

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1856.

---

No. I.

---

---

ARTICLE I.—*The Church Review and Register for October 1855.* Art. VI. “Professor Hodge on the Permanency of the Apostolic Office.”

As even the more important periodical publications of one denomination circulate only to a limited extent within the bounds of other Churches, we may, without offence, state for the information of some of our readers, that the *Church Review* is an Episcopal Quarterly, published in New Haven, Connecticut. It is ably conducted, and seems to represent the high-church party in the Episcopal Church, as distinguished on the one hand from the Puseyites, and on the other from the Evangelicals.

In the last number of the *Review* there is an article on an Address delivered in May last before the Presbyterian Historical Society. The object of the article is to present an argument, from the pen of Bishop McIlvaine, in favour of the permanency of the apostolic office. This argument the Reviewer commends to our special notice. He pronounces it perfectly unanswerable; saying that a man might as well question one of the demonstrations in Euclid, as to contest either its pre-

mises or conclusions. He predicts with confidence that the author of the Address himself will be convinced, if he will give the argument a thorough examination.

We have never felt any inclination to engage in the Episcopal controversy, for two reasons. First, because so far as the Scriptures are concerned, there does not seem to us to be any room for controversy; and secondly, because when we go beyond the Scriptures, and get into the field of historical testimony, there is no end to controversy. The discussion cannot by possibility be brought to a satisfactory conclusion, not only because the field is so extensive, but also because the testimony itself is so ambiguous or contradictory; and also because the parties are not agreed as to what is genuine, what spurious, and what interpolated in the writings quoted on the one side or upon the other. If, as was taught by the most eminent of the Christian Fathers, and is conceded by the leading authorities of the Church of Rome, and was held by the great divines of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, and is now strenuously insisted upon by the Anglican or Oxford party in that Church, Episcopacy cannot be proved from Scripture alone, then the controversy must be left in the hands of those who have made historical research their special vocation. But when the advocates of Prelacy venture out of the jungles of patristic lore, and attempt to establish themselves on scripture ground, then any man who can read the Bible may join the conflict, and strive to drive them back to the thickets whence they came.

As the argument to which our attention has been specially called, purports to be a scriptural one, we feel bound to give it our serious attention. For if Prelacy be taught in the Bible, all men are bound to be prelatists.

Before turning to the question concerning the perpetuity of the apostleship, the Reviewer takes exception to the statement in the Address, that according to the prelatival theory, all church-power is in the hands of the clergy. He says the writer could not have looked at the Diocesan or General Constitutions of the Episcopal Church in this country, without finding abundant evidence that the lay clement has free scope for healthful and vigorous action. The Reviewer however should have noticed

that the Address does not treat of the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, but of the prelatical theory as it is known in history and in theological discussions. That theory teaches that all church-power was originally given to the apostles, and by them transmitted to prelates as their successors in the apostleship. To them alone it belongs authoritatively to teach, and to decide what is, and what is not, part of the revelation of God. They alone have the right to rule, to confirm, to ordain and to depose. Priests and deacons are their delegates, deriving what power they have from them and holding it at their discretion. This is the theory which underlies all the great historical Churches of the East and West. It is the formative idea of which those Churches are the development, and which has made them what they are.

This, however, is not the only form of Episcopacy. It was an opinion held by many of the Fathers, retained by many in the Roman Church, and embraced by the leaders of the Reformation in England, that presbyters and prelates were originally of the same order, and that on the ground of expediency, one presbyter was by the Church set over other presbyters with the title of bishop; as subsequently archbishops were set over bishops. This is held to be lawful and in accordance with the liberty given to the Church, which the theory assumes has the same right the State possesses to modify her organization at discretion. The general principle of this theory is, "government is of God, the form of man." According to this view, bishops have no higher divine right than kings, and those who make, can unmake them; as queen Elizabeth once profanely said to a refractory prelate.

Others go a step higher. They admit that the apostleship was temporary. Bishops are not apostles, but superintendents appointed by the apostles and intended to be permanent. Some hold that this element in the organization of the Church is essential, and adopt the maxim, "no Bishop, no Church." Others do not hold episcopacy to be essential to the being of the Church, though they regard it as a matter of divine appointment. They simply assert the fact that the apostles instituted a permanent office in the Church lower than their own, and higher than that of presbyters.

Advocates of all these theories are to be found among Episcopalians. In England the subjection of the Church to the State has materially modified its organization—and in this country it has been greatly modified by the influence of Presbyterians. As Independents have borrowed from us their Associations and Consociations; so Episcopalians have borrowed from us their lay-delegates. This is a new feature, unknown to any Episcopal organization in the old world. What degree of church power these lay-delegates really have, we shall not attempt to determine, lest we should betray an ignorance as gross as that betrayed by the Reviewer when he speaks of Presbyterians. "If there is one ecclesiastical system," he says, "in our country from which the lay element is effectually excluded, that system is the Presbyterian. Professor Hodge must confess that it is the merest sophistry to pretend that the lay-element is fairly represented by ruling elders. For the ruling elder by becoming such by ordination, ceases to be a mere layman." Our ruling elders are merchants, farmers, mechanics, lawyers, physicians, men without theological training, engaged in secular pursuits, mingling with the people to whom, as a class distinguished from the clergy, they belong, having the same spirit and interests. Their ordination is simply a declaration by the proper authority, that they have the gifts to qualify them to represent the people in church courts. That ordination has such magic power as to change the very nature of things, could never have entered the mind of any man not trained to take shadows for substance, and names for things. Our ruling elders are truly laymen, they belong to the people, and not to the clerical body; and yet they have real church-power. No one can be received to the communion of the church, or excluded from it, without their consent. No minister can be ordained or deposed, acquitted or condemned on the charge of immorality or heresy, but with their co-operation. If the Reviewer can say as much for the lay-delegates to Episcopal Conventions, we shall be glad to hear it. We warn him, however, that the revelation of the fact will go far to destroy the prestige of the Episcopal Church. The idea of priestly power has a great charm for the human heart, and great power over the imagination. Once convince men that

there is no mystic virtue in a mitre, no grace of orders, and they will soon believe that Episcopalians are no better than other people.

This, however, is a subordinate matter. The main point is the perpetuity of the apostleship. This is the question on which the Reviewer joins issue. He correctly remarks that the whole force of the argument contained in the Address, against the doctrine that bishops are apostles, lies in the syllogism: "If prelates are apostles, they must have apostolic gifts. They have not those gifts, therefore they are not apostles." This, he adds, is a "very convenient method to dispose of the prelatistical theory." We think it is. It is convenient, because it is so short and so effectual. It is not new. It is the old scriptural method of disposing of false pretences. In the apostolic age, if a man claimed to be an apostle, he was asked to furnish "the signs of an apostle." If he claimed to be a prophet, he was asked to produce proof of his inspiration. It was not then the custom for a man to say, I have the office of an apostle, but not his gifts; I am a prophet, but am not inspired. In those days such language would have exposed any man to ridicule. The propriety of this convenient method of settling the question whether a man was an apostle or not, was then universally recognized except by pretenders. The genuine apostles and prophets cheerfully submitted to it. Paul said to the Corinthians, If ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, I will give it to you. The Reviewer objects to this method. He says, "the supposition that if the apostolic office was to be continued, the miraculous gifts originally appertaining to that office would have been continued also," is a mere *petitio principii*, or begging of the question. He is probably labouring under a misapprehension of the doctrine which he opposes. He uses the expressions "miraculous gifts of an apostle," and "apostolic gifts," as though they were synonymous, and so does Bishop McIlvaine whose argument he quotes. They are however very different. The former is generally and correctly understood to mean the power of working miracles. This is the sense in which the expression is used throughout this article, both by the Reviewer and by the Bishop whose discourse is included in it. The latter expression, "apostolic gifts," means

those inward gifts which qualified their possessor to exercise the functions of an apostle. The power to work miracles was an evidence that a man possessed those gifts, if the miracles were wrought in confirmation of his claim to be an apostle. The gifts of an apostle were inspiration and infallibility; or more correctly stated, such a measure of inspiration as to communicate to the recipient full knowledge of the gospel, and to render him infallible in the communication of it. It was this that made a man an apostle; working miracles only proved him one. The doctrine of the Address is not, that if prelates are apostles they must have the power to work miracles; but that if they are apostles they must be inspired and infallible. It might be very reasonable to call upon those who claim to be thus the messengers of God, to work miracles in attestation of their claim; but that was not insisted upon. All the Address asserts, is that to claim to be an apostle without infallibility, is as absurd as to claim to be a prophet without inspiration, or to claim to be a man without a soul. The Reviewer does not see fit to discuss this principle. He prefers presenting an independent argument which he pronounces to be unanswerable in favour of the permanency of the apostolic office. The argument is found in a discourse delivered by Bishop McIlvaine on the occasion of the consecration of Bishop Polk in 1838.\*

We have no recollection of ever having seen this discourse before. For its author we have the highest personal regard, founded not only on the associations of early life, but also on his elevated character and services. It is because we know that

\* The following letter was addressed to Bishop McIlvaine requesting a copy of his sermon.

