

# A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY OF NEW SOUTH WALES,

IN THE DIOCESE OF AUSTRALIA,

AT THE VISITATION HELD IN

THE CHURCH OF ST. JAMES, SYDNEY,

*On Wednesday, October the 6th, 1841,*

BY WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, D.D.,

BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA.

---

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY.

---

SYDNEY:

PRINTED BY JAMES TEGG, GEORGE STREET.

---

1841.

THE CHAIRMAN

THE CHAIRMAN OF NEW SOUTH WALES

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF AGENCIES

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF AGENCIES

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF AGENCIES

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF AGENCIES

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

OF THE DISTRICT OF AUSTRALIA

TO THE REVEREND  
THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF AUSTRALIA,

THIS CHARGE IS DEDICATED

WITH SENTIMENTS OF SINCERE RESPECT

AND GRATEFUL ATTACHMENT,

BY THEIR AFFECTIONATE BROTHER

AND HUMBLE SERVANT,

W. G. AUSTRALIA.

*Sydney, 11th October, 1841.*

## A CHARGE, &c.

---

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

That I should have felt a disposition to shorten the interval between the synodical meetings of the clergy, rather than have allowed the full period of three years to elapse, you will attribute I trust only to the sense which I entertain of the advantage arising from frequent intercourse and conference between the Bishop of a Diocese and his officiating clergy. In England, it may be admitted that a triennial Visitation secures every practical advantage; because the clergy being generally placed within a short day's journey from the residences of their respective Diocesans, have, at all times ready access to them in private should they require the advice or instruction of their appointed superior. Independently of such facilities of personal intercourse, there are so many channels of indirect communication between the various classes of our profession, that from the highest to the most humble a constant circulation of intelligence is going on; and the principle of mutual concert between the many members of the same body is uninterruptedly maintained. It is needless to remark that we are in possession of no corresponding advantages here. Scattered, isolated, and uncombined, the clergy of this Diocese enjoy but very seldom opportunities of conference and consultation with their Bishop; and still less frequently with one another. A General Visitation affords the only abatement of such disadvantages which it is in my power

to apply; and it would grieve me to think that I had prematurely or without sufficient reason required you to undertake the long and tedious journeys which some have had to encounter in complying with the summons to attend here to-day. As we have thus met, I should wish the occasion not to pass away without my offering to you some observations upon the state of religion, and the general aspect of Church-affairs in this Colony, and upon the position and prospects of the clergy themselves. I should wish to promote such an understanding of the principles involved in our ecclesiastical polity, and to give such an explanation of the terms upon which our claim to the ministerial character rests, as may introduce unity into all our operations, and render us more stedfast in the discharge of our several duties, in proportion as we are more fully convinced of the validity of the commission under which we are appointed to this charge. At the same time I would most sedulously warn you against admitting any such exaggerated estimate of the effect of that commission as might lead us to attribute to ourselves a larger share in imparting efficacy to the ordinances which we administer than the Scriptures recognize, or justify our assuming.

The exertions which have been continued up to a very recent date in so many parishes and districts to collect funds towards the erection of Churches and parsonage-houses, have effected a great increase in the number of resident clergymen since our last meeting here.\* These measures have been attended with a marked improvement in the manners and dispositions of the people who have the ordinances of religion brought more immediately within their reach, and experience the beneficial effect arising from their regular observance. The condition of public affairs

\* Appendix (A.)

at the present moment has occasioned a natural, though it may be hoped no more than a temporary cessation of these exertions; but I believe that in nearly all the instances in which the erection of a Church had been undertaken, it may be regarded as having advanced beyond that point at which success is doubtful. There are cases, I am well aware, in which the completion of the buildings cannot but require a considerable lapse of time and much additional exertion. Nor am I sorry to witness a few such instances; it being my firm persuasion that where persons, contemplating things not seen as yet, are reduced to the necessity of making with their limited resources a succession of efforts to obtain for themselves the blessings of a Christian ministry and of public worship, a more distinct proof may be given of the power of faith than where the possession of greater opulence ensures an unimpeded progress from the commencement to the conclusion of the undertaking.

It is indeed in the gradual unfolding of a spirit of true religion, springing from that principle of faith of which I speak, as a branch out of its root, that I behold a promise of those mature fruits which will be the crown and recompense of our present labours. That which chiefly casts a damp and a discouragement upon the exertions of an earnest clergyman, is his observation of the too prevailing want among his parishioners of habitual thoughtfulness and concern about religion, of a becoming sense of its importance, of due anxiety for its operative extension as distinguished from mere profession, of a disposition to provide free scope for the energies of the Church which is the chosen and proper organ for spreading abroad the knowledge of sacred Truth. These are the dispositions, the prevalence of which it requires all the energy of a clergyman's character, and all his confidence in the promise of divine assistance, to enable him to struggle against without

being disheartened. And even where resolution is not wanting to sustain the contest, what a spirit of forbearance and self-denial must he put forth, and what a clearness and steadiness of judgment must he display, if he would bring it to a prosperous termination! It would be comparatively easy for us, all must admit, to call forth a strong, and as it may be termed a convulsive effort (which therefore could be but transient) if we would have recourse to mere appeals to the feelings, and could consent to employ that style of address which depends for its effect upon the degree of excitement which it produces. But such a course would be unworthy of our station, and, I feel satisfied, ultimately injurious to our cause; which is that of soberness as well as truth. Warmth and earnestness I am so far from recommending you to check, that it is the want of their sufficient manifestation I principally lament: These are the very feelings which it is my most anxious wish to behold universally diffused. But then, it must be a steady and enduring flame which we seek to kindle in the bosom of every churchman; reminding him that under an habitual sense of duty he is to let its light so shine before men, that they beholding his good works may be encouraged to display corresponding zeal in glorifying their Father which is in heaven. In fact I must despair of ever seeing the divine services provided for in a becoming manner, or satisfactory evidence given that the community is influenced by a spirit of devotion, until every one shall deliberately make it matter of conscience to contribute, in proportion to his station and circumstances, to maintain the visible Church of Christ as the proper safeguard against the incursions of unbelief and irreligion. This observation I offer with the less reserve, because were it even true that the duty of providing the due supports of piety was a burdensome one, that would not furnish justifiable grounds for declining it. Much less can such a plea be urged when, as things are, it

would not be a burdensome undertaking if each man would conscientiously act upon the principle of applying what he could easily spare towards so holy a purpose. Nothing impresses a more painful conviction of the decay of a general feeling of earnestness in religion than the comparison which we are too often compelled to draw between the conduct of professors in early and in later times:—much to the disadvantage of the latter. In the primitive Church religion was every man's personal concern; it was the first object in all their thoughts. It is now, too generally, the last. Then, they were forward in determining that the service of God should be at all events becomingly provided for, and that only after this was done might attention be directed to individual wants. Now, we must lament to observe a prevailing disposition to secure every temporal comfort advantage and safeguard, present and prospective, before any contribution is made towards God's service; and in many, indeed in a great many instances, both rich and poor venture to consume their all upon the things of the present world. I do not speak this without exception. There are many very gratifying exceptions as we are all aware. It is a subject of daily thankfulness with me that as in the darkest periods of the Church's history God has been ever careful to preserve a remnant who complied with the precept of seeking first of all his kingdom and righteousness, even so at this present time also there are those (and they form an increasing number) whose anxious desire and endeavor, whose very meat and drink, it is to provide before all things that God's service should not be neglected. It is to the extension of this self-denying spirit (for such it is) that we must principally look for the diffusion both of the form and of the power of godliness. Had our lot been cast in a land where the previous exertions of piety (even of erroneous piety in some of its views) had to a wide extent provided for the needs of external religion, even then, as the example of our

mother England is at this time shewing, the continued sacrifices of an emulative piety would still require to be offered at the altars of the living God. How much more forcibly must such a duty be felt to devolve upon us here, when, in place of enjoying the accumulated provision of past ages applied to the service of the sanctuary, we have the obligation laid upon us of founding those institutions for ourselves? and the perseverance of those that shall come after, in the profession of the Christian faith, will much depend upon their being provided by us with the ordinances of Christian worship. In striving by reasoning to break through that formidable barrier of selfishness which seeks continually to repel every suggestion of this nature, we are entitled to deal with our flocks as Christians by their own profession and acknowledgment; and in that character we may submit to their serious consideration in what manner they expect the ordinances and the influence of Christianity to be supported unless it be some one's acknowledged duty to make exertions to that end. The fairer conclusion is that it is every Christian's duty to contribute, as has been already said, to maintain the institutions of the visible Church. We have to sustain the argument against some who profess to think that the Church should have no appropriate revenues, no settled endowment, no title to a legal maintenance. This is precisely the Church's condition here. She enjoys no endowments. But in proportion as this is her condition, it becomes only the more evident that the obligation of providing for the maintenance of the Church is cast from day to day upon those who acknowledge her as a divine institution. God never wills an end without furnishing means by which it may be accomplished; and the means which he has in this instance provided are the substance and resources which He has given to those who profess a belief that it is God's will the Church should be supported, and who at the same time

know that this cannot be accomplished without their assistance. The profession of that belief and the possession of those means united, constitute, I must think, a divine obligation. It cannot be justifiable to detach ourselves from all care and concern for the continuance of those benefits which the Church confers, and to remit the whole affair to the working of Providence. The ordinary care of Providence promises us nothing except through our employment of the proper means which are granted us for its attainment; and as to an extraordinary interposition in our favour, we can assuredly have little right to look for that when it is our own negligence and unconcern which alone have rendered it necessary.

