

CONTENTS OF NO. 2.—VOL. VII.

	Page.
ART. I.—BARNES ON THE GOSPELS, <i>Albert Barnes</i> Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Gospels; designed for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Classes. By Albert Barnes.	149
ART. II.—THE DOCTRINE OF APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS, The Doctrine of Appeals and Complaints. By a mem- ber of the Synod of Philadelphia.	162
ART. III.—NEW ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. No. II. <i>Samuel Miller</i>	186
ART. IV.—THE SCOTTISH SECEDERS, <i>Amos Miller</i>	198
ART. V.—STUART'S GREEK GRAMMAR, <i>John Stuart</i> A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect. By M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Seminary, Andover.	233
ART. VI.—EPISCOPACY TESTED BY SCRIPTURE, <i>Samuel Miller</i> Episcopacy Tested by Scripture. By the Right Reve- rend Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D. Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Common- wealth of Pennsylvania.	239
ART. VII.—PRESBYTERIAN POLICY WITH RESPECT TO LEARN- ING, <i>Amos Miller</i> Annual of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: a New Year's Offering for 1835. Edited by John Breckinridge, A. M. Cor- responding Secretary of the Board.	272
ART. VIII.—BARNES ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, <i>Charles Hodge</i> Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Romans, designed for Bible Classes and Sunday Schools. By Albert Barnes.	285

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

APRIL, 1835.

No. II.

J. A. Alexander
ART. I.—*Notes, explanatory and practical, on the Gospels: designed for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Classes.* By Albert Barnes. *In two volumes. Fourth edition—each edition contains two thousand.* New York and Boston, 1834, 12mo.

THOUGH we hardly have a right to notice, as a new work, one which has been so long in circulation, and with which so many of our readers are familiar, we feel ourselves called upon as Christian critics, to say what we think of Mr. Barnes's expositions. This we shall do as plainly and as kindly as we can. As our object is simply to characterize a book, which is likely to exert a very durable and extensive influence, we shall confine ourselves entirely to an enumeration of the points in which we think it worthy either of praise or censure. We have only to premise that our conclusions have been mostly drawn from the notes on Matthew and John, especially the former, though we have so far compared the rest as to remain convinced, that the first part of the work is a sample of the whole. Throughout our strictures, we shall endeavour to be pointed and specific, referring when we can, to individual examples, both of defect and merit, though it be at the risk of seeming sometimes hypercritical, a reproach which can scarcely

trations and examples have a constant bearing on the all important object of their labours, so that nothing will be lost, but every fragment of a sentence introduced into the volume, may be turned to some account. A comprehensive and profound investigation of the style of the New Testament on higher grounds, and for the use of more advanced inquirers—such a book substantially as Winer's is for Germany—though a very different thing from the present publication, would form a welcome sequel to it. May it not be expected from Professor Stuart?

A
Samuel Miller

ART. VI.—*Episcopacy tested by Scripture.* By the Right Reverend Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D. Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 12mo. pp. 46. 1831.

We think some apology to our readers will be considered as proper, not for being so tardy in our notice of this pamphlet, but for noticing it at all. It is not customary, we suppose, to review "Tracts;" not merely because of their number, and their diminutive and fugitive character; but also because, when they are decisively sectarian in their nature, they are regarded as meant for circulation only among the members of the particular sect for whose benefit they are intended. The history of this tract, however, is somewhat peculiar. It was first published as an article in a periodical, entitled "The Protestant Episcopalian," without a name. Soon afterwards a large number of extra copies were stricken off from the press of that work, and extensively circulated; but still without a name. In this form copy after copy was sent to us by mail, which convinced us that something more was intended than to inform and satisfy Episcopalian. In a short time it came forth from the Protestant Episcopal Press in New York, as a formal Tract, with the name of the writer; and was soon followed by intimations, from various quarters, that it was deemed conclusively to establish the divine right of Episcopacy; nay, that it was unanswerable. The whole Presbyterian Church, in no very indirect form, was challenged

to reply. At length something like a tone of exulting sarcasm was publicly indulged. An answer was again and again called for, accompanied with more than insinuations that the silence of Presbyterians in regard to this Tract must be interpreted as a virtual acknowledgment that they felt themselves refuted and overcome.

On the undignified and offensive aspect of this conduct, we do not think proper to multiply remarks. Such puerile exultation is the language of weakness, not of strength. It is very evident that those who indulged it, were acquainted with only one side of the controversy. We are far, however, from ascribing this conduct to Bishop Onderdonk himself. We have no doubt he would disdain it.