*Cincinnati, Dec. 9, 1838.*

*Right Rev. and dear Brother:*—We have listened to your discourse this morning with emotions we will not attempt to describe. We pray the divine blessing on the holy truth contained therein. In asking you to furnish a copy for publication, we feel assured that we shall gratify, not merely those who heard it, but far more who will delight to read it. We pray that God may long spare you, and give you grace to exhibit and recommend in your life and labours, the exalted sentiments set forth in the sermon of which we hereby request the publication.

Yours most affectionately in the gospel of Jesus Christ,

WILLIAM MEADE, Assistant Bishop of Virginia.

B. B. SMITH, Bishop of Kentucky.

JAMES H. O'KEY, Bishop of Tennessee.

LEONIDAS POLK, Missionary Bishop of Arkansas.

he sets Christ above the Church, truth above form, regeneration above baptism, and the communion of saints above agreement in church polity, that we regard him as an ornament to his profession and a blessing to the Church of Christ. We wish that some one other than a life-long friend had written the discourse we are called upon to review. We would much rather dwell upon the points in which we agree with such a man, than upon those on which we differ.

The proposition which Bishop McIlvaine undertakes to sustain is, that the apostolic office is permanent, and that bishops are the official successors of the original apostles, clothed with "the same power and authority." As, however, he does not hold the prelatial theory, in the form in which it was stated above, he is forced to begin by an attempt to reduce the apostolic office to a minimum. He makes it a mere episcopate. The office which he claims to be perpetual is not really the office which Paul and Peter filled, but one essentially different, though agreeing with it in certain points, as is the case with the office of every minister of the word. Unless we first come to an understanding as to what an office is, it is all lost time to dispute about its continuance. Something is perpetual. Some of the functions exercised by the apostles, have been continued in the Church—the authority to preach, rule and administer the sacraments. But these functions were not peculiar to the apostles, and therefore did not constitute their office as distinguished from that of other preachers. What is true of the apostles as such, and true of no other class of officers mentioned in the New Testament, is, 1. That their teaching was authoritative. It constituted for that age and for every other the rule of faith and practice. This is not true even of the New Testament prophets, whose inspiration was merely occasional, and whose instructions, except on those occasions, had no more authority, than those of other teachers. If any epistle written by Timothy, Titus, Barnabas or Silas should now be brought to light, it would have no more authority than the writings of Clement, Polycarp, or Irenæus. But if any well authenticated production of one of the apostles could be produced, it would bind the faith of the whole Church. There is an impassable line between the apostles and all other teachers, as to the authority with which they taught. And it is this that consti-

tutes one of the distinguishing elements of their office. It belonged to them as apostles and to all apostles. If any man taught with divine authority in the Church he was an apostle; if his teaching was not infallible, he was no apostle. 2. It is equally plain that the apostles exercised a jurisdiction which had no limits either as to its geographical sphere, or as to its degree. An apostle was an apostle everywhere, because his authority arose out of his personal gifts. Peter had the same authority in Babylon as in Rome. Paul laid down the rule of faith as authoritatively to those churches which had not seen his face in the flesh, as to those which he had himself founded. All their ordinances and decisions were as binding as the express commands and decisions of Christ. 3. They had the power of communicating miraculous gifts by the imposition of hands. These things the apostles had, and others had not. These things therefore are the distinguishing functions of the apostolic office; so that to say the office is continued without these gifts is a simple contradiction. The consequence is and ever has been, that those who claim to have the apostolic office, also claim these apostolic prerogatives. Romanists make the teaching of the bishops of any age the rule of faith for that age—it is infallible and authoritative. They also hold that the institutions, ordinances and decisions of those bishops bind the conscience, and, finally, they hold that the bishops, and they only, have power to give the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands. There is some sense in this. But for a man to claim that bishops are apostles, and yet renounce for them every one of these distinguishing functions, is self contradiction. We do not overlook the flaw even in the Romish theory. It attributes to the bishops collectively what belonged to the apostles individually. Bishops are not, even according to Papists, apostles; but the order of bishops have apostolic authority. Individually they are fallible, and may be heretical, but collectively they are infallible. This is a very lame apostleship. Still it keeps alive the office. It claims that true apostolic authority in teaching, ruling and discipline, exists in every age of the Church. This, which is the only intelligible theory of a perpetual apostleship, no man can hold without being or becoming a Romanist. The Puseyites, therefore, who revived this



doctrine in England and in this country, are going over in shoals to the Church of Rome. It is with profound regret we learn that Bishop McIlvaine has given his sanction to a proposition which contains the fundamental error and very formative idea of Romanism. It is true, he does understand the proposition in the sense in which Romanists do. But their sense is the true one; it is the only sense the proposition will bear; and it is the sense which has always been put upon it. The simple and stringent logic of Rome is: All men are bound, on pain of perdition, to submit to the teachings and authority of apostles. The bishops are apostles. Therefore all men are bound, on pain of perdition, to submit to the teaching and authority of bishops. Bishop McIlvaine admits the first and second of these propositions, and denies the third. Romanists thank no man for admitting the third, if he will grant the first and second. That is all they want, and all they need ask. Bishop McIlvaine would of course say that the fallacy in the above syllogism, is that the word *apostle* is used in a different sense in the second proposition, from that in which it is used in the first. That is, that bishops are not apostles in the same sense as the original messengers of Christ. That however is saying they have not the same office; and therefore is contradicting the very proposition his sermon is intended to demonstrate. If bishops have the same office that Peter and Paul had, they are intitled to the submission due to the official authority of Peter and Paul. For what is sameness of office, but sameness of functions and prerogative? Bishop McIlvaine cannot maintain his ground before Romanists. He has conceded everything, in conceding the perpetuity of the apostleship. With that concession they can lead any man, who follows his reason and conscience, to the feet of the Pope. They need ask no man to believe in transubstantiation, the priesthood of the ministry, the sacrifice of the mass, the supremacy of the Pope, purgatory, the worship of saints, or adoration of the virgin; all these and other doctrines are included in that one concession. For if the apostleship is perpetual, apostles have taught those doctrines, and we are bound to submit.

That the Roman view of the nature of the apostolic office,  
VOL. XXVIII.—NO. I. 2

which is the view almost universally recognized as correct, is the right view, is plain—First, from the fact, that the apostles rested their claim to absolute and universal obedience in matters of faith and practice, upon their office. It was because they were apostles they called on all men to acknowledge that what they wrote were “the commandments of the Lord.” 1 Cor. xiv. 37. Secondly, from the fact that submission to the apostles in matters of faith and practice was universally recognized as due to them in virtue of their office. Thirdly, from the fact, that the New Testament is the standard of faith to Christians, because it was written by the apostles or received their sanction. The argument for the inspiration of the New Testament is invalidated, unless infallibility belonged to the apostles as such. Fourthly, because Christ in constituting them apostles promised to give the Holy Spirit in such measure as to render their teaching as authoritative as his own; and he forbade their entering on the discharge of the duties of their office, until they had received the Holy Ghost. Fifthly, Christ authenticated their claim to be regarded as his immediate and infallible messengers, by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost. Sixthly, Paul, in claiming to be an apostle, disclaimed having derived either his knowledge or authority from men, and asserted that he had received the one by direct revelation, and the other by an immediate commission from Christ. He admits that had this not been the case, he would not be an apostle. Finally, we appeal to the maxim so much perverted and abused, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, must be true. In every age and in every part of the Church infallibility in teaching and supreme authority in ruling have been recognized as belonging to the apostles in virtue of their office. It is on this ground Rome claims this infallibility and authority, because she claims that the apostleship is continued in her prelates. It is the height of suicidal infatuation, therefore, in Protestant bishops, for the sake of exalting their order or strengthening their position, to claim to be apostles, with whatever explanations or limitations that claim may be presented.

