent for farcical operations I touch my hat. I was not aware before of your powers of mimicry and description. The shade of Grimaldi must, I have no doubt, be mightily pleased, could the news be carried to him that another son of genius has appeared to the world, to perpetuate his art, and to keep alive the spirit of Momus among mankind. Nay, old Loyola himself, if it were possible, would smile from his mouldy cerements to behold a son of “*the Church*” in these latter ends of the world, achieving so great a *coup de main*, and carrying by buffoonery what he cannot carry by sober fact. Now let us turn to the analysis of the picture,—

“The Presbyterian on the anxious seat!”

We infer that anxious seats have got into the private study of an Episcopal parson. Well done! We knew not before that this alteration had been made. “Anxious seats” adopted by the prelatial clergy! Here is one symptom we hope, of a return to spiritual Christianity, and the orthodoxy of St. Paul. Thank you for the information, and trust that your notion of regeneration and salvation by water baptism, may be driven out by the Spirit, indicated in the fact that you are beginning to have anxious seats among you.

Now for the soliloquy. How admirably have you put into the mouth of your imaginary gentleman the sentiments you have not courage to speak yourself. You make him thrust in again doubts about his ordination. This is fancy-work in good earnest, and much easier business than to prove your distinctive Church claims. Very likely in this case, "the wish was father to the thought," and being just now very much troubled about your own ordination, you could readily imagine a gentleman about your stature quite at his wit's end on this important subject. Then you make him talk about history's being a strange thing, and few people know much of it. Ah! Br. Bolles, this discloses how uncomfortable you are. The truth is people know too much about it to allow for a moment your arrogant assumptions, or swallow down your apostolic succession. Then you make him talk about the manuscripts of Scripture, a most clear and conclusive illustration of the insolence of Prelacy. Then you make him pay a beautiful compliment to yourself in the intimation that you are standing in the way of somebody—as though you did stand in the way of anybody here! Really, your egotism my friend, reminds one of the man whom Coleridge tells us of, who had so much of this commodity that when he spoke of himself he always took off his hat!!! Then you make him talk of a fight, of sending the journal, of the first shot, of the horrible predicament in which he finds himself, reciting to the very man who stands in his way! What an awful fix your Presbyterian must be in, standing beneath the shadows of such colossal greatness. How he must feel under the influence of the freezing dignity of the personage beneath whose august instructions he, poor soul, lies crushed and overwhelmed. How his people must pity him! What will they say, sure enough!!

We will now turn to the other side, where the counterpart will appear. We here behold a studio, on the door of which is posted the following placard in large letters:—

"Polemical Pedagogue—Professor of Priestly genealogies, who will explain to all persons that are meek and humble, *and not too inquisitive*, the mysteries of these things." Then looking inside the door, we behold the veritable Professor

himself indulging in "the reflections of his own mind," and speaking somewhat after the following manner:—

Am I the only scripturally ordained minister in this place or am I not? That's the question. Some say I am, but the vast majority say I am not. If I am, then I can trace my line of ordination back to the apostles, step by step and man by man. If I am not, then there are other scripturally ordained ministers here too, and I am in a very bad predicament in denying their authority and setting up my own. But is there an unbroken line of ordainers from myself back to the Apostles? Ay, there's the rub. I'm sure I never have seen it, and I'm afraid no body else ever did. I wonder what people will think about this point when the correspondence comes to be published! Hum! ha! I wish I *could* cover up this tracing my succession. It does look so glaringly assumptive even to myself. They tell me there are *breaks* in my chain, and I cannot deny it. How I have exposed my prelati- cal pretensions! I have sent a journal to Mr. S. How unlucky it was! Alas! alas! if it had not been for this, I should still have continued to enjoy "the fat slumbers of the Church" without molestation. Ah, what a dreadful mistake! I thought he would receive it not only as act of courtesy, but as a mark of genuine taste. But he has read the book, and now wants me to explain its phrases. Why didn't I tell him at the outset that I'd have nothing to do with it? Ah me, I commenced a regular correspondence with him. I thought to overwhelm him with our books of magic. But it daunts him not! He still follows me with questions which I must try to dispose of in some way. He has shown up my blunders even—*for that I have blundered cannot be denied!* Oh, miserable, what if he gets me into a written discussion, so that I can neither answer nor withdraw—what will my people think to see me in this condition? What *shall* I do?

I'll turn pedagogue—get him down here alone, and then nobody will know what is said or done. Thank the stars for my wit! But first let me overwhelm him with a mass of questions which will make him think I am very wise, put a stop to the written correspondence, *for I've had enough of that*, and when I get him here I can domineer over him as

an Instructor, and nobody will know but that he is studying to take orders. A lucky thought!

I have proposed his coming—I have *volunteered* to instruct him. He has taken me up. Here again I am at my wits' end. If he asks me questions how can I answer him? I have little ground to stand upon in reality, but I'll worry him with these melancholy volumes upon these dusty shelves! Yet he will keep sending me letters. This will look bad. I must end it some way. I have refused two of them already. It grieves me to be so hard put to it as this.

But stop—I thought to frighten him by intimating the possibility of a public discussion. Even this does not trouble him. He has formally challenged me! What can I do? I dare not appear with my claims and my arguments before the good people of Batavia! Oh, that unfortunate journal! Oh, these contemptible authors and books of mine! Oh, for the good old days when the priesthood were not required even to learn to read, much less to rack their brains in defence of "*the Church*," when the dungeon and the fagot silenced all objections, and left a conviction of her authority as profound as the grave!

My "host of writers" are good for nothing to help me out of this fix. I am more unfortunate than Falstaff himself.

"If I be not ashamed of my soldiers I am a soused garnet.
* * * And now my whole charge consists of ancients, corporals, lieutenants, gentlemen of companies, slaves as ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth, and such as indeed were never soldiers, but discarded unjust serving-men, younger sons to younger brothers, revolted tapsters, and ostlers trade-fallen, the cankers of a calm world and a long peace! * * * No eye hath seen such scare-crows. I'll not march through Coventry with 'em—that's flat!"

But I must do something. Ah, now my wit returns again! I'll calmly sink behind my dignity as an Instructor, as the sun often descends behind the gorgeous clouds! Nor will I allow my repose to be broken again by letters from this son of a Puritan (oh, how I hate the race!) Then I can put what construction I please on the whole matter. Of my wit and my cunning, I can keep up the flourish of trumpets, while my

blunders shall find a tomb on which this inscription shall be written :—

“Requiescant in pace!”

And thus will I retrieve the ancient honors of my priesthood, and re-establish the dynasty of the Old Man of the Tiber !!!!

After what has now been offered, you must begin to see, my friend, that it is exceedingly unprofitable for you to attempt a vindication of your ministerial position, by rodomontade alone. From the topics you have chosen to exhibit, and your manner of treating them, one would suppose that you were determined to evade “the true issue,” and since you could do no better, to substitute assertion for argument, raillery for reason. For myself I do not speak of this complainingly, for, amused with your ingenuity, I have at the same time been struck with the tendency of the human mind to resort to expedients to relieve itself from “an awkward predicament,” and with the analogies of the same principle furnished us in the tribes of lower animals. This propensity is so clearly exemplified in your communication as to remind one of a certain *fish*, which is provided with an ink-bag for defence, and which when hard pressed, opens this ink-bag, discolors the waters, and so eludes pursuit. And this you tell us expressly is “after the fashion of an authorized parson.”

That a gentleman of your general shrewdness should, in such relations and upon such a subject, have so much exposed himself to severe criticism, requires an explanation of no trivial character. I can now see, as I think, a good reason for your unwillingness to send me your last communication, and your desire to read it to me in the privacy of your study. You must have been conscious that the greatest portion of it was unworthy of yourself, and could not merit a reply. And the only apology that I have for reviewing it, is the danger that you and some of your particular friends might take occasion to misconstrue and misrepresent my silence. I have no ambition, however, to be thought capable of competition with you in this department. While I remember what I owe to the character of a clergyman, and how little ultimately, is

gained to the cause of Christian truth and charity by resorting to such arts. I shall ever cheerfully accord to you the *need* of having worsted me in every kind of personal raillery. It will be sufficient for the purposes of this "friendly correspondence" if *you alone* have deemed it necessary to part with all that constitutes a courteous and high-toned investigation of the grave matters which lie before us. It has been my part simply to expose the apparent skilfulness of your defences, not, be assured, in any spirit of unkindness or impatience, but rather with a feeling of regret that your conduct should have required so thorough a chastisement. How far therefore this new style of yours comports with the dignity of your position as an Instructor, to say nothing of the *superior clerical character* which you assume, is a question which after all I must leave you to determine. While I have been reluctantly drawn aside from the main purpose, through your unwholesome method of discussion, I shall still extend towards you all possible leniency of judgment, and hope also that the public may take into consideration your embarrassments on "the true point at issue," as affording at least some small palliation for the outrages you have committed upon the rules of good sense and amicable debate.

I intend in future, as far as possible to keep clearly in view the chief points of my present investigation, well persuaded that the public will take little interest in our merely personal rencounters, but will desire much to see the claims of your Church and ministry fairly discussed. And I rather imagine that after the laugh and the jeer excited by your production are over, men will readily see through the *finesse* of its paragraphs, and will naturally turn to those more important and necessary questions,—What is truth? Can Mr. B. satisfactorily prove to us that he really is, what he claims to be, the only authorized Minister of God in this place? Can he show that the kind of Episcopacy which he holds to and teaches is the only kind of Episcopacy warranted by the word of God? Can he show that his ideas of the offices in the Christian Church are the only true ideas, as represented in Holy Writ? Can he trace his own line of ordination, step by step, and man by man, in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles? All this, he

as a minister of the P. E. Church of these U. S., professes and claims he is able to do. *Can he do it?*

On this view of the subject, which is the first legitimate one for debate, I have the happiness to acknowledge your *attempt* for the first time, to answer in your own words, my "three original questions." This is the very thing which I have desired from the outstart. All your irrelevant matters, particularly the personalities, might have been avoided, had you seen fit to inform me in the beginning, *what you for one do believe and teach*. I could have wished, it is true, that you had been in some respects more definite. However, I will proceed to the consideration of your opinions, believing that you have stated *all* that you deem it *prudent* to state in regard to these fundamental topics.

I. You say,—“We neither hold to Parochial nor Prelatical Episcopacy, in the odious sense of the latter term. But the Episcopacy which we do hold is the same which was established by the Apostles, of which they were the first Bishops, which was universally received for fifteen centuries, in the Christian Church, as we believe, without an exception.”

You here make an assertion which it will be necessary to examine. With your usual prudence, I see, my friend, you have thrown in the saving clause, “*as we believe*.” This is well, for if you should find that *facts* do not support you, there will still be left the reliance of *faith*. You have no doubt reflected on the circumstance that men *believe* a great many things which are very foolish, and directly in the face of history and common sense. It will remain to be seen, whether your belief on the subject of Episcopacy is of this kind.

You deny holding either to Parochial or to Prelatical Episcopacy in any odious sense, but you affirm your possession of Apostolic Episcopacy. In other words you pretend that the Episcopacy which you hold to is the only Episcopacy established by the Apostles, the only Episcopacy warranted in Scripture, and consequently the only Episcopacy which “is binding on the conscience of Christian people.”

It is evident then from your own declaration that our ap-

peal must be directly to the New Testament. A fair way to test your claims will be to compare your system of Episcopacy with the Sacred Scriptures, if they coincide, your views will be supported, if they *do not* coincide, your views will appear "unwarranted" by the Word of God, and not of any such divine institution as to be "binding on the conscience of Christian people."

