

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXVI.

ARTICLE I.

PRELACY A BLUNDER.

Two theories of Christianity prevail in Christendom, which are in fact essentially opposite. If one is the gospel of God, then the other cannot be. To him who heartily holds the one, the assertor of the other must be as one who "brings another gospel," and who ought to "be Anathema Maran-atha." That the advocates of these incompatible schemes should co-exist, and should have co-existed for three hundred years, in the bosom of the same communion, can only be accounted for by the stringency of the political influences which originally dictated the unnatural union, and by the absurdity of that theory of the Church which requires its tolerance. The hatred of Queen Elizabeth for the gospel, with what she regarded as her diplomatic and secular interests, prompted her to coerce the two religions into cohabitation in the State Church, by the despotic hand of persecution. The blunder of making a visible unity an essential attribute of the Church, where Christ required only a spiritual unity, has betrayed both parties into a dread of "the sin of schism," which holds them to the hollow mockery of union.

The one of these plans of salvation may be described, with sufficient accuracy, as the high-Prelatic, held by Rome, the Greek Church, and the Episcopalian Ritualists. It is often called the theory of "sacramental grace;" not because the other party deny

all grace through sacraments, but because the sacramentarian party makes the sacraments essential to the reception of grace. The dogma of a tactual succession, through prelates, from the apostles, is its corner-stone. This dogma teaches that the apostles transmitted their peculiar office by ordination to the prelatish bishops and metropolitans; and with it a peculiar *χάρισμα* of the Holy Ghost, which is conferred in every case of canonical, prelatish ordination, by the Lord Jesus Christ, through the laying on of the prelate's hands; making every "priest" thus ordained a depository of the spiritual energy, and every "bishop" (apostle) a "proxy" of the Saviour himself, endued with these gifts, in the same sense in which he was endued with them by his Father. Thus Dr. Hammond, for instance, with the current of prelatists, interprets our Saviour's words, John xx. 21: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." This *χάρισμα*, transmitted in ordination, includes a spiritual superintendence, which keeps the clergy orthodox (and, as represented in their head, the Pope, says Rome, infallible) in expounding the gospel to souls. It also enables them to put into the sacraments a supernatural energy of the Spirit, by which they omnipotently *work grace*, and are not mere means of grace. Rome was accustomed to say, in her scholastic nomenclature, that her sacraments wrought saving graces, *ex opere, operato*: by which she seems to have meant, that the manipulation itself effected the gracious result, without any dependence on any state of knowledge, holy desire, penitence, or faith, in the recipient; even as calomel would touch the liver of the patient who supposed that he had taken only a bread pill. The ritualists assert substantially the same view, in teaching the baptismal regeneration of an unconscious or sleeping infant, by the application of the water. Rome teaches that her sacraments are so absolutely essential and efficient, that no soul can be introduced into a state of grace, save by them. The Anglican ritualists say that without the prelatish sacraments, the soul is left to the "uncovenanted mercies."

Thus, the theory of the gospel dispensation described amounts to this: that Christ's provision for applying his mercy for man, consisted simply in his instituting on earth a successive hierarchy

as his "proxies," empowered to work, through his sacraments, the salvation of submissive participants, by a supernatural power, precisely analogous to that by which he enabled Peter to speak in an unknown tongue, and by which Peter and John enabled the lame man to walk.

It is perfectly obvious that if this claim of *χάρισμα* bestowed in prelatic ordination, is unfounded; if the only energies of the Holy Spirit now bestowed on men are given to them, not as priests or prelates, but as penitent, believing, praying sinners; if they are given by the Holy Ghost in his own gracious and sovereign intercourse with souls, through no other mediator than Christ, and by the means of the word and ordinances intelligently apprehended and embraced; if this communion in his grace is as common to the layman as to the clergyman; then the whole scheme of sacramental grace, above described, is a dream. Then, the dependence on that hierarchy and its sacraments, working *ex opere operato*, is related to true Christianity, precisely as is a fetish or a pagan incantation. It is an attempt to heal the soul by a series of acts of ecclesiastical jugglery. It is not asserted that the transaction carries all this profanity and mischief to every misguided votary. As in so many other instances, so here: grace may render men's subjective faith better than their dogmas; the Holy Spirit may mercifully disarm the destructive points of the evil theory, and turn the soul's attention to the other parts containing an element of truth. We doubt not that many devout minds, under this sacramentarian teaching, embrace, with a true though obscure faith, the saving, didactic truths so beautifully taught in the sacraments and in the Scriptures. But they do so in spite of this Gentile error which overlays the doctrine of redemption, not in consequence of it. The theory itself is, essentially, superstition, and not Christianity.

The rival scheme of the application of redemption is that summed up in the words of our Saviour: "Sanctify them *through thy truth*: thy word is truth." The apostle Paul declares it in one word: "It pleased God, by the foolishness of *preaching*, to save *them that believe*." 1 Cor. i. 21. So in Rom. x. 4 to 17: "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be

saved. . . . So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." John i. 12: "As many as received him, to them gave he power (*ἐξουσίαν*) to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name." Eph. iii. 17: Christ "dwells in your hearts *by faith*." 1 John v. 11, 12: "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath (*ἔχει*, holds,) the Son, hath the life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not the life." The previous part of the chapter proves that the holding of the Son is faith on him. But to cite all the proofs of this view, would be to repeat nearly the whole of both Testaments. Ps. xix. 7-10; cxix. 9, 93, 98, 104, 130; Prov. iv. 13; Isaiah xxxiii. 6, liii. 11; Jer. iii. 15; Hos. iv. 6; Hab. ii, 14; 1 John v. 1; 1 Pet. i. 23; Luke viii. 11; 1 Cor. iv. 15; John viii. 32; James i. 18; John v. 24; xv. 3; Acts xiii. 26; xx. 32; 1 Pet. ii. 2. And here, at the outset, is an insuperable objection to the scheme of sacramental grace, that it is irreconcilable with this universal teaching, repeated in such multifarious forms. For its constant doctrine is: The Son of God having purchased redemption for his people by his vicarious work, that salvation is actually applied to their souls by the agency of his Spirit, through the means of his word, taught, intelligently apprehended, and embraced by faith, without other conditions or *media*. Hence, all preachers, even inspired evangelists and apostles, instead of being a mediating hierarchy, are "*ministers* by whom we believed;" themselves partaking of redemption precisely as the believing layman does. The sacraments are but "*means of grace*," presenting the truth in symbol, and, while greatly instructing and assuring the faith of the believer already in Christ, yet doing it no otherwise than the Word also does it. Christ reserves the administration of them to the ministers whom he calls in the Church, not on any hierarchical or sacerdotal ground, but simply on grounds of *ἐνταξία* and didactic propriety.

Which of these theories is the more favorable to priestcraft, priestly assumption, and spiritual tyranny, may be seen without a word. We shall not say that this tendency is the thing which commends the doctrine to all prelatists; it would be puerile to

deny that history shows us a multitude of them using it for a weapon of despotism over souls ; and still another multitude of prelatists, less malicious, but more romantic, cherishing it at the unconscious promptings of self-importance. It is a fine thing when a poor mortal can believe himself the channel of eternal life to his subject fellow-creature—the “proxy” of the Son of God and King of Heaven ! The motives which have led the majority of nominal Christians to hold a theory so glaringly opposed to Scripture, are complex, but easily detected. On the part of the hierarchy, those motives are lust of power and pride of importance. On the part of the laity, they are the natural tendency to find a concrete object for the instinct of superstitious veneration ; the terror of the despotism in which they have been reared to believe holding the issues of their salvation or damnation at its option ; and above all, the intense craving of the sinful heart, remorseful yet impenitent, for a palpable mode of reconciliation to God without the prior necessity of the sincere crucifixion of self and sin. As long as men are weak, superstitious, depraved, and conscious of guilt, sacramentarianism must have abundant followers.

This prelatist theory is founded on the following assumption as its corner-stone : That episcopal ordination *confers* the spiritual gifts, or *χαρισματα*, of spiritual powers, instead of merely *recognising* ministerial qualifications, and conferring official title. And this assumption, in its turn, rests upon the false claim that the acts of apostles, laying on hands to confer the Holy Ghost, as in Acts viii. 17, 2 Tim. i. 6, are the prelates’ precedents and warrants for it. The especial object of this discussion is to overthrow this false foundation. If it can be shown that this employment of those passages of Scripture is essential to the prelatist theory of orders and sacramental grace, and that prelatists do, in fact, so usurp them ; and if it can then be evinced that these Scriptures relate to a wholly different subject, when properly understood, and have nothing to do with scriptural ordination to clerical office ; then the whole system of Prelacy is effectually undermined.

I. Our first position, then, is, that the advocates of sacramental

grace do, in fact, usurp those passages in which the *χάρισμα* of working supernatural "signs" is conferred or promised. as the authority for their false scheme of ordination to their so-called priesthood. If they did not, they would have no show of Scripture proof-texts whatever to support the wondrous fabric! This position must be supported by citations from their own authorities, ancient and modern. But as the prelatie scheme was the gift of Rome to the modern churches, we will begin with her most authoritative standards, the Decrees and Catechism of the Tridentine Council. First: In the Cat., Part II., Chap. vii. Q. 25: The administration of the "sacrament of orders" belongs to the bishop; "which it will be easy to demonstrate by the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, most certain tradition," etc. The texts cited here—such as Acts vi. 5, 6, xiv. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6—show that Trent asserts this because she holds bishops to be apostles, and because she usurps these texts erroneously. Then, in the decrees concerning the "sacrament of order," Session 23d, she proceeds thus:

"I. Sacrifice and priesthood are so conjoined by the ordination of God, that each has existed under all dispensations. . . . This (New Test. priesthood) has been instituted by the same Lord, our Saviour: and the Sacred Scriptures show, as the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that the power of consecrating, sacrificing, and distributing his body and blood, and also of remitting sins, has been delivered to the apostles and their successors in the priesthood."

"III. It is plain from the testimony of Scripture, apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the fathers, that *grace is conferred* by holy orders, which are solemnised by words and exterior signs," etc.

