

A 55251 2^{DUPL}

Tappan Presbyterian Association
LIBRARY.

Presented by HON. D. BETHUNE DUFFIELD.

From Library of Rev. Geo. Duffield, D.D.



George Duffield A.M.

In tali nunquam lassat venatio sylva.

A.D. 1884.

No. _____

BV
670
.B26

THE
SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT

FOR
EPISCOPACY EXAMINED:

**FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE QUARTERLY CHRISTIAN
SPECTATOR FOR MARCH, 1834, AND MARCH, 1835.**

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY LEAVITT, LORD & CO.
182 Broadway.
BOSTON:—CROCKER & BREWSTER,
47 Washington-street.
1835.

Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year
1835, by LEAVITT, LORD & Co., in the Clerk's Office of the
District Court of the Southern District of New-York.

Gift
Tappan Presb. Ass.
3-7-1932

ADVERTISEMENT.

14-1-32 JMB

THE following little work was first published in two articles in the Quarterly Christian Spectator. They were originally written, and are now re-published, from no desire of controversy. The only purpose in issuing the articles in this form is, to furnish those who believe in the equality of Christian ministers with a brief view of the arguments on which the parity of the clergy is defended; and to show from the New Testament that the claims of Episcopalians are without a scriptural foundation.

A. BARNES.

Philadelphia, 1835.

West & Trow, Printers.

EXAMINATION

OF

“EPISCOPACY TESTED BY SCRIPTURE;”

A tract by the Right Rev. H. U. ONDERDONK, D.D., Assistant
Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

THE history of this tract is this. It was first published as an essay, in the “Protestant Episcopalian,” for November and December, 1830. It was then issued in a pamphlet form, without the name of the author. It was next requested for publication by the “Trustees of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Press;” and after being amended by the author, with an addition of several notes, it was printed in the form of a tract, and as such has had an extensive circulation.

The tract is one which has strong claims on the attention of those who are not Episcopalians. The name and standing of the author will give it extensive publicity. The fact that it comes from the “Press” of the Episcopal church, in this country; that it is issued as one of their standing publications, and that it will, therefore, be circulated with all the

zeal which usually characterizes associations organized for defending the exclusive views of any religious body ; and most of all, the character of the tract itself, and the ground assumed by it, give it a title to our attention, which can be claimed by hardly any *single* tract of the kind ever published in our country. Our views of it may be expressed in one word. It is the best written, the most manly, elaborate, judicious, and candid discussion, in the form of a tract, which we have seen on this subject. Our Episcopalian friends regard it as unanswerable. They have provided amply for its circulation, and rely on its making converts wherever it is perused ; and in a tone which cannot be misunderstood, they are exulting in the fact, that to this day it has been left entirely unnoticed by the opponents of prelacy.* And *we* wonder, too, that it has not been noticed. There are men among us who seem to consider the external defence of the church as intrusted to their peculiar care ; who delight to be seen with the accoutrements of the ecclesiastical military order, patrolling the walls of Zion ; who parade with much self-complacency, as sentinels in front of the temple of God ; who are quick to detect the movements of external enemies ; and who are admirably adapted to this species of warfare. They seem to have little heart for the interior operations of the church,

* "Has the tract 'Episcopacy tested by Scripture,' been answered? This, we believe, is neither the first time of asking, nor the second, nor the third."—*Protestant Episcopalian*.

and seldom notice them, except to suggest doubts of the expediency of some new measure proposed, or to promote discord, and strife, by laying down rules for the conduct of those who are laboring in the direct work of saving souls. Much do we marvel that these men have suffered this tract to lie so long unnoticed.

We have never regarded the Episcopal controversy with any very special interest. Our feelings lead us to dwell on subjects more directly connected with the salvation of the soul. We have no taste for the species of warfare which is often waged in guarding the outposts of religion. Christianity, we have supposed, is designed to act directly on the *hearts* of men ; and we regard it as a matter of very little moment, in what particular church the spirit is prepared for its eternal rest, provided the great object be accomplished, of bringing it fairly under the influence of the gospel.

But we propose, for the reasons already suggested, to examine the arguments of this tract. We do it with the highest respect for the author ; with a full conviction that he has done ample justice to his cause ; that he has urged on his side of the question, all that can be advanced ; and we enter on the task with sincere pleasure, at meeting an argument conducted with entire candor, without misrepresentation, and with a manifest love of truth. Our wish is to reciprocate this candor ; and our highest desire is to imitate the chastened spirit, the sober argumenta-

tion, and the Christian temper evinced in this tract. It is firm in its principles, but not illiberal ; decided in its views, but not censorious ; settled in its aims, but not resorting to sophism, or ridicule, to carry its points. There is, evidently, in the author's mind, too clear a conviction of the truth of what he advances, to justify a resort to the mere *art* of the logician ; too manifest a love of the cause in which he is engaged, to expose himself to the retort which might arise from lofty declamation, or the expression of angry passions towards his opponents.

One object which we have in view, in noticing this tract, is to express our gratification, that the controversy is at last put where it should have been at first, on *an appeal to the Bible alone*. Never have we been more disgusted, than at the mode in which the Episcopal controversy has usually been conducted. By common consent, almost, the writers on both sides have turned from the New Testament, where the controversy might have been brought to a speedy issue, to listen to the decisions of the fathers ; and, as might have been expected, have

“ Found no end, in wandering mazes lost.”

It was the policy of the friends of prelacy to do so ; and it was the folly of their opponents to suffer them to choose the field of debate, and to weary themselves in an effort to fix the meaning, to secure the consistency, and obtain the suffrages of the fathers. Full well was it known, we believe, by the friends

of Episcopacy in other times, that the New Testament could furnish a most slender support for their claims. In the times of the papacy, it had always been defended by an appeal to the fathers. The system had risen, sustained, not even *professedly*, by the authority of the Bible, but by the traditions of the elders. The ranks and orders of the papal priesthood could be defended only by the authority of a church which claimed infallibility, and which might dispense, therefore, with the New Testament. The Reformers came forth from the bosom of the papacy with much of this feeling. They approached this subject with high reverence for the opinions of past times ; with a deference for the fathers, nourished by all the forms of their education, by all existing institutions, and by the reluctance of the human mind to break away from the established customs of ages. On the one hand, the advocates of Episcopacy found their proofs in the *common law* of the church, the institutions which had existed "time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary ;" and on the other hand, the opponents of prelacy were equally anxious to show, that *they* had not departed from the customs of the fathers, and that the defence of their institutions might be found in times far remote, and in records which received the veneration, and commanded the confidence of the Christian world. Into this abyss both parties plunged. In this immense chaos of opinions and interpretations, into these moving, disorganized,

jostling elements, where, as in the first chaos, light struggled with darkness, and confusion reigned, they threw themselves, to endeavor severally to find the support of their opinions. "Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance," says Milton, "hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the fathers." With those who, according to Mosheim,* deemed it not only lawful, but commendable, to deceive and lie for the sake of truth and piety, it would be singular if *any* point could be settled that involved controversy. With men who held to every strange and ridiculous opinion; to every vagary that the human mind can conceive; † it would be strange if *both* sides in this controversy did not find enough that had the appearance of demonstration, to perplex and embarrass an opponent *ad libitum*. In examining this controversy, as it was conducted in former times, we have been often amused, and edified, at the perfect complacency with which a passage from one of the fathers is adduced in defence of either side of the question, and the perfect ease with which, by a new translation, or by introducing a few words of the context, or more frequently by an appeal to some other part of the same author, not studious himself of consistency, and probably having no settled principles, the passage is shown to mean just

* Murdock's Mosheim, vol. i., p. 159.

† See Tillemont's Ecclesiastical History, *passim*.

the contrary ; and then again a new version, or yet another quotation, shall give it a new aspect, and restore it to its former honors.* Thus the fathers became a mere foot-ball between the contending parties ; and thus in this controversy the weary searcher for truth finds no solid ground. Eminently here " he which is *first* in his cause seemeth just ; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." Prov. xviii. 17. To this wearisome and unsatisfactory toil he is doomed, who will read all the older controversies on Episcopacy. There he,

" O'er bog, or steep, through strait, rough, dense or rare,
With head, hands, wings or feet, pursues his way,
And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps or flies."

Were we to adduce the most striking instance of the plastic nature of this kind of proof, we should refer to the epistles of Ignatius. To our eyes they seem to be a plain, straight-forward account of the existence of Presbyterianism in his time. They are substantially such a description as a man would give, writing in the inflated and exaggerated manner in which the orientals wrote, of Presbyterianism as it exists in the United States. Yet it is well known, that with the utmost pertinacity those letters have been adduced as proving the doctrine of Episcopacy. And so confident have been the assertions on the subject, that not a few non-Episcopalians have given them up as unmanageable, and have

* See the Letters of Dr. Miller, and Dr. Bowden, on Episcopacy, *passim*.

stoutly contended, what may be very true, that no inconsiderable part of them are forgeries.

Any man can see what a hopeless task is before him, if he endeavors to settle this controversy by the authority of the fathers. The waste of time, and talent, and learning, on this subject, is fitted deeply to humble the heart. And even yet the passion has not ceased. Even now, men high in office and in rank, leave the New Testament and appeal to the fathers. Episcopacy is discarded, not principally because the New Testament is a stranger to it, but because Jerome was not a prelatist; it is rejected, not because it cannot be made out from the Bible, but because it is a matter of debate, whether the fathers teach it or not.

From this unprofitable and endless litigation, we are glad to turn to the true merits of the case. We rejoice sincerely that one man can be found who is willing to bring to this subject the great principle of the Protestant reformation, that *all* religious opinions are to be tested by the Scriptures. And we especially rejoice to see this principle so decisively advanced, by a man of the talents and official rank of Dr. Onderdonk; and that it is so prominently avowed by sending forth from the "Protestant Episcopal Press," a tract defending this principle. It indicates a healthy state of things in the Episcopal church in this country. It will save endless disputes about words, and much useless toil in endeavoring to give consistency and sense to the fathers. This

mode of reasoning, too, will soon decide the controversy. Long have we wished to see this matter brought to so obvious and so just an issue; and long have we expected that when this should be the case, the matter would be soon decided. Hereafter let it be held up as a great principle, from which, neither in spirit nor in form, we are ever to depart, that if the peculiar doctrines of Episcopacy are not found in the Scriptures, they are to be honestly abandoned, or held, as Cranmer held them, as matters of mere expediency. Let this truth go forth, never to be recalled; and let every man who attempts to defend the claims of bishops, appeal to the Bible alone. On this appeal, with confidence, we rest the issue of this case.

The great principle on which the argument in this tract is conducted, is indicated in its title; it is farther stated at length in the tract itself. Thus, in the opening sentence, "The claim of Episcopacy to be of divine institution, and therefore obligatory on the church, rests fundamentally on the one question—Has it the authority of Scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding." Again, on the same page, "No argument is worth taking into the account, that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic—the scriptural evidence of Episcopacy." Having stated this principle, the writer proceeds to remark, that "the argument is obstructed with many extraneous and irrelevant difficulties, which, instead of aiding the mind in reaching the

truth on that great subject, tend only to divert it and occupy it with questions not affecting the main issue." The first object of the "essay" is then stated to be, "to point out some of these extraneous questions and difficulties, and expose either their fallacy or their irrelevancy." "The next object will be, to state the scriptural argument."

In pursuing this plan, the writer introduces and discusses, as one of these extraneous difficulties, the objection that Episcopacy is inimical to a free government. He next notices, as "another of these extraneous considerations, the comparative standing in *piety*, as evinced by the usual tokens of moral and spiritual character, of the members respectively of the Episcopal and non-Episcopal churches." A third "suggestion" noticed, is, "that the *external* arrangements of religion are but of inferior importance, and that therefore all scruple concerning the subject before us may be dispensed with." p. 5. A fourth "apparently formidable, yet extraneous difficulty, often raised, is, that Episcopal claims unchurch all non-Episcopal denominations." p. 6. This consequence, the author of the tract says is not by him allowed. "But granting it to the fullest extent," it is asked, "what bearing has it on the truth of the single proposition that Episcopacy is of divine ordinance?" A fifth among these extraneous points, is "the practice of adducing the authority of individuals, who, although eminent in learning and piety, seem at least to have contradicted themselves or these public

standards on the subject of Episcopacy." p. 7. The last objection noticed, as not affecting the ultimate decision of the controversy, is, "that though the examples recorded in Scripture should be allowed to favor Episcopacy, still that regimen is not there explicitly commanded." p. 9.

To most of the observations under these several heads, we give our hearty assent. And it will be perceived, that the controversy is thus reduced to very narrow limits ; and that, if these principles are correct, numberless tomes which have been written on both sides of the question are totally useless. We are glad that all this extraneous matter is struck off, and should rejoice if every consideration of this kind were hereafter to be laid out of view.

In discussing the second topic proposed, "the *scriptural evidence* relating to this controversy," (p. 11) the first object of Dr. Onderdonk is to state the precise point in debate. It is then observed, that "parity declares that there is but one *order* of men authorized to minister in sacred things, all of this order being of equal grade, and having inherently equal spiritual rights. Episcopacy declares that the Christian ministry was established in *three orders*, called ever since the apostolic age, bishops, presbyters, or elders, and deacons ; of which the highest only has a right to ordain and confirm, that of general supervision in a diocese, etc." p. 11. The main question is then stated, correctly, to be, that "concerning the superiority of bishops ;" and the object

of the essay is to prove, that, according to the New Testament, *such* an order existed, and was clothed with such peculiar powers. p. 11. Let it not be forgotten, that this is the main point in the case ; and that if this is not made out, so as to be binding on the church *every where*, the claims of Episcopacy fall to the ground.

In endeavoring to establish this point, the author maintains, "that the apostles ordained," and denies that elders (presbyters) ever did. p. 14. In supporting this position, the plan of argument is to show, that "the apostles and elders had *not* equal power and rights." p. 14. An attempt is, therefore, made to prove that the difference between the two orders is, that the former had the power of ordination, the latter not. In pursuing the reasoning, (p. 16.) the writer endeavors to show, that "there is no scriptural evidence that mere elders (presbyters) ordained." Under this branch of the argument, he examines the texts which have usually been adduced in favor of Presbyterian ordination. Having shown as he supposes, that these passages do *not* prove that they did thus ordain, Dr. O. next proceeds to the last branch of the subject, viz., that "this distinction between elders and a grade superior to them, in regard especially to the power of ordaining, was so persevered in, as to indicate that it was a *permanent* arrangement, and not designed to be but temporary." p. 23.

This is the outline of the argument. It mani-

festly embraces the essential points of the case. And if these positions cannot be maintained, Episcopacy has no binding obligation on men, and such a claim should be at once abandoned. This argument we propose, with great respect, but with entire freedom, to examine. And we expect to show, that the point is *not* made out, that the New Testament has designated a superior rank of church officers, intrusted with the sole power of ordination, and general superintendence of the church.

In entering on this discussion, we shall first endeavor to ascertain the *real* point of the controversy, and to show that the Scripture authorities appealed to, do *not* establish the point maintained by Episcopalians. In pursuance of this, we remark, that the burden of proof lies wholly on the friends of Episcopacy. They set up a claim,—a claim which they affirm to be binding on all the churches of every age. It is a claim which is specific, and which must be made out, or their whole pretensions fall. In what predicament it may leave other churches, is not the question. It would not prove Episcopacy to be of divine origin, could its friends show that Presbyterianism is unfounded in the Scriptures; or that Congregationalism has no claims to support; or that Independency is unauthorized; or even that lay-ordination is destitute of direct support. The question after all might be, whether it was the design of the apostles to establish *any* particular form of church government, any more

than to establish a fixed mode of civil administration? This question we do not intend to examine now, neither do we design to express any opinion on it. We say only, that it is a question on which much may be said, and which should not be considered as settled in this controversy. The specific point to be made out is, that there is Scriptural authority for that which is claimed for the bishops. And we may remark further, that this is not a claim which can be defended by any doubtful passages of Scripture, or by any very circuitous mode of argumentation. As it is expected to affect the whole organization of the church; to constitute, in fact, the peculiarity of its organization; and to determine, to a great extent at least, the validity of all its ordinances, and its ministry; we have a right to demand that the proof should not be of a doubtful character, or of a nature which is not easily apprehended by the ordinary readers of the New Testament.

We repeat, now, as of essential importance in this controversy, that the burden of proof lies on the friends of Episcopacy. It is theirs to make out this specific claim. To decide whether they can do so, is the object of this inquiry.

The first question then, is, What is the claim; or, what is the essential point which is to be made out in the defence of Episcopacy? This claim is stated in the following words: (p. 11.) "Episcopacy declares, that the Christian ministry was established in *three orders*, called, ever since the apostolic age,

bishops, presbyters, or elders, [if so, why do they *now* call the second order *priests* ?] and deacons ; of which the highest only has the right to ordain, and confirm, that of the chief administration in a diocese, and that of the chief administration of spiritual discipline, besides enjoying all the powers of the other grades." The main question, as thus stated, relates to the authority of bishops ; and the writer adds, " If we cannot authenticate the claims of the Episcopal office, (the office of bishops,) we will surrender those of our deacons, and let all power be confined to the one office of presbyters." The same view of the main point of the controversy is given by Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity,—b. vii. § 2.

It will be seen that *several* claims are here set up in behalf of bishops. One is, the right of ordination ; a second, that of confirmation ; a third, that of general supervision ; a fourth, that of the general administration of discipline. These are separate points to be made out ; and a distinct argument might be entered into, to show that *neither* of them is founded on the authority of the Scriptures. To enter on this discussion, would require more time and space than we can now spare. Nor is it necessary, for we presume the Episcopalian would be willing to stake the whole cause on his being able to make out the authority of *ordination* to lie solely in the bishop. For, obviously, if *that* cannot be made out, all the other pretensions are good for nothing ; and, as the writer of this tract limits *his* inquiries to

this single point, we shall confine our remarks to this also.

The question, then, is, Has a bishop the sole power of ordaining? Is setting apart to a sacred office,—to the office of preaching, and administering the sacraments, confined in the New Testament exclusively to this order of ministers? The Episcopalian claims that it is. We deny it, and ask him for the explicit proof of a point so simple as this, and one which we have a right to expect he will make out, with very great clearness, from the sacred Scriptures.

The first proof adduced by the author is, that the apostles had the sole power of ordaining. This is a highly important point in the discussion, or rather, the very hinge of the controversy. We cannot, therefore, but express our surprise, that a writer who can see the value and bearing of an argument so clearly as Dr. Onderdonk, should not have thought himself called upon to devote more than *two* pages to its direct defence; and that, without adducing any explicit passages of the New Testament. The argument stated in these two pages, or these parts of *three* pages, (14, 15, 16,) rests on the assumption that the apostles *ordained*. "That the apostles ordained, all agree." Now, if this means any thing to the purpose, it means that they ordained *as apostles*; or that they were set apart to the apostolic office for the *purpose* of ordaining. But this we shall take the liberty to deny, and to prove to be an

unfounded claim. Having made this assumption, the writer adds, that a *distinction* is observed in the New Testament between "the apostles *and* elders," "the apostles *and* elders, *and* brethren." He next attempts to show, that this distinction was not made because they "were appointed by Christ personally," nor because "they had seen our Lord after his resurrection;" nor "because of this power of working miracles : " and then the writer adds, "It follows, therefore, or *will not at least be questioned,*"—a qualification which, by the way, seems to look as if the writer had himself no great confidence in the consecutiveness of the demonstration,—“that the apostles were distinguished from the elders, because they were *superior* to them in ministerial power and rights.” p. 15. This is the argument; and this is the whole of it. On the making out of this point, depends the stupendous fabric of Episcopacy. Here is the corner-stone, on which rests the claims of bishops; this the position on which the imposing and mighty superstructure has been reared. Our readers will join with us in our amazement, that this point has not been made out with a clearer deduction of arguments, than such as were fitted to lead to the ambiguous conclusion, "it follows, therefore, or—,"

Now, the only way of ascertaining whether this claim be well founded, is to appeal at once to the New Testament. The question, then, which we propose to settle now, is, Whether the apostles were

chosen for the *distinctive* and *peculiar* work of ordaining to sacred offices? This the Episcopalian affirms. This we take the liberty of calling in question.

The Evangelists have given three separate and full accounts of the appointment of the apostles. One is recorded by Matthew, ch. x. ; another by Mark, iii. 12, etc. ; the third by Luke, ch. vi. They were selected from the other disciples, and set apart to their work with great solemnity. Luke vi. The act was performed in the presence of a great multitude, and after the Saviour had passed the night in prayer to God. Luke vi. 12. The instructions given to them on the occasion occupy, in one part of the record, (Matt.) the entire chapter of forty-two verses. The directions are given with very great particularity, embracing a great variety of topics, evidently intended to guide them in all their ministry, and to furnish them with ample instruction as to the nature of their office. They refer to times which should follow the death of the Lord Jesus, and were designed to include the whole of their peculiar work. Matt. x. 17—23.

Now, on the supposition of the Episcopalian, that the peculiarity of their work was to *ordain*, or that "they were distinguished from the elders because they were *superior* to them in ministerial powers and rights," (p. 15.) we cannot but regard it as unaccountable, that we find not one word of this here. There is not the slightest allusion to any

such distinguishing "power, and rights." There is nothing which can be *tortured* into any such claim. This is the more remarkable, as on another occasion he sent forth seventy disciples at one time, (Luke x. 1—16.) usually regarded by Episcopalians as the foundation of the *second* order of their ministers; (See "the Scholar Armed,") and there is not the slightest intimation given, that *they* were to be inferior to the apostles in the power of ordaining, or superintending the churches. We do not know what explanation the Episcopalian will give of this remarkable omission in the instructions of the primitive bishops.

This omission is not the less remarkable in the instructions which the Lord Jesus gave to these same apostles, after his resurrection from the dead. At *that* time, we should assuredly have expected an intimation of the existence of some such peculiar power. But, not the slightest hint occurs of any such exclusive authority and superintendence. Matthew, (xxviii. 18—20.) Mark, (xvi. 15—18.) and Luke, (xxiv. 47—49.) have each recorded these parting instructions. They have told us that he directed them to remain in Jerusalem (Luke,) until they were endued with power from on high, and then to go forth, and preach the gospel to every creature: but not a solitary syllable about any *exclusive power of ordination*; about their being a peculiar order of ministers; about their *transmitting* the peculiarity of the apostolic office to others.

We should have been glad to see some explanation of this fact. We wish to be apprised of the reason, if any exists, why, if the peculiarity of their office consisted in "*superiority* of ministerial powers and rights," neither at their election and ordination, nor in the departing charge of the Saviour, nor in any intermediate time, we ever heard of it; that even the advocates for the powers of the bishop never *pretend* to adduce a solitary expression that can be construed into a reference to any such distinction.

We proceed now to observe, that there is *not any where else, in the New Testament*, a statement that this was the peculiarity of their apostolic office. Of this any man may be satisfied, who will examine the New Testament. Or, he may find the proof in a less laborious way, by simply looking at the fact, that neither Dr. Onderdonk, nor any of the advocates of Episcopacy, pretend to adduce any such declaration. The apostles often speak of themselves; the historian of their doings (Luke,) often mentions them; but the place remains yet to be designated, after this controversy has been carried on by keen-sighted disputants for several hundred years, which speaks of any such peculiarity of their office.

This point, then, we shall consider as settled, and shall feel at liberty to make as much of it as we possibly can, in the argument. And we might here insist on the strong *presumption* thus furnished, that this settles the case. We should be very apt to

regard it as decisive in any other case. If two men go from a government to a foreign court, and one of them claims to be a plenipotentiary, and affirms that the other is a mere private secretary, or a consul, we expect that the claimant will sustain his pretensions by an appeal to his commission or instructions. If he maintains that this is the *peculiarity* of his office, though he may "enjoy all the powers of the other grades," (p. 11.) we expect to find this clearly proved in the documents which he brings. If he is mentioned by no *name* that designates his office,—as the Episcopalian admits the bishop is not,—(pp. 12, 13.) if his commission contains no such appointment, and if we should learn, that *specific* instructions were given to him at his appointment, and again repeated in a solemn manner when he left his native shores; we should at least look with strong suspicions on these remarkable claims. Would not any foreign court decide at once that such pretensions, under such circumstances, were utterly unfounded?

