

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXV.

ARTICLE I.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ST. LOUIS.

Our Church was very fully represented at the last Assembly. If we have counted rightly, 133 commissioners were present; every Presbytery was represented, at least in part, excepting only Sao Paulo, our Missionary Presbytery in Brazil; and not counting that Presbytery, every commissioner was present, excepting three ruling elders. The body is now almost or quite large enough. An overgrown Assembly is no blessing to any Church.

Without designing any invidious comparisons, the marked ability of the late Assembly may also be referred to. This certainly is a very great blessing to any Church—to have its highest court filled with men of wisdom and learning and the grace of God; men competent to handle the grave questions which concern the whole Church; “men that have understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.”

It was a wise arrangement, as the late Assembly found by experience, to give the afternoons of the first four or five days to the standing committees. Time is not lost, but saved by it. Reports considered thoroughly in committee are apt to be quickly and favorably disposed of by the body at large.

Last year the Northern Assembly met at St. Louis, with its half a thousand commissioners. When our Assembly at Columbus resolved to meet this year in the same city, the Philadelphia

ARTICLE II.

A PRESBYTERIAN CLERGYMAN LOOKING FOR THE CHURCH.

A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church. By Rev. FLAVEL S. MINES, first Pastor of Trinity church, San Francisco, (under the signature of "*One of Three Hundred.*") New York: H. B. Durant. 1868. Copyrighted by the Treasurer of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union.

We would rejoice to be delivered from the necessity of saying a word about this book and its deceased author, if we could do so with propriety. But it happens, that, though the author is dead, the book is not. It still lives, and is sent forth by the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union, on its sinister mission, and is made an instrument for proselyting unstable souls, and leading astray plain and uninformed people. So that we have no right to keep silence while it cries aloud, and shall affect no reservation in speaking of the work according to its merits. It derives its whole importance, not from its author, but from the source whence it proceeds, and would not be noticed at all, but for the fact that it is now circulating among our own churches, and disturbing the minds of some who only need information to be delivered from its snares.

For us it was a very hard book to read. We did wade through it, however, only under a sense of duty. With premeditated design to sit down and deliberately undertake a volume of 580 pages duodecimo, made up of caricatures of our own most cherished doctrines, misrepresentations of the polity of the Church of our choice and our love, pointless anecdotes to cast ridicule upon it, and all this interspersed with derogatory observations about such saints of God as Drs. Miller, Alexander, Potts, Smyth, and others, and contemptuous remarks about the Presbyterian Church generally, required a good degree of courage, with a commendable stock of perseverance. At any time such reading is extremely irksome, and on this occasion it was a more severe trial

to our patience, since in no part of the book was there anything new or refreshing in the argument to elicit our interest. Moreover, the misrepresentations of our Church, our doctrines, and our polity, are the same stale caricatures, which have been repeated from author to author, and which Presbyterians and Calvinists have endured for many ages. In like manner, instead of any advancement in the discussion, we have served up to us a rehash of worn-out arguments, of obsolete exegesis, abandoned as irrelevant or untenable by genuine scholars and profound theologians among our Episcopalian friends, who would be loth to place the defence of their system on such grounds as captivated and satisfied this writer; but, nevertheless, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union has the assurance to endorse and republish these absurdities.

We shall not attempt the task of going through the whole of this mass of misrepresentation to expose its shallowness and its want of fairness, for that would require a volume. As we expect to confine ourselves to the limits of an ordinary Review article, we shall be compelled to satisfy our readers with samples of the injustice done us, and with pointing out some of the inconsistencies, not to say the puerilities, of the writer. This book speaks derisively of the "sects;" it calls the Presbyterians "dissenters," p. 341; it runs a pretended parallel between us and Papists; it even classes us with the Mormons, Swedenborgians, and Spiritualists, p. 519; and indulges in much contemptuous talk, indicative of the fact that the writer and disseminators of it had become the narrowest of sectaries. Well, we shall give reasons which are at all events satisfactory to ourselves for not following the "three hundred" into the tangled web of Episcopacy and its various parties or "sects," such as Ritualists, Puseyites, High Churchmen, Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen, and Reformed Churchmen, in a vain effort to find "the Church."

I. The author informs us at the very outset that he was not only born and bred a Presbyterian, but he became one by conviction; and toward the close of the book, we discover what an enormous conquest Episcopacy made in getting him, when, in-

order to justify himself for becoming, with pristine zeal, a High Church Episcopalian, he informs us he had been a "High Church Presbyterian," p. 575. And yet, on page 7, he tells us that, while he was a Presbyterian minister, "he had been at no pains to form a definite or fixed conception of the ministry, the sacraments, the keys, the Church, but had rather passed these matters over as things we were not required to define, and which perhaps it were better not to define too nicely," etc. Now, was not this a precious sort of Presbyterian? He had no fixed ideas on any subject pertaining to the very points of distinction between his own Church and all other Churches; yea, on those very questions which are vital to the whole system of Church polity, and which at once determine the matter for every honest inquirer. He was a "Presbyterian clergyman," but had no definite conception of the ministry; he administered the sealing ordinances of Christ, but had no fixed conception of the sacraments; he had opened and shut the kingdom of heaven, both by the key of doctrine and the key of discipline, but had no determinate conception of the keys—in a word, he was a minister of the Church, but had no decided conception of the Church itself! Is not this a most extraordinary statement to come from a man, who not only had been born and bred a Presbyterian, his father being a Presbyterian minister, but who at his ordination had solemnly, as in the presence of God, declared his belief in our doctrinal standards, and sworn to maintain them even at the risk of life, estate, and reputation, and who had in like manner declared his approval of the government and discipline of the Church? Now, the Confession of Faith has clear and distinct statements of doctrine on all the points suggested, covering the seven chapters from chapter xxv. to chapter xxxi.; and in addition to that, the practical application of these doctrines of the Confession is given in the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory of Worship. No Presbyterian has any excuse for not having a clear understanding of all these matters; and we hesitate not to affirm that no man has a just claim to the name, nor can he honestly assume the position of a Presbyterian minister, who does not receive and accept the clear and definite statements

of the standards of the Church on these subjects. Why, the very word Presbyterian suggests at once the doctrine that the presbyter is the highest order in the ministry of the Church; and all true Presbyterians have defined and decided opinions of that ministry, its rights, duties, limitations of power, etc.; and so of the other points mentioned. Now, according to his own account of himself, there is no just sense in which this writer ever was a Presbyterian; and as he had embraced no true Presbyterianism, notwithstanding his solemn vows of ordination, but confesses himself to have been at sea on the whole subject, his conversion to Episcopacy was no loss to Presbyterianism. He went out from us, because he was not of us. That we are not unjust in this judgment is made perfectly evident by a remarkable fact recorded of himself by the author. On p. 22, he says:

“Seven years before I entered the Church, I submitted my children, although secretly, for fear of the synagogue and elders, to Episcopal baptism; that *they* might hereafter the more readily glide into a Church which at this time I regarded as having no other advantages above ‘the fair daughters of the Reformation’ than in her manifest and tried conservatism, by virtue chiefly of her noble and unalterable Liturgy.”

Is it uncharitable in us to say that a man who could make such an extraordinary avowal as this was not a Presbyterian; that he went out from us because he was not of us? For seven years his professions of Presbyterianism were manifestly insincere. If not a wolf in sheep's clothing, he was at all events an Episcopalian in Presbyterian garb. For seven years, while occupying a Presbyterian pulpit, he was at heart an Episcopalian, though in disguise; and secretly, as far as he felt it safe to do so, threw his influence, certainly in his own family (but who believes it stopped there?) in favor of Episcopacy! He is dead, and we shall add nothing. The facts speak for themselves without the necessity of emphasis. We leave them to the judgment of honorable men, even among Episcopalians. We confess, however, that on reading this shameless avowal, we felt at a loss to know of what kind of material the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union is composed; seeing they give this book their endorsement, and circulate it for purposes of proselyting.

Is this kind of Jesuitry a part of their scheme of operations? Is Punic faith to be tolerated among Christians, and to be practised by those who make exclusive claims to all true churchism?

II. Throughout the book the writer indulges sometimes in anecdote, at other times in direct statement, and often in insinuation, charging that Presbyterians are drifting away from the principles and doctrines of their own Church; and sometimes the inference is adroitly left to be drawn, and at other times it is boldly asserted, that it is ignorance which made them Presbyterians in the first instance, and which still keeps them in that fold. (See chapters 6, 21, 22, 23, *passim*.)