"Episcopacy" then is a term which you employ at the present day, to denote in a general manner your form of Church Polity. In this *polity* you hold there are *three orders of the ministry, and no more*—Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. It is the office of Deacons among other things to *preach and baptize*. The Priests may preach, baptize, and administer the communion, but they cannot *confirm* or *ordain*. It is the office of the Bishops to preach, baptize, administer the communion, *confirm and ordain*. In your Church the Bishops are superior to the Priests in other powers and rights, beside those already named. One Bishop has jurisdiction over many single congregations or Churches. The Bishop is *Prelate* or Governor of a Province or Diocese, while the Priests in that diocese are only Pastors of single congregations, and are amenable to their Bishop. An essential doctrine of your Church is that your Bishops at the present day hold precisely the same office that the Apostles held *as such*, and that they have derived its authority through a direct, unbroken line of ordainers—of men holding the same office, and exercising the same functions as the original twelve Apostles, personally called by Christ himself, which line of ordainers extends from *the twelve* down to the present day, and "has never, and can never be broken." You hold, in short, to the monarchical form of government in the Church, and pretend that it has been preserved and perpetuated unaltered, from the times of Christ, through a lineal succession.

These are, if I mistake not, some of the more prominent features of that system of Church polity to which you hold, and which you designate by the term "Episcopacy." Let us now compare this system with the word of God, and see whether they coincide.

1st. Where is your authority for *three orders* of the

Christian ministry and *no more*? Hear the language of Inspiration, 1st Cor., 12: 28,—“And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily, prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.” Also in Eph. 4: 11, it is said, “and he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.” Here are at least *ten* different orders of officers in the Christian Ministry. But where is it ever said that there are only *three and no more*, and that these three are those at present existing in your Church? So on the first feature of your “Episcopacy,” we find that your views and the Bible do by no means coincide, and therefore your doctrine of the *threefold* ministry has no divine warrant.

You cannot evade this conclusion by saying that it lies with equal force against the Presbyterian or any other form of Church government. Another principle comes in to cut you off from any such resort. It is precisely this,—“You are to establish the authority of your Church upon grounds independent of other denominations. It is not enough for *you*, even if you could do this, to prove somebody else in the wrong, and then infer that of course you are in the right. You might as well conclude that some *infants* are damned, because some *adults* are saved. The one would be about as logical as the other. Besides, this mode of reasoning is as good *against* as *for* you. You have been a good deal perplexed already by not keeping the above principle clearly in view. What have you to do with the doctrines of other Churches while attempting to sustain your own?

2d. Where is your authority for Deacons to *preach* and *baptize*? It cannot be found in the Scriptures. This I have shown more clearly in a former letter. Hence the second feature of your “Episcopacy” falls to the ground.

3d. Where is your authority for calling an order of the Gospel Ministry “Priests?” No such term is applied to them in the Bible. I suppose you will say the term “Priest” is a contraction of the word “Presbyter,” meaning *Elder*, and has the same signification. If so, then

4th. Where is your authority for making a distinction

between Presbyters and Bishops, as though they were two separate orders of the Christian ministry? We know in direct opposition to this view, that in Apostolic times both these terms were applied to, and significant of one *and the same office*. See Acts 20th chapter, 20-28 verses, where the Elders or Presbyters of Ephesus are directly called Overseers or Bishops. See also Tit. 1: 7, where the same terms are used. By what authority then do you subject the Priests in your Church to the jurisdiction of the Bishops? I venture to assert that this distinction has no foundation in the Word of God, and so another feature of your Episcopacy falls to the ground.

5th. Where is your authority for making a Bishop the Prelate or Governor of a Diocese or Province, thus giving him authority over many Churches or congregations, instead of a single one? There is no authority for this in the Bible. It cannot be shown that Bishops were anything more than the Pastors of single congregations in apostolic times, as in Rome, Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth, &c. So here again your Episcopacy does not coincide with the Word of God.

6th. Where is your authority for the assumption that your Bishops at the present day have the very office of the twelve Apostles chosen personally by Christ? If they have retained the *office* why have they cast off the *name*? By what authority was this done? It cannot be shown that *the Apostolic office proper* was ever designed to be perpetuated in the Church. Only fourteen persons can be shown ever to have borne it, as I shall prove in another place. None can be shown to have borne it since. The office having expired, its name has gone with it, and hence it is only just to conclude that your Bishops at the present day do not hold the Apostolic office. Strange that they should possess the *thing*, and yet be so modest as to abandon the *name* of the thing! Their *great veneration* for the Apostles, called by Christ personally, is alledged as the ground of giving up the proper title of their office. This spirit is distinctly rebuked in Matt. 23: 8-12. No *feeling of deference* for any man can furnish sufficient reason for changing the titles and terms of the Christian min-

istry, as you profess to do, and so again your "Episcopacy" finds no warrant in the Word of God.

7th. And lastly, where is your authority for claiming that the Apostolic office has reached you by an unbroken succession of ordainers for the last eighteen centuries? The idea of a lineal succession is distinctly repudiated in the Bible. See 1st Tim. 1 : 4, and also Tit. 3 : 9. Moreover facts do not sustain it. Where is the list of this boasted succession of which you speak? I risk the assertion that you cannot produce it, unbroken and properly authenticated and proved, for the very good reason that it does not exist.

In the light of these facts, what becomes of your claim to "Apostolic Episcopacy?" Your Episcopacy has no warrant from Scripture, as we have clearly seen. It could not then be "the Episcopacy established by the Apostles, and of which they were the first Bishops!" Why therefore talk about its being "universally received for fifteen centuries?" The ecclesiastical history of these centuries falsifies your entire assertion. The modifications, changes, destruction and revivification which Church polity has undergone during this period in various parts of the world are almost innumerable. It were spending breath for nought here to recount them. Among these alterations, your "Episcopacy" in the precise form and manner in which it has been held in this country, arose about 58 years ago!!! And yet you say that it "was universally received for fifteen centuries!" I declare to you I am losing confidence in your knowledge of Ecclesiastical history. But I shall close this notice of your attempted answer to my first question by the single observation that as "Episcopacy" as you hold it has no warrant in the word of God, you are compelled by your own expressions to concede one of two things, either that "Apostolic Episcopacy" is not in your Church, but has descended among other bodies of Christians, or else that the Church universally received for fifteen centuries, according to your reckoning, a corrupt and spurious Episcopacy of which your Church has at length become the inheritor! Take which horn you will, your cause is ruined!!!

II. To my second question you have seen fit to reply in

your own words as follows :—“The Church *does not* mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation—she *does* mean by Priest a simple Presbyter or Elder, and she *does not* mean by Deacon, merely one whose office it is to attend to the pecuniary concerns of the Church, &c.”

If you had put “I” in the place of “*the Church*,” your reply would have been *logical*. I did not ask you for the opinion of the Church, but for your own opinion. “The Church,” who is “the Church?” where and what is “the Church?” When I wish information from “the Church,” I will ask “the Church,” directly. But if I inquire of the Rev. James A. Bolles, I rather expect, if the gentleman deigns to reply at all, he will do so relying on his own knowledge and belief, rather than call in an intangible witness to speak for him; But more than this; after having answered the question, as it were, by proxy, you go on to say that “*you have no peculiar views on any of these subjects*. What you believe and teach respecting them is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as unfolded in the Prayer Book, as explained by the authors already sent me, and as universally believed and practised by the primitive Christians.” This paragraph I suppose you have indited in view of my request that you would add some of the chief proofs of the position which you take. I am finally to understand then that *you*, the Rev. James A. Bolles, do not “mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation,” &c.—and that you adduce as the demonstrative proof of this opinion, the fact that you have *no peculiar views on any of these subjects*—that what you believe is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,” &c. What sheer assumption is all this? May not the most drivelling and imbecile mountebank make the same assertions, and to as good a purpose, in favor of his cause? You ought to know that your ideas of the authority of “Deacons” (meaning by this term the office to which *the seven* were elected, as recorded in the 6th of Acts) to preach and baptize, are not warranted by the Word of God. You ought to know that your ideas of Priests, which you define to be simple Presbyters or Elders, are essentially different from the representations of Holy Writ—that you recognise no distinction of Ruling Presbyters

of Elders, *and* Presbyters or Elders who both *rule and preach*, which distinction is plainly set forth in the Bible. See 1st Tim. 5 : 17. You ought to know that the Word of God recognizes no such permanent official distinction as that of Presbyter Bishops, and Apostolic Bishops, and hence that your ideas of your first two orders of the Christian ministry, are not supported by the Sacred Scriptures. "You do not mean by Bishop the Pastor of a single congregation," and yet your friend Chapin, with whom you pretended to agree, whose book you sent me, with the leaves all nicely turned down, and between such and such pages of which you triumphantly told me, that I would find what "*you meant* by Deacons and Priests and Bishops," expressly teaches that *Bishops were the Pastors of single congregations*. Chapin knew better than to publish any other view than this to the world. And although he undertakes to obscure and cover up the import of plain passages of Scripture by ingeniously coining the compound words "Presbyter-Bishops," and "Apostolic Bishops," terms which are nowhere to be found in the Bible, he nevertheless evidently feels compelled to admit that *Bishops were and are on Scriptural grounds, the Pastors of single congregations or Churches*. He knew this, and you ought to know it. He *confesses it and you deny it!* Now what say you to your "logical answers," to "your agreement with your standard writers," and to your immense "light and instruction?" Was I not right in demanding a reply "to my three original questions" in your own words? If I had not insisted on this, but had simply contented myself with the books you sent me, I should have been misled as to what your views are. Ay, the very book on which you have relied so much, and which you have trumpeted forth as a complete answer to my interrogations, is now found to maintain a doctrine which you repudiate, and that on the very point whether a Bishop be the Pastor of a single congregation!

1st. You deny that a Bishop is the Pastor of a single congregation. Where is your authority for this? You ought to know that it is not in the Word of God. Show me a single passage where such an idea is clearly taught, and I will yield to your claims. On the contrary, we learn from the

Bible that Bishops were Pastors of single churches. Bishop and Presbyter both designated the same office. Hence wherever there was a Presbyter he was also a Bishop. There was at least one of these in every single Church and congregation. See Acts 14: 23; Acts 20: 20-28; Phil. 1: 1; Tit. 1: 5, &c. This fact is also most convincingly confirmed by the historian to whom you yourself have appealed, as authority, Dr. Mosheim.

2d. You do mean by Priest a simple Presbyter or Elder. Then why do you make no distinction between Presbyters or Elders who only *rule* and those who both preach and *rule*? You ought to know that such a distinction exists in the Word of God. Your Priests also are inferior in rank to your Bishops. You say a Priest is a Presbyter. The Bible teaches that a Presbyter is a Bishop. Then a Priest and a Bishop should, according to the Word of God, denote one and the same office, even if we allow that the term "Priest" is one which may be employed at all to designate an order of the gospel ministry. The conclusion is unavoidable. Your ideas of the order of Priests cannot be sustained by Scriptural authority.

3d. You deny the office of Deacon to be one merely for attending to the pecuniary concerns of the Church, &c. You affirm a Deacon has power by virtue of his office *as such*, to preach and baptize. There is not the least particle of support for this in the Word of God. Your ideas of the office of Deacons are utterly gratuitous and unfounded, as I have previously shown. And so you have my comments on your reply to my second question, and I think you may well take it to heart that you have no more real authority for your exclusive doctrines.

III. You respond to my third question in the most vague and indefinite manner, that "Our Saviour ordained the Apostles, and commissioned them to ordain others, and the Apostles did ordain others, and commissioned them to ordain others, and thus from that time to the present there has been a succession of ordainers—of men ordained themselves and having authority to ordain others—and this succession of ordainers has never and can never be broken, having the pro-

mise of Christ for its continuance and perpetuity—and we call it an Apostolic Succession both because it has come down from the Apostles, and has been continued in that order of ministers who have succeeded to the office of the Apostles.”

Do you call this a direct and logical answer to my third interrogation? I trust not. There are in the first place several most glaring assumptions in your declaration:

1st. That the Apostles were ordained at all in the sense in which you practice ordination.

2d. That the promise of Christ had any reference whatever to a lineal succession of ordainers ; and

3d. That the Apostles had any successors in the apostolic office.