We proceed now to inquire whether it is possible to ascertain the *peculiarity* of the apostolic office, for it must be conceded that there was *something* to distinguish the apostles from the other ministers of the New Testament. Here, happily, we are in no way left in the dark. The Saviour, and the apostles and sacred writers themselves, have given an account which cannot be easily mistaken; and our amazement is, that the writer of this tract has not

adverted to it. The first account which we adduce is from the lips of the Saviour himself. In those solemn moments, when he was about to leave the world; when the work of atonement was finished; and when he gave the apostles their final commission, he indicated the nature of their labors, and the peculiarity of their office in these words: (Luke xxiv. 48.) "*And ye are WITNESSES of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you,*" etc. The object of their special appointment, which he here specifies, was, that they should be WITNESSES to all nations. (Comp. v. 47, and Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.) The "things" of which they were to bear witness, he specifies in the preceding verse. They were *his sufferings in accordance with the predictions of the prophets*: "thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer;" *and his resurrection from the dead*: "and to rise from the dead the third day." These were the points to bear "witness" to which they had been selected; and these were the points on which they, in fact, insisted in their ministry. See the Acts of the Apostles, *passim*.

We would next remark, that this is *expressly declared* to be the "peculiarity" of the apostolic office. It was done so at the election of an apostle to fill up the vacated place of Judas. Here, if the *peculiar* design had been to confer "superiority in ministerial rights and powers," we should expect to be favored with some account of it. It was the very time when

we should expect them to give an account of the reason why they filled up the vacancy in the college of apostles, and when they actually did make such a statement. Their words are these : (Acts i. 21, 22.) "Wherefore, of these men which have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day when he was taken up from us, *must one be ordained to be a WITNESS WITH US of his resurrection.*" This passage we consider to be absolutely decisive on the point before us. It shows, first, for what purpose they ordained *him* ; and, second, that *they* were ordained for the *same* purpose. Why do we hear nothing on this occasion, of their "superiority of ministerial rights and powers ?" Why nothing of their peculiar prerogative to ordain ? Why nothing of their "general superintendence" of the church ? Plainly, because they had conceived of nothing of this kind, as entering into their original commission and peculiar design. For this purpose of bearing *testimony* to the world of the fact of the resurrection of the Messiah, they had been originally selected. For this they had been prepared, by a long, intimate acquaintance with the Saviour. They had seen him ; had been with him in various scenes, fitted to instruct them more fully in his designs and character ; had enjoyed an intimate personal friendship with him, (1 John i. 1.) and were thus qualified to go forth as "witnesses" of what they had seen and heard ; to con-

firm the great doctrine that the Messiah had come, had died, and had risen, according to the predictions of the prophets. We just add here, that these truths were of sufficient importance to demand the appointment of twelve honest men to give them confirmation. It has been shown, over and over again, that there was consummate wisdom in the appointment of witnesses *enough* to satisfy any reasonable mind, and yet not so many as to give it the appearance of tumult or popular excitement. The truth of the whole scheme of Christianity rested on making out the fact, that the Lord Jesus had risen from the dead; and the importance of that religion to the welfare of mankind, demanded that this should be substantiated to the conviction of the world. Hence the anxiety of the eleven to complete the number of the original witnesses selected by the Saviour, and that the person chosen should have the same acquaintance with the facts that they had themselves.

It is worthy, also, of remark, that in the account which the historian gives of their labors, *this* is the main idea which is presented. Acts ii. 32. "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof *we are witnesses.*" v. 32. "And we are *witnesses* of these things." x. 39—41. "And we are *witnesses* of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew and hanged on a tree." "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; *not to all the people, but unto WITNESSES chosen before of God, even unto us,*" etc. In this place we

meet with another explicit declaration, that this was the object of their original appointment. They were "chosen" for this, and set apart in the holy presence of God to this work. Why do we not hear any thing of "their superiority in ministerial rights and powers?" Why not an intimation of the power of confirming, and of general superintendence? We repeat, that it is not possible to answer these questions, except on the supposition, that they did not regard any such powers as at all entering into the peculiarity of their commission.

Having disposed of *all* that is said in the New Testament, so far as we know, of the original design of the appointment to the apostolic office, we proceed to another and somewhat independent source of evidence. The original number of the apostles was twelve. The design of their selection we have seen. For important purposes, however, it pleased God to add to their number, one, who had *not* been a personal attendant on the ministry of the Saviour, and who was called to the apostleship four years after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. Now this is a case, evidently, which must throw very important light on our inquiries: It is independent of the others. And as he was not a personal observer of the life and death of Jesus; as he was not an original "witness" in the case, we may expect in the record of *his* appointment, a full account of his "superiority in ministerial rights and powers." If such superiority entered into the peculiarity of the apostolic office, this was the very case

where we expect to find it. His conversion was *subsequent* to the resurrection. He was to be employed extensively in founding and organizing churches. He was to have intrusted to him almost the entire pagan world. Comp. Rom. xv. 16. His very business was one that seemed to call for some specific account of "superiority in ministerial rights," if any such rights were involved in the apostolic office. How natural to expect a statement of such rights; and an account of the "general superintendence" intrusted to him, as an apostle! Let us look, therefore, and see how the case stands. We have three distinct accounts of his conversion, and appointment to the apostleship, in each of which the *design* of his appointment is stated. Acts xxii. 14, 15. In his discourse before the Jews, he repeats the charge given to him by Ananias, at Damascus: "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee," etc. "For thou shalt be his WITNESS *unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.*" Again, (Acts xxvi. 16.) in his speech before Agrippa, Paul repeats the words addressed to him by the Lord Jesus in his original commission: "I have appeared unto thee *for this purpose*, to make thee a minister *ἐκπρόσωπον* and a WITNESS of those things," etc. Again, (Acts xxiii. 11.) in the account which is given of his past and future work, it is said: "As thou hast *testified* of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear *witness* also at Rome."

This is the account which is given of the call

of Saul of Tarsus to the apostolic office. But where is there a single syllable of any "superiority in ministerial powers and rights," as constituting the peculiarity of his office? We respectfully ask the writer of this tract, and all other advocates of Episcopacy, to point to us a "light or shadow" of any such Episcopal investment. We think their argument demands it. And if there *is* no such account, neither in the original choice of the twelve, nor in the appointment of Matthias, nor in the selection of the apostle to the Gentiles; we take the liberty to insist with firmness on a satisfactory explanation of the causes which operated to produce the omission of the very *gest* of their office, according to Episcopacy. We insist on being told of *some* reasons, prudential or otherwise, which made it proper to pass over the very vitality of the original commission.

But we have not done with the apostle Paul. He is too important a "witness" for us, as well as for the purpose for which he was appointed, to be dismissed without further attention. It has been remarked already, that he was not a personal follower of Jesus of Nazareth, and was not present at his death and ascension. It may be asked, then, how could he be a witness, in the sense, and for the purposes, already described? Let us see how this was provided for. We transcribe the account from his own statement of the address made to him by Ananias. Acts xxii. 14. "The God of our fathers

hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the words of his mouth." That he *had* thus seen him, it is not necessary to prove. See 1 Cor. xv. 8; Acts ix. 5, 17. The inference which we here draw is, that he was permitted to *see* the Lord Jesus in an extraordinary manner, for the express purpose of qualifying him to be invested with the *peculiarity of the apostleship*. This inference, sufficiently clear from the very statement, we shall now proceed to put beyond the possibility of doubt.

We turn, then, to another account which Paul has given of his call to the apostleship, 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2: "Am I not an apostle? Am I not free? *Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?*" We adduce this passage as proof, that *to have seen Jesus Christ*, was considered as an indispensable qualification for the apostleship. So Paul regarded it in his own case. We adduce it also for another purpose, viz. to strengthen our main position, that the apostles were designated to their office specifically as *witnesses* to the character and resurrection of Christ. If this was *not* the design, we ask, why does Paul appeal to the fact that he had *seen* the Saviour, as proof that he was *qualified* to be an apostle? And we further ask, with emphasis, If the apostles, as Episcopalians pretend, did, in virtue of their office, possess 'superiority in ministerial powers, and rights,' why did not Paul once *hint* at the fact in this passage? His express object was to vindicate his claim

to the apostleship. In doing this, he appeals to that which *we* maintain to have constituted the peculiarity of the office, his being "*witness*" to the Saviour. In this instance we have a circumstance, of which Paley would make much in an argument, if it fell in with the design of the "*Horæ Paulinæ.*" We claim the privilege of making *as* much of it, upon the question, whether the peculiarity of the apostolic office was "*superiority* of ministerial powers and rights."

We have now examined all the passages of Scripture which state the design of the apostleship. And we have shown, if we mistake not, that the ground of the distinction between the "*apostles and elders,*" "*the apostles and elders, and brethren,*" was not that the former had superiority of "*ministerial powers and rights.*" We might leave the argument here; for if the Episcopalians cannot make out *this* point to entire satisfaction, all that is said about *successors* in the apostolic office, and about perpetuating the apostleship, must be nugatory, and vain. But we have an independent topic of remark here; and one which bears on the subject, therefore, with all the force of a cumulative argument. To the consideration of this, we are led by the next position of Dr. Onderdonk. This is stated in the following words: that "*there was continued, as had begun in the apostles, an order of ministers superior to the elders.*" p. 16. This he attempts to prove, on the ground that "*there is no scriptural evidence that mere elders (presbyters) ordained.*" pp. 16—23.

And that "the above distinction between elders and a grade superior to them, in regard especially to the power of ordaining, was so persevered in as to indicate that it was a *permanent* arrangement, and not designed to be but temporary." pp. 23—29. We shall reverse the order of this argument.

In the inquiry, then, whether this distinction was *continued* or persevered in, we might insist on what has been already shown, as decisive. If the original distinction was what we have proved it to be, it could *not* be persevered in, without (as in the case of Paul) a personal, direct manifestation of the ascended Saviour, to qualify every future incumbent in the apostleship. 1 Cor. ix. 1. No modern "bishop," we presume, will lay claim to this. The very supposition that any such revelation was necessary, would dethrone every prelate, and prostrate every mitre in Christendom.

But we have, as before remarked, an independent train of arguments on this point. It is evident that the whole burden of proof here lies on the Episcopalian. He maintains that such an original distinction existed, and that it was perpetuated. Both these positions we deny. The first we have shown to be unfounded, and have thus virtually destroyed the other. We proceed, however, to the comparatively needless task of showing that Dr. Onderdonk's *second* position is equally unfounded. His evidence we shall examine as we find it scattered throughout the tract before us.

The first argument is, that "some are named apostles in Scripture, who were not thus appointed, (i. e. by the Saviour himself,) as Matthias, Barnabas, and probably James, the brother of our Lord, all ordained by merely human ordainers. Silvanus also, and Timothy, are called "apostles;" and besides Andronicus and Junia, others could be added to the list." p. 15.

The argument here is, that the *name* "apostle" is given to them, and that they held, therefore, the peculiar *office* in question. But the mere circumstance that they had this *name*, would not, of itself, establish this point. It is not necessary, we presume, to apprise our readers, that the word *apostle* means *one who is sent*, and may be applied to any person employed to deliver a message; and in a general sense, to any ministers of religion, or to any one *sent* to proclaim the message of life. Thus in John xiii. 16, it is applied to *any* messenger, sustaining the same relation to one who sends him, that the servant does to his master. "The servant is not greater than his lord, [master] neither he that is sent, ἀπόστολος, greater than he that sent him." Thus it is applied (Phil. ii. 25) to Epaphroditus, not as an apostle, in the specific sense of the term, but as *a messenger*, sent by the church at Philippi, to supply the wants of Paul. (Comp. Phil. iv. 18.) "Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labor, but *your messenger*," ἡμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον, *your apostle*. Thus also in 2 Cor. viii. 23, it is applied to the "brethren,"

“the messengers of the churches;” “our brethren are the messengers of the churches,” ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν. These passages show beyond a question, that the name is often used in the New Testament, in its *generic* signification, and consequently the mere fact that it is applied to an individual, is not proof that he was an apostle in its specific sense,—the only sense which would be of value in the argument of the Episcopalian. The *connections*, the circumstances, are to determine its meaning. We make this remark, in accordance with the judicious observation of Dr. Onderdonk, p. 13. “*A little reflection and practice will enable any of our readers to look in Scripture for the several sacred OFFICES, independently of the NAMES there or elsewhere given to them.*”

The question then is, Whether the name *apostle* is so given to the persons here designated, as to show that it is used in its strict, specific sense?

The first case is that of “Matthias.” The *reason* why the name was given to him, we have already shown. He was an apostle in the *strict, proper* sense, because he was chosen to be a “witness” of the resurrection of the Saviour. Acts i. 22.

The second case is that of Barnabas. He is once called an apostle. (Acts xiv. 14.) That he was not an apostle in the strict, proper sense, Dr. Onderdonk has himself most laboriously and satisfactorily proved. In his argument against Presby-

terian ordination, (p. 16, 17.) he has taken much pains to show that Barnabas was set apart (Acts xiii. 1—3) “to a special missionary work;” “was merely set apart to a particular field of duty;” that is, was sent as a messenger of the church to perform a particular piece of work. It is observable that before this, Barnabas is called merely “a prophet and teacher;” (Acts xiii. 1—11) that he is called an *apostle* in immediate connection with this designation, and no where else. Acts xiv. 14. How Dr. Onderdonk, after having shown so conclusively, as we think, that the transaction at Antioch was not a Presbyterian ordination; that it was a mere *designation to a particular field of labor*, should persist in maintaining that Barnabas was an apostle, in the strict sense, as having a “superiority of ministerial rights and powers,” we profess our inability to conceive. We shall thus dismiss the case of Matthias and Barnabas.

The next case is “*probably* James, the brother of our Lord.” The use of the word *probably*, here, shows a wish to *press* cases into the service, which we regret to see in a tract, making strong pretensions to strict demonstration: (comp. pp. 3, 11, 16, 23, etc.) but it evinces a *deficiency* of strong, palpable instances, which betrays the conscious feebleness of the argument. “James, the Lord’s brother,” is *once* mentioned as an apostle: Gal. i. 19. But it could not have escaped the recollection of Dr. O. that there were *two* of the name of *James* among

the apostles in the specific sense of the term ; viz. James the brother of John, and son of Zebedee, and *James the son of Alphaeus*. Matt. x. 3 ; Luke vi. 15. Nor can it be unknown to him, that the word *brother*, was used by the Hebrews to denote a relative more remote than that which is designated by the ordinary use of the word among us ; and that *Alphaeus* was probably a connection of the family of our Lord. What proof, then, is there, that he was not referred to in the passage before us ? As this case is alleged to have only a *probability* in its favor, we consider it disposed of.

Sylvanus and Timothy are the next mentioned. As their claim to be considered *apostles* rests on the same foundation, so far as the *name* is any evidence, we shall dispose of these cases by considering that of Timothy at length in a subsequent part of the argument.

The remaining cases are those of Andronicus and Junia. The foundation for their claim to be enrolled as apostles, is the following mention of them by Paul : Rom. xvi. 7. "Salute Andronicus, and Junia, my kinsmen, *who are of note among the apostles,*" *διδυνίς εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις.* On this claim we remark : (1.) Admitting that they are here *called* apostles, the name, as we have proved, does not imply that they had any "superiority of ministerial rights and powers." They might have been distinguished as messengers, or laborers, like Epaphroditus. (2.) It is clear, that the apostle did not

mean to give them the name of *apostles* at all. If he had designed it, the phraseology would have been different. Comp. Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. (3.) All that the expression *fairly* implies, is, that they, having been early converted, (Rom. xvi. 7) and being acquainted with the apostles at Jerusalem, were held *in high esteem by them*; the apostles regarded them with confidence and affection. We consider this case, therefore, as disposed of.*

The next point of proof in the tract before us, "that the distinction between elders and a grade superior to them, in regard especially to the power of ordaining, was so persevered in as to indicate that it was a *permanent* arrangement," is drawn from the charge given by the apostle Paul to the elders of Ephesus. Acts xx. 28—35. The point of this evidence, as we understand it, is this. Paul charges the elders at Ephesus to "take heed to themselves,"—"to take heed to all the *flock* over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers,—to feed the church of God,—to watch against the grievous wolves that would assail the flock," etc. In all this, we are told, there is not a word respecting the power of ordaining, nor any thing which shows that they had the power of clerical discipline.

* Dr. Onderdonk says that Calvin, in his Institutes, "allows Andronicus and Junia to have been apostles;" but he ought to have added that Calvin, in his Commentary on the passage, written at a later period, denies that they were apostles in the *specific* sense of the term.

“No power is intimated to depose from office one of their own number, or an unsound minister coming among them.” They are to “tend” or “rule” the flock as shepherds; “for shepherds do not tend and rule shepherds.” pp. 23, 24.

This is affirmed to be the sole power of these elders. In connection with this, we are asked to read the epistles to Timothy,—the power there given “personally to Timothy at *Ephesus*,” (p. 23.) or as it is elsewhere expressed. “Compare now with this sum total of power assigned to mere elders, or presbyters, that of *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, the very city and region in which those addressed by Paul in Acts xx., resided and ministered.” p. 25. In those epistles it is said, that the “right of governing the clergy, and ordaining, is ascribed to him personally;” and numerous undisputed passages are then adduced, to show that Timothy is addressed as having this power. 1 Tim. i. 18; iii. 14, 15; iv. 6; 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 19—21, etc. etc.

Now this argument proceeds on the following *assumptions*, viz: 1. That Timothy was called an apostle; was invested with the same powers as the apostles, and was one of their *successors* in the office. 2. That he was, at the time when Paul gave his charge to the elders at Miletus, bishop of *Ephesus*. 3. That the “elders” summoned to Miletus, were ministers of the gospel of the second order, or as they are now termed, usually, *priests*, in contradistinction from bishops and deacons. If these

points are not made out from the New Testament, or if any one of them fails, this argument for "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," will be of no value. We shall take them up and dispose of them in their order.

The first claim is, that Timothy is called an "apostle," and was, therefore, clothed with apostolic powers. This claim is advanced on p. 15. "Silvanus also, and Timothy, are called 'apostles,'" and the claim is implied in the whole argument, and is essential to its validity. The *proof* on which this claim is made to rest, is contained in 1 Thess. i. 1, compared with 1 Thess. ii. 6. Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, are joined together in the commencement of the epistle, as writing it to the church at Thessalonica; and in ch. ii. 6, the following expression occurs, "Nor of man sought we glory,—when we might have been burdensome as the *apostles* of Christ." This is the sole proof of the *apostleship* of Timothy,—of which so much as is made in the Episcopal controversy, and which is usually appealed to as itself sufficient to settle the question.

Now without insisting on the point which we have made out, that the apostolic office was conferred not to impart "superiority of ministerial rights and powers," but to establish every where the great doctrine of the truth of Christianity, and that consequently *if* Timothy is called an apostle, it is only in the generic sense of the word, to which we have adverted, and that Paul might also on this occasion speak of himself, as joined with Timothy and Silva-

nus, as a messenger of the churches; (comp. Acts xiii. 2; xiv. 14; Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 23.) not to insist on this position, we shall dispose of this claim by the following considerations. 1. The passage does not fairly imply that Timothy was even called an apostle. For it is admitted in the tract, (p. 15.) that "it is not unusual for St. Paul to use the plural number of himself only." It is argued indeed that the words "apostles," and "our own souls," (v. 8.) being inapplicable to the singular use of the plural number, hence the "three whose names are at the head of the epistle, are here spoken of jointly." But if Paul used the plural number as applicable to himself, would it not be natural for him to continue its use, and to employ the adjectives, etc. connected with it in the same number? Besides, there is conclusive evidence that Paul did *not* intend to include the "three" named at the head of the epistle, in this expression, in v. 6. For in the verses immediately preceding, mention is made that "*we* had suffered before, and were shamefully treated, as ye know, at Philippi," etc. Now it is capable of demonstration, that *Timothy* was *not* present at that time, and was not engaged in those labors, or subjected to those sufferings at Philippi. Acts xvi. 12, 19; xviii. 1—4. It follows, therefore, that Paul did *not* intend here, to imply that "the three named at the head of the epistle" were apostles; and, that he either intended to speak of himself alone, in v. 6, or what is more probable, that he spoke of

himself as one of the apostles, and of what the apostles *might* do in virtue of their office; that is, that they might be burdensome, or might "use authority," as in the margin.

Our next proof that Timothy was not an apostle, is, that he is *expressly distinguished* from Paul, as an apostle; that is, in the same verse, Paul is careful to speak of *himself* as an apostle, and of *Timothy* as *not* an apostle. Thus, 2 Cor. i. 1, "Paul an *apostle* of Jesus Christ, and Timothy *our brother*." Again, Col. i. 1, "Paul an *apostle* of Jesus Christ, and Timothy *our brother*." Now our argument is this, that if Paul regarded Timothy as an apostle, it is remarkable that he should be so careful to make this distinction, when *his own name* is mentioned as an apostle. Why did he not also make the same honorable mention of *Timothy*?—Will some of our Episcopal friends be kind enough to state *why* this distinction is made?—The distinction is the more remarkable from the next consideration to be adduced, which is, that Paul is so cautious on this point, so resolved *not* to call Timothy an apostle, that when their names *are* joined together, as in any sense claiming the same appellation, it is not *as apostles*, but as *servants*. Phil. i. 1: "Paul and Timothy, *the servants* of Jesus Christ." See also, 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1. These considerations put it beyond debate, in our view, that Timothy is *not* called an apostle in the New Testament. This

it will be perceived, is an important advance in our argument.

The second claim for Timothy is, that he was bishop of Ephesus. This claim is essential to the argument of Dr. Onderdonk, and is every where implied in what he says of Timothy. See pp. 23, 25. Proof is not indeed attempted; but it is assumed as a conceded point. Now this point should have been made out, for it is not one of those which we are disposed by any means to concede. It is to be remembered too, that it is a point which is to be made out from *the New Testament*, for our inquiry is, whether Episcopacy can be defended "by Scripture." Let us see how this matter stands.

It may be proper here to remark, that the subscription at the close of the second epistle to Timothy, "ordained first bishop of the church of the Ephesians," etc., is admitted on all hands not to be inspired, and therefore is of no authority in this argument. Assuredly Paul would not close a letter in this way, by seriously informing Timothy that he wrote a second epistle to him, etc., and by *appending* this to the letter. By whom these subscriptions to the epistles were added, is unknown. Some of them are manifestly false; and none of them, though true, are of any authority. The subscription here belongs, we believe, to the former class.

Now, how does the case stand in the New Testament, with respect to Timothy? What testimony

does it afford, as to his being "bishop of Ephesus?" A few observations will save further debate, we trust, on this subject.

1. It is admitted that he was *not* at Ephesus, at the time when Paul made his address to the elders at Miletus. Thus, p. 25, "Ephesus was without a bishop when Paul addressed the elders, Timothy not having been placed over that church till some time afterwards." Here then was one *diocese*, or one collection of churches, which is admitted to have been constituted *without* a bishop. The presumption is, that all others were organized in the same way.

2. The charge which Paul gives to the elders *proves* that Timothy was not there; and proves further, that they, at that time, *had* no bishops, and that they previously had done. They are charged to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock, "to feed" or "to rule" the flock, etc. But not one word is to be found of their having then any prelatical bishops; not one word of Timothy as their Episcopal leader. Not an exhortation is given to be subject to any prelate; not an intimation that they would ever be called on to recognize any such bishops. Not one word of lamentation or condolence is expressed, that they were not fully supplied with all proper Episcopal authority. All of which is inexplicable, on the supposition that they were then destitute, and that they would be supplied with an officer "superior in ministerial rights and powers." Nay, they are *themselves* expressly called bishops, without the

slightest intimation that there were any *higher*, or more honorable prelates than themselves. Acts xx. 28 : "Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *bishops*," *ἐπισκόπους*.

3. It is admitted by us, that Timothy subsequently *was* at Ephesus, and that he was left there for an important purpose, by the apostle Paul. This was when Paul went to Macedonia. 1 Tim. i. 3. This is the *only* intimation, that we know of, in the New Testament, that Timothy was ever at Ephesus at all. It is important, then, to ascertain whether he was left there as a *permanent bishop*? Now in settling this, we remark, it is no where intimated in the New Testament, that he was such a bishop. The passage before us, 1 Tim. i. 3, states, that when they were travelling together, Paul left him there, while *he* himself should go over into Macedonia. The *object* for which he left him is explicitly stated, and that object was not that he should be a permanent bishop. It is said to be "to charge some that they teach no other doctrine, neither to give heed to endless genealogies," etc.; that is, manifestly to perform a *temporary* office of regulating certain disorders in the church; of silencing certain false teachers, of Jewish extraction; of producing, in one word, what the personal influence of the apostle himself might have produced, but for a sudden, and unexpected call to Macedonia. Acts xx. 1. Hence it is perfectly clear that the apostle *designed* this as a temporary ap-

pointment for a specific object, and *that* object was not to be *prelate* of the church. Thus he says, 1 Tim. iv. 13, "*Till I come*, give attention to reading," etc.: implying that his temporary office was then to cease. Thus too, referring to the same purpose to return and join Timothy, he says, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15: "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but *if I tarry long*, that thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God," etc.; implying that these directions were particularly to serve him during his appointment to the *specific* business of regulating some disordered affairs produced by false teachers, and which might require the discipline of even some of the *bishops* and *deacons* of the church. ch. v. vi. These directions, involving *general* principles indeed, and of value to regulate his whole life, yet had, nevertheless, a manifest *special* reference to the cases which might occur there, in putting a period to the promulgation of erroneous doctrines by Jewish teachers. 1 Tim. i. 3.