"Canon IV. If anybody says that the *Holy Ghost is not given by holy orders*, and that accordingly the bishops have no ground to say " (to the recipient,) "*Receive ye the Holy Ghost*, or that the character is not impressed through this sacrament, etc., let him be accursed."

Rom. Catechism, *De Ordine*, Chap. VII., § 28: •

"But it is certain that, although the Sacrament of Orders, as before stated, regards very greatly the advantage and beauty of the Church, yet it also works in the soul of him who is initiated into sacred things, the grace of sanctification, by which he is rendered fit and able for the right performance of his duty, and for the administration of the sacraments: just as a person, by the grace of baptism," (baptismal regeneration,) "is fitted for receiving the other sacraments. It is plain that another grace.

also, is ascribed to this sacrament," (ordination,) "viz.: *the special power* which relates to the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, which power is in the priest, full and perfect; so that he alone is able to make the body and blood of our Lord," etc.

Let us pause here to introduce one proof of Rome's misunderstanding. She expressly teaches that this gift of the Holy Ghost conferred in ordination, and this character impressed, *are not the illumination and sanctification* which make men believers and saints. For Rome holds that men can "fall from grace," while they can never lose this gift and character. Rome holds that the ordained man may be all his life unconverted, and still he has the whole gift and character. Now, then, if they are not saving grace, what are they? The only other kind of *χάρισμα* of the Holy Ghost known in Scripture, is that gift of supernatural tongues and signs which Judas had; which was conferred sometimes on females and children, and which 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, describes as compatible with spiritual death. But the texts which Rome quotes to sustain her dogma, clearly betray the same thing. They are mainly and foremost, John xx. 21, 22, 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, with some others not even apparently relevant. But on these three she "rings the changes" throughout the chapters; and especially on John xx. 21, 22.

Before we examine these texts more nearly, let us also look at the doctrine of the Anglican Church. In the form for the consecration of bishops, the following words are addressed to the candidate by the presiding bishop, as he and his assessors lay their hands upon his head:

"*Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*"

Then follows the exact language of 2 Tim. i. 6. And one of the Scriptures directed to be read before the consecration is John xx. 21. The Anglican Church has learned her lesson from Rome accurately in this matter. The same formula of words is also put into the bishop's mouth for ordaining a "priest," along with an alternative which is less unscriptural. Bishop Cummins, in ordaining Bishop Cheney, refused to employ the unscriptural

language of Rome, because he had repudiated her theory of sacramental grace. He discloses the interesting fact, that it was not until the twelfth century that these superstitious words were finally established in the Romish formulary; and that to this day, they are not used in that of the Greek Church. It required all the ignorance, superstition, and priestly imposture of the dark ages, to prepare the way for this usurpation of the teachings of Scripture.

Let us now see whether the three texts support the dogma of such a "gift of the Holy Ghost," actually conferred by a prelate's hands in our day, in ordinary consecration of a minister; or whether they do not belong to wholly another matter. 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6, are parallel verses in part. The first reads: "Neglect not the gift (*χάρισμα*) that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on (*μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως*) of the hands of the presbytery." The second: "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on (*διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως*) of my hands." The interpretation which we shall establish at a more appropriate stage for these verses, is, that the latter refers to a time when Paul, by his peculiar, apostolic power, and with the laying on of his hands, conferred on Timothy a *χάρισμα* of supernatural working, just like that he conferred on the disciples at Ephesus—Acts xix. 6; and that the former contains a double reference to this same endowment by Paul and to Timothy's regular presbyterial ordination to office as a minister—the two having probably been near or at the same time.

Let us now look at John xx. 21, 22, which Prelatists evidently regard as the mainstay of their dogma. Christ is now risen. Meeting ten of the apostles at night, he says: "Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost.* Whosoever's sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." To the Protestant these words are plain enough—Christ is God-man, Redeemer, High Priest, Sacrifice, King, and Intercessor to his people. These offices he devolves on nobody, but holds them always. But he condescended for a time to be

“sent” by his Father, in the humble office of a preacher in the Church. This office he now devolves on his twelve apostles. They, as his heralds and ministers, are to proclaim and explain to mankind the terms on which sins are pardoned by him; “for who can forgive sins but God only?” But as they would enjoy the guidance of inspiration, their publication of their Master’s forgiveness would be authoritative, and would be ratified by him in heaven. (Compare Matt. xvi. 19.) For thus setting up the new dispensation, the apostles needed supernatural assistance, and it had been promised to them before the crucifixion—John xvi. 13. They were, at the proper time, to be inspired. They would also need to be accompanied by some supernatural attestations. These, also, the Holy Ghost would work by and in them. These gifts Christ now ensures to them by a significant act, while he repeats the promise, as near its fulfilment. That the gift of the Holy Ghost which he now bestowed was the very same exercised by the apostles in the day of Pentecost, is made as clear as a sunbeam, by Christ’s own words, as recorded by Luke, Acts i. 4, 5: “Depart not from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, *which ye have heard of me*. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence.” *When* did they hear this promise from him? Evidently on the night described by John xx. 21, 22. Thus, that gift of the Spirit, whose bestowal was then symbolised by the act of breathing upon them, is identified with the effusion of the day of Pentecost. What that was, all know (Acts ii. 2—4)—a miraculous inspiration.

Thus, when Prelatists claim this promise of John xx. 21, 22, as the foundation of their doctrine of orders and supposed power to work sacramental grace, they claim what Christ applied to a totally different matter from ordination: the bestowal of supernatural powers of the Holy Ghost. Our charge is made out by their capital text.

The next proof-text quoted by Rome, and by the Anglican divines, is Acts vi. 3, the appointment of the first recorded deacons: “Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom, whom we may

appoint over this business." Then (verses 5, 6,) the multitude chose, and apostles set them apart, by laying on of hands and prayer. To the plain Protestant reader, it would seem that this instance is totally irrelevant to prove that ordination *confers a gift of the Holy Ghost*. For, the possession of that gift by the seven men was the prerequisite qualification for ordination, which, because the gift was already possessed, conferred simply the diaconal office. But stay: Rome wishes to imply, in spite of this, that the apostles' hands *conferred the charisma*. Chrysostom argues expressly, that Stephen is not heard of, as exercising that gift, until after this laying on of hands, when (verse 8) he "did great wonders and miracles among the people." The interpretation is false; but it none the less establishes the charge with which we set out, that Prelacy erroneously builds upon these instances of supernatural gifts; when, in fact, they belong not to the matter of ordination to the ministry at all, as results thereof. It may be added here, that the Pentecostal Church being adorned with many instances of these extraordinary gifts *among its laymen*, the apostles deemed it proper, for the time, to take the deacons from among these laymen thus honored of God. The occasion of their choice was a threatened faction in the Church; and they wished the present appointment to carry universal confidence. But when we turn to 1 Tim. iii. 8, etc., where we find the regular qualifications for the diaconal office defined for customary times, the power of tongues and miracles is not heard of among them.

Our next proof, that the Prelatists have actually built their theory on the mistaken foundation, is also historical. Every intelligent reader knows the monstrous lengths to which the abuse of purchasing ordination to clerical office went, in the Romish and Anglican Churches. It was the glory of the administration of the great Pope Hildebrand, Gregory V.II., to resist this abuse; but it has never been conquered. Now, Prelacy has given it a name, which exactly and technically separates it from all other sins. That name is *Simony*. It is confessedly taken from Simon the Samaritan, usually known as Simon Magus, in that act which is described in Acts viii. 14 to 21. Philip the Evangelist,

though supernaturally qualified for preaching by the *charisma* which he had before he was appointed deacon, and though competent to convert and baptize people, yet was not an apostle; and hence he could not confer these extraordinary gifts by laying on hands. Hence, the church newly planted in Samaria as yet lacked that honor. Peter and John, apostles, were sent down to confer it. Those on whom they laid their hands received these visible *charismata*. Doubtless they spake with unknown tongues, or prophesied; for the result was obvious to Simon's observation as a spectator (verse 18). The same ambition which has moved so many an assertor of Prelacy since to claim this peculiar apostolic power, moved him. He proposed to give them money, "saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." Note, the thing Simon craved was not the ability to speak with tongues or work a miraculous sign. Possibly he had received this as a reprobate Judas received similar powers. He desired *the ability to confer this power on others*. And this criminal proposal so perfectly defined by Simon's own words, is precisely the thing which Rome and the Anglican Church have selected to denominate the sin of procuring clerical orders by money. The fact is evinced yet more clearly by another trait. The canon law of Rome declares that an ordination procured by Simony is null and void *ab initio*, and all priestly acts done by the man thus ordained, are utterly invalid. The Hildebrands, more righteous than the Anglican dignitaries, actually enforced this law. The scriptural basis of it is the words of Peter: "*Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter.*"

Thus prelacy shows that, in its apprehension, the imposition of hands by Peter and John on these Samaritan converts, and the consequent possession of the extraordinary *charisma*, was a precedent and a basis for their doctrine of orders. The disclosure is complete. Prelacy deems, that when a man purchases of the Bishops the powers conferred, as they claim, in Episcopal ordination, he commits the identical sin attempted by Simon. But did these Apostles then ordain those members of the new Samaritan church to clerical office? Obviously they did not; but

did wholly another thing : conferred on some laymen, and possibly women, a *charisma* of supernatural powers. Thus the sheer usurpation and misconception of the Scripture by the prelatist is again disclosed.

Our next testimony is even a more express betrayal of the blunder. It is from the *Parainesis* of Dr. Hammond, *Quere 5th* : “*Χειροθεσία* is answerable to that imposition of hands in ordination so often mentioned in the New Testament . . . as, generally, when *by that laying on of hands it is said they received the Holy Ghost*; where the Holy Ghost contains all the *χαρίσματα* required for the pastoral function, and also signifies power from on high,” etc.

