

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 43.—JANUARY, 1898

---

## I. THE ISRAEL TABLET OF MERNEPTAH.

EVER since the Rosetta Stone unlocked the Egyptian hieroglyphs scholars have eagerly searched these ancient records for some mention of the Israelites, who, according to their own Scriptures, sojourned in the land of the Pharaohs for four hundred and thirty years, being cruelly oppressed during a portion of this period, and forced to build for the government the great store cities of Rameses and Pithom, and who then marched out of the country under the human leadership of Moses and with the miraculous assistance of the Almighty. But, although Pithom itself has been unearthed and identified beyond question by its own inscriptions found on the spot, and although the monuments and papyri have given us abundant proofs of the correctness of the biblical references to Egyptian manners and customs, once impeached by a rash criticism, and although the political conditions of the country in the several stages of its history were closely connected with the fortunes of Israel for several centuries and with the outworking of its predicted destiny (Gen. xv. 13-16), yet until last year there has never been found a single clear reference in the Egyptian records to the children of Israel. Neither the brick-makers, who are represented on the well-known wall-painting of a Theban tomb, and who were once supposed to be the enslaved Hebrews, nor the Habiri of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, who are described as having stormed various cities of Southern Palestine in the time of Khuenaten (fifteenth century, B. C.), and whom Haynes and Conder still take to be the invading He-

## V. THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.<sup>1</sup>

IN his preface the writer defines his purpose as follows: "The purpose of the volume is not to dim the glory of any church. Its real object, no matter what its apparent aim may seem to be, is to defend the principles of the Reformation relative to church government, to lay bare the grounds of Anglican claims to an historic episcopate, to set in clear light once more the validity of Methodist orders, and thus by breaking down some middle walls of partition to contribute something to the tendency toward unity and peace in the church of Jesus Christ."

In carrying out this worthy purpose, Dr. Cooke has given us an instructive and readable book. He has traversed quite carefully the period of history during which the Anglican Church severed its connection with Rome, and started on its independent career. His object is to show how much foundation there is for the claim that in severing this connection the Anglican Church did not sever the continuity of the historic episcopate. It did not fall within the scope of his purpose to go back of that period to inquire whether or not the line of succession had been preserved intact by the Church of Rome up to the time when the severance took place. Granting that Rome had the apostolic succession when Henry VIII. divorced himself from the papacy that he might divorce himself from Catharine, did the refractory king break the sacred chain that linked the bishops of the Anglican Church with the twelve primitive bishops known as the apostles? This is quite an interesting question in ecclesiastical surgery. It is to be borne in mind that the operation was performed against the will of the pope, who was losing part of his body, and chloroform had not yet been discovered. It is also to be borne in mind that the burly king was not skilful in the use of the scalpel, and was in no mood to be particularly tender. It should not surprise

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Historic Episcopate.* A Study of Anglican Claims and Methodist Orders. By R. J. Cooke, D. D., Professor of Exegetical and Historical Theology. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1897. 12mo., pp. 224. Cloth, \$1.00.

us, therefore, if in severing all other ligaments and tissues, the rough surgeon, dealing with a restless patient, severed this bond also. He was thinking more about Anne Bo'eyn than he was a'out how deep his knife was going, and what havoc he was playing with the delicate little tendons and cartilages that enter into the cellular structure of apostolic succession. There is a very wide and warm difference of opinion as to what Henry and his successors did. That slice of the papacy which they severed from the parent body, and which now constitutes the Anglican Church, insists that while it is entirely independent and enjoys complete autonomy of life, yet this subtle tie, this umbilical cord, was never cut. "Had it been cut," say the Anglicans, "we should have died at once, for no church can live unless linked by the chain of tactual succession through its bishops to the apostles." As they can only prove that they are living by proving that this cord was never cut, they grow very warm over the question of the surgery performed by Henry and his imperious daughter, Elizabeth.

The pope has recently been consulted, and he says, with strong emphasis, that every cord, ligament, and link of every kind was severed; that a broad gap was made between the parent body and the separated part, and that no vital current flows across this gap. What! is the Anglican Church no church? So says the infallible pope. He has held a coroner's inquest over it, and he says it is as dead as a door nail; that it really has no vital organs, and never had; that the contumacious king and queen cut it off from all contact with head and heart and lungs, and so it has never had anything but the semblance of life. Such is the verdict also of the Greek Church and other bodies whose vital connection with the apostles has never been disturbed.