4. "That Paul and Timothy were together at Ephesus, and that Paul left him there when he went on some occasion into Macedonia, may be plainly inferred from 1 Tim. i. 3. "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia." The time to which there is here an allusion is the more easily ascertained, because the apostle is recorded to have been twice only at Ephesus; on the first

occasion, he merely called on his voyage from Corinth and Jerusalem; on the second, he went from Ephesus into Macedonia, according to the words of the epistle.

“That Timothy was left at Ephesus, when Paul, expelled by the riot, went into Macedonia, obtains satisfactory proofs. Before he wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia, but he himself remained in Asia for some time. Acts xix. 22. 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10. In the first letter to the Corinthians, which he wrote at Ephesus, and sent by Titus to Corinth, he mentioned his purpose of coming to them, but not immediately; of which Luke also informs us, Acts xix. 21, and desired them, if Timothy came to them, 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11, to conduct him forth in peace, that he might come to Paul, then at Ephesus, for he looked for him, with the brethren. When he closed that letter, he was expecting Timothy’s return, which that letter might also have hastened. Paul remained at Ephesus, on this visit, the space of three years. Acts xx. 31. There is therefore no reason to suppose, that he was disappointed in his expectation of the arrival of Timothy from Corinth at Ephesus, before he went into Macedonia; and if so, he might have left him there, as he at some period certainly did. 1 Tim. i. 3. He had intended to go by Corinth into Macedonia, 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, but changed his mind and went by Troas thither. 1 Cor. xvi. 5;

2 Cor. ii, 12, 13. Whilst in Macedonia, he wrote his first letter to Timothy, for he proposed to him to remain at Ephesus until he should call there on his way to Jerusalem. 1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14, 15. The words imply, that Paul might tarry some time; and that he did so before he went into Greece, is fairly implied in the expression, "And when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece." Acts xx. 2. Timothy was advised, solicited, or besought (*παρεκαλησα*) to abide still at Ephesus, which gave him liberty to exercise his discretion, but several motives must have influenced him to go to the apostle. The enemies at Ephesus were numerous and violent; Timothy was young; his affection for Paul ardent; the request of Paul that he should abide at Ephesus was not peremptory; and Paul told him he expected to tarry a long time. Also Timothy had been, from their commencement, familiarly acquainted with the churches in Macedonia and Greece. Accordingly we find Timothy in Macedonia when Paul wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians. 1 Cor. i. 1. The apostle went from Macedonia into Greece, Acts xx. 2, as he had promised in that letter, chap. xiii. 1, and abode there three months. Acts xx. 3. Timothy was with him at Corinth, for he sends his salutations to the Romans, Rom. xvi. 21, in that famous epistle written from thence.*

* Compare Acts xviii. 2, with Rom. xvi. 3. Vide Acts 19, xviii. 26. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

“ That there was sufficient time for Paul to have written from Macedonia to Timothy at Ephesus, and for Timothy to have spent some months at Ephesus, before he came to Paul in Macedonia, appears from the time he waited for Titus at Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13, his determination not to go to Corinth till he could do it without heaviness, 2 Cor. ii. 1, his distress in Macedonia before Titus arrived, 2 Cor. vii. 5, and his success in raising charities for the saints in Judea, 2 Cor. viii. 2, 3 ; ix. 4. He had intended to tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, but went sooner, Acts xx. 1. He passed on to Jerusalem at another Pentecost, Acts xx. 16 ; all which time he was in Macedonia, except three months. Acts xx. 3.

“ That Paul expected to spend so much time in Macedonia and Greece, may be collected from his intimation, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, that he might spend the winter with the Corinthian church. The apostle’s purpose of sailing from Corinth was disappointed by the insidiousness of his own countrymen ; he therefore went up into Macedonia again, that he might pass over to Troas with his companions. Timothy was among those who crossed first. Acts xx. 3, 5. Paul’s disappointment in sailing from Corinth, and his wish to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost, prevented the call he intended at Ephesus, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, but he landed at Miletus, and sent for the elders of the church at Ephesus.

“ The directions of the apostle in the third chapter

of the first epistle to Timothy, fairly imply that he had left the church at Ephesus, according to his usual practice, without officers; for he gives this evangelist, not a new commission, he already had power to ordain, but instructions as to the choice of bishops, that is, presbyters and deacons. These had been complied with before he landed at Miletus. Acts xx. 17. This record of the existence of elders at Ephesus, compared with the directions given to Timothy, not only renders it probable that Timothy had ordained them, but fortifies the presumption that the first epistle to Timothy was written in Macedonia, before this visit to Jerusalem, and consequently before his imprisonment.

“The language ‘I going (*πορευομενος*) into Macedonia, besought thee to abide still at Ephesus,” did not form a permanent connection between Timothy and Ephesus. At the very greatest extent, the instructions given in this letter were of a continuance only till Paul should come to him, (*εως ερχομαι*) 1 Tim. iv. 13; iii. 14. But it is certain that Timothy did not remain at Ephesus, till Paul passed on his way to Jerusalem.

“The second epistle of Timothy will prove itself written by Paul when a prisoner at Rome; and at least establishes the absence of the evangelist from his spiritual father, at the time it was written. But he was at Rome in the time of the first imprisonment, as has been proved by his having been joined with Paul in the letters to the Collossians, Philippians

and Philemon. Demas and Mark were also there in the first imprisonment, Col. iv. 10, 4; but absent at the writing of the second to Timothy. 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11.

“It is therefore an error to suppose it to have been written before the epistle to the Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, during the first imprisonment. Also in 2 Tim. iv. 20, Paul tells him, Erastus abode at Corinth; but this needed not to have been told to Timothy, if Paul meant that Erastus abode at Corinth when he went to Jerusalem, and so to Rome, for Timothy was then with him, and must have known the circumstance, had it been so. In like manner he says, *ibid*, “Trophimus have I left at Miletum, sick.” But Trophimus was not left at any place on the voyage to Jerusalem, for he was there and the occasion of the jealousies of the Jews. Acts xxi. 29.

“These two facts, compared with this, which appears in the epistle, that it was written by Paul a prisoner at Rome, afford sufficient certainty, that there was a second imprisonment when this letter was written.

“But it by no means follows, that Timothy was at Ephesus when the second epistle was written. This ought not to be assumed, but shown. If Timothy was then at Ephesus, why should he have been told, ‘I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus?’ 2 Tim. iv. 12. He must have arrived at that place before the letter, and the fact could have been then known.

Also, Tychicus needed no introduction to Timothy. Had Timothy been at Ephesus, Paul would not have sent him to Troas, for articles he had left there. It appears more probable, that Timothy was, at the time the epistle was sent to him, at Troas, or in the neighborhood of that place. The salutations will not establish the destination of the epistle. Onesiphorus resided in Asia, but the particular place of his abode is not known. He helped Paul both at Ephesus and Rome. Also Aquila, who had resided at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, and again at Rome, was a native of Pontus, on the margin of the Euxine. Trophimus, whom Paul had left at Miletum, was an Ephesian. Acts xxi. 29. Miletus was near Ephesus, and Timothy would have known the facts, unless Miletum in Crete was the place.

“If Timothy was not at Ephesus when the second letter was written to him, there is no evidence of his being in that city, after Paul’s first imprisonment. But if he had been at Ephesus, he must have then left it, the letter calling him to Rome, and the sacred records speak not of his return to that city. The second epistle assigns to Timothy no other duties than those proper to his general office of evangelist; and bears no relation to a particular oversight of any church or churches.

“Some writers suppose that Paul, when he landed at Miletus on a subsequent voyage to Jerusalem, left Timothy with the elders of the church at Ephesus, “to govern them in his absence.” But nothing

of the kind was spoken on the occasion; and instead of a temporary absence, Paul assured the elders they should "see his face no more." In 1 Tim. i. 3, it is not said, "when I went to Jerusalem," but expressly, "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, *when I went into Macedonia.*" Also it has been asserted, that the apostle, having placed Timothy at Ephesus prior to his first imprisonment, "wrote both his epistles to Timothy while a prisoner at Rome." But Timothy was with Paul at Rome, during a part of the first imprisonment, for he is joined in the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Salutations also might have been expected in the first epistle to Timothy, had it been written from Rome, as in those to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Hebrews. He was indeed absent from Rome during a part of the time of the first imprisonment, but Paul expected his return, Heb. xiii. 23, and so far was he from hoping to come unto Timothy shortly, as expressed in 1 Tim. iii. 14, he promises, if Timothy come shortly to Rome, with him to visit the Hebrews. Also it seems strange, if Timothy had been at Ephesus when the epistle to the Ephesians was sent by Tychicus, Ephes. vi. 21, that no notice whatever should have been taken of the beloved youth.

"Another hypothesis is, that Paul, when the Jews deterred him from sailing from Corinth, and he determined to go through Macedonia to Jerusalem, besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus; to

which, when Timothy agreed, he went forward to Troas, with Aristarchus and the rest; and whilst waiting there for Paul, Timothy received the first epistle from the apostle, written in Macedonia. But this is a departure from the correct meaning of the passage, which is that Paul besought Timothy *προσμειναι* to *continue* or remain at the place where Timothy was at the time he was thus entreated. Those who went before with Timothy to Troas are represented to have accompanied Paul into Asia, Acts xx. 4, 5. This circumstance renders it an improbable supposition, that Paul should write so long and important a letter to his fellow traveller, whom he must overtake in a few days; and wholly unaccountable, that he should say in the letter, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, "these things write I unto you, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long," &c. That Paul should have thus purposed to come to Timothy unto Ephesus, but really at Troas; and in a few weeks afterwards, without any apparent cause for a change of views, should have said at Miletus to the elders of the church of Ephesus, "I know that ye all shall see my face no more," Acts xx. 25, exhibits a fluctuation approximating versatility. If Timothy was on this occasion left with the officers of the church at Ephesus, and especially, if he was to be thenceforth their diocesan bishop, it is strange that not a word of either of those circumstances should have been mentioned to those elders. But so far was the apostle from mentioning their subordination unto, or support of

the authority of young Timothy, that he enjoins them; "take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost *hath made you* *ἐπισκοπους* *bishops, to feed the church of God,*" &c. But as not a word is said of leaving Timothy at Miletus, so it is improbable that he should have parted from Paul there, because he appears to have been of the company of the apostle, when he arrived at Rome, where he is joined with him in the letters which have been mentioned.

"Others allege, that Paul visited Ephesus after his first imprisonment, left Timothy there, went into Macedonia, and from thence wrote to him his first letter. They build upon the circumstances, that whilst at Rome he had written to Philemon to prepare him lodgings at Colosse; and that he had told the Philippians, by letter, he trusted he should shortly come to them.

"This opinion is much more respectable than either of the former; and although several of the fathers have positively asserted what is incompatible with it, that Paul went into Spain, after his first imprisonment, according to his purpose expressed Rom. xv. 28, yet, however credible these holy men were, their conjectures deserve often but little regard. That Paul was at Philippi after his imprisonment is probable, because he left Erastus at Corinth, 2 Tim. iv. 20. Also he may have been at Colosse, if he left Trophimus at Miletus; but the place was Miletum. *ibid.* He entertained a purpose subsequent to those, of visiting Judea with Timothy.

Heb. xiii. 23. This may have been first accomplished, and Timothy left in the neighborhood of Troas, where he remained till the second epistle was sent to him. But if these purposes were effectuated, which is a matter of uncertainty, there is not a word to prove even an intention to visit Ephesus. The letter to the Ephesians neither mentions Timothy, nor any coming of Paul. But Tychicus, a faithful minister of the Lord, and companion of the apostle, was named as sent to them. Ephes. vi. 21. To the Ephesians Paul had said, that he knew they should "see his face no more," and it is no where shown that he did. The supposition that nevertheless Paul afterwards went to Ephesus with Timothy, left him there, with the request to tarry till he should return to him, and then went into Macedonia, and wrote his first epistle to Timothy, is entirely gratuitous, and without the least reason appearing in any exigencies of the Ephesian church; which had had three years of Paul's labors, and had been afterwards long blessed with the regular administration of the ordinances by pastors of their own, besides help from Tychicus, and perhaps others.

"If Paul constituted Timothy bishop of Ephesus, it is an affirmative, and ought to be proved. But Paul tells the presbyters of Ephesus at Miletus, that the Holy Ghost had made them *bishops* (*ἐπίσκοποις*) of that church. Those elders had previously received the powers which were necessary to ordaining others; on Timothy a similar presbytery laid

their hands at his ordination. If this circumstance will not show that a presbytery could have ordained an evangelist, an apostle not being present, because evangelists were extraordinary officers of a higher grade ; yet it must prove that a presbytery have some power to ordain. They were the highest fixed officers in a church, and the power of ordination was necessary to their succession. They could not have been appointed coadjutors to Timothy, in the ordination of themselves. And it does not appear they were ordained before the riot, when he was left at Ephesus. If thus there were no officers in that church when Paul left it, the direction to Timothy, who was an evangelist, to ordain bishops, that is, elders in Ephesus, was to do no more than his duty ; which, when accomplished in any church, gave such bishops or elders, power to continue the succession. If the presbyters of particular churches had not the power of ordination, there has been no succession in the church of Christ since the deaths of the apostles and evangelists ; for their offices expired with them, and there were no officers of a higher order. The office of Timothy was given to him prior to his visiting Ephesus. The duty assigned him was afterwards declared to be the work of an *evangelist*. 2 Tim. iv. 5. His appointment to Ephesus was temporary, being limited, at the farthest, to the time when Paul should come to him ; but an earlier period of its termination was evidently left to his discretion, which he

exercised by coming to Paul into Macedonia. Thus there was a disruption of the connection, if any had been fixed ; but none such was intended ; the epistle was neither a commission, nor an ordination, but a *mere letter of instruction*, directing him in the discharge of his high and important office of evangelist.

“ If Timothy returned to Ephesus from Rome, which is not recorded in the Scriptures, and died there, it will not establish that he ever exercised, or had any other office, than that of an evangelist.”*

5. The claim that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, is one that must be made out by Episcopalians from the New Testament. But this claim has *not* been made out, nor can it ever be.

6. The epistle to the Ephesians shows further, that at the time of writing that, there was no such bishop at Ephesus. Though the apostle herein gives the church various instructions about the relations which existed, there is not the slightest hint that Timothy was there ; nor is there the least intimation that any such officer ever had been, or ever would be, set over them.

Now, if it cannot be made out, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus ; if the point is not established beyond a doubt, then in reading Paul's charge to the elders at Miletus, we are to regard *them* as intrusted with the care of the church at Ephesus. It is not necessary to *our* argument to inquire whether

* Dr. Wilson.

they were ruling elders, or presbyters, ordained to preach as well as to rule. All that is incumbent on us, is to show that the New Testament does not warrant the assumption, that they were subject to a diocesan bishop. We affirm, therefore, simply, that Paul addressed them as intrusted with the spiritual instruction and government of the church at Ephesus, without any reference whatever to any person, either then or afterwards placed over them, as superior in ministerial rights and powers. And this point is conclusively established by two additional considerations; first, that *they* are expressly called *bishops*, *ἐπισκόπους*, themselves, a most remarkable appellation, if the apostle meant to have them understand that they were to be under the administration of *another* bishop of superior ministerial powers and rights; and secondly, that they are expressly intrusted with the whole spiritual charge of the church, *ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κ. τ. λ.* But every thing in this case is fully met by the supposition, that they were invested with the simple power of *ruling*. Dr. Onderdonk himself admits that the word translated "feed," *ποιμαίνειν*, may be rendered to "rule." p. 37. And if this point be conceded, the idea that they were *elders* in the Presbyterian sense, is all that can be proved from the passage. It is *essential* to the argument of Episcopalians, that they should be able to make out that these *elders* not only *ruled*, but also preached the gospel, and performed the other functions of their "second order" of clergy.

Let us now gather the results of our investigation, and dispose of the case of Timothy. We have shown, that he was not an apostle. We have further shown, that he was not bishop of Ephesus. We have thus destroyed the claim of the *permanency* of the apostolic office, so far as Timothy is concerned. And we now insist, that the readers of the New Testament, they who wish to defend Episcopacy by "Scripture," should read the two epistles to Timothy, without the vain and illusory supposition, that he was bishop of Ephesus. Agreeing with Dr. Onderdonk, that this point must be settled by the New Testament, and that "*no argument is worth taking into the account which has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic,—the scriptural evidence of Episcopacy,*" (p. 3) we now insist that these epistles should be read without being interpreted by the unsupported position, that Timothy was the permanent bishop of Ephesus. We insist, moreover, that *that* supposition shall not be admitted to influence the interpretation. With this matter clear before us, how stands the case in these two epistles? We answer, thus:—

(1.) Timothy was sent to Ephesus for a *special* purpose,—to allay contentions, and prevent the spreading of false doctrine. 1 Tim. i. 3. (2.) This was to be *temporary*. 1 Tim. i. 3. Comp. iii. 14, 15; iv. 13. (3.) He was intrusted with the right of ordination, as all ministers of the gospel are, and with the authority of government. 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 19—

21 ; v. 22. 2 Tim. ii. 2. (4.) Laying out of view the gratuitous supposition that he was bishop of Ephesus, the charge given to Timothy was just such a one as would be given to any minister of the gospel authorized to preach, to ordain, to administer the ordinances of the church, and its discipline. It is just such as is given now to men who hold to the doctrine of ministerial parity. The "charges" which are given to Presbyterian and Congregational ministers at ordination, are almost uniformly couched in the same language which is used by Paul, in addressing Timothy ; nor is there any thing in those epistles which may not be, and which is not, in fact, often addressed to ministers on such occasions. With just as much propriety might some antiquarian, hereafter, some future advocate for Episcopacy, collect together the *charges* now given to ministers, and appeal to them as proof that the churches in New-England, and among Presbyterians, were *Episcopal*, as to appeal now to the epistles to Timothy, to prove his office as a prelate. (5.) The epistles themselves contain evidence of the falsehood of the supposition, that there was an order of men superior to the presbyters in "ministerial powers and rights." There are but *two* orders of ministers spoken of, or alluded to, in the epistles,—*bishops* and *deacons*. There is not the slightest allusion to any other order. We call the attention of our readers here, to an emphatic remark of Dr. Onderdonk, p. 12 : "ALL that we read in the New Testament concerning 'bishops,'

is to be regarded as pertaining to the 'middle grade;' i. e. nothing in these epistles or elsewhere, where this term is used, has any reference to a rank of ministers superior "in ministerial powers and rights." The case here, then, by the supposition of the Episcopalians, is this. Two epistles are addressed by an apostle to a successor of the apostles, designated as such, to retain and perpetuate the same rank and powers. Those epistles are designed to instruct him in the organization and government of the churches. They contain ample information, and somewhat protracted discussions on the following topics: The office of a presbyter. The qualifications for that office. The office of the deacons. The qualifications for that office. The qualifications of deacon's *wives*. 1 Tim. iii. The proper discipline of an elder. The qualifications of those who were to be admitted to the office of *deaconesses*. 1 Tim. v. The duties of masters and servants. 1 Tim. vi. The duties of *laymen*. 1 Tim. ii. 8. And of Christian females. 1 Tim. ii. 9—11. Nay, they contain directions about the apostle's *cloak*, and his *parchments*; (2 Tim. iv. 13) but from the beginning to the end, not one single syllable respecting the existence of a grade of officers in the church superior "in ministerial rights and powers;" not a word about their qualifications, of the mode of ordaining, or consecrating them, or of Timothy's fraternal intercourse with his brother prelates; nothing about the subjection of the priesthood to them, or of their

peculiar functions of confirmation, and superintendence. In one word, taking these epistles by themselves, no man would dream that there were any such officers in existence. We ask now, whether any candid reader of the New Testament can believe that there *were* any such officers; and that two epistles could have been written in these circumstances, without the *slightest* allusion to their existence or powers? "*Credat Judæus Apella.*" We ask whether there can be found *now* among *all* the charges which Episcopal bishops have given to their clergy, any two in which there shall not also be found *some* allusion to the "primitive and apostolic order" of bishops in the churches? It remains for our eyes to be blessed with the sight of *one Episcopal charge*, reminding us in this respect of the charges of Paul to Timothy.

We now take our leave of the case of Timothy. The case of Titus, the next in order, pp. 26, 27, we must despatch in fewer words. The argument of Dr. Onderdonk, in defence of the claim respecting Titus, does not vary materially from that used in reference to Timothy, p. 26. It is, that he was left in Crete to ordain elders in every city, and that the powers of "ordination, admonition, and rejection, are all committed to Titus personally." Titus i. 6—9; iii. 10. The only point here which requires a moment's examination, in addition to what we have said on the case of Timothy, is the purpose for which he was left at Crete. Titus i. 5. The claim

of the Episcopalians here is, that this indicates such a *perseverance* in the "distinction between elders and a grade superior to them," as to prove that it was "to be a *permanent* arrangement." p. 23. In other words, Titus was to be a *permanent* bishop of Crete, superior to the elders "in ministerial rights and powers." This claim it is necessary for them to establish from the New Testament. If there are any intimations that it was *not* designed to be *permanent*, they will be fatal to their argument. We affirm, then, in opposition to this claim, that the case is fully met by the supposition that Titus was an extraordinary officer, like Timothy, at Ephesus, appointed for a specific purpose. 1. The appointment itself looks as if this was the design. Paul had himself commenced a work there, which from some cause he was unable to complete. That work he left Titus to finish. As it cannot be pretended, that *Paul* had any purpose of becoming the permanent bishop of Crete; so it cannot be pretended, that Titus' being left to *complete* what Paul had begun, is proof that Paul expected that Titus would be *permanent* bishop. An appointment to *complete* a work which is begun by another, when the original designer did not contemplate a permanent employment, cannot surely be adduced in proof of a permanent office. If I am employed to complete an edifice which is commenced, it does not suppose that I am to labor at it all my life; still less, that I am to have successors in the undertaking. We presume that

this passage, to most unbiassed minds, would imply that Paul expected Titus, after having *completed* what he had left him to do, should leave the island of Crete, and accompany him in his travels. 2. That this *was* the fact; that he had no expectation that Titus would be a *permanent* bishop of Crete, superior in "ministerial rights and powers," is perfectly apparent from the direction in this same epistle, ch. iii. 12. "When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, *be diligent to come unto me at Nicopolis.*" Here we find conclusive proof, that the arrangement respecting Titus in Crete was a temporary arrangement. To suppose the contrary, is to maintain a position in the very face of the directions of the apostle. Every thing in the case shows, that he was an extraordinary officer, appointed for a specific purpose; and that when that work was effected, which the apostle supposed *would be* soon, he was to resume his station as the travelling companion and fellow laborer of the apostle. 3. That this was the *general* character of Titus; that he was so regarded by Paul, as his companion, and very valuable to him in his work, is further apparent from 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13; vii. 6—13. In the former passage he says, that he expected to meet him at *Troas*, and intimates that his presence and help were very necessary for him. "I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother." In the latter place, (2 Cor. vii. 6—13) we find him the companion of the apostle Paul, in Philippi. Again,

(2 Cor. xii. 18) we find him employed on a special embassy to the church in Corinth, in respect to the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. Comp. Rom. xv. 26. And again we find him on a mission to *Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. iv. 10. Assuredly these various migrations and employments do not appear as if he was designed by the apostle as the permanent bishop of Crete. 4. It is to be presumed that Titus regarded the apostolic mandate; (Titus iii. 12;) that he *left* Crete in accordance with Paul's request; and as there is no intimation that he returned, as the New Testament throws no light on that point, as indeed there is not the slightest proof any where, that he died there, we come to the conclusion that he was employed for a temporary purpose, and that having accomplished it, he resumed his situation as the companion of Paul. Comp. Gal. ii. 1. It must be admitted, on all hands, that the Episcopalian cannot *prove* the contrary. Since, moreover, our supposition meets *all* the circumstances of the case as well as his, and we are able to show that this was the general character of the labors of Titus, we shall dismiss his case also.