Dr. Hammond here betrays the fact that his prelatist error was carried by him through the whole New Testament. Quoth he, “Generally by *that laying on of hands*,” [*scilicet*, ordination to clerical office,] “it is said they received the Holy Ghost.” But it is never said of any ordination to clerical office, that the clergyman received the Holy Ghost from his ordination; never once within the lids of the New Testament. But hear him again :

“*Of this ceremony, thus used*” (meaning imposition of hands for ordination) “several mentions there are. First, Acts viii. 17, where after Philip the deacon had preached and baptized in Samaria, Peter and John, the Apostles, came from Jerusalem to perfect the work, and laid hands on them, [not on all that were baptized, but on some special persons whom they thought meet,] and they received the Holy Ghost.”

This pious Anglican prelatist thus declares expressly the same mistake which his predecessors in error had made, when they supposed that the sin of obtaining ordination by a bribe was just the sin which Simon Magus committed.

To show that this was the traditionary and original ground of prelacy, we will now go backwards, and cite two examples of the same false exposition, from the most learned of the Greek Fathers. Theophylact, on 2 Tim. i. 6, gives as the equivalent of the words, *διὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*, this gloss : *Τούτ' ἐστὶ, ὅτε σε ἐχειροτόνουν ἐπίσκοπον*. He thus expressly confounds the appointment to clerical office, with an Apostle's bestowal of spiritual gifts.

Chrysostom on Acts vi. 8, says: "See how one man (Stephen) was preëminent among those seven, and held a primacy. For although their ordination was common among them, yet this man derived a larger grace. But before this ordination, he wrought no signs, but only after he was manifested. This was designed to teach them that grace alone was not sufficient; but that ordination is requisite, in order that the access of the Spirit may take place."

It is still the same obstinate misconception: that ordination is the bestowal of supernatural gifts, instead of the recognition of gracious qualifications for clerical duties.

The prelatist conception of an application of redemption exclusively by sacramental grace has been thus carefully explained, and its founding, by its own architects, upon an imaginary scriptural basis has been evinced; because so many, even of Protestants, fail to conceive it aright. We repeat then: The prelatist supposes that the grace of Christ is applied to the soul, not as the Bible teaches, by the Holy Spirit, through the Word rationally apprehended and embraced by faith; but by the Holy Spirit working miraculously, without the truth, but through a priestly and sacramental hand, just as when, through a miracle-worker, He casts out a demon or heals a leper. In the eyes of the prelatist, ordination is not the conferring of a didactic and ruling ministration, proceeding on the candidate's previous possession of natural and gracious qualification; but it is a miracle wrought upon the candidate, by the hand of an Apostle, enabling him in turn to work certain other miracles. When the priest, clothed with this endowment, consecrates the Eucharist, he truly works a miracle, then and there, converting bread and wine into the real flesh and blood of Christ, and conveying by them supernatural and spiritual life into the souls of the persons in whose mouths he puts the elements. So, when he applies the water of baptism to an infant, he works another miracle by it: he quickens the soul thereby, which was born dead in sin. In a word, souls are brought into a state of salvation, not by a rational, scriptural, and spiritual faith on the gospel; but by a miracle-working power, deposited with the priest, and dispensed by his sacramental forms.

And the deposition of that power by the Apostle-Bishop is precisely a case like that of the communication of tongues and powers by the Apostles' hands in the book of Acts.

This last point, we repeat, is imperfectly apprehended, even by many intelligent opponents of prelacy. They do not grasp here exactly what prelacy means. One cause of this imperfect apprehension is, that they see these same prelatists claiming these instances of the imposition of hands as precedents for their "sacrament of confirmation," or, as the Episcopalians have it, rite of confirmation. It seems unlikely to our friends, that prelatists should be guilty of the inconsistency of claiming the same set of cases for two different uses. We reply, first, that if they appreciated the nature of prelatistical logic more justly, it would not appear to them at all strange that prelatists should use the same cases in two inconsistent ways. But second, from the prelatists' point of view, (if once its error be assumed,) the inconsistency is less than at first thought appears. According to them, only a bishop (an actual apostle) can ordain a priest; and he only can confirm a convert. When the first Apostles conferred *charismata* of spiritual powers by the laying on of hands, those powers were numerous, and varied with the different needs of the recipients. Some received tongues; some the powers of healing; some prophecy; some casting out demons. So, when the apostle (bishop) ordains some, and confirms others, he bestows different supernatural powers. To the one he gives the power of regenerating infants with water and of making a mass; to the other, the power of resisting the flesh and the devil. But in either case, it is a *charisma* through the apostolic hands: a supernatural endowment through the tactual means. This is the common point of union for these parts of their scheme.

In dismissing this point, we may remark once for all, that if our view of these impositions of hands be sustained, then all scriptural ground for the rite of confirmation will be as completely removed, as for prelatist orders and sacramental grace.

Another source of defective apprehension concerning the real nature of the prelatist scheme, is the studied intermixture which they make of their real doctrine with certain scriptural truths

concerning gracious qualifications for the pastoral office. They so mingle the scriptural and the superstitious, as to throw dust into Protestant eyes, and to obscure certain plain distinctions. True, the two schemes, of a ministerial or a sacerdotal work, are incompatibles; but prelatists are not troubled by logical inconsistencies. Thus, at one time, when descanting on the *charismata* bestowed in orders, they speak in the most edifying way of the integrity of spirit, spiritual discernment, and biblical knowledge, which enter into our Protestant conception of the "aptness to teach." To us it seems that the only channels by which these things come from the Holy Ghost, must be study and prayer. We can scarcely raise our Protestant minds to the height of the conception, that our prelatist brethren should apprehend even these as oozing through a prelate's fingers into a priest's skull. We fail to grasp their meaning. Then, to complete the confusion of our minds and the intermixture of pastoral qualifications with supernatural, sacerdotal powers, they take us to such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 28, etc., and Rom. xii. 6. We are reminded that the apostolic, prophetic, and miracle-working (*δυνάμεις*) offices are here described as "set in the Church," alongside of the pastoral, the ruling, and the diaconal. They show us the *χαρίσματα κυβερνήσεως* side by side with the *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*. They intimate to us, that as the latter endowment must have been bestowed through the supernatural power of an apostle, so the former, so familiarly associated with it, must have been also. And thus they would have us jump to the prelatist conclusion, that the pastoral qualification in our day as well as the first age, is conferred by the tactual succession.

The trick here is obvious to a little reflection. It consists in assuming that the *charisma* was a specific thing always; namely, some endowment of spiritual power conferred by imposition of the Apostles' hands, and distinct always from those "graces of the Holy Spirit" which characterise the saint, whether layman or clergyman, as a believer. But in fact, the word *χάρισμα*, in the usage of the New Testament, is general; almost as general as its *congener*, *χάρις*. The common idea of both words is that of gratuity. bestowing without price. The only difference between

them is, that while *χάρις* denotes the generous and disinterested affection in God. (or his child,) *χάρισμα* signifies something bestowed, the expression of that affection. The latter word is still a general one. In Rom. v. 15 and 16, justification through Christ is called a *χάρισμα*. In Rom. vi. 23, eternal life is called *χάρισμα*. In xi. 29, electing love is called *χάρισμα*. In 1 Cor. i. 7, utterance and knowledge are spoken of as *χαρίσματα*. In 1 Cor. vii. 7, Christian continence is called a *χάρισμα*. 1 Cor. xiii., plainly implies that in the light of the last verse of the preceding chapter, faith, hope, and charity, are *χαρίσματα*. Thus, anything with which God endues a Christian out of his unbought kindness is, in this sense, a *charisma*. The word is, beyond doubt, used a few times to describe those supernatural endowments; and so is the word *δωρεά*, as in Acts viii. 20. When, therefore, qualifications for pastoral or diaconal service are called by the Apostles *χαρίσματα*, by that term alone *nothing is taught as to the channel* of their bestowal; all that is taught is that they have their source in the grace of Christ. To find whether they are attained in any "sacrament of holy orders" or not, we must look elsewhere in the Scriptures.

Making these obvious discriminations, then, we remove the dust from our eyes. We are able to disembarass the matter of this question: Whence the pastoral qualifications? whose reality in true ministers and elders we all admit. We separate the question, whether ordination by the modern prelate bishop confers any power to work sacramental grace. And we detect the hollowness of that claim by tracing it to its *genesis* in a sheer misconception of the Apostolic history.

II. We are thus led to the second department of our discussion, for which the way has designedly been prepared. We have repeatedly stated the postulate in the first branch, that the instances of the Apostles' conferring supernatural *charismata* by laying on their hands, have nothing whatever to do with the substance of ordination to ordinary church offices. It remains now to establish that postulate. We have shown that prelacy is compelled to assume the opposite, as one of the foundation stones

of its theory; so that when our position is established, that theory is overthrown.

Other lines of argument against it have been successfully followed. The claim of an "apostolic succession," in the sense of sacramental grace, is utterly demolished, by proving that *there are no apostles* in the world; that there have been none since the death of the Apostle John; as, in the nature of the case, it is impossible there should be. The apostolic office proper was necessarily temporary; because it could only be filled by men who enjoyed the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; who possessed the gift of working palpable miracles; who had "seen the Lord Christ;" who had "compained with the eleven all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from them, and so could be a witness with them of his resurrection."

This figment of "apostolic succession" is destroyed again by showing that the thing has no existence on earth, to which they claim to succeed. When we ask the early prelatic Church, the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican Catholic: *To what* have your prelates succeeded? The universal answer is: "To priesthood and sacrifice;" to the mediating functions of a hierarchy. The succession is that, or it is nothing. But since Christ's ascension, there is neither priest nor sacrifice on earth. The true Apostles were not priests, in the prelatic sense, and had no atoning sacrifice. There is no altar nor priest on earth. This line of refutation has been pursued by Dr. Thomas E. Peck, among others, in *THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW* of July, 1872, with irresistible perspicuity and force.