In speaking of the maintenance of the Church I have expressed myself in general terms; and without particular reference to the provision to be set apart for the support of the clergy. This, however, it is obvious must form a very important branch of the question. It is not that department, certainly, which we can ourselves treat of with the greatest satisfaction. Nevertheless, if, from any feeling of personal disinclination to expose myself to the hazard of misrepresentation, I were to pass over the subject without notice, it might be not unjustly imputed to me that I was wanting in duty not only to the body of the clergy but also to the Church at large; whose welfare is involved in the state and character of its ministers as deeply at least as that of the clergy themselves. In reminding the laity of their duty to attend to the welfare of those who are over them in the Lord, I would proceed upon no other principle, I would make no more extended demand, I would not claim one jot or one tittle of advantage beyond this one admission, "that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel."\* In this however I assume that there is

\* 1 Cor. ix., 14.

more than the dead letter of a maxim. Christians must give to it vitality and animation by carrying it into effect according to the intention of its divine Author. In seeking to ascertain that intention it shall be my object to guard against all extravagance, and as in fixing the general duty of providing for the support of the clergy, I have confined myself to the terms of the simple precept, so in considering the proper extent of that support I will not go beyond the limits of the immediate context. The subject of providing for the maintenance of the Christian ministry (which an inspired apostle did not deem an unfit topic for his notice) is introduced you are aware by a reference to the system according to which the Jewish priesthood was by divine appointment maintained. "Do ye not know," he asks, which according to his usual style and indeed in ordinary language means no less than *ye know full well*, "that they which minister about holy things live of the temple," that is by the tithes and offerings annexed to it; "and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so hath the Lord also ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." St. Paul, it is true, disclaims all personal interest; and forbears to use the right which he thus asserts generally on behalf of the preachers of the Gospel. But the existence of such a right he does establish not only by that reference to the services of the temple, but upon the express authority of him who is greater than the temple: "so hath the Lord ordained." He states expressly too that this is said "altogether for our sakes: for our sakes no doubt it is written that he that plougheth might plough in hope;"\* or that the energies of the Christian husbandman might not be smitten with torpor on beholding around him nothing but the gloomy prospect of impending destitution. I feel assured that the example of the Apostle justifies my allusion to this subject; and will draw your attention once

\* 1 Cor. ix., 10.

more to the use which is made of the old-law precept, that they which minister about holy things should derive from that ministry the means of their temporal support. We do not mean any of us, I am sure, to advance any claim to a provision of the same kind or of the same extent with that which was reserved for the ministry of the temple; though my own persuasion is that no interest either public or private would be impoverished in the slightest degree if there were such an appropriation of things carnal for the support of those who are engaged in things spiritual. But from the Apostle's premises, this deduction must follow; that whatever provision may be made for a Christian ministry it ought to be so constituted as to extend with the increase of all other interests, or upon the principle which God sanctioned in determining the inheritance of the tribe of Levi, that it should bear at all times a fixed proportion to the general stock of national property. "Even so" or in conformity with this equitable principle "hath the Lord ordained" that a livelihood should be provided out of the Gospel for those who preach it. What is meant is evidently this; that it would be unjust, and contrary to the tenor of the divine appointment to confine the minister of the Gospel to one invariable rate of remuneration, while every other class, stimulated by the artificial encouragements which abound in civilized societies, is in a state of progressive advancement. This is contrary to the essential principle of that institution which the Scripture tells us is ordained to be our guide herein; and if this be departed from, it will not fail to happen that the provision for the Church, suffering by comparison with other interests continual diminution, will in process of time become equivalent to *no* provision.

These observations are offered not without a perfect acquaintance with the danger of provoking by them the cus-

tomary imputation of worldly-mindedness. But I venture to propose them because my sense of duty to the Church is superior to my fear of the animadversion of the world. It is the ordinance of the Lord that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel, as they who ministered about holy things were to live by the temple; or by a fixed system of recompense, keeping always, as to its amount, on a level with the general fortunes of the community. It is more necessary here to recal these principles to remembrance, because our clergy are placed at present in a state of dependence upon two unstable supports; the will of government, and the disposition of the people. Both of these I regard as objectionable; but especially the former, if contemplated as a permanent measure. It cannot but present itself to our thoughts, as lying within the limits of possibility at least, that the control which is thus established over the interests of the clergy may be at some future time employed as an engine to try their independence and fidelity. The clergy are exposed to the risk of utter destitution if they withstand the trial; or else, if they sink under it, to a general degradation of character and forfeiture of influence. The warning delivered by our Lord himself upon this subject must not be forgotten or disregarded. "He that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me." The train of evils which is thus described as the certain consequence of contempt falling upon the preachers of the Gospel, ought, I think, to awaken some consideration as to the means of preventing its occurrence, so far as human resources can guard against it. I do not speak of what is to happen this day or the day following. We are required to provide against the evils of futurity; but that, perhaps, not a very distant one. If it be asked, how is such provision to be made? the reply must be, by general combination; by a movement of the Church at large, which is constituted

a body with the express intent that many members may combine for the accomplishment of a general object. I know not any object indeed which more deserves the consideration of devout men, desiring the welfare and improvement of the country, than that of averting the evils which cannot but proceed from the clergy being left in a condition of poverty and state-dependence.

But while I thus speak of the importance, for the sake of the public good, of some regular provision being made for the support of the clergy, I hope it will not be considered that the estimation and respect due to that body are dependent on their obtaining such provision. The duty of furnishing them with becoming means of subsistence is recognised in Scripture; and the utility of a moderate independence, in protecting them against those trials of their probity to which men unprovided with any substantive resources must be continually exposed, is too clear to need support from argument. But the estimation in which the clergy are held by truly sensible and religious persons will depend chiefly on their own conduct, whatever their worldly circumstances may be. The highest and at the same time the most becoming principle, upon which we can aim at sustaining our office and ourselves in suitable respect, will be to have always printed in our remembrance what the character of that office is; and to let it serve as an admonition to us that we aim at walking worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, and of the mission whereupon we are sent. We are ordained for men in things pertaining to God; and men themselves cannot easily despise those whom they behold sustaining with faithful consistency the character impressed upon them by a regularly continued succession from the Apostles. I would not myself consent to sit in the seat of authority in the Church without the most assured conviction that it had been conveyed to me by

lawful descent from those who had public authority given unto them in the congregation ; and I do trust that there is no member of the body of the clergy who does not think in his heart that he possesses by a similarly valid title the right and privilege of ministering in sacred things. Without hesitation it may be acknowledged that it is by no means dignified, it is by no means advantageous that we should be prone to obtrude, whether in season or out of season, the assertion of our spiritual claims. Much more becoming we may be assured it is to imitate the practice of the Apostles, who were sparing in their references to this topic ; introducing it only so far as was necessary to shew that they maintained their own title to a mission derived to them from their Divine Master's appointment, and to be transmitted by them to others in succession. No one possessed of proper feeling will call in question that "when we are sure ourselves, and find others in no doubt of our having had committed to us the word of reconciliation, we may then cease from enlarging upon the certainty and dignity of the power given us by Christ."\* But if we look back only to times which fall within our own remembrance, we shall find evidence enough to convince us that the prevailing disposition has been to doubt whether any ministerial charge has been peculiarly committed to us, if not altogether to deny it. Our title to any transmissive spiritual authority conferred by ordination has been disputed not by those alone who stood aloof from our communion disavowing any participation in its principles ; and whose opposition was therefore natural. With them, not a few who continued to profess those principles have so far made common cause as to declare by their proceedings, if not in express terms, that they attributed no superior validity or importance to that form of ordination which their own Church

\* Discourses on Tradition and Episcopacy, by the Rev. C. Benson, p. 43.

professes to derive from the practice of the Apostles.\* Until a very recent period the clergy themselves have been, in general, far from shewing any inclination to enlarge upon the certainty or dignity of the commission which they bear; but had fallen, blameably it must be admitted, into the opposite extreme. While they continued silent upon the subject of their own claims, the reality of any Apostolical succession in the office of the ministry was obstinately disputed in other quarters; insomuch that but for the revived assertion, at almost the last hour, of our just pretension to be accounted of as stewards of the mysteries of God, the title itself, and the whole train of ideas which it suggests, would ere long have fallen into desuetude and oblivion. Under these circumstances it is difficult to account for the extreme jealousy and aversion with which the very mention of the revival of such a pretension, apart even from any apprehended excess or abuse to which it may be liable, has been received. It passes my ability to reconcile such a display of feeling with the admission which is at the same time made that "the Reformation beginning in a resistance to the unjust pretensions, has been followed in too many instances by a denial of the just claims of the clergy.—In many places, and by many writers, and in not a few Christian communities, the office of the Christian ministry is stripped of all its sacred dignity, the teacher is counted subordinate to the taught, and the steward of the mysteries of the Gospel required to distribute its spiritual treasures and divide its saving doctrines according to the passions or pleasures of his fellow servants, rather than the fixed will and commandment of their common master."† This is a description of the state of things within the Church which must create uneasy sensations in every mind

\* Preface to the Form of Ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

† Benson's Discourses, p. 30.

earnest for its welfare and preservation; and must occasion us to pause before we can bring ourselves to censure any endeavour having in view to rectify those admitted disorders by the revival of a becoming feeling of respect for the ministerial office and character. I am aware how dangerous it may be for one in my situation to express even a qualified opinion upon a point which has given occasion to much recent controversy. Contemplating however the true statement which we have just heard of the evils which afflict the Church, and filled with apprehension that the gates of hell must eventually prevail against any branch of it in which such evils should continue without notice or reformation, I should be wanting in the firmness which becomes my position here, if, after attentive consideration of the subject, I should hesitate to express my thankfulness to those among ourselves who have ventured, at this crisis, to promulgate what I must consider the juster view of the nature of the ministerial function; not with a desire to exalt the office and power of the clergy, but to abate, if God will, those internal disorders which have brought it may be said, the Church into jeopardy. In expressing my satisfaction with these views, I would not be understood to approve all the arguments by which they may be supported; much less to concur in all the lengths to which they may be carried. Certainly it must be acknowledged that in questions connected with practical Theology, the judgment and discrimination are never so severely taxed as when it is requisite to fix the point at which opinions, true in themselves, begin to be associated with error. Truth itself however far it may be pushed can never be transmuted into error. But thus it is,—some other principle, not founded in Truth as the former was, is taken up as an apparent deduction from it; and this being constantly associated with the primitive truth begins to be viewed as forming a part of it, by those who are not very

watchful and cautious in their conclusions. Thus, for example, there is no position for which we ought to contend with greater stedfastness than for the reality of that commission by virtue of which we undertake to preach the word of God and to minister the sacraments in the congregation. This is that primary truth for the bringing of which out of long neglect into more general notice and becoming prominence, the Church is under a weighty obligation to those who have had the firmness to declare themselves in favour of the older and more solid sentiments. But I perceive with regret that there are others who, not content with temperately holding those sentiments, appear disposed to connect them with certain consequences supposed to follow necessarily from them; and who will by such a course of proceeding bring discountenance upon principles which by themselves might command very general approval. The first among the principles here referred to limits itself to affirming that there exists in the Church of Christ a ministry of Apostolical institution, which has been conveyed by uninterrupted succession from their hands to the present time. But by some it is maintained that the admission of this involves a farther consequence, that there can be no force or validity in any divine ordinance administered by mere laymen, or by such as do not partake of that successional appointment to the ministry. Now this, unless I am exceedingly mistaken, is the very turning point which separates the true and beneficial from the mistaken and injurious acceptance of the doctrine we are now engaged with; namely, the doctrine of Apostolical succession. The effect of this denial of validity to all ordinances, and to sacramental ordinances in particular, not being administered by lawful ministers, that is, in our sense, by clergymen episcopally ordained, has shewn itself in a refusal to inter in consecrated ground, according to the Order of the Church, such as have received the rite of baptism from lay hands, or

those which are so reputed. This occurrence I have noticed with regret, both as it seems likely to do mischief by itself and in its consequences, by throwing difficulties in the way of the admission of a sound principle, the working of which it might be hoped would gradually have composed the disturbed unity of the Church. In order, as far as possible, to guard against the introduction of any such evil among ourselves, I think it right to refer to the subject, and to state my own belief that the refusal of interment upon such grounds is not accordant with a correct view of the nature of the ministerial office, or with the analogy of Scripture, and that it derives no sanction from the practice of the earlier Church, or from the ordinances of the Church of England.\*

The character which we derive from our ordination is, we shall none of us hesitate to own, authoritative as well as ministerial; that is to say, the imposition of hands confers upon us a right and authority to minister and to preach, which it is my firm persuasion cannot be conferred by any other ordinary means or in any other regular way. But it does not hence follow that God will withhold all effect from acts done by others not participating with us in such imparted authority.† The Scripture does not confirm that view. It does not contain any express declaration to that effect; and if recourse be had to the principle of analogy, enough may be collected by its means to shew that God by establishing a particular channel for the conveyance of his grace, does not thereby restrict himself from bestowing the same by other means if it shall so please him. Salvation was of the Jews;‡ but the converse did not necessarily follow that there should be no salvation with the Samaritans. Even after the separation of the kingdom of Israel

\* Appendix (B.)