The last argument of Dr. Onderdonk is derived from the epistles to the seven churches of Asia. Rev. ii. iii. This argument is embodied in the following position: "Each of those churches is addressed, not through its clergy at large, but through its 'angel,' or chief officer; this alone is a very strong argument against parity in favor of Episcopacy."

“One of those churches is Ephesus; and when we read concerning its angel, ‘*thou* hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars,’ do we require further evidence that what Timothy, the chief officer there, was in the year 65, in regard to the supreme right of discipline over the clergy, the same was its chief officer when this book was written, in 96?” The singular number, it is added, is used emphatically in the address to each of the angels, and “the individual called ‘the angel,’ is, in each case, identified with his church, and his church with him.” pp. 27, 28.

This is the argument; and this is the whole of it. We have sought diligently to see its bearing; but our labor, in doing it, has not been crowned with very flattering success. We can see, indeed, that those churches were addressed through their ministers, or pastors, called “angels;” but it requires more penetration than we profess to have, to discover how this bears on the precise point, that there is an order of men superior to others “in ministerial rights and powers.” Such an argument can be founded only on the following assumptions: 1. That there was an *inferior* body of clergymen, called here “clergy at large.” *Assuming* this point, it would not be difficult to make out an argument from the address “to the angel.” But this is a point *to be proved*, not to be assumed. We would respectfully ask the writer of this tract, where he finds an intimation of the existence of an order of “*clergy at*

large," in these churches. In the epistles themselves, there is not the slightest *hint* of the existence of any such personage distinct from "the angels." Nay, the very style of address is strong presumption that there were not any such inferior clergymen. The only mention which occurs, is of *the angel* and *the church*. We hear nothing of an intermediate order; nothing of any supremacy of "the angel" over "the clergy at large;" not the least intimation of any duty to be performed by the supposed prelati- cal "angel," towards the inferior presbyters. Why is a reference to them omitted, if they had any existence? Is it customary in addressing "bishops" *now*, to omit all reference to their duties over the inferior "clergy at large?" This is a point of too much consequence to be left now so unguarded; and accordingly the rights and duties of the order, superior "in ministerial rights and powers," are sedulously marked out and inculcated.* 2. It must be *assumed*, in this argument, that there were in each of those cities more churches than one; that there was a circle, or confederation of churches, that would answer to the modern notion of a diocese, over which "the clergy at large" of inferior "ministerial rights and powers," might exercise a modified jurisdiction. If this is not assumed, the argument has no force; since if there were but *one* church in

* We of course lay out of view, here, the case of the "elders at Ephesus, as being already disposed of; and as not being relevant to Dr. O's argument, since that they were "clergy at large," is to be *proved*, not *assumed*.

each of those cities, the "angel" was *not* a bishop in the Episcopal sense, but a pastor in the ordinary acceptance. Now this is a point, which, in an argument like this, should not be *assumed*. It should be *proved*, or at least rendered highly probable from the New Testament. But there is not the slightest hint of any such divided and scattered diocesan organization. In each instance, the church is addressed as one, and undivided. "The angel of *the church*," — not the churches, — "of Ephesus." Rev. ii. 1. "The angel of *the church* in Smyrna;" ii. 8: "the angel of *the church* at Thyatira;" ii. 18; the angel of *the church* in Sardis;" iii. 1, etc. In every instance the address is uniform. The point of inquiry now is, whether in this address the Saviour meant to intimate that there was a *plurality* of churches, an ecclesiastical, diocesan organization? This is a point for Episcopalians to *prove*, not to assume. Light may be thrown on it by comparing it with other places where a church is spoken of. The presumption is directly *against* the Episcopalian. It is, that the apostles would not organize separate churches in a single city; and that if it were done, they would be specified as *the churches*. Accordingly, we learn that the apostle organized "a church" at Corinth. 1 Cor. i. 1, 2. Thus, also, at Antioch. Acts xiii. 1. Thus, also, at Laodicea. Col. iv. 16. And in the epistle to one of the very churches under consideration, that at Ephesus, it is mentioned not as *the churches* of Ephesus, but as *the church*. Acts xx.

28. When Paul addressed this same church in an epistle, it was directed, not to *the churches*, but to *the saints* at Ephesus. Eph. i. 1. But where there were *distinct* churches organized, there is a *specific* mention of the fact of the plurality. They are mentioned as being many. Thus, Acts xv. 41 : "Paul went through Syria confirming (i. e. strengthening, establishing,) *the churches*." Rom. xvi. 4 : "the *churches* of the Gentiles." 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ; "the *churches* of Galatia." 19 : "the *churches* of Asia." 2 Cor. viii. 1 : "the *churches* in Macedonia." See also, 2 Cor. viii. 19, 23 ; xi. 8 ; Gal. i. 22 ; Rev. i. 4. Now if it is neither proved that there was a body of "clergy at large," nor that there were separate churches, in each of those cities ; we ask What is the force of the argument of Dr. Onderdonk from this case ? How does it bear on the point at issue ? What has it to do with the subject ?

With one or two additional remarks, we shall dismiss this point. The first is, that it cannot be argued from the term *angel*, given to those ministers, that they were Episcopal bishops. That term, as is well known, has no such exclusive applicability to a prelate. It is no where else applied to the ministers of religion ; and its original signification, "a messenger," or its usual application to celestial spirits, has no special adaptedness to an Episcopal bishop. An ordinary pastor,—a messenger sent from God ; a spiritual guide, and friend of the church, will as fully express its sense, as the application to

a prelate. Without invidiousness, we may observe, that prelates have not usually evinced any such extraordinary sanctity, or devotion, as to appropriate this title to themselves alone by prescriptive right. Our other remark is, that the supposition that these *angels* were *pastors* of the churches, presbyters on a parity with each other, and with all others, will fully meet every thing which is said of them in the book of Revelation. This supposition, too, will meet the addresses made to them, better than the assumption that they were prelates. Their union, as Dr. Onderdonk remarks, to the church, is intimate. "The angel is in each case identified with his church, and his church with him." Now to which does this remark best apply; to the tender, intimate, endearing relation of a pastor with his people; to the blending of their feelings, interests, and destiny, when he is with them continually; when he meets them each week in the sanctuary; when he administers to them the bread of life; goes into their abodes when they are afflicted, and attends their kindred to the grave? or does it best apply to the union subsisting between the people of an extended *diocese*,—to the formal, unfrequent, and, in many instances, stately and pompous visitations of a diocesan bishop; to the *kind* of connection formed between a people scattered into many churches, who are visited at intervals of a year, or more, by one claiming "a superiority in ministerial rights and powers," robed in lawn, and perhaps with the crosier and mitre, as emblematical

of office, state, and power ; who must be a stranger to the ten thousand tender ties of endearment, which bind as one the hearts of a pastor and his people ? To our minds, it seems clear that the account which Dr. Onderdonk has given of the "identity" of the angel and the church, applies to the former, and not to the latter. It speaks the sentiments of our heart, as respects the union of a pastor and people. And while we would not allow ourselves to speak with disrespect of the Episcopal office, we still feel that the language of the Saviour, by the mild and gentle John, to the churches of Asia, breathes far more of the endearing "identity" of the pastoral relation, than it does of the comparatively cold, and distant functions of one, who, in all other lands but this, has been invested with his office by the imposing ceremony of *enthroning*, and who was borne, less as badges of affection than of authority, the crosier and the mitre.

We have now gone entirely through with the argument of Dr. Onderdonk, in proof that there is an order of men superior "in ministerial rank and powers." We have intended to do justice to his proofs, and we have presented the whole of them.

Our readers have *all* that Episcopalians rely on from the scriptures, in vindication of the existence of such an order of men. It will be remembered that the burden of proof lies on *them*. They advance a claim which is indispensable to the existence of their ecclesiastical polity. These are the arguments

on which they rely. Whether their arguments justify the language of assumption which we sometimes hear; whether they are such as to render appropriate the description of all people but the members of Episcopal churches, as left to "the uncovenanted mercies of God;"* whether they are such as to prompt, legitimately, to a very frequent reference to "the primitive and apostolic order" of the ministry; or to the modest use of the term "the church," with an exclusive reference *to themselves*, must now be left to the judgment of our readers.

It was our intention, originally, to have gone somewhat at length into a defense of the scripture doctrine of ministerial parity. But the unexpected length of our article admonishes us to close. We are the less dissatisfied with this admonition, because we conceive the point already made out. If Episcopalians, cannot make good *their* claims in reference

* We do not charge Dr. Onderdonk with having any such views and feelings. We have great pleasure in recording his dissent from the use of such language, and from such consequences, p. 6. "An apparently formidable, yet extraneous difficulty, often raised, is, that Episcopal claims *unchurch* all non-Episcopal denominations. *By the present writer this consequence is not allowed.*" We simply state this, with high gratification. We are happy also that we are not called upon to *reconcile* the admission with the claim set up in this tract, that "the authority of Episcopacy is permanent, down to the present age of the world;" (p. 40.) that the obligation of Christians to support bishops, i. e. to conform to Episcopacy, is not ended; (p. 40.) that of "any two ministries now existing, the former (Episcopacy) is obligatory, to the *exclusion* of the latter;" (parity, p. 39.) and that "the position cannot be evaded, that Episcopacy is permanently *binding* 'even to the end of the world.'" p. 39.

to their bishop, it follows of course that ministers are on an equality. The whole argument is concentrated in *their* claim. We take our stand here. It is admitted on all hands, that there is somewhere in the church a right to ordain. Episcopalians, with singular boldness, in not a few instances with *professed*, and in all with *real* exclusiveness, maintain that this power lies *only* in the *bishop*. They advance a claim to certain rights and powers ; and if that claim is not made out, the argument is at an end. The power of ordination must remain with those over whom they have set up the power of jurisdiction and control. This claim, as we have seen, is not made out. If from the authority of the New Testament, they cannot succeed in dividing the ministers of religion into various ranks and orders, it follows that the clergy remain on an equality.

On this point, also, they are compelled, as we conceive, to admit the whole of our argument. So manifest is it, that the sacred writers knew of no such distinction ; that they regarded all ministers of the gospel as on a level ; that they used the same name in describing the functions of all ; that they addressed all as having the same Episcopal, or pastoral supervision, that the Episcopalians, after no small reluctance, are compelled at last to admit it. They are driven to the conclusion that the term *bishop* in the New Testament, does not *in a single instance* designate any such officer, as now claims exclusively that title. Thus Dr. Onderdonk says, that

“that name (bishop) is there, (i. e. in the New Testament,) given to the middle order or presbyters; and ALL that we read in the New Testament concerning ‘bishops,’ (including of course the words ‘overseers,’ and ‘oversight,’ which have the same derivation,) is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade. It was after the apostolic age that the name ‘bishop’ was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first.” p. 12. This admission we regard as of inestimable value. So we believe; and so we teach. We insist, therefore, that the name *bishop* should be restored to its primitive standing. If men lay claim to a higher rank than is properly expressed in the New Testament by this word, we insist that they should assume the name *apostles*. As they regard themselves as the successors of the apostles; as they claim that Timothy, Titus, Andronicus, Junia, were called *apostles*, why should not the name be retained? The Christian community could then better appreciate the force of their claims, and understand the nature of the argument. We venture to say, that if the name “apostles” were assumed by those who claim that they are their successors, Episcopacy would be soon “shorn of its beams,” and that the Christian world would disabuse itself of the belief in the scriptural authority of any such class of men. We admit that if “the *thing sought*” (p. 12.) were to be found in the Scriptures, we would not engage in a controversy about the mere name. But we maintain that the fact here

conceded is strong presumptive proof that "the things sought" is *not* there. The *name*, therefore, is to be given up; that is conceded by Episcopalians, that the name bishop does not any where in the New Testament designate any such class of men as are now clothed with the Episcopal office.

We remark now, that *the thing itself* is practically abandoned by Episcopalians, themselves. If other denominations can be *true churches*, (see the remark on p. 6, that the Episcopal claims do not "*unchurch* all non-Episcopal denominations,") then their ministers can be true ministers, and their ordinances valid ordinances. Their ministers may be ordained *without* the imposition of the hands of "a bishop;" and thus the whole claim is abandoned. For what constitutes "non-Episcopal denominations" churches, unless they have a valid ministry, and valid ordinances? Still further. It is probably known to our readers, that even ordination is never performed in the Episcopal church by the bishop alone. In the "Form and manner of Ordering Priests," the following direction is given. "The bishop *with the priests* [presbyters] *present*, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of priesthood; the receivers humbly kneeling, and the bishop saying: Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of *our hands*," etc. We know that there is among them a difference of opinion about

the *reason* why this is done. One portion regard the *bishop* as the only source of authority.* The other suppose that the presence and act of the presbyters express the assent and confidence of the churches, and that it is essential to a valid ordination. But, which ever opinion is maintained, it is, *in fact*, a Presbyterian ordination. If not, it is an unmeaning and idle ceremony; and the presence of the presbyters is mere pageantry and pomp.

We have now passed through the argument. Could we enter farther into it, we could prove, we think, *positively*, that there were no ministers in the apostolic churches, superior to presbyters "in ministerial powers and rights;" and that a presbytery did actually engage in an ordination, and even in the case of Timothy.† But our argument does not require it, nor have we room. We have examined the whole of the claims of Episcopalians, derived from the New Testament. Our readers will now judge of the validity of those claims. We close, as Dr. Onderdonk began, by saying, that if the claim is not made out *on scriptural authority*, it has no force, or binding obligation on mankind.

Who can resist the impression, that if the New Testament had been the only authority appealed to in other times, Episcopacy would long since have ceased to urge its claims, and have sunk away with

* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. book vii. § 6.

† 1 Tim. iv. 14.

other dynasties and dominations, from the notice of mankind? On the basis which we have now examined, this vast superstructure, this system which has heretofore spread over the entire Christian world, this system which, in *some* periods at least, has advanced most arrogant claims, has been reared. The world, for ages, has been called to submit to various modifications of the Episcopal power. The world, with the single exceptions of the Waldenses and Albigenses, *did* for ages submit to its authority. The prelatical domination rose on the ruins of the liberties of cities, states, and nations, till all the power of the Christian world was concentrated in the hands of one man,—“*the servant of the servants of God!*” The exercise of that power in his hands is well known. Equally arrogant have been its claims in other modifications. The authority has been deemed necessary for the suppression of divisions and heresies. “The prelates,” says Milton, “as they would have it thought, *are the only mauls of schism.*” That power was felt in the days when puritan piety rose to bless mankind, and to advance just notions of civil and religious liberty. Streams of blood have flowed, and tears of anguish have been shed, and thousands of holy men have been doomed to poverty, and want, and imprisonment, and tears, as the result of those claims to supremacy and validity in the church of God. It may surprise our readers, to learn, that *all* the authority from the Bible which could be adduced in favor of these enor-

mous claims, has now been submitted to their observation. And we cannot repress the melancholy emotions of our hearts, at the thought that *such* power has been claimed, and *such* domination exercised by man, on so slender authority as this!

We have little love for controversy ;—we have none for denunciation. We have no war to wage with Episcopacy. We know, we deeply feel, that much may be said in favor of it, apart from the claim which has been set up for its authority from the New Testament. Its past history, in some respects, makes us weep ; in others, it is the source of sincere rejoicing and praise. We cannot forget, indeed, its assumptions of power, or hide from our eyes the days of the Papacy, when it clothed in sackcloth the Christian world. We can forget the days, not few, or unimportant, in its history, when even as a part of the Protestant religion, it has brought “a numb and chill stupidity of soul, an inactive blindness of mind, upon the people, by its leaden doctrine ;” we cannot forget “the frozen captivity” of the church, “in the bondage of prelates ;”^{*} nor can we remove from our remembrance the sufferings of the puritans, and the bloody scenes in Scotland. But we do not charge this on the Episcopacy of our times. We do not believe that it is essential to its existence. We do not believe that it is its inevitable tendency. With more grateful feelings, we recall other events of its history.

* Milton.

We associate it with the brightest and happiest days of religion, and liberty, and literature, and law. We remember that it was under the Episcopacy that the church in England took its firm stand against the papacy ; and that this was its form when Zion rose to light, and splendor, from the dark night of ages. We remember the name of Cranmer,—Cranmer first, in many respects, among the reformers ; that it was by his steady and unerring hand, that under God the pure church of the Saviour was conducted through the agitating and distressing times of Henry VIII. We remember that God watched over that wonderful man ; that He gave this distinguished prelate access to the heart of one of the most capricious, cruel, inexorable, blood-thirsty, and licentious monarchs that has disgraced the world ; that God, for the sake of Cranmer, and his church, conducted Henry as “ by a hook in the nose,” and made him faithful to the archbishop of Canterbury, when faithful to none else ; so that, perhaps, the only redeeming trait in the character of Henry, is his fidelity to this first British prelate under the reformation.* The world will not soon for-

* It may be proper here to remark, that Cranmer by no means entertained the modern views of the scriptural authority of bishops. He would not have coincided with the claims of the tract which is now passing under our review. He maintained “ that the appointment to spiritual offices belongs indifferently to bishops, to princes, or to the people, according to the pressure of existing circumstances. He affirmed the *original identity of bishops and presbyters* ; and contended that nothing more than mere election, or appointment, is essential to the sacerdotal office, without consecration, or any other solemnity.” Le Bas' Life of Cranmer, vol. i. p. 197.

get the names of Latimer, and Ridley, and Rodgers and Bradford ; names associated in the feelings of Christians, with the long list of ancient confessors "of whom the world was not worthy," and who did honor to entire ages of mankind, by sealing their attachment to the Son of God, on the rack, or amid the flames. Nor can we forget, that we owe to Episcopacy that which fills our mind with gratitude and praise, when we look for examples of consecrated talent, and elegant literature, and humble devoted piety. While men honor elevated Christian feeling ; while they revere sound learning ; while they render tribute to clear and profound reasoning, they will not forget the names of Barrow, and Taylor, of Tillotson, and Hooker, and Butler ;—and when they think of humble, pure, sweet, heavenly piety, their minds will recur instinctively to the name of Leighton. Such names, with a host of others, do honor to the world. When we think of them, we have it not in our hearts to utter one word against a church, which has thus done honor to our race, and to our common Christianity.

Such we wish Episcopacy still to be. We have always thought that there are Christian minds and hearts that would find more edification in the forms of worship in that church, than in any other. We regard it as adapted to call forth Christian energy, that might otherwise be dormant. We do not grieve that the church is divided into different denominations. To all who hold essential truth, we bid God

speed ; and for all such we lift our humble supplications to the God of all mercy, that he will make them the means of spreading the gospel around the globe. We ourselves could live and labor in friendliness and love, in the bosom of the Episcopal church. While we have an honest preference for another department of the great field of Christian action ; while providential circumstances, and the suggestions of our own hearts and minds, have conducted us to a different field of labor ; we have never doubted that many of the purest flames of devotion that rise from the earth, ascend from the altars of the Episcopal church, and that many of the purest spirits that the earth contains, minister at those altars, or breathe forth their prayers and praises in language consecrated by the use of piety for centuries.

We have but one wish in regard to Episcopacy. We wish her not to assume arrogant claims. We wish her not to utter the language of denunciation. We wish her to follow the guidance of the distinguished minister of her church, whose book we are reviewing, in not attempting to " unchurch " other denominations. We wish her to fall in with, or to go in advance of others, in the spirit of the age. Our desire is that she may become throughout,—as we rejoice she is increasingly becoming,—the warm, devoted friend of revivals, and missionary operations. She is consolidated ; well marshaled ; under an efficient system of laws ; and pre-eminently

fitted for powerful action in the field of Christian warfare. We desire to see her what the Macedonian phalanx was in the ancient army ; with her dense, solid organization, with her unity of movement, with her power of maintaining the position which she takes ; and with her eminent ability to advance the cause of sacred learning, and the love of order and of law, attending or leading all other churches in the conquests of redemption in an alienated world. We would even rejoice to see her who was first in the field at the Reformation in England, first, also, in the field when the Son of God shall come to take to himself his great power ; and whatever positions may be assigned to *other* denominations, we have no doubt that the Episcopal church is destined yet to be, throughout, the warm friend of revivals, and to consecrate her wealth and power to the work of making a perpetual aggression on the territories of sin and of death.

When the review of the tract, "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," was prepared,* it was not our design, to engage in a controversy on the subject there discussed. We well knew how unprofitable and how endless such a controversy might become ; and we felt, that we had more important business to engage our attention, than that of endeavoring to defend the external order of the church. The subject attracted our notice, because, on two different occasions, the tract, which was the subject of the review, had been

* Christian Spectator, vol. vi.

sent to us, in one instance accompanied with a polite request,—evidently from an Episcopalian,—to give to it our particular attention; because, too, the tract had been published at the “Episcopal Press,” and it was known, that it would be extensively circulated; because it had been the subject of no small self-gratulation among the Episcopalians, and had been suffered, notwithstanding the manifest complacency with which they regarded it, to lie unanswered; but *mainly*, because it made an appeal at once to the Bible, and professed a willingness, that the question should be settled by the authority of the scriptures alone. This appeared to us to be placing the subject on new ground. The first emotion produced by the title of the tract, was one of surprise. We had been so accustomed to regard this controversy as one, that was to be settled solely by the authority of the fathers; we had been so disheartened, and sickened by the unprofitable nature, the interminable duration, and the want of fixed bounds and principles, in that investigation; we had seen so little reference made to the Bible, on either side of the question, that it excited in us no small degree of surprise, to learn, that a bishop of the Episcopal church should be willing to make a direct, decisive, and unqualified appeal to the New Testament. It was so unusual; it gave so new a direction to the controversy; it promised so speedy an issue, and one so little auspicious to the cause which the bishop was engaged in defending, that we were not unwilling to

turn aside from our usual engagements, and to examine the proofs adduced in this somewhat novel mode of the Episcopal controversy.

Shortly after our review was published, an "Answer" to the article appeared in the "Protestant Episcopalian," understood to come from the author of the tract. With a copy of this, the writer of the review was politely furnished by Dr. Onderdonk. The "Answer" is marked with the same general characteristics, as the tract itself. It evinces, in general, the same spirit of Christian feeling, and of candid inquiry; the same calm, collected, and manly style of argument; the same familiarity with the subject; and the same habit,—by no means as common as is desirable,—of applying the principles of the inductive philosophy to moral subjects. To this *general* statement, perhaps, should be made a slight exception. A candid observer possibly, would discern in the "Answer," some marks of haste, and some indications of disturbed repose,—possibly of a slight *sensation* in perceiving, that the *material point* of the argument in the tract, had not been as strongly fortified as was indispensable. As instances of this sensation, we might notice the train of remarks in pp. 8, 9, and especially in the following expressions. "The reasonings throughout his article, (the reviewer's,) are much the same as those usually brought against Episcopacy; and where they are not the same, they are so much *minus* the former ground," etc. "No one, for three years, brought

these old reasonings against the tract, no one, till the reviewer fancied he had discovered a weak spot in it, and might, therefore, re-produce some of them with effect." "The present is only a start in its slumber." And again, on p. 15, the author of the reply speaks of the reviewer, as one whom he suspects "to be a *new comer* into this field of controversy," if not with the intention, at least with the *appearance*, of designing to disparage the force of the arguments, which the reviewer had urged. Now, it is unnecessary for us to remind Dr. Onderdonk, that the inquiry is not, whether the arguments are old or new, but whether they are pertinent and valid. Nor is the question, whether one is a "new comer" into this controversy. Arguments may not be the less cogent and unanswerable, for being urged by one who has not before entered the lists; nor will arguments from the Bible be satisfactorily met, by an affirmation, that they are urged by one unknown in the field of debate. It may be proper, however, for us to observe, in self-vindication, that the arguments which we urged, were drawn from no other book than the Bible. The "Tract" and the New Testament, were the only books before us in the preparation of the article. The course of argument suggested, was that only which was produced by the investigation of the scriptures. Whether we have fallen into any train of thinking, which has been before urged by writers on this subject, we do not even now know, nor are we likely to know; as it

is our fixed purpose, not to travel out of the record before us,—the inspired account of the matter in the sacred scriptures. If, however, the arguments which we have urged, be “the same with those which are usually brought against Episcopacy,” it furnishes a case of coincidence of results, in investigating the New Testament, which is itself some evidence, that the objections to Episcopacy are such, as obviously occur to different minds, engaged in independent investigation.