Protestant sects are not supposed to be experts in such matters, and it must be confessed that they are somewhat perplexed and bewildered as they study the question. They are disposed to think there is something seriously wrong with the Anglican Church. It behaves in a manner which is hardly consistent with the supposition that it has fallen heir to the spiritual heritage of the apostolic church. Its bishops bear no strong family likeness

to the humble fishermen. We cannot conceive of Peter and John as lords spiritual, occupying seats in the highest council of the nation, sitting in judgment on the affairs of Cæsar, and living in a style that rivals the splendor of the haughtiest nobles of the realms. Think of Peter in full canonicals! It would take him a fortnight's hard study to learn the names and uses of all the variegated toggery that goes to make up an Anglican bishop's habit. But the difference between the apostles and Anglican bishops lies deeper than clothes. They differ in their way of estimating persons and things. Peter and Paul and John say: "Look at the doctrine of those who preach to you; see whether they are sound in the faith. If not, though they should be angels from heaven, hold them to be accursed of God. If any one comes to you, no matter where from, nor with what credentials, if he does not preach a pure gospel, shut your door against him." Anglican bishops say: "Look at the ordination of your teacher. If that be regular, defer to his authority, no matter much what he preaches. But if he be not in the line of succession, however pure his doctrine and devout his spirit, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican." Apostles and bishops lay stress on different things. The former exalt doctrine; the latter, order. The former glorify truth; the latter, fiction. When the Protestant sects note this strong contrast, they are disposed to side with the pope and say that the tie was broken, and that there is no longer any medium conveying apostolic influence to Anglican bishops. On the other hand, when we look at Rome and note the strong likeness that still exists between the Anglican Church and the papacy, we are disposed to take the other side. Surely, the severance could not have been perfect; the operation could not have been thorough. Especially does this conclusion seem forced on us when we note the growing likeness. The same life is still in the two bodies. Now, if, as the Anglicans claim, the life is in the historic episcopate, if life depends on the continuous flow of the grace of orders, then Henry and Elizabeth did not entirely check it. That there is some kind of life in the Anglican Church, Rome denies in vain. Growth implies life; and as the growth brings out even more clearly the likeness of the severed

part to the parent body, the presumption is almost a demonstration that the same life exists in both.

If we had to decide this question by an off-hand guess, we should say that whatever the papacy has, the Church of England has, but in an attenuated or emaciated form. If the papacy has the small-pox, the Anglican Church has the varioloid; if the former has scarlet fever, the latter has scarlatina. Perhaps the best way to decide this whole controversy is by an off-hand guess. It is a waste of energy to enter into a serious argument to refute the Anglican claims. Dr. Stuart Robinson used to say that reason can never get anything out of one's head that reason did not put in. Reason played no part in putting apostolic succession into the heads of our Anglican friends. It got in through the door of a disordered fancy. The way to get it out is to work on their hearts.

If, however, any one wishes argument, he will find it, clear and strong, in Dr. Cooke's volume. After a general survey of the doctrine of apostolic succession, he states as a historical fact that the claim to this succession rests upon the validity and sacramental character of Matthew Parker's consecration to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. "He is the head of the stream. From him the English episcopate is derived." Starting from this premise, he lays it down as his purpose to show—1, That the fact of Parker's consecration is at least doubtful; 2, That if he was consecrated, the consecration, on Anglican principles, was invalid; 3, That if valid it did not continue the apostolical succession; 4, That the Church of England, when established by law in the Reformation, utterly rejected the theories and principles now maintained by high church teachers as the original doctrines of the Church of England.

It is not necessary, and would neither be profitable nor edifying, to follow our author through all the process of his arguments, but we may, perhaps, interest the reader by culling out a few points and presenting them to his attention.