These are points which you can never prove, and hence your whole reply is the most arrogant *petitio principii* that you could have devised. Indeed you could not draw the conclusion yourself, being aware that your general assertion proved nothing for your particular and special claims. I have no doubt you have felt the force of my third question, and been embarrassed with it not a little ; for, however well and wisely you may reason on the general doctrine that there has always been a standing ministry of Christ in the world, which ministry you call the *Apostolic Succession*, you know that upon your principles of reasoning it can do *you* no good unless you are able to show your own connection with it. This you are unable to do and it perplexes you. I regard it in fact the *great point* in this investigation. You set up and claim to be the only scripturally authorized minister of God in this place. You profess to have substantial grounds on which this exclusive authority is based, or in other words, you pretend to be the only person in this village in whose hands are the proper credentials of a minister of God. Suppose then you are importuned to show your credentials, how do you propose to proceed? Let us see :

1st. I, James A. Bolles, am the only minister of God in this place, *because* there has always been a standing ministry in the world. No, this won't work. The argument is as good for others as it is for myself. Try it again.

2d. I, James A. Bolles, am the only minister of God in this

place, *because* there are no other ministers here! No, this won't work; for first, it is not true in fact, and secondly, the argument is as good for others as for myself.

3d. I, James A. Bolles, am the only minister of God in this place, *because I alone* have the *proper credentials*.

Now what *are* the *proper credentials*? This question comes back upon you with tremendous emphasis. On what, I ask, is your exclusive authority based, but on the *one idea* that there has been an unbroken line of ordainers from yourself back to the Apostles, which can be legitimately shown to exist, that is, which can be traced step by step, and man by man, which has so been preserved in the providence of God, without interruption, irregularity, change, invalidity, or any such like thing, that it can be sustained in every portion by the records of authentic history? You must take this ground or else allow that your credentials are no better than those of other men. It is not enough for you to refer to the promise of Christ,—“Lo I am with you always to the end of the world.” You cannot exclusively appropriate this promise to yourself. It is not enough for you to resort to *faith* to fill up all the breaks in your succession which the records of history most positively reveal; for other men can avail themselves of the same resort. All that is left for you to do is either to show your line of ordination as before described, proving at the same time that *you alone* possess this lineal descent from the Apostles—or else frankly to abandon all your distinctive and exclusive claims as a Minister of God, and freely confess that they are unsupported by any divine right, and are no better than the claims of ministers of other denominations.

Where is your *list* of ordainers then? Show it to me. Will you tell me it is in Chapin, or Percival, or the Episcopal Almanac? You know better. You will not say it is there, clear, unbroken, unadulterated, positive, and entire!

Where is your list of ordainers then? Nowhere, *nowhere*, my friend! You have no such list. It does not exist. Invoke it, but like the worshippers of Baal, though calling with all the frenzy of superstition, you shall cry in vain. Like “the spirits of the vasty deep,” it will not come!

As you often refer to the Jewish Priesthood as a kind of

illustration of your doctrine of succession, I will here take occasion to refer to it myself. You will remember that on the return of the Hebrews from their captivity, "the children of Habaiah, Koz and Barzillai sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found; therefore were they as polluted put from the priesthood!" (Ezra 2: 61, 62). Now here was a dispensation under which a regular lineal succession of the priesthood was *professedly preserved*; and those who could not find the register of their own names, and trace their own line of genealogy step by step, and man by man, *were polluted from the priesthood*. Now you maintain that under the gospel dispensation there is continued just such a *lineal succession*, and that you yourself are in it, and that you are the only person in this place (unless it may be some other of your priests, deacons, or bishops) *who is in it*. I say then that this pretension can only be sustained by your registered genealogy; you are bound to trace your line of ordination step by step and man by man, back to the Apostles, by the light of well authenticated history, or you are inevitably excluded, upon your own principles, and by them you should as it were, "be polluted from the priesthood."

Again. While on this topic allow me to make use of an illustration furnished by yourself, and for which I most heartily thank you. It is the example of the manuscripts of Scripture. I could scarcely have hit upon a more happy conception or a more forcible illustration of the unmitigated folly of Prelatical assumption. Suppose you take the ground that your Bible alone is the true Word of God in this community, because you can trace its line of manuscripts step by step and codex by codex, in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles. What real advantage do you gain by tracing the *succession of manuscripts*? Might not the *proof* be just as conclusive and much more direct and simple, if, instead of pretending it necessary to depend upon such a succession, you should just take your copy of the various books of the Bible, and compare it with the oldest ones? A *coincidence thus shown* would have all the weight of a demonstrative argument, without the cumbersome and interminable task of hunt-

ing out a manuscript pedigree for eighteen centuries! But I suppose I hazard nothing in asserting that the tracing of such a succession of Scripture documents is, under the circumstances of this world for the last two thousand years, *manifestly impossible*. Nor is the question whether we now have the veritable Word of God, of any such nature as to demand it. The truth is, that both in regard to the Bible and the Christian ministry, lineal successions have been from the first repudiated. You can neither show an unbroken succession for your ministry, nor trace the line of manuscripts of the sacred oracles. The attempt is equally puerile in both cases. The perpetuity and power of Christ's church and kingdom rests not upon such foundations.

Your position then, is absolutely ludicrous. Suppose your Bible set itself up over my Bible, and claim itself to be exclusively the Word of God, on account of its lineal descent of manuscripts! Is it any more like the first copy because it pretends to be "*in the succession?*" Is my Bible any the *less* like the first copy because it pretends to "no lineal succession?" Must not every man laugh at the ridiculous conclusion? And yet this is precisely your predicament when you attempt to define or defend your doctrine of the Apostolic Succession.

You assume that this apostolic chain stretches down to yourself because of the promise of Christ,—“Lo, I am with you,” &c. But it is a mere assumption. How know you that this promise has any reference whatever to your doctrine of the Apostolic Succession? Nothing of this kind is specified in it. Who has informed you that it has any such application? You might as well have alluded to the first verse of the first chapter of the first book of Chronicles, in proof of your succession,—“Adam, Sheth, Enosh!”

But you ought to look at another thing—the stronger you make your argument on the general proposition that this Apostolical Succession has always existed in the world, the firmer you establish *this*, while yet you yourself personally cannot show *your* connection with it, the higher you raise the gallows on which your own authority; is to be executed, the keener you whet the knife with which it is to be decapitated.

For in taking this strange position of a lineal and unbroken succession, you seek to prove too much by proving against facts—you make something necessary to the validity of the Christian ministry which the Bible nowhere recognizes or enjoins. Reason dashes her powers in pieces against the adamantine walls of God's Providence and Word, and attempting to soar on waxen wings, plunges like the fabled Icarus, into the sea of her own confusion.

Is it not plain then that you have completely run round the point, and that you have little relish for meeting the inquiry full in the face. I ask you if you can show your credentials as a minister of God? Do you think it will content me or satisfy the public, to say that somewhere in the world ministers have existed from the times of Christ, and *therefore* you conclude you are one of them? No! my friend, you *must* trace your own line of ordination, as before described, or else give up the whole ground on which you rest ministerial authority, and choose another more respectable.

And now upon a review of the whole three questions, you intimate that I am desirous of bringing you into a personal controversy and that I shall find myself very much mistaken, and that I have been trying to avoid "the true issue," and that I "must already begin to feel myself in an awkward predicament!" I know not what you mean, my dear friend, unless it be that you feel very uncomfortable yourself, and you wish me *to think* that I feel so too! Have I shrunk from any legitimate investigation of "my three original questions?" Have I not signified my willingness to meet you either in a public debate or in a written correspondence or in your oral lectures? And yet you charge me with striving to shun a thorough investigation of the truth! Have I not held you exactly to the three points of "the true issue?" And yet you charge me with a design to evade them! What is the "true issue" which the P. E. Church raises with her neighbors? Or rather, what is the P. E. Church herself? What have I, or what has any man to do with the idea of your Church, save as composed of individuals, men responsible for what they themselves believe and teach, and who may justly be discredited, if, when fairly challenged to define and defend

their sentiments, they shrink away under the pusillanimous and unmanly plea that they "have *no peculiar* views on any of these subjects." Of what avail is it for you then to impugn my motive, as though I was determined to quarrel with you about yourself, about "what *you teach and say, and do and are*—and not what is truth?" Do you not profess yourself a "living teacher?" Do you not pretend to do and say things connected with great questions of truth or error? Are you not yourself a substance—a man—a champion of certain doctrines—a defender of certain distinctive principles for which you are to be held responsible? Or are you nothing and nobody—a mere name, a shadow as impalpable to the senses as you are irresponsible to the claims and advocacy of truth? Do you deny that you possess the right of private judgment, or that you think, reason, and judge for yourself—do you take shelter under the old Romish dogma of ignorance and imbecility, and cry with the unthinking and deluded multitudes who lie in the dust and lick the feet of the man of sin, "Oh, I believe what the Church believes—the Church believes what I believe, and we both believe the same!" Is this the mode of settling your accounts when hard pressed by the difficulties which surround you?

And of what avail will be your intimation that my course has been wanting in courtesy, nobleness and magnanimity, when the questions I have propounded to you are the very questions which the truth requires you to answer—which the common sense of mankind will sustain, as embracing the precise points at issue, that is, the precise points which should be fairly and fully met by you and settled? They bring you at once to your bearings—they test the whole strength of your exclusive claims, your pretended superior authority. Every person can see this; and if they place you in a ridiculous or odious position, it is only showing you in your true colors and doing for you what you are afraid to do for yourself. I have no doubt you would hesitate to say in so many words before the people of this intelligent community that you regard yourself as the only scripturally authorized minister of God in this place. This would be a ridiculous and odious position indeed for you to take. Yet what you dare not ut-

ter with the tongue, your actions speak. In concluding my remarks upon your attempted answer to "my three original questions," I confess you have greatly disappointed me. You give me to understand in a very patronizing and self-complaisant way, that you are now about to take the field yourself. I behold you approaching, apparently like a brave champion, to grapple with the exact force and formidableness of these questions, and I am preparing to witness a fair and honorable rencounter, when lo! your polemical charger takes fright and dashes away with you into the thickets and morasses of subterfuge and evasion. He makes for the region of the dark ages, and the Canon law, and the famous graves of the "Fathers."

" Away, away, and on ye dash!
Torrents less rapid and less rash!"

While you, Mazeppa-like, writhing beneath the ecclesiastical thongs which bind you, have only time to howl back something about "my ignorance," and shriek that "*you have no peculiar notions!*"

" For fly ye on your far career,
And all behind is dark and drear,
And all before is night and fear!"

IV. I will now consider what you appear to regard as the great *Scriptural* bulwark of your pretensions—a work which you have produced with quite an air of satisfaction in your oral lectures, I mean, the tract of Dr. Onderdonk, entitled "Episcopacy tested by Scripture." I shall notice this production only so far as it has any essential bearing on the merits of this discussion.

The main proposition of the Rev. Dr. and the one on which the whole structure of his argument is reared is this: "The Apostles and Elders, (distinctively so called,) had *not* equal power and rights."

His mode of proof in support of this position is as follows:

"These two classes of ministers are distinguished from each other, because they are spoken of in Scripture as "*Apostles and Elders.*"

But,

1. "The Apostles are not thus distinguished from the El-

ders because they were appointed by Christ personally, for some are named Apostles in Scripture who were not thus appointed."

2. "The Apostles are not thus distinguished from the Elders because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection, for five hundred brethren saw him."

3. "The Apostles are not thus distinguished from the Elders because they had been selected as special witnesses of the resurrection, for others were called Apostles who were not thus selected."

4. "The Apostles are not thus distinguished from the Elders because of their power to work miracles, for others wrought miracles who were not Apostles."

Conclusion. "It follows, then, or will not be questioned, that the Apostles were distinguished from the elders because they were superior to them in ministerial power and rights."

This is his *inference* from the reasoning now stated. It is for us to see whether the logic be sound and the conclusion just. I am constrained to say, my friend, after a careful study of the same, that whether his main proposition be true or false, in my opinion the Rev. Dr. has signally failed in his line of proof. I will proceed to give you the grounds on which my judgment rests.