† Appendix (C.)

‡ Joh. iv, 22.

the title of prophet is not withheld from its teachers, though they were far from any approach to regular ordination; and it is said expressly "I have not sent these prophets yet they run; I have not spoken yet they prophecy."\* Indeed it is farther declared notwithstanding this defect in their mission, that if they had faithfully acted up to its engagements the grace of God should still have accompanied them and given effect to their teaching; "if they had stood in the counsel of the Lord, and caused the people to hear his words, then even they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings."

In the instance of the man who cast out devils, though enrolled neither among "the twelve" nor the "other seventy" afterwards sent out, (for this proceeding fell between the two appointments)† the attention of the disciples would appear naturally to have been drawn to the circumstance of his so acting without an express and orderly mission, by the remembrance of their own recent want of power to expel an evil spirit. Their Lord appears to avail himself of this opportunity to instruct them that although he had given them a special mission, yet they were not to gather from this that he had made the operation of his power exclusively dependent on their agency.‡ More than this I do not think it necessary for our present purpose to infer from that occurrence; but the example seems conclusive against the position which some have taken up as to the nullity of ordinances except from the hand of a minister lawfully ordained. So again, in the case of those of Rome who preached Christ of contention not sincerely, or out of mere opposition to St. Paul,§ we cannot think that these persons were sent or ordained by him; their object being,

\* Jerem. xxiii., 21, 22.

† Luke ix., 1, 49; and x. 1.

‡ Appendix (D.)

§ Philipp. i., 15

as he says, to add affliction to his bonds. Yet it is equally difficult to believe that this their ministration, undertaken without or rather against authority, was altogether invalid in effect. Had it been so regarded by the Apostle, what ground could he have had for the joy which he expressed that Christ was preached even by them? If baptism at the hands of any other than a lawful minister be null, so as not to entitle those who receive it to Christian privileges, then also must the preaching of the Gospel by any other than a lawful minister be void of all spiritual effect; because the offices of preaching and baptizing are alike included in that commission of Christ to his Apostles from which our own is derived.\* Yet there are few probably prepared to affirm that the converting grace of God has in no instances accompanied his holy word when preached by those who followed not with us. If we turn to consult the opinions of the early Church we shall find that there were always some whose disposition it was to reject lay-baptism as of no effect; but the judgment of the Church in general was adverse to this view of the subject, and was expressed with sufficient clearness to prevent its reception. Indeed it must be admitted that authorities are not wanting which seem to lean almost to excess in the opposite direction; by acknowledging as valid and sufficient those baptisms which had been administered after an heretical form, by individuals under an actual sentence of heresy.† The settled line of distinction however appears to have been this: that where the solemnly appointed form of Christian baptism was adhered to, the ordinance was admitted to be valid, even though administered by those who having no ministerial commission from the Church were regarded as laymen; but the heretics who baptized after any other than the appointed form were not recognized as giving Christian bap-

\* Matth. xxviii., 19; Mark xvi., 15; Appendix (E.)

† Appendix (F.)

tism. They were looked upon as scarcely if at all superior in point of religious privileges, to the aliens of the heathen.\* The Church of England has followed the practice of antiquity in forbearing to pronounce the services of a minister in holy orders essential to the validity of baptism.† The record of her proceedings at a very critical period of her history and the tenor of her authorised formularies, appear sufficiently to shew that her sense is against that supposition; and that it never could have been her intention to exclude from her office of Christian burial, such as had been baptized duly as to the form and matter of the sacrament, but not by persons in Holy Orders. The Rubrick prefixed to the Ministration of Private Baptism in the reign of Edward the 6th, and so continued until the time of James the 1st, has been thought by some to “insinuate” or “tacitly to sanction” ‡ the practice of baptism by laymen, or even by females. The alteration introduced at the period last named, was intended to remove any supposed sanction given by the Church to such a practice, by requiring that baptism should be the act of “the lawful minister;” or, as it stands since the last review, of “the minister of the parish, or, in his absence, any other lawful minister that can be procured.” This determines the question as to the persuasion of our Church that baptism *ought* to be administered by a lawful minister. But still there is a wide distinction between declaring how an act ought to be done, and pronouncing it to be null and void if it be done in any other way; and therefore the question still remains whether those baptisms which are not solemnized according to the mode approved by the Church of England are regarded by her as devoid of all spiritual effect? The proceedings of her acknowledged representatives at the

\* Appendix (G.)

† Appendix (H.)

‡ Dr. Short's History of the Church of England, sect. 424 and sect. 511.

period of the Restoration, enable us, it appears to me, to answer this question in the negative. The Convocation in 1661 introduced two alterations of the Liturgy which bear upon this point. The first of these is the Rubrick then inserted before the Order for the Burial of the dead, prohibiting its use in the case of persons dying "unbaptized;" the second was the Office for the Baptism of persons in riper years. The period at which these changes were introduced renders them highly important. The condition of the kingdom then was such that, owing to the disuse and prohibition of the Book of Common Prayer, and the banishment, destruction, or silencing of the episcopal clergy during so many years, the greater portion of persons under age were either unbaptized, or had received lay baptism only. To meet the case of the former, that is of the unbaptized, the new office for such as are of riper years is stated to have been provided,\* and the Rubrick at the same time prefixed to the Order of Burial may have been charitably intended to admonish them what penalty awaited those who should neglect the opportunity thus afforded of obtaining admission into the Church of Christ. But was the same penalty intended to be denounced against those also who had received lay-baptism, among whom, as must have been known, the greater part of the youth of the kingdom were included? Thousands and tens of thousands most piously devoted to the Church had failed to receive baptism at the hands of those whom alone they regarded as lawful ministers, not with their own free consent, not through any offence or fault of theirs, but solely through the cruel necessity of the times. If, then, it had not been the persuasion of the Convocation that the baptism which they had received was valid though irregular, is it not to be presumed that measures would have been taken for the

\* Preface to the B. of C. Prayer.

lawful baptism of the multitudes who, during the continuance of the Great Rebellion had been excluded from it? But no such remedy was applied, or even proposed; whence we must infer that, in the judgment of the Church, the lapse which would have rendered such measures necessary had not occurred. If the expression "*unbaptized*," now introduced into the Rubrick had been meant to include all who had received lay-baptism only, the very members of the Convocation by whom that expression was admitted must have been continually called upon, in their ministerial capacity, to apply it in that sense by refusing to read the burial service over persons baptized by dissenting ministers, or by mere laymen: for numbers so circumstanced must have been brought every year for interment to the various churchyards throughout the kingdom. Yet I do not find it stated in any of the histories of the time that there existed among the clergy any general disposition to decline officiating according to the appointed form. As then the question was not raised on the part of the clergy generally, nor, so far as we have means of judging, even by any of those who had been parties to the alteration of the Rubrick, although perpetual occasions for calling it into their notice must have been occurring, and that for many years in succession, it must be considered as rather too late to attempt at this time to affix a so much stricter interpretation to the term in question.\* If, without being prepared positively to pronounce lay-baptism invalid, the Convocation had entertained even a strong *doubt* upon that subject, it is reasonable to think that they would have made provision at least for the conditional administration of the ordinance in such cases. But it is worthy of observation that the Church of England has no form applicable in such instances; for the use of the conditional form in her service is so guarded as to exclude the

\* Appendix (I.)

particular case of previous baptism by laics. The inquiries directed to be addressed to such as bring the child are these: "By whom was this child baptized?" "With what matter?" "With what words?" Here was certainly the fittest occasion for repudiating lay-baptism, if its sufficiency were questioned by the Church. Nothing more was needed than a direction that the conditional form should be employed in cases where from the answers it should appear that a lawful minister had not officiated. But the Rubrick, passing over that defect in case it should have been brought to light, proceeds to say only that "if they which bring the infant to be baptized do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with *Water*, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost (which are essential parts of baptism) then let the priest baptize it, using the conditional form of words." We cannot but regard this as an admission that the ministry of one in Holy Orders, however agreeable to the Church's appointment and expressed sense of right it may be, is nevertheless not among the things which are "essential parts of baptism." My duty, therefore, both authorizes and requires me to say that I should regard with disapprobation, as being contrary to the intention of the Church, the employment of the conditional form in any case where baptism had been already administered with that matter and with those words which are pronounced to be essential. Moreover, I should regard it as an infraction of the due and charitable order of the Church if the rite of burial, by her appointed, were withheld from those, as being "unbaptized," who have had baptism according to the proper form though not by persons holding the Orders of the Church.

I have dwelt at greater length and with more particularity upon this point because it is important in itself,

and is also one which for the peace and credit of the Church and for the satisfaction of consciences ought to be determined. And I lay the more stress upon it at this juncture because it is to be dreaded lest eagerness in carrying out our principles, or rather in maintaining consequences which are not legitimately to be deduced from them, should throw obstacles in the way of the general acknowledgment of a wholesome and catholic system. If it should once be imagined that the views which I am now enforcing with regard to the spiritual character derived from ordination cannot be supported without bringing those further consequences which have been glanced at, much will have been done to foil the endeavours of those who are seeking to vindicate our just claims to such a character upon the several grounds of Scripture reason and antiquity. The apprehension appears to be that by acknowledging the validity of an ordinance not administered by any one duly appointed to that charge, we virtually make a surrender of the very character we claim. But it has been shewn, I trust, that there is nothing impossible in the conveyance of spiritual benefits through a channel not expressly designated for that purpose, and that in such benefits being so conveyed there is nothing inconsistent with the certain knowledge, at the same time, that God has instituted a particular order expressly for that end. The authority of the New Testament, with the light shed upon it by the practice of the Church, satisfies me that the body of the clergy has been thus instituted, and that there can be no regular administration of holy offices by any other hands than theirs. But we mistake the nature of our calling and exaggerate its privileges, as often as, not content with being the stewards by whom the mysteries of the Gospel are orderly to be dispensed, we assume that God has closed up against Himself every other channel for the conveyance of spiritual gifts. It might be so if everything were comprehended in the out-

ward ministerial act. But we know that the invisible and secret operation of the Spirit is that in which the real efficacy of the Christian Sacraments resides; and God may reserve to Himself the power of dispensing this in such manner as to Him shall seem best. I may myself think very seriously of the responsibility incurred by those who undertake that holy administration without an orderly call and proper mission. God knows that I would not for the wealth of worlds incur that responsibility. But I cannot discover justifiable grounds for saying that God never will work by such agency. You may believe the agents culpable. But even this admitted would not prove the point, because God may express his displeasure against such proceedings in other ways than by denying grace to those who irregularly partake of his ordinances. So far as my own judgment serves, it leads me to conclude, not that ordinances so partaken of are ineffectual to individuals who are the recipients, but that the practice of administering them by unauthorized hands gradually leads to incurable schisms and disorders in all societies which permit its continuance; and that *this* is the punishment which sooner or later attends the disregard of the divinely instituted order and government of the Church. So that in fact a ministry derived by Apostolical succession, though not indispensable to the maintenance of the Church in *being*, is finally essential to its continuance in *well-being*; as there are things not positively necessary to life which are yet necessary to health. It may be objected that we ourselves acknowledge "the Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith;"\* and yet there was never any Church more careful to uphold regularity of succession in the ministry. We do acknowledge this; but then those points of faith wherein the Church of Rome hath erred, the Church of England has reformed;