To respond to such offensive insinuations, if they came from one who did not pretend to personal knowledge of the matter from his own experience, would be absurd. But here is an author who once was professedly a Presbyterian, and therefore ought to have known, and the public have a right to believe did know the truth of his allegations, and hence their damaging nature. There is this, however, to be observed, that most people are somewhat careful in taking vows; and because he was careless enough to take on himself the fearful obligations of ordination, in doing which he called God to witness that he firmly believed the doctrines of the Presbyterian standards and approved of its government and discipline, while his mind was unsettled on the whole subject, we are not to infer that others, ministers or elders, are as undecided in their convictions and as reckless in taking obligations as he was. Again, while we confess that there is not in the Presbyterian Church, or any other, as advanced a state of intelligence as we should desire, we feel safe in appealing to candid men among Episcopalians, and candid men every where, as to whether Presbyterians are one whit behind the foremost in intelligent attachment to their doctrines, and in the faithful instruction of their children. Indeed, until this recreant son came forward to defame the good repute of his mother, they have always been esteemed foremost of all in these respects. Nor does the anecdote told of the New York elder (p. 74), who was entrapped into denouncing the language of the Confession of Faith on the subject of baptism as Puseyism, when read to him

out of a Puseyite newspaper, prove the contrary. It would be an easy thing for an adroit reader, by putting the emphasis on particular words and phrases, and passing lightly over others, to change the apparent meaning so as thereby to mislead an elder who was not, and did not pretend to be, a theologian. And the fact that he was not familiar with the phraseology of the article of the Confession of Faith in question is easily accounted for. The Church has provided catechisms containing the very same doctrines which are designed for family and Sabbath-school instruction with which the eldership and membership of the Church are expected to be, and in considerable part are, familiar. But to make anything more out of the circumstance, and many other such recorded in this book, than a mere matter of pleasantry to be told as a joke on the elder in social conversation, is so absurd, that we feel sure no born-and-bred Episcopalian would condescend to use the anecdote as an argument, or to point an argument. The use made of it, however, and several similar anecdotes, manifests a spirit of resentment against the Presbyterian Church, and a disposition to speak of it in the language of ridicule, which is unaccountable to us. The fact, however, serves to illustrate the old adage that new converts are the worst enemies of the order they desert. The wonder is that such a book, written in such a spirit, can obtain the sanction and endorsement of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union; that that body is willing to risk its reputation on such a performance.

But not only is the charge everywhere asserted or insinuated that our ministers and people are Presbyterians, or rather are not Episcopalian, aye, and Puseyites at that, because of ignorance—ignorance of the Scriptures, ignorance of the Fathers, and ignorance of their own doctrines; but, again and again, the author asserts (see Ch. IX.,) that the ministers do not believe the doctrines of their Church (pp. 552, 554,) and that the Church is drifting away from its moorings. Lest any one should contradict his assertion, he gives us to understand that he knows all about it; he was one of them, and has talked with them on the

subject. Where he himself had doubts and difficulties, he found others had doubts also.

Well, did he find nobody in the Episcopal Church who had any doubts? He was greatly distressed at the divisions among the sects; but did he find all the ministers of the Episcopal Church perfectly agreed on all the particulars of church doctrine and church order? This author was a Puseyite—had he lived till now, he would doubtless have been a Ritualist. Were his brethren all Puseyites? all High Churchmen? all Churchmen? all Low Churchmen? We trow not. Now, it is probable that, in conversing with Presbyterian ministers, he found them to be very modest in giving their views on questions not revealed, and that they abstained from dogmatising where they had no “thus saith the Lord.” For just there comes in the difference between Presbyterianism and the writer and publishers of this book. They are just as positive and dogmatical about rites and ceremonies, and ordinances confessedly of human origin, as Presbyterians are about things revealed in the Scriptures. But as to Presbyterian ministers as a class, or any considerable number of them remaining in the Presbyterian Church while doubtful of her doctrines or order, we flatly deny it. There is a capital method of escape for the Church from all such damage. It has the comfortable assurance that all disaffected ministers will soon follow the “Three Hundred;” and even though the number should reach five hundred, as this zealous convert thinks he might safely have stated it, it would be a most happy deliverance to a Church steadfast in its faith and order, such as the Presbyterian Church is, to get rid of all such unstable souls. Whether it is a matter of gain to the Episcopal Church, is a question which concerns it, not us:

Still further, we have already shown that “One of Three Hundred” was not, in any proper sense, a Presbyterian at all; and it happens to be the case that, while he was nominally connected with the New School Presbyterian Church, his associations, as he informs us, were much with Congregationalists, or those who had once been such. This element in great force entered our Church

many years ago; and as the Old School always contended, and as this author asserts. (p. 38,) they aimed to revolutionise the Presbyterian Church. They gave the Church much trouble, and kept it in constant agitation for many years, until the year 1837, when their schemes were brought to an end by the vigorous policy adopted by our General Assembly. Our New School brethren did not then see through their purposes, but thought they had been too severely dealt with; and the disruption of the Church was the consequence. In the New School body, the struggle was renewed; nor did that Church have any peace until the Congregationalists, defeated in their plans, gradually withdrew to themselves. Now, we suspect, all this talk which the author heard, derogatory of the Church, its doctrines, its polity, and its standards, was by the Congregationalists; or if not, certainly by those who had fallen under their influence. It was they who introduced the irregularities into the Church, of which he speaks, p. 81; and the new measures in revivals which scattered wild-fire and disorder over many portions of the land, and the heresies recounted on pp. 166-168, were brought in by them. But before he wrote his book, he and his publishers, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union, knew, and ought to have stated, that there was a vigor and power in Presbyterianism, which had arrested those things altogether in the Old School Church, and were making valorous headway against them, in the New School body, where in like manner, the Church finally became triumphant, and the Congregationalists withdrew or subsided. We here speak chiefly of the polity of the Church. As to doctrine and the sacraments, it is well known that the Old School adhered strictly to the standards; and so far as the New School are concerned, we are safe in saying that, during all that controversy in the Presbyterian Church, no sermon was preached and no doctrine inculcated which would not have been received in the Episcopal Church without the slightest official objection from bishop or priest, provided the minister who preached it professed the subjection of himself and congregation to the jurisdiction of the bishop.

Now, we have a life-long knowledge of the Presbyterian

Church, and know whereof we affirm when we say that it is not so, that the ministers of that portion of it with which we are connected have ever expressed doubts about our doctrines, sacraments, or polity, in our presence; but they have unanimously sustained them, preached them with earnestness and zeal, and have professed to cling to them as the palladium of their salvation. Enthusiastic attachment to the doctrines of our Confession of Faith and our system of church order, we unhesitatingly affirm, notwithstanding the contrary statements of this book, is uniformly characteristic of our ministry, so far as we have ever heard, or had an opportunity of knowing. Those who know us, will think our opportunities have been abundant and of the most favorable kind for correct information. Nothing is more certain to us than that this writer took too much for granted when he presumed that his former ministerial brethren were as indifferent to the principles of their Church and as careless of their vows as he was whilst one of them. If occasionally one such person happens to stray into the fold by accident or mistake, he does not tarry long, but is soon found numbered with the "Three Hundred," to the great relief of the Church.

III. As an illustration of this departure of the Church from its ancient faith, he takes the sacrament of baptism. He says, p. 83, "As to the *sacrament* of baptism, we can scarcely say of it *stat nominis umbra*; it has got to be regarded and to be called an unessential 'rite.'" If he only means that Presbyterians do not hold that ritual baptism is regeneration, and do not believe that it is necessary to salvation, we grant it. But manifestly he means, and elsewhere says, that Presbyterians do not believe the doctrines of their own standards on the subject of baptism, and that they have ceased to regard it as a sacrament. We cannot reply to any such patent untruth as this, which every intelligent reader has the opportunity of testing for himself by simply attending a Presbyterian Church on any occasion of the administration of that sacrament. Equally baseless is the charge that Presbyterian ministers do not preach from the texts which give clear utterance on the subject of baptism, (p. 559.) He quotes eleven texts on that point, and then asks, "Who ever heard a

sermon from a Presbyterian pulpit on any of these texts?" "I never did." The reason doubtless was that *he* occupied the pulpit. We have often heard these texts discussed; they are quoted in every Presbyterian treatise on the subject; and in our own ministrations, we have ourselves preached on eight out of the eleven texts. It is only necessary to notice such reckless statements, because these lines may be seen by others than Presbyterians.

As proof positive, however, of a departure from our standards on this subject, an attempt is made to convict us of a great neglect of baptism for infants by a forcible array of figures, p. 52. Several of the leading Presbyteries of the country are taken as samples, and it is shown that the average number of infants baptized is one to every twenty-five communicants; whereas, in the Episcopal Church, the proportion is one to every five. Now this at first blush is a sad contrast. But let us stop a little and look at it. Does any body believe that the natural increase of the human family among Episcopalians is so great as one child to every five adults per annum? The thing is incredible. What then is the reason of the difference? The explanation is simple enough. Among Presbyterians, none are baptized unless either father or mother is a communicant. Not so among Episcopalians; but anybody's child, who can find a god-father and a god-mother who themselves have been baptized, is admitted to the ordinance. What baptism means when thus administered, we know not. We refer inquirers to the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union for information; but the reason of the difference of statistics is evident.

IV. One of the most adroit methods of discrediting the Presbyterian Church which this book and its sponsors employ, is the profession of giving the views and principles of Presbyterians with the strongest arguments which they use to support them; and then, having thus placed that Church in a false position, they come up with a great flourish of trumpets, and demolish the citadel of their own erection. For an example of this, witness the array of arguments which they profess to have got at Princeton against Episcopacy, (p. 43, elaborated in chapters 17-23.) 1st. Episcopacy is anti-republican. 2d. It is *now* conceded that the

official names of bishop and presbyter in the New Testament are of the same exact meaning; and hence the setting of bishops above presbyters is a usurpation and an anti-christ. 3rd. The Apostles were twelve in number, and their number was no more intended to be increased than that of the twelve tribes or the twelve constellations. 4th. Hilary declares that, "in Egypt, even at this day (say the end of the fourth century) the presbyters ordain in the bishop's absence," etc., etc.