Again, the claim of apostolic succession in the Anglican Church has been historically refuted, by showing this fatal chasm, among almost a score of others: That during the reigns of Elizabeth and her successors, the succession was filled by the crown, and not by the episcopate. And the persons wearing the crown were rebels against the Lord Jesus Christ, living in open sin; if not infidels, friends rather of Popery than of the Church of Christ; and uniformly filling the succession on grounds of choice not spiritual or Christian, but wholly secular and usually

VOL. XXVII., NO. 1—3.

wicked and selfish. The pretended election of a Bishop by his Chapter, was under a *Conge d'elire*, which contained the single name for which the electors were compelled to vote by the vague but urgent terrors of the statute of "*Præmunire*." The consecration which followed by the hands of three prelates appointed in the same anti-christian manner, was obviously, as the pretended "creation of a bishop," a farce too hollow to impose on any sane mind. Hildebrand, the great bulwark of Middle Age prelacy, utterly refused to recognise the validity of such a farce, when attempted by the Emperor of Germany.

Again, the scheme of sacramental grace is refuted by the doctrine of the gospel in the Old Testament. If the two Testaments contain the same covenant of grace, then salvation under both must be substantially by the same means and agencies. For then the two Testaments contain the same religion and the same salvation. But that this is so is evinced by these among other facts. Both Testaments have the same Mediator. Both suspend salvation practically upon faith on Him. Both promise precisely the same redemption from the same evils. The very ordinances which distinguish the Old Testament from the New foreshadowed the gospel truths, more clearly taught in the latter. But under the Old Testament, no sacraments saved souls *ex opere operato*. There was no regeneration by circumcision parallel to the pretended baptismal regeneration of prelacy; but if the Jew became a "breaker of the law, his circumcision was made uncircumcision; and he was a Jew who was one inwardly; and circumcision was that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." "All those fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them; and that Rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness . . . Now these things *were our examples*." Then no salvation by sacramental grace is promised to us in the New Testament. "Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth, (upon this prelatie foundation,) take heed lest he fall." (1 Cor. x.) "Abraham's faith was imputed to him not in

circumcision but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Such was the meaning of an Old Testament sacrament. But he is still the exemplar to us, "who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham." (Rom. iv. 11, 12.) To him therefore who understands aright the relation between the Old Testament and the New, prelacy is impossible.

But our purpose is to pass hastily over these more familiar topics of refutation, and to establish the correct view touching these *charismata* conferred by the Apostle's hands, which prelacy endeavors unwarrantably to press into its service. We do this, because they are less understood, and the doctrine of them needs explication, even to many Protestant minds.

We hold, then, that Christ by his Spirit bestowed these supernatural powers on his Apostles and certain others, for a temporary purpose. That purpose cannot be more accurately stated than in the language of Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 22: "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." Compare Mark xvi. 15 to 18. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature . . . And *these signs shall follow them that believe*: in my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues," etc. See also, 1 Cor. xiv. 14 and 19; Acts iv. 29, 30; Acts v. 12; Hebr. ii. 4. The fact of the resurrection is the corner-stone of the whole gospel-promise. But the credence of an unbelieving world to that most surprising event was to be gained by the testimony of the Apostles as eye-witnesses. The world was invited to commit its immortal interests to the "say-so" of twelve men, who were but *ιδιωται*, and even unlearned and obscure in the main, asserting a most extraordinary fact! Manifestly, when they first stood up before an unprepared and unbelieving world, it was absolutely essential that God should sustain their credibility by some supernatural attestations. He did this accordingly by enabling them, from the day of Pentecost onwards, to exhibit manifestations of divine power, palpable to the senses and of indispu-

table force. The legitimate effect on men's reason was seen in the conversion of the three thousand.

But twelve men could not preach everywhere. Therefore it was desirable that others should be endued with the power of exhibiting these divine "signs." Notice now, the consistency and wisdom of the divine plan here. If any human agency was employed to communicate, to others than the twelve, these powers, that agency was the twelve themselves; and they were appointed to do it by an obvious, visible action. To this agree the best expositors, ancient and modern, including the prelatie. This, indeed, is their ground for restraining all ordaining and confirming acts to their bishops, whom they deem Apostles. And the reason why the power of working "signs" was derived by others only from the twelve, was, that *they were the appointed witnesses to the resurrection whose testimony needed support*, and received support, from the signs. Thus, through Peter's agency, the power of speaking with new tongues came to the family of Cornelius. (Acts x. 44.) Let us represent to ourselves a young child of the Centurion exercising indisputably before us, this supernatural gift. It demonstrates the fact that God has here intervened. But for what? That boy is no competent eye-witness to the Resurrection! But he can say that it was through Peter's agency he was enabled to exhibit this sign: and Peter is one of those eye-witnesses. Thus, the endowment of the boy reflects back its evidence upon Peter the witness whose credibility is all-important to the propagation of the gospel. Again, let us suppose the young evangelist Timothy endued with this *charisma* by the laying on of Paul's hands, going forth to a heathen village to proclaim the resurrection of Christ, and to exhibit his "signs." The question immediately arises, To what does this divine attestation bear relation? Timothy answers: To Christ's resurrection. But was Timothy an authentic eye-witness of the fact? No: he does not pretend to be. But he can testify that it was Paul who bestowed this power of working "signs;" and Paul claimed to have actually seen the Lord in glory, after his resurrection. Thus, in a word, it was best that the ability of others to exhibit the "signs" should visibly proceed from the

Twelve; because it was *to sustain the testimony of the Twelve* that the "signs" were needed.

But the necessity was temporary. By the time that the last of the apostles and their converts had passed off the stage of life, the attitude of the new dispensation before the world was greatly changed. The civilised world was now dotted over with churches. See, for instance, Rom. xv. 19. The canon of Scripture was complete. The effects of the gospel in the renewal and sanctification of souls were now visible to every nation. When at first the twelve unknown men stood up before a world all unbelieving, to claim belief for the astounding fact, a miraculous support of their credibility was absolutely needed. Without it, the credence of mankind could not have been reasonably or justly claimed. But now, this species of support to the great central facts was no longer necessary. The world now had, in place of the few original eye-witnesses, a countless multitude of witnesses at second hand, but still honest witnesses. It had the historical attestations of the recent past to a multitude of miracles, the authenticity of all of which could not be impugned. Mankind now had the completed Scriptures, with all their self-evidencing light, and the witness of the Spirit in the called. And above all, they had the divine results of the gospel in paganism overthrown, and souls sanctified under their own inspection—a kind of evidence whose stream has widened and deepened to our day. The same necessity for supernatural "signs" now no longer existed; and God, who is never wasteful in his expedients, withdrew them. Henceforward, the Church was to conquer the belief of the world by its example and teachings alone, energized by the illumination of the Holy Ghost.

Finally, miracles, if they became ordinary, would cease to be miracles, and would be referred by men to customary law.

The good sense of both Chrysostom and Augustine led them in some places to teach this view of the matter, with remarkable distinctness; although they both, in other places, inconsistently assert the validity of post-apostolic, and even contemporary miracles.

Chrys., in Acts, Vol. III. 65: "On this account, *charismata*

were given, at the beginning, even to the unworthy; for the early Church had need of this support for the sake of (sustaining) faith. But now these *charismata* are not bestowed even on the worthy." Hom. in Cor.: "The fact that signs do not occur now, is no proof at all that they did not occur then; because then they were necessary and now they are not." Aug. De Vera Relig. c. 47.: "For since the Catholic Church is spread and founded through the whole globe, those miracles have not been allowed to continue to our times; lest the mind should continually demand something visible; and mankind, who, when the miracles were novelties, were all on fire about them, should become callous by means of their customariness."

Such being the purpose of these peculiar *charismata*, it was reasonable that there should be no regular connection whatever, between them and the ministry as an office. They might, in many cases, be connected with that office; and in many other cases they might be bestowed upon laymen, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 5, or on a child, as in Acts x. 44, or on women, as in Acts xxi. 9. They might even be exercised by an ungodly man, (see 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2,) and yet might have their effect as signs. But neither child, nor female, nor unrenewed man, was allowed to hold any episcopal or presbyterial office known to the New Testament. See 1 Tim. iii. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 9. Hence it is manifest that the imposition of hands, conferring these *charismata* of signs, could not have been ordination.

The general evidence in favor of this position, will be seen to be in its consistency with the whole history of the Apostolic Church and the teachings of its founders. When the scheme is viewed dispassionately in this light, it will appear satisfying in its coherency. Another general evidence in its favor is, that it gives a satisfactory and consistent solution to the vexed question, when and how miracles ceased out of the primitive Church. That all these supernatural signs would vanish, while the Church was still on earth, was clearly predicted by St. Paul: "Whether prophecies, they shall fail;" (not fail of fulfilment; but the power of uttering them by divine warrant was to be withdrawn, *καταργεῖσθαι*;) "whether tongues, they shall cease." But *how*

long they endured after the Apostles' deaths, is still greatly debated. Rome claims, from her prelatie false premises, that the Church still enjoys these *charismata* of miracles. The intelligent reader is familiar with her "lying wonders," even in this day. And Rome is herein far more consistent than the high Anglican prelatist. If the bishops are literal apostles, holding their very office by succession; if ordination is still that very *χειροθεσία* to convey supernatural powers; if the sacramental performances of the priest are, every one of them, exercises of that very power, and every baptism and "sacrifice of the altar" is literally the exertion of the very same *charisma* by which men who had received this *χειροθεσία* of old, spake with tongues and healed diseases; (which is precisely their theory;) if the very work of the priest for his charge is, to make the sacramental application of the ghostly powers of redemption to their souls, by this personal power of *charisma*, instead of being the rational, didactic minister of their effectual calling by the Word and Spirit: then this same priest ought to be expected, from time to time, to exhibit this other fruit of his *charisma*, MIRACLES. The man who has the supernatural power to quicken the dead soul of an infant with water, any hour of the day, and to make a divine sacrifice out of a piece of bread, every Sunday and saint's day, ought to be expected to shew us the easier miracles of an inspired prediction, and a Tartar or Chinese sermon, and a case of paralysis cured by his word, at least now and then. Why does he not? It would be very satisfactory! And the apostle who is able, by the touch of his fingers, to manufacture us one of those stupendous miracle-workers every time he "consecrates a priest," ought to be able to endow us a few holy virgins, like Philip's four daughters, to speak with tongues. Why is he so prodigal of the former species of manufacture, and so stingy of the latter? We stubborn Protestants are greatly in need of some such "signs," to establish our faith in the prelatie gospel! Why do not the Anglican Catholics, give us some, like the French Popish clergy? For somehow, the *δυνάμεις* wrought by the Ritualists at "the font and the altar," with water and bread and wine, seem not to be convincing! The children that are "now regenerated" do not remain regene-

rate long enough for us to find it out; but go on, from the first, to exhibit the same waywardness, innate love of lies, carnality, and devotion to the "world, the flesh, and the devil," with our unfortunate little ones, who are aliens from the ritualistic Israel; and if the former ever become Christians, they have to be converted in precisely the same Protestant fashion—"by the foolishness of preaching." The prelatie communicants, who feed on the "real presence" at "the altar," thus literally eating and drinking spiritual life, as they would have us believe, go so straight from "the altar," back to "dead works," in so many cases, that our eyes are not quick enough to see the change, and we remain sceptical about the "altar's" working any *δυνάμεις* for them. And we have to ascribe the piety of the many pious ritualists rather to that *modicum* of "the foolishness of preaching" which they still get in spite of the altar. Thus, the Papists who stand to their error consistently, by giving us all the kinds of *δυνάμεις* still, are much wiser than the "Anglican Catholics."