\* Art., xix.

and this we regard as a manifest instance of God's interposition for the re-establishment of his Truth through means which He had himself provided to secure its perpetual preservation. When we thus witness an instance of any other than an episcopal Church, after sinking into so grievous a state of error, manifesting its possession of the inherent vital energy by which it is enabled to bring back all things to the original model, and also, as has been the case with our own Church, while it rejects whatever savours of innovation, yet holding fast all, whether of doctrine or discipline, which was included in the holy deposit delivered by the hands of the Apostles, then, but not otherwise, we shall acknowledge that our Apostolical order is not that precious and important object which we now verily think it is; and, under that persuasion, contend for it, as for one among the main bulwarks of the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

It has been my endeavour to express in clear terms the grounds of the conclusions which I have laid before you; because we live in an age when the prevailing disposition is to explore the foundations of things, and to enquire upon what footing received opinions rest. Long therefore as I have already detained you, I cannot terminate this Address without some notice of the call which is made upon us to vindicate once more the principles of our Reformation; a call with which we cannot satisfactorily comply unless our own views upon that subject are definite, the result of accurate enquiry and impartial meditation. It is not a narrow question, nor one which is easily mastered. Whatever may have been the case in other quarters, our first English Reformers never admitted a doubt that the Church into which they were baptized was a Christian Church, though much encumbered with error; and the ministry to which they were ordained a lawful ministry in point of derivation. The fruit

of that spirit of enquiry which was, as we think, providentially excited among them, was the discovery that many points which they had hitherto considered of divine authority and therefore of an unquestionable certainty, were in reality of human origin and invention. The question between them and the Church to whose tenets they opposed themselves was whether their departure from some of the opinions to which they had before subscribed, afforded just grounds for branding them with heresy, degrading them from their ministry, and expelling them the Church. To determine this it was necessary to fix what had been the faith delivered by the Apostles; for both sides were ready to admit this as the true object of enquiry, which being determined there could be no room for farther controversy. Both sides again were in agreement that the entire deposit of their faith was originally conveyed verbally, and must for a season at least have been traditionally preserved. On the Romanist part it is maintained that although a portion of the Apostolical preaching was eventually committed to writing, many fundamental articles continued unwritten. These however, it is believed, are no less secure in the keeping of the Church, and have been transmitted with no less fidelity and certainty than the written portion. Indeed it is not perfectly plain what actual usefulness there is, or can have been, in committing any part of the word of God to writing, because according to the approved hypothesis, no additional certainty, no greater plainness, no superiority of any kind, is attributable to the portion which is written beyond what is possessed by the other portion which remains, it is pretended, in the distinct keeping of the Church.

The first objection which strikes a mind ordinarily conversant with the rules and habits of evidence is that no reasonable proof, that is no proof founded upon an appeal to evidence, can be furnished of the actual parentage of those

unwritten portions of the word of God. The subject does not admit of proof of that kind. If it should be demanded, the only reply would be that the tradition has been from the beginning in custody of the Church; and the only voucher for this, as well as for the fidelity of the guardianship exercised by the Church, is the *character* of the Church: a character of divinely appointed infallibility. After all the ingenious answers which have been put forth to meet this difficulty, there remains, to say the least, something unsatisfactory in this mode of appealing first to the infallibility of the Church in proof of the fidelity of her guardianship and then to the record, of which the Church is thus the guardian, for proof of her infallibility.\* But not to dwell upon this, nor upon the uncertainty attending the question whether the Church of Rome *is* that infallible Church to whose charge such a trust was committed, strong reasons exist for doubting whether the possession of a divine constitution by a Church furnishes a full guarantee for its exhibiting at each particular period of its existence, a true and correct exhibition of the testimony which it originally received. In the example of the Jewish Church we find a flagrant instance to the contrary. In that case there is a Church unquestionably of divine institution, respecting the identity of which no question can be raised, (for there was no other in existence) and in which there was no difference of opinion as to where the authority commissioned to pronounce in the last resort was constituted (a point which is not so well agreed on in the Church of Rome). To the Jewish Church belonged promises both clear and ample of divine light and guidance, and even of perpetuity. And yet if we refer to the condition of belief in the existing Church in the age of our Saviour, and strive by means thereof to travel back to the uncorrupt principles of primitive Judaism, we shall be speedily convinced that no reliance can be securely placed upon mere Church

\* Appendix (K.)

authority as a guarantee of the fidelity with which a religious system will be handed down through many ages. In the cases both of the Jewish and of the Roman Church the same spirit of deference to tradition has impaired the soundness of their faith. The instance of the former plainly proves the possibility that innovations upon the original purity of a religious system may be silently introduced; and groundless opinions may upon the credit of tradition be adopted as articles of faith even with the sanction of the ruling authorities, and in a Church divinely instituted. Our Lord indeed is so far from supplying the defects of Scripture by the fulness of tradition that he, upon the great article of a future life, reproves the insufficiency of tradition by an appeal to Scripture. Our Reformers therefore, when first awakened to the incorrectness of the system with which they had been previously satisfied, came to the determination that no Article of Faith should be retained, or required of any man to be believed, without *evidence* that it had been accepted by the Church from the beginning. The mere voice of authority which says, such is the present persuasion of the Church, and the Church being infallible such *must* have been its belief from the beginning,—was no longer listened to with implicit deference. A distinction was drawn by them between the principles of the Church in that age and in the age of the Apostles: or rather that difference was too notorious to be disguised unless they would close their eyes against all light of evidence, and be content that every thing should be sheltered under the cloke of infallible authority. The rule which they decided upon following was to admit as Truth no more than it could be shewn had been held at all times, in all places, and by all persons acknowledged as members of the Catholic Church. In carrying back this enquiry to the fountain-head, that is to the belief and practice of the Church directed by the Apostles, it was found to be impracticable, as common sense shews it must be, to fix with cer-

tainty what that belief had been otherwise than by reference to the writings of the Apostles, or the Book of the New Testament. Authority, resting upon a supposed independent and indefectible possession of all Truth, might dispense with such a reference. A system which professed to seek all its support in an appeal to the decision of antiquity could not. The noblest object of contemplation which the history of the world affords, next to the example of the inspired Apostles, is the conduct of those remarkable men into whose hands by the will of God, the management of this great cause was committed. Their unequalled learning and comprehensive judgment, their independence of spirit, yet becoming deference for all well ascertained authority, nay their very faults, their caution sometimes degenerating into timidity, their occasional coarseness, the inconsistent recourse to persecution to the charge of which some of them, not yet released from the shade of error in which they were nurtured, are too justly liable,—all contributed in the appointed measure to forward the great work of our Reformation from Popery. But principally the blameless lives of all, and the painful deaths of most of the Reformers, have indeed lit up that candle which by God's grace shall never be put out. I think it even providential that the spirit of enquiry into their proceedings should have been again so largely awakened; because the more carefully such enquiries are prosecuted, the more durable (I speak it with full sincerity) will be our conviction of the solidity of the ground, hallowed by their footsteps, upon which we stand. The distinction between the system which they adhered to and that which they relinquished, or between the system of the Church of Rome and ours, *is the difference between an imperfect and a perfect testimony*. The system of the Roman Church fails in establishing by motives of sufficient credibility, first, that the promise of infallibility to the Church includes an assurance that the Truth shall be at all periods maintained entire by the directive body or visible heads of that Church; and, secondly, that the

promise itself is limited to that portion only of the Church which acknowledges the jurisdiction of the See of Rome. Again as to the fundamental supposition upon which the whole fabric rests, that the decree of the existing Church at any given time, concerning points of faith, conveys infallible assurance of correspondency with the divine prototype, this, it has been said, does not admit of confirmation by *evidence*, but it must necessarily be admitted, if it *be* admitted, upon the sole ground of *authority*. It is impossible it should be otherwise when the final confirmation of Scripture is not required; for Scripture is the only overt testimony which has come down to us of the actual doctrines held by the Apostles. Apply this test to any of the peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome, the adoration of the Virgin Mary, devotion to angels and saints, reverence for images and relics, prayers for the dead in purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, private masses and the like. It is well if Scripture be not pointedly against them (as against the greater number of these it most certainly is): but even on the most favorable supposition, after being traced in human writings up to some one or other point of time, in all cases very far short of the Apostolic age, all mention of those doctrines is lost. Neither is there any resumption of it in Scripture. All attempts to bridge this chasm by *evidence* must be for ever ineffectual. The only substitute is *authority*; or the assumption that the doctrine contended for having been at *one* time held by the Church must have been *always* held, for an infallible creed can never have varied. I speak therefore with every wish and disposition to represent things fairly and as they really are when I say that the controversy between our Church and that of Rome, is a contest between *perfect* and *imperfect* testimony. This controversy, it was publicly predicted, several years ago, was on the point of revival.\* Now therefore that this has come to pass, it will be our own faults, if, having

\* See the Bishop of Lincoln's *Eccles. Hist.*, illustrated from Tertullian. p. 297,—1826.

been thus warned, we be not duly prepared to meet the discussion, and to defend the citadel of our faith. In undertaking this service, let me admonish you my brethren, that whatever may be your devotedness, it will be right that we proceed with caution, and not without having made ourselves fully acquainted with the subject. This is to be recommended not only because an indiscreet or an unprepared advocate may injure a good cause, but also on account of the hazard of being disclaimed by some of those with whom we profess to be associated, if we should warmly, affectionately and fearlessly espouse the cause of the Church ; some of the principles of which have been herein referred to. Its supporters, that they may be prepared to meet the assault from such opposite quarters, must "approve themselves as the ministers of God ——— by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left."\* My exhortation to you however is, not to suffer yourselves to be driven to any concealment of your genuine Church principles, by any dread of being misrepresented as setters-forth of strange doctrines. I should regret unfeignedly that any of those by whom such principles are maintained should think of adding strength to their cause by disparaging reflections upon the Reformers or upon the Reformation itself. I should regret that any attempt were now made to unsettle any of the land-marks then established, by bringing back, or proposing to bring back, into the use of the Church any rites or practices which our Reformers advisedly resolved should be discontinued. There is nothing in their principles which prohibits us from placing their proceedings continually under review ; and having been led to do this by the events of recent years, I have myself been more than ever confirmed in my persuasion of the piety, knowledge, wisdom, and charity with which all their proceedings were carried on, and all their determinations formed. I should therefore

\* 2 Cor., vi., 4, 7.