1st. I observe that the reasoning of the Rev. Dr. contains statements which are unfounded.

A. He asserts that "Silvanus and Timothy, Junia and Andronicus and others that could be added to the list," are all called Apostles in Scripture. *This is not so.*

B. He asserts that "Matthias was ordained by merely human ordainers." There is no account of this in the Bible.

C. He asserts that "James, the Lord's brother, was ordained by merely human ordainers." I find no record of this in the Word of God.

D. He asserts that Barnabas was ordained by merely human ordainers, and then rejects the only supposable evidence of it, recorded in Acts 13: 1-3. Both positions cannot be true.

These unfounded statements can surely add nothing to the

strength of the Rev. Dr.'a logic. On the contrary, they have a tendency to cast suspicion upon the whole of it.

2d. Again I observe that his reasoning, if legitimately carried out, destroys itself. Let us see.

"The Apostles and Elders are distinguished from each other."

But,

1. "The Apostles are not thus distinguished from the Elders because they were appointed by Christ personally."

2.—"Nor because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection."

3.—"Nor because they had been selected as special witnesses of his resurrection."

4.—"Nor because of their power to work miracles."

What next? The Dr.'s conclusion? By no means. But a fifth position equally tenable with the four preceding. It is this:

5. The Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because they possessed superior ministerial powers and rights, for some are named "Elders" in Scripture, who had these powers and rights. (As Peter and John.)

Thus in attempting to establish his main proposition, our author opens the door for its complete refutation.

3d. Again I observe that his reasoning proves too much. It proves anything or everything as you please. Each one of the links in the chain of his argument can be put for the conclusion, and the conclusion for each one of the links, or the conclusion can be employed as a link, and any other predicate, however singular or incongruous, can be put for the conclusion. Thus:

"The Apostles and Elders are distinguished from each other."

But,

1. "The Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because they were appointed by Christ personally."

2.—"Nor because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection."

3.—"Nor because they had been selected as special witnesses of his resurrection."

4. —“Nor because they possessed superior ministerial powers and rights.

Con.—“It follows then, or will not be questioned, that the Apostles were distinguished from the Elders on account of their power to work miracles.” And so by a simple change of sentences the 1st, 2d, and 3d links of the chain may be put for the conclusion, while the conclusion is put for them, respectively. And so may the whole chain be negatived or affirmed with equal sense and logic. But other predicates may be put for the conclusion. Thus,

1. “The Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because they were appointed by Christ personally.”

2.—“Nor because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection.”

3.—“Nor because they had been selected as special witnesses of his resurrection.”

4.—“Nor because of their power to work miracles.

5.—“Nor because they had superior ministerial powers and rights.”

Con.—“It follows therefore, or will not be questioned, that the Apostles were thus distinguished from the Elders” on account of their *personal appearance*, or their *age and native talents*, or the *number of their children*, &c., &c. !!

This strikes us as being a very convenient mode of reasoning which will prove *for* or *against*, *more* or *less*, precisely according to the fancy of the Rev. Dr. and his friends.

4th. Once more I observe that his reasoning is characterized by inherent weakness, looseness, sophistry, and inconsistency. What sense, for instance, is there in saying,

“That the Apostles were not distinguished from the Elders because they were appointed personally by Christ, for some are named Apostles in Scripture who were not thus appointed.”

Put this in the following form and its inherent weakness will appear at once :—

Maj. prem. 1. All that is common to the Apostles and Elders cannot be made a ground of distinction between them.

Min. prem. 2. The being appointed personally by Christ is *common to the Apostles*.

Con. 8. Therefore the being appointed personally by Christ is not a ground of distinction between the *Apostles* and *Elders*! In other words, a circumstance *not common* to the Apostles and Elders forms no ground of distinction between the *Apostles* and *Elders*, because that circumstance is also *not common* to the Apostles and somebody else besides the Elders!! Do you think this is good logic?—you, my friend, who have paraded it so exultingly in your last communication?

It may be attempted perhaps, to meet this view of the case by another argument, arranged in the syllogistic form. Let us then put the subject in its strongest light. Your Rev. author might reply as follows:—

1st. All that is not common to the Apostles *as a class*, cannot be regarded as distinguishing them from any other class, as for example, the Elders.

2d. The being called personally by Christ is not common to the Apostles *as a class*,

3d. Therefore the being called personally by Christ cannot distinguish the Apostles from the Elders.

This reasoning would be conclusive if the second proposition *was only true*. But it is not. The Apostles *as a class* were severally and separately called or designated by the direct agency of Christ, as will be shown in another place. And so we turn the argument of Dr. Onderdonk home upon himself. Thus:

1. All that is common to the Apostles as a *class* will afford a proper ground of distinction between them and every other class, as for example, the Elders.

2. The being called or designated directly by Christ is common to the Apostles *as a class*.

3. Therefore the being called or designated directly by Christ may be regarded as a ground of distinction between the Apostles and Elders. Our conclusion is unavoidable, and the Rev. Dr. must either give up his argument thus far, or else show that the Apostles *as a class* of officers in the commencement of the Christian era, were not severally and separately called or designated directly by Christ, which I am fully persuaded he can never do.

A similar difficulty occurs with the next assertion, that

"the Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection, for five hundred brethren saw him."

State this proposition as follows :

1. All that is common to the Apostles and Elders cannot be made a ground of distinction between them.
2. The seeing our Lord after his resurrection is common to the Apostles and five hundred brethren.
3. Therefore the seeing our Lord after his resurrection is no ground of distinction between the *Apostles and Elders!*

Were the five hundred brethren Elders? An important question!

The same difficulty attends the next statement, That "the Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because they had been selected as special witnesses of the resurrection, for others were called Apostles who were not thus selected."

See the fallacy of this declaration:

1. All that is common to the Apostles and Elders cannot be made a ground of distinction between them.
2. The being selected to be the special witnesses of the resurrection is common to the Apostles *as a class*.
3. Therefore the being selected to be the special witnesses of the resurrection is no ground of distinction between the *Apostles and Elders!*

Once more the same difficulty besets this position, That "the Apostles were not thus distinguished from the Elders because of their power to work miracles, for Stephen and Philip, who were both Deacons, are known to have had this power."

Test this premise in the same manner.

1. All that is common to the Apostles and Elders cannot be made a ground of distinction between them.
2. The power to work miracles is common to the *Apostles and Deacons*.
3. Therefore the power to work miracles is no ground of distinction between the *Apostles and Elders*.

This kind of reasoning, my friend, is not likely to make "Churchmen," as you call them very fast. We have now

clearly seen that our author's reasoning is characterized by *inherent weakness*.

That it is characterized by *looseness* appears from the disclosed fact, that it is for the most part made up of a mere play upon words, a mere string of sentences, more jingle than argument, a collection of empty sounds signifying nothing.

That it is a piece of *sophistry* seems evident from the fact that there is no legitimate connection between the premises and conclusion.

That it is marked with *inconsistency* is evinced by the fact that it may be thrown together, or analysed, or its parts may be abstracted or added in any manner with equally conclusive though opposite results.

Hence we must pronounce it as intrinsically unsound and unworthy of our assent.

5th. But what caps the climax is, that the reasoning of your Rev. friend is *very assuming*. He pretends by it to have "*established nearly the whole of the Episcopal claim.*" Indeed! Is this so? I understand by the "*Episcopal claim,*" a pretension on the part of the advocates of the P. E. Church of these U. S., that they have the only true Church of Christ, the only true ministry, the only true ordinances or sacraments, the only true ideas of the offices of the Christian Church, and the only veritable Apostolic Succession within the boundaries of Protestantism! Now this you are aware is something of a claim. And how it is established by the simple fact that more than eighteen hundred years since there existed in a certain portion of the Eastern Continent a class of officers called Apostles, and another class called Elders is more than I can see. Important steps are wanting in the Dr.'s logic. If we agree with him in his conclusion, it will be by desperate leaps, and by the right supreme of an unmitigated assumption.

Having demonstrated in these various ways that our author has signally failed in *his line of proof*, I will now notice his main proposition itself, namely,

That "the Apostles and Elders (distinctively so called) had not equal power and rights."

Admit this statement to be true, what then? Does it afford your ministry my friend, any peculiar advantage, in proving

that you hold exclusively the only Episcopacy established by the Apostles, the only Episcopacy warranted by the Word of God, the only Episcopacy which is "binding on the conscience of Christian people?" Candor will compel you to confess that it does not. In order to substantiate the "Episcopal claim," you will be obliged to show precisely,

1. What the Apostolic office is.
2. That it was designed to be, and has been a permanent office in the Church.
3. That it is and has been identified in every essential particular with the office of Bishop in your Church.
4. That nothing important has been either added to or taken from it.
5. That it has descended to you from the Apostles in a direct and unbroken chain every step or link of which can be traced by the light of authentic records; and
6. That this office exists only in your Church.

Perhaps you will think I am planning considerable labor for you, but my friend, the responsibilities of your position demand it. You have committed yourself to the advocacy of such "a claim," and I must with all courtesy and respect *press* you to it. It will not answer for you to seek to evade *this issue* by talking about "students of divinity" and "Presbyterian Meeting-Houses" and "ploughs" and the "Barebone's Parliament," and undertaking to raise a *laugh* just in the spot where you should put an argument.

To set the subject in a little clearer light before your mind, as well as to dissipate from it the darkness which many of your writers have drawn over it, I propose here to state a few plain facts concerning

THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE.

1. Only fourteen persons can be shown ever to have borne it, viz:—Peter, Andrew, James the son of Zebedee, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James the son of Alpheus, Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, Judas, Matthias, and Paul. See Matt. 10: 2-4, Acts 1: 26, 1st Cor. 9: 1.

True, you may say that Barnabas and Epaphroditus and even Christ himself are *called* "Apostles." See Acts 14: 14, Phil. 2: 25, Heb. 3: 1. But this circumstance by no means

determines *the fact* that they held the *apostolic office*. The term "Apostle" in Scripture is applied sometimes in a *personal* and sometimes in an *official* sense. Hence if it is sought to determine whether a given individual bore the *apostolic office proper*, you must adduce some other evidence besides the mere appellation in his favor, in order to show that *he did bear it*. Now of Barnabas and Epaphroditus and Christ, you cannot show the first item of proof beyond the *name*, that they held and exercised the proper functions of the *apostolic office*.

You certainly would not affirm of our divine Lord and Master that he was in rank only equal to *the twelve*, whom he himself commissioned to their work, and this merely because a single *name* is applied to Him which is also applied to them!

Of Epaphroditus nothing whatever is predicated in the Scriptures, which belonged to the powers and functions of the *apostolic office*. On the contrary, the record shows that he was for the time being subject to the control of one (Paul) who had no authority to direct him on the supposition that Epaphroditus was an Apostle in the official sense. Indeed the whole context conclusively shows that Epaphroditus was a *simple messenger, one sent*, according to the import of the term as used in John 13: 16. Similar remarks are applicable to Barnabas.

Besides these instances, you will not be able, I venture to assert, to produce another individual who is even called an apostle. Junia, Andronicus, Timothy, Titus, Silvanus, or any other mentioned by your authors, cannot be shown to have borne even the *name*, much less the *apostolic office*. Hence our conclusion must be fully justified that only *fourteen* persons can be shown ever to have borne the *apostolic office*.

2. A person could not, and did not bear *apostolic office*, without the following things could be and were predicated of him:—

A. He must have been an eye and an ear-witness of our Lord, so that from *positive knowledge*, he could testify to Christ's *person, offices, and works*. See Acts 1: 21-26, Acts 5: 29-32, Acts 22d chap., 1st Cor. 9: 1.

B. He must have been designated to *the office* by Christ

himself, not by "*ordination*" in the prelatical sense of it, but by some sensible, outward, and palpable act, proceeding directly from the Lord himself. It cannot be shown that one of the Apostles was ever set apart to the *apostolic office*, by prayer and the imposition of hands! See Mark 3: 14-19, Acts 1: 26, Acts 22d chap., 2d Tim. 1: 11.