Now, let any man who is a Presbyterian look over this array of arguments, and see whether he has rested his convictions on any such grounds, or whether he ever knew any Presbyterian who did. Indeed, it is incredible that the writer and disseminators of these misrepresentations did not know that Presbyterians do not base the argument on any of the above principles, nor on all of them put together.

It is true that sometimes Presbyterians, after proving the untenableness of prelacy from the Scriptures, have added as an additional objection the manifest fact that it is aristocratic and anti-republican; but this argument has always been considered subsidiary and cumulative. We do not believe that it was ever by any Presbyterian writer placed as a primary or fundamental proposition. With us the question is not, Is Episcopacy republican? but, Is it scriptural?

It is also true in conducting the argument, that Presbyterians, in order to explicitness, are compelled to refer to the fact that the titles presbyter and bishop are synonymous in the Greek Testament; and it is very proper to say that Episcopalians *now* confess it, because notwithstanding the contemptuousness with which this book treats Dr. Miller's language, when he says that prelatists "*now* concede" this point, and notwithstanding the positive assertion which it makes that prelatists have never denied that the two words mean one and the same officer—all prelatists—take Bishop Hobart as an example—have not always confessed it. *Now* all scholars acknowledge that the two words are titles of the same officer, as used in the New Testament. But of course the question here with us is this: Is the apostolical office perpetual; and is the diocesan bishop, as now established in the

Episcopal Church, the same scriptural office which was designed by Jesus Christ when he ordained the twelve apostles? The title of the office is comparatively a matter of indifference.

Again, it is true that some authors have contended that the apostolical college was to consist of only twelve, that the number was never designed to be increased, and that there actually never were more than "twelve Apostles of the Lamb;" but this never was asserted in any authoritative way by Presbyterians: it is the opinion of private individuals, who have no authority to speak for the Church, and do not pretend to do so. What Presbyterians require is, that every man for whom a claim is made to be an apostle, shall possess the apostolical gifts and qualifications which the Scriptures set forth, and shall be clothed with the evidences thereof, viz., apostolical power. And if this book could show that these things concurred in the cases of all the thirty disciples whom it calls apostles, it would violate no principle of Presbyterianism to accept them all. The question therefore is this: Do those who now claim to be apostolical successors, whether twelve, or twelve hundred in number, exhibit the scriptural qualifications of apostles, and perform apostolical functions?

Lastly, it is true that in order to turn its own weapons against Episcopacy, Presbyterians have quoted Hilary and Jerome, and others of the Fathers, to show that they do not give that full countenance to prelacy which Prelatists contend for. But Presbyterians care nothing for the Fathers, as their appeal is always to the law and the testimony. The question with them on the whole subject is not, What say the Fathers? but, What saith the Scripture?

Now, when this book comes to what it calls "The True Issue," (ch. 22,) it boldly takes up the scriptural argument, and to the satisfaction of the writer, proves, with a great affectation of learned discovery, that there were no less than thirty apostles in the primitive Church, all of them deducible from the Scriptures! In this, he out-Herods Herod; he goes farther than the boldest champions of prelacy among genuine native-born Episcopalians, who, so far as we are aware, have never claimed for several of these persons that they were more than bishops. What they

have considered doubtful, this zealous convert from "the sects" esteems as clear as noon-day; what they have confessed to be untenable, he maintains with a firm grasp; what they have rejected as unsustained by a sound scriptural exegesis, this voracious recruit swallows at a single gulp; and he seems to look with astonishment at his *quondam* Presbyterian friends, because they do not open their mouths as widely as he did, and swallow with as keen a relish the food which he sets before them, without asking any questions for conscience' sake. We think it was Horne Tooke who, when asked by the bishop at his ordination, if he believed the Thirty-nine Articles, replied, "Yes, my Lord; and I like them so well, I am only sorry there are not as many more of them." This convert from the sects had a more voracious appetite than even Horne Tooke, and refused to be satisfied with old-fashioned Episcopacy. He has found as many more reasons for Episcopacy as anybody before him, and has swallowed them down without mincing. He even manifests a sort of childish delight and triumph at every new absurdity which he has persuaded himself to accept. All this is accompanied with a pretension to learning which would make the whole thing ridiculous, but for the fact that the book was designed for popular circulation, and unfortunately the bulk of common readers have not always the ability to discriminate between learning and the affectation of it. We doubt not that this is the reason of the dissemination of this book among plain people; but the consciences of those who circulate it must be very elastic, or they must be very ignorant of the grounds on which their own church polity is defended by true Churchmen of all grades, and also of the reasons for opposing Episcopacy which Presbyterians assign, as well as those on which they defend their polity.

The argument of the book on this subject is something of a curiosity; the author approaches the discussion with much gusto in a taunting style; and with a triumphant air he marches on in his onslaught on Presbyterians, with Quixotic courage, dealing out right and left his trenchant blows. He shows us how his former Presbyterian prejudices against apostolical succession, which arose from ignorance, gave way before the prodigious dis-

coveries he made as he read for himself the Greek Testament and the Fathers. He had, as a good Presbyterian, believed that there could not be more than twelve apostles. But it happened to occur to him that there were actually thirteen, for, beyond a doubt, Matthias was the successor of Judas Iscariot—an indubitable proof of apostolical succession; and besides, that makes thirteen apostles. To be sure that there is no mistake in this, he gives the list without Matthias, and behold, it is full—there are twelve. Then he gives it again, adding the name of Matthias, and behold, there are thirteen! “The charm is broken. Thirteen is said to be a fatal number. Certainly it is fatal to Presbyterianism.” The wonder is, that no Presbyterian had ever before thought of this ingenious plan of ascertaining the truth which we have here exhibited, viz., the setting down of two lists, one with, and the other without Matthias, but both of them containing the name of the Apostle Judas Iscariot! But worse still for Presbyterians: on reading his Bible he came to the case of the Apostle Paul; and now he has “fourteen apostles—genuine, *bona fide*, large-as-life-apostles.” “And there is yet another: Barnabas is twice called an apostle.” And now “it is time to amend the catalogue;” and here we have it once more printed in full, but increased now to fifteen. “Gentlemen, if a thirteenth apostle puts you thus to your wit’s end, what will you do with the *fifteenth*. Remember we have now *fifteen*.” And what think you, O benighted Presbyterians! he is just half done! Hear him again. “Turning to Scripture, I found it said, ‘Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles;’ and I could not for my life perceive that either in Greek or English the passage would bear any other straight-forward, above-board meaning than that Andronicus and Junia were *apostles*.” “In like manner I found Epaphroditus called the apostle of the church at Philippi.” After rubbing his eyes, clearing his spectacles, and consulting Jerome, he says: “Accordingly I gave it up that Epaphroditus was an undeniable apostle.” “The next that troubled me was St. James.” But after full consideration and examining the Fathers, he accepts James the Just as an apostle. “And now my

catalogue runs thus;" and here we have it for the fourth time; but the list has grown to nineteen—yes, nineteen apostles! And thus on he went, and in a similar way he enrolls Timothy and Titus and Silas and Luke, until the number reaches twenty-three—yes, verily, twenty-three apostles in the Scriptures! and the very name apostle used with regard to every one of them! And there they are; for he now gives his list for the fifth time, so that we can look it over for ourselves and see that it is actually twenty-three, and no mistake. But here he stops in his rapid triumphal march to take breath, and makes a sad confession, (p. 419.)

"It is really not the most pleasing thing in the world to confess one's former ignorance.

Durum est

Quæ juvenes didicere, senes perdenda fateri.

"I did once believe that the apostolic office had perished with St. John, and that the twelve had passed away without successors; nor can I give a better apology for my mistake than that I had never thought the subject of sufficient importance," etc.

Now, is it not really distressing that a "Presbyterian clergyman," educated at Princeton Theological Seminary, should awaken to such a state of facts as this: that there in his own Bible, notwithstanding his "High Church Presbyterian" prejudices and training, he was compelled to see with his own eyes a record of such a company of apostles as twenty-three, and in every case the very name apostle confronts him! But worse and worse, he is not yet done. For, "of course, in this inquiry, I could not overlook . . . 'the angels of the seven churches.' The words angel and apostle both meaning 'messenger,' are much more nearly synonymous than the names presbyter and bishop." And so, after some consultation of the Fathers, he adds on these seven angels to his list. "It is unnecessary to pursue the succession further. Here is the catalogue, so far as we have gone;" and then for the sixth and last time he gives us his list, now increased to thirty. "Well, really!" will exclaim the Presbyterian, "according to this, apostles are not so rare on the earth as I had supposed."

Now, is it not a shame for our Theological Seminaries to keep our students for the ministry in such ignorance? But this new convert, we are happy to say, turned out to be too smart for them. They could not conceal these facts from him; for he discovered in his own Bible the very name apostle used with reference to these twenty-three different men, if not thirty. There certainly can be no mistake on the subject now; for this writer says again and again, "I have found! I have found! Eureka! Eureka!" and with his own eyes he tells us he has read the very name in English and in Greek—apostle—ἀπόστολος; moreover, he has published the fact to the world. What can Presbyterians say now?