I repeat, unfeignedly lament to find any disposition prevailing to derogate from them or from their works; especially from their incomparable Liturgy by which so spiritual, devout, and improving a character is impressed upon our public worship, and most eminently upon the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion.

At the same time duty requires me to express my opinion that there has been shewn on the other hand an unnecessary disposition and eagerness to attach the name of popery, or to impute a papistical tendency, to much which is of the sound and genuine substance of Church of England divinity. The arraignment of it as erroneous appears to have been eagerly caught up on account of its opposition to the system of quitting the Romish ground of infallible authority only to take the opposite extreme of maintaining an unqualified right of private judgment; a principle which the Church of England never recognized. I discover, however, no symptoms which should excite a reasonable dread of any contemplated departure from our governing principle, that nothing is to be required of any man to be believed as necessary to salvation except it be read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby. If there be any disposition (which I confess, though asserted, I do not discover) to revive among us usages and ceremonies confessedly ancient, but which the good sense of our Reformers saw fit upon sufficient grounds to abolish, that disposition can extend only to a very limited number, and needs only to be discouraged by superiors to be readily laid aside. Let me also express my most earnest hope that no attempts will be made to shew, as proofs of argumentative dexterity, how near we can shape our course to the shoals of Romanism without making shipwreck of our own belief. It is an unwise and dangerous employment, and may be destructive of those who practice it. But in fairness I ought to add, that

so far as relates to the doctrine of Justification, to the nature of the Holy Sacraments, and the effect of their due reception, to the qualifications of those by whom they may be lawfully administered, to the sanction derived, by an appeal to antiquity, upon the doctrinal Articles of our Church, or upon that interpretation of the word of God conformable with them which constitutes the deposit of faith put into our hands at the time of our ordination, upon these points, and upon the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, I know nothing and suspect nothing to have been written by any whose kindred with us we acknowledge, which is in any degree contrary to the holy principles which our Reformers taught, and in defence of which they died. Above all, then, let there be no suggestion of divisions or parties within the Church. I thankfully acknowledge our perfect exemption from them, and from any tendency to them, here; and my principal source of hope and rejoicing is in that spirit of unanimity and concert which so visibly prevails among us all. The best wish which I can form on behalf of our Church in general is, that while a suitable freedom of enquiry and independence of judgment, within the limit sanctioned by the Church, are maintained there may be no severing among our clergy, of the bond of external unity; as I am sure there is not any of agreement in the principles of their common faith. Indeed there appears to me never to have been a time when a stronger tendency to agreement upon all points of importance, or a more perfect identity of feeling and spirit in the views taken of the becoming discharge of their duties, prevailed among the clergy, than at the present moment. Divisive names, and feelings of prejudice and alienation had been wonderfully laid aside in comparison with former periods within our own remembrance, and earnestly do I pray that there may be no disposition or endeavour to revive them now. At all times improper and dangerous, such feelings would be so in a

tenfold degree at this time present when the united services of all in the sacred ministry of the Church are not more than sufficient to "feed the flock of God which is amongst us." To secure the common salvation, there must be the most perfect unity of counsels among the Bishops themselves ; and the best understanding between them and their clergy. And among the clergy in general let there prevail, I beseech you, a spirit of unanimity, not only upon points of doctrine, but also in their combined discharge of those duties whereof an allotted portion is given to each, with an accompanying precept that "as they are zealous of spiritual gifts, they seek to excel for the edifying of the Church."

---

ERRATA.

- p. 5. l. 27. *for*, endeavor *r.* endeavour.  
8. l. 32. *for*, destitution *r.* destitution.  
26. l. 27. *for*, attributaple *r.* attributable.

## APPENDIX.

( A. )

The following is a brief statement of ecclesiastical edifices in New South Wales before and subsequently to the erection of the Bishoprick in 1836.

Before 1836 there were in the Colony :—

### CHURCHES.

St. Philip, Sydney..... and Parsonage house.  
St. James's, Sydney..... and Parsonage house.  
St. John, Paramatta..... and Parsonage house.  
St. Luke, Liverpool.....  
St. Peter, Campbell Town..  
St. Matthew, Windsor..... and Parsonage house.  
St. Ann, Hunter's Hill.....  
St. Thomas, Port Macquarie  
Christ Church, Newcastle.. and Parsonage house.  
Eight chapels or school-houses used as such.

Since 1836 have been added :—

### CHURCHES CONSECRATED.

St. Thomas ..... Mulgoa.  
St. Mary Magdalene..... South Creek.  
St. Stephen ..... Penrith.  
Holy Trinity..... Kelso.  
St. Peter ..... Richmond.  
St. John the Baptist..... Mudgee.  
St. Bartholomew..... Prospect.  
St. Peter ..... Newtown.  
St. James, the Apostle..... Morpeth.

## CHURCHES OPENED BY LICENSE.

St. Peter .....	East Maitland.
St. Saviour .....	Goulburn.
St. Mark .....	Appin.
St. Simon.....	Castle Hill.

## CHURCHES IN PROGRESS.

St. Andrew .....	Sydney.
Christ Church (parish of St. Lawrence).....	} Sydney.
Holy Trinity (parish of St. Philip).....	
St. John the Baptist.....	Ashfield.
St. Mary the Virgin.....	West Maitland.
St. Luke .....	Scone.
St. Clement .....	Fal-Brook.
St. Paul.....	Paterson.
St. Paul.....	Cobbity.
St. John the Evangelist....	Camden.
Christ Church .....	Bungonia.
St. Mary Magdalene.....	Lower Hawkesbury.
St. Michael the Archangel..	Wollongong.
St. James the Less.....	Melbourne.
St. _____ .....	Limestone Plains.

## PARSONAGES.

<i>Complete.</i>	<i>In Progress.</i>
Mulgoa.	Penrith.
Mudgee.	Morpeth.
Newtown.	Raymond Terrace.
Goulburn.	Brisbane Water.
St. Lawrence.	Yass.
West Maitland.	Liverpool.
Scone.	Campbell Town.
Paterson.	Sutton Forest.
Bungonia.	
Lower Hawkesbury.	
Hexham.	
Hunter's Hill.	

( B. )

The Scripture, as all admit, contains no *express authority* for any to baptize, except such as were regularly constituted to the office of the ministry. There was no difference of opinion upon this point in the early Church; there is none at present among ourselves. But the question then remained, as it does still, what is to be determined or done when unauthorized persons intermeddle with the duties of the clergy; adhering, in the case of baptism, to the appointed form, and being defective only in a regular call to the sacred office? After all the discussion which this question has undergone, certain facts remain incontestable; proving that the Church did by its general voice admit the validity of baptisms administered by persons who had either forfeited the sacerdotal character, or had never possessed it.

There were, as has been said, always some who would willingly have introduced a different determination, and practise. In the African branch of the Church this appears to have been one of the earliest subjects of controversy: for Cyprian (A. D. 250) says expressly that it was not then a new persuasion in his Church that those who came over from heresy were to be baptised; any former reputed baptism which they might have received being regarded as null and void. That rule he represents to have been established ever since the time of Agrippinus by a numerous Synod of Bishops. Basnage very reasonably infers from the expression which he employs (*multi jum anni sunt et longa ætas—Epist. 73*) that the age of Agrippinus cannot be placed later than the close of the second century; sixty or seventy years before the episcopate of Cyprian.

From this latter era the controversy assumed more importance; and the merits of the question itself as well as the sentiments of the ancients on either side, have been not sparingly discussed by the learned of later ages. Two conclusions appear to be established by their enquiries and labours.

*First*, that in cases of *necessity*, baptism might be ministered within the Church by laymen holding the Catholic faith; and that lay-baptism in *such* cases was sufficient and not to be repeated.

*Secondly*, that if baptism were administered by persons in a state of heresy, who had either been duly ordained in the Church, or, if not so ordained, yet assumed to be in Holy Orders, such baptism might be accepted as valid, provided that the form of administering, ordained by Christ, had been adhered to.

1. As to lay-baptism in cases of necessity, Tertullian (A. D. 200) says "It remains to wind up this brief treatise with a rehearsal of the rules of conferring and receiving baptism. The chief priest, that is the Bishop, holds authority to baptise; and derivatively the Priests and Deacons; but not without the sanction of the Bishop, on account of the subordination of the

Church, which being maintained peace is secure.\* But for this, laymen would have a right (to baptise): for what is received in common might be given without distinction, but that Bishops, Priests, or Deacons are already called (to this office). They (that is the laity) will reply, As the word of God ought not to be hid by any, so baptism, which is equally the ordinance of God, may be administered by all. † But how much more becoming on the part of the laity is a strict observance of deference and modesty, seeing that even upon those who are over them it is incumbent not to assume the functions of episcopacy which are appropriated to the Bishop! Rivalry is the parent of schisms. All things are lawful to me, said the very holy Apostle, yet all things are not expedient. Let it suffice accordingly that the laity exercise their right *in cases of necessity*, as the circumstances of place, time, or person may require. For when the state of one in imminent danger presses, then another's decision and firmness in coming to his aid is commendable; for, in truth, that other would be guilty of the destruction of a fellow-creature if he should omit to afford that which he is at liberty to apply," (*De baptismo*: c. xvii). Mr. Dodwell and Dr. Waterland have spoken of this as no more than Tertullian's own private opinion; and the latter says that the reason upon which he founds it is a weak one (*First Letter on Lay-baptism*. Works. Vol X. p 6. ed: *Oxford*). But however this may be, Jerome and Augustin concur, both in the opinion and in the reason. "Authority to baptise" the former says "is often granted to laymen (*provided that a necessity exists*): for, as every one receives, so every one may give," (*Dial: adv: Luciferian*: Opp: Vol 2. p 96). Augustin says "If any man be *constrained by necessity* to administer baptism to one at the point of death, which from having himself received, he has learned the obligation of conferring upon others, I am not sure whether any can, with a safe conscience, insist upon its repetition. For should it be done without the plea of necessity it amounts to a usurpation of another's office: but if there be a pressing necessity, it is

\* Interpreters have not very clearly expressed the sense of the original by rendering "honorem ecclesiæ," *the honor of the Church*. Mr. Kelsall paraphrases the words thus: "for order's sake and decency in the Church of God, which is necessary for the preservation of peace:" which seems to convey the accurate meaning. There is a corresponding passage in the *Treatise De præscript: adv: hæreticos*: where Tertullian describing the order which prevails in the Church says "ibi—promotio emerita, et subjectio religiosa, et apparatus devota, et processio modesta, et Ecclesia unita."