The simple truth is, that we never gave this Tract even a cursory perusal, until within the last twenty-four hours. Although copy after copy was poured upon us by the mail, in all the stages of its publication; yet, after glancing at a page here and there, to the amount of a fourth, or, at most, a third part of its contents, and finding not a thought or an illustration with which we had not been made familiar by other writers we closed the pamphlet under the deliberate impression that it did not call for any public notice. It never occurred to us as possible that any *well-informed* Presbyterian or Episcopalian could consider this manual as placing the claims of prelacy on any other or firmer ground than that on which it was regarded as resting before. And, as we had repeatedly said, in preceding numbers of our work, what we thought sufficient to discredit these claims, with all impartial readers, we felt no disposition to renew a controversy, on which we thought enough had been written; especially when so many other subjects more nearly connected with the best interests of society, and the salvation of the soul, were urgently pressed upon our attention, and more than sufficient to fill our pages.

These, most candidly, are our reasons for not having before taken any public notice of this manual. And our general estimate of its character, would dispose us still to be silent. But as the voice of exultation over its supposed unanswerable character seems to be, in the Episcopal camp, waxing louder and louder; and as it is possible that some of our less informed friends may misapprehend the reason of our silence, we have resolved to offer a few cursory remarks on the boasted production before us.

And in the outset, we think proper to say, that, although

the style of this Tract is, in general-circuitous, heavy and feeble;—and although a single thought is not recognised in the whole, which has not been, to say the least, quite as clearly and forcibly presented by preceding writers; yet it possesses some characteristics which are worthy of high commendation. The author has avoided all indecorum and severity of remark. He writes like a scholar and a gentleman. He has resorted to no unbecoming language, or disingenuous arts. Every thing bespeaks a writer at home in his subject; qualified to arrange with some degree of skill the old and common place matter which he presents; and disposed to maintain his cause by fair reasoning, as he understands it, rather than by denunciation or acrimony. In these respects the manual before us is worthy of much praise. If all writers in favour of prelacy had maintained an equally inoffensive and respectful manner, it would have formed a much less revolting page than it does, in the history of ecclesiastical polemics.

If there be a feature in this Tract which partakes in any measure of novelty, it is that the author should be willing to bring Episcopacy to the “TEST OF SCRIPTURE.” His predecessors have seldom ventured to risk this. It has generally been their policy to pass in a very cursory manner over the testimony drawn from the inspired writings, and to place their chief reliance on that of the “Fathers.” And even when the question *was* asked, “what saith the Scripture?” it was seldom the inspired oracle *alone* that was consulted; but Scripture interpreted, commented upon, and modified by human authority. We are glad to see the appeal made, and for once, professedly *confined* to the Word of God. When fairly brought to this test, we cannot doubt the issue, among all impartial judges. We are not merely willing, then, but insist, that the whole subject shall be brought and decided before this tribunal. The BIBLE contains the religion of Protestants. It is the *only* infallible rule of faith and practice. By this great rule we must try the Fathers themselves. And whatever, in their writings, is not supported by the Bible, we are bound to reject without hesitation.

Before Bishop Onderdonk proceeds to array in form the testimony of Scripture in favour of Episcopacy, he attempts to dispose of what he calls certain “*extraneous* questions and difficulties, and to show either their fallacy or irrelevancy.” We are quite willing that these “ques-

tions and difficulties" should be, for the present, put out of view. Not because we think them really either irrelevant or unimportant; but because we do not think them *essential*; and because we are disposed to disembarrass the main question as much as possible, and to keep the mind of every reader firmly fixed on the position of the writer before us, *that Episcopacy is taught in the Bible.* To this position, therefore, let us address ourselves with all candour and impartiality.

Bishop Onderdonk, then, maintains, that the Gospel ministry was, by divine authority, "established in *three orders*, called, ever since the Apostolic age, *Bishops, Presbyters*, or *Elders*, and *Deacons*; of which the highest only—that is *Bishops*—has a right to ordain and confirm," &c. In opposition to this claim Presbyterians maintain, that, by divine authority, the Gospel ministry was established in a *single order*; that all ministers in the Apostolic Church, who were authorized to preach the Gospel, and administer the Christian Sacraments, were empowered to perform the highest functions of the sacred office. We differ, then, in regard to the Christian ministry, in *two respects*, from our Episcopal brethren. In the *first* place, we confidently deny that there is the least foundation in Scripture for considering *Deacons*, as an order of Gospel ministers at all. And, in the *second* place, we as confidently assert, that there is no authority whatever in the word of God for any "order" of ministers above that of ordinary pastors.