It is some time since we have indulged in light literature; but we remember in our younger days reading a book on Irish character, in which one of the illustrations was that of an Irish youth who applied for admission to the Dublin University in order to take his degrees. The Professors set about his examination, but soon the whole Faculty was summoned to the contest; for the student was discomfiting the Professors at a fearful rate, man by man; and then the Regents and Fellows were called in; but still the young student held the ground; and at last, worn out in body and mind, the contest had to come to an end through sheer exhaustion, leaving the student master of the situation, he having triumphed over the whole University by *one word*. We think we have found the equal of this redoubtable Irish lad, and can match him with "One of Three Hundred;" for this book furnishes us the evidences of that wonderful learning which enabled this rare scholar, with the skill and ability of the youth of Erin, to vanquish Princeton Theological Seminary, its faculty, students, and alumni, and to remain master of the situation, ahead of all opposers, by one word; and though he is gone, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union stands in his shoes, and flourishes his invincible shillalah, inscribed all over with the talismanic name, APOSTLE, and is waging a war against all Presbyterians, which threatens the extermination of the whole "sect." Presbyterians, avaunt!

But hold! Let us look around for a moment on the battle-

field, and see whether we are not more scared than hurt. For though this modern Goliath, panoplied in full armor, has come forth to announce great swelling words of defiance of the whole Church militant, except a single denomination, we must remember that it is not the distant sound of thunder, but the instant stroke of lightning, that kills; and though his staff or shillalah be as thick as a weaver's beam, it may be rotten to the core. While the triumphant gusto of the book can do us no conceivable harm, a smooth stone taken from the book of truth will overcome this redoubtable champion, and place his weapons in the custody of those he defies, for their own defence.

Then, seriously, what does all the argument which is here furnished on the subject of "the true issue," amount to? Simply to a play on words, or rather to an ignoring of distinctions which all scholars and intelligent Episcopalians have always recognised. To illustrate and prove our position is an easy matter.

The word Bible, in the English language, means simply and only the word of God. But it is derived from the Greek word, *biblos*, which means a book, and in Greek is used for all books, without distinction. The word presbyter, in English, is the title of an officer in the Christian Church, usually called an elder, and in English it means nothing else; but in Greek, the original word from which it is derived, means not only a church officer, but also sometimes civil magistrates; sometimes it is used of age, and sometimes as a mark of dignity or respect. The word apostle, in the English language, is used for those whom Jesus Christ called to be the witnesses of his resurrection, and the founders of the Christian Church; but in Greek it means one sent forth; *i. e.*, a messenger or a missionary. The word deacon, in English, means the lowest officer in the Church; but the original word means a minister or servant. Now, our translators, to prevent confusion and to make the word of God intelligible, in rendering into English the words above given, and many others which we might name, observed the above distinctions; and hence the word *biblos* is always translated book, and not Bible. The original words for apostle, presbyter, and deacon, are so translated as to convey the idea of the distinction between their usage as the titles of church officers

and their other meanings. The translators were chiefly Episcopalians, but in addition to that, they were men of unquestionable scholarship. The display of learning in this book chiefly consists in a contempt of those manifest distinctions which these translators carefully observed. Let us illustrate. The word translated deacon, as we have shown, means, and is ordinarily translated, a minister or servant; and in that sense it is used again and again in the New Testament, before the officer of the Christian Church known as the deacon was first appointed. Because it now has an appropriated meaning as the title of a church officer, it does not cease to have its previous meanings; but is used in Greek precisely as it had been used before, as a word descriptive of the fact that a certain ministry or service pertained to the person to whom it was attributed. Well, if this book, on this plan of confounding all distinctions, gathered together a great cloud of apostles, so also it arrays before us an innumerable company of deacons, by its method of reasoning; for, while none are deacons officially and technically but those called to serve tables, yet, since every follower of Christ is a minister or servant of Christ, they would all become deacons, according to this new system of hermeneutics. But it is not correct to say, as this book does, (pp. 376, 471,) that the apostleship is ever called "deaconship" in the New Testament, or that Paul ever calls himself and his fellow-ministers by the title of deacon, for the reason already assigned, viz., that the word deacon, though derived from the Greek, is an English word, which means that officer in the Church whose duty is to serve tables; and the word deaconship in English simply means the office of deacon. The apostles, indeed, appointed the deacons in the first instance, in order that they might give themselves to "the ministry (diaconia) of the word" (Acts vi. 5). Thus in the very verse appointing the deacon's office, they use the Greek word in its ordinary sense, with reference to their own work, which, in its official sense, refers to the office of deacon. In like manner, they call themselves and their associates, "ministers of the gospel," "ministers of the word," "ministers of Christ," etc., where the same word from which the English word deacon is derived is used in

its ordinary sense. In this latter sense, the Greek word occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek Testament; whereas, in its technical sense, as a title of office in the Church, it is only used three times. In these three instances, it is properly translated *deacon*; whereas, in every other instance, with equal correctness, it is translated *minister* or *servant*, since to translate it *deacon* would simply make nonsense out of the word of God. It only tends to confusion, therefore, to obliterate all these manifest distinctions, as this book does.

Again, to exhibit, in a still more striking light, the utter absurdity of this method of interpretation, let us take the word "*biblos*," from which our English word *Bible* is derived. It occurs thirteen times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of the *Bible*. Now, suppose we should imitate the manner of displaying learning or ignorance, as the case may be, which this book adopts, and wherever the word occurs should translate it *Bible*, what confusion of ideas would be introduced into the word of God. For example, we would have, Acts xix. 19, "Many of them also which used curious arts brought their *Bibles* together and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver." It is seen at a glance what shocking nonsense and falsehoods this method of interpretation would cause the *Bible* to utter. Now, it is just as true that the books of divination or conjury burnt by the converts at Ephesus, who had "used curious arts," were *Bibles* worth fifty thousand pieces of silver, as it is that Andronicus, and Junia, and Epaphroditus, and James the Just, and Timothy, and Titus, and Silas, and Luke, and Barnabas were apostles, according to the official meaning of that word.

V. We will now take up the question of the apostleship, as it is thus presented before us. Dr. Scott, the eminent Episcopalian commentator on the *Bible*, in his notes on 2 Cor. viii. 23, ("Whether any do inquire of Titus he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers [in the Greek, apostles,] of the churches, and the glory of Christ.") of the word "messengers," says:

"Christ was the apostle of the Father" (Heb. iii. 1); the twelve were his apostles; "these (messengers) were the apostles of the churches."

We need not discuss Christ's apostleship at this time; our inquiry relates to the other two senses of the word. But it is evident that Dr. Scott makes as broad a distinction between the apostles of Christ and the apostles or missionaries of the churches, as he does between the apostles of Christ and Jesus Christ as the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.

1. What, then, was the calling, and what were the qualifications of the apostles of Jesus Christ? 1. They received their vocation immediately from Christ himself: Matt. x. 2-8; Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13; Acts ix. 15; Gal. i. 1. 2. Their special function was to be personal witnesses of Christ's doctrine, resurrection, ascension, and glorification: John xv. 27; Acts i. 8, 22; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8, 14, 15. 3. They were to preach the gospel, administer ordinances, and establish the Church: Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15. 4. In order to qualify them for their work, God bestowed on them the gift of inspiration: Matt. x. 19, 20; Acts i. 5, 8; ii. 4. 5. God attested their commission by the power of working miracles: Matt. x. 1, 8; Mark iii. 15; Heb. ii. 4; Acts ii. 43; v. 12; iii. 6, 7, etc. 6. Their authority was several, supreme, and plenary (which necessarily follows from their inspiration): Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23; 1 Cor. v. 3-5. 7. They carried their office and authority with them wherever they went: Matt. xx. 19; Mark xvi. 15, etc. Now, wherever the claim to apostleship is sustained by the above gifts and qualifications, we care not how many applicants there may be for the office, whether thirty or thirty thousand, we are ready to accept their credentials and recognise their authority; but wherever any of these marks is wanting, we deny that there is any evidence of apostleship.

On all sides it is admitted that Jesus chose twelve disciples, to whom he gave the title of the "twelve apostles," and throughout the New Testament they are spoken of as the "twelve," or as "the apostles of Christ;" that is, those chosen and ordained by Jesus Christ himself. Matthias was added to the number through the casting of the lot by the eleven, after the apostasy of Judas and the ascension of the Lord; but the Scriptures nowhere mention him

afterwards, nor is there any indication as to whether the action of the apostles in that matter met the divine approval, except the silence of the Scriptures on the subject. This fact some interpret as an approval of the transaction, while others infer from it the reverse. But Paul, though called out of due time, was constituted an apostle by the Lord himself, which fact leaves no room for doubt in his case. If the apostles had been authorised to add to their own number, here was an appropriate occasion for the exercise of that authority. Throughout the Bible, and to the end of the world, God honors his own ordinances. If such authority belonged to them, it would be in accordance with the divine method of procedure for the Lord to direct them to set Paul apart: but instead of that, he was commissioned by Jesus himself, without the mediate agency of any man or body of men. Hence he claimed to be an apostle of Christ, equal in authority with the chiefest of the apostles; moreover, he draws a broad distinction between the apostles of Christ, officially so called, and all others who go by the name of apostles, that is, missionaries. In inditing his Epistle to the Galatians, he says: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." Here the distinction is clearly drawn between the apostles of men, who were also ordained by the agency of man, and those chosen and called directly of the Lord. Epaphroditus was an apostle of the Church at Philippi, (in our English version, "messenger,") and though many suppose that he was merely a delegate or legate sent from Philippi to bear a contribution to the apostle, and possibly to consult him, there is a probability that he was what Paul meant by an apostle of men, and by man; that is, that he was a minister of the gospel and a missionary of the Church. For every minister sent out by the Church to carry the gospel to the destitute, is an apostle of the Church, according to the Greek; a missionary of the Church, according to the Latin; or a messenger of the Church, according to the French, from the Latin—the three words, apostle; missionary, and messenger, all radically meaning the same thing. There is a sense in which every minister is an apostle of Christ; but in its technical sense none are,

save those chosen and commissioned personally by the Lord himself.