† The original here is not intelligible. Dr. Waterland "throws in two or three words in the translation to clear the sense;" but it may perhaps be more simply done, by reading "Dicent, Ut Domini sermo &c.," instead of "dicentes ut &c.:" the construction being similar to that in Lucretius—

Ut sunt dissimiles extrinsecus, et generatim  
Extima membrorum circumcæsuræ coercet,  
Proinde et seminibus distant. iv—650.

either no offence or a venial one. But even though it be usurped without necessity, and baptism be given by any man whatever to whomsoever it may, (*a quolibet cui libet*) still that which has been given, cannot be described as *not* given, but may be rightly spoken of as given contrary to rule." (*Contra Epist : Parmeniani*. cap. xiii. § 29). Augustin may be thought by some to have gone very far in admitting that the intrusion of laymen to solemnize baptism in cases of urgent necessity amounted to a venial sin, or to none at all. But he proceeds much beyond this when he says that baptism administered by whomsoever to whomsoever, though irregular was not void. It would therefore be valid if given by a layman to a person not in danger of dying. He puts the validity of baptism upon a totally different footing when in another place he asks, "But who can be ignorant that there is no Christian baptism, if the evangelical words be wanting, which are 'the sign and seal.' (*symbolum*, see Art. 27). But it is more easy to meet with heretics who entirely omit baptism than such as baptise with any other words than those. And we on this account maintain that not every mode of baptism (for men are said to be baptised according to many sacrilegious and idolatrous rites) but the baptism of Christ, that is the baptism consecrated by the evangelical words, is every where the same, and cannot be despoiled of its sufficiency (*violari*) by the utmost perverseness of any men whatsoever." (*De Baptis : c. Donat : L. VI. c. 25.*) Thus he appears not obscurely to express his sense of the disparity which there was, in point of essentiality, between the form of the Sacrament and the administrator.

2. If the Church, excepting in cases of urgent necessity, never admitted any baptisms to be valid except such as were solemnised by persons in holy orders, it will follow that she acknowledged and avouched the true sacerdotal character of all those whose baptisms she recognised and forebore to repeat. But it will then be difficult to shew that there was any true succession in the ministry, or any true Church. In those schismatics who had been baptised and ordained in the Church, a remaining sacerdotal character might be recognised even after their desertion of the orthodox faith. But this would not remove the difficulty; because the greater number of those who assumed the titles of bishops and priests among the heretics did not even profess to have derived them from any warrantable source. Paul of Samosata (A.D. 269) was the first bishop who departed into heresy; and yet the baptisms of his sect were annulled by the Council of Nice, while other sects which sprang from no bishop and had therefore no continuation of orders among them, had their ministrations confirmed. Jerome in his Dialogue against the Luciferians urges against Hilary that after his death the sect must expire with him; because he, as a deacon, could ordain none to succeed, and without a priest no Church could exist. How is it also, he asks, that you are so shocked at the admission of Arian baptisms by the Church, when you yourself were not only baptised but held the office of a deacon in that same Church, which

yet has constantly admitted such as were baptised by Manicheans and Ebionites, by Praxeas, Cerinthus and Novatus? This, he says is an argument in reply to which his opponent had not a word to offer (*adversum quod ne mutire quidem audeat Hilarius*). If Jerome be correct in saying that the Church had constantly recognised as valid, baptisms administered by sects which separated themselves even in the age of the Apostles, it is plain that such admission must have been anterior to the earliest account which we have of the denial of their validity in the age of Agrippinus. Can it be supposed that the Church on that account acknowledged that the orders among the Manicheans, Ebionites and Cerinthians were valid? That is not probable. Besides, the Samosatenians had regular orders; and yet their baptisms were adjudged to be null. St. Augustin declares his persuasion that the reason of this was their having abandoned the ordinance of baptism "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" which form, he adds, the heretics in general took with them when they abandoned the Church, and continued to observe in their state of separation.\*

It is therefore plain that the Church was accustomed to admit the validity of baptisms administered by those, whose title to Holy Orders, consistently with her own rules, she did not and could not recognise. From an early date however there are traces of a more rigid system insinuating itself, and by degrees attaining maturity. That system did not limit itself to maintaining that Christ had appointed a ministry in the Church to be the *proper* and *authorised* dispenser of his word and mysteries; and that an intrusive administration, however it might convey the spiritual blessings of the sacraments to individuals who devoutly received them, would be found ultimately subversive of unity and peace in every congregation which admitted it. The persuasion was continually more and more encouraged that sacramental grace could not possibly be conveyed through any other channel than that of the apostolical ministry: and that principle, unknown to Scripture, and the mere embryo and rudiments of which are discoverable in the writings of the second and third centuries, had made great advances in the age of Chrysostom. "If none" he says "can enter into the kingdom of heaven except he be born of water and of the Holy Ghost, and every one that eateth not the flesh of the Lord and drinketh not his blood is cast out from everlasting life, and if all these can be administered by none else but only by those holy hands—the priests, I mean—how can any one without them escape the fire of hell, or be made partaker of the crowns that are laid up for us in heaven?" (*On the Priesthood: Discourse 3. Bunce's Translation, p. 113*). It is much to be regretted that so objectionable a sentiment should be found quoted, appa-

\* *Liber de Hæres: c. 44.* Athanasius however expresses a somewhat different opinion; maintaining that lawful or valid baptism could be given by those only who held the Catholic faith whole and undefiled, as well as observed the appointed form of words. *Oratio III. contra Arianos. p. 413. Vol. I. Edit: Colon: 1686.*

rently with approbation, by Bishop Beveridge (on Art. xxii); for it never was so acknowledged by the Church of England since the Reformation. Dr. Waterland, it is true, speaks somewhat contemptuously of those who regard her as recognising any validity in baptism except from the hands of a lawful minister. "We need not talk" he says "of the Whitgifts, the Hookers, the Bilsons, the Bancrofts or others. The Church's public acts are open and common, and he is the truest Church-of-England-man that best understands the principles there laid down, and argues the closest from them. All the rest are but assertions, fancies, or practises of particular men and are not binding rules to us." (*Reply to Mr. Kelsall's Answer*. Works, Vol. X. p. 186. Ed. Oxford). All true churchmen will without hesitation consent to be bound by the ascertained sense of the public acts of the Church; which may be thought by some to speak clearly enough. But when this is the very point in debate, to whom can an appeal be more becomingly made than to those early witnesses (such as Whitgift and Hooker) trained in opportunities and habits of personal intercourse with the Reformers? Hooker's decision is too well known to require insertion here. The opinions of three successive Archbishops, Whitgift, Bancroft, and Abbott will be found in Bingham, (*Scholastical Hist: of Lay-baptism*. Works, Vol. 2, p. 567), all in favour of the validity of lay-baptism.

To go back however to an earlier date;—it is impossible not to be moved to suspect double-dealing in some points connected with this branch of ecclesiastical history. On the one side Mr. Bingham shews "that hereticks and schismatics, and degraded and excommunicated clerks, when once convicted and legally censured, are no longer authorised to minister baptism, or to officiate as true priests and ministers of the Church; but are reduced to the state of laymen, or even to a lower degree; and that some whose administration of baptism was received, never had originally any true or real ordination to the ministerial office, and consequently were no other than unauthorised persons." Neither is there any portion of his laborious writings in which he has shewn more extended powers of research, or has more completely established the conclusion contended for. On the other hand his opponent, the author of "Lay-baptism invalid," asserts that "according to the discipline of the ancient Church, heretics and schismatics, even when they were cut off, and cast out of the Church, were still allowed to be true and lawful priests, with full power, authority, and right to baptise; and that, upon this principle only the Church allowed of the validity of baptisms conferred by them—because they were then priests by commission and not mere laymen." Dr. Waterland also maintains that "the main point which St. Augustine in his controversy with the Donatists undertakes to prove, and in which he prevails and triumphs over his adversaries at every turn, is that heresy and schism did not null or vacate orders—which once validly given are always valid; therefore can never be deleted by any heresy, schism, or apostacy; therefore schismatical

clergymen still retain their sacerdotal character; therefore their ministrations, and particularly baptism, are still valid." (*Second Letter in Reply to Mr. Kelsall*, Vol. X. p. 119-20). So far as relates to the case of a sacerdotal character once validly given it is certain that very forcible proofs are urged in support of each of these opposite opinions. But both Mr. Bingham's opponents have omitted the case of baptisms conferred by such as never had originally any true or valid ordination to the ministry, and upon this point he clearly has the sense of the Church with him. No doubt there were within the Church many who felt unwilling to admit that baptism could be administered by any except a person in Holy Orders: fearing apparently lest such an acknowledgment might detract from the sanctity and influence of the clerical character. Hence, it may be presumed, arose the anxiety to maintain the persuasion that even heretical priests could not cease to be priests, and to find some decent pretext for attributing the sacerdotal character to those who, without having ever possessed it, were found administering baptism. The becoming course would have been to say, These are in reality laymen, disturbing the unity of the Church, and meriting its censures for intruding into another's office; yet their baptisms are valid, as being administered agreeably to the form ordained by Christ. It was felt to be impossible to set aside such baptisms; because the practise of the Church required that they should be acknowledged. The expedient resorted to was therefore to endeavour to hide, so far as was possible, the defect in the clerical character of the administrators. This certainly could not be done without some sacrifice of consistency; but it seems to have been thought better that so it should be, than to admit even an apparent infraction of the Canon (expressed by Chrysostom) that none except through those ordinances which depended for their efficacy upon their reception from the hands of the priest "could escape the fire of hell, or be made partakers of the crowns laid up in heaven."

With reference to the question which has renewed this debate at the present time, namely the denial of the rites of burial to the "unbaptized," I must remark that Ambrose in his oration on the death of Valentinian (who died before baptism, but not without an expression of his desire to receive it) recognises that desire as entitling the young emperor to the privileges of an actual baptism; and he accordingly does not scruple to inter him in his own Cathedral of Milan with all the rites due to the faithful dead. Upon the whole we may be led to think that when those rites are required from us on behalf of any who have been baptised "with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; which things are essential to baptism," that feeling which Hooker terms "remorse of equity," should incline us to give them, as Ambrose did, the benefit of that disposition, trusting that they desired and designed to be partakers of the true baptism of the Church. Whatever we may appear to lose hereby in point of exact discipline, it is to be hoped we shall more than recover in an augmented unity of the spirit; and

in cases of doubt it is assuredly\* better to err on the side of abundant charity than on that of an over-rigorous construction.

## ( C. )

In hoc sacramento baptismatis celebrando, tres esse species constat, quas et vos nec augere nec minuire nec prætermittere poteritis. Prima species est in Trinitate; secunda in credente; tertia in operante; sed non pari libramine ponderandæ sunt singulæ: duas enim video necessarias, et unam *quasi* necessariam. Principalem locum Trinitas possidet, sine quâ res ipsa non potest geri: hanc sequitur fides credentis: jam persona operantis vicina est, quæ simili auctoritate esse non potest. Cum ergo videatis omnes qui baptizant, operarios esse non dominos, et Sacramenta per se esse sancta non per homines, quid est quòd vobis tantum vindicatis? quid est quòd Deum a muneribus suis excludere contenditis? Concedite Deo præstare quæ sua sunt. Non enim potest id munus ab homine dari quod divinum est. Optat: Milevit: *De Schism: Donatist: Lib. V. c. 4.*

## ( D. )

In quo baptizarentur gentes a Salvatore mandatum est: per quem baptizarentur nullâ exceptione discretum est. Non dixit Apostolis *Vos facite*, alii *non faciant*. Quisquis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, Apostolorum opus implevit. Denique lectum est in Evangelio, Joanne dicente, *Magister, vidimus quemdam in nomine tuo expellentem dæmonia, et prohibuimus eum, quia non sequitur nobiscum*, sic Christus ait; *Nolite prohibere: qui enim non est contra vos pro vobis est*. Nam et ipsis sic mandatum est ut opus esset illorum Sanctificatio Trinitatis; nec in nomine suo tingerent, sed in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Ergo nomen est quod significat, non operarius. Intelligite vos, vel serò, operarios esse non dominos.—Id: Lib. V. c. 7.