C. He must have been endowed with the power of performing miracles, with the gift of inspiration, and with such other authority and rights *extraordinary* as were necessary for the accomplishment of his *office work*. See Mark 3: 15, Acts 1: 8, Acts 2d chap., Acts 28: 1-9, as well as the Gospels of Matthew and John, and the Epistles of Paul, Peter, James and John, and also the fact that both Luke and Mark were under the supervision of the Apostles. See Acts 12: 12, 25; 2d Tim. 4: 11.

Now you cannot say in reply to these facts that all these qualifications are not *peculiar to the apostolic office*, for that is not the question. The question is rather, could any one or did any one bear the *apostolic office* of whom these particulars could not be and were not predicated? We are willing to risk the merits of this question, if you prefer it, on the single characteristic of the *apostolic office* which required that each one bearing it should be personally or directly designated to *that office* by Christ himself! Point us to one of the *fourteen individuals* already named, who *was not* so designated, and we will yield the argument—point us to another beside them who *was* so designated and we will admit your claims!

3. The end of the *apostolic office* was to introduce a *preached gospel to the world*, to gather churches, to furnish the materials of Inspiration for the completion of the Canonical Books of Scripture, to establish the Christian ordinances, and appoint the officers of the Christian ministry in the permanent polity of the Christian Church. See for this the New Testament *passim*.

4. The officers they did appoint were not *Apostles* in the official sense as now explained, but *Bishops*, or *Presbyters* or *Elders* and *Deacons*. See Acts 6: 1-6, Acts 14: 23, Acts 20th chapter, Phil. 1: 1, Tit. 1: 5. In no passage of Scripture can you show an ordination to the *apostolic office*, subsequent to the *fourteen* directly designated by Christ.

5. The Apostles in the nature of the case had and could have no successors in that office. They themselves held the *apostleship* as an office extraordinary and peculiar, and one which as a matter of course could not be permanent. That they did also exercise the rights and functions of the ordinary and permanent offices of the Church, namely, those of Bishops or Presbyters, those of Preaching and Ruling Elders is evident from Mark 16 : 15, 16, 1st Pet. 5: 1, 2d John 1.

6. The Apostles in their office *as such*, had no *Dioceses*. Their commission *as preachers of the Gospel* was general, and they went whenever and wherever the Spirit of the Lord directed them. See Matt. 28: 18-20, Acts 11: 1-17.

7. The *apostolic office* from the nature of the case, must have expired with the last of *the fourteen persons* already enumerated. Hence the *name* of "Apostle" even was not retained, which would evidently have been done by the Primitive Church, had they considered the Apostleship a permanent and perpetual office in the polity of the Christian Church.

In the light of this clear and concise account of the *apostolic office* how utterly idle is your pretence that your Bishops now hold the veritable office of the Apostles? Have these Bishops seen or heard Christ in person? Have they been set apart to their office not by *ordination* as a kind of tactual charm, but by some direct act of Christ himself? Have they the power of miracles, the gift of inspiration, and authority to extend the canons of Scripture? You know they have not. And if not, they are no Apostles, and no successors of the Apostles in *that office*!

I am now prepared to answer the four memorable questions with which you conceived you had so perplexed me in your study, on the morning of Jan. 19th, 1847. You ask:—

1. If I deny that the Apostles and Elders are fairly distinguished from each other in several places in the Acts of the Apostles as distinct and separate orders.

Answer. I *do not* deny it.

2. If I deny that the Apostles were not distinguished from the Elders simply because they were appointed by Christ personally.

Answer. I *do* deny it.

3. If I deny that the Apostles were not distinguished from the Elders merely because they had seen our Lord after his resurrection.

Answer. I *do* deny it.

4. If I deny that the Apostles *were* distinguished from the Elders in consequence of their superiority in ministerial powers and rights?

Answer. I *do deny it*, to a certain extent.

And now what have you gained? I maintain that Presbyters or Elders had equal ministerial powers and rights with those exercised by the Apostles, meaning by the phrase "*ministerial powers and rights*," such powers and rights as were designed to be in the Christian ministry, not *temporary*, but *permanent* and *perpetual*, as for example *ordination, preaching, and administering the sacraments*. The functions of the apostolic office were peculiar and extraordinary and in this sense might be called superior, but it by no means follows that to ordain, preach, and administer the sacraments were not ministerial rights and powers belonging to the office of the Bishop or Presbyter as well as to the *apostolic office*. Nor is it possible for you to prove for instance that Peter *did not ordain, preach, and administer the sacraments* as well by virtue of his office as an *Elder* as by virtue of his office as an *Apostle*! The Apostles then were not distinguished from the Elders for the superiority of their ministerial power and rights as now defined, but on account of the peculiarities of the apostolic office itself, already above set forth. These facts forever destroy the argument of Dr. Onderdonk, and prepare you to concede, I think, that his reasoning in favor of the "Episcopal claim" is completely nugatory!

V. There is one other author on whom you have much relied in the progress of this investigation. I refer to a book entitled "the Primitive Church," by the Rev. A. B. Chapin. It remains for me to notice such portions of this work as relate to your *three-fold* order of the ministry.

I. Upon the subject of *deacons* I have little need extensively to dwell. Suffice it to say that your author takes the old ground of the authority of deacons to *preach and baptize*,

which we have already seen is without the least particle of proof from the Sacred Word.

II. Upon the subject of *priests* your author admits in so many words that "*the terms Presbyter and Bishop are often used in the Bible to designate the same class of officers.*" And after making this admission, he goes on to *invent* a pair of very ingenious compound words, namely "Presbyter-Bishops" and "Apostolic-Bishops," in order to evade, if possible, the full force of the admission which he had just made. These words are altogether *a human invention*, since they occur nowhere in all the word of God.

1. Chapin undertakes to show by a reference to various languages that the term "priest" is only a contraction of the word "Presbyter," thus as I think, evincing his full sense of the awkwardness and unsuitableness of applying it in its original signification to an order of the gospel ministry. We shall permit him to enjoy the fruits of his philological pursuits on this point without disturbance.

2. With the eight qualifications which he lays down for a Priest, Presbyter-Bishop, or Pastor of a single congregation, I find no fault, excepting the *last*. He says of a Priest that "he must have been a Deacon, and have acquitted himself honorably in that station," and immediately adds "there is no *positive statement* in Scripture that this was the fact!" Did you ever hear anything like it? No indeed there is no proof whatever that this was one of the qualifications necessary to a candidate for the order of Presbyters or Bishops.

3. He maintains that a Presbyter-Bishop or Pastor of a single congregation could only be made by an Apostle by virtue of the apostolic office as such. This is denied. Titus and Timothy as we have already shown, did not bear the apostolic office. They are nowhere called Apostles. And yet these are the persons whom Chapin quotes as having *ordained* "Presbyter-Bishops" as he calls them.

4. With the six different particulars in which your author has pointed out the power and duties of a Bishop of a single congregation I find no fault worth mentioning, unless it be in the final one, namely, that "the 'Presbyter-Bishops' owed obedience to the commands of an Apostle." This statement is,

I judge, to be taken with some limitation inasmuch as Chapiñ refers to no Scripture warrant for its support.

III. The entire force of all that your author has advanced upon the subject of your highest order of the ministry, namely, Prelates, Diocesans, Bishops, or "Apostolic-Bishops," as he terms them, depends primarily upon this simple question,—whether the apostolic office as such has ever been borne by more than the *fourteen persons* already enumerated, that is, whether this office has been perpetuated in your Church through a lineal succession? To show that this has been the case he places great reliance upon what he is pleased to term "THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION!" This commission he gets up by throwing together several scattered passages of the Gospels, after the following manner:—"Go ye into all the world, and *preach the Gospel* unto every creature, *baptizing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the HOLY GHOST: *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And unto you *I give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven*, and whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven: and whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained: AS THE FATHER HATH SENT ME EVEN SO SEND I YOU; and lo I am with you *always, even unto the end of the world.*" (Matt. 16: 19; 18: 18; 28: 19, 20; John 20: 21, 23.)

"This commission," he continues, "as *it here reads* is one of the most important things of which we can conceive!" Is not this as much as to say we have now got it *patched up* so that we think it will suit our purpose? However, let us take a view of the *document* as he has given it to us.

1. What powers does the instrument specify? Answer. *Preaching, baptizing, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the power to bind and loose, to remit and retain sin.*

2. Were these powers and rights any or all of them *peculiar* to the *apostolic office*? Answer. None of them were peculiar to it. See Matt. 18: 17, 18, Acts 20th chap., 2d Cor. 2: 10, 1st Tim. 5: 17.

3. The expression, "*as the Father hath sent me, even so*

'send I you," refers to *the fact*, and not to *the manner* or *modality* of the fact of sending, as is evident from the construction of the Greek in this passage. Besides, this argument drawn from the *analogy* of the commissions will apply as well to Bishops or Presbyters as to the Apostles. It is perfectly true that "as the Father sent Christ, even so *He* hath sent prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers." See Eph. 4: 11.

4. The expression "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is assumed outright to be a promise or pledge into which Christ enters, to preserve unbroken and uncorrupted in every period a lineal succession of ordainers, to the end of time! Indeed. And yet nothing of the kind is specified or even hinted at. How much more rational, and in accordance with the actual events of history, to interpret this promise of the Saviour as referring to the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the preservation of the truth and ordinances of the Church on earth? But interpret the promise as you will, you cannot say that *you* yourself and your ministry are alone and specially named and commissioned in and by it, which you should be able to do if you intend in any adequate manner to support your exclusive claims.

5. It is quite curious to observe how your author runs the line of comparison between Christ and the Apostles, on the subject of their being set apart to their office by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them, of their having a kingdom appointed to them, and of their clear and positive authority to remit sin, as recorded in John 20: 23, as though he had forgotten that in all these respects your Bishops of the present day are no more like the Apostles, than your gown and bands are like the fisherman's coat of Peter!

6. Now under this commission your author maintains that the Apostles exercised certain powers. We shall attend briefly to a consideration of this point.

A. "The Apostles alone possessed the power of conferring apostolic authority on others." How is this maintained? We are told that "the power to judge in the Church was exclusively an apostolic right."

This is not so. Read Matt. 19, 25—30, 1st Cor. 6 : 2, Rev. 3 : 21. Besides, it is a mere assumption to say the passage in Luke 22 : 29, 30, has any reference to the polity of the Church on earth, meaning by this her visible organization, her permanent offices, with their powers and functions. I see not one particle of evidence in proof of this assumption. What then avails his inference that the “imparting of this authority (power to judge in the Church) to others, is evidence of the transmission of apostolic authority? It does not appear that the power to judge, spoken of in Luke 22 : 30, either was “exclusively an apostolic right,” or that it has in fact any reference to the permanent polity of the Church on earth. Again he asserts that the power to judge in the Church was conferred by Paul on Timothy and Titus. Now I have searched somewhat thoroughly, and I discover no authority for this declaration in the Word of God whatever. Even your learned author finds the same difficulty with myself—for when he comes to adduce passages in support of his statement with regard to Timothy and Titus, he cannot produce one in which the authority spoken of in Luke 22 : 30, is conferred upon them by Paul. It is evident from the passages which he does quote (Tit. 1 : 5, 1st Tim. 5 : 22, 2d Tim. 2 : 2,) that these men Timothy and Titus were simple assistants of the Apostle in fulfilling the ordinary work of the Christian ministry. There is no evidence whatever to believe they were anything more than ordinary Pastors or Evangelists. That Paul ordained them to the Apostleship or conferred upon them apostolic authority in any respect, there is no ground for concluding in Holy Writ. And setting aside the Bible, the very authors quoted by Chapin testify against him. “All antiquity asserts,” he says, “that Titus was ordained Bishop of Crete by St. Paul.” But a Bishop in those days was not an Apostle, nor did he claim to fill the apostolic office—he was one and the same with a simple pastor or evangelist. So by his own witnesses do we refute his position. If Titus was only ordained a Bishop, then certainly *apostolic authority was not conferred upon him.* The same remark will apply to Timothy. Your learned author gains nothing to his cause from this quarter. His argument

in respect to Epaphroditus is too feeble, in my judgment, to merit a serious reply. The circumstances of the case, as they appear in the epistles are so very obvious that the Rev. gentleman seems puzzled to get along with them ; and accordingly six pages are expended in endeavoring to unsettle a question which, to any candid mind is as plain as the rules of philology and the laws of language can make it. Nearly six pages more are taken up with an attempt to prove that "the seeing our Lord alive after his resurrection," was not a peculiarity of the apostolic office, when it can be triumphantly shown that no person who had not seen Christ personally could bear or did bear the apostolic office. If it was not a *peculiarity of the office*, it was one of the *indispensable qualifications for the office*. And so all his labor on this point must pass for nothing. Your author also makes this declaration : "That the Apostles appointed successors to themselves in all Churches, is proved by the unanimous voice of all antiquity." Let the statement be properly modified according to the very authors from whom he quotes, and it will become perfectly harmless. The Apostles appointed successors, that is, men that were to come after them in the ministry, no doubt, but they did not appoint any *Apostles* to succeed them. Their successors held such offices as were designed to be permanent in the polity of the Christian Church—their successors were Bishops or Presbyters—successors only in the ordinary office of the ministry, and not in the extraordinary one of the Apostleship. This the writings of Clement, Polycarp, Irenæus, and Tertullian clearly show.