But another embarrassment is, about the reported miracles of the third and fourth centuries. The "Fathers" gravely detail them, in great numbers. The great Augustine in his sermons on the martyr Stephen, for instance, relates some wonderful things wrought at his tomb. Ambrose was a stout asserter of miracles wrought by his Milan relics. The learned Jerome was a devout believer in the miracles of his hero, the Monk Anthony. What to do with these stories occasioned, in the last century, a stout debate in the Anglican Church. Dr. Conyers Middleton was rather inclined to treat them all as so much "gammon." The famous Bishop Warburton, and the Dodwells, on the other hand, argued that Middleton's spirit, if consistently indulged, would equally impugn the apostolic miracles themselves. For, said they, if the authentic Fathers may not be admitted as sufficient, though uninspired, testimony to historical events, occurring not long before their day, in their own country, it will be hard to show on what plea greater authenticity is to be claimed for Mark and Luke. The best solution of this difficulty is suggested by our account of these *charismata* of supernatural powers. If

the Twelve could confer them, and nobody else, then they would continue to the end of the second generation of Christians. The Apostle John might have conferred them on some favored young convert, in the ninth or tenth decade after the Christian era; for to the latter date this apostle lived. The recipient might have lived, like the aged Polycarp, far into the second century: so that until that time, the occurrence of a genuine *σημειον* in the Church was possible. But the Christians of that and the next generations, with much of the ignorance, and some of the superstition of their recent paganism, cleaving to them, were doubtless very tenacious of this splendid endowment of the churches just before them. We see traces of this in 1 Cor. xiv. Hence, they would naturally close their eyes to the unwelcome fact, that this gift of power was dying out. They would catch at anything which wore the appearance of it. They would find here a most alluring field for the exercise of the art of pious frauds, which the Church was even then learning. Hence, the state of opinion and assertion which we have exhibited—the abler men avowing, in their better moods, that the power was gone, because no longer needed; and the weaker men still passionately asserting its continuance, and persuading themselves that they found instances of it in every startling occurrence—is precisely what we are to expect on our hypothesis. This difficulty may be further explained by the ambiguity of the words employed by the Fathers. The term, miracle, had probably not then received its exact definition. *Miracula* meant, by its etymology, “something to be astonished at.” In this sense, the magnetic telegraph, the Great Eastern, the *Credit Mobilier* at Washington, and the fortunes of “Beast Butler” and “Boss Tweed,” are *miracula*. It is most likely that Augustine intentionally used it in this sense, of striking religious events; and that his great mind did not claim in them the perfect, supernatural demonstration, which we claim for a strict technical miracle; but only that strong probability of the divine, providential superintendence, which every devout mind sees in rare and impressive concurrences. Again, the Patristic mind, ardent and indiscriminating, often rushed to the conclusion that a certain event could only be caused by strictly supernatural in-

tervention, which we would account for as an infrequent, but natural, concurrence of providences. Such may have been the "miracle" of the Thundering Legion, in the days of M. Antoninus, if it is authentic at all.

But we have more positive arguments to support our theory of these *charismata*. One will be an examination of a number of Scripture passages, which will, as we claim, be successfully shown to maintain it. Others will be drawn from principles recognised in the Scriptures.

These peculiar gifts began, for the new dispensation, with Pentecost. Let us take the apostle Peter as an example of the Twelve, and examine the relation of the endowment to his Christian experience. Luke tells us (ch. xxii. 62,) of one instance of Peter's repentance; which our Saviour, in John xxi. 18, evidently sanctioned as evangelical and genuine. For when he affectionately replied to Peter's solemn protestation, "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee;" "Feed my sheep"—we have the assurance that Peter was then a new-born man. Now, repentance and holy love are fruits of the Spirit. No sinner has them, until he has the work of the Spirit in him. Yet, there was another sense, in which the Spirit was not yet received by Peter. For, this same Saviour, on the very day of his ascension, says to Peter, along with the others: "Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." And in verse 8: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." In one sense, Peter had already been "baptized with the Holy Ghost." In one sense, that Agent had already "come upon him," and he had "received His power;" otherwise he would have been no saint. It must, then, be in the other sense, that he was still to wait for it. And what that was, is clearly disclosed in ch. ii. 4: "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with tongues." There was therefore, one kind of spiritual influence, which *made sinners Christians*, which wrought effectual calling, faith, repentance, love, and obedience. There was another kind clearly distinguished from it.

and here called the power of the Holy Ghost, which made men *sign-workers* who were already Christians, or which, if it found them unrenewed, left them so. The latter was the power especially bestowed at Pentecost.

Which, now, of these two species of power does the Church of Christ profess instrumentally to dispense to sinners? Which do sinners now need? All answer: That kind which, of sinners, makes them Christians indeed. The terms of the dispensation of the other species, then, have nothing direct to do with those ordinances by which the Church proposes to save souls: it is another matter.

We now proceed to another illustration of this truth. When the multitude at Pentecost was amazed at the supernatural signs wrought, Peter explained: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," etc. . . . "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Acts ii. 16, 18, and 32, 33. The apostle's argument is as follows: Your prophet Joel has given you a visible mark by which God will signalize "the last days," or the latter dispensation of his Kingdom. That mark was to be the powerful effusion of supernatural signs, just such as are now exhibited before you. Your Scriptures also predicted that your Messiah should be distinguished by rising from the dead. These two signatures of the new dispensation, pointing to Jesus as that Messiah, precisely concur, here, and now. For, we attest the fact that he rose and ascended to his Father; and as for the other sign, the supernatural prophesyings and tongues, you can hear for yourselves, and see for yourselves. The conclusion is, that your Messiah is come, and the latter dispensation of the kingdom has come, claiming your allegiance.

The demonstration, as put by Peter, was perfect. But the reader must observe, that to make it hold, he must interpret the prediction of Joel, "God will pour out his Spirit on all flesh,"

as Peter does, of the power which made men *sign-workers*. For, in the other sense, of the power which makes men Christians, *the outpouring of God's Spirit is not the peculiar mark of the new dispensation*. The Spirit performed his converting and sanctifying office-work throughout the old dispensation. He who doubts this, may examine Gen. vi. 3; Psalm li. 11, 12; Is. xxxii. 15; Zech. iv. 6. Moreover, the silent, gentle, gradual operation of sanctifying grace, while ultimately presenting a powerful evidence, under the rule, "By their fruits ye shall know them," could not constitute such a σημεῖον as would fix the new epoch of the Church by an outward, palpable, definitive, temporal mark. Nor would the pouring out of this influence of conversion and sanctification on "all flesh." *i. e.* on Gentiles and Jews, and on many of all nations alike, present such a mark. This also is probably involved in the blessed promise of Joel; but it is not this which answers Peter's purpose of fixing the epoch of the new dispensation by a something which spectators could "now see and hear." We are thus compelled, by another line of argument, to discriminate this "power of the Holy Ghost" from that which the Church undertakes to minister for the conversion and sanctification of sinners.

The hearers are, by Peter's sermon, cut to the heart by conviction, and cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" In Acts ii. 38, we have the apostle's reply: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." See the exact correspondence of the latter part of this promise with our Saviour's in Mark xvi. 17. The previous verse had said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Compare Peter's "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins.") "And these σημεῖα shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils," etc. (Compare Peter's "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" *i. e.*, the gift of working those σημεῖα.) Here, repentance, (μετάνοια) is the prerequisite of baptism. In Mark xvi. 16, and Acts viii. 12, we learn that faith is a prerequisite for it. The gift of the Holy Ghost is here mentioned as consequent on baptism. Now, we

are taught in both Testaments, that faith and repentance are the fruits of the Holy Spirit. No man exercises them sincerely until the Spirit of God has been given to him, to enlighten and quicken his dead soul. Hence, when the reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost is here spoken of as a consequence of repentance, the apostle evidently has in mind some other phase of that gift than that which converts and sanctifies. What is this? Obviously, the same phase whose miraculous effects had filled the hearers with amazement: We may justly explain the apostle's promise thus: The penitent and believing sinner, professing a saving faith, by the act of baptism, shall receive, first, that which is his prime need, reconciliation with God. But the Scriptures of the Jews themselves had just taught the hearers that these supernatural powers the apostles then displayed were the very signatures of that blessing and of its new dispensation. Now, saith he, embrace this gospel with penitent faith, and you shall receive the prime blessing of redemption, and, in addition, shall share with us these miraculous "signs" which are given to attest it infallibly.

This meaning Peter confirms in the 39th verse: "For the promise is unto you," etc. What promise? Obviously the one cited from Joel, to which their attention had been so recently and strongly pointed. But, as we have seen, this promise specifically indicated these *charismata* of supernatural signs.

This passage, therefore, correctly understood, contains no intimation of baptismal regeneration. The prelatists who so often quote it as a proof-text for their baptismal grace, wholly miss the mark. Of these adults, this text requires evangelical repentance as a prerequisite; and no man repents, save he who already enjoys the regenerating and saving grace of the Spirit. And that species of spiritual power which is promised as the consequence of a saving change, of baptism, and of forgiveness, is the temporary kind exhibited by the inspired twelve at Pentecost.