1. On the *first* of these points it is not our intention to dwell long. Not merely because Bishop Onderdonk says little about it; but also because if the *second* point, viz. that which relates to the claim of the *Bishop*, or alleged highest order, cannot be sustained—as we are very sure it cannot—the claim of the *Deacon* to a share in the evangelical ministry, as one of "three orders," will fall of course. We say, then, that the alleged claim of the *Deacon*, in the Episcopal Church, to a place as one of the "orders of clergy"—has no foundation whatever in the Word of God. To establish this, nothing more is necessary than to glance at the inspired record, in Acts vi. 1—7, where the original appointment, and the duties of *Deacons* are explicitly and plainly stated. "In those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve

called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, "It is not meet that we should *leave the word of God and serve tables*. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But WE WILL GIVE OURSELVES CONTINUALLY TO PRAYER, AND TO THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD. And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

This is the *first* and the *only* account in the whole New Testament of the original appointment of Deacons, and the *only* statement which we find of their appropriate duties. And we appeal to every candid reader whether it affords the least countenance to the idea that the deaconship was *then* an office which had any thing to do with *preaching* and *baptizing*; in other words, whether it was an office at all devoted to the spiritual duties of the sanctuary? Really, if such an idea had not been actually advanced, it would never have occurred to us as possible that it should enter the mind of any thinking man. Indeed, if the whole passage had been constructed upon the distinct plan of precluding the possibility of such an interpretation, it is difficult to conceive how such a design could have been more clearly manifest. The Apostles say—"It is not meet that we should *leave the word of God*—(that is, evidently,—LEAVE PREACHING)—and SERVE TABLES; wherefore, look ye out seven men, &c., whom we may appoint over THIS BUSINESS; (that is this business of SERVING TABLES,) and *we will give ourselves* to prayer, and to *the ministry of the word*." Can any man who is not blindly wedded to a system, consider this passage as importing that Deacons were appointed to be preachers of the word? Nay, is it not expressly stated that the Apostles considered the duties of this office as of such a nature, that their undertaking to fulfil them, would compel them to LEAVE PREACHING, and devote themselves to the care of money tables?

It militates nothing against this plain statement of the inspired historian, that he represents *Stephen*, one of these Deacons, as soon after his appointment, defending himself with great power before the Jewish council; and *Philip*, another of them, employed, in a year or two after his ordi-

nation to the Deaconship, preaching and baptizing in Samaria. With respect to *Stephen*, it is not said, that he either preached or baptized. He simply replied to those who "disputed" with him, and defended himself before the council by which he was arraigned. In all this, there was evidently nothing which any man might not do, in any age of the church, without infringing ecclesiastical order. And as to *Philip*, when we read a few chapters onward in the same book, (Acts xxi. 8,) we find him spoken of as "Philip the *Evangelist*, who was one of the seven." Here, then, we find precisely the same title given to this man that was afterwards given to *Timothy*. (2 Timothy iv. 6.) From which we may confidently infer, that, having "used the office of a deacon well," (1 Tim. iii. 13,) in the church of Jerusalem, and being found a man "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom," when he and his brethren were driven from that city, and were all "scattered abroad in consequence of the persecution which arose about his colleague, *Stephen*," he was invested with a *new office*, and sent forth to minister in various parts of the country as an "Evangelist." At any rate, nothing is plainer than that the "ministry of the word" made no part of the Deacon's office, as laid down by the apostles; and as he is soon afterwards introduced to us as bearing the office of an "Evangelist," the appropriate function of which we know was preaching the gospel, we are warranted in concluding that he was set apart to the latter office, before he went forth to engage in public preaching. In short, until it can be proved that *Philip* preached and baptized as a *Deacon*, and not as an *Evangelist*;—which we are perfectly sure never can be proved—the allegation, that the apostolic Deacons were preachers, is perfectly destitute of Scriptural support; nay, directly opposed to the Scriptural account of the institution of their office.