B. "The Apostles and those to whom they had committed Apostolic authority possessed the exclusive right of appointing or ordaining Presbyters and Deacons." We have already seen that the transmission of apostolic authority, is an idea without support, and consequently the above statement in this respect must be regarded as a most unmitigated assumption. That the Apostles had the exclusive right not only of ordaining but of selecting Presbyters or Elders and Deacons is denied as an unfounded declaration. Timothy and Titus were not Apostles, neither had they apostolic authority. Yet Timothy was exhorted to lay hands

suddenly on no man," and Titus was left in Crete, to "ordain Elders in every city." There is nothing here but what a simple Evangelist, Pastor, or Bishop might exercise—authority to ordain others to the offices in the Christian Church, and to take the watch-care of the flock. To what purpose, then, has Chapin wasted seventeen or eighteen pages on the question of ordination, mystifying Scripture, quoting "the Fathers," and running here and there, now to "Egypt," and now to "the neighboring regions of the Gentiles," and now to "the troubles in the reign of Charles I?" Your polemic is indefatigable, to say the least, but his chase is mostly after an *ignis fatuus*!

C. "To the Apostles belonged the sole power of administering confirmation." It is enough on this point to affirm that there is no foundation for the statement in the Word of God. Such a rite of confirmation as exists in your Church, and as your author here attempts to fasten on the apostolic office and authority is a mere figment of the human brain. The Bible knows no such thing. Your learned friend must be hard pushed for peculiarities of "the apostolic authority," when he is obliged to conjure up a characteristic of this kind from the vague, shadowy, and impalpable images of things about Antioch and Ephesus and the Provinces of Western Asia.

D. "The Apostles, and those to whom the Apostles had committed apostolic authority had the rule over Presbyter-Bishops and Deacons." There is the same difficulty with this statement as with the other. Your learned gentleman assumes what he has not yet proved, namely, that *the apostolic authority was transferrable!* And then he intimates that the rule over Presbyter-Bishops and Deacons was exclusively the right of the Apostles. This must be the meaning, if it is anything to the purpose. At this point again, he has ingeniously introduced his compound word "Presbyter-Bishops," and placed these individuals under the control of those to whom he ascribes apostolic authority, as though these Presbyter-Bishops were not just such officers as Timothy and Titus themselves—that is Pastors, Evangelists, the highest officers in the permanent polity of the Christian Church. The

fact of the case stands thus : There were two kinds of Presbyters or Elders. See 1st Tim., 5: 17. There was one kind or class of Presbyters who both "ruled and labored in word and doctrine." There was another kind who "*ruled*," but did not "labor in word and doctrine." Both were called Presbyters, and the first class especially were called also teachers, prophets, pastors, or bishops. If then by the term "Presbyter-Bishops" your ingenious author means Pastors or Bishops of single congregations, as denoting the highest office in the permanent polity of the Christian Church, it surely does not appear that *such* were under the rule of Timothy and Titus—for Timothy and Titus as we have seen, were neither Apostles, nor had apostolic authority. They were only Presbyters or Bishops themselves, and of course they could have no *superior* authority over their *equals*! Hence this peculiarity of *their* office vanishes; and whatever superior authority constituted a characteristic of the *apostolic office*, it evidently expired at the death of the Apostles themselves. That there is government in the Church we are not disposed to deny—that both classes of Presbyters have their appropriate and peculiar powers and obligations is a truth implied in the very organization of the Church, as well as intimated in the Word of God. But that you possess the only scriptural ideas of the constitution of this government is a bold assumption which you are called upon now either to prove or abandon. The epistles of Ignatius, the sayings of Irenæus and Tertullian so copiously quoted by Chapin on this point, all go to disprove his own position. The Bishops to whom obedience was enjoined are universally acknowledged to have been *not Apostles* but Pastors of single congregations. If then the Apostles *as such* ruled, it was not exclusively their right; for all that was peculiar to them *as Apostles* expired with them, while all that belonged to the ordinary ruling power of the Christian ministry remained.

E. "To the Apostles and those to whom they had committed apostolic authority belonged the exclusive right of disciplining the Church." How is it possible that your friend could say this in the face of such passages as 1st Tim., 5: 17; Acts 20th chap.; Matt. 18th chap.? He must have taken

leave either of his memory or his conscience while spurring himself up to such a declaration. No matter how much he labors as he does to show that the Apostles *did discipline*, the question is, did *they alone* hold the right to discipline? You know well they did not.

F. "It was the right and duty of the Apostles and of those on whom they had conferred 'apostolic authority' to preside in all councils, and to declare the sentiments of the Council." This is expressly offered as a peculiarity of the "apostolic authority" founded only on one Scripture passage, Acts 15th chap., which recognizes also the authority of Presbyters. We have as good ground to conclude that it is the right and duty of the Presbyters "to preside in all councils" as your learned friend has to conclude in favor of Apostles. The passage adduced by him is the very one which cuts the throat of his argument.

G. For the following admission of your learned friend I must say I was not prepared. It is this:—"In every apostolic Church there was one Apostle or person endued with apostolic powers, having under him a plurality of Presbyter-Bishops and Deacons." What, an Apostle in every Church? Then certainly those Apostles could not have been Diocesan Bishops, for these exercise their control over whole tracts of territory. They must rather have been like simple pastors, that is, the Bishops of single congregations. The Rev. gentleman argues in favor of Parochial rather than of Prelatical Episcopacy. Well done! His "Apostles" then are Bishops, Pastors or Overseers of single congregations—his "Presbyter-Bishops" are simply those who "ruled" but "did not labor in word and doctrine," and his "deacons" mean only such as take charge of the pecuniary concerns of the Church—and then we have just that system of Parochial Episcopacy which you profess to abjure! Have you thought of this, my friend? Whatever you may say of the apostolic character itself, if an Apostle was, besides being endowed with an extraordinary office, also the Pastor of a single congregation, then though the apostolic office expired, still *Parochial Episcopacy* would remain. What a singular conclusion to reach in a work written by one of your own champions! Hence all his efforts through sixteen or eighteen pages more, his allusions to James

at Jerusalem, to Timothy at Ephesus, to Titus in Crete, to Epaphroditus at Philippi, to Epaphras at Colosse, to Archippus at Laodicea, to Nymphas, Aquila and Priscilla, with "*the Churches in their house*," (small dioceses they must have had for modern prelates!) to Polycarp and his epistle, to Linus and Dionysius and Anianus and Philip and Thomas and Andrew and Erodus, to Ignatius and Cyprian and Cornelius and Fabius, to Hobart and Brownell, and to the quotations from Clement of Rome and Irenæus—all this so far as it is worth anything as argument, goes to show that in the early history of the Christian Church, Parochial and not Prelatical Episcopacy was established.

H. "To each Apostle there seems to have been allotted a particular portion of country in which he preached the gospel, and over which he exercised jurisdiction." I observe that it is not at all evident that this was a peculiarity of the "apostolic authority." It is nowhere mentioned as such. Doubtless the Apostles were directed by the Spirit of God whither to bend their steps and bring the news of salvation. The world was not mapped out into dioceses, each having an Apostle to preach in and watch over it. You might as well say that in this day every missionary station on the globe is a diocese, with a prelate at the head of its affairs! The cases of Peter and Paul, and the traditions about Thomas and Andrew and John prove nothing in support of dioceses, so long as these men were *finite*, and were directed by the spirit of God into what portions of the world they should go. Not being able to fulfil literally the commission to preach the gospel to *every* creature, some were led one way and some another. *Dioceses* were altogether subsequent affairs! "They originated," we are told, "in the arrangement made by Constantine in the fourth century, when Christianity was made the religion of the state!"

I. "The country thus allotted to the Apostles was divided into several districts, and apostolic authority committed to different individuals in each of those districts." How does this tally with what he has said before, or with the diocesan regulations in your Church at the present day? Are your dioceses divided into several districts, each one of which is ruled by a person having apostolic authority, under one gene-

ral Prelate? How does Mr. Chapin propose to identify your bishops and dioceses with those he describes in the apostolic age? But we deny the assertion itself. We say again he has not made it appear that the apostolic office or authority was designed to be transferrable. Hence all his argument concerning individuals having apostolic authority conferred on them, and presiding in particular districts as under the Apostles themselves, at the same time, must fall as nothing worth to the ground.

7. We have now reviewed the points in which Chapin has undertaken to define what the apostolic authority is, and what powers and rights the Apostles exercised under what he terms *the apostolic commission*. We have seen that the transfer of apostolic authority from the Apostles to any successors *as in the apostolic office*, is an utter and unfounded assumption. We have seen that his APOSTOLIC COMMISSION gives no countenance whatever to the perpetuity of the apostolic office, or to a lineal succession of ordainers in that office down to the present time! We have seen that much less are you and your ministry specified and named in this commission as having the only true succession, and hence we conclude that "the episcopal claim," of which Onderdonk tells us, is not so easy to be supported, as your writers would have us suppose. Indeed we hold it as a monstrous usurpation, unworthy to be countenanced by the Christian community.

IV. A few chapters on, and in a portion of his book not reviewed by us in your oral lectures, Chapin makes *the attempt to give us the list* of the ordainers of your priesthood. The very fact that he makes *the attempt* is conclusive proof that he is fully sensible that such a *list*, clearly and legitimately shown, is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of your distinctive claims. Why make the *attempt* unless the thing were *felt* by your writers to be necessary. Your almanac for the last few years has also contained a long catalogue of names, as though your Church thought it somewhat important to parade before the people some legitimate proof of their peculiar claims and doctrines. Now if this catalogue were really what it purports to be, and what it ought to be, it would go far to maintain your idea of the succession. But

it has characteristics which utterly invalidate the whole chain for the purposes for which you adduce it. The following things may be predicated of it :—

1. It is confessedly not a complete list of the *names* even.
2. It is not a list of *the line of the successive ordainers* at all.
3. It is not a list of diocesan bishops, at all, at least for the first and second centuries.
4. It is by no means an authentic list, even as it stands. Great disputes have arisen about the very *names* and the *order* of their position.
5. Your writers do not conceal the fact that of several periods in the history of the Church there are *no records* extant.
6. It is not known with regard to a great many of the persons whose names are in this catalogue, whether they were duly ordained, consecrated, or otherwise inducted into their office. All these are important items, and absolutely indispensable to be shown to give to your Catalogue the weight it should have in this argument. You have failed then to prove your distinctive doctrines in regard to these three particulars :

1. What the apostolic authority is.
2. That it was designed to be and has been permanent authority existing in and exercised by a certain class of officers in every age of the Church.
3. That your Church *alone* has this authority, being able to trace it through every step and portion by authentic records back to the Apostles.