As Bishop McIlvaine and ourselves differ so essentially as to the nature of the apostleship, there might seem to be no use

in continuing the discussion. He admits that what we, in common with most other men, understand by the apostleship was not continued. He only contends that the episcopal authority of the apostles has been perpetuated. There are, however, two points included in the proposition which he labours to sustain. First, that the apostolic office is perpetual—second, that that office was an episcopate. But the danger of this method is, that in attempting to prove the divine origin and permanency of the episcopate, he proves fatally too much; too much for himself, too much for Protestantism, and too much for the truth of God. Suppose he succeeds in proving the first of these points, as he thinks he has beyond contradiction, and fails in proving the second, as beyond contradiction he has failed, what becomes of him and of Protestantism? Both are hopelessly engulfed. There is an unbroken succession of infallible teachers, and those teachers are the Romish prelates. Bishop McIlvaine has attempted to walk on a paper bridge over a sea of fire. Everything, therefore, is at stake, and it is surely worth while to examine what he says on both the points just indicated.

He takes the second first, and attempts to show that the apostleship was and is a simple episcopate. His proof is drawn from the commission recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and from Acts i. 20, where the office from which Judas fell is said to be his bishopric or episcopate.

The commission is in these words: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world." Whatever, says our author, is not contained in this commission, "expressly, or by necessary inference, must be considered as not pertaining to the characteristic duties and powers of the apostles." Nothing is here said of their having seen Christ after his resurrection; nor of an immediate appointment from Christ; nor of miraculous powers and endowments. All these must therefore be considered as unessential to the office. What then is the office? Peter expressly styles the office which Judas "vacated, his bishopric, or his episcopate, as the original reads." But as

the word *episcopate* means supervision in general, we must go, he says, to the commission to learn its nature. The commission reads, "Go teach all nations," &c. "Therefore, whatever powers their apostleship or episcopate embraced, were not limited to any particular congregation of the Church, but extended to the whole Church; in other words, the *bishopric* in the hands of the apostles was evidently general, as distinguished from congregational. What particular functions belonged to that general oversight or episcopate, their commission leaves no room to doubt. First, 'go and teach all nations;' or as the more accurate and universally preferred translation is, 'go and make disciples of all nations.' Thus was given authority to propagate the gospel; 'baptizing them,' &c. Here was authority to administer the sacraments of the Church; and by the sacrament of baptism, to open the doors of the Church, and of its privileges, to disciples out of all nations. Finally, 'Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' These words conveyed to the apostles the authority to rule the Church, after they had made disciples by preaching, and members by baptism. An essential part of the government of the Church, consisted in seeing to the succession of its ministry. That the authority to do this, to ordain successors in the ministry, was included among the powers of the apostles, is not only necessarily implied in their authority to govern, but also in those impressive words of the Saviour, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' For as it was part of the office on which Jesus was sent, to institute the ministry of his Church, so, it follows from these words, that it was part of the sending of the apostles, to continue that ministry, by the ordaining of others to its functions. The conclusion, then, with regard to the characteristic nature of the apostolic office, is that it was one of a general supervision or episcopate; and embraced essentially, the authority to preach and propagate the gospel; to administer the sacraments of the Church; to preside over its government, and as a chief part of government, to ordain helpers and successors in the ministry. All these powers the apostles held, not as a collective body, or college, but severally and individually."

There are two modes of defending episcopacy, either of

which is intelligible and worthy of consideration. The one is to admit that bishops are not apostles, and endeavour to prove that an order of the ministry was instituted higher than that of presbyters, with the exclusive right to rule and ordain. The other is, to maintain that bishops are apostles, having their gifts as well as their office. But this attempt to reduce the apostleship to a mere episcopate, shocks the common sense of every reader of the New Testament. It is so palpable that Peter and Paul held a higher position than a mere bishop, that our author attempts to account for this undeniable fact by a reference to their "extraordinary endowments and all that striking array of miraculous powers with which they were furnished for their enterprise. Such endowments were needed," he says, "for the first propagation of the gospel. They have not been needed since."

We have already adverted to the distinction between the gifts essential to the office of an apostle, and the miraculous powers by which the claim to those gifts was authenticated. A man might be an apostle without those powers, but not without the gifts. The high position of Peter and Paul was not due to their miraculous powers, but to their inward gifts. Their office was only a commission giving authority and command to exercise those gifts. Our author says, we must distinguish between "the office of an ambassador, and the force of mind, or personal endowments with which he sustains his embassy." It is true that an ambassador may be more or less intelligent, but he must have intelligence. You cannot make a log of wood an ambassador. His embassy is only authority to exercise his intellectual gifts in the discharge of a certain duty. A man who has no eyes cannot be appointed a painter; nor a deaf man a musician; nor a dumb one an orator; nor an idiot a teacher; nor an uninspired man a prophet. Who then will believe that a man can be an apostle, one sent to prescribe the rule of faith and practice for all ages and for all nations, without plenary knowledge and infallibility?" The principle that every office implies a gift suited to its nature, runs through the Bible and applies to all cases from the lowest to the highest. If Jesus Christ is exalted to dominion over the universe, does not this imply the possession of divine perfections? Will it

be said we have no right to infer he is God from the nature of his work, because we must distinguish between the office and the qualifications for it? He could not be clothed with the office of God, without possessing the attributes of God. Neither can a man be clothed with the office of an apostle, without possessing the inward gifts of the apostleship. The endowments and the office are from the nature of the case inseparable. Bishop McIlvaine confounds inward gifts or endowments with miraculous powers, and the distinction between the superior qualifications for an office and the office itself, has no application to the case before us. What is meant by superior qualifications for infallibility?

Again, it is not only an arbitrary, but an unreasonable assumption, that we must confine ourselves to the original commission, in ascertaining the nature of the apostolic office. There are several ways in which the nature of an office may be legitimately determined. One is, the instructions given to those who hold it. Another is, the powers which they actually exercised in virtue of it, and the kind and degree of authority which it conferred. Another is, the qualifications declared to be essential to the exercise of its functions. We know that a presbyter is a teacher, because he is required to be "apt to teach." Another is, the nature of the end the office was designed to accomplish. These are all legitimate sources of information as to the nature of the apostleship, and they all furnish abundant evidence that it was not a mere episcopate. The men selected by Christ for this office were instructed to make known the gospel which they had received by immediate revelation; to establish the Church, to lay down rules for its organization and government. They everywhere exercised the powers of infallible teachers and supreme rulers. They claimed for their teaching the authority of God, and for their ordinances the submission due to divine commands. They were utterly unfit for the exercise of their office until they were endowed with power from on high; and were forbidden to act as apostles until they had received the promise of the Holy Ghost, and finally, the design of their appointment was to lay the foundation of the Church, and to furnish it with an infallible rule of faith and practice.

But suppose we ignore all these sources of information as to the nature of the apostleship, and confine ourselves to the commission. The commission does not contain a word about episcopal authority either expressly or by implication. Every word it contains might be addressed to presbyters. In Mark the whole commission is contained in these words: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." How simple and sublime is this! but what does it say about episcopacy? Our author argues that the first clause of the commission, as given in Matthew, "Go teach all nations," &c., gives authority to instruct; the second, "baptizing them," &c., gives authority to administer the sacraments; and the third, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," gives authority to rule the Church! Since the world began was the claim to a divine right to rule ever rested upon such a foundation as this! Suppose the emperor of the French should say to a company of schoolmasters, Go into all France, and teach the people to obey my commands; would that confer on each of these teachers severally and individually the right to superintend the education concerns of the nation, and to appoint successors to this educational episcopacy? If the command in the first clause to teach conveys only authority to instruct, how is it that the command to teach in the third clause, which is only a repetition of the first, conveys the episcopate? Again, if the authority to teach conveyed in the first clause, and the authority to baptize conveyed in the second, do not belong exclusively to bishops, how is it that the authority to rule the Church, said to be conveyed in the third clause, belongs exclusively to them? Again, if the command to rule involves the right to ordain, when addressed to bishops, why does not the same command involve the right to ordain, when addressed to presbyters? Here is a commission of three clauses, the first and second convey powers common to all ministers, and the third, powers belonging exclusively to a particular order of ministers. Why is this? Why is the right to rule claimed as an exclusive prerogative, when the rights to teach and baptize, all contained in one commission and addressed to the same persons, are admitted to be common to ministers?