The next clear teaching concerning this influence is at the appointment of the seven deacons, Acts vi. As has been remarked no *charisma* of tongues or miracles is required among the permanent qualifications of deacons, in 1 Tim. 3d. But as the juncture was critical, the office now newly instituted, and the Church in its

incipiency very liberally adorned with these extraordinary gifts, the apostles deem it well to make the first selection from among men who possessed them, in addition to the regular qualifications of wisdom and good character. Hence they were to be also men "full of the Holy Ghost." This undoubtedly means, in this place, possessed of the extraordinary gifts. It is explained in vi. 8. and viii. 6 and 13. Stephen, one of the seven, "full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people." Philip, another of them, did "miracles and signs." But it is certain, against Chrysostom and later Prelatists and Papists, that ordination to the diaconship by the apostles *did not confer these miraculous powers* upon Stephen and Philip. They were, as we have seen, possessed before. Their previous possession was the very qualification by which the people were guided to vote for them. That supposition of Chrysostom, that, at any rate, they had not exercised them before, is untenable, because, when the question is of the possession of this kind of gift, it can only be known by its visible exercise. All that the apostles do, is to confer the diaconal office upon those whom the people select. And the exercise of supernatural powers is not among the duties of that office, which is expressly defined as "serving tables." Stephen and Philip, then, both wrought signs and preached, not in virtue of their diaconal ordination, but in virtue of their previous endowment with those *charismata*, at some time and by some means not recorded. And the Prelatists may not even surmise that unknown juncture to have been some previous "sacrament of orders;" because the diaconship was the lowest order then existing in the Church.

The next passage illustrating the subject is Acts viii. 15, etc. This proves two points. The twelve alone could confer the supernatural powers. Philip could exercise them in his own person, but he could not confer them. Notwithstanding his splendid success in winning souls and founding a church, it was necessary to send to Jerusalem, and secure the presence of two of the original twelve in person, to gain for any Samaritan the honor of this gift. So Simon Magus clearly perceives in the 18th verse. The other inference drawn from this instance, is that this gift was

distinct from that work of the Holy Ghost which makes men true Christians. These Samaritans had "received the word of God." They were "believers." They were full of spiritual joy. They were fit for adult baptism. Yet they still lacked this gift of the Holy Ghost. But the sinner who "receives the word," "believes," rejoices in Christ Jesus, already has the saving powers of the Spirit in him. And finally, when Simon Magus was detected as not a true believer, Peter does not recommend to him the attainment of this *charisma* as the remedy for his wretched case, but repentance and prayer.

The next instance requiring our attention is that of Saul of Tarsus, Acts ix. 17. He had been awakened partially, even in the midst of his controversial bitterness, by the powerful demonstrations of truth in the discourses of the martyr Stephen. He had been thoroughly convicted by the appearance of the Messiah on the way. The converting Spirit had employed the truth thus carried home to his mind, to bow him in sincere repentance. The renewal of his soul was unmistakably expressed in the words: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and in the prayer which now occupied his hours. It was after his effectual calling that the pious Ananias, probably one of the earliest evangelists among the disciples at Damascus, came to him by the special commission of God, "and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul," thus recognising by the fraternal title that he was already reconciled to Christ, "the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." The Lord distinctly informs Ananias, verse 15, why it was desirable that Saul should be filled with these powers: "for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel." In this arduous mission Paul would need the support of miraculous signs, if any man could. We pursue here the same line of argument, to prove that this endowment of the Spirit was not the converting and sanctifying, but the miracle-working influence. The former he had already: this alone was able to awaken him, to convict him, to convert the rebel into a submissive servant, to make him a child

of prayer, to make him a "brother" of the saints, to fit him for adult baptism. The ceremony used by Ananias points the same way—"putting on his hands." Thus far we have seen this form used but for two things: ordaining to office, and conferring the supernatural power of signs. But Ananias certainly did not ordain Paul to his office. (See Gal. i. 1.) The rite was therefore for the other purpose. For in what other possible sense could it be said, after Paul had received an unusually forcible and effectual renewal by the power of the Spirit, that Ananias must still be sent, in order to fill him with the Holy Ghost? Some probability is also found in the accompanying work, the opening of Saul's eyes. This was no doubt an extraordinary cure, wrought by God, through the good Ananias. It therefore concurs with the belief that the filling with the Spirit, which attended it, was also extraordinary.

The next case is even more plain. In Acts xix. 2, the apostle Paul for the first time came to Ephesus. That it was his first visit is plain from Acts xvi. 6; and it seems plain that none of the twelve had yet been there. But the eloquent Apollos, and the good Priscilla and Aquila, had been there, and their labors had resulted in the beginning of a church. The apostle Paul found this little band unadorned by any *charismata* of miracles. This led him to ask, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed"? And they said unto him, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism." Paul explained to them that John's, while an evangelical, was yet a preliminary and prospective baptism; and administered Christian baptism proper. "And when Paul had" (then) "laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied:" verse 6.

It is absolutely impossible to explain this singular history in any other sense than the one we advocate. Shall we say that these twelve men were now ordained to be clergymen? This is preposterous. One does not see cases where *all* the males in a Christian community are ordained presbyters or "priests;" and that, the first day they received Christian baptism. Shall we say

that they now, for the first time, received the sanctifying and saving influences of the Holy Ghost? for, that the gift they now received was a novel one, is beyond all doubt. But these men were the pupils of the eloquent Apollos, who came from Alexandria, the focus of Hebrew learning, who was mighty in the Old Testament Scriptures, who had adopted the doctrines of John the Baptist, and recognised his mission as divine. Such a teacher had taught them "diligently;" and yet they were ignorant even of the work of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling and sanctification! Is the Old Testament, then, such a stranger to that great and blessed truth? This is absurd. When these men said, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," we must understand them as intending, We have not so much as heard anything of those *charismata* of miracles. You are the first apostle we have ever seen. We are a little band in the bosom of a great pagan city, one of the very centres of superstition. We have had no privileges of communion with other more favored Christians. The only knowledge of the new dispensation we have, is such as our revered teacher, Apollos, has been enabled to give us from the predictions and promises of his Old Testament Scriptures, and from what he was able to hear in Alexandria, of the great forerunner, John, and his preaching and baptism. Until recently, this pair of humble mechanics from Rome, told us a few things more. So that, so far from possessing any of these supernatural attestations, we never witnessed any of them; we know nothing of them. We only trust in God's written word, and endeavor to walk in the grace of his promises, while we wait for more light. This view of their meaning is confirmed, again, by their profession of John's baptism. This was a baptism unto true repentance. Is it not the doctrine of the Old Testament as much as the New, that only the Holy Ghost produces true repentance? They are recognised as disciples or professed believers. But it is equally the doctrine of both Testaments, that true faith is the implantation of the Holy Ghost. As soon as the apostle learned that they had only received John's baptism, the cause of their having no miraculous signs among them was clear to his mind. That peculiar gift of

VOL. XXVII., NO. 1—5.

the Holy Spirit was *subsequent* to John's whole mission, as John himself knew. "There cometh one *after me*, who shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire," saith he. But if it had been question of the illuminating and sanctifying influences of the Spirit, their lack of it would have found no explanation in their having received John's baptism; for those influences were implied in John's baptism, as they inspired his preaching. Those influences had been shed upon the saints of all ages, before John; from Enoch and Noah, through David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, to the latest prophets. Preparation for John's baptism, then, should have made them acquainted with the ordinary saving work of God's Spirit. But when we apply the question of Paul to his supernatural influences in working "signs," we see that the nature of their baptism is the sufficient explanation of their answer; because the Church was not fully endowed in that way, until Christ's baptism was instituted.

Our view is confirmed, finally, by the result. After these men had received Christian baptism, Paul laid his hands upon them with the purpose of bestowing the gifts in question; and "they spake with tongues and prophesied." The narrative plainly implies that this was just what the apostle designed. He wished, it may be presumed, to strengthen the faith of the little band, struggling with all the might of Greek paganism, by these visible attestations. He was the first of the twelve who had visited Ephesus. He was about to publish his testimony as an eye-witness to his risen Lord. He was about to begin a series of labors in Ephesus, to be continued two years and three months. See 1 Cor. xvi. 9: "A great and effectual door was opened to him there; and there were many adversaries." It was every way desirable that the cause of truth should be armed with these incontestable signs, and that connected immediately with his person; so that in the coming debates with unbelief, every Christian might point to these miraculous energies, proceeding, notably, from Paul's person, and say: "There God sets to his seal, to the testimony of his servant."

In the Epistle to the Romans, written before Paul, and, as we believe, before any other apostle had ever visited the imperial

city, he begins by declaring his eagerness to see them in person. In chapter i. 11. he says : " For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established." It is every way probable that this spiritual gift was the power of miracles. One of the twelve only could impart it, by the laying on of hands. None of them had yet visited the infant church of Rome. Thus far, they had contended against Judaism and Paganism, only by the powers of argument and example. Could an apostle reach them and clothe even a few of their members with the miracle-working energies, not only would their faith in the testimony to the great Christian facts, which thus far they had reposed in witnesses far from them, unseen and unknown by face unto them, be greatly established, but the infant church would attract far more notice, and be a more powerful witness for Christ, in that grand centre of empire and population.