1. It is made evident that the dominant power in giving being and shape to the Anglican establishment was the power on the throne. By the Act of Supremacy, Queen Elizabeth was put in the

place of the pope, and whatever the bishops possessed in the way of authority, they got from her. Here is a section of the Act of Supremacy: "Such jurisdiction, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority have hitherto been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall forever, by the authority of the present Parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm." Now, it would seem, that whatever apostolical succession was brought over from Rome was "united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm," the wearer of which, at that time, happened to be the Virgin Queen. Elizabeth was constituted "head over all things to the church." It was not her nature to be a figure-head. She was disposed to magnify her office. When the Bishop of Ely refused compliance with her command, she wrote him the following note: "Proud Prelate, you know what you were before I made you what you are. If you do not immediately comply with my request, by G—d, I will unfrock you." It is evident from this that she could dispense the disgrace of orders; and it would seem to follow, logically, that she possessed the "grace of orders." As she was made head of the church, it is charitable to suppose that she was credited with possessing some grace, and she gave proof of possessing no other grace except the grace of orders. Our author tells us that "in her speech to Parliament in 1584, her majesty informed the bishops that if they did not amend their ways, she would depose every one of them. 'For there seems to have been,' says Hallam, 'no question in that age but that this might be done by virtue of the crown's supremacy.'" Elizabeth understood that the cleavage between the papacy and the Church of England was absolute; that no bond of spiritual or ecclesiastical power of any kind remained intact, that no bishop or archbishop in her realm was authorized to perform any ecclesiastical function in virtue of an ordination previously received from Rome. They were all required to take oath acknowledging her supremacy. Those who

refused were no longer bishops. Apostolic succession, apart from the oath, availed nothing. Not merely theoretically, but practically, authority to discharge spiritual and ecclesiastical functions proceeded from the throne. Elizabeth claimed to be the repository of all kinds of power. When Matthew Parker was to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, there was a doubt whether the persons named in the queen's mandate for his consecration were canonically qualified to act. The queen commanded them to go forward, promising to supply, "by our own supreme royal authority, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, whatever, either in the things to be done by you, pursuant to our aforesaid mandate, or in you, or any of you, your condition, state, or power for the performance of the premises, may or shall be wanting of those things, which either by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws, are required, or are necessary on this behalf, the state of the times and the exigency of affairs rendering it necessary." The queen virtually says: "When your own qualifications are exhausted, draw on me for whatever is still wanting." One point in dispute was whether two of those appointed to consecrate Parker were *bona fide* bishops. "If not," says the queen, "we will supply the defect by our supreme authority, of our own mere motion." She was equal to the occasion. She was like the pedler's mill, of which we used to hear in our boyhood. The pedler went from house to house grinding out pepper, spice, salt, or any kind of condiment called for, in any quantity demanded. The queen, out of her inexhaustible resources, "of her mere motion," supplied any and all kinds of deficiencies. Froude is quoted as saying of the Anglican hierarchy: "It drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The image in its outward aspect could be made to correspond to the parent tree, and to sustain the illusion it was necessary to provide bishops who could appear to have inherited their powers by the approved method as successors of the apostles." Elizabeth cared nothing about the inner nature of ecclesiastical things. Her whole concern was to so shape the outside as best to promote the interests of her throne. Green, in his short history of the English people, says: "No woman ever

lived who was so totally destitute of the sentiment of religion. While the world around her was being swayed more and more by theological beliefs and controversies, Elizabeth was absolutely untouched by them. Her mind was unruffled by the spiritual problems which were vexing the minds around her; to Elizabeth, indeed, they were not only unintelligible, they were ridiculous. She looked at theological differences in a purely political light. She agreed with Henry IV., that a kingdom was well worth a mass. It seemed an obvious thing to her to hold out hopes of conversion as a means of deceiving Philip, or to gain a point in negotiation by restoring the crucifix to her chapel." Such was the woman who did more than any and all others to fix the metes and bounds of the Anglican hierarchy, and to determine the extent of variation between the English church and the papacy.

2. One of the most telling points made by Dr. Cooke against Anglican pretensions is in connection with the refusal of the Anglican authorities to recognize the validity of the orders of the Reformed Episcopal Church. In 1873, during a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, Dr. Cummins, then Assistant Bishop of Kentucky, partook of the Lord's supper in a Presbyterian church. This was a heinous offence in the eyes of the high churchmen. They were more incensed at this act of fraternity than they were at Dr. Heber Newton for preaching the baldest rationalism. Bishop Cummins withdrew from the Episcopal Church, and united with a few kindred spirits in founding the Reformed Episcopal Church. What about his apostolic succession? He had been regularly ordained a bishop in the Episcopal Church. His ecclesiastical pedigree was as pure as that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Had any one called in question the validity of his orders, every man of the high-church persuasion would have risen up to defend it. His title to the true apostolic succession was without a flaw at the time he withdrew. What became of it then? Did he lose it, or was he deprived of it by the church whose communion he had renounced? Could they deprive him of it? Did he not, by his ordination, receive the *character indelebilis*? This is an interesting question. If he did, then the discipline of the Anglican Church is a mere *brutum fulmen*.