Conscious, as any sane man must be, of the insufficiency of

the language of the commission, to prove that the apostolic office was a mere episcopate, Bishop McIlvaine turns to two other passages for aid. The one is, "the impressive words of the Saviour, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.'" On this passage he argues thus: "As it was part of the office on which Jesus was sent, to institute the ministry of his Church; so it follows from these words that it was part of the sending of the apostles to continue that ministry by the ordaining of others to its functions." Then, by parity of reason, as it was part of the office on which Jesus was sent, to make expiation for sin, it is part of the sending of the apostles, and of the bishops exclusively, as their successors, to continue that expiation! The other passage, outside the commission to which appeal is made, is Acts i. 20, in which the office held by Judas is called a bishopric or episcopate. From this it is inferred that the apostleship is in its specific nature an episcopate. The word however so translated is in the margin rendered, "*office or charge.*" And in Ps. cix. 8, whence the passage is quoted, the expression is, "His office let another take." How then can the specific nature of the apostolic office be determined by a word which may express an office of any kind? It might just as reasonably be argued that the apostleship is a *deaconship*, because it is expressed by the general term *diaxovia*. It is nothing less than humiliating to see good men catching at such straws as these, to prove themselves apostles. To men perishing with thirst, the mere sound of water is refreshing. We consider the argument for the supremacy of the Pope founded on the passage: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church;" and the still stronger passage: "Peter, lovest thou me? feed my sheep," (i. e. be their shepherd,) a thousand fold more plausible than Bishop McIlvaine's argument for episcopacy.

The most extraordinary feature of this case, however, is still to be presented. Our author attempts to determine the nature of the apostolic office, and thence deduce the permanency of the episcopate, from a passage which has no reference to the apostles in their official capacity, nor even to the apostles as ministers of the gospel. The commission in question is neither the commission of the apostles, nor of the ministry, but of the



Church. This has been the common opinion of God's people from the beginning. It was not addressed to the apostles alone, but to a promiscuous assembly of believers, probably to the five hundred brethren assembled to meet their risen Lord. The duty which it enjoins does not bind the apostles only, but the whole Church. Who can believe that the command, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," was meant for episcopal ears only? It sinks into the heart of every member of the Church, man or woman, and makes all feel they belong to a body whose vocation it is to disciple all nations. The powers which the commission conveys do not belong to the apostles as such, but to the Church as a whole. It is the essence of Popery to suppose and to feel that all Church power inheres in bishops or in the clergy. Finally, the promise which the commission contains, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," was not made to the apostles in their official capacity, but is the promise on which the whole Church has lived from that day to this. If this view of the matter be correct, then Bishop McIlvaine's structure is left standing on thin air. It is founded on the assumption that the commission was given to the apostles as such. If it was given to the Church as a whole, he has no ground left to stand on.

The sum of what we have said of this argument in proof that the apostolic office is a simple episcopate, is—First, that it is unreasonable to confine our attention to the commission alone, and ignore all other means of determining the nature of the apostleship. Second, that if we do confine ourselves to the commission, there is not a word nor a thought in it which has any reference to an episcopate. It might have been addressed to any company of ministers. Third, the commission was not addressed to the apostles, but to the whole Church, and therefore neither defines their office nor enumerates their powers.

Having endeavoured to show that Bishop McIlvaine has misconceived the nature of the apostleship, we come to consider his argument in favour of the permanency of the office.

The permanence of the office, he says, "is undeniably evident from the promise, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' Now, if neither the persons of the apostles were intended to remain to the end of the world, nor

their miraculous endowments, nor their distinguishing office, we are quite unable to comprehend how that promise has been fulfilled, or what it could have meant. But the persons of the first apostles do not remain. Their miraculous gifts have not been continued in the Church. It follows then, that their distinguishing office must remain; that it was to this office, and to those who should hold it in succession, that the Saviour promised his presence to the end of the world. No other sense can possibly be put on his words." p. 413.

Our answer to this is: 1. That the promise was not made to the apostles, and therefore not to their successors. It has not been fulfilled in reference to bishops. According to the authoritative declaration of the Church of England, there was not a bishop on the face of the earth, at the time of the Reformation, who had not sunk into idolatry and heresy. Is this consistent with the presence of Christ? Would the promise to the Church be fulfilled, if the whole body of those who name the name of Christ turned heathen? The only sense in which the promise in question has been fulfilled, and therefore the only sense in which it was intended, is that Christ has never forsaken his Church. He has always had a seed to confess and serve him; in the midst of persecutions and of corruptions he has preserved his living members, and in the end always brought them off victorious.

2. But if we grant that the promise was made to the apostles, it was made to them as teachers and not as bishops, and therefore secures only the perpetuity of the ministry, and not the perpetuity of the episcopate. As we have already seen, the commission does not contain a word about episcopacy. It reads, "Go teach; and, lo, I am with you always." If it is addressed to the apostles, it must be to them as teachers.

3. If the promise secures the perpetuity of the apostleship, and if, as we have seen, the apostleship implies infallibility in teaching, it secures an uninterrupted succession of infallible teachers in the Church. If Bishop McIlvaine's argument proves any thing, it proves Romanism. If any man wishes to see this argument in the hands of a master, let him read Bossuet, who urges it with a force which might make our author's heart quake, and force him to retract his dangerous concession of the

perpetuity of the apostleship. Half-way measures and half-way arguments are always weak.

Bishop McIlvaine's first and great argument for the perpetuity of the apostleship, is the one just considered. His next is from the actual continuance of the office in the Church in the order of bishops, for whom he claims "the same power and authority which they (*i. e.* the apostles) had." p. 419.

We have seldom felt more sad than when reading these words. So long as the clergy of the Episcopal Church in England and America were content to stand on the ground of Jerome and of their own Reformers, and regard bishops as men lawfully appointed by the Church over presbyters; or even to assume that the apostles instituted such an order, other Protestants, however much they differed from them, felt that the foundation had not been forsaken. But when they claimed that their bishops are apostles clothed with "the same power and authority" as the original messengers of Christ, it was seen that the citadel had been given up; that the radical principle of Popery had been adopted, and that all the corruptions of that system must inevitably follow. Until recently the doctrine of apostolic succession as involving the perpetuity of the apostleship was confined to the Laudean faction in the Episcopal Church; but now it seems that the heads of the evangelical party have gone over to the enemy. There is no use of disguising the fact. The doctrine that bishops are apostles clothed with "the same power and authority," is the very life and essence of the Romish system. We know Bishop McIlvaine does not mean what he says. Still he says it. He says the very thing Rome says, and all she says. He uses almost the very language of the Oxford Tracts when they present the beginning, middle, and end of their system.