When the reply appeared, it became a question with us, whether the controversy should be prolonged. A perusal of the “Answer” did not suggest any necessity for departing from our original intention, *not* to engage in such a controversy. It did not appear to furnish any new argument, which seemed to call for notice, or to invalidate any of the positions defended in the review. Almost the whole of the “Answer” appeared to be simply an *expansion* of a note in the tract, (p. 12, note z.) which, when the review was prepared, seemed not to furnish an argument, that required particular attention. The fact, too, that *then* the argument was expressed in a *note*, in small type, and at the bottom of the page, was an indication, that it was not of much magnitude, in the eye of the author of the tract himself. Why it is now *expanded*, so as to constitute the very body and essence of the reply, is to us proof, that the subject on the *Episcopal* side, is exhausted. This fact is of such a nature, as to impress the mind

strongly with the belief, that henceforth nothing remains to be added, in the effort to "Test Episcopacy by Scripture."

In departing from our original purpose, it is our wish to reciprocate the kind feeling and candor of the author of the "Tract," and of the "Answer." Truth, not victory, is our object. We have but one wish on this subject. It is, that the principles upon which God designed to establish and govern his holy church, may be developed and understood. We resume the subject, with profound and undiminished respect for the talents, the piety, and the learning of the author of the Tract and Answer; and with a purpose, that this shall be *final*, on our part, unless something new, and vital to the subject, shall be added. In this as well as in all other things, our desire is, not to write one line, which, dying,— or in heaven,

—we would wish to blot.

Still, this desire, so deeply cherished, does not forbid a full and free examination of arguments. Our conscientious belief is, that the *superiority* "in ministerial power and rights," (Tract, p. 15.) claimed by Episcopal bishops, is a superiority known in the Episcopal churches only, and not in the New Testament; and this we purpose to show.

In entering upon our examination of the "Answer," we may remark, that the scriptural argument for Episcopacy is now fairly and entirely before the world. On the Episcopal side, nothing

material to be said, can remain. The *whole* argument is in the Tract, and in the Answer. If Episcopacy is not established in these, we may infer, that it is not in the Bible. If not in the Bible, it is not "necessarily binding." (Tract, p. 3.) To this conclusion,—that the whole of the material part of the scriptural argument is before the world, in these pamphlets,—we are conducted, by the fact, that neither talent, learning, zeal, nor time, have been wanting, in order to present it; that their author entered on the discussion, manifestly acquainted with *all* that was to be said; that the subject has now been before the public more than four years; (See advertisement to the Tract,) and that, during that time, it is to be presumed, if there had been any more *material* statements to be presented from the Bible, they would have appeared in the "Answer." There is much advantage in examining an argument, with the conviction, that nothing more remains to be said; and that we may, therefore, contemplate it as an unbroken and unimproveable whole, without the possibility of any addition to the number of the arguments, or increase of their strength. On this vantage-ground we now stand, to contemplate the argument in support of the stupendous fabric of Episcopacy in the Christian church.

In entering upon this examination, we are struck with—what we had indeed anticipated,—a very strong inclination, on the part of the author of the tract, to appeal again to certain "extraneous"

authorities, of which we heard nothing in the tract itself, except to disclaim them. The tract commenced with the bold and startling announcement, that if Episcopacy has not the authority of scripture, it is not "necessarily binding." p. 3. "No argument," the tract goes on to say, "is *worth taking into the account*, that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic,—the scriptural evidence of Episcopacy." p. 3. We have italicised a part of this quotation, to call the attention of our readers particularly to it. The affirmation, so unusual in the mouth of an Episcopalian, is, that no argument is WORTH TAKING INTO THE ACCOUNT, that does not bear on the scriptural proof. Now we anticipated that if a reply was made to our review, from any quarter, we should find a qualification of this statement, and a much more complacent regard shown to the fathers, and to other "*extraneous considerations*," (Tract, p. 4.) than would be consistent with this unqualified disclaimer, in the tract. The truth is, that the fathers are regarded as too material witnesses, to be so readily abandoned. The 'tradition of the elders,' has been too long pressed into the service of the Episcopacy; there has been too conscious a sense of the weakness of the scriptural proof, to renounce heartily, entirely, and forever, all reliance on other proof than the New Testament. The "Answer" would have lacked a very material feature which we expected to find in it, if

there had been no inclination manifested, to plunge into this abyss of traditional history, where light and darkness struggle together, and no wish to recall the testimony of uninspired antiquity, to the service of prelacy. Accordingly, we were prepared for the following declaration, which we quote entire, from pp. 3 and 4, of the Answer :—

‘ Because the author of the tract rested the claims of Episcopacy finally on scripture—because he fills a high office in the church—and because the tract is issued by so prominent an episcopal institution as the “ Press,” the reviewer seems to think, that Episcopalians are now to abandon all arguments not drawn directly from the holy volume. Not at all. The author of the tract, in his sermon at the consecration of the four bishops, in October, 1832, advocated episcopacy, besides on other grounds, on that of there being several grades of office in the priesthoods of all religions, false as well as true, and in all civil magistracies and other official structures,—and, in his late Charge, he adverted to the evidence in its favor contained in the Fathers. And the “ Press,” at the time it issued the tract, issued also with it, in the “ Works on Episcopacy,” those of Dr. Bowden and Dr. Cooke ; which embrace the argument at large. There is no reason, therefore, for thinking, that, however a single writer may use selected arguments in a single publication, either he or other Episcopalians will (or should) narrow the ground they have usually occupied. The Fathers are consulted on

this subject, because the fabric of the ministry which they describe forms an historical basis for interpreting scripture. And general practice, in regard to distinct grades among officers, throws a heavier burden of disproof on those whose interpretations are adverse to Episcopacy : this latter topic we shall again notice before we close.'

This passage, so far from insisting, as the Tract had done, that **no** argument *was worth taking into the account*, except the scriptural proof, refers distinctly to the following points, which we beg leave to call "*extraneous considerations*," as proof of Episcopacy. (1.) The fact, that there "are several grades of office in the priesthood of all religions ;" (2.) That the same thing occurs "in all civil magistracies, and other official structures ;" (3.) The evidence of the fathers ; and, (4.) "Other grounds," which the author informs us he had insisted on, in an ordination sermon, in 1832. And in this very passage, he makes the following remarkable statement, which we propose soon to notice further : "The fathers are consulted on the subject, because the fabric of the ministry which they describe, forms an historical basis for interpreting scripture."

Slight circumstances often show strong inclinations, and habits of mind, How strong a hold this reference to other "considerations" than the scriptures, has been taken upon the mind of the author of the Tract, and how reluctant he was to part with the "extraneous" argument from the fathers, is

shown by the fact, that he again recurs to it in the "Answer," and presents it at much greater length. Thus on pp. 18, 19 at the very close of the Answer, we are presented with the following recurrence to the argument from other considerations than the scriptures :—

"One word more concerning the "burden of proof," as contrasted with the "presumptive argument." The tract claimed no presumption in its favor in seeking for the scriptural proofs of episcopacy. We do — a presumption founded on *common sense*, as indicated by common practice. Set aside parity and episcopacy, and then look at *other systems of office* both religious and civil, and you find *several grades* of officers. In the patriarchal church, there was the distinction of "high-priests" and "priest." In the Jewish church (common sense being, in this case unquestionably, divinely approved,) there were the high-priest, priests, and levites. Among Pagans and Mahomedans, there are various grades in the office deemed sacred. Civil governments have usually governors, a president, princes, a king an emperor, &c., as the heads of the general, or state, or provincial magistracies. In armies and navies, there is always a chief. If the reviewer should claim exceptions, we reply, they are exceptions only, and very few in number. The *general rule* is with us. That general rule, next to universal, is, that among officers, there is a *difference* of power, of rights, of rank, of grade, call it what you will. And this general rule gives a

presumption that such will also be the case in the Christian church. We go to scripture then with the presumptive argument fully against parity. If we should find in scripture neither imparity nor parity, still *common sense* decides for the former. If we find the tone of scripture doubtful, on this point, imparity has the advantage, common sense turning the scale. If we find there intimations, less than positive injunctions, in favor of imparity, common sense, besides the respect due to scripture, decides for our interpretation of them. And if any thing in scripture is supposed to prove or to justify parity, it must be very explicit, to overturn the suggestion of common sense. The "presumptive argument," then, is clearly with *us*, and the "burden of proof" lies on parity. Let the reviewer peruse the tract again, bearing in mind the principles laid down in this paragraph, and he will, we trust, think better of it."

These observations, it will be remembered, are made by the same writer, and in connection with the same subject, as the declaration, that "NO ARGUMENT IS WORTH TAKING INTO THE ACCOUNT, *that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic,—the scriptural evidence of Episcopacy.*

Now, against the principles of interpretation here stated, and which the Tract led us to suppose were abandoned, we enter our decided and solemn protest. The question,—the only question in the case, *is*, Whether Episcopacy "has the authority of scripture?" (Tract, p. 3.) The affirmation is, that if it

has not, "it is not necessarily binding." (p. 3.) The principle of interpretation, which in the Answer is introduced, to guide us in this inquiry, is that "the fathers are consulted on the subject, because the fabric of the ministry which they describe, forms an historical basis of interpreting scripture." (Answer, p. 3.) In order to understand the bearing of this rule of interpretation, it is necessary to know what it means. A "basis" is defined to be "the foundation of a thing; that on which a thing stands or lies; that on which it rests; the ground-work or first principle; that which supports." *Webster*. An "historical basis" must mean, therefore, that the opinions, or facts of history, that is, in this case, the testimony of the fathers, constitute the *foundation, the ground-work, or first principle*, of the interpretation of the Bible; or that on which such an interpretation *rests*, or by which *it is supported*. It would seem to follow, therefore, that, unless we first become acquainted with this "historical basis," we are wholly in the dark about the proper interpretation of the Bible, and that our interpretation is destitute of any true support and authority. To this principle of interpretation, in this case, and in all others, the objections are obvious and numerous. (1.) Our first objection lies against the supposed necessity of having any such previously ascertained *basis*, in order to a just interpretation of the oracles of God. We object wholly to the doctrine, that the scriptures are to be interpreted by historical facts to be de-

veloped long after the book was written. The great mass of men are wholly incompetent to enter into any such "historical" inquiry; but the great mass of men are not unqualified to understand the general drift and tenor of the New Testament. (2.) The statement is, that "the fabric of the ministry which they describe," is to be the basis of such interpretation. But who knows what the fabric of the ministry which they describe is? It is to be remembered, that the question is not respecting the ministry in the fourth century and onwards. But the inquiry,—and the only one of material value in any supposition,—pertains to the fathers previous to that period. And there every thing is unsettled. Prelacy claims the fathers in that unknown age. The papacy claims the fathers there. Presbyterianism claims the fathers there. Congregationalism and Independency too, claim them there. Every thing is unsettled and chaotic. And this is the very point which has been the interminable subject of contention in this whole inquiry, and from which we hoped we had escaped, by the principles laid down in the Tract. Yet the position *now* advanced, would lead us again into all the difficulties, and controversies, and jostling elements, and contradictory statements, which have always attended the appeal to the fathers. If we are to wait until we have ascertained "the fabric of the ministry" which these fathers describe, before we have a "basis" for interpreting scripture, we may close the New Testament

in despair. (3.) This canon of interpretation is contrary to the rule which Dr. Onderdonk has himself laid down in the Tract itself. (p. 3.) In that instance, the authority of the scriptures was declared to be ample, and final. And throughout the Tract, there is a manifest indication of a belief, that the Bible is susceptible of interpretation, on the acknowledged rules of language, and the principles of common sense. We hailed such a manifestation, not only as auspicious to the cause of truth in regard to the claims of Episcopacy, but because it evinced the spirit to which the church *must* come,—of a direct, unqualified, and final appeal to the word of God,—to determine religious doctrine. To that standard, we mean to adhere. And, as far as in us lies, we intend to hold it up to the view of men, and to insist on the great truth from which nothing shall ever divert us, and from which we fervently pray the church may never be diverted, that we are not to look for the discovery of truth, by ascertaining *first* an “historical basis,” or, a set of instruments by which we are to measure and adjust the proportions of truth which we find in the revelation of God. Without any design to disparage or undervalue the fathers, whom we sincerely reverence, as having been holy, bold, and venerable men; without any blindness, as we believe, to the living lustre of that piety which led many of them to the stake; without any apprehension, that their testimony, when examined, would be found to be on the side of Episcopacy,—for it re-

mains yet to be seen, that the fathers of the first two centuries ever dreamed of the pride and domination which subsequently crept into the church, and assumed the form of prelacy and popery : without any thing to influence us, so far as we know, from any of these "extraneous" sources, we intend to do all in our power to extend and perpetuate the doctrine, that the ultimate appeal in all religious inquiry, is to be the Bible, and the Bible only. "The Bible," said Chillingworth, "is the religion of the Protestants." We rejoice, to hear this sentiment echoed from the assistant bishop of Pennsylvania. And without meaning to insinuate, that this sentiment is not as honestly acted on by Episcopalians, as by any other denomination of Christians, we may add, that we deem the first sentence of the Tract worthy to be written in letters of gold, on the posts of every Episcopal sanctuary, and over every altar, and on the cover of every "Book of Common Prayer." "*The claim of Episcopacy to be of divine institution, and therefore obligatory on the church, rests fundamentally on the one question,—Has it the authority of scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding.*" (4.) Our fourth objection to this rule of interpretation is, that it is, substantially, that on which rests the papal hierarchy. We do not know, that the papist would wish to express his principles of interpretation in stronger language, than that "the fathers are consulted on this subject, because the fabric of the ministry which they describe, forms an historical basis

for interpreting scripture." To us it seems, that this would express all that they ask; and as we doubt not, that Dr. Onderdonk would shrink from any approximation to the papacy, quite as firmly as ourselves, we deem it necessary merely to suggest the consideration, to render the objection at once satisfactory to his own mind.

We object, also, to the principle of interpretation advanced on p. 18, of the Answer, which we have already quoted. The fact there assumed, is, that various orders of men are observable in civil government, etc.; and hence, that there is presumptive evidence, that such orders are to be found in the scriptures. We are not ignorant of the purpose for which this fact is adduced. It is to show, that the "burden of proof" does not lie so entirely on the Episcopalian, as we had affirmed in the review. We admit, to some extent, the modifying force of the circumstances, so far as the "burden of proof" is concerned. But it merely *lightens* the burden; it does not *remove* it. Presumption, in such a case, is not proof. When the fact affirmed relates to a doctrine of the Bible, it is not sufficient to say, that that fact occurred elsewhere, and *therefore* it must occur in the Bible. It is still the business of the Episcopalian, to *prove* his affirmation from the New Testament itself, that bishops are superior to other ministers of the gospel, in ministerial power and rights. This is *his* affirmation; this is the point which he urges; this is to be made out from the Bible *only*; and assu-

redly fact, that there are dukes, and earls, and emperors, and admirals, and nabobs, forms, at best, a *very slight* presumption in favor of the affirmation, that the ministry of the gospel consists of three 'orders.' But our objections may be further stated. *So far as the presumption goes, it is not particularly in favour of Episcopacy, as consisting in THREE orders of the clergy.* For, (1.) The fact is not, that there are three orders observable every where. It is, that there are many orders and ranks of civil officers and of men. (2.) The presumption drawn from what has taken place, would be rather in favor of despotism, and the papacy. (3.) The presumption is equally met by the doctrine of Presbyterianism as by prelacy. Presbyterians hold equally to a division of their community into various ranks,—into bishops, and elders, and deacons, and people. The presumption, drawn from the fact, that civil society is thus broken up, is as really in their favor, as in favor of Episcopacy. (4.) The Congregationalist may urge it with the same propriety. His community registers the names of his minister, *and* deacons, *and* church, *and* congregation, each with distinct privileges and rights. If Dr. Onderdonk should reply to this, that his remark referred only to the distinction of "*systems of office*, both religious and civil," (p. 18.) and "that among *officers*, there is a difference of power and rights," (p. 19.) we reply, that the distinction of *officers* pertains to other churches, as well as the Episcopal. No non-Epis-

copalian, perhaps, can be found, who holds to a *parity of office*. He will refer, at once, to his minister, to his elders, to his deacons, as evincing sufficient *disparity*, to meet the full force of the *presumption* alledged by Dr. Onderdonk. But our main objection here, as before, is to the principle of interpretation. We respectfully insist, that it should be laid aside, as an "extraneous consideration," in the inquiry, whether Episcopacy "has the authority of scripture."

In our review, we stated, that the burden of proof, in this inquiry, was laid wholly on the friends of Episcopacy. This point was so obvious, that we did not think it necessary to illustrate it at length. Nor do we now intend to do more than merely, by advertng to it, to recall it to the attention of our readers. The author of the "Answer" has endeavored to *remove* this burden from himself and his friends. (p. 4, and p. 18.) This he has done, by attempting to show, that there is a *presumptive* argument in favor of Episcopacy; which presumption throws the task of *proving* the parity of the clergy on those who advocate it. Now we are not disposed to enter into a controversy on this point. To us it seemed, and still seems, to be a plain case, that where it was affirmed, that the clergy of the Christian church was separated, by divine authority, into three grades, or orders, and that *one* of those orders had the *exclusive* right of ordination, of discipline, and of general superintendance; it could not be a matter

requiring much deliberation, to know where rested the burden of proof. If a man assumes authority over an army, demanding the subordination of all other officers to his will, it is not a very unreasonable presumption, that the burden of proof lies with him; nor would it be the *obvious* course, to expect the entire mass of officers to show, that he had *not* received such a commission. We shall, therefore, feel ourselves to be pursuing a very obvious course, if we do not recognize the authority of Episcopal bishops, unless there is proof positive of their commission. We may add further, that in the supposed case of the commander of the army or the navy, we should not regard that as a very satisfactory proof, which was pursued with as little directness and explicitness as are evinced in the argument to establish the original domination and perpetuity of the prelatical office. And in this connection we may remark, that it is perfectly immaterial, as to the main point, what may be the opinion of the man who calls the claim in question, or what may be the particular denomination to which he is attached. Whether he is an Independent, a Presbyterian, or a Congregationalist, it may be equally true, that the bishop of the Episcopal church is unable to make out his claims from the New Testament. The only material point, in which *all* other denominations are agreed, is, that the ministers of the New Testament are on an *equality*, in the respect under consideration; that the power of ordaining, and adminis-

tering discipline, and of superintending the concerns of the church, is intrusted to them, as equals, in opposition to the exclusive and exalted assumptions of a few, who claim the right to deprive them of these powers, and to make their ministrations null and void. And when claims of this order are advanced, —claims designed to dispossess the great mass of the ministry throughout the world, of the right of transmitting their office to others ; of exercising government and discipline in their own pastoral charges ; of superintending and controlling the affairs of the particular portion of the church universal, with which they are specifically intrusted ; when claims like these are presented, tending to degrade them from their office, to annihilate their authority, and to leave their charges without a ministry ;—we may respectfully insist, that the proof of this should be drawn, by no circumlocution, from the Bible. We wish to see, with great pertinency, the chapter, and the verse : we can with difficulty resist the impression, that it should be done *totidem verbis*, or at least, so nearly so, that there could be no possibility of mistake.

We may here remind our readers, of the precise points which Episcopacy is called upon to make out. The *first* is, that the apostles were “ distinguished from the elders, because they were *superior* to them in ministerial power and rights.” (Tract, p. 15.) The *second* is, that this distinction “ was so persevered in, as to indicate, that it was a *perma-*

ment arrangement." (Tract, p. 23.) These are independent propositions. One by no means follows from the other. Should the first be admitted, yet the second is to be established by equally explicit and independent proof. Nay, the second is by far the most material point, and should, as we shall show, be fortified by the most irrefragable arguments. The *third* point, indispensable to the other two, is, that there is no evidence in the New Testament, that presbyters, or elders, discharged the functions which are now claimed for bishops; that is, that they either (1.) ordained, or (2.) exercised discipline, or (3.) exerted a general supervision. (Tract, p. 11.) Unless then it is shown, that not *one* of these functions was ever performed by presbyters, the Episcopal claim fails of support, and must be abandoned. These are independent positions, and a failure in one, is a failure in the whole.

To a cursory review of what can be said on these points, we now propose to call the attention of our readers.

The *first* claim asserted, is, that the apostles were "distinguished from the elders, because they were *superior* to them, in ministerial power and rights." (Tract, p. 15.) The points of their alleged superiority, are, exclusive ordination, exclusive discipline, exclusive confirmation, and exclusive right of general superintendence. The question is, whether this is the nature of the superiority, with which the apostles were intrusted; or, which is the

same thing, were *these the purposes for which they were set apart to the apostolic office, and for which they were called apostles?* Dr. Onderdonk affirms it; we take the liberty, most respectfully, of calling for explicit proof of it, from the New Testament.

His direct proof is contained in a nut-shell. It consists of *one* expression of scripture: (Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi. 4.) "Apostles *and* elders," "apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren;" and a note on p. 12, of the tract, and in the reply, expanded to more than two pages, showing that, in his apprehension, they administered discipline. As this is the basis on which the whole fabric is reared, and as it embraces the very gist of the "Answer," we shall be pardoned for adverting to it with some particularity.

We may then inquire, why the apostles were distinguished from the elders, or presbyters? Dr. Onderdonk affirms, that it was because they were "superior in ministerial power and rights." The argument on this subject, from the New Testament, is, that the two classes of men are *distinguished* from each other, (Acts, xv. 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi. 4.) by the following expressions; "apostles *and* elders," "apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren." Now in regard to this *proof*, we beg leave to make the following remarks.

(1.) That it is the *only* direct passage of scripture, which Dr. O. is able to adduce, on the subject of the alledged superiority of the apostles. Its importance, in his view, may be seen from the fact,

that it is not merely the *only* proof, but, that it is repeated not less than five times, in the space of less than a single page of the tract; (pp. 14, 15.) and that it occupies a similar prominence in the Answer. The tract has been written four years. Diligent research during that time, it would be supposed, might have led to the discovery of some *other* text, that had a bearing on the point. But the matter still rests here. There *is* no other text; and the fabric is to be sustained on the solitary expression, "apostles *and* elders," "apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren."

(2.) What does this passage prove? It proves this, and no more, that there was a distinction of *some sort*, between the apostles *and* elders,—which is a point of just as much importance, as when we affirm, that one class were called apostles, *and* another called elders. But it is difficult for us to see, how this determines any thing respecting the *reasons* of the distinction. In Ephesians, iv. 11, the apostle affirms, that God gave some, apostles; *and* some, prophets; *and* some, evangelists; *and* some, pastors and teachers. Here a distinction is made out. But is the *nature* of the distinction thereby ascertained? I speak of guineas, *and* doubloons, *and* guilders. I affirm a distinction, indeed; but is its *nature* ascertained? Have I determined, that the guinea is, *therefore*, superior in weight or value to the others?

(3.) We have never denied, that, there was a

distinction between the apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren. The very fact, that they had the name apostles, shows, that there must have been some distinction, or some reason why they were so called. Unusual discernment, or labored argument, surely, are not necessary to perceive this. But the very point is, *what* is the *nature* of this distinction? And this is to be settled, not by the use of the word, but by the statement in the New Testament; and it is incumbent on the Episcopalian to show, by *proof-texts*, that it was *because* the apostles were superior in the power of ordination, of confirmation, of discipline, and of general superintendence of a diocese. Dr. Onderdonk *affirmed*, that the name was not so given, because they were appointed by Christ personally; nor because they had seen the Lord after his resurrection; nor because they had the power of working miracles: and then observed, that "it followed, OR would not be questioned, that it was because they were superior in ministerial power and rights." (Tract, p. 15.) It seems not to have occurred to him, that they could be appointed to be WITNESSES of his entire ministry, including the fact of his resurrection, as a main point. We took the liberty, therefore, of examining this matter, as very material to the argument. We proved, (1.) That in the original appointment of the apostles, there was no reference to their superiority, in the powers of ordination, discipline, etc. This position we supported by the three separate accounts of

Matthew, Mark, and Luke. (2.) That no such thing occurred in the instructions of our Lord, after his resurrection from the dead. This also we confirmed, by an examination of the testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in neither of whose gospels was there found a vestige of such instructions. (Review, p. 10.) (3.) That there was no where else, in the New Testament, any account, that what Dr. O. affirmed, as the peculiarity of the apostolic office, was known to the writers. This conclusion we rested upon our own examination, and the fact, that Dr. O. had not adduced any such passage. (4.) That the reason of the appointment to the apostolic office *was expressly affirmed*; and, that it was *not* that which Dr. O. supposed it to be. We showed, (a) that it was expressly affirmed, in the original appointment, (Luke xxiv. 48. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.) that they should be WITNESSES *of these things*; (Review, p. 12.) (b) that this was expressly provided for, in the case of the election of one to fill the place vacated by Judas; (Acts, i. 21, 22.) (c) that this was the account which the apostles uniformly gave, of the design of their appointment; (see p. 13.) (d) that the same thing was again expressly provided for, in the case of the apostle Paul, and, that *in order* to a qualification for that office, he was permitted to "SEE the Just one," the Lord Jesus; (Acts xxii. 14.) and, (e) that he himself expressly appeals to the fact, as a proof, that he was fully invested with the apostolic office. 1 Cor. ix.