## ( E. )

If therefore at any time it come to pass that in teaching publicly, or privately in delivering this Blessed Sacrament of Regeneration, some unsanctified hand contrary to Christ's supposed ordinance do intrude itself, to execute that whereunto the laws of God and his Church have deputed others, which of these two opinions seemeth more agreeable with equity, ours that disallow what is done amiss yet make not the force of the word and sacraments, much less their very nature, and very substance, to depend on the minister's authority and calling, or else their's which defeat, disannul, and annihilate both, in respect of that one personal defect? (of the minister's authority and

calling :)\* there being not any law of God which saith that if the minister be incompetent his word shall be no word, his baptism no baptism. He which teacheth and is not sent, loseth the reward, but yet retaineth the name of a teacher; his usurped actions have in them the same nature which they have in others, although they yield *him* not the same comfort. And if these two cases be peers, the case of doctrine and the case of baptism both alike, sith no defect in their vocation that teach the truth is able to take away the benefit thereof from him which heareth, wherefore should the want of a lawful calling in them that baptise make baptism to me vain?—Hooker *Ec: Pol: B. V. c. 62. § 13.*

( F. )

Basil in his 1st Ep: to Amphilochius (Canon 1) imputes this to even the Great Dionysius, in recognising the baptism of the Pepuzenians, (a sect of Montanists,) "which oversight," he says "I am much surprised that he, being in general so strict an observer of the Canons, should have fallen into." But, he afterwards says, "though this escaped the observation even of the Great Dionysius, we must not defend the imitation of him in that error." (See Hooker *E. P. V. 62. § 6.*) The above section of St. Basil which gave rise to much observation during the controversy in the last century concerning the validity of lay-baptism, appears to confirm the view which has been taken of the practise of the primitive Church in determining what baptisms were admissible. The ancients, he says, considered all baptisms receivable which did not in any respect "deviate from the faith;" and what is meant by that expression he afterwards explains, by saying that the baptism of the Pepuzenians was null because "they are manifestly heretics. They blaspheme the Holy Ghost; wickedly and shamefully bestowing the appellation of the Comforter upon Montanus and Priscilla—what pretence then can their baptism have to be esteemed valid when it is administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of Montanus and Priscilla? for they are not baptised who are not baptised according to the form delivered to us." To depart from that form was therefore in his estimation, the same thing as to deviate from the faith. Basil speaks of three classes of separation: heresies, schisms, and conventicles. The heretics are they who are completely separated, being alienated from the faith itself: schismatics are such as dissent on account of any ecclesiastical cause, or upon sanable points; (*ἱασίμα*) conventiclars are the members of congregations assembled by contumacious

\* Referring to the opinion openly expressed by Thomas Cartwright, the puritan, and embraced in general by those who held the puritan views, that no man could *preach* unless regularly ordained, "no not although he speak the words of Scripture and interpret them," neither *baptise* "although he pour water and rehearse the words which are to be rehearsed in the ministry of baptism."

priests or bishops, and by uninstructed people. From the very beginning therefore it had seemed good to reject heretics altogether; such as the Manicheans, the Valentiniens, and the Montanists. Cyprian and Firmilian with their followers, he adds, were for including under one sentence of condemnation all the Cathari, Encratites, Hydroparasts, and Apotactites, upon the plea that schism is the forerunner of separation.\* "They who have disjoined themselves from the Church, have no longer among them the grace of the Holy Spirit; for the imparting of it has failed through the succession being cut off. For they who first seceded had ordination derived from the fathers, and through the laying on of hands possessed spiritual grace. But they who have since been disunited have become laymen, having no commission either to baptise or ordain.—Wherefore they (Cyprian and Firmilian) gave direction that such as had been baptised by them should be regarded as baptised by laymen, and be brought to the Church to be cleansed by the true baptism of the Church." This was no doubt the system of Cyprian, but he was opposed in it by the Church, and his practice set aside. It might indeed be admitted that schism was introductory to heresy; but the Christian charity of God's Church did not permit it to treat schismatics as heretics until they had shewn that they were so, not only by acts of irregularity, but by an actual departure from the faith and ordinances of the Gospel. Basil mentions one fact which undesignedly affords convincing proof that the Church did not repeat baptism when it had been once ministered according to the ordinance of Christ. "It behoves us," he says "to be aware of the craft of the Encratitæ; namely, that with a view to disqualify themselves for reception by the Church, they have essayed for some time past to be beforehand by the administration of baptism among themselves; although they thereby have stamped forgery upon their own custom." He means that, finding the custom of the Church to be that all who came over to it should be baptised afresh if they had been previously baptised according to any other than the regular form, these Pepuzeanians craftily abandoned their own rite, and resorted to the true ordinance of Christ, as a sure means of preventing a repetition of it by the Church; although, as he says, they thus made a plain admission that the form which they had used was a mere forgery. "But," he adds "so long as they do but

\* Mr. Sikes observes, "A certain writer of the last century, not famed for orthodox divinity, has nevertheless happened upon a clear and correct definition of Church Unity. 'This Unity,' he says 'may be considered in two respects. First *Essential*; that is such an union as is necessary to the Church's *being*. All schism in this respect is a separation *from the body*. Secondly *Integral*; that is such an unity as is necessary to the Church's *well-being*; and all schism in this respect is separation *in the body*. A breach of integral Unity is the worst sort of criminal schism in the Christian Church. This was that with which St. Paul charged the Corinthians (1. Cor. I. 10-12).—It has a fatal tendency to the dissolution of the body of Christ, according to our Lord's own observation (Matth. xii, 25) Every kingdom and house divided against itself falleth.'" *Diss. on Parochl. Communion*. Chap. 11. p. 88.

maintain our form of baptism, let us not lay it to heart. Not that any thanks are on our part due to them on that account; but what we are bound to attend to is the strict observance of the Canon." Basil, who shews very evidently his own inclination towards the system of Cyprian, even while he admits that it cannot be maintained, endeavours to make it appear that the reason why the Church recognised the baptisms of the Encratitæ was because it had admitted two bishops of that party (Zoin and Saturninus) to retain their rank. But it is plain that this was an act of pure indulgence; that the Encratites had no valid orders among them; and that the real ground of their being admitted was their having abandoned their former heretical peculiarities and reverted to the Apostilical form of administration "with water, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—which things," the Church of that age held, as the Church of England does now, "are essential to baptism."

( G. )

An account of many of these is given by Wall, *Histry : of Infant-Baptism*. Part II. Cn : 5.—Vol. 2. p. 135. ed. Oxford, 1835.

( H. )

"To conclude: it is now called in question whether the children of papists and excommunicate persons (notwithstanding their parents be christians and cannot *amittere baptismum*, lose their baptism, as it is determined by St. Augustine against the Donatists) ought to be baptised. And whether the minister be of the *essence* and being of baptism: and none to be counted ministers but such as be preachers: so that whosoever hath not been baptised of a minister also a preacher is not baptised. The which question, and others such like, sprung out of the schools of the Anabaptists; and tend to the rebaptization of all, or the most part of, those that at this day are living. With these and such like questions, partly impious and partly vain and frivolous, is the Church of Christ at this day marvellously troubled; and men so occupy themselves about them that they neglect those things that pertain to their own salvation, and forget due obedience." Archb: Whitgift—*Sermon before Q. Elizabeth*, March 26, 1574.

From its being said, only twelve years after the 39 Articles were agreed upon, "it is *now* called in question whether the minister be of the *essence* of baptism," and from the strong censure thus pronounced upon such as disputed the validity of irregular baptisms, it appears necessarily to follow that such questions had not been raised nor such opinions adopted, among those by whom the Articles were framed. At the Hampton Court Conference the Bishops appear, by the modification of the rubric then agreed upon, to have

expressed more plainly their view of the propriety that a lawful minister should officiate; yet it cannot, after what is stated above, (Appx. B.) be assumed that the Bishops of that day considered all as "unbaptised" who had been baptised by laymen.

## ( I. )

"It remains that the gentlemen who espouse the opposite side of the question produce (if they be able) at least one Divine of the Church of England, of equal standing with those whom I have here quoted, giving it as his opinion that our Church, by altering her Rubrick, or by any other act of her's hath declared lay-baptism to be invalid. I think it cannot fairly be denied that she once declared the contrary since the Reformation. If then it cannot be made appear that she ever retracted that declaration, we must look upon it as still in force; that is, that it is yet the declared sense of the Church of England that a lay-administration of baptism, howsoever *criminal* and *irregular*, is not "altogether *null* and *invalid*." "To speak the truth, her constant and present practise is a sufficient declaration of this. In the time of the great rebellion, the sacrilegious invaders of our offices were men that had no ordination: (for we are all agreed that *anti-episcopal* ordination is *none*;) by these men were *very great numbers* of children baptised, who were born in those miserable days: which children nevertheless, after the restoration of religion and loyalty, were admitted by our holy Church to confirmation, communion, and all the privileges of Church-members, many of them doubtless to holy orders too, without being rebaptised. This all the world knows. And whosoever will dispute it ought to produce some act of her's decreeing their rebaptization; ought to produce *some* instances (I shall be thankful, as I said before, to any that will shew me so much as one) of persons rebaptised by her authority, or with the approbation and consent of at least some one of her bishops (as the Rubrick directs) upon that account." (The Reverend E. Kelsall's *Answer to Dr. Waterland's First Letter on Lay-Baptism*.) It is very observable that in his Second Letter Dr. Waterland makes no reply whatever to the above observation of Mr. Kelsall. Dr. Gauden (afterwards Bishop of Worcester) in his *Ecclesie Anglicanae Suspiria*, written and published during the usurpation, thus describes the state of religion during that unauthorised invasion of the office of the clergy. "The late licentious variations, innovations, corruptions, and interruptions, even in this *grand point of the Evangelical office and Ministry in England*, have, partly by the common people's arrogance, giddiness, madness, and ingratitude, and not a little by some preacher's own levity, fondness, flattery, and meanness of spirit, not only much abated and abased to a very *low ebbe* that *double honour* which is due; but they have poured forth *deluges* of scorn, contempt, division, confusion, poverty, and almost *nullity*, not only upon the persons of many worthy *ministers*, but upon

the very order and office, the function and profession; whose sacred power and authority, the pride, petulancy, envy, revenge, cruelty, and covetousness of some people have sought not only to arrogate and *usurp* as they list, but totally to innovate enervate and at last *extirpate*. What wise and honest-hearted Christian (that hath any care of posterity or prospect for the future) doth not daily find as an *holy impatience*, so an infinite despondency rising in his soul while he sees so many *weak shoulders*, such unwashen hands, such unprepared feet, such rash heads and such divided hearts, not only *disown*, cast off, contemn and abhor all *ministry* and *ministers* in the *Church of England*, but they are publicly intruding themselves upon all holy duties, all sacred offices, all solemn mysteries, all divine ministrations after what fashion they list, both in admission and execution. All our *catechisings*, preachings, prayings, baptisings, consecrations, instructing of babes, confirming of the weak, resolvings of the dubious, terrifying and binding over to judgment of unbelieving and impenitent sinners, censuring and admonishing of the scandalous, excommunicating the contumacious, loosing the penitent, comforting the afflicted, binding up the broken hearted, all the exercise and operations of *spiritual power*, yea *ordination* and *holy orders*, gifts and graces, ability and authority, either from God or this Church, all these are either baffled and *disparaged*, or invaded and usurped by some *rude Novellers* with equal insolency and insufficiency, being for the most part by so much the more impudent, by how much they are grossly ignorant." (p. 160-1-2.)