Before prosecuting his argument to prove that bishops are apostles, our author stops to deprecate the charge of arrogance. "Nothing," he says, "is so humble and unpretending as truth." True; but nothing is so arrogant as falsehood. If bishops are really apostles there is no harm in their claiming the authority and power attached to the office. But if they are not—what then? The claim is no trifle. Bishop McIlvaine says that bishops are the official successors of the apostles,

having the "same power and authority;" which authority is episcopal supervision, including the authority "to rule the Church," and the sole right to ordain; and that this authority was given not to the apostles collectively, but to each of them severally and individually; and that it extends over, not a single congregation, but over the whole Church. See particularly page 412. According to this, our author claims to be an apostle—to be entitled as such to the supervision, not only over a single congregation, not over those only who choose him to be a bishop, but over the whole Church on the ground of a divine warrant. The Church universal therefore is bound to recognize this claim—and all Christians within his diocese are bound to submit to it. He is the only man in Ohio who has the right "to rule the Church," or to ordain. All Christians within that State, who do not submit to his jurisdiction, are in a state of rebellion against God. Venerable men here in New Jersey, such men as Drs. Alexander and Miller, have died in this state of rebellion, because they did not recognize the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bishop Doane over them, and submit to him as an apostle. This without exaggeration we understand to be included in the claim advanced in this discourse. It may appear to our author very humble and unpretending, but we assure him it appears to others in a very different light. We regard it as an insult to the common sense, and an outrage on the Christian feelings of men. And so long as episcopacy insists on these claims, it will be an offence and a nuisance which every good man is bound to do what he can to abate. If such be the character of these assumptions when the apostleship is reduced to a mere episcopate, what is to be thought of them when the office is regarded in its true light? Then the arrogance of claiming to be an apostle is only short of the arrogance of the Man of Sin, in claiming to be the vicar of Christ, and setting himself as God in the temple of God. To claim the apostleship in this sense of the term, we hold to be an enormous wickedness; and to claim it in a sense in which the office has never been understood, we regard as a proof of such infatuation as portends a fall. With all our love and respect for Bishop McIlvaine we cannot help thus speaking. We fully believe he is sincere; that he does not mean to claim the apostleship for

his order, but something very different under that name. This, though it may save the man, does not redeem the doctrine. The doctrine that bishops are apostles, with the same power and authority, is apostacy to Rome; and must be so, however innocently, through misconception of its meaning, the doctrine may in some cases be propounded.

His argument in proof of the assumption that bishops are apostles, is drawn first, from the fact that the word is used in the New Testament in application to others than the original immediate messengers of Christ; and second, from the assumed fact, that such persons exercised apostolic functions.

We are ashamed to ask our readers to travel with us over a road as much beaten as Broadway or the Strand. It is impossible that either Bishop McIlvaine or ourselves should present anything new, or even in a new form on these topics. It is, however, with knowledge as with food: that millions of men before us have eaten to satiety, does not satisfy our hunger. And that the testimony of Scripture, on these points, has been presented a thousand times before, does not prevent the necessity of considering it afresh, when it is afresh presented.

“That the office of the apostles did descend,” says our author, “from them to successors; that it was communicated to others by the hands of those who received it from the Lord, is manifest. For not to mention Matthias and Barnabas, who were apostles, Acts xiv. 14, we find Timothy, who was ordained by St. Paul, 2 Tim. i. 6, not only called an apostle by that writer, as he is called bishop by the writers of the next century, but actually charged by St. Paul with the exercise of all the authority we have mentioned as contained in the apostolic commission. The First Epistle to Timothy is the plainest evidence that he was put in trust with the government of the Church of Ephesus; which at that time, as the Acts of the Apostles declares, contained a plurality of presbyters; that over those presbyters, as well as over the deacons and laity, he was invested with the personal charge of discipline and government, and that in discharging such government, the authority to ordain was distinctly in his single hands. The same is evident concerning Titus, from the Epistle of St. Paul to him. It was his charge from St. Paul to set in order all the Churches of

the large island of Crete, and 'ordain presbyters in every city.' Thus we see the office of the apostles handed down by a succession of hands to one of the latest dates of which the Scriptures speak. It certainly continued in the world as long as the lifetime of the apostle St. John; and he lived to the hundredth year of the Christian æra." pp. 416, 7.

That the apostleship continued in the Church as long as the apostle John lived, we do not deny. For that would be to deny that John lived till he died; or that he lost his inspiration and became a fallible teacher before his death.

The conclusion to which these arguments would lead us involves of course the official equality of Timothy and Paul. There is a preliminary difficulty in the way of this conclusion, which our author does not attempt to remove. It is just as evident from the New Testament that Timothy and Titus were officially subordinate to the apostle Paul, as it is evident from other sources that a Russian colonel is officially inferior to the Russian Czar. They were ordered here and there, directed to do this and that; they were required to make Paul's teachings their rule of faith, and Paul's precepts their rule of life. While his teachings were thus authoritative, their teachings had no authority at all except what it derived from his. To say, therefore, that he and they had the same office, and "the same power and authority," seems to us nothing less than absurd. If the Bishop of London were to write to Bishop McIlvaine as Paul did to Timothy and Titus, we suspect the latter would think that the English prelate was assuming official superiority over him.

Let us, however, look at the arguments. The first is, that Timothy and others were officially apostles because the title "apostle" is given to them.

Our answer to this is—1. That neither Timothy nor Titus, whose cases are principally relied upon to prove the transmission of the apostleship, is ever called an apostle in the New Testament, in any sense. With regard to Titus it is not pretended that he was ever so called. The proof that Timothy is called an apostle is supposed to be found in 1 Thess. i. 1, as compared with chap. ii. 6, of that Epistle. In the former passage it is said, "Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus unto the

Church of the Thessalonians," &c.; and in the latter, "We might have been burdensome to you as the apostles of Christ." From this it is inferred that Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus were equally apostles of Christ. Every reader of the New Testament knows that Paul was accustomed to associate with himself any of his travelling companions, who happened to be with him at the time, in his salutations to the Churches. Every reader also knows, that he was frequently in the habit when speaking of himself to say "we." To make every thing which he says of himself, in the use of that pronoun, apply equally to those associated with him in the salutations, would upset the authority of all those portions of Scripture. It would make Sosthenes as much the author of the first epistle to the Corinthians as Paul. It would make him and Silas and Timothy inspired and infallible men. It would reduce the Epistles to a mass of contradictions and absurdities. Thus, in this very instance, Paul says, 1 Thess. iii. 3, "We thought it good to be left alone at Athens, and sent Timothy;" that is, Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, thought it good to be left alone, and sent Timothy—Timothy sent Timothy! So low as this will even good men stoop to sustain a foregone conclusion. Paul associates his companions with him in his salutations, not in his epistles. They are his epistles and not theirs, by the common faith of the Church, and by the common sense of mankind. So far from Paul ever calling Timothy an apostle, he frequently and expressly says he was no apostle, but a brother, a minister. "Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ and Timothy our brother," by all the rules of grammar as plainly declares that Timothy was not an apostle, as in the expression, "the apostles, elders, and brethren," it is declared that the brethren were not apostles. All this ground, however, has been gone over much more thoroughly in our pages years ago.

2. Admitting, as we cheerfully do, that the word apostle is sometimes applied to others than the original messengers of Christ, it proves nothing as to the transmission of the office. Every one knows that all the terms of office used in the New Testament, are significant, and may be used either in their primary sense, in which they may be applied to officers of all kinds; or in an official sense, when they designate officers of only one

kind. Thus the word apostle means *one sent*, and is used of any messenger, as in John xiii. 16, "The servant is not above his master, neither he that is sent (the apostle) greater than he that sent him." In the same sense Epaphroditus is called the messenger of the Philippians, Phil. ii. 25; which is explained by saying "he ministered to my necessities." And in chap. iv. 18, Paul says, "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you." 2. It is used of those sent on a religious mission, *i. e.* missionaries, as Barnabas was the apostle, or missionary of the Church of Antioch, having been sent by that Church. Acts xiii. 1, 2. 3. It is used of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is called "the apostle and high-priest of our profession," because he was the messenger of God. 4. It is used in its official sense of the original messengers of Christ; and in this sense it is never used of any but inspired and infallible men. No passage can be produced in which, from the context or from any other source, it can be proved that the word is applied to any one who was not infallible, in the same sense in which it is applied to Paul. Unless, therefore, it can be proved that every messenger is a messenger of God, in the technical sense, it cannot be proved that calling a man an apostle establishes the transmission of the apostolic office. In like manner the word bishop means a superintendent, and may be applied to any kind of office, secular or religious; or it may be used in an official sense for an officer of a particular kind. Presbyter means an old man, and hence Peter says, "I also am a presbyter;" officially it means a particular class of Church officers. Deacon means, follower, servant, or minister, hence all the presbyters and apostles are called deacons; officially the term is restricted to a particular class. Bishop McIlvaine's argument then is, a man's being called bishop does not prove him to have been officially a bishop; a man's being called a presbyter does not prove him to have been officially a presbyter; a man's being called deacon does not prove him to have been officially a deacon; but his being called apostle does prove that he was officially an apostle. This is the total amount of the argument, and it is evidently entirely destitute of weight. Of this our author betrays a secret consciousness, for he says, "We go by office more than name."