1, 2.) (See Review, p. 15.) In the course of the argument, we adduced not less than *twenty* explicit passages of scripture, bearing directly on the point, and proving beyond dispute, that this was the design of the appointment to the apostolic office. Our purpose in this, was evident. It was to show, that the peculiarity of the apostolic office was of such a nature, that it could not be transmitted to distant generations; but, that it had a specific, yet very important design, which, as a matter of course, must cease.

With deep interest, therefore, we opened the "Answer," to ascertain how this array of scriptural argument was met. We did not deem it unreasonable to suppose, that there would be some new attempt to show, that the peculiarity of the apostolic office, was to ordain; that the passages of scripture on which we had relied, were irrelevant; or, that other passages might be adduced in proof of what Dr. O. had affirmed to be the peculiarity of the apostolic office, and which we had respectfully denied. Our readers will join with us in our '*amazement*,' to find the following, as the result of an examination of the "Answer."

(1.) A solemn, and somewhat pompous re-adducing of the expression, (Acts xv.) "the apostles *and* elders," "the apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren;" (Answer, p. 7.) a passage, maintaining still its solitary dignity, and reposing in the "Answer," as it had in the "Tract," in its own lonely grandeur.

We could not restrain our 'amazement' that no other passages were even referred to, on this material point; and we came to the conclusion, that we had reached an end of the argument, so far as direct scripture proof was concerned.

(2.) We found a notice of our extended array of proof-texts, showing what was the design of the apostolic appointment, of a character so remarkable, that we shall quote it entire.

"The reviewer, in order to show what *he* thinks was the point in which the apostles excelled the elders, in the matter in question, dwells largely on the fact, that they were *special* witnesses of our Lord's resurrection,—and with the help of CAPITAL and *italic* letters, he has certainly made a showy argument. But nobody denies, that they were the special witnesses,—or, that they were distinguished from the elders, as well as from others called apostles,—the tract gave due attention to both these particulars. The point is,—was *this* distinction the one that led to the expression, "apostles *and* elders?" Surely not. Among *those* apostles was Barnabas, and perhaps Silas,* neither of whom was a special witness of the resurrection. Besides, the expressions, "apostles *and* elders," "apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren," are used with immediate reference to the council at Jerusalem,—and the reviewer is more acute than we pretend to be, if he can say

*Acts xiv. 14; xv. 2, 4, 22. 1 Thess. i. 1; ii. 6.

why, in a council, acting on questions concerning 'idols, blood, things strangled, and licentiousness,' the special witnesses of the resurrection should, *as such*, have peculiar authority. We really think the tract argues with more consistency, when it says, that the apostles were *ministerially* above the elders." Answer, p. 16.

Here, it will be observed, there is no notice taken of texts, which we had adduced, as irrelevant, or unsatisfactory in number, or as unfairly interpreted. Dr. Onderdonk, if he was the writer of the Answer, deemed it an ample notice of those texts, to remark, that, "with the help of CAPITAL and *italic* letters, he (the reviewer,) had certainly made a showy argument." (Answer, p. 16.) That our argument was *thus* noticed, was, indeed, to us a matter of 'amazement.' It was, however, an indication,—of which we were not slow to avail ourselves, and the hold upon which, we shall not be swift to lose,—that our proof-texts were *ad rem*, and that they settled the question. When all that the assistant bishop of Pennsylvania deems it proper to say, of our array of more than twenty explicit declarations of the word of God, is, that, by the help of capitals and italics, they constitute a "SHOWY argument," (we mean no disrespect, when we display the word in a *showy* form,) we deem the conclusion to be inevitable, that our texts are just what we intended they should be,—that they settled the question,—and, to use an expression from the

favorite chapter of the Acts of the apostles, we "rejoice for the consolation." Acts xv. 31.

(3.) Though we were not met by any new proof-texts, or by any answer to our own, we were referred to the sentiments of the following distinguished men, viz. : the late Dr. Wilson, Dr. Miller, Dr. Campbell, Matthew Henry, "the *divines* who argued with Charles I, in the isle of Wight," and Calvin, to prove, that the apostles were superior to the elders, and the evangelists. (Answer, p. 10.) Respecting these authorities, we may be permitted to remark, (1.) that we shall probably not yield, out of regard to their names, to any person. With us, they have all the authority which uninspired men can ever be allowed to have. The writer of the review may be permitted to remark, perhaps, that he has occasion of peculiar respect for two of those venerable men. By one,—whose superior, in profound powers of reasoning, in varied and extensive learning, and in moral worth, he believes, is not now to be found among the living, in any American church,—he was preceded in the office which he now holds. At the feet of the other, it has been his privilege to sit, for nearly four years, and to receive the instructions of wisdom from his lips; and, whatever skill he may have in conducting this argument, on the government of the churches, he owes to the "basis" which was laid by those instructions. Whatever may be said, therefore, of these authorities adduced in the "Answer," will not be traced to

want of respect for these venerable names. But, (2.) we may remark, that in *this* argument, the authorities of uninspired men are to be laid out of the account. With all due deference to them, and to Dr. O., we must be permitted to believe, that their authority belongs to the "extraneous considerations," as well as that of the opinion of Cranmer, (Answer, p. 5.) which, by common consent, it had been agreed to lay out the controversy. (See Tract, pp. 3—10. Review, p. 5.) Our wonder is, that after the disclaimer of relying on these extraneous considerations, in the tract, the author of the Answer should have occupied nearly two pages, with the statements of these distinguished men. (3.) Their authority, even when adduced, does not bear on the point before us. The question is, whether the apostles were superior to other ministers of the gospel, in ministerial power and rights? that is, in the power of ordination, confirmation, discipline, and general superintendence. Their authorities adduced, prove only, that in the judgment of these venerable men, they were superior in some respects, to evangelists, and teachers; or, that there was a distinction between them,—a point on which we make no denial. On the only question in debate, they make no affirmation. On the claim set up by Episcopalians, that the apostles were superior in *ordination*, etc., they concede nothing, nor did they believe a word of it.

Having thus noticed the "Answer" on this part

of our argument, we shall dismiss it. We do it by simply reminding our readers, that the solitary text, which undisputed learning, talents, and zeal; have discovered, during a period of more than four years, since the discussion first commenced,—the lonely scripture proof of the sweeping claims, that the apostles *only*, had the power of ordination, and that this was the peculiarity of the office,—stands forth in the Tract, and in the Answer: “the apostles *and* elders,” “apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren!”

But the author of the “Answer” complains, (p. 11.) that we did not give the ‘whole’ of his argument on the subject; and he refers to a note on p. 12, of the Tract, designed to show, that the apostles had the power of administering discipline, and that therefore, they were superior to the presbyters, or held a more elevated grade of office. The note is this:—

‘That the apostles alone *ordained*, will be proved. In Cor. iv. 19—21; v. 3—5; 2 Cor. ii. 6; vii. 12; x. 8; xiii. 2, 10; and 1 Tim. i. 20; are recorded inflictions and remissions of *discipline* performed by an apostle, or threatenings on his part, although there must have been elders in Corinth, and certainly were in Ephesus.’

This note he expands into an argument, which constitutes the most material part of the “Answer.” It is incumbent upon us to examine it, and to ascertain how far it goes to settle the point under discussion. Before examining the particular cases referred

to, we would remind our readers, that the purpose for which they are adduced, is to show, that the apostles were *superior to presbyters in power and rights*; and the alledged proof is, that *they administered discipline*. To bear on the case, therefore, the passages must prove not only that *they exercised discipline*, but, (1.) That they did it *as apostles*, or in virtue of the apostolic office; (2.) That they did it in churches where there were presbyters; and, (3.) That presbyters *never* administered discipline themselves. The *second* point here adverted to, is all that the author of the "Answer" feels himself called upon to make out. (Answer, pp. 11—13.) Now in regard to this point of the proof, we make the following general remarks: (1.) There were certainly, in all, fourteen apostles; and if we may credit the writer of these pamphlets, and reckon Timothy, and Barnabas, and Sylvanus, and Apollos, and Andronicus, and Junia, and Titus, and perhaps half a dozen others, there were somewhat more than a score invested with this office; yet it is remarkable, that the only cases of discipline referred to, as going to prove the superiority of the whole college of apostles, are cases in which the apostle Paul only was concerned. (2.) There are accounts in the New Testament of perhaps some hundreds of churches; and yet, we meet with no instance of the kind of discipline relied on, except in the single churches of Corinth and Ephesus. It is incredible, that there should have been no other cases of discipline in these

churches. But if there were, the presumption is, that they were settled without the intervention of an apostle. (3.) These very cases, as we shall presently show, were cases in which Paul administered the rod of discipline in the churches where Titus and Timothy,—apostles also and bishops,—were present, by the showing of the author of the “Answer,” and thus were acts of manifest disrespect for the authority of those prelates. And if the fact, that the discipline was administered where there were presbyters, (Answer, pp. 11, 12.) proves that the apostle was superior to them, the same fact proves, that he was superior to Timothy and Titus. The course of the argument urged by the author of the “Answer,” would be, that Paul was disposed to assume the whole power into his own hands, and to set aside the claims alike of bishops and presbyters. It has a very undesirable looking towards the authority claimed by the papacy.

The two cases alledged as proof, that the apostles *only* had the power of administering discipline, are those at Corinth and at Ephesus. Paul wrote fourteen epistles, and wrote them to eight churches. In all these epistles, and in all the numerous churches of which he had the charge, (2 Cor. xi. 28, “the care of all the churches.”) these are the only instances in which he was called, so far as appears, to exercise discipline. We now inquire, whether he did it for the purpose of showing, that the apostles *only* had this power?

The first case alledged, is that at Corinth. "In 1 Cor. iv. 19—21, etc., are recorded inflictions and remissions of *discipline* performed by an apostle, or threatenings on his part; although there must have been elders at Corinth." (Note z, Tract, p. 12.) The *argument* here is, that there must have been elders at Corinth, and yet that Paul interposed over their heads to inflict discipline. This is the whole of the argument. (See Answer, p. 11.)

In reply to these, we observe: That there were elders, teachers, ministers, instructors in Corinth, we think is placed beyond a question, by the argument of the "Answer," and by the nature of the case. This fact we do not intend to call in question. The *argument* of the "Answer" from this fact, we state in the author's own words:—

'Yet, without noticing these elders in the matter so far as the epistles show—though they doubtless were noticed and consulted, as much as courtesy and their pastoral standing made proper—without putting the matter into their hands, or even passing it through their hands, Paul threatens, inflicts, and remits *discipline* among the people of their charge. This is a "ministerial" act. And Paul's doing it himself, instead of committing it to the elders, shows that he, an apostle, was "*superior* to them in ministerial power and rights."' p. 11.

Further, if there were elders there, there was an "apostle;" a prelatial bishop, according to the Tract, there also. This is shown by a quotation

from the epistle itself, relating to this very time, and in immediate connection with the case of discipline. (1 Cor. iv. 17.) "For this cause, [that is, on account of your divided and contending state,] have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every church." Now, as it will not be pretended by Episcopalians, that Timothy was not an "apostle," and as it is undeniable, that he was at that time at Corinth, the argument will as well apply to set aside *his* right to administer discipline in the case, as that of the elders. Borrowing, then, the words of the Answer, we would say: "Yet without noticing" this apostle "in the matter, so far as the epistles show,—though" he was "doubtless noticed and consulted, as much as courtesy and his" apostolical "standing made proper; without putting the matter into" his "hands, or even passing it through" his "hands, Paul threatens, inflicts, and remits *discipline*. This is a 'ministerial' act. And Paul's doing it himself, instead of committing it to" Timothy, "shows, that he, an apostle, was *superior* to" him "in ministerial power and rights." Now no Episcopalian will fail to be a once deeply impressed with the fallacy of this reasoning, in regard to the "apostle" and "bishop" Timothy. And yet, it is manifestly just as pertinent and forcible in his case, as it is for the purpose of the Answer in regard to the elders of Corinth. It

cannot be pretended, that a difference existed, because the "elders" were *permanently* located there, and Timothy not ; for the argument of the "Tract" and the "Answer" is, that the apostles were superior *as apostles*, and therefore it made no difference on this point, whether they were at Corinth, or at Crete or at Antioch ; they were invested with the apostolic office every where. *Our* conclusion from this instance, and from the fact which we have now stated, is, that there was some peculiarity in the case at Corinth, which rendered the ordinary exercise of discipline by presbyters difficult ; which operated equally against any interference by Timothy ; and which called peculiarly for the interposition of the founder of the church, and of an inspired apostle,—for one clothed with authority to inflict a heavy judgment here denominated "delivering unto satan for the destruction of the flesh," (1 Cor. v. 5.)—a power which could be exercised by none then in Corinth. Our next inquiry is, whether there are any reasons for this opinion ? The following we believe satisfactory :—

(1.) Paul had founded that church, (Acts xviii. 1—11.) and his interference in cases of discipline, would be regarded as peculiarly proper. There would be a natural and obvious deference to the founder of the church, which would render such an interposition in the highest degree appropriate. We are confirmed in this view, because he puts his authority *in this very case* on such a fact, and on the

deference which was due to him as their spiritual father. 1 Cor. iv. 15. "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many FATHERS; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel."

(2.) The circumstances of the church at Corinth were such, evidently, as to render the ordinary exercise of discipline, by their own elders, impossible. They were distracted; were rent into parties; were engaged in violent contention; and the authority, therefore, of one portion of the "teachers," and "instructors," would be disregarded by the other. Thus no united sentence could be agreed upon; and no judgment of a party could restore peace. An attempt to exercise discipline, would only enkindle party animosity, and produce strife. See chap. i. 11—17. So great, evidently, was the contention, and so hopeless the task of allaying it by any ordinary means, that even *Timothy*, whom Paul had sent for the express purpose of bringing them into remembrance of his ways, (1 Cor. iv. 17.) could have no hope, by his own interference, of allaying it. It was natural, that it should be referred to the founder of the church, and to one who had the power of punishing the offender.

(3.) It is material to remark, that this was not an ordinary case of discipline. It was one, that required the severest exercise of authority, and in a form which was lodged only with those intrusted

with the power of inflicting disease, or, as it is termed, "of delivering to Satan for the destruction of the flesh." 1 Cor. v. 5. Such cases would inevitably devolve upon the apostles, as clothed with miraculous power; and such, beyond all controversy, was this case. It therefore proves nothing about the *ordinary* mode of administering discipline. This case had reached to such a degree of enormity; it had been suffered to remain so long; it had become so aggravated, that it was necessary to interpose in this awful manner, and to decide it. Yet,

(4.) The apostle supposes, that they *ought* to have exercised the usual discipline themselves. This is evident, we think, from a comparison of the following passages: 1 Cor. v. 9, 10, 11, 12, with v. 2. In these verses it is supposed, that they did themselves *usually* exercise discipline. Paul (ver. 9.) gave them the general direction, not to keep company with fornicators; that is, to exercise discipline on those who did. In ver. 11, he asks them,—in a manner showing that the affirmative answer to the question expressed their usual practice,—whether they did not "judge those that were within?" that is, whether they did not ordinarily exercise discipline in the church? And in ver. 2, he supposes that it *ought* to have been done in this case; and as it had *not* been done by them, and the affair had assumed special enormity, he exercised the miraculous power intrusted to him, by inflicting

on the offender a grievous disease. (ver. 4, 5; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 30.)

(5.) It is evident that other churches did, in ordinary cases, exercise discipline without the intervention of an apostle. Thus the church in Thessalonica,—where Episcopacy, with all its zeal, has never been able even to *conjecture*, that there was a diocesan bishop,—was directed to exercise discipline; in any instance where the command of the inspired apostle was not obeyed. (2 Thess. iii. 14.) We shall soon make this point incontestible.

(6.) The circumstances of the early churches were such, as to make this apostolic intervention proper, and even indispensable, without supposing that it was to be a permanent arrangement. They were ignorant and feeble. They had had little opportunity of learning the nature of Christianity. In most cases, their founders were with them but a few weeks, and then left them under the care of elders ordained from among themselves. (Comp. Acts xiii, xiv. et passim.) Those elders would be poorly qualified to discharge the functions of their office; and they would be but little elevated, in character and learning, above the mass of the people. The churches must be imperfectly organized; unaccustomed to rigid discipline; exposed to many temptations; easily drawn into sin; and subject to great agitation and excitement. Even a great many subjects which may now be considered as settled, in morals and religion, would appear to them open

for debate ; and parties, as at Corinth, would easily be formed. (Comp. Acts xiv. xv ; Rom. xiv ; 1 Cor. viii.) In these circumstances, how natural was it for these churches to look for direction to the inspired men, who had founded them ? and how natural, that such persons should interpose and settle important and difficult cases of discipline ? And after these obvious considerations, are we to suppose, that the fact, that the apostle Paul, in *two* cases,—and two such cases only are recorded,—exercised an extraordinary act of discipline, is to be regarded as proof, that this power appertained *only* to the apostolic office, and was to be a permanent arrangement in the church ? We confess our ‘amazement,’ that but *two* cases of apostolic interference are mentioned, during the long and active life of Paul ; and we regard this as some evidence, that the churches were expected to exercise discipline, and actually did so, on their own members.

(7.) We are confirmed in our views on this point, from what is known to take place in organizing churches in heathen countries at the present day. Since we commenced this article, we were conversing with one of the American missionaries, stationed at Ceylon.* In the course of the conversation, he incidentally remarked, that the missionaries were obliged to retain the exercise of discipline in their own hands ; and that, although the mission had been established more than fifteen years, yet

* Rev. Mr. Winslow.

the exercise of discipline had never been intrusted to the native converts. He farther observed, that the missionaries had been endeavoring to find persons, to whom they could intrust the discipline of the church, as elders, but that as yet they had not found one. The native converts were still ignorant of the laws of Christianity; they had so little influence in the church; they were so partial to each other, even when in fault; that thus far, discipline,—though somewhat frequent acts of discipline were necessary,—was retained in the hands of the missionaries. Substantially the same thing must have occurred in the early churches in Asia Minor, in Syria, and Greece. Will Dr. Onderdonk infer, that because Mr. Winslow, Mr. Poor, and Dr. Scudder, in Ceylon, have found it necessary to retain the power of administering discipline, that therefore they are diocesan bishops, and that they do not contemplate, that the churches in Ceylon shall be other than prelatical? If not, his argument in the case of the church in Corinth can be allowed no weight.

We have now done with *this* instance of discipline. We have shown, that all the circumstances of the case can be accounted for, without any such conclusion, as that to which the author of the Tract is desirous to conduct it. We turn, therefore, to his other case of discipline, in the church at Ephesus.

The case is thus stated in 1 Tim. i. 20: "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have

delivered *unto Satan*, that they may learn not to blaspheme." His argument is, that "it is the apostle who inflicts the discipline; the elders do not appear in the matter. And discipline is a ministerial function, and excommunication its highest exercise." (Answer, p. 13.) In reply to this case, we make the following observations.

(1.) It occurs in a charge to Timothy,—Timothy, on the supposition of Episcopalians, an apostle co-ordinate with Paul himself; Timothy, prelate of Ephesus. If Timothy was an apostle, and diocesan bishop, and if the exercise of discipline pertained to an apostle and bishop, why did Paul take the matter into his own hands? Why not refer it to Timothy, and repose sufficient confidence in him to believe, that he was competent to fulfill this part of his Episcopal office? Would it now be regarded as courteous, for the bishop of Ohio to interpose and inflict an act of discipline on some Hymeneus or Alexander, of the diocese of Pennsylvania? And would there be as cordial submission of the bishop of Pennsylvania, as there was of the bishop of Ephesus? If Timothy was at Ephesus, and if the case of discipline occurred at the time which Dr. O. supposes, this case appears, to our humble apprehension, very much as if Paul regarded Timothy as neither an apostle nor a prelate.

(2.) If the exercise of the authority in this case of discipline by Paul, proves, that the presbyters at Ephesus had no right to administer discipline; for

the same reason it proves, that Timothy had not that right. By the supposition of Episcopalians, Timothy was there, as well as the presbyters. The assumption of the authority by Paul, proves as much, that it did not belong to Timothy, as that it did not belong to the presbyters.

(3.) This was a case such as occurred at Corinth. It was not an ordinary act of discipline; it was one, which supposed the infliction of the judgment of God by a miraculous agency. "Whom I have delivered *unto satan*, that they may learn not to blaspheme." Compare this account with the record of the case in Corinth, (1 Cor. v. 5.) and it is evident, that this was not an *ordinary* act of discipline, but was such as implied the direct infliction of the judgment of the Almighty. That such inflictions were intrusted to the hands of the apostles, we admit; and that Paul, not Timothy, inflicted this, proves, that the latter was neither an apostle nor a prelate.

(4.) Dr. Onderdonk supposes, that this occurred at Ephesus, and while Timothy was there. But what evidence is there of this? It is neither affirmed, that the transaction was at Ephesus, nor that Timothy was there. His argument proceeds on the assumption, that Timothy was bishop there when this epistle was written, and that the case of discipline occurred there. And the *proof* of this would probably be, the subscription at the end of the *second* epistle, and the "tradition of the elders." But that subscription has no authority; and it is not

to be *assumed, but proved*, that Timothy was there in the capacity of a prelate, or there at all, when this epistle was written to him. The demonstration, that a bishop only exercised discipline, it must be admitted, rests on slender grounds, if this be all.

(5.) But if this case *did* occur at Ephesus, what evidence is there, that it occurred at the *time* that bishop Onderdonk supposes? The account in the epistle to Timothy, by no means fixes the time of the transaction. "Whom I have delivered (*παρίδωκα*) unto Satan," etc. It was already done; and the presumption is, that it was done when Paul was himself present with them. It is morally certain, that it was *not* an act of discipline, that was then *to be done*.

Our readers have now the whole case before them. Episcopacy affirms, that prelates *only* have the power of administering discipline. It affirms, that the churches are prohibited from exercising it on their own members; that those appointed to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to be pastors of the flock, and who may therefore be supposed to understand the cases of discipline, and best qualified to administer it, have no right to exercise this act of government over their own members; but that this exclusive prerogative belongs to a stranger, and a foreigner, a prelatical bishop, whom the churches seldom see, and who must be, in a great degree, unacquainted with their peculiar wants and character. All power of discipline, in an entire diocese of some hundreds of

churches, is to be taken away from the members themselves, and from the pastors, and lodged in strange hands, and committed to a solitary, independent man, who, from the nature of the circumstances, can have little acquaintance with the case, and possess few of the qualifications requisite for the intelligent performance of this duty. And does the reader ask, What is the authority for this assumption of power? Why are the churches, and their pastors disrobed of this office, and reduced to the condition of humble dependants, at the feet of the prelate? Let him, in astonishment, learn. It is not because there is any *command* to this effect in the New Testament; it is not because there is any declaration implying, that it *would* be so; it is not by any affirmation, that it ever *was* so. This is the reason, and this is all: — The apostle Paul, in two cases, and in both instances over the heads of presbyters, (and over the head of bishop Timothy, too,) delivered men ‘to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that they might learn not to blaspheme;’ and THEREFORE, bishop Onderdonk, and bishop Griswold, and bishop Doane, *only*, have power to administer discipline in all the churches in Pennsylvania, and in the eastern diocese, and in New-Jersey; and THEREFORE, all the acts of discipline exercised by Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc., in Pennsylvania, and New-Jersey, and by the Congregationalists of New-England, are null and void. The disposal of *such* antecedents and consequents, may be safely left to all

who hold, that "no argument is worth taking into the account, that has not a *clear* and *palpable* bearing on the naked topic,—the scriptural evidence of Episcopacy." Tract, p. 3.