The next passage which seems clearly to treat of this subject is 1 Cor., chapters xii. to xiv. The discussion of the *χαρίσματα πνευματικά* here is so extended and explicit, that the necessity of comment is almost superseded. For the same reasons which we have just applied to Ephesus and Rome, the infant church in the important metropolis of Corinth had also been liberally supplied with supernatural endowments while Paul was with them. But he had learned (chap. i. 11) that in his absence they had been abused. Each possessor of a given *charisma*, fascinated by its splendor, and by the pleasure of exerting it, was exalting his particular power as the chief one, and depreciating those of his brethren. Hence the Church was threatened with parties and strifes. It is to meet this evil that the apostle enters into a detailed explanation of the nature and objects of these gifts. The main truths he inculcates are these : While there are diversities of gifts, the same Spirit gives them all. None is given for the aggrandisement of its subject ; but all for the good of the common body. Hence, all should be exercised in their respective places, harmoniously and concurrently, even as the several grades of the ministry should be. Of these supernatural gifts, tongues, though a more startling and splendid endowment, were less useful than prophecy, inasmuch as the former could but excite atten-

tion and convict the unsanctified reason. The most splendid of these supernatural gifts were inferior to the graces of true sanctification ; and indeed, without them, worthless to the possessor. It was entirely possible for an unrenewed soul, heir of perdition, to receive these miraculous endowments ; so that their enjoyment was no sufficient evidence of a state of salvation. And all of them were destined to vanish from the Church at no remote day, (their purpose having been attained,) leaving the graces of spiritual life and sanctification, "faith, hope, love," as inwrought by the Spirit, through the truth, to be thenceforward the only abiding gifts of the Holy Ghost to Christ's Church. Finally, the apostle's discussion implies, beyond all dispute, that the *charismata* of supernatural powers in that church, were the endowment not of their clergymen only, but also of the lay members. Thus we have in this important passage all the points confirmed, by which we separate these gifts from ordination and clerical qualifications.

The two parallel passages remain to be noticed in the Epistles to Timothy. In 1 Tim. iv. 14, the apostle enjoins on the young evangelist : "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy. with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." In the 2d Ep., i. 6 : "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up (kindle up) the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Of these two texts, Rome, and her imitators among the Ritualists, endeavor to make pillars for their favorite doctrine of ordination-grace. Here, argue they, ordination certainly *confers* a grace of the Holy Spirit. For, say they, when we put the two texts together, we clearly learn, first, that it is Timothy's ordination which is here alluded to ; and it is as clearly said that it imparted a gift of God. One has even said that this imposition of the apostle's hands imparted all Timothy's qualifications for the work of the ministry.

One insuperable difficulty offers itself to the prelatie view at first sight. If the texts describe only an ordination to ministerial office, and refer to the same event, then it was a presbyterial ordination. It is as clear that the eldership laid on hands as that Paul did. And this is fatal to the prelatie scheme. The Anglican Church seeks to evade this difficulty, by allowing three

presbyters to join the bishop. as a kind of sub-assessors, in ordaining a "priest." If ordination is a sacrament, in which the apostle-bishop. and he alone, imparts the qualification for the priestly work, by infusing a *charisma* of miracle-working energies, then this usage is thoroughly inconsistent. If ordination is a joint, ruling act of presbyters, in which the diocesan acts as merely a presbyter-president among presbyters, then the usage is most consistent. But the prelatist theory is surrendered, and our debate at an end. But, to return. If the two verses do not describe the same act, then the proof that *ordination imparts gifts* of the Holy Ghost is gone. Such gifts were imparted to Timothy; but it may have been the other transaction which imparted them. Between the horns of this dilemma we hold the Prelatist inexorably. If nothing but ordination is here described, then it was Presbyterian ordination. If something else than ordination is described, then the spiritual gift may have been imparted by that something else.

The latter is evidently the correct alternative. Paul here stimulates the conscience of Timothy by recalling two transactions, which probably occurred at or near the same time. One was his ordination to office, which office he received at the hands of his brother presbyters. The other was his endowment with some supernatural gift to fit him further for the missionary work, which he received from the apostle's own hands. This gift he received *διὰ προφητείας*, through prophecy. Doubtless the explanation of this may be found in Acts xiii. 1, 2, where the Holy Ghost, moving in the hearts of the prophets and teachers at Antioch, as a spirit of prophecy, said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." In like manner, some prophet, either Paul himself, or possibly Silas, (see Acts xv. 32,) "who was a prophet also himself," and was with the apostle when Timothy was called to the missionary work, (Acts xv. 40,) received the prophetic injunction that the young disciple of Lystra should be ordained, and clothed also with the power of working signs. Of this transaction we have the history in Acts xvi. 2, 3: "Timothy was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with

him; and took and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek," *i. e.*, a pagan. Henceforth we find Timothy accompanying Paul, Silas, and Luke, in the missionary work in "Phrygia, the region of Galatia," and Macedonia. Although the ordination and the imparting of the *charisma* are not mentioned in the two verses recited, we can scarcely doubt that it then took place. We read in Acts xiv. 23, that the churches of Derbe, Iconium, and Lystra, had been for some time furnished with ordained elders. We can hardly err in supposing that "the presbytery" which ordained Timothy an evangelist, was composed of presbyters from "Lystra and Iconium," with perhaps Silas and Paul himself (who could say with Peter, "which also am an elder,") as assessors.

Whether the imposition of Paul's hands *conferred* on Timothy his ministerial qualifications, as the Prelatists would have it, or whether his presbyterial ordination proceeded upon his previous possession of the natural and gracious qualifications, as we believe, may now be decided. The brief record in Acts, mentions as a ground of Timothy's selection as missionary-companion for Paul, that "he was well reported of by the brethren which were at Lystra and Iconium." Unless Luke intended us to understand that Timothy enjoyed a deserved reputation with them for qualities fitting him for this ministry, his statement seems aimless and unaccountable. Timothy was recognised as having these qualities before his ordination; and his appointment was grounded on this fact. Again, Paul, in 2 Tim. iii. 14-17, (compare, also, ch. i. 5,) evidently refers much of Timothy's ministerial qualification to the work of the pious Lois and Eunice, his grandmother and mother, and to the study of the Old Testament Scriptures. The apostle then proceeds to exalt the value and sufficiency of those inspired Scriptures, and declares that by their study alone, the man of God—the minister or herald of the gospel—"may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*" We are not ignorant that some prelatie expositors would have us take the phrase, "man of God," in the sense of "believer," "servant of God," in order to obliterate this damaging argument. But we

can show that their rendering is wrong. Neither Paul, nor any other New Testament writer, employs this phrase at all, except in the two places in the Epistles to Timothy: the one under discussion, and 1 Tim. vi. 11. But it is a very common title in the Old Testament, and there it means some distinguished church officer, commissioned prophet, or theocratic king. Who can doubt that Paul had this usage in his eye when he called this pious and glorious evangelist "man of God?" Again, the apostle has his own phrases for denominating believers, which he uses so currently and accurately, that we are never in uncertainty about it in any other Epistles. The established phrases in Paul's mouth for a "believer," are, πιστός, πιστὸς ἄνθρωπος, ἀδελφός, or ἅγιος; never once ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ. What violence to the apostle's meaning, then, is committed, when this peculiar phrase is here reduced to the meaning of simple "believer"! Again, in 1 Tim. vi. 11, the apostle's scope shows very clearly that he designed by the phrase, "O man of God," to address Timothy as a church officer, for a particular purpose. In cautioning him against complicity with the corruptions prevailing among some church members at Ephesus, Paul aims to bring the considerations, drawn from a clerical appointment and profession, to bear upon his conscience. He intimates that, while avarice and its attendant evils are bad enough in a private Christian, they are far more heinous in a "man of God," an ordained leader and teacher of God's host, who ought to be an "ensample to the flock;" and that a blameless and zealous Christian warfare is more obligatory on him than on others, as a clergyman. The "man of God," then, in 2 Tim. iii. 17, is a preacher of the gospel; we are willing to say, an evangelist. But if Prelatists will have it that Timothy was a diocesan bishop, so much the worse for them; for the apostle here declares that the inspired Scriptures are able to make such a preacher "qualified and thoroughly equipped" (ἀρτιος καὶ ἐξηρτισμένος) "unto ALL good works" incumbent on his office, without any ordination graces imparted from a prelate's hands. Of course the apostle here has in view the ordinary duties of the minister's office, in the stated condition of the Church—not the extraordinary energies of the miracle-worker, in the ages of inspiration; for these

he had found it desirable to convey to Timothy by the putting on of his hands, after all the latter's scriptural and gracious qualifications had been acquired. If they insist on making Timothy a diocesan bishop, then they only get the damaging declaration, that even the prelate gets all needful qualification for all *his* work, without any "holy orders," by the faithful, believing study of the Scriptures!

After this simple and obvious review of the history of Timothy's case, the meaning of the apostle in the two verses referring to his ordination is easy. Timothy had been inducted into the ministerial office by the laying on of the hands of a presbytery; which transaction proceeded on their knowledge of his ministerial qualifications, previously possessed. But in connexion with that act, the apostle had also, by the imposition of his own hands, imparted to him some *charisma*, (most probably of prophesying.) which an apostle alone could give, and which was given on suitable occasions to laymen, women, ministers, or even to children; because Timothy would be thereby better fitted for convincing sceptical pagans, among whom he was to labor. It is worthy of notice, that when Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 14, mentions the imposition of the hands of the presbytery in connexion with this *charisma* to Timothy, he does not attribute to them any *agency* in it, but only an accompanying presence. It is μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου; but in 2 Tim. i. 6, it is διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου. In the latter place, the apostle omits all reference to Timothy's presbyterial ordination; and speaking of his *charisma* of inspiration, assumes to himself all the human agency in conferring it.

We have thus gone over all the clear instances of these *charismata* in the New Testament history. The result has been a complete discrimination between them and the power of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling and sanctification on the one hand, and ordination on the other hand. These gifts were not the former; because a man might have them in eminent degree, and yet be so utterly devoid of grace as to be "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," because they were in many cases yet to be enjoyed, or even heard of, by true believers already effectually called and sanc-

tified. These gifts were not ordination, because we have seen them fall on laymen, women, and children, as well as unrenewed men ; because a presbytery can ordain, according to Scripture, while only an apostle could bestow these powers ; and as soon as the original twelve were gone, the influence died out of the world, with the next generation, despite the passionate longing of misguided Christians to display them still. The irresistible conclusion is, that they were peculiar powers of exhibiting miraculous "signs," temporarily given to some professed Christians, for the sole purpose of supporting and reinforcing the testimony of the twelve to the cardinal Christian facts, by divine attestation, until their witnessing work was completed.