A claim is made (p. 408) for the apostleship of Timothy, from the fact that Paul joins him with himself in writing several of his Epistles. But let us examine in what manner the apostle introduces the name of Timothy. The first time it occurs is in the salutation of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother." What a broad distinction is here drawn between these two ministers! If Timothy was indeed an apostle in the sense in which Paul was, may we not add, what an insult is here given to this servant of God? Paul arrogates to himself the name and authority of the apostolic office, but refuses to recognise his companion Timothy as entitled to it. Does any man believe Paul would have been guilty of such treatment of his "son Timothy," even setting aside divine inspiration? But when we take that into the account, it becomes more incredible still, unless we adopt the irreverent supposition that the object of this particular verse was to obscure the truth.

We shall see how much strength is given to this view of the subject, by turning to the next place in which Paul joins Timothy's name with his own. It is in Phil. i. 1: "Paul and Timotheus, servants of Jesus Christ." In the original it is "the bondsmen of Jesus Christ." Here we see the kind of parity which Paul recognised. When asserting his divine commission as an apostle of Jesus Christ, he could not join the name of Timothy with himself; but when he lays aside all official designations, and aims to express the common relation between the Lord Jesus and all His people, then he places himself along with Timothy and all his fellow-disciples as bondsmen of Christ, purchased by the blood of redemption. When, however, he proceeds from the salutation to perform his apostolical function of commanding the churches, the name of Timothy is immediately dropped, and the apostle writes in the first person singular. This, again, would have been a striking violation of propriety, if Timothy were indeed an apostle in the official sense, and would doubtless have had the effect to cause the churches to treat his au-

thority with contempt. On the other hand, when the apostle united the missionary or evangelist Timothy on this and other occasions with himself in the salutation to the churches which he was addressing, it was bestowing on him a mark of confidence, honor, and love, before all the churches of Christ. The apostle adopted a similar course in several of his Epistles, uniting others of his companions with himself in the salutations, and in part in the exhortations of the Epistles. But when he does so, in every instance he suppresses all official titles of himself and of them; while in every other instance he describes himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ. This would be very remarkable, if they were equally apostles with himself, and possessed of the same official authority.

Still further: when Paul comes to deliver his charges to his companions, Timothy and Titus, before leaving them for the crown that awaited him, he does so as "an apostle of Jesus Christ," but does not call them apostles, nor speak to them as his successors, nor commit to them his official work. But, on the other hand, he tells Timothy to do the work of an evangelist, and his charge to Titus is based on the same conception of his work that he had already enjoined on Timothy; and hence it is manifest that Titus was an evangelist also. And now how utterly absurd would Paul's affectation of superiority to Timothy and Titus appear in these Epistles, if they were apostles equally with himself, equally inspired, and his coëquals in authority! How remarkable, moreover, that he should omit the apostolical office altogether in explaining to them the character and qualifications of church officers, whom they were to ordain, if apostle-bishops were also to be chosen and ordained by them! These things are unaccountable on the theory we are combating.

This book (p. 409) differs from us in our view of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and argues that they contain internal evidence of the fact that they were instructions from the apostle Paul on assigning them episcopal charge of the churches of Ephesus and Crete. These are the only cases out of this new batch of apostles, whose claims Mr. Litton, in his book on the

“Church of Christ”,* deems worthy of discussion at all. The claims of all the rest he sets aside as untenable on general principles, without even arguing the cases separately. As to Timothy and Titus, Mr. Litton makes a careful examination of the Epistles addressed to them, and clearly proves that neither the episcopate nor any other permanent office was intended to be established in their cases; but that the internal evidence furnished by these Epistles is conclusive that their commission was temporary. He says, pages 292, 293:

“In fact, Timothy and Titus belonged to a class of persons occupying a conspicuous place in St. Paul’s Epistles, who may be called apostolic delegates or commissioners; who, from the resemblance which their functions bore in some particulars to those of a bishop, and probably from the fact that the first bishops were chosen from their number, were, by a later age, easily mistaken for formal bishops.” “St. Paul, in his Epistles generally, appears attended by one or more of these apostolic delegates; and by a comparison of these compositions, we can discover with a high degree of probability many of their names.”

Dr. Jacob,† in his “Ecclesiastical Polity,” uses very similar language. We quote from p. 73, as follows:

“Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, were delegated by St. Paul to perform for him what we might call episcopal functions, in ordaining, superintending, reproofing, or encouraging the ministers of these churches, as well as endeavoring to promote the general well-being of the Christian communities there. But they are never called ‘bishops,’ or any other name which might indicate a special order or ecclesiastical office. Their commission was evidently an exceptional and temporary charge, to meet some peculiar wants in those places during the necessary absence of St. Paul: and there is no intimation of any kind that such appointments were of general necessity—no intimation that they were needed, or that

*The Church of Christ. By the Rev. Edward Arthur Litton, A. M., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, England.

†The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament: a Study for the Present Crisis in the Church of England. By Rev. G. A. Jacob, D. D., late Head Master of Christ’s Hospital. A *verbatim* reprint. From the American Edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker, No. 2 Bible House. Dated 1871.

they were made, or ought to be made, in any other churches of the time."*

Both Mr. Litton and Dr. Jacob describe, without naming, the function already alluded to, which Presbyterians still recognise as essential to a progressive and expanding Church—that of the evangelist; and that is the precise office or work, as we have already shown, which Paul exhorted Timothy to perform, viz., the work of an evangelist. Dr. Wm. Smith takes precisely the same view of these cases as Mr. Litton, except that he designates, as we have already done, these companions of Paul as evangelists. Dr. Bloomfield, on Eph. iv. 11, says:

"We learn from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, v. 9, and other writers cited by Suicer, that in the Apostolic Church, evangelist, *εὐαγγελιστής*, was the appellation given to those preachers who aided the labors of the apostles," "not by taking charge of any particular church, but by acting as itinerant preachers and teachers, wherever their labors might be needed." "We can scarcely doubt that to those duties above mentioned may be added that of evangelising the heathen—in fact, discharging the kind of duties performed by the missionaries of modern times."

That this observation is correct, is manifest from Paul's declaration to Titus, that he left him "in Crete, to set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." In concurrence with the above is the testimony of Theodoret, who,

* We make the following characteristic extract from the book under review, p. 412:

"These Epistles to Timothy require such interminable straining and forcing into a sense so entirely non-natural, in order to get rid of the episcopal prerogative, that some more skilful Presbyterians, who have felt the pressure, and who can, *a la Hudibras*,

———' divide
A hair 'twixt south and southwest side,'

have fallen on the expedient of allowing Timothy a delegated authority to act temporarily in the place of Paul, as a sort of *tertium quid*, or intermediate thing between the presbyters at Ephesus and the apostle."

How impotent is this language aimed at Presbyterians, when we find that the view of the cases of Timothy and Titus, which he charges on Presbyterians as an evidence of moral obliquity, is that not only of Litton and Jacob, but also of Scott, Bloomfield, Smith, Conybeare and Howson, etc. What a contrast is here presented! This book *versus* such a host of Episcopalian scholars!

according to Smith, describes the primitive evangelists as traveling missionaries. Undoubtedly, Timothy and Titus were evangelists.

Again: an argument for the apostleship of Timothy, and Silas also, is derived from 1 Thess. ii. 6. In the salutation of the Epistle, Paul had united Timothy and Silvanus (or Silas) with himself; and throughout the Epistle he writes in the first person plural. In the verse above alluded to he says: "But we might have been burdensome to you, as the apostles of Christ." Now, argues our book, since the salutation of the Epistle includes the names of Timothy and Silvanus, and since Paul here writes in the first person plural, saying "we," they are undeniably called apostles in this verse. In confutation of this, we find that while neither Dr. Scott nor Dr. Bloomfield discusses the special point, they both speak of the declaration of the apostle as being personal, and relating wholly to himself. Conybeare and Howson translate the Epistle throughout as if written in the first person singular; and the above-quoted expression is given by them thus: "*as being Christ's apostle.*" In explanation of their manner of translating, they say, Vol. I., p. 391:

"It is important to observe in this place, once for all, that St. Paul uses "*we*" according to the idiom of many ancient writers, where a modern would use "*I.*" Great confusion is caused in many passages by not translating according to his true meaning, in the first person *singular*; for thus it often happens that what he spoke of himself individually, appears to us as if it were meant for a general truth," etc.

Unmistakable internal evidence is then given, that though he uses the plural form, he meant to speak only for himself.