But we have not done with this subject. We are now prepared to show, not only, that there is no evidence, that the apostles exclusively exercised discipline, but that there *is* positive proof, that all the acts of discipline were *in fact* exercised by the presbyters of the churches. To put this matter to rest, we adduce the following passages of scripture :

Acts xx. 17, 28. "From Miletus, Paul sent to Ephesus, and called for the PRESBYTERS of the church, and said unto them : Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you BISHOPS, (*ἐπισκόπους*) to feed, (*ποιμαίνειν* like good shepherds, to provide for, watch over, and govern,) the church of God." It would be easy to show, that the word translated *feed*, includes the whole duty which a shepherd exercises over his flock, including all that is needful in the supervision, government, and defence, of those under his care. Proof of this may be found in the following passages of the New Testament, where the word occurs in the sense of ruling, or governing, including of course the exercise of discipline ; for how can there be government, unless there is authority for punishing offenders ? Matt. ii. 6 ; John, xxi. 16 ; 1 Pet. v. 2 ; Rev. ii. 27. "And he shall *rule* them (*ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς*) with a rod of iron ;" an expres,

sion which will be allowed to imply the exercise of discipline. Rev. xii. 5; xix. 15. Comp. Ps. ii. 9; xxiii. 1; xxvii. 12; xlvii. 13. And the Iliad of Homer may be consulted, *passim*, for this use of the word. See particularly, I. 263; II. 85.

1 Pet. v. 2, 3. "The PRESBYTERS who are among you I exhort, who am also a PRESBYTER. FEED (ποιμάνατε) the flock of God which is among you, taking the OVERSIGHT (ἐπισκοπῶντες discharging the duty of BISHOPS,) thereof, not by constraint, but willingly," etc. Here the very work which is claimed for prelates, is enjoined on presbyters, the very name which prelates assume, is given to presbyters; and *Peter ranks himself as on a level with them, in the office of exercising discipline, or in the government of the church.* It is perfectly obvious, that the presbyters at Ephesus, and the presbyters whom Peter addressed, were intrusted with the pastoral care to the fullest extent. It is obvious, that they were required to engage in all the work requisite in instructing, directing, and governing the flock. And it is *as* obvious, that they were intrusted with a power and an authority in this business, with which presbyters are *not* intrusted by the canons of the Episcopal church. We respectfully ask, Whether the bishop of Pennsylvania, or New-Jersey, would now take 1 Pet. v. 2, 3, for a text, and address the "priests," or "second order of clergy," in these words, without considerable qualification: "The PRESBYTERS who are among you I exhort, who am

also a PRESBYTER. *Feed* (ποιμάνατε) the flock of God, ἐπισκοποῦντες discharging the duty of BISHOPS over it, not by constraint, neither as being LORDS *over God's heritage.*"

Heb. xiii. 7. "Remember them which have the rule over you : τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, YOUR RULERS." Verse 17 "Obey them that have the rule over you." (Πειθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν.) That bishops are here referred to, no one will pretend. Yet the office of *ruling* certainly implies that kind of government which is concerned in the administration of discipline.

1 Thess. v. 12. "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, *and are over you in the Lord.*" (καὶ προστραμένους ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ.) 1 Tim. v. 17. "Let the PRESBYTERS that rule well (προεστῶτες) be counted worthy of double honor." There can be no question, that *these* passages are applied to presbyters. We come, then, to the conclusion, that the terms which *properly* denote government, and discipline, and on which alone, *any* claim for the exercise of authority can be founded,—the terms expressive of governing, of feeling, of ruling, of taking the oversight, are all applied to presbyters ; that the churches are required to submit to them in the exercise of that office ; and that the very term denoting *Episcopal jurisdiction*, is applied to them also. We ask for a solitary passage which directs apostles, or prelates, to administer discipline ; and we leave the case of *discipline*, therefore, to the common sense of those

who read the New Testament, and who believe, that presbyters had any duties to perform.

We have now examined the essential point in Episcopacy; for, if the claims which are arrogated for bishops are unfounded, the system, as a system, is destroyed. We have examined the solitary passage urged directly in its favor, "the apostles *and* elders," "the apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren;" and the claims set up in favor of their exclusive right to administer discipline; and, if we mistake not, we have shown, that hitherto, so stupendous claims have never been reared on so narrow a basis.

The next point which it is indispensable for Episcopalians to make out from the Bible, is, *that it was intended, that the superiority in ministerial rank and power, should be a permanent arrangement.* This, it will be perceived, is a distinct and independent inquiry. It by no means follows of necessity, even if all that the Episcopalians claim for the apostles, were conceded; for it might be true, that the apostles had this superiority, and yet, that it was designed merely as a temporary arrangement. As the "Answer" has added nothing material to the argument of the tract, on this subject, we shall not long be detained on this point. The *sole* argument in the "Tract" is drawn from the claim, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete; and that the "angels" of the seven churches were prelatical bishops. (pp. 23—29.) In our review, we examined

these several claims at length. (Review, pp. 17—31.) As the writer of the Answer has not thought proper to notice our argument here, we are left to the presumption, that an obvious or satisfactory reply was not at hand. The train of our reasoning, then, we shall take the liberty of regarding as unbroken and untouched. The only *appearance* of argument on this subject, in the Answer, is found on p. 14, and it is this: that its author supposes, our argument to have been, that Timothy and Titus had a temporary and extraordinary office, because they were “migratory;” and, as many of the presbyters, —Apollon, for example,—were migratory, hence it would follow, that the office of presbyter, also, was temporary. Now in reply to this, we observe, that although we *did* affirm the appointment of Timothy and Titus to have been ‘temporary,’ yet we were not so weak, as to suppose, that it was *because* they were migratory. That this fact *indicated*, that they had not a permanent prelatical office, we assuredly did, and still do, believe. But we showed,—in a manner which we marvel the author of the answer did not notice,—that Timothy was sent to Ephesus for a *special* purpose, and that he was to execute that office *only* until Paul returned. (Review, pp. 22, 24. 1 Tim. i. 3; iv. 13. 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.) The same thing we showed, from the New Testament, to be the case with regard to Titus. (Review, p. 26, See Titus i. 6—9; iii. 10, 12.) We never so far forgot ourselves, as to suppose, that *because*

Timothy and Titus were "migratory," that, therefore, they were not bishops. We put the matter on wholly different ground; and in the course of our argument, we quoted no less than *forty-six* passages of the New Testament, containing, we believe, all that can be supposed to bear on the point. We cannot withhold the expressions of our 'amazement,' that an author, whose express object was, to 'test Episcopacy by scripture,' should have left unnoticed, this argument. Never was there invented a shorter and more convenient mode of avoiding such an argument, than by saying of something which we never intended to urge, that the whole of it was founded on the fact of their being 'migratory.' We would now remind the author, that our argument was *not* of such a character; but it was, (1.) That Timothy is not even called an apostle; (2.) That he is expressly distinguished *from* the apostles; (3.) That there is no evidence, that he was bishop of Ephesus; (4.) That the scripture *affirms*, he was sent to Ephesus for a *special* and *temporary* purpose; (Review, p. 22.) and, (5.) That the epistles to Timothy contain full proof of the falsehood of any such supposition, as, that he was a prelatial bishop; because, (a) there are but two orders of officers in the church, spoken of in those epistles; (b) they contain no description of his own office as a prelate; (c) they contain full and explicit directions, on a great variety of other topics, of far less importance than the office which, according to Episcopacy, was

to constitute the very *peculiarity* of the church ; and not a word respecting his brother bishops, then existing, or any intimation, that such an order of men ever *would* exist.

In regard to Titus, we proved, (1.) That he was left in Crete, for the *special* purpose of completing a work which Paul had begun ; (2.) That Paul gave him express directions, when he had done that, to come to him ; and, (3.) That he obeyed the command, left Crete, and became the travelling companion of Paul ; and, that there is not the slightest reason to suppose, that he ever returned to Crete.

In regard to the “angels” of the seven churches, we showed, that the whole of Dr. Onderdonk’s argument was a mere assumption, that there was an inferior body of the “clergy at large ;” that there were in each of those cities, more churches than one,—a fact which should be proved, not assumed ;—also, that the style of the address to the “angel,” was that of the “angel of *the church*,” evidently referring to an individual congregation, and not to such a group of churches as constitute a modern diocese ; and, that the application of the term “angel,” to the pastor of a single church, was much more obvious, and much the more probable supposition, than to “the formal, unfrequent, and in many instances, stately and pompous visitations of a diocesan bishop.” (Review, pp. 27—30.)

To this argument there is no reply, except by an assumption, that Timothy was bishop of Ephe-

sus ; that the same thing must be presumed to exist in the year 96 ; and, that the "elders" at Ephesus being there also, and being ministers, any direction to the "angel," must suppose, that he was superior to the presbyters. (Answer, p. 17.) Now the whole of this argument proceeds on the supposition, that the elders at Ephesus were ordained ministers of the gospel, a distinct rank of the clergy, and sustaining the same office as the "second order" in the Episcopal church. But this is assuming the very point in debate. In our review, we showed, (p. 23,) that all the facts in the case of the elders at Ephesus, (Acts xx. 17, etc.,) are met by the supposition, that they were ruling elders, or persons appointed to govern, guide, and secure, the spiritual welfare of the church. Our argument is, (1.) That Dr. O. admits, that the word rendered "feed," (*ποιμαίνειν*) may mean, to rule ; (Tract, pp. 24, 37. (2.) That the idea of *ruling*, is the one which is there *specifically* dwelt on. That he directs them to "feed," or exercise the office of a shepherd over them, that is, to guard, defend, provide for them, as a shepherd does, in the care of his flock. He directs them to watch against the grievous wolves which should come in, and against those who should rise up from among themselves, to secure parties, etc. ; (3.) There is no counsel given them about the proper mode of administering the sacraments, the peculiar duty of the "second order" of clergy. (4.) There is no expression of lamentation, that they

had not a prelatical bishop; or any intimation, that they would soon be furnished with one. (5.) It is evidently implied, that the *number* of these elders was considerable. They are addressed as such; and yet they are addressed as in charge of one "flock," over which they had been placed. Now it is incredible, that any considerable body of the "second order of clergy" should have been ordained in an infant church like Ephesus. And it is equally incredible, that *if* Paul had so ordained them, he should have set them over *one* flock, in a single city,—collegiate 'rectors' in a single church in Ephesus,—under a "diocesan" also, of the single "flock," or church; a diocesan not then present, and concerning whom not the slightest hint was dropped by Paul, either of lamentation or promise. So that, on the whole, one knows not at which to be most surprised, the number of *assumptions* indispensable to the purpose of "enthroning" the bishop Timothy at Ephesus, or the singular coolness with which Episcopalians urge all these assumptions, as if they were grave matters of historical record.

In reference to the term "angel," as used in the apocalypse, we have only to remark, further, that the interpretation which makes it refer to a prelatical bishop, is so unnatural, and forced, that Episcopalians, are, many of them, themselves compelled to abandon it. Thus Stillingfleet, than whom an abler man, and one whose praise is higher in Episcopal churches, is not to be found among the advo-

cates of prelacy, says, of these angels: "If many things in the epistles be denoted to the angels, but yet so as to concern the whole body, then, of necessity, the angel must be taken as a *representative* of the whole body; and then, why may not the word *angel* be taken by way of representation of the body itself, either of the whole church, or, *which is far more probable*, of the *consessors*, or order of presbyters, in that church? We see what miserable, unaccountable arguments those are, which are brought for any kind of government, from metaphorical or ambiguous expressions, or names promiscuously used." *Irenicum*.

In regard to this *second* point, which it is incumbent on Episcopalians to make out, we are now prepared to estimate the force of these arguments. The case stands thus. (1.) There is no *command* in the New Testament, to the apostles, to transmit the peculiarity of the apostolic office. If there *had* been, the industry of Dr. Onderdonk would have called it to our attention. If the peculiarity of the office was to be transmitted, it was required, that such a command should be given. (2.) There is no affirmation, that it would be thus transmitted. If there had been, Dr. O.'s tract would not have been so barren on this point. And we ask him, whether it is credible, that the apostles were bishops of a superior order, and that it was designed, that all the church should be subject to an order of men, "superior in ministerial rank and power," deriving

their authority from the apostles; and yet, not the slightest command thus to transmit it, and not the slightest hint that it would be done? We say again, *Credat Judæus Apella!* (3.) It was *impossible*, that the peculiarity of the apostolic office *should* be transmitted. We have shown, not by assumptions, but by a large array of passages of scripture, what that peculiarity was,—to bear witness to the great events which went to prove, that Jesus was the Messiah: we have been met in this proof, by the calm and dignified observation, that this was a “showy” argument; and we now affirm, that the peculiarity of that office, as specified by Jesus Christ, by the chosen apostles, by Paul, and by the whole college, **COULD NOT** be transmitted; that no bishop is, or can be, a *witness*, in the sense, and for the purpose, for which they were originally designated. (4.) We have examined the case of Timothy, of Titus, and of the angels of the churches,—the slender basis on which the fabric of Episcopal pretension has been reared. We now affirm, (5.) That, should we admit all that Episcopalians claim, on each of these points, there is not the slightest proof, as a matter of historical record, that the Episcopal office has been transmitted from prelate to prelate; but that the pretended line has been often broken, and that no jury would give a verdict to the amount of five dollars, on proof so slender as can be adduced for the uninterrupted succession of prelates. As satisfactory evidence on this point,

we repeat the following passage, contained in the September number of this journal :

“ We are informed by many ancient historians, and very expressly by Bede, in his famous Ecclesiastical History, ‘ That at the request of Oswald, king of Northumberland, certain *presbyters* came (in the seventh century) from Scotland into England, and ordained bishops ; that the abbot, and *other presbyters* of the island of Hy, sent Aydan for this express purpose, declaring him to be worthy of the office of bishop, and that he ought to be sent to instruct the unbelieving and the unlearned.’ He informs us, that ‘ those presbyters ordained him and sent him to England on this errand ; and that Finan, sent from the same monastery in the same island, succeeded him in the Episcopal office, after having been ordained by the Scottish presbyters.’ ”

Upon this testimony of Bede, Baxter remarks, “ You will find, that the English had a *succession* of bishops by the *Scottish presbyter’s ordination* ; and there is no mention in Bede, of any dislike or scruple of the lawfulness of this course. The learned Dr. Doddridge refers us to Bede and Jones, to substantiate the fact, that ‘ the ordination of English bishops cannot be traced up to the church of Rome as its original ; that in the year 668, the successors of Austin, the monk, (who came over A. D. 596,) being almost extinct, *by far the greater part* of the bishops were of Scottish ordination, by Aydan and Finan, who came out of the Culdee mo-

nastery of Columbanus, and were no more than *presbyters*."

And is it verily so, that the Episcopal blood was thus early and extensively contaminated in England? Is it verily so, that when the effects of pious Austin's labors had become almost imperceptible, the sinking church was revived again, by sending to Scotland for *presbyters* to come and *ordain* a *multitude* of bishops? Then it is verily a fact, that Presbyterian ordination is one of the sturdiest pillars that support the vast fabric of the church of England. No matter if only *ten* bishops were thus ordained, the contamination, (if it be one,) having been imparted more than *eleven hundred years ago*, has had a long time to diffuse itself, and doubtless has diffused itself so extensively from bishop to bishop, that not a single prelate in Great Britain can prove, that he has escaped the infection. For what one of them can tell, if he was not consecrated by bishops, who were themselves consecrated by bishops, and they by other bishops, to whom all the ordaining power they ever had, was transmitted from the *presbyters of Scotland*? But this is not the whole of the evil. As no one bishop can trace his Episcopal pedigree farther back, perhaps, than two or three centuries, so he cannot certainly know, that any presbyter, on whose head he has imposed hands, has received from him any thing more than Presbyterian ordination. Nor is this all the evil. The Protestant Episcopal bishops and presbyters in

America are in the same plight ; for I am told that all their authority came from England. But as the English bishops who gave it to them, could not *then*, and cannot *now*, certainly tell whence it came, so who knows but all the Episcopal clergy in the United States of America, are originally indebted to the hands of *Elder Aydan* and *Elder Finan*, for all their ministerial powers ? I tremble for all Protestant Episcopal churches on both continents, if Presbyterian ordination be not VALID and SCRIPTURAL." pp. 486, 487.

One point more, in the argument for Episcopacy, remains. It is, *that none but prelates ordained*. It is incumbent on Episcopalians to prove this, as essential to their argument. For if presbyters or elders exercised the office of *ordaining*, then the main point claimed for the superiority of bishops, is unfounded. We aim, therefore, to show, that there is positive proof, that presbyters *did* ordain. We have shown, in the course of our argument, that they exercised the office of *discipline*, one of the things claimed peculiarly for bishops ; we now proceed to show, that the office of *ordaining* was one which was intrusted to them, and which they exercised. If this point be made out, it follows still further, that the peculiarity of the office of the apostles was not, that they ordained, and that the clergy of the New Testament are not divided into 'three orders,' but are equal in ministerial rank and power. The argument is indeed complete without this ; for,

unless Episcopalians can show, by positive proof, the superiority of their bishops to the right of ordination and discipline, the parity of the clergy follows as a matter of course.

The writer of these articles is a Presbyterian. But the argument does not require, that he should go largely into the proof of his own views on church polity. The object is, to *disprove* Episcopacy. If *this* is disproved, it follows, that the clergy are on an equality. If it is shown, that the doctrine of the New Testament is, that presbyters were to ordain, it is a sufficient disposal of the "feeble claims of lay-ordination," and of all other claims. It will follow, that a valid ordination is that, which is performed in accordance with the direction, that *presbyters* should ordain. What particular churches, *besides* the Presbyterian, accord, in their practice, with the direction, it is not our business to inquire. It is sufficient for our purpose, that the *Presbyterian* and Congregational churches accord with that requirement, and follow the direction of the New Testament, in the ordination of their ministry by presbyters, and in their ministerial equality. This is all the reply that is necessary, to the train of reflections in the "Answer." (pp. 5, 6.) We have seen, also, that Episcopal ordination is valid, not because it is performed by a prelate, but because it is, as we remarked, (Review, pp. 32, 33.) in fact a mere Presbyterian performance.

In proof of the point now before us, therefore, we

adduce 1 Tim. iv. 14 : "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Of this passage, which, to the common sense of mankind, affirms the very thing under discussion, it is evidently material for Episcopalians to dispose; or their claims to exclusive rights and privileges are forever destroyed. We shall, therefore, examine the passage, and then notice the objections to its *obvious* and *common sense* interpretation, alledged by Dr. Onderdonk.

We observe then, (1.) That the translation of the passage is fairly made. Much learned criticism has been exhausted, to very little purpose, by Episcopalians, to show, that a difference existed between "with," (*μετὰ*) in this place, and "by," (*διὰ*) in 2 Tim. i. 6. It has been said, "that such a distinction may justly be regarded as intimating, that the *virtue* of the ordaining act flowed from Paul, while the presbytery, or the rest of that body if he were included in it, expressed only *consent*." (Tract, p. 22.) But it has never been shown, nor can it be, that the preposition "with" does not fairly express the force of the original. The same observation may be applied to the word, "presbytery," (*πρεσβυτεριου*.) It denotes properly a body, or assembly of elders, or presbyters. In Luke xxii. 66, it is applied to the body of elders which composed the Sanhedrim, or great council of the Jews, and is translated "the elders of the people :"
το πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ. See also,

Acts xxii. 5 : "the estate of the elders." The word occurs no where else in the New Testament, except in the passage under consideration. Dr. Onderdonk has endeavored to show, that it means "the *office* to which Timothy was ordained, not the *persons* who ordained him; so that the passage would read, 'with the laying on of hands to confer the *presbyterate*,' or presbytership, or the clerical office;" and appeals to the authority of Grotius and Calvin, in the case. Tract, pp. 19, 20.) In regard to this interpretation, we observe, (1.) That if this be correct, then it follows, that Timothy was not *an apostle*, but *an elder*, —he was ordained to the office of the *presbyterate*, or the eldership. Timothy, then, is to be laid out of the college of the apostles and reduced to the humble office of a presbyter. When prelacy is to be established by showing that the office of apostles was transmitted, Timothy is an apostle; when it is necessary to make *another* use of this same man, it appears that he was ordained to the *presbyterate*, and Timothy becomes a humble *presbyter*. But, (2.) If the word "presbytery" (*πρεσβυτέριον*) here means the *presbyterate*, and not the *persons*, then it doubtless means the same in the two other places where it occurs. In Luke xxii. 66, we shall receive the information, that "the presbyterate," "the presbytership," or "the clerical office" of the people, that is, the body by which the people conferred "the presbyterate," came together with the scribes, etc. In Acts xxii. 5, we shall be informed, that "presby-

terate," or "the clerical office," would bear witness with the high-priest to the life of Paul. Such absurdities show the propriety of adhering, in interpretation, to the obvious and usual meaning of the words.

(3.) The word is fixed in its meaning, in the usage of the church. Suicer (*Thesaurus*,) says, it denotes "an assembly, congregation, and college of *presbyters* in the Christian church." In all the instances which he quotes from Theodoret, (on 1 Tim. iv. 14.) from Chrisostom, (Homil. xiii. on this epistle,) from Theophylact, (in loco,) and from Ignatius, (Epis. to Antioch, and to the Trallians,) there is not the slightest evidence, that it is *ever* used to denote the *office*, instead of the *persons*, of the presbytery.

(4.) As the opinion of Grotius is referred to by Dr. O., we beg leave to quote, here, a passage from his commentary on this place. "The custom was, that the presbyters who were present, placed their hands on the head of the candidate, at the same time with the presiding officer of their body," *cum cœtus sui principe*. "Where the apostles, or their assistants, were not present, ordination took place by the presiding officer (*Præsidem*) of their body, with the concurrence of the presbytery." We were particularly surprised, that the authority of CALVIN should have been adduced, as sanctioning that interpretation, which refers the word *presbytery* to *office*, and not to *persons*. His words are, "They who interpret *presbytery*, here, as a collective noun, denoting the college of presbyters, are, in my judgment,

right." Our first argument, then, is, that the word "presbytery," denoting the persons who composed the *body*, or *college of elders*, is the proper, obvious, and established sense of the passage.

(2.) It is evident from this passage, that whoever or whatever else might have been engaged in this transaction, a material part of it belonged to the presbytery or eldership concerned. "*Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy; WITH THE LAYING ON OF THE HANDS OF THE PRESBYTERY.*" Here it is evident, that the presbytery bore a material part in the transaction. Paul says, that the gift that was in Timothy, was given him by *prophecy*, with the laying on of the hands of *the presbytery*. That is, that prophecy, or some prophecies relating to Timothy, (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, "according to the prophecies which went before in thee,") had designated him as a proper person for the ministry, or that he *would* be employed in the ministry; but the prophecy did not invest him with the office, —did not confer the gift. *That was done*,—that formal appointment fulfilling the prophecy,—by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery. It was necessary, that that act of the presbytery should thus concur with the prophecy, or Timothy had remained a layman. The presbyters laid their hands on him; and he thus received his office. As the prophecy made no part of his ordination, it follows, that he was ordained by the presbytery.

(3.) The statement here, is just one which would

be given now in a *Presbyterian* ordination; it is *not* one which would be made in an Episcopal ordination. A Presbyterian would choose these very words, to give an account of an ordination in his church; an Episcopalian would not. The former speaks of ordination by a *presbytery*; the latter, of ordination by a *bishop*. The former can use the account of the apostle Paul, here, as applicable to ordination, without explanations, comments, new versions, and criticisms; the latter cannot. The passage speaks to the common understanding of men, in favor of Presbyterian ordination,—of the action of a *presbytery* in the case: it never speaks the language of Episcopacy, even after all the torture to which it may be subjected by Episcopal criticism. The passage is one, too, which is not like the “apostles *and* elders,” “the apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren,”—the *only* direct passage on which Episcopacy relies,—a passage which has no perceptible connection with the case; but it is one, that speaks on the very subject; which relates to the exact transaction; and which makes a positive affirmation of the very thing in debate.

(4.) The supposition, that this was not a *presbyterial* transaction, renders the passage unmeaning. Here was present, a body of men, called a *presbytery*. We ask the Episcopalian, why they were present? The answer is, *not* for the purpose of ordination, but for “concurrency.” Paul, the bishop, is the sole ordainer. We see Timothy bowing before

the presbytery. We see them solemnly impose their hands on him. We ask, 'Why is this?' 'Not for the purpose of ordination, the Episcopalian replies, but for "concurrence." Paul is the ordainer.' But, we ask, Had they no share in the ordination? 'None at all.' Had they no participation in conferring the gift designated by prophecy? 'None at all.' Why, then, present? Why did they impose hands? For "concurrence," for form, for nothing! It was an empty pageantry, in which they were mistaken, when supposing, that their act had something to do in conferring the gift; for their presence really *meant* nothing, and the whole transaction could as well have been performed without, as with them.