Dr. Gauden who thus expresses his keen sense of the profanation arising from the intrusion of unwashen hands and unprepared feet into all holy duties both of execution and admission, or of baptising and ordaining in particular, was, it is well known, an active member of the Savoy Conference; and sat, as Bishop of Exeter, in Convocation of the following year. Yet there is no trace in the records of the time, or in his own writings, of his ever expressing any persuasion that the baptisms administered by those unwashen hands were null, or that the receivers of them should, as "unbaptised," be denied the rites of burial. The distinction between irregular baptisms and irregular ordinations (both of which Dr. Gauden reprobates) is strongly marked by the proceedings of the Church at that time. We find no proof that the former were pronounced invalid by the same Convocation. On the other hand that same Convocation did, by recommending and supporting the Act of Uniformity (xiv. Cor: 2) declare its sentiments against the validity of irregular ordinations. It is impossible not to ask, why should not irregular or lay-baptism have been pronounced void by some similar public act if the opinion had been held that it really was so? Another point worthy of consideration is that the same Convocation of 1661-2 which prohibited the use of the burial-service over the "unbaptised," drew up also the Form of Prayer for the 30th of January. Assume that among the "unbaptised" they designed to include all who were not baptised by a minister episcopally ordained; and we

shall be forced to make an acknowledgment, painful and offensive to every loyal heart; that while they instituted one service with a design that "the memory of their martyred Sovereign might be ever blessed among us," they would, at the same moment, unite with his murderers in depriving him of the rites of Christian burial: for it must not be forgotten, as Bingham remarks, "that the Royal Martyr was baptised by a Scotch presbyter only." *Scholast: Hist: of Lay-Baptism*. Part 2, page 594. Some sensible and useful observations upon this subject will be found in the *Visitation Charge* of Archdeacon Sharp.—Anno. 1733. p. 16-39. ed. Oxford, 1834.

## ( K. )

The continued existence of a Church from the days of Christ to the present is a matter of fact and notoriety which requires no argumentative proof; or rather admits of none which can render it more certain and evident than it is. It may therefore be admitted as a principle. And if the Roman Catholics and ourselves formed the same conception of the Church, there would be little or no controversy between us. Chillingworth, accurately conveying the sense of the Church of England upon this point, says to his opponent, "It is superfluous for you to prove out of St. Athanasius and St. Augustine, that we must receive the sacred canon upon the credit of God's Church; understanding by *church*, as here you explain yourself, the credit of tradition. And that,—not the tradition of the present church, which we pretend may deviate from the ancient,—but such a tradition which involves an evidence of fact, and from hand to hand, from age to age, bringing us up to the times and persons of the apostles, and our Saviour himself, cometh to be confirmed by all these miracles and other arguments whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true." *Relig. of Protestants*. Ansr. ii. § 53, vol. 1, p. 238) But the fallacy on the opposite side is, as he observes, that they transfer what is true of "the Church in one sense," to "the Church taken in another sense;" or they acknowledge that alone to be the Church, which has the note or characteristic of being in connexion with, or rather in subjection to, the particular See of Rome. The inextricable difficulty experienced by the advocates of that system consists in shewing that this condition or limitation has been legitimately annexed to the definition of the Church; and hitherto at least their endeavours to furnish proof of this have been unsuccessful. Roman Catholics themselves are aware both of the difficulty and of their own inability to solve it. In the Roman "Catholic Magazine," for March, 1834 (vol. v., No. 38) is a very remarkable letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Fletcher, by the late Mr. Charles Butler, author of "The Book of the Roman Catholic Church," and other well-known works of controversy. In this letter, Mr. Butler gives an account of his having lent Dr. Milner's "End of Religious Controversy" to a lady of great in-

tellectual powers and of highly-cultivated understanding—telling her, what he really thought, “that it would probably conduct her to the Catholic faith.” But the lady returned the book with the objection, that “to prove the preliminary proposition—the existence of the authority of the Church—a Roman Catholic must have recourse to the same mode of proof as the Protestant uses to prove the truth of his religion”—that is, she says, “you must prove the authority of the Church from Scripture, from general reasoning, or from both;—and all Dr. Milner’s objections to this mode of proof will then assail you. All that he says of the inability and the want of opportunity of the immense majority of mankind to convince themselves of the truth of the Protestant religion by Scripture or general research, applies in an equal degree to your attempts to convince Protestants of the authority of your church.” (p. 177) Mr. Butler acknowledges his own inability satisfactorily to meet the objection. He referred it to Dr. Milner, who confounded it with another and totally different difficulty; and to Dr. Poynter, who promised to supply an answer, but omitted to do so. “The task,” Mr. Butler adds, “is to state one or more facts, or one or more arguments, which shew the title of *the Roman Catholic Church* to the authority claimed for her so clearly, as to make it the duty of all to whom they are presented to assent and yield obedience to *her authority*.” (p. 178) Dr. Wiseman admits that in his Fourth Lecture “On the authority of the Church,” he had but vaguely determined the existence of authority in the Church of Christ, without defining where how or by whom it has to be exercised. (*Lect. viii.*, p. 261.) He is evidently sensible that this effected nothing for the cause of Rome; and therefore, anxious that he “may not appear to be building on a frail foundation,” he proceeds to meet the real difficulty in attempting to prove “that the Pope or Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, possesses authority and jurisdiction in things spiritual over the entire Church, so as to constitute its visible head, and the vice-gerent of Christ upon earth.” (p. 263) The way in which he undertakes to prove this is “from Scripture, from general research, or from both.” Independently of the objection which is urged that this mode of proof, even if it were solid, could furnish no more infallible grounds of faith than the principles of the Reformed Church can supply, there is nothing in the proof itself which has not undergone most anxious examination on the other side by men of at least equal attainments with Dr. Wiseman; who have remained satisfied that the claim of the Roman bishop, to possess authority in things spiritual over the entire church, is utterly groundless, founded in palpable error and usurpation, and not maintainable by Scripture or general reasoning. “The task,” as Mr. Butler very justly terms it, “of stating one or more facts, or one or more arguments which may clearly prove the title of *the Roman Catholic Church* to the authority claimed for her,” remains yet to be performed. Yet most assuredly this claim ought to receive the most rigorous proof

before so much is built upon it. "No one is or can be a Catholic," Dr. Wiseman says "but by his entire submission to the authority of the Church;" and "they cannot be its denizens and children if they enter not by that one gate, of absolute unconditional submission to the teaching of the Church;" so that Chillingworth did not misrepresent them when he said "in effect you say no man can have faith but he must be moved to it by your church's authority." (vol. 1, p. 235.) That foundation, then, upon which every thing else is made to rest, ought to be itself immoveably fixed; that truth by which every other is to be tried and confirmed, ought to be first made infallibly clear and certain. "You will say, observes the great writer already quoted, "dependence on your church's infallibility is a better way of proceeding. I answer it would be so if we could be infallibly certain that your church is infallible; that is, if it were either evident of itself and seen by its own light, or could be reduced unto, and settled upon, some principle that is so. But seeing you yourselves do not so much as pretend to enforce us to the belief hereof (namely, that your church *is* infallible) by any proofs infallible and convincing, but only to induce us to it by such as are, by your confession, only probable and prudential motives, certainly it will be to very little purpose to put off your uncertainty for the first turn and to fall upon it at the second; to please yourselves in building your house upon an imaginary rock, when you yourselves see and confess that this very rock stands itself at the best but upon a frame of timber." (*ub. sup.* sect. 28, p. 221) There was, therefore, slight ground for the assumed triumph of Bossuet, who, in his conference with Claude, thought he had brought the contest to a close in his own favour by pressing his opponent with the consequence that according to his principles "there is in your religion a point at which a christian is not certain whether the Gospel is a fable or the truth." (*Hist. de Bossuet*, par. M. de Bausset, vol 2, p. 26) Unless he will take everything for granted, there must no less be such a point in the experience of every Roman Catholic, when he has not yet attained the infallible assurance, which his religion requires he should possess, of the infallibility of his church; for until that conviction is fully formed he cannot, as his teachers acknowledge, know anything in religion with certainty.

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

Since the preceding pages were committed to the press, I have received through the kindness of the Right Reverend author "A Sermon delivered at the Cathedral Church of St. John Calcutta, at an Ordination holden on Sunday, May 3rd., 1841, by Daniel, Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan of India," wherein His Lordship observes "it cannot be dissembled that a great controversy is agitating the Church at home on the question of the rule of faith." With reference to this question the Bishop of Calcutta adds "let men once be taken off from the Inspired Scriptures, as the sole and adequate rule and standard of our religious belief, and let human tradition, and the authority of the Church be in part substituted, and a way is opened for every other corruption of faith and practise." In the truth of this declaration I entirely and heartily concur. The observations contained in my Charge have reference to *principles* rather than to any particular expositions of them; but I would, without a moment's hesitation, retract all that I have said, if I could discover or suspect the existence of a disposition in any person or party, worthy of consideration, within the Church of England, to substitute human tradition, or the authority of the Church, in the minutest degree, in place of that of the Inspired Scriptures. I have however as yet met with no evidence which creates an apprehension, much less convinces me, that there are any among us who would require any thing to be believed of any man as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation, except it be read in Holy Scripture or may be proved thereby. The Bishop of Calcutta, observes that "The pamphlet in the Series of the 'Tracts for the Times,' No. 90, having reached him, he has substituted some remarks upon it in place of those which he had delivered on similar, but less open invasions of our thirty-nine Articles of Religion." Not having had an opportunity of meeting with the publication here named, I am unable (except in deference to the very high authority from which it proceeds) to form a judgment concerning the grounds upon which this severe censure rests; but it will be right my clergy should understand that this pamphlet is not included among the works to which my remarks in the Charge were intended to apply.

W. G. A.

6th December, 1841.