A passage which has occasioned more discussion than probably any other, is Gal. i. 19, where "James the Lord's brother" is named, who, according to the common translation, is there called an apostle. Who is here spoken of, is a difficult question, about which scholars, ancient and modern, are much divided. The most prevalent view is, that the word "brother" is not here used in its absolute sense, but in the sense of a near kinsman; and that hence the allusion is to our Saviour's cousin, James the son of Cleopas, or Alpheus, (he is called both,) and Mary, the sister

of our Lord's mother, who was one of the original twelve. Drs. Scott and Bloomfield take this view, following Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Eusebius says that James, the Lord's brother, was a son of Joseph by a previous marriage; and he, as also the spurious Apostolical Constitutions, gives a list of fourteen apostles, viz., the twelve, Paul, and James. Conybeare and Howson are in doubt as to who this James was; and we suppose most others are in a similar state of mind. Litton confesses that it was James, the brother of the Lord, referred to in Matt. xiii. 55, who presided over the council of Jerusalem, and exercised some sort of presidency over the Church there, but denies his apostleship. The expression in Gal. i. 19, "save James the Lord's brother," which creates all the discussion and originates all the doubt, is susceptible of a translation equally correct with the common version, which would remove all the difficulty, thus: "But other of the apostles saw I none; but *I saw* James the Lord's brother." This rendering is advocated by many Episcopalian scholars, along with Winer, Schaff, etc. There is scarcely a question more disputed, or on which scholars are more divided, than on those which arise here, as to who the several Jameses were, what was their relation to our Lord, to each other, to the apostleship, and to the apostolic Church. Questions of scholarship, however, do not stand in the way of this book and its theory. In the most summary manner, with the dash of a pen, all such matters are fully disposed of to the writer's abundant satisfaction.

Another text where this book gets two more of its thirty apostles is Rom. xvi. 7: "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles." "When we say that Washington was of note among the Presidents, . . . the whole world at once perceives our meaning." P. 401. Now, there is a bare possibility that Andronicus and Junia were missionaries; but the great probability is that they were simply private, or at the most, official, members of the church at Rome. Chrysostom and many others think Junia is the name of a woman; and Olshausen calls her the wife of Andronicus. Dr. Bloomfield renders the expression, "*of note among the apostles,*" thus: "who were well known and had in

consideration by or among the apostles." Conybeare and Howson translate the phrase thus: "who were well known among the apostles." Dr. Scott makes it "well-known and esteemed." Dr. Alford (and also John Calvin,) takes the word apostles in its wide sense of messengers. Dr. Wm. Smith calls Andronicus "a Christian at Rome," and uses precisely the same language of Junia. Kitto says of them both, "they were doubtless Jewish Christians." These are all eminent Episcopalian authorities; and if there is any one "of note" who sustains this book, we have not met with him. How perfectly characteristic, therefore, is the assurance with which it is said: "I could not for my life perceive that either in Greek or English the passage would bear any other straight-forward, above-board meaning, than that Andronicus and Junia were *apostles*." What was perfectly plain to this sapient writer, cannot be seen at all by Episcopalian scholars:

Passing by, for the present, the cases of Barnabas and Luke, the remaining seven of the thirty whom this book enrolls on its final list are "the angels of the seven churches of Asia." As the whole book of Revelation is symbolical and prophetic; as writers are about equally divided in ancient and modern times on the question as to whether these angels were personifications, symbols, or heavenly guardians, on the one hand, or human personages on the other, it is perfectly idle to spend time in discussing them with reference to any theory of the Church or of church government. A reply to this book on that point would be useless, though we believe the Presbyterian theory covers the case more completely than any other possibly can, if it be admissible to attempt their interpretation on any theory of ecclesiology. We will only observe, however, that the words *angel* and *apostle* are not synonymous; and even if they were, the word *apostle* is the official title, the omission of which is fatal in this case to the writer's theory.

2. We have shown that Paul makes a broad distinction between the technical usage of the word and its primitive meanings and ordinary use. The first time it occurs in the apostolical history, when, we think, it does not have its official sense, is in the account of the first mission of Barnabas and Paul to the Gen-

tiles, to which they were set apart by the laying on of hands by the Presbytery of Antioch, Acts xiii. 1-4. In the next chapter these missionaries are once called "the apostles," and once "the apostles, Barnabas and Paul." (Ch. xiv. 4, 14.) But that the word is not here used in its technical sense, but in the ordinary meaning of missionaries, is manifest to us, first, because, while Paul is uniformly called "an apostle," this title is only given to Barnabas on the two occasions above referred to, both of which related to the same great mission; and in the next place, in the Epistle to the Romans, written fifteen years afterward, (Rom. xi. 13,) Paul claims to be "the apostle of the Gentiles," conveying at once the idea that no one had been associated with him in this trust, which was untrue if Barnabas was also an apostle; and, that the office being indeed one of immediate divine appointment, was not transmissible; for he makes no allusion to limitation of time or possible transmission of the office. This is in striking contrast with the use of his title of office in other places. In the salutation at the beginning of ten of his Epistles, Paul calls himself "an apostle" of Jesus Christ, but in no instance in any of his writings does he call himself "*the* apostle of Jesus Christ;" because, when strictly construed, the language would be as untrue as it would be arrogant; for he was only one of a number of apostles of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, he twice calls himself "*a* teacher of the Gentiles," 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; (not *the* teacher,) because he was only one of many teachers of the Gentiles. How carefully he discriminates—he is *the* apostle, but only *a* teacher of the Gentiles.

When we find him so careful in using language strictly correct and courteous to his fellow-apostles in every instance when speaking of his general relation to the apostolic work, we must believe that he always uses accurate language in speaking of himself with regard to all parts of his work. Now, is it to be supposed that Paul the aged, after having carefully guarded the phraseology of the salutation of his Epistle to the Romans, forgot all his previous good manners when he came to write the 11th chapter, and began to magnify his office above measure, and to play the braggart by calling himself "the apostle of the Gentiles," if Barna-

bas, and Titus, and Timothy, and some ten or twelve more, were also apostles of the Gentiles? For, remember, he and Barnabas were, at the same time, by the Presbytery of Antioch, sent forth to the Gentiles, (Gal. ii. 9,) that they actually went together on their first mission, and that if Barnabas was an apostle at all, in the official sense of the word; Paul was no more "the apostle of the Gentiles" than Barnabas was. The same would be true of all the other evangelists whom the Bible calls apostles, in the sense of being missionaries.

This book, p. 398, places much emphasis on the fact that Barnabas's name takes precedence in several instances of that of Paul, from which it infers that Barnabas was at least the equal of Paul. But does the appointment of a layman as chairman of a committee, with ministers or even prelates under him, prove that laymen are officially equal to those officers? Assuredly not. Now, these servants of the Church were sent out on a mission for the organisation of churches, the ordaining of officers therein, and the preaching of the gospel, but not necessarily to perform any apostolical functions. Barnabas had been at Antioch at the introduction of Christianity into that city. He himself had gone from thence to seek Paul in the first instance, and had induced him to come there. Certainly he was before Paul in the order of time in preaching the gospel in that region. This may account for the fact that his name precedes Paul's on several occasions. But all this is immaterial, since, in the 13th verse, (Acts xiv. 13,) Paul is named as the chief of the embassy; the rest were "his company;" and besides during that mission, Paul for the first time asserted apostolical authority and exercised apostolical power, while Barnabas made no such pretension. True, the intimation that he was to fill the apostolic office had previously been given to Paul by divine revelation; (Acts xxii. 15; xxvi. 16;) but until now we see no assumption of apostolic authority, nor the exercise of any gifts which were not common to all the preachers of the gospel at that day. But now, on this mission, he stands forth as an apostle of Christ, with the divine credentials, viz., the power to work miracles. Barnabas did nothing of the kind, and appears never to have claimed any such gifts, nor

to have performed any apostolical functions. His work was that of the evangelist.

Again, this book (p. 399) errs in saying Paul includes Barnabas among the apostles in 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6. This it requires no scholarship, but only common intelligence, to see is not correct. The apostle is discussing ministerial support; and he claims the right of himself and Barnabas to live and marry, and be supported by the Church, as much as "the other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas." Says this book, with characteristic assurance (p. 399):

"Can any man, in his senses or out of his senses, tell us why Barnabas, who is not mentioned again in the whole Epistle, should be named in this connexion, unless he were an apostle as well known as St. Paul, and as well entitled to the support of the Church at large?"

Now, in reply to this, we ask. Were all "the brethren of the Lord" apostles, in the technical sense? If not, then men "in their senses" cannot draw the inference from this passage that Barnabas was one. Indeed, Paul is not discussing the question with reference to the apostleship, but with regard to the rights of the gospel ministry generally; and the conclusion which he reaches is given in v. 14: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Then his whole argument pertained to the rights of those who "preach the gospel;" and all that is involved in the introduction of the name of Barnabas in this place is, that he was a preacher of the gospel. The name of Barnabas is doubtless used because he was well known as a pioneer missionary or evangelist, and as a companion of Paul, when they both labored at their own charges.

To this class of ministers we have already shown that Timothy, Titus, Silas, and all Paul's companions and associates in labor belong. Luke was one of the most faithful, constant, and laborious of them all, and is by many called an evangelist, not only because he wrote one of the Gospels, but because he was a distinguished missionary and preacher of the gospel. The claim which this book makes for his apostleship is based on 2 Cor. viii. 23, because Luke was sent with Titus to Corinth. Now, is it not astonishing that this writer did not see, in this reason for calling

Luke an apostle, that he deluded himself by a word! Assuredly we have no objection to confessing that Luke was an apostle in that sense; in other words, that he was an evangelist or missionary.

In the place just alluded to, however, (2 Cor. viii. 23,) and also in Phil. ii. 25, the word apostle, in the Greek, is rendered "messenger," in our common version. While the words, missionary and messenger, have radically the same origin, they are not precise synonyms in our language. We think our translators were right in rendering the word into English in those two verses. In the first case, Epaphroditus, whoever he may have been, whether a private member or the pastor of the church at Philippi, is sent to that church as the bearer of their contribution to the aid of Paul while he was at Rome. Paul writes them a letter and acknowledges their bounty, which he had received by the hands of their messenger, deputy, legate, or ambassador, (in the original, apostle,) Epaphroditus. There can be no mistake as to the meaning of the word in this case; it certainly no more means apostle, officially, than the Greek word *biblos* meant Bible in Acts xix. 19. Epaphroditus was their messenger, viz., he was the bearer of their bounty.