What then becomes of your "Episcopal claim." I tell you, my dear friend, it will not bear a sound investigation, and I do not much wonder that you have refused to enter into a public discussion with regard to it, or sought in so many ways to divert my attention to other objects.

In regard to Buel's reply to Whately, seeing that it is only a jostling between "the standard writers of your Church," and as Buel seems to get the hardest of it by dashing his head against the impregnable fortresses of the Primate of Ireland, I need not here speak in detail. It is a controversy in the bosom of your own Church, a trouble which it belongs to *you* to settle and not to *me*.

Respecting "Hobart's Apology" I would simply observe that while reading it I could fancy your great man, whose capabilities, according to your own account were thought to render him adequate to manage the destinies of this country, brought nevertheless into a very uncomfortable and "awkward predicament," so keen was the pain inflicted on him, by the masterly logic of Mason! Several of the first chapters of his book are but the feeble attempt of a defeated and chagrined antagonist to vent his remaining spleen and recover his wasted strength. The last part of the volume is made up of *stale* arguments, long known and long refuted. It is a production worth very little in settling the distinctive claims of your Church.

Consider me not rash in these comments upon your writers. If you are ready to support them, bring forward your strong arguments, and I will reply to them. Think not to evade "the true issue" by subterfuge or dogmatism, or general responses. The *ambiguity* of the fabled oracle of Delphi will not serve your present turn. But take the subject by its proper handle, and then hold your own, if truth and authority be yours. In concluding this epistle, I think I may take it upon me to say, although you are my Professor of Divinity that I am very sorry to see you so blinded and given over as you appear to be on the subject of your Church doctrines. I regret that you will still continue to keep up the *bars* of that "detestable sectarianism" which you seem to abhor so much. It is a pity you will allow yourself to be so manacled and enslaved by the king-chartered band of Prelacy. I believe you naturally susceptible of kindness and courtesy, and I lament that you should have embraced a system which is so well adapted to crush and kill out of you all the higher and nobler sentiments of Christian charity and concession, for the sake of dogmas which ought to be the ridicule of the world, and are destined to be exploded before the progress of Christ's kingdom in the earth "as flax is sundered at the touch of fire." I hope, however, the time may come when you will see your error and renounce it. And after all that has passed between us, I still possess that fraternal spir-

it towards you which leads me in anticipation of your recovery from your wanderings to subscribe myself as ever,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,

BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Feb. 10th, 1847.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—You stated to me this morning that you *would not* continue your instructions to me without you could have the privilege of directing the books which I am to study. I told you if you would furnish me with any book containing a list of ordainers from yourself step by step, and man by man, in a direct unbroken chain back to the Apostles, and this sustained by well authenticated history, I would be most happy to continue the investigation under your instruction.

Now this is to inform you that you have as yet furnished me with no such book; and accordingly I wait before attending to any more of your oral lectures, or giving you any more abstracts, until you shall signify to me in writing that you have such a book, or document containing the list of such a succession of ordainers as above described, and that you are ready to submit it to my inspection.

I have never consented to become to you a pupil at large, or to listen to your oral lectures on rambling and irrelevant topics. You must confine yourself to the true and only subjects contained in my three original questions, or our agreement is null and void. And while I hereby assure you that I am ready still to listen to your instructions on the legitimate points before us, I do not feel myself at liberty, from the remarks you made this morning, to continue my attendance at your study on Tuesday morning, because you positively refused to go on with your oral lectures unless I would consent to recite to you from Chapin on a subject which to my mind does not at all meet the real merits of my third original question.

I have only to add that whenever you are ready to prove to me your own line of ordination as above described, and will so inform me, I shall be exceedingly pleased to meet you. Wishing you much success in every lawful undertaking, and

praying, as ever for the welfare of you and yours, I remain,
my dear friend,

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,
BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Feb. 16th, 1847.

Rev. James A. Bolles,

Dear Sir,—Have you got the text-book yet which contains a regular list of your line of ordainers, back to the Apostles? Or if you have not this, will you write a document to this effect, sustained by well authenticated history? And will you inform me that you are ready to instruct me in this way, for I feel very anxious to continue the investigation under your tuition. Yet how can I without a proper text-book, or if you neglect and positively refuse in your oral lectures to give me the proper information?

Your brother in the bonds of Christ,
BYRON SUNDERLAND.

Batavia, Feb. 20th, 1847.

Having now completed the correspondence, I regard it a suitable opportunity to add a few brief chapters upon subjects which are naturally suggested by it.

CHAPTER I.

RULES OF DISCUSSION.

If it be desired by any one to test the real strength of Pre-lacy in debating with its Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, the object may be readily accomplished, by observing the following *rules* :—

1. Demand of them to define what they mean by "Episcopacy."
2. Demand of them to define what are the precise powers and functions of their *three orders of the ministry*.
3. Demand of them a list containing their own line of ordi-

nation step by step back to the Apostles, sustained by well-authenticated history.

4. Demand of them a Bible-warrant on all these points.

5. Never suffer them to draw you away from the "true point at issue," by turning your attention to foreign matters, by ridicule or finesse, or any of the tricks of sophistry.

Following these rules you will soon compel them to beat a retreat, or else frankly to acknowledge that their system is without any exclusive divine right.

CHAPTER II.

PRELITICAL MODE OF REASONING.

A common way of reasoning among Prelatists is first to charge their opponents with being ignorant and knowing very little about the subject, then to deny all the *facts* of history which make against them, then to appeal to *faith* to eke out the evidence required, and finally to set themselves up on their dignity, and not reply at all! Often they will begin by professing to investigate their own claims, and before you know it, they will suddenly change the subject and spin out a long tale as foreign from "the true point at issue" as Nantucket is from the Tonga Islands!

CHAPTER III.

CONCESSIONS.

Prelatists sometimes make mention of great names *out* of their connection as a kind of argument which ought to have much weight, never thinking, I imagine, of the multitudes *in* their communion who have been frank enough to confess that their distinctive claims are not of any such divine right as to "be binding on the conscience of Christian people." Notice

this important fact, *the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters by Divine right was never broached in the Church of England till Jan. 12th, 1588, more than 70 years after the commencement of the Reformation on the Continent.* Up to this time, the whole body of the Church founded by Henry VIII, acknowledged that there is no warrant in Scripture for the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters. This dogma was first asserted by Dr. Bancroft, then by Whitgift, and afterwards by Laud and his party, and it has ever since been the theme of those Prelatists who have little else of which to boast.

If the names of those who have denied this dogma are called for, we can give a great number of the most learned and eminent men in the very reign of Henry VIII, both in Church and State, such as Thomas (Lord) Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London, Durham, Lincoln, Bath, Ely, Bangor, Salisbury, Hereford, Worcester, Rochester and Chichester. To these we can add Cranmer, then the Primate of the Church of England, Dr. Whittaker in the reign of Elizabeth, Dr. Cox, Dr. Holland, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Bishops Jewel, Morton, and Burnet. Dr. Raignolds, Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, in a letter to Sir Francis Knollys, in 1588, says :—“ ALL that have labored in reforming the Church for 500 years past, taught that *all Pastors* be they entitled Bishops or Priests, have *equal authority and power by God's word*—as first the Waldenses, next Marsilius Petavinus, then Wickliffe and his disciples, afterwards Huss and the Hussites, and last of all, Luther, Calvin, Brentias, Bullinger, and Musculus. Among ourselves we have Bishops, the Queen's Professors of Divinity in our Universities, and other learned men as Bradford, Lambert, Pilkington, Humphreys, Fulke, WHO ALL AGREE IN THIS MATTER ; and so do all divines beyond sea that I ever read, and doubtless many more whom I never read. But why do I speak of particular persons? It is the common judgment of the reformed Churches of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries, and our own (the Church of England.) Wherefore I hope that Dr. Bancroft will acknowledge that he was *mistaken* when he asserted the

superiority which Bishops HAVE AMONG US, over the clergy, TO BE GOD'S OWN ORDINANCE." To this we add the judgment of Grindal, Primate of the Church of England in 1582, that the ordination of the Rev. John Morrison, a Presbyterian Minister, was not only *valid* but "laudable."

Charles I. refused to abolish Episcopacy as the state religion, because, he said, it was more favorable to monarchy than Presbyterianism !!! He also pleaded "conscience." He addressed a letter to his friends and counsellors, Lord Jermyn, Lord Culpepper, and Mr. Ashburnham (all Episcopalians) in which he says :—"Show me any precedent wherever Presbyterian Government and regal was together, without perpetual rebellions ; which was the cause which necessitated the king my father to change that government in Scotland. And even in France where they are but upon tolerance (which in likelihood should cause moderation) did they ever sit still so long as they had power to rebel ? *And it cannot be otherwise for the ground of their doctrine is anti-monarchical!!!*" He adds, "I will say without hyperbole that there was not a wiser man since Solomon than he who said—NO BISHOP, NO KING." To this royal epistle the above gentlemen replied :—"If by '*conscience*' your meaning be that Episcopacy is *jure Divino* exclusive, whereby no Protestant or Christian Church can be acknowledged for such without a Bishop, we must therein crave leave *wholly to differ*. And if we be in error we are in good company, *there not being* as we have cause to believe, *SIX PERSONS of the Protestant religion of the other opinion !*"

Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, who has been styled "the father of the Episcopal Church" in this country, said :—"Now if even those who hold Episcopacy to be of *Divine right* conceive the obligation to it *not* to be binding when that idea would be destructive of public worship, much more must *they* think so, who indeed prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible, *but without any idea of DIVINE RIGHT in the case*. This the author believes to be the sentiment of the great body of Episcopalians in America ; in which respect they have in their favor unquestionably the sense of the Church of England, and as he believes, the opinions of the most distinguished Prelates for piety, virtue, and abilities."

We could fill a volume with such *concessions*, "proving that in former days, 'the great body' of English and American Episcopalians repudiated as *false* the sentiment now so common on both sides of the Atlantic, that the system of Prelacy is founded on the *Word of God*, in such a sense as to make it obligatory on all Christians to adopt that form of polity, and in such a sense as to deny to other denominations the *name*, rights, privileges, and fellowship of Churches of Christ. THAT UNHOLY DOGMA IS A REFINEMENT OF MODERN CHARITY."

A question may now arise in the mind of the reader,—if the sentiments above expressed were general among the English Ecclesiastics, why did they adhere to and maintain the system of Prelacy? This is easily answered from their own mouths. Stillingfleet says in his *Irenicum*:—"I doubt not but to make it evident that the *main ground* for settling Episcopal government in this nation *was not accounted* ANY PRETENCE of *Divine right*, but the CONVENIENCY of that form of Church government to the state and condition of this Church at the time of the Reformation." Dr. Haweis in his continuation of Milner's Church History, candidly acknowledges:—"As yet (previous to 1588) the English Bishops claimed not their office by Divine right, but *under the constitution of their country*; nor pleaded for more than two orders of apostolical appointment, Bishops and Deacons." James I, "who was eager to grasp supreme and unlimited power, at once judged that the *Presbyterian* form of Church government was adverse to his designs, and the *Episcopal* favorable to them; because Presbyterian Churches form a kind of republic, which is subject to a number of leading men, all possessing equal rank and power; while Episcopal Churches more nearly resemble a monarchy. The very name of a *Republic, Synod, or Council* was odious to the King, and he therefore studied most earnestly to increase the power of the Bishops, and publicly declared *without Bishops the throne could not be safe!*" We have already seen the opinion of his son and successor, Charles I. According to these statements, it *was not Divine authority* but merely human *conveniency* and *expediency* on the one hand, and on the other a desire for power, an all grasping

ambition which established and maintained the system of Prelacy in preference to the system acknowledged to be taught in the Word of God.

Talk then to us of concessions! It is only a Prelatical madness, which blinds its subjects to the ruin they draw upon themselves.

CHAPTER IV.

PRELITICAL ORTHODOXY.

Prelatists do not seem to believe or teach *their own doctrines*. Two or three illustrations of this remark will be given.