That church tried to obliterate the mark, and claimed that it had succeeded. The Anglican Bishop of St. Albans warned his flock against the new bishops as "intruders in the guise of real bishops," and denied that they had any valid jurisdiction. Bishop Gregg, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, wrote a note to the Bishop of St. Albans, in which he said: "The bishop through whom the historical succession reached me had his connection directly through the Anglican communion, and had not been deposed when the succession was transmitted through him to the three bishops by whom I was validly and canonically consecrated." To this the Bishop of St. Albans replied: "Reverend sir, you assert that the bishop through whom the historical succession reached you had his consecration directly through the Anglican communion, and had not been deposed when the succession was transmitted. I presume the bishop to whom you refer was Dr. Cummins. This bishop, though not yet formally deposed, lay under prohibition from performing any episcopal act, which prohibition was publicly notified December 1, 1873, just a fortnight before he proceeded to consecrate that bishop through whom, as you say, you received the historical succession. I have authority to state that none of the American bishops have ever recognized the act of pretended consecration performed by Dr. Cummins, or any act growing out of it." What became of Bishop Cummins' apostolic succession? The church that gave it to him claimed to take it away from him, or, at any rate, to deprive him of the power of transmitting it. When that church laid its prohibition on him, forbidding him to perform any episcopal act, at that very moment his power to confer the grace of orders was paralyzed. He could not add another link to the chain of historical succession. He could do the same things and say the same words which before this had resulted in making successors to the apostles, but the things and words have been deprived of their efficacy. His consecrations are "pretended" consecrations; his bishops are "intruders in the guise of real bishops, but having no jurisdiction."

It seems very reasonable that a church should be able to depose its officials and strip them of every prerogative with which it had invested them. The power that can make can destroy. But if

this holds good as between the Anglican Church and its deposed officials, why should it not hold good between the Church of Rome and her deposed officials? How happens it that the papacy could not stop the flow of the grace of orders? When she laid her prohibition on the English prelates who dared to disobey her voice, why did not this paralyze their power to transmit apostolic succession? Rome did not spare her excommunications and anathemas. She hurled them thick and fast on the heads of her revolting subjects. Were not her interdicts as powerful as those of these same revolting subjects? If we are to believe our Anglican friends when they profess to deprive refractory bishops of the power to impart valid orders, are we not bound to believe our papal friends when they profess the same thing? But if we believe our papal friends, then we must believe that our Anglican bishops never had any power to impart valid orders.

Look at the position of the Anglican Church. It looks down on the Reformed Episcopal Church, and says: "You are no church. Your bishops have no apostolic succession. When they rebelled against me, I at once severed the tie that bound them to the apostles." At the same time the Church of Rome is looking down on the Anglican Church and saying: "You are no church. Your bishops have no apostolic succession. When they rebelled against me, I at once severed the tie that bound them to the apostles." In the meantime the Protestant sects stand off and wonder what the dear Lord thinks, and whether the apostles know what folly is being perpetrated in their name.

3. We will mention but one other point insisted on by our author, and that is that the noble reformers of the sixteenth century did not wish to bring over any apostolic succession or grace of orders from the Church of Rome. They wanted to separate themselves from the papacy by a "great gulf fixed," across which there should remain no single strand of vital connection. Perhaps the shortest and surest way to get at what the English reformers thought of the Church of Rome is to look at the Homilies, appointed to be used by the clergy of that time. There were two Books of Homilies, the first published under Edward VI. in 1547, the second under Elizabeth in 1563. We have an