(5.) If this ordination was the joint act of the presbytery, we have here a complete scriptural account of a Presbyterian ordination. It becomes then, a very material question, how the Episcopalians dispose of this passage of scripture. Their difficulties and embarrassments on this subject, will still farther confirm the obvious interpretation which Presbyterians suggest, and hold. These difficulties and embarrassments are thus presented by Dr. Onderdonk:

He *first* doubts, whether this transaction was an *ordination*. (Tract, pp. 18, 19.) To this we answer, (1.) That, if it were not, then there is no account, that Timothy was ever ordained; (2.) That there is no specific work mentioned in the history of the apostles, to which Timothy was designated,

unless it was ordination; (3.) That it is the *obvious* and fair meaning of the passage; (4.) That, if *this* does not refer to ordination, it would be easy to apply the same denial to all the passages which speak of the "imposition of hands," and to show that there was no such thing as ordination to the ministry, in any case; (5.) That it accords with the common usage of the terms, 'imposition of hands,' ἐπιθέσις τῶν χειρῶν, in the New Testament. The phrase occurs but four times:—Acts viii. 18; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. vi. 2. In all these places, it evidently denotes conferring some gift, office, or favor, described by the act. In 2 Tim. i. 6, it denotes, by the acknowledgment of all Episcopalians, ordination to the ministry. Why should it not here? (6.) If, as Dr. Onderdonk supposes, it refers to "an inspired designation of one already in the ministry, to a particular field of duty," (Tract, p. 19.) then, (a) we ask, why we have no other mention of this transaction? (b) We ask, how it is to be accounted for, that Paul, while here evidently referring Timothy to the duties and responsibilities of the ministerial office in general, should not refer to his *ordination*, but to a *designation to a particular field of labor*? His argument to Timothy, on such a supposition, would be this: 'Your office of a minister of the gospel, is one that is exceedingly important. A bishop must be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, etc. (chap. iii.) In order to im-

press this more deeply on you, to fix these great duties in your mind, I refer you,—not to the solemnity of your ordination vows,—but *I solemnly remind* you of “*an inspired separation of one already in the ministry, to a particular field of duty.*” We need only observe here, that this is not a strain of argument that looks like Paul. But,

Secondly. Dr. O. supposes, that this was not a *Presbyterian* ordination. (Tract, pp. 19—21.) His first supposition is, that the word “presbytery” does not mean the *persons*, but the office. (p. 19.) This we have already noticed. He next supposes, (pp. 20, 21.) that if “the presbytery” here means not the office given to Timothy, but a body of elders, that it cannot “be shown, “of whom this ordaining presbytery was composed.” (p. 21.) And he then proceeds to state, that there are “seven modes” in which this “presbytery” might be composed. It might be made up of “ruling elders;” or, it might be composed of the “grade called presbyters;” or, as Peter and John called themselves “elders,” it might be made up of “apostles;” or, “there may have been ruling elders *and* presbyters; or, presbyters *and* one or more apostles; or, ruling elders and one or more of the apostles; or, ruling elders, *and* presbyters, and apostles.” (p. 21.) Now, as Dr. O. has not informed us *which* of these modes he prefers, we are left merely to conjecture. We may remark on these suppositions, (1.) That they are *mere* suppositions. There is not the shadow of

proof to support them. The word "presbytery," "a body of elders," does not appear to be such a difficult word of interpretation, as to make it necessary to envelop it in so much mist, in order to understand it. Dr. O.'s argument, here, is such as a man always employs, when he is pressed by difficulties which he cannot meet, and when he throws himself, as it were, into a labyrinth, in the hope, that amidst its numerous passages, he may escape detection, and evade pursuit. (2.) If this "body of elders" was made up of "ruling elders," or, "of the grade called presbyters," then the argument of Episcopacy is overthrown. Here is an instance, on *either* supposition, of Presbyterian ordination, which is fatal to the claims, that bishops only ordain. Or, if it be supposed, that this was not an ordination, but "an inspired separation of one already in the ministry, to a particular field of duty," it is an act equally fatal to the claim of prelates to the general "superintendence" of the church; since it is manifest, that these "elders" took upon themselves the functions of this office, and designated "the bishop of Ephesus" to his field of labor. Such a transaction would scarcely meet with Episcopal approbation in the nineteenth century.

But in regard to the other suppositions, that a part of all the "presbytery" was composed of apostles, we remark, (1.) That it is a *merely gratuitous* supposition. There is not an instance in which the term "presbytery," or "body of elders," is applied,

in the New Testament, to the collective body of the apostles. (2.) On the supposition, that the "presbytery" was composed entirely of apostles, then we ask, how it happens, that, in 2 Tim. i. 6, Paul appropriates to himself a power which belonged to every one of them, in as full right as to him? How came they to surrender their power into the hands of an individual? Was it the *character* of Paul thus to assume authority which did not belong to him? We have seen, already, how, on the supposition of the Episcopalian, he superseded bishop Timothy, in the exercise of discipline, in Corinth, and in his own diocese at Ephesus: we have now an instance in which he claims all the virtue of the ordaining power, where his fellow apostles must have been equally concerned.

But if a *part* only of this "presbytery" was composed of apostles, and the remainder presbyters, either ruling elders, or "the second grade," we would make the following inquiries: (1.) Was he ordained as a *prelate*? So the Episcopalians with one voice declare,—prelate of Ephesus. Then it follows, that Timothy, a prelate, was set apart to his work, by the imposition of the hands of elders. What was then his prelatical character? Does the water in the cistern rise higher than the fountain? If laymen were concerned, Timothy was a layman still. If presbyters, Timothy was a presbyter still. And thus all the power of prelates, from him of Rome downward, has come through the hands of

humble presbyters,—just as we believe, and just as history affirms. (2.) Was he ordained as a *presbyter*? Then his Episcopal character, so far as it depends on his ordination, is swept away; and thus we have not a solitary instance of the consecration of a prelate, in all the New Testament.

Which of these suppositions of Dr. O., he is disposed to receive as the true one, we are unable to say. All of them cannot be true; and whichever he chooses, is, as we have seen, equally fatal to his argument, and involves a refutation of the claims of prelacy.

The only other reply, with which Dr. O. meets the argument for Presbyterian ordination, from this passage, is, by the supposition, that the *virtue* of the ordaining act was derived from the apostle Paul. The passage on which he rests the argument, is (2 Tim. i. 6.) “that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands.” On this passage we observe, (1.) Paul does not deny that *other* hands were also imposed on Timothy; nor that his authority was derived *also* from others, in conjunction with himself. (2.) That by the supposition of Episcopalians, as well as Presbyterians other hands were, in fact, imposed on him. (3.) It was perfectly natural for Paul, in consequence of the relation which Timothy sustained to him, as his adopted son; (1 Tim. i. 2.) as being selected by him for the ministry; (Acts xvi. 3.) and as being his companion in the ministry, and in travels, to re-

mind him, near the close of his own life, (2 Tim. iv. 6.) that he had been solemnly set apart to the work by himself,—to bring his *own* agency into full view,—in order to stimulate and encourage him. That Paul had a part in the act of the ordination, we admit; that others also had a part,—the “presbytery,”—we have proved. (4.) The expression which is here used, is just such as an aged Presbyterian minister would now use, if directing a farewell letter to a son in the ministry. He would remind him, as Paul does in this epistle, (2 Tim. iv. 6.) that he was about to leave the ministry, and the world; and, if he wished to impress his mind in a peculiarly tender manner, he would remind him, also, that *he* took part in his ordination; that, under his own hands, he had been designated to the work of the ministry; and would endeavor to deepen his conviction of the importance and magnitude of the work, by the reflection, that he had been solemnly set apart to it by a *father*. Yet who would infer from this, that the aged Presbyterian would wish to be regarded as a *prelate*?

Dr. O. remarks on this case, (Tract, p. 22.) that, if *Paul* was engaged in the transaction, it was the work of an *apostle*, and was “an apostolic ordination.” We admit, that it was an “*apostolic* ordination;” but when will Episcopalians learn to suppose it possible, that an “*apostolic* ordination” was not a *prelatical* ordination? Did not Dr. O. see, that this was *assuming* the very point in debate, *that*

the peculiarity of the apostolic office was, the power of ordaining? We reply further, that whoever was engaged in it, a "presbytery" was concerned, and it was a *Presbyterian* ordination.

We have now considered all the objections, that have been made to the obvious interpretation of this passage; and we are prepared to submit it to any candid mind, as a full and unqualified statement, of an instance of Presbyterian ordination. Whichever of the half-dozen suppositions,—assuming a hue, chameleon-like, from the the nature of the argument to be refuted,—which Episcopalians are compelled to apply to the passage, is adopted, we have seen, that they involve them in all the difficulties of an unnatural interpretation, and conduct us, by a more circuitous route, only to the plain and common sense exposition of the passage, as decisive in favor of Presbyterian ordination.

Having thus shown, that there was one Presbyterian ordination, in the case of Timothy, claimed by Episcopalians as a prelate, and this too, in perhaps the only instance of ordination to the ministry, recorded in the New Testament; we now proceed to adduce the case of a *church*, that was *not* organized on the principles of Episcopalians, with three orders of clergy. We refer to the church at Philippi. "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." *σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις.* In regard to this church, we make the fol-

lowing observations. (1.) It was organized by the apostle Paul himself, in connection with Silas, and was, therefore, on the truly "primitive and apostolic" plan. (Acts xvi.) (2.) It was in the centre of a large territory, the capital of Macedonia, and not likely to be placed in subjection to a diocesan of another region. (3.) It was surrounded by other churches; as we have express mention of the church at Thessalonica, and the preaching of the gospel at Berea. (Acts xvii.) (4.) There is mention made of but two orders of men. What the *deacons* were, we know from the appointment in Acts vi. 1—6. They were designated, not to preach, but to take care of the poor members of the church, and to distribute the alms of the saints. As we have there, in the original appointment of the office, the express and extended mention of its functions, we are to infer, that the design was the same at Philippi. If we admit, however, the supposition of the Episcopalians, that the deacons were *preachers*, it will not at all affect our argument. The other class, therefore, the "bishops," constitute the preaching order, or the clergy,—those to whom were committed the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and of the discipline of the church. Now, either these bishops were *prelates*, or they were the *pastors*, the *presbyters* of the church. If Episcopalians choose to say, that they were *prelates*, then it follows, (a) that there was a plurality of such prelates in the same diocese, and the same city, and

the same church; which is contrary to the fundamental idea of Episcopacy. It follows, also, (b) that there is entirely wanting, in this church, the 'second order' of clergy; that an Episcopal church is organized, defective in one of the essential grades, with an appointment of a body of prelates, without presbyters; that is, an order of 'superior' men, designated to exercise jurisdiction over "priests" who had no existence. If it be said, that the "presbyters," or "second order," might have been there, though Paul did not expressly name them; then we are presented with the remarkable fact, that he specifies the *deacons*, an inferior order, and expresses to them his Christian salutations; that he salutes and addresses also the saints, and yet entirely disregards those who had the special pastoral charge of the church. Paul thus becomes a model of disrespect and incivility. In the epistles to Timothy, he gives him directions about every thing else, but no counsel about his brother prelates: in the epistles to the churches, he salutes their prelates, and their *deacons*, but becomes utterly regardless of the 'second order of clergy,' the immediate pastors of the churches.

But if our Episcopal brethren prefer to say, that the "bishops" here mean not prelates, but presbyters, we, so far, shall agree with them; and then it follows, (a) That here is an undeniable instance of a church, or rather a *group* of churches, large enough to satisfy the desire of any diocesan bishop for extended jurisdiction, organized without any pre-

late. None is mentioned; and there are but two orders of men, to whom the care of the "saints at Philippi" is intrusted. (b) If there was a prelate there, then we ask, why Paul did not refer to him, with affectionate salutations? Why does he refer to 'the second and the third orders of clergy,' without the slightest reference to the man who was 'superior to them in ministerial rank and power?' Was Paul jealous of the prelate? or have we here *another* instance of indecorum and incivility? (c) If they had had a prelate, and the see was now vacant, why is there no reference to this fact? why no condolence at their loss? why no prayer, that God would send them a man to enter into the vacant diocese? (d) Episcopalians have sometimes felt the pressure of these difficulties to be so great, that they have supposed the prelate to have been absent, when this epistle was addressed to the church at Philippi; and, that this was the reason why he was not remembered in the salutation. Of this solution, we observe only, that, like *some* other of their arguments, it is mere assumption. And even granting this assumption, it is an inquiry of not very easy solution, why Paul did not make some reference to this fact, and ask their prayers for the absent prelate. One can scarcely help being forcibly reminded, by the ineffectual efforts of Episcopalians to find a prelate at Philippi, of a remarkable transaction mentioned 1 Kings xviii. 27, 28, to which we need only refer our readers. It is scarcely necessary to

add, that, if a single church is proved to have been organized without the "*three orders of clergy*," the parity of the ministry is made out by apostolic appointment, and the Episcopal argument is at an end.

We may add, that our view of the organization of the church in Philippi, is confirmed by an examination of the organization of the church in its immediate neighborhood, in Thessalonica. In the two epistles which Paul directed to that church, there is not the slightest reference to any prelatical bishop; there is no mention of 'three orders of clergy;' there is no hint, that the church was organized on that plan. But *one* order of ministers is mentioned, evidently as entitled to the same respect, and as on an entire equality. They were men, clearly of the same rank, and engaged in discharging the functions of the same office. "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love, for their work's sake." 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. Will our Episcopal friends be kind enough to inform us, why there is no mention of the prelate, whether present or absent?

We are here prepared to estimate the force of the undeniable fact, that there is no distinction of grade or rank, by the *names* which are given to the ministers of the gospel in the New Testament. It is admitted by Episcopalians themselves, that the

names bishop, presbyter, etc., in the Bible, do not denote those ranks of church-officers to which they are now applied, but are given indiscriminately to all. On this point, we have the authority of Dr. Onderdonk. "The name 'bishop,'" says he, "which now designates the highest grade of the ministry, is not appropriated to this office in scripture. That name is given to the middle order, or presbyters; and ALL THAT WE READ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CONCERNING 'BISHOPS,' (including, of course, the words 'overseers,' and 'oversight,' which have the same derivation,) IS TO BE REGARDED AS PERTAINING TO THIS MIDDLE GRADE." (Tract, p. 12.) "Another irregularity of the same kind, occurs in regard to the word 'elder.' It is sometimes used for a minister, or clergyman of any grade, higher, middle, or lower; but it more strictly signifies a presbyter." Tract, p. 14.

In accordance with this fact, which is as remarkable as it is true, we have seen, that Peter applies to himself the name presbyter, and puts himself on a level with other presbyters. "The presbyters which are among you, I *exhort*, (not, I *command*, or *enjoin*, as a prelate would do,) who am also a presbyter." 1 Pet. v. 1. And in the very next verse, he exhorts them, (the elders, or presbyters,) to "feed the flock of God, taking the oversight, (*ἐπισκοποῦντες* exercising the office of bishop,) not by constraint," etc.

Now let these conceded facts be borne in mind.

The term presbyter is applied to the apostles. "All that we read of in the New Testament concerning 'bishops,' is applied to the middle grade." The apostles address each other, and their brethren, by the same terms,—by no words or names, that indicate rank, or grade, or authority. We maintain, that this fact can be accounted for, only on the supposition, that they regarded themselves as ministers, *as on a level*. If they meant to teach, that one class was superior in rank and power to others; we maintain, that they would *not* have used terms *always* confounding such distinctions, and *always* proceeding on the supposition, that they were on an equality. It will not be pretended, that they *could* not employ terms, that would have marked the various grades. For if the term 'bishop' can now do it, it could do it then; if the term presbyter can now be used to denote 'the middle grade,' it could then have been so used. We maintain, too, that if such *had* been their intention, they would have thus employed those terms. That the sacred writers were *capable* of using language definitely, Dr. Onderdonk will not doubt. Why, then, if they *were* capable, did they choose *not* to do it? Are Episcopal bishops, now, ever as vague and indefinite in their use of the terms 'bishop' and 'presbyters,' as were the apostles? Why were the latter so undesirous of having "the pre-eminence?" (3 John 9.)

It is remarkable, that the mode of using these terms in the New Testament, is precisely in accord-

ance with the usage in Presbyterian and Congregational churches. *They* speak, just as the sacred writers did, of their ministers, indiscriminately as 'bishops,' as 'pastors,' as 'teachers,' as 'evangelists.' *They* regard their ministers as on an equality. Did not the sacred writers do the same?

It is *as* remarkable, that the mode of using these terms in the Episcopal churches, is NOT, (*ex concessis*,) that which occurs in the Bible. And it is *as* certain, that *were* they thus to use those terms, it would *at once* confound their orders and ranks, and reduce their ministers to equality. Do we ever see any approximation in their addresses, and in their canons, in this respect, to the language and style of the New Testament? Do we ever hear of bishop Tyng, or bishop Hawkes, or bishop Schroeder, or bishop Crowell? Do we ever hear of presbyter Ives, or Doane, or Onderdonk? How would language like this, sound in the mouth of a prelatial bishop? Would not all men be amazed, as if some new thing had happened under the sun, in the Episcopal church? And yet, we venture to presume, that the terms used in the New Testament, to designate any office, may be used still. We shall still choose to call things by their true names, and to apply to all ranks and orders of men, the terms which are applied to them by the spirit of inspiration. And as the indiscriminate use of these terms is carefully avoided by the customs and canons of the Episcopal church; as there seems to

have been a presentiment in the formation of those canons, that such indiscriminate use would reduce the fabric to simple 'parity' of the clergy; and as these terms *cannot* be so used, without reducing these 'ranks and orders' to a scriptural equality, we come to the conclusion, that the apostles *meant* to teach, that the ministers of the New Testament are equal in ministerial rights and powers.

We have now gone through this entire subject. We have examined, we trust, in a candid manner,—we are sure with the kindest feelings towards our Episcopal brethren,—every argument which they have to adduce from the Bible, in favor of the claims of their bishops. We have disposed of these arguments, step by step. We have done this, remembering, that these are ALL the arguments which Episcopacy has to urge from the Bible. There is nothing that remains. The subject is exhausted. Episcopacy rests here. And it is incumbent on Episcopacy to *show*, not to *affirm*, that our interpretation of those passages is not sustained by sound principles of exegesis.

The burden of proof still lies on them. They assumed it, and on them it rests. They affirm, that enormous powers are lodged in the hands of the prelate,—every thing pertaining to ordination, to discipline, to the superintendence of the Christian church. They claim powers, tending to degrade every presbyter in the world, to the condition of a dependent and inferior office; stripping him of the right of

transmitting his own office, and of administering discipline among his own flock. They arrogate powers, which go to strip all other presbyters, except Episcopalian, of any right to officiate in the church of God; rendering their ordination invalid, their administrations void, and their exercise of the functions of their office, a daring and impious invasion of the rights of the priesthood, and a violation of the law of Christ. The foundation for these sweeping, and certainly not very modest claims, we have examined with all freedom. The argument for prelacy, may be summed up in a word. It consists in the text,—the solitary text,—“the apostles *and* elders,” “the apostles, *and* elders, *and* brethren,” joined to a circuitous train of reasoning, remote from common apprehension, and too abstruse for the guidance of the mass of men. Step by step, we have followed them in their circuits; argument after argument, we have patiently displaced; and at the conclusion, we may ask any person of plain common sense, to place his finger on that portion of the book of God, which is favorable to prelacy.

This argument having been met and disproved, we have produced an instance of express Presbyterian ordination, in the case of Timothy. Two churches we have found, that were organized without prelates. We are thus, by another train of argument, conducted to the same result,—that prelates are unknown in the New Testament. And, to make our argument perfectly conclusive, we have

shown that the *same titles* are applied indiscriminately to all.

Our argument may be stated in still fewer words. The Episcopal claims are *not* made out; and, of course, the clergy of the New Testament are equal. The Episcopalian has failed to show that there were *different grades*; and it follows, that there must be *parity*. We have examined the only case of ordination specified in the New Testament, and the constitution of the churches, and find, that it *is so*; and we are conducted, inevitably, to the conclusion, that prelacy is not in the Bible.

We now take our leave of the Episcopal controversy. As Episcopacy has nothing which it *can* add to the scriptural argument, we regard our labors in this department as at end. The whole *scriptural* argument is exhausted, and here *our* inquiry ends; and here *our* interest in this topic ceases. We take leave of the subject, with the same kind feelings for that church, and the same respect for the author of the "Tract," with which we began the inquiry. We remember the former services which the Episcopal church rendered to the cause of truth, and of the world's redemption; we remember the bright and ever-living lights of truth, which her clergy, and her illustrious laymen, have in other times enkindled in the darkness of this world's history, and which continue to pour their pure and steady lustre on the literature, the laws, and the customs of the Christian world; and

we trust the day will never come, when our bosoms, or the bosoms of Christians in any denomination, will cease to beat with emotions of lofty thanksgiving to the God of grace, that he raised up such gifted and holy men, to meet the corruptions of the papacy, and to breast the wickedness of the world.

In our view of ecclesiastical polity, we can have no unkind feelings towards any branch of the true church of God. We strive to cherish feelings of affectionate regard for them all, and to render praise to the common Father of Christians, for any efforts which are made to advance the intelligence, the purity, and the salvation of mankind. In our views of the nature of mind, and of freedom, we can have no unkind feelings towards any denomination of true Christians. "There are diversities of operations, but the same spirit." We have no expectation, that all men, in this world, will think alike. And we regard it as a wise arrangement, that the church of God is thus organized into different sections and departments, under the banner of the common Captain of their salvation. It promotes inquiry. It prevents complacency in mere forms and ceremonies. It produces healthy and vigorous emulation. It affords opportunities for all classes of minds to arrange themselves according to their preferences, and their habits of thought. And it is not unfavorable to that kindness of feeling which the Christian can cherish, and should cherish, when he utters in the sanctuary, the article of his faith, "I believe in

the holy catholic church, the communion of saints." The attachment of a soldier to a particular company or squadron, need not diminish his respect for the armies of his country, or extinguish his love of her liberty. Being joined to a company of infantry, need not make me feel, that the cavalry are useless, or involve me in a controversy with the artillery.

We ask only, that Episcopacy should not assume arrogant claims; that she should be willing to take her place among other denominations of Christians, entitled to like respect as others, to all the tender and sympathetic affections of the Christian brotherhood; and willing, that others should walk in the liberty wherewith Christ has made his people free? We shall have no contest with our Episcopal brethren, for loving the church of their choice, and the church in which they seek to prepare themselves for heaven. We shall not utter the language of unkindness, for their reverencing the ministerial office, in which the spirits of Cranmer and Leighton were prepared for their eternal rest. Content that other denominations should enjoy like freedom, when they do not arrogate to themselves unholy claims, and attempt to "lord it over" other parts "of God's heritage;" we shall pray for their success, and rejoice in their advancement. But the moment they cross this line; the moment they make any advances which resemble those of the papacy; the moment they set up the claim of being the only 'primitive and apostolical church;' and the moment they speak of the 'invalid

ministry' and the 'invalid ordinances' of the churches, and regard them as 'left to the uncovenanted mercies of God,' that moment, the language of argument and of Christian rebuke may properly be heard from every other denomination. There *are* minds, that can investigate the Bible, as well as the advocates for Episcopacy; there are pens, that can compete with any found in the Episcopal church; and there are men, who will not be slow to rebuke the first appearance of arrogance and of lordly assumption, and who will remind them, that the time has gone by, when an appeal to the infallible church will answer in this controversy. Arrogant assumptions, they will be at once reminded, do not suit the present state of intelligence in this land, nor the genius of our institutions. While the Episcopal church shall seek, by kind and gentle means, to widen its influence, like the flowing of a river, or like the dews of heaven, we shall hail its advances; when she departs from this course, and seeks to utter the language of authority and denunciation,—to prostrate other churches, as with the sweepings of the mountain-torrent,—she will be checked by all the intelligence and piety of this land; and she will be reminded, by a voice uttered from all the institutions of these times, that Episcopacy has had its reign of *authority* in the dark ages, and at the Vatican; and that the very genius of Protestantism is, *that one church is not to utter the language of arrogance over another; and that not authority or denunciation, but* SCRIPTURAL EXPOSITION,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06433 7929