The other case is equally clear. Paul had enjoined the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3) to lay by in store their alms, to have it in readiness to be sent up to Jerusalem by "whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters." In 2 Cor. 8th chapter, he sends to Corinth Titus, and "the brother whose praise is in all the churches," probably Luke, (who also was chosen of the churches to travel with him to carry their contributions,) in order that they might stir up the Corinthian church and hasten their liberality, as he was about to leave for Jerusalem. Those persons, then, who were chosen of the churches and sent with the Apostle to carry their alms to Jerusalem, are very properly called the messengers of the churches; and the Greek word apostle is properly translated "messengers" in that case. It is probable, indeed, that these persons were not only messengers for that special object, but also that they were in the wider sense of the original word missionaries or evangelists, as there is scarcely a doubt that they

were chosen from among the companions and helpers of the Apostle. The epistle was sent to Corinth by Titus and Luke, who were both of them co-workers with Paul; and Titus at least, as there is reason to believe, was frequently sent out by him on missionary tours to perform the work of evangelist. The probability is, that the same is true of Luke, though some doubt. Archbishop Thompson is followed by Smith's Dictionary in calling him a missionary or evangelist. We need only add that among modern Episcopalians, Alford, Scott, Bloomfield, Litton, and Conybeare and Howson, together with Kitto's Cyclopaedia and Smith's Dictionary, all agree with the translators of the Bible, that Epaphroditus was not an apostle in its official sense, but only a messenger, deputy, or legate, from the church at Philippi to Paul at Rome. Conybeare and Howson think he was a leading presbyter of that church; while some suppose him to have been its pastor; but it is all surmise, since there is no trustworthy historical testimony. Moreover, all the authorities to which we have already referred, and all to which we have had access, agree with Dr. Scott and our translators, that in 2 Cor. viii. 23, the word does not mean official apostles.

We have shown that the mere use of the word apostle in the Scriptures proves nothing unless there is other evidence to establish a claim to apostleship. But in none of these cases is there the slightest evidence. Some of the missionaries or evangelists, for whom this claim is set up, were doubtless inspired; but there is no proof that any of them wrought miracles; that any of them claimed to have been commissioned as apostles, by direct revelation, or to be able to give personal testimony to the resurrection and ascension of our Saviour. Hence, no one of them ever claimed to be anything more than a minister of the gospel and a missionary of the Church, otherwise called an evangelist; and some of them were probably private members of the church. In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, and in Bloomfield's Notes on the New Testament, we cannot find a hint that anybody ever thought that Andronicus, Junia, Epaphroditus, Timothy, Titus, Silas, or Luke, or the angels of the seven churches, belonged to the rank of apostles. If any

one besides the author of the book under review now thinks so, neither Smith nor Kitto, nor any of their learned co-laborers, thought his views to be of sufficient importance to combat them or even state them. Hence in the judgment of these eminent Episcopalian scholars, to whom we have referred this grand list of thirty apostles, which our new convert found in his Bible, and which the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union has ventured to accept, dwindles down and becomes beautifully less, till it is found to include only the original apostolic college, viz., the eleven, with Matthias and Paul, to which some would add the names of Barnabas and James the Just.

We wish we had room for the whole of the learned and conclusive argument by which Mr. Litton maintains that not only did the original apostles have no successors, but that Episcopacy was not founded by them; but our room forbids it. On p. 377, he proposes to inquire, "first, whether Episcopacy can be proved to be of divine right, or to have been instituted by Christ himself; secondly, whether the *sole* evidence of Scripture is sufficient to enable us to pronounce it to be of apostolical institution; and lastly, whether we can fairly draw this latter conclusion from the *joint* testimony of Scripture and ecclesiastical history." The first and second of those questions, after full examination of the whole Scripture argument, he answers negatively, (see Jacob, pp. 75, 79,) though he answers the third question in the affirmative. But his previous answers settle the matter in the minds of all Presbyterians. For the sole authority, for them, is the Bible. What cannot be proved from it, they reject. But Mr. Litton is a true Churchman; to a certain extent he accepts tradition and the testimony of the Fathers; and hence, he gave the last question its affirmative answer. With us, however, the simple and only question is, What saith the Scripture? Notwithstanding all the vaunting of this book, and its triumphant quotations from the Bible, when the Anglican scholar and theologian, Mr. Litton, takes the witness stand, he is compelled to confess that the Bible, which is the sole rule of faith and practice, does not, without external aid and additions, give support to diocesan Episcopacy.

With him agree Archbishop Whately and Dr. Jacob. With us, that fact is conclusive.

VI. The reasoning of this book in favor of the rite of confirmation is fully as triumphant in tone and as destitute of scriptural foundation as its reasoning on the subject of the apostleship. It bases the rite wholly on Heb. vi. 1, 2.

“ ‘Leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.’ According to this, ‘*the foundation,*’ ‘*the principles of the doctrine of Christ*’—what are they? ‘Repentance, Faith, Baptism, *Laying on of hands,* the Resurrection, the eternal Judgment.’ Let me think, said I within myself—is this the order of teaching among Presbyterians? They teach, first, ‘*Repentance.*’ Very well: for St. Paul says, first, ‘*Repentance.*’ They teach, secondly, ‘*Faith.*’ very well, again; for St. Paul says, secondly, ‘*Faith.*’ They teach, thirdly, Baptism; very well, once more; for St. Paul says, thirdly, ‘*Baptisms.*’ But at the fourth stage, St. Paul and the Presbyterians part; St. Paul says, fourthly, ‘*the laying on of hands.*’ Presbyterians break the chain binding our youthful Isaacs to the altar, and our young Samuels to the temple, and cast the bright link away.” Pp. 91, 92.

Now, all this and much more which is given us on the subject is just as clear as mud. But notwithstanding its triumphant tone, the very thing to be proven is taken for granted, and assumption and assertion take the place of exegesis and logic. No proof is offered, for there is none, that there was in the apostolical Church any such rite as that of confirmation; and in the absence of any such scriptural evidence, it is simply a pragmatistical assumption that “the laying on of hands” (Heb. vi. 1, 2) alluded to confirmation. The laying on of hands is a custom of very remote antiquity, which was used in pronouncing a blessing, offering sacrifices, setting apart to an office, etc., etc. Moreover, it was used by the apostles when imparting the gifts of the Spirit, when working miracles, and when ordaining church officers. No matter: there was the custom of laying on of hands, argues this book, and bishops now lay on hands in confirmation. Now, without any attempt at argument or proof, but simply and

only because the expression "laying on of hands" is found in Heb. vi. 1, 2, and because the same rite is now used in confirmation, this book goes into raptures at its triumph over Presbyterians on this subject. Such reasoning tramples on logic, exegesis, and common sense; but for the multitude, who from want of knowledge, can be imposed upon, it answers just as valuable proselyting purposes as if it were a work of true learning. On this point we shall again turn over this book to our prelatial friend, Mr. Litton, for answer. He says that the apostles could, by the imposition of hands, communicate spiritual gifts, such as "wisdom," "knowledge," "faith," etc.; but that, after the apostolic age, these gifts were not imparted as they had been by the apostles by the imposition of hands; and then in a foot note, p. 380, he says:

"Hence the groundlessness of the assumption that our rite of confirmation is identical with the apostolic imposition of hands. There is hardly anything between them in common, save the outward sign. The apostles, as *apostles*, had no successors; and the signs which accompanied the apostolic rite, and which constituted its specific difference, have long ceased; there only remains the imposition of hands, which they practised, and we practise now. The fact is, that the *ceremony* was continued in the Church, as a salutary and scriptural one, when the effects that once followed it were withdrawn; and as a useful and scriptural custom of the Church it can only now be regarded."

Dr. Jacob takes precisely the same view of this matter with Mr. Litton; but we cannot spare room for his clear and convincing statement. We need, however, say no more in reply to the profound and triumphant observations of this book on this subject.

VII. But "the Fathers"—Dr. Miller did not quote the Fathers in full—did not quote them fairly; and hence it is no wonder the young men who come from Princeton are good Presbyterians! About Dr. Miller's quotations of the Fathers, we shall say a few words directly. But, first, did he not quote the Scriptures correctly? That is the main question, the only question with us. Presbyterians draw their doctrine and their church order from the Bible alone, which they hold that God has given us for our infallible guidance in faith and life. The Fathers do not speak

by the inspiration of God, as do the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. And from the predictions which Paul gave by divine inspiration of the fearful corruptions which, from the ambition of men, would originate in the bosom of the Church immediately after his departure, and similar warnings by the other apostles; and especially when we remember the disorders and irregularities that sprang up while the apostles were still present—it does not seem to Presbyterians that they have much encouragement to look from the infallible Scriptures to the fallible Fathers to learn anything about the constitution and order of the Church, any more than about its doctrines; and more especially do they thus feel in view of the fact, that nearly all the decisive quotations from the Fathers on these points are in dispute, and many of them are without question spurious.