1. In article 6th of their creed it is said, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Now they do not pretend that their great doctrine of "the apostolic succession" can be proved by the Bible; they go to the Fathers and to profane history and to the dark ages, and the canon law, and even to a blind unmeaning faith, to prove this doctrine, and assert that it must and ought to be believed! Does this agree with the creed to which they are solemnly sworn? Tradition, *tradition* and the Bible is their cry now-a-days!

2. The 17th article of their creed roundly asserts the doctrine of *unconditional election*! Do they teach or believe this? Let Mr. Bolles answer. When did *he* ever preach the sentiments of the 17th article out and out to his people! I call the public attention especially to this point. Prelacy has *sneered* long enough at the Calvinistic churches about *election*, not to be told that "those who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones!"

3. Besides, take their doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, in connection with this article on *election*, and see what a

horrid monster is begotten of the two! When Mr. Bolles baptizes an infant, that soul is regenerated, is a member of the body of Christ, if I understand his doctrine. Can that soul finally fall away and be lost forever? If not, then Mr. Bolles has the power of dispensing certain and final salvation when, how and where he pleases! He can send as many souls to heaven as he sees fit to baptize!! But if the soul regenerated when he baptizes it, can finally fall away and be lost, then what becomes of his doctrine of election, as contained in the 17th article? Truly was it said by an illustrious Englishman of the Church of England, that "she had a Calvinistic Creed, a Popish liturgy and an Arminian clergy!" Such monstrous and abhorrent opinions are inwoven into the very texture of Prelacy, and these they call their *orthodoxy*!

CHAPTER V.

A BOAST.

Prelatists often boast that their system has been universally received for fifteen centuries without a question. This they think a demonstrative proof of their claims, as though the truth *is always* with numbers and antiquity! But if these are the standards of truth, the world must go over to *paganism*, a system much *older* and more *prevalent* than Prelacy.

The *boast*, however, is *not true in fact*. We have the Greek, Arminian, Romish and Abyssinian churches, all claiming the apostolical succession, and denouncing and excommunicating each other, and among these old and bloated hierarchies, the Episcopal Church, comparatively in her *teens*, lifts up her impertinent head and arrogates the authority of them all! If this be not child's play, then the course of nature is reversed!

CHAPTER VI.

MOSHEIM'S AUTHORITY.

Prelatists often quote the Ecc. Hist. Mosheim to prove that there are three classes of officers in the Church. They scarce ever allude however, to his description of *Bishops* as they were in the first two centuries. If he is good authority for the one so he is for the other. The following is his language : "The rulers of the Church were called either Presbyters or Bishops, which two titles are in the New Testament undoubtedly applied to the same order of men. * * Let none, however, confound the Bishops of this primitive and golden period of the Church with those of whom we read in the following ages. * * A Bishop during the first and second century was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly. * * In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a *master* as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful *servant*. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of Divine worship, attended the sick, inspected into the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged indeed the Presbyters" (or Elders) "with the performance of those duties and services which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil ; but had not the power to decide or enact anything without the consent of the Presbyters" (or elders) "and people." * * The obligations of the Church were to "be divided between the Bishops, Presbyters," (or elders) "and deacons." Where is Prelacy in the golden age of the Church?

CHAPTER VII.

THE AGE OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The Episcopal Church in England is about 300 years old, being founded by Henry VIII, several years after the commencement of the Reformation by Luther.

The Episcopal Church in this country did not exist with full power to propagate itself till 1790, which makes her now about 58 years old! How venerable she is!! The four men who first exercised prelatical functions in this country were Seabury, White, Madison, and Provoost, consecrated abroad and under conditions and provisós from the King and Parliament of England, which ought to bring down upon them the indignation and contempt of all mankind! How striking is the difference between the commission of Christ to his ministry, and that of George III. to his ministry. Our Saviour said :—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." George III. and his Parliament said :—*Go ye into all the world except the British dominions.*" These king-shackled prelates having finally obtained license and been consecrated to preach, set up their Church in this country. And now, forsooth, after half a century, Prelacy, younger by several years than the Shakers or Universalists, pretends to exalt herself and talk of antiquity! Her *youngness* affords no obstacle to her impertinence.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRELACY NOT REPUBLICAN BUT MONARCHICAL.

We have already seen how kings regard it. It is a system in its own nature opposed to such a government as ours. Republicanism places the power to govern primarily in the people, makes its officers but the servants and administrators of the interests of the people, confers on them the functions of office by the authority of the people, and arranges the frequent reversions of power to its original possessors. Prelacy on the other hand places the power to govern in the Bishop, irrespective of the people, asserts that the Church cannot exist without a Prelate,—that the Prelate is the head and the *laity* the body, and that the latter is defunct without the former. Hence monarchs have always preferred the Prelatical form of government in the Church, because it is not only

similar in its principles to their views of the State, but also tends to preserve and disseminate the idea that a few are born to power and the masses to subjection. The *Divine right* of Kings stands on the same foundation with the *Divine right* of Prelates. James I. revealed the whole secret of this matter at the Hampton Court conference, where he so often repeated that remarkable epigram, "*no Bishop, no King!*"—the principle of which in its application to the Church has recently been revived by the ingenious Dr. Wainwright, of New York. Let republicans then take care how they receive to their bosoms in religion a doctrine which strikes at the very root of their civil liberty.

CHAPTER IX.

ALLIANCE OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Prelatists cannot avoid the adulterous connection of *religion* with *politics*. In England these are united. Nor have any of the officers of the Church any permission, license, or liberty to ordain or consecrate or in any way *perpetuate their own orders*, without the consent and approval of the Sovereign, who in this relation sustains the character of a kind of Pope. At this day the Romanists sneer at the English Church for having a *woman at their head!* Thus in a measure they return the compliment which was long ago paid them in the tale of Pope Joan, successor of Leo IV. When the first Prelates for this country were consecrated, the English Prelates dare not move a finger towards it till an Act of Parliament was passed upon the subject, which act provides that a license signed and sealed shall be obtained from the King before the consecration shall take place, that no person so ordained or any of his successors *shall exercise his or their offices in His Majesty's dominions*, and that a certificate of such consecration shall in due form be preserved. How foul and dishonorable is such a subjection of the Church and her ministry to the domination of civil rulers. The national Council

législating upon the right to preach salvation to perishing men! The Episcopal Church in this country owes its existence to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, and not to the Word of God, or Christ the only Head of the Church, recognized by them *as such*. Such paternity may well shame the advocates of Prelacy in this land, and call out, as in Dr. DeLancey's Address, an unqualified rebuke upon the attainted and illegitimate connection.

CHAPTER X.

A BEAUTIFUL ILLUSTRATION.

Prelatists sometimes bring up the *manuscripts of the Bible*, as exemplifying their doctrine of the "Apostolic Succession." They say for example, we all believe that we have the veritable gospel of St. Matthew, although we are not able to trace the manuscripts of this gospel step by step back to the original one. And so they say it is with the Prelatical ministry. We ought all to believe that this ministry *now* is the same as it was in the days of the Apostles, although we are not able to trace the succession of it up to the Apostles, step by step! There never was a more unfortunate illustration for the claims of Prelacy. For

1. It denies the very thing for which Prelatists contend, namely, that the succession can be traced. Why then do Prelatists fill their books with lines and catalogues of names? This illustration adduced by them renders their labors in this quarter completely futile. Their chapters on genealogy should begin somewhat in this way:—"It is just as much impossible to trace the succession of ordainers in our Church as it is to trace the succession of the manuscripts of the Bible. Still we shall go on and put down a list of names which will show pretty well to the eye!"

2. It shows the tracing of a lineal succession to be completely *unnecessary* for the settling of the question whether the Christian ministry *now* is the same that it was in primitive

times. Is my Bible now like the Bible written by the Apostles? By a comparison of the two I determine the fact. And one manuscript between, or one thousand or one million, alters not the question of identity a single hair. A succession of manuscripts proves nothing for the *identity* or sameness of the first and last manuscripts. And so it is with the lineal succession of the ministry; it proves nothing because alterations may have been made in successive ages. The only true method in the light of this illustration, of settling the authority of the Christian ministry, is for Prelatists to take *the type* of it as at the present day and compare with it the *type* of the ministry in apostolic times. Let them do this, and they will soon be compelled to put aside not only every pretension to an apostolical succession, but also every particle of support for their peculiar system.

CHAPTER XI.

MOTIVES FOR PREFERRING EPISCOPACY.

It is believed that the great mass of the people in this country who are attached to the Episcopal Church have chosen this connection on almost any other ground than a persuasion of its exclusive divine right. Some prefer this denomination as a matter of *taste*, others on account of family relations, others from the force of circumstances too pointed to be here detailed, and indeed there are many *reasons* which persons assign for their preference of Episcopacy, aside from its being in their view exclusively of *Divine right*. And I suppose I may say that the great majority of Episcopalians never have for themselves given the subject a thorough examination. They receive what their ministers tell them, conscientiously believing it to be true. And this would not be so very bad if it did not make them so very bigoted. Here is the great trouble of the case: the people are taught to deny fellowship to other Christian denominations, while yet they know scarcely anything as they should know it of the first

principles on which all Church or ecclesiastical authority is based. Multitudes who attend this Church never stop to inquire into its particular claims, but led by their feelings, or the example of others, or some inducement entirely foreign to the merits of the question, they take for granted what they wish to be true, and think that demonstrable which pleases their fancy most. I do not speak disparagingly of this class of persons. It is but the infirmity of our nature, which needs at all times to be guarded against, or it will lead us astray.

CHAPTER XII.

“THE TRUE POINT AT ISSUE.”

The point on which we claim a right to resist the teaching and influence of Prelatists is just that of their bigotry and assumption. Let them come on to the broad platform of a true Christian liberality and catholicism, and we shall have no contention with them. Let them look upon and fellowship other denominations as being as much a part of the Church of Christ as themselves; let them throw down the walls of their “detestable sectarianism,” as Mr. Bolles calls it; let them suppose that they are fallible as other men—and in some things respecting Church polity liable to be mistaken, and that this liability affords good ground for that charity towards others which they would claim for themselves; let them no more arrogate the covenanted mercies, immunities, powers and privileges of Christendom; let them come and worship with their brethren, still retaining, if they like, such portions of their system as the Word of God does not forbid; let them put their preferences upon the ground of *taste* or *convenience* or *expediency* and not on an exclusive divine right, and we shall desire no controversy with them. We shall cheerfully accord to them whatever we claim for ourselves. We will fellowship them as brethren, and uniting our moral strength, we will, under God, go forth to plant the gospel in all the earth.

But never, no never, can we allow the distinctive and arrogant assumptions of Prelacy! We protest against them as unwarranted and anti-christian, and tending continually to harm. We protest against them as principles with which we can never enter heaven, and which of course are not fit for us on earth. We protest against them as principles destined to pass away as the gospel in its purity shall still more and more prevail. And we call on all candid and Christian people to resist them through all suitable endeavors till they shall have perished from the world.

CHAPTER XIII.

TO THE READER.

In the conclusion of these chapters which is virtually a conclusion of the present volume, allow me to say a few words to such as may give these pages a perusal.

Do not, I entreat you, imbibe the idea from anything which has gone before, that Mr. Bolles and myself harbor towards each other any personal ill-will. It was months after this correspondence was closed that I invited him to participate in my Church in the services of a funeral. I should be ready to do it again under like circumstances. I hold that personal and social feeling is entirely distinct from the discussion of the claims of a given system of Church polity, and while I would treat Mr. Bolles both as a man and a minister, with all due respect, I must resist the system he adheres to, and the sentiments he utters, with all the strength of which my nature is susceptible.

If any suggest that it is idle to attempt a change by a single arm of that which for centuries has withstood the force of great combinations, I reply the idea is unsuitable to the freedom of thought and expression, as well as subversive of the very agencies by which in the gospel economy the world is to be subdued to Christ. Suppose I bear a single arm against what I deem to be gross error, and for a time my attempts