This conclusion is exceedingly profitable and instructive in many directions. It teaches us, first, that the sight of a physical work of supernatural power, however stupendous, is not the immediate instrument of true conversion. Men are truly born again only by the instrumentality of the Word. 1 Peter i. 23. We expose here a superstition very current among the ignorant. Thus, the nominal Christian negroes, and many ignorant white Christians, believe that Saul of Tarsus was converted by *the vision* on the road to Damascus ; whereas, he was converted by gospel truth, and the vision had no nearer connexion with the saving work than to establish intellectual conviction of the truth. Had not the Holy Spirit applied that gospel to his soul, in the rational, enlightening, renewing work of effectual calling, Saul's godless heart would never have been made one whit better by all the terrors of ten thousand visions and voices, or of the rising dead and opening hell. This is obvious enough to the intelligent reader. But it is instructive to note the close affinity between this Bœotian superstition and the theory of your Ritualist, who considers his company the aristocracy of the religious world. He also expects men to be renewed by a *charisma* of power, instead of a work of rational illumination through the truth. He makes the same confusion between the physical *δύναμις* and saving grace. Whereas, the apostle teaches us that all the former does is to make way for the saving truth, by attracting the attention and convincing the understanding. "Wherefore tongues are for a

sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." Here again, the self-destructive inconsistency of the prelatic system is displayed. They say that their canonical sacraments impart a *charisma* of saving grace; such a one, viz., as the "priest" receives from the laying on of the apostles' hands. But Paul says, the utility of such *charismata* is only for the unconverted.

Second: The discussion is valuable, to refute a cardinal error of the sect of Alexander Campbell. This heresiarch taught, in the interests of his thoroughly Pelagian scheme, that no agency of the Holy Ghost whatever is concerned in the sinner's believing and conversion. But the Scriptures assert so clearly that there is an office-work of the Spirit, that he dared not wholly deny it. Hence, his expedient is to say that this work begins after, and only after, baptism and conversion. Now, the texts he quotes are precisely such as we have explained. But when we show that the spiritual gifts which were once the occasional sequel of conversion and baptism, were temporary *charismata* of miracles, his whole argument explodes.

It remains to add the general arguments, establishing the other branch of the conclusion, that these *charismata* are entirely distinct from ordination. The sacramentarian theory is, that they are *conferred* in the ordaining act, when the bishop (apostle) lays on his hands. The Protestant and Bible theory is, that ordination, which is a presbyterial, and not a ghostly act, only *recognises* ministerial qualification, inwrought by Christ's Spirit, and confers nothing but office-title. Now, we demonstrate our theory by these two arguments: *First*. The Holy Spirit, legislating by Paul for the ordinary and stated times of the Church, has expressly given two lists of the qualifications requisite for all orders of clergy—bishops or pastors, "elders that rule well," and deacons—in 1 Tim. iii., and in Titus, i. So, in Acts 20th, he has given to the bishops of Ephesus a detailed injunction as to their official duties. So, Christ has left, in the "letters to the seven churches," a number of items of duty and qualification enjoined on their "angels." *But in none of these is any power of working "signs" or power of sacramental grace required of them.* We hear of sincere piety, gravity and virtue in example, fidelity

if oversight, and aptness to teach, or didactic ability; but we hear not a word of any gift of *charismata* derived or transmitted through apostolic hands.

The *second* argument, is that all the clergymen of the primitive Church were undoubtedly chosen by election of the brethren. The apostles fixed this precedent, even for deacons, in the very outset, in Acts vi. The usage of electing all presbyters and bishops prevailed, and the right was claimed by the brotherhood universally, in the ages next the apostles; and every one well-informed in church-history knows through what a long train of usurpations and resistances the usage which now prevails in prelatic churches was finally reached. Now, it was to guide the brotherhood in bestowing their votes, that the apostle describes the qualifications requisite in a bishop, elder, or deacon, so accurately and completely. But these qualifications must be pre-existent, in order to justify the casting of the votes to their possessor. Hence, indisputably, they are not *conferred* by the ordaining rite, which follows and is predicated on the election. Some attempt to evade this, by pleading that these lists of qualification, given us in the Pastoral Epistles, do not contain all the endowments and qualities of the acting clergyman, but only those which constitute a suitable state of reciprocity for the gifts to be bestowed in "holy orders" by the bishop's hands. This evasion will not answer. The apostle, in giving the list of qualifications, says expressly: "*A bishop* then must be blameless"—not "*a candidate for the bishopric.*" He thus shows that these are the qualifications and gifts the man will exercise after his ordination, in his actual ministry. And again, in all the descriptions and inculcations of the episcopal, or pastoral work, relating to the stated condition of the Church and her ministers, there is no whisper of any possession or exercise of any other endowments by ordained men.

We have now gone over the whole teachings of the New Testament on this question of the minister's endowments. We have drawn a clear line of demarkation between those gifts or powers of the Holy Ghost, which enabled some men in the Apostolic Church to work miraculous signs, and the ministerial gifts and

powers of the scriptural clergyman. Removing the prelatie mistakes and errors touching the former, we have not left one line or word of Scripture to support the theory of tactual succession and sacramental grace. It stands a mere dream-castle, with no basis, except the corruptions of the uninspired and decadent ages of Christendom, the strength of blind and erroneous prescription, and the superabounding assertions of its advocates.

The writer experienced for some time, a certain difficulty in realising to himself the full destructiveness to prelacy of the line of criticism along which he has now attempted to lead the reader. It is to be expected that the latter also will feel something of the same difficulty. This will be, not because the criticism is, in any point, inconclusive; but because it will appear almost incredible that a great and permanent party in Christendom, and especially that a party in a certain sense evangelical, like the High Church Episcopal, should really hold a theory which is obnoxious to so easy a refutation, and which is, to the thoroughly Protestant mind, so intrinsically absurd. Another, and a more seemly-looking cause of the same difficulty, is in the pious confusions which so-called Protestant prelatists have introduced into the subject. No better example of this need be sought, than parts of the Anglican liturgy: the wretched patchwork of churchmen overruled by the most deceitful, unscrupulous and truth-hating politician who ever sat upon the throne of England, acting from motives always purely secular, and often wicked. The doctrine of the Anglican forms (not the Articles) touching "holy orders," is a medley of inconsistencies. Ordination is not a "sacrament," as Rome holds; and yet, as Rome holds, it confers an invisible grace by a visible sign—which is the very essence of a sacrament. The bishop is authorised to say to the "priest" on whom he lays his hands, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," etc.; and yet, the bishop has a little before required the candidate to profess that he has already experienced the powers of that Spirit, qualifying him for, and moving him unto, the office. The ritual professes to arm the priest with ghostly power to regenerate the infant in baptism; and tells him and the parents, in the most solemn form of prayer to God, that He "hath regenerated *this infant* with thy

Holy Spirit." But as soon as he has come to years of understanding, this same "priest," now a pastor, is sent forth to preach to him, as a sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, the excellent doctrines of the "Articles and Homilies"; exhorting him to receive the application of redemption through that effectual calling whose theory is utterly incompatible with that of sacramental grace.

Protestant prelatists, again, obscure the real nature of their theory of sacramental grace, by seeming to concede that the age of miracles is past; and that they claim for their "priests," on whom the bishop has conferred the grace of holy orders, no gift of tongues, or healing, or casting out dæmons. But they do claim for him a gift of conferring sacramental graces; which is another thing than that ministerial instrumentality, which the Protestant pastor claims to exert, in inculcating the truths which the Holy Ghost uses as his rational means for working grace. We ask the prelatist: Is this all you claim to do for souls? Do you, in this thing, put yourself into our class? He stoutly refuses; and he asserts that he can communicate a something which we cannot, who do not boast his tactual succession from the apostles—namely, sacramental grace. But the Scriptures discriminate the efficacious influences of the Holy Ghost into only two classes: his sanctifying influences through the truth; and his direct, supernatural, physical *δυνάμεις*, through a miracle-worker. If sacramental grace is not the one, it must be the other. Besides, if their sacramental grace is apprehensible at all, it can only be apprehended as the sort of thing which the *χάρισμα* was—a power exerted *ex opere operato*, and not only through the rational means of truth understood and embraced. There is a more crucial question: Why this rigid, inexorable requirement of a tactual succession? Why will not a correct doctrinal succession from the apostles, like that claimed by Irenæus, answer the pastor's purpose? The true answer is, that this power of working sacramental grace claims to be the *χάρισμα* of miracles—the thing, and the only thing, which, in the New Testament, could be received only from the laying on of the apostles' hands. Finally, we have seen the *genesis* of the theory in the

doctrine of Rome, which is avowedly and explicitly built upon her claim of possessing the same miraculous *χαρίσματα*, and all of them, which the apostles wielded. The daughter is of the same species with the mother. We have also quoted some of the more perspicacious and candid prelatists, as Hammond, expressly avowing the mistaken claim and basing it upon the Roman position.

It is true, that the Protestant and prelatie conceptions of the application of redemption are incompatible. The one excludes the other. The ultramontane Papist is the only consistent asserter of sacramental grace. And this is the explanation of the characteristics of the Protestant-prelatie logic, with its sophisms, pious confusions, and *non-sequiturs*. Those men cannot be expected to build better, who condemn themselves to the task of combining the clay with the iron, the gold, and the brass.



ARTICLE II.

THE TITHE LAW.

As a starting point to the discussion of one of the most interesting questions of the present day, to wit, how may the pecuniary resources of the Church be drawn into action, the tithe law serves a good purpose. As a positive law, its reaction on the popular thinking of the day is to correct the erroneous conclusion that gospel liberty is the balance between action and non-action; between compliance and refusing to perform Christian duty. For true Christian liberty has no negative pole. It is essentially positive, and consists in our introduction into a region of motives which impel to action and create liberty.

As a dogma, it will help us to form a just estimate of the comparative excellence of those great heart-forces which it is the prime object of gospel truth to cultivate and employ, and which it takes care not to wrap up in any fixed formularies.

Incidentally, it has the additional value of promoting the discussion of a question which has never yet been definitely an-