Hence Presbyterians read the Fathers just as they do the writings of other pious and learned men, receiving what is according to the Word of God, and rejecting whatever is not in accordance with the inspired writings. So it matters not to a Presbyterian what may be proved from the Fathers: our appeal is always to the law and testimony. When a Presbyterian agrees to refer to the Fathers, it is to meet Prelatists and others on their own ground—to use their own weapons against themselves. But let them prove what they may by the Fathers, it amounts to nothing with us; for the Bible is not only an infallible rule of faith and practice—it is the only rule, to the exclusion of the Fathers, the traditions of the Church, and every thing else which is not of divine revelation. The frailty of human nature is such, that Moses could not remain forty days and forty nights away from the congregation without the people corrupting the worship of God by idolatry with Aaron at their head; and when we consider the warnings given us in the apostolical Epistles, and the fulfilment of those forebodings as exhibited in the book of Revelation, we should be very careful to construct the Church, its doctrine, its order, its worship, according to the pattern shown in the mount; that is, according to the commandments of the Lord, given us by his inspired apostles, who were commis-

sioned by him for that very purpose. We should never forget that the Church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

But let us return to the charge made in this book, that Dr. Miller misquotes and misrepresents the Fathers. On p. 432, the author says :

“I left Princeton sure that at least Augustine and Hilary and Jerome and Cyprian were Presbyterians at heart, as much as Dr. Miller was. And if they were not, it certainly was not the Doctor's fault, who did his best, by every *ex post facto* art, to make them so.”

On p. 445, we find the following, referring to Dr. Miller's references to Hilary and others :

“Very queer quotations these of the Doctor's. But no matter. Hilary must serve them one more good turn before they can let him go.”

And in the chapter on “Presbyterianism and the Fathers” throughout, he represents Dr. Miller as garbling them so as to make out a case ; with misrepresenting them intentionally so as to deceive the students, etc. ; and in view of it all, says on p. 454 :

“Is it to be wondered at that the students at Princeton are satisfied with Presbyterian ordination ?”

The above quotations will show the animus of this assault on Dr. Miller, and will leave no room for any one to doubt that the charge is clearly made, that he garbled, misinterpreted, and misquoted the Fathers, to suppress their testimony in favor of Episcopacy, and to torture their language into an approval of Presbyterianism. This charge of dishonesty is made in the most offensive form, viz., that of covert insinuation. We shall say but little about Dr. Miller, because he does not need it. He did not need it when living, nor does he now since his ascension; need any defence of his integrity and moral character against the attacks of so reckless a book as this. But to show how outrageous these accusations are, we will refer our readers to the same book from which we have already quoted Mr. Litton's “Church of Christ.” On p. 388, he says :

“The most remarkable instance in which a deviation from the rule that bishops only should ordain appears to have taken place in the well known one of the Alexandrian Church, in which, as Jerome reports, it was the custom for the presbyters ‘to choose out one of their own num-

ber, and, placing him in a higher position, to salute him bishop; as if an army should make an emperor, or the deacons should elect one of themselves and call him archdeacon.' To the same effect is the testimony of Hilary the deacon, and of Eutyehius of Alexandria. To the evidence of the former writer, Mr. Palmer (on the Church, part 6, c. 4,) objects that the word 'consignant' which he (Hilary) uses signifies not 'ordain,' but 'confirm,' and to that of the latter, that he lived too late (in the tenth century) to have any weight in determining such a question. But, however indecisive the expressions or the opinions of each writer separately may be, the presumption in favor of the obvious meaning of Jerome's language created by their united testimony is very strong, especially as it is confirmed by a passage which occurs in the book printed with Augustin's works, *Quæstiones de utroque Testamento*: 'Nam in Alexandria et per totum Ægyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.' Quæst. CI. By the Benedictine editors this work is pronounced spurious; but the author is supposed to have lived not later than the close of the fourth century."

Now compare the above candid and just observations from this distinguished Episcopal author and advocate with the shameless charges of the book under review. The quotations from and the allusions to the Fathers made in the above extract from Litton, the honest Episcopalian, are the chief ones referred to in this author's allegations against Dr. Miller. It will be seen that Litton throughout sustains Dr. Miller in all his translations, quotations, and allusions to the Fathers.

Additional illustrations of the want of fairness of this book, in quoting from and alluding to the Fathers, we must omit. But we confess that the further we go in examining the book, and the more we see of its jesuitry and unfairness, the more it becomes a difficult problem to solve, what sort of people they are who endorse it.

VIII. On p. 518, this book says: "Presbytery has also, without compunction, added to the ancient creed, or substituted for it, the dogmas of predestination, limited redemption, and, in short, the resolutions of the Synod of Westminster." But, in contrast, "Episcopacy maintains the ancient creed *intact*, as the ancient compact and sacred bond of union; and would no more presume to add to that sacred instrument, or to take from it, than she would alter or mutilate the Scriptures." Now this writer once

professed to be a Presbyterian minister, and ought to have known that the Apostles' Creed is part and parcel of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church, though it is far from occupying the same place in our esteem as the word of God. At the end of the Shorter Catechism, the Apostles' Creed is inserted in the Confession of Faith, as it was in the Westminster Confession as held by the Church of Scotland, and so it is always published with the Shorter Catechism and universally committed to memory by our children along with it. Moreover, parents are required to teach their children the Apostles' Creed along with the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. (Directory of Worship, ch. IX., sec. 5.) Again, he misstates the truth with regard to the Church of his new love, in order to give a stab at the Church he had abandoned. "The Presbyterians have substituted the resolutions of the Synod of Westminster," says he, "for those of the Creed;" but with what holy horror "the Church" would look at any addition to or abatement from the Creed! But all this time, what about the Thirty-nine Articles, not of the Synod of Westminster, but of Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth? Again, the Westminster doctrines are derided, and Presbytery is held up to contempt, because it inculcates the doctrine of predestination; and afterward we find one of the justifications which this author offers for quitting the Presbyterian Church, is that it taught this doctrine. Now, let us turn to the 17th of the Thirty-nine Articles; and what do we find? There, in all its naked deformity, is this very doctrine of predestination. The difference is that the Presbyterians hold the doctrine of predestination as stated in the Westminster Confession, and Episcopalians profess to believe the very same doctrine taught in their Thirty-nine Articles, while both Churches hold and teach the formulary called the Apostles' Creed! That is all the difference. Such, once more, is the trustworthiness of this book, which is now circulating under the auspices of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union!

But we must bring our criticisms to a close. Our readers can judge of the whole book by these samples of its method of presenting its cause and these illustrations of its unfairness in stating the position and views of Presbyterians. There are many other

accusations just as baseless, which we must pass over for want of room. If there is a single instance in which it represents us correctly, we have failed to find it. The venerable maxim which forbids our speaking anything of the dead but that which is good has been in our mind; but we have felt it to be a mixed question in this instance. For though the author is dead, the book is not; but is still promulgated by the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union. Whilst we would not invade the sepulchre with the language of opprobrium, we cannot consent to allow a book which affects great fairness, but which in point of fact is glaringly prejudiced and uncandid, and freighted with untruths, to go unrebuked while it is circulated to our injury and has living endorsers. We feel, indeed, as though we had not done ourselves and our cause full justice in our exposures of it, from the restraint we have put on our language. Our indignation, however, is far less at the original writer than at the endorsers and disseminators of it. It is manifest that he was gullible to the last degree; and as he seems, in the first instance, to have taken Presbyterianism on trust without much thought or serious examination; so, on changing church relations, his facile susceptibilities led him to embrace everything which seemed to favor Episcopacy, without exercising sufficient judgment or discrimination to save him at all times from appearing ridiculous. Moreover, he was actuated by a twofold zeal, first, to justify himself for abandoning the faith of his fathers, on which point he seems to have been very sensitive, resenting in advance the apprehended criticisms of his former confreres; and secondly, to vindicate his embrace of Episcopacy. Moreover, he appears to have been urged on by a necessity to exert himself to secure the confidence of the Church he had entered, when, as we infer from some statements on p. 35, etc., he received an inverse welcome; and hence he was tempted to go to greater lengths in advocating pretentious Episcopacy, and in opposing Presbyterianism, than the more sober-minded and original Episcopalians venture to go. But the aforesaid Sunday-school Union has no such excuses: they are impelled by no such necessity. This book they must know is utterly untrue in its representations of Presbyterianism as well as in its pre-

tences of arguments for Episcopacy. That "Union" knows perfectly well that Episcopalian scholars do not maintain many of the absurd positions taken in this book, on the subject of the apostleship, the rite of confirmation, etc., etc.; and they ought to know that Dr. Miller's quotations from the Fathers were perfectly correct, and that his translations were the same as those given by their own wisest and most learned writers. They are, therefore, to be greatly blamed for the circulation of a book which vilifies Dr. Miller, and is calculated to mislead; a book which inculcates ignorance, instead of true learning, and circulates slanders against Presbyterianism, instead of the truth of history. How they reconcile this conduct with their consciences, we know not; but certainly such proceedings are deserving of the condemnation of all honest men, especially among Episcopalians, since the character of their Church is affected thereby. It is a mendacious book, like *Theodosia Ernest*; and like it, is only used for proselyting purposes among plain people, ignorant of the facts involved, who cannot see through its irrelevant reasonings, its misstatements of history, its want of scholarship, and its glaring misrepresentations. The upright, honorable, and learned men among the ministry and membership of the Episcopal Church, assuredly can look on this publication and its vendors only with disapprobation and shame.