official declaration of the value and design of these Books of Homilies in the thirty-fifth article of the Thirty-nine Articles, in the following language: "The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which was set forth in the time of Edward VI., and, therefore, we judge them to be read in the churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." Let us read one or two extracts from these Homilies "diligently and distinctly," and we shall understand that if Rome transmitted any apostolic succession to the first Anglican bishops, she did it not only against her own will, but against theirs also. We read from the second part of the sermon for Whit Sunday "in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory:" "But to conclude and make an end, ye shall briefly take this short lesson; wheresoever ye find the spirit of arrogance and pride, the spirit of envy, hatred, contention, cruelty, murder, extortion, witchcraft, necromancy, etc., assure yourselves that there is the spirit of the devil and not of God, albeit they pretend outwardly to the world never so much holiness. Such were all the popes and prelates of Rome for the most part as doth well appear in the story of their lives, and therefore they are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets and false Christs which deceived the world a long time. The Lord of heaven and earth defend us from their tyranny and pride, that they may never enter into his vineyard again, to the disturbance of his silly flock; but that they may be utterly confounded and put to flight in all parts of the world; and he of his great mercy so work in all men's hearts by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable gospel of his Son Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the beating down of sin, death, the pope, the devil, and all the kingdom of anti-Christ." This is what the Anglican Church of Elizabeth's day called "godly and wholesome doctrine." The sermon from which the extract is taken enters into an elaborate argument to show that the Church of Rome was no true church of Christ, that it had none of the marks of the true

church, that it was the kingdom of antichrist, and that the pope was an incarnation of the devil. In the homily against idolatry, the Church of Rome is described as "being indeed not only a harlot (as the Scripture calleth her), but also a foul, filthy, old withered harlot (for she is indeed of ancient years), and understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsomeness which of herself she hath, doth (after the custom of such harlots) paint herself and deck and tire herself with gold, pearl, stone, and all kinds of precious jewels, that she, shining with the outward beauty and glory of them, may please the foolish phantasy of fond lovers, and so entice them to spiritual fornication with her, who, if they saw her (I will not say naked), but in simple apparel, would abhor her as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen; according as appeareth by the description of the garnishing of the great strumpet of all strumpets, the mother of whoredom, set forth by St. John in his Revelation, who by her glory provoked the princes of the earth to commit whoredom with her." This sounds like the rugged severity of "honest Hugh Latimer," but whoever first wrote or spoke these scathing words, they were officially adopted by the Anglican Church of Elizabeth's day as "godly and wholesome doctrine," and ordered to be read to the churches by the ministers "diligently and distinctly." Is it conceivable that the Anglican bishops who could express their judgment of the papacy in that style staked their right to be regarded as a true church of Christ on the validity of orders brought over from Rome? Perish the thought! They claimed no relationship with, much less direct descent from, the "foul, filthy, old withered harlot." Their sentiment is expressed with more force than elegance by Dr. Fulke when he says, writing to papists: "You are most deceived if you think we esteem your offices of bishops, priests, deacons, any better than laymen. Again, with all our hearts, we defy, abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, antichristian orders."

We admit that this is not the most mellifluous language, but we have not seen anything that comes more nearly doing justice to the subject. Dr. Fulke was a rhetorician for the times, and did the best he could without doing violence to the third com-

mandment. We bow our thanks, and cherish his memory. Cranmer with almost equal strength, but with somewhat chaster language, says, "But if we allow the pope, his cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, canons, friars, and the whole rabble of the clergy, to be this perfect church of God, whose doings are clean contrary, for the most part, to the will and commandment of Christ, left and expressed in his word written, then make we him a sinner and his word of no effect. For as sweet agreeth with sour, and black with white, and darkness with light, and evil with good, even so this outward, seen and visible church, consisting of the ordinary succession of bishops, agreeth with Christ." Men who talked in this strain could not account it a blessing that the hands of Rome's apostate bishops had touched their heads. They gloried in no grace that was transmitted by such polluted touch. Calhill, bishop elect of Worcester, proposes a method by which the taint imparted by the bishop's fingers may be obliterated. He suggests to the papists that they had better use in their anointing the oil which the "greasy merchants will have in every mess, for the *character indelebilis*, the 'mark unremovable,' is thereby given. Yet there is a way to have it out well enough; to rub them well—favorably with salt and ashes, or if that will not serve, with a little soap." Now considering that the Church of Rome neither desired nor intended to transmit the succession, of whatever kind it was which she possessed, to the excommunicated and anathematized Anglican bishops and through them to their successors, and that these same excommunicated Anglican bishops neither claimed nor desired such succession, is it wise on the part of the high-churchmen of our day to suspend the existence of their church on the fact that the succession was transmitted nevertheless? If we had no more substantial basis than that on which to rest a claim to be the true church of Christ, we should not put forth our claim with any great blare of trumpets. We should be rather disposed to enter our closet and shut the door, and pray to our Father which seeth in secret.