The second branch of the argument above quoted, for the transmission of the apostolic office, is in effect this: The powers conferred on Timothy and Titus, and the acts which they were required to perform, prove their official superiority to presbyters; and their official superiority to presbyters proves they were apostles.

Our answer to this argument is again two-fold. First, there is no evidence that Timothy and Titus were officially superior to presbyters; and secondly, admitting that fact, it does not prove that they were apostles.

The first assumption by Bishop McIlvaine, in reference to Timothy, is that he was ordained by Paul alone, from which he seems to infer that he was ordained to the apostleship. In proof of his ordination by the apostle, reference is made to 2 Tim. i. 6, "Stir up the gift of God that is in thee by the laying on of my hands." Ordination, however, does not confer "the gift of God." It is a solemn recognition that that gift is already possessed, and gives authority publicly to exercise it. It is only on the supposition that ordination is a sacrament, or a rite conferring grace, that this passage can naturally be understood to have any reference to that ceremony. The gifts imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands, were the power of working miracles, speaking with tongues, healing the sick, prophesying, or some other form of miraculous power. When Peter and John laid their hands on certain converts in Samaria, they received the Holy Ghost. When Simon Magus saw this, he said to the apostles, "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." Acts viii. 15-18. It is evident that these gifts were something, the possession of which was at once manifest to all. When Paul baptized certain disciples and laid his hands on them, immediately they spake with tongues and prophesied. Acts xix. 6. The passage, therefore, in 2 Tim. i. 6, to say the least, has no necessary reference to ordination.

The second assumption in the argument is, that the powers conferred on Timothy and Titus were several and not joint; that is, that they were authorized to exercise the powers of discipline, government, and ordination, individually, and not in connection with others. It is certain, that all that is said to

them may be naturally explained, on the supposition that they were to act as members of a court. If the Secretary of War, in summoning a general court martial, were to address the members severally, he might say to each of them just what Paul said to Timothy. He might say, You are not to take up a charge against a brother officer lightly; you are not to pass sentence on insufficient evidence; every specification must be proved by two or three witnesses, &c. Such language would not imply that every officer thus addressed had individually the right of judgment.

We are willing, however, to admit that Timothy was ordained by Paul, and that he as well as Titus had, as individuals, the right to ordain and to exercise discipline. Still nothing is gained. For the third assumption of our author, that the right of ordination implies official superiority, is not only gratuitous but palpably false. Bishop McIlvaine maintains that Paul ordained Timothy an apostle, and yet that they held the same office; one bishop ordains another bishop, and yet is not his official superior; then why may not one presbyter ordain other presbyters without being officially their superior? What kind of reasoning is this? To ordain apostles does not imply that the ordainer is more than an apostle; to ordain bishops does not prove that the ordainer is more than a bishop; but to ordain presbyters does prove that the ordainer is officially superior to presbyters! How could the ministry be continued on the principle that the ordainer must be officially superior to the ordained? Who then could ordain the highest? As the right to ordain presbyters does not prove official superiority over them, neither does the exercise of discipline. One bishop often sits in judgment on other bishops; one presbyter on other presbyters. A single bishop has often a whole province or kingdom under his jurisdiction, with authority to ordain or depose his fellow bishops at discretion. In the early history of the Scottish Church, one presbyter was invested with all the powers attributed to Timothy and Titus, and yet he was nothing more than a presbyter. The superintendents in Germany are presbyters, and yet they are the organs of the Church in the exercise of discipline over clergy and people. One colonel often has under his command other colonels, and is superior to

them only in age, not in rank. How then can it be rationally inferred from the fact that Timothy and Titus exercised discipline over presbyters that they belonged to a higher order in the ministry?

The plain fact is, that the apostles were the governing authority in the Church; and they sent presbyters to organize churches, to ordain other presbyters, to exercise discipline, to set things in order, just as the Pope or Council sends one bishop to correct abuses, to consecrate other bishops, or to depose them when necessary; and just as in the Presbyterian Church, as formerly in Scotland and still in Germany, one presbyter may be commissioned to exercise similar controul over his brethren. In a settled, organized state of the Church, this is unnecessary. But there is nothing in this kind of jurisdiction of one bishop over others, or of one presbyter over other presbyters, which implies superiority of order. It is a settled principle that mere jurisdiction does not imply official superiority. It has often happened in the Latin Church that a simple deacon, as *legate a latere*, has had a whole province under his authority with power to depose bishops at his pleasure. It is no use to cry out against this as one of the abuses of Romanism. It is simply acting on a principle recognized in all States and Churches. The executive may take a civilian, and give him as Secretary of the Navy, authority over all the officers in the service. In like manner Paul might take any presbyter and send him where he pleased, and give him what power he saw fit. It is at all events clear that whatever authority Titus and Timothy had, they derived it all from him, and remained as inferior to him afterwards as they were before. To Titus he said, "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, *as I had appointed thee.*" His commission was from Paul; and when he had executed it, he was required to be diligent to come to his master at Nicopolis, where he had determined to winter. To Timothy he gave a somewhat similar commission in reference to Ephesus, but commanded him when he had done his work, to come to him at Rome. Admitting therefore all that is claimed from the New Testament in relation to Timothy and Titus, there is not the slightest evidence of their being any-

thing more than presbyters. As to one being the bishop of Crete and the other bishop of Ephesus, it is directly opposed to the scriptural record. For as we have already seen their commissions were merely temporary; they continued afterwards, as they had been before, the travelling companions, helpers and servants of the apostles.

We are willing, however, to concede still more. Let it be granted, what of course we do not believe, that Timothy and Titus were officially superior to presbyters, we are as far as ever from the conclusion that they were apostles. Prophets were superior to presbyters, and yet were not apostles. As we have already intimated, something more is necessary to prove that a Russian colonel is autocrat of all the Russias, than that he is officially superior to captains. Still further, the official superiority of Timothy and Titus, even if admitted, is no step towards proving even prelacy. First, because they were not diocesan bishops; they were vicars apostolic, temporary officers appointed for a special purpose. This is as plain as day, so far as the New Testament is concerned; and it never could have occurred to any man to take any other view of the case, were it not that tradition had been allowed a voice in the matter. Men have held up the lantern lighted in after times, to throw back its coloured rays upon the New Testament, and read its pages under their misleading influence.

Secondly, because the mere existence in the apostolic Church of officers superior to presbyters, is no evidence that such officers were intended to be permanent, and, if not intended to be so, they are not so. Nothing but a clear manifestation of the divine will that the Church should always have certain officers, renders it obligatory that she should have them. That will may be expressed by an explicit declaration that certain officers were intended to be permanent; or by a command to appoint them; or by a specification of the qualifications to be required of those who sought the office, and directions as to the mode of their appointment; or by a clear intimation of the continuance in the Church of the inward gift of which the office is the organ. In the absence of these, or similar decisive indications of the divine will, the mere fact that officers superior to presbyters existed in the apostolic age would no more prove that they

were intended to be permanent, than the existence at that time of prophets and deaconesses proves that they were intended to be continued in all ages. The apostles did many things to meet temporary emergencies, which they did not intend should be done afterwards. Few things have been productive of greater evils to the Church and the world, than the false principle that mere scriptural example is obligatory. It is on this ground that men so long contended it was the duty of the Church and of the State to put heretics to death. That Samuel hewed Agag to pieces, was considered a proof of the propriety and obligation that we should deal in the same way with idolaters. On the same ground it has been contended that civil magistrates are called upon to interfere in matters of religion, because the Hebrew magistrates were the guardians of both tables of the law. Hence also, as Peter was called first to the apostolate, Romanists contend that there must be a visible head to the Church in all times. Hence too, because the apostles were supreme rulers, it is contended she is bound always to have such rulers—clothed with the same authority and power—that is, with the power to give the Holy Ghost, and with the authority to make their teachings the rule of faith and practice to all mankind, and their decisions binding on the consciences of all men. This whole principle is radically false. It is a device of the devil to give to what is human or worse, the authority of God, and thereby to turn off the allegiance of men from their true sovereign, the Lord Jesus Christ. Religious liberty consists in refusing to submit to any authority but that of God, and in refusing to receive, as of divine authority, anything which cannot be proved from his word to have been intended to bind his people in all ages. It does appear to us therefore to be a most dangerous principle, that because the apostles did a certain thing, therefore the Church is for ever bound to do it. This principle is so unreasonable that no body of men act on it further than suits their convenience. Those who are loudest in their assertions that because, as they falsely assume, the apostles appointed a class of officers higher than presbyters, we are bound to have such officers, are as mute as mice about our obligation to have deaconesses. This whole thing is a humbug; not episcopacy, but the doctrine of the divine

right of bishops. The only sensible, manly course for Episcopalians to take, is either to assume the authority of tradition and the infallibility of the Church, and say, that as the Church has decided in favour of episcopacy it is obligatory; or to renounce all claim to divine right and put their bishops and archbishops on the same ground, *i. e.* the ground of expediency. The kindred doctrine of the divine right of kings is pretty generally abandoned, and royalists are content to rest the authority of their sovereigns on the surer basis of the will of the people. It will be a happy day for all concerned, when bishops are brought to the same *σωφροσύνη* or saneness of mind.

The argument then in favour of the permanence of the apostolic office, derived from the case of Timothy and Titus, we consider utterly void of force. Neither they, nor any others, except the original, inspired, and infallible messengers of Christ, are ever called apostles, in the official sense of the term. No distinctive apostolic function is ever attributed to them nor exercised by them. They were invested with no powers which prove their official superiority to presbyters. And if it should even be admitted that they were thus superior, in the absence of all intimation of the will of God, that such officers were to be continued, the Church is no more to have them than she is to have prophets or deaconesses. This claim to apostolic power without apostolic gifts, as we have before said, is not only a delusion, but a gross and wicked imposture. In this sentiment we doubt not Bishop McIlvaine fully concurs. He would revolt as much as we do at claiming for fallible bishops the authority of infallible apostles. We only deplore that he has been led to use language in a sense which it will not bear—when he makes the apostleship to mean only episcopacy—and thus while he contends for the latter, he should appear to the world as contending for the former.

Having exhausted the case of Timothy and Titus, our author turns to the angels of the apocalyptic Churches. “Who,” he asks, “were those angels, or messengers, of the seven Churches of Asia . . . called also ‘the seven stars,’ on the right hand of the Lord, held responsible for the whole Church embraced within the limits of those several extensive cities with their suburban dependencies? Of one of them, Ephesus, we know

from Acts xx. 17, that some forty years before the book of Revelation was written, it had several presbyters, and of course congregations." His answer to this question is that they were presidents, having jurisdiction over clergy and laity, and that they were called bishops and apostles by subsequent writers.

Bishop McIlvaine answers his own question with great confidence, as though that was the only answer the question admitted. He is well aware, however, that there is scarcely a point, regarding which greater diversity of opinion exists among writers of all classes, episcopal and non-episcopal, than as to what is meant by these apocalyptic angels. It would seem from the very nature of the case somewhat adventurous to go among the majestic types and symbols, the visions, and hieroglyphics of this mystic book, which opens heaven to our view, to learn the organization of the Church on earth. No one has ever gone into that magic circle, and returned seeing things as others see them. It is the opinion of some eminent men, that the seven apocalyptic epistles were not addressed to the seven historical Churches named, but are prophetic exhibitions of seven successive ages of the Church, so that the prosaic view of the matter, on which Bishop McIlvaine's argument is founded, vanishes into thin air. The angels then would be the ideal representatives of the controlling powers of these successive periods of Church history, according to the analogy of the other angels mentioned in this book, and not the presiding officers of cities of stone and brick, "with their suburban dependencies."

Another very common opinion, in harmony with the general character of the book, is, that the angels were guardian angels. Every reader of the Bible knows that the imagery of the Apocalypse is borrowed in large measure from the Old Testament, and especially from the prophecies of Daniel, where every nation is represented as having its ruling angel. Others again, as Hengstenberg, think the term expresses the ideal or personified directorship or governing power in the Church, "denoting a number of persons;" as under the Old Testament the priests or prophets are collectively called the angel of God.

We refer to these as a few of the opinions entertained on this subject, simply to show on what uncertain data these prelatical

arguments are founded. Some, as we have seen, rest on sand, this rests on clouds. Here however, as before, we are willing to concede everything that can by possibility be asked. We are willing to admit that "angel" designates an individual, and that that individual was the presiding officer of the Church—and what then? Why then, says our author, as at Ephesus, at least, there were many presbyters, this president must have been a diocesan bishop and an apostle. Here again we have a seven league stride. If these presidents were presbyters, elected by their brethren to preside over the one Church to which they all belonged, (for there was but one church in Ephesus, Thyatira, or in any of these places,) then he was not an apostle, nor even a diocesan bishop. Can any one say this was not so? Can any one pretend to prove that one of the presbyters, constituted by the Holy Ghost bishops of the Church of Ephesus, (see Acts xx. 28,) had by a new ordination been constituted an apostle? Is not this a purely gratuitous assumption? Among the French Protestants, under the empire, the Christians of each city, as in the early ages, constituted one church. They had (as Edinburgh so long had) but one session, or consistory. All the ministers were members of that body. One, however, was the permanent president. He was the organ of communication with the government, and represented the church in all its transactions. He was written to if disorders prevailed, and was called to account and held responsible for the character of the whole body. Yet he was a presbyter, with no higher rank and no greater powers than his brethren. If this argument for diocesan episcopacy be valid, it would prove every president of a French consistory, and every superintendent in Germany, to be a diocesan bishop. An argument which leads to such a conclusion must be false.

The most plausible plea for diocesan episcopacy is its early origin and its general prevalence in the Church. Bishop McIlvaine does not fail to make the most of this argument. He says, "at the present day about eleven-twelfths of those called Christians in the world, are under the spiritual jurisdiction of an order of ministers called bishops, whose individual office embraces the essential particulars of that of the apostles, and whose succession they regard as derived by an unbroken chain



from the apostolic times. It is quite notorious that from the sixteenth century to within a hundred and fifty years of the last of the apostles, the whole Church in all lands was under such jurisdiction." He quotes Blondel as admitting that diocesan episcopacy was introduced (not generally, as his remarks would seem to imply, but in certain places) within sixty years of the death of St. John. "And within this short period, we have shown you," adds our author, "the testimony of writers who then lived, that bishops were then exercising the jurisdiction of the Churches, and were considered, without the moving of a question, as having succeeded to the office of the apostles." If the original organization of the Church was not prelatical, he argues that this great change would not have been introduced "so silently, that history has preserved not the slightest trace of its beginning and progress; and so perfectly and universally, that though the Scriptures were daily read in the churches, and presbyters and laity were made of the same materials they are now, none perceived the usurpation." pp. 420, 421.

We do not intend to waste time with the details of this argument. We take it as it stands. Our answer to it is—First, a distinct denial of the fact on which it is founded. We deny that prelacy prevailed universally until centuries after the apostles. Its rise was gradual and its progress slow. Of all the modern German historical critics, probably the most learned, laborious and untrammelled body of scholars the world ever saw, not one to our knowledge admits this early and general prevalence of prelacy.\* As these writers reject any and every peculiarity of the Churches to which they belong, it cannot be pretended that this unanimity of judgment arises from prejudice. The fact assumed, therefore, is contrary to the united testimony of the great body of the most competent and impartial witnesses.