4. Our author spends more time than the importance of the subject warrants, in the closing chapters of his book, in proving that Mr. Wesley had authority to ordain, and originate an episco-

pany. Mr. Wesley's acts, in providing for the necessity of the churches that resulted from the spiritual awakening that originated with him and a few other kindred spirits, need no defence. Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander lays down the true principle: "All valid powers are derived from Christ, and not from the apostles, or from any intervening men whatever. The agency of men in ordination is a simple, natural, and efficacious method of perpetuating the ministry without disorder, recommended by experience, sanctioned by apostolical practice and approved of God, but not essential to a valid ministry, when Providence has made it either not at all attainable, or only at the cost of greater evils than could possibly attend the violation of external uniformity." Why should Wesley be dependent for authority on the will of men who gave no evidence of being so near to the great source of all authority as Wesley himself? It is preposterous to think about the spirit-filled Wesley deriving power for the performance of valid ministerial acts from the Lord Jesus Christ through the round-about way of the apostles and their successors in the papal and Anglican churches. He had the living and reigning Christ with him all the time. It was so much easier and more certain to apply to him directly. As the writer from whom we have just quoted says: "The doctrine of succession seems to place the Saviour at the end of a long line, in which the generations of his ministers follow one another, each at a greater remove from him than that which went before it, and consequently needing a still longer line to reach him." Away with such a conception of Christ and his relation to his ministers! His last promise was, "Lo, I am with you alway, unto the end of the world." He is in his church to-day, and we do not have to grope our way across the track of weary centuries through the darkness of gross superstitions to find him by way of Palestine. We receive not our apostleship from man, and it matters little whether we receive it by man. For the sake of decency and order, it is altogether proper and right that the church have a regular method of recognizing and setting the seal of her approval on those who furnish the proof that they are called of God to the office of bishop. But the call of God is the essential thing, and if a lukewarm or apostate church refuse to

recognize this call, then he who receives it is bound to obey God rather than man. He must go forward in defiance of the voice of the church, discharging the functions of his high calling.

What does God want with a ministry? An exhaustive answer is given in the last command that Christ laid upon his apostles: "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." God perpetuates the office of the ministry for the sole purpose of perpetuating the teaching of what Christ taught. Paul writes to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses commit to faithful men who shall be able to teach others." Paul was making arrangement to transmit, not an office or an order, but the very same doctrines which he had taught. Is it possible to secure the perpetual teaching of what Christ taught, the perpetual preaching of pure doctrine, by means of a mere outward, historical, tactual succession of bishops? Supposing such succession to exist in the Roman Catholic Church, and to have been transmitted to the Anglican Church, has it accomplished what God designed? Have Peter's successors in the See of Rome maintained and propagated all the teachings which Christ commanded his apostles? Have they preached the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? We will let an Anglican bishop of Queen Elizabeth's day answer: "The great antichrist of Europe is the king of farces, the prince of hypocrisy, the man of sin, the father of errors, and the master of lies, the Romish pope." It would seem, then, that apostolic succession failed to secure the end which God had in view. Did it fail only in the case of the pope? "He is the head of the said pale horse, whose body are his patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, fat prebends, doctors, priests, abbots, priors, monks, canons, friars, nuns, pardoners, and proctors, with all the sects and shorn swarm of perdition, and with all those that consent with them in the Romish faith, obeying their wicked laws, decrees, bulls, counsels, and constitutions, contrary to God's truth. The wickedness of these hath so darkened the blind world that scarce was left one sparkle of the verity of the true Christian faith. No-

where can men dwell to greater loss to their souls' health than under their abominations." Not in one case, but in all cases, the historical succession failed to secure the succession of sound doctrine. At best, it can only be regarded as a means to an end; and, failing to secure the end, "it is fit for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Its absolute and appalling failure brands it as a mere human invention. God could not have committed so egregious a blunder. Instead of perpetuating truth, it has murdered truth, enthroned fraud, and canonized crime. It spread a pall of darkness over the earth, and, to use the language of Froude, "the so-called horrors of the French Revolution were a mere bagatelle, a mere summer shower, by the side of the atrocities committed in the name of religion, and with the sanction of the Catholic Church." The voice of history unites with the silence of the Bible in assuring us that God never intended to secure a continuance of apostolic teaching by means of apostolic succession, in the sense defined. Where we find the succession, the teaching is wanting; and where we find the teaching, the succession is wanting. God never joined them together.

R. C. REED.

*Nashville, Tennessee.*