Secondly, the delusion under which Bishop McIlvaine labours

\* Rothe cannot be fairly cited as an exception, although in his work entitled "Anfang der Kirche," (a book which his countrymen say excited attention principally by its paradoxes,) he supposes the apostle John introduced diocesan episcopacy just before his death, as a remedy for disorders existing within the sphere of his labours; yet he repudiates all the arguments drawn from the New Testament in support of its apostolic origin.

is easily accounted for. He assumes that the officer called a bishop in one age is the same as that called bishop in another. It is true that episcopacy prevailed universally from the beginning. But in the early ages it was parochial, and not diocesan episcopacy. It suits our author's purpose to borrow his idea of a bishop from the middle ages, and to transfer that idea to the bishops of the first century. He sees bishops everywhere, and therefore supposes he sees prelates. He admits however that bishops were not always prelates; those of the New Testament were presbyters. When did they become prelates? Bishop McIlvaine would have us believe that it was on the night the last apostle died. They all went to bed presbyters, and all awoke the next morning diocesan bishops. This is the greatest miracle ever wrought in behalf of a theory. Prelatists swallow this camel without even knowing it. They admit that as long as the apostles lived, bishops were presbyters; and assert that as soon as the apostles were dead, bishops were prelates. It is not merely a word which changes its meaning throughout Christendom in a night; but the thing meant by that word changes its nature. If it appear incredible that any one could adopt such a theory, let him bring the case before his mind and judge if the representation given is not just. "Bishop," says our author, "was not a specific name of office until after the apostolic age. The highest rank of the ministry had then the title of apostle." p. 417. It follows from this that bishops were not prelates during the apostolic age, but simply presbyters; but during the immediately succeeding age, our author says, they were prelates. The change is instantaneous. In the last apostolic writing, bishops are presbyters. In the first non-apostolic writing, they are prelates. If anything more wonderful than this has ever been assumed in the history of the world, we know not what it is.

Thirdly, Bishop McIlvaine argues that no great change in the organization of the Church could take place suddenly and universally, without attracting attention. This we admit. The government of the Church was always episcopal, that is, it was in the hands of men called bishops. The change from parochial to diocesan episcopacy was gradual, protracted through centuries, was distinctly understood, and deliberately submitted

to. The change was not only gradual, but it was very unequal in its progress in different parts of the Church. The two systems long coexisted; diocesan episcopacy prevailing in cities and centres of influence, and the parochial form in the country. The circle of influence of the city bishop was gradually extended, and his country brethren at last were deprived, though not until several centuries had elapsed, of their original title. It was a thing unheard of in the early ages, that one bishop should be subject to another. At first there were, at least in many cases, several bishops in one church, as at Ephesus and Philippi.\* The first change as to title was to confine the term bishop to the presiding officer of each church, as is now done by Presbyterians. Every church, however, had its own bishop. And the churches were then, to all appearance, just as numerous in proportion to the number of believers as they are now. There were to a late period often two or three hundred in a single province, and of course just as many bishops. There was, however, only one church in any one city. We never read of the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, or Ephesus, but only of the church in those and other cities; whereas we read of the churches of Judea and of the churches of Galatia. The one church, however, in these several cities was very large—having many ministers, and officers of various kinds. The presiding presbyter or bishop of such city churches had the oversight or superintendence therefore of many presbyters, deacons and laymen. But at the same time, every remote village had its presiding presbyter or bishop, independent of any other bishop. This state of things, apparent from the face of history, was very analogous to the organization of the French Protestants, as before remarked, under the empire. The Protestants of Paris, Rouen, Orleans and other large cities, constituted one church with many ministers, and one president or presiding presbyter, while every village containing a sufficient number of Protestants, had its own presiding officer. What more natural, what more in accordance with analogy, what more sure to be

\* Paul called together the presbyters of Ephesus and told them the Holy Ghost had made them the bishops of that church. He addressed his Epistle to the Philippians to the "bishops and deacons" of the church in Philippi. Acts xx. 28, and Phil. i. 1.

the result of "the leaven of iniquity" which dwells in the human heart, and that instinctive desire of men to rest on authority in matters of religion, than that these presiding presbyters or bishops of large cities should gradually exalt their claims, and extend their jurisdiction? What more natural than that they should first make their presidency perpetual or for life; then instead of being content with being *primi inter pares*, claim superiority of order—and then make that superiority of order a matter of divine right; and then claim that their jurisdiction extended not only over a city, but a diocese, and reduce their poorer and weaker brethren to the subordination of their own clergy? Soon one city bishop came to assert superiority over other city bishops, and thus became archbishop. In process of time, the heads of great centres of influence, as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome, became the patriarchs; and the system finally culminated in a universal Bishop or Pope. This development of the hierarchy was greatly facilitated and controlled by political influences and events, but it is from beginning to end perfectly natural and intelligible, without assuming any divine right or apostolic authority or origin. The rise and spread of monarchical institutions is an event of much the same kind. Kings exist everywhere, as far back as history goes. We find them even in the book of Genesis. They were first elective and temporary, then for life, then hereditary, and then claimed divine right. An old French lady once said to us, There is a king in France, a king in England, a king in heaven, and a king in hell, a king everywhere but in America. This was her argument for monarchy; and we do not see why it is not as good as Bishop McIlvaine's argument for prelacy. It is surely quite as well put.

The *Church Review* called upon us to examine this discourse in favour of the perpetuity of the apostleship. We have done so, and express, as the result of that examination, the opinion that a more inconclusive piece of reasoning we never saw. We have the highest respect both for the abilities and character of its author. But no man can make a bad cause good, or a weak argument strong. He assumes without proof and against evidence that the commission recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, was

addressed to the apostles and not to the Church as a whole. He assumes that the promise of Christ's perpetual presence, which that commission includes, was addressed to the apostles as such, and not to the Church as such. He assumes that the promise it made to the apostles was made to them as bishops, and not as ministers of the word. He assumes, contrary to the judgment of ninety-nine hundredths of the Christian world, that the apostleship was a mere episcopate, instead of the office of inspired and infallible men. He assumes, therefore, against the almost unanimous judgment of the Church, that whatever proves the permanence of the episcopate proves the permanence of the apostleship. He assumes, contrary to the plainest dictates of reason, that authority in a single individual to ordain presbyters, implies official superiority to presbyters; while he admits that authority in a single apostle to ordain apostles, or in a prelate to ordain prelates, proves no such superiority. He assumes that the angels of the apocalyptic churches were prelates, because they were presidents and representatives of those churches, though such presidency in other cases implies no superiority of order. He admits that so long as the apostles lived, bishops were presbyters, and assumes that immediately after, the world over, they were prelates. He assumes, contrary to the judgment of the great body of the most competent witnesses, that prelacy prevailed universally during the first century after the apostolic age. He assumes that the prevalence of prelacy is unaccountable on any other hypothesis than that of its divine origin, while the like prevalence of monarchy requires no such solution. His argument, therefore, is built on false assumptions from beginning to end. Further, if his argument proves anything, it proves Puseyism and Romanism, and not simply diocesan episcopacy. If the apostleship is perpetual, then a body of infallible teachers and absolute rulers is perpetual. Möller, the ablest modern defender of Romanism, defines, in his *Symbolik*, the Church to be, the people of God under the government of a perpetual apostleship. Bishop McIlvaine in conceding the correctness of this definition, has conceded everything. It is very painful to us to say this of a man who has done so much and so ably to defend evangelical truth against doctrinal Romanism. It is, however, a duty to

say it. Bishop McIlvaine has on this vital point put himself in opposition to all the great authorities of his own Church, and sided with the Laudean and Puseyite faction in that Church. Men will take his premises and legitimately deduce from them conclusions which he would rather die than admit. Even his eulogist in the *Church Review*, we presume, is no advocate of his doctrinal views, and has no fellowship with his evangelical spirit. In the very article under review, he calls Congregationalists and Presbyterians "the sects," in distinction from the Church. So Mohammedans call Christians dogs. The spirit in both cases is the same. And this spirit is the legitimate and inevitable fruit of the doctrine of the perpetuity of the apostleship; for by the clearest declarations of the Bible, those not subject to apostles are not subject to Christ.

We conclude our review of this discourse with the remark, that the author risks everything on a single throw. The divine right of bishops is made to depend on the permanency of the apostolic office; and the permanency of that office is made to depend on its having been a simple episcopate. This is the filament on which the whole cause of diocesan episcopacy hangs. As by the plainest testimony of Scripture and the general judgment of the Church, the apostleship was more than an episcopate, the office was not continued, and therefore diocesan episcopacy is of man, and not of God.

---

ART. II.—*Arminianism and Grace.*

IT is not our desire to wound the feelings of our Arminian brethren. Nor have we any pleasure, except as it may subserve the cause of righteousness, in pointing out what we regard as a most serious conclusion, drawn legitimately from their principles. Both for their own sake, and to avoid distracting the attention of men by the differences of Christian denominations, we would gladly omit the observations now to be made. Such, however, is the prominence given in the Scriptures to the doc-