Accordingly, when, in the subsequent parts of the New Testament there is a reference to the proper *qualifications* for the Deacon's office, no intimation is given that, in the candidates for that office, the gifts requisite for public instruction were received. We are told that it was necessary that those who bore this office should be sober, grave, faithful in all things, ruling their own houses well, sound in the faith, &c.; but not a word of their being "apt to teach," as was expressly demanded of all who were candidates for "ministering in the word and doctrine."

It is plain then, that "the order of Deacons," as one of

the "three orders of clergy," for which our Episcopal brethren contend, cannot stand the test of Scripture. It must, undoubtedly, be given up, if we would be governed by the word of God. Deacons there undoubtedly *were*, in the apostolic church; but they were evidently curators of the poor, and attendants on the tables of the church; precisely such as were found in the Jewish Synagogues, before the coming of Christ, and such as are found in all completely organized Presbyterian churches at the present day. And this continued to be the nature of the office, for several hundred years after the apostolic age. But when a spirit of carnal ambition began to reign in the church, and led ecclesiastical men to aspire and encroach, Deacons invaded the province of preachers, and committed to "*sub-deacons*" the burden of their primitive duties.*

Having thus been compelled to set aside one "order" of

* The following extracts from early writers plainly show, not only that the Deacon's office was, originally, what we have above represented; but that this continued to be the case for several centuries. *Hermas*, one of the Apostolical Fathers, in his *Similitude* 9, 27, tells us that "of such as believed, some were set over inferior functions, or services, being entrusted with the care of the poor and widows." *Origen*, (*Tract.* 16, in *Matt.*) says, "The Deacons preside over the money tables of the Church." And again, "Those Deacons who do not manage well the money of the church committed to their care, but act a fraudulent part, and dispense it, not according to justice, but for the purpose of enriching themselves;—these act the part of money-changers, and keepers of those tables which our Lord overturned. For the Deacons were appointed to preside over the tables of the church, as we are taught in the *Acts of the Apostles*." *Cyprian*, (*Epist.* 52,) speaks of a certain Deacon who had been deposed from his "sacred deaconship, on account of his fraudulent and sacrilegious misapplication of the church's money to his own private use; and for his denial of the widows' and orphans' pledges deposited with him." And, in another place, (*Epist.* 3, ad *Rogatianum*,) as a proof that his view of this office is not misapprehended, he refers the appointment of the first Deacons to the choice and ordination at *Jerusalem*, as already recited. *Ambrose*, in speaking of the fourth century, the time in which he lived, (*Comment.* in *Ephes.* iv.) says "The Deacons do not publicly preach." *Chrysostom*, who lived in the same century, in his commentary on *Acts* vi, remarks, that "the Deacons had need of great wisdom, although the preaching of the Gospel was not committed to them;" and observes further, that it is absurd to suppose that they should have both the offices of preaching, and taking care of the poor committed to them, seeing it is impossible for them to discharge both functions adequately. *Jerome*, in his letter to *Evagrius*, calls Deacons, "*ministers of tables and widows*." And, in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which, though undoubtedly spurious as an Apostolical work, may probably be referred to the fourth or fifth century, it is declared (*Lib.* viii, cap. 28,) "It is not lawful for the Deacons to baptize, or to administer the Eucharist, or to pronounce the greater or smaller benediction." Other citations, to the same amount, might easily be produced. But it is unnecessary. The above furnish a clear indica-

Episcopal clergymen, when "tested by Scripture," we now proceed.

II. To the *second* point insisted on by the author of this Tract, and which, indeed, evidently forms his main object—viz. that we are taught in Scripture, that, in the apostolic church, there was a grade of ministers of the Gospel superior to the ordinary pastors; above common ministers of the word and sacraments; that ministers of this grade were *alone* empowered to *ordain*, to *confirm*, and to *govern* the church;—and that there is evidence in Scripture that this arrangement was intended to be *permanent*. Such is the confident allegation of Bishop Onderdonk; and he professes an entire willingness to rest this Episcopal claim *on Scriptural testimony alone*. It is hoped that our readers will bear this in mind, and not suffer themselves for a moment to forget that our appeal is TO THE BIBLE,—and to the BIBLE ONLY. Does the BIBLE, then, countenance the claim, that prelates, or an order of ministers superior to ordinary pastors, and having alone a right to *ordain*, &c. were established by Divine appointment in the apostolic age; and intended to be a *permanent order* in the Christian Church? The author of the tract before us, maintains the affirmative. We are constrained with confidence, to take the negative side; and to the Scriptures we make our appeal.

Bishop O. sets out in his argument with acknowledging that "the name *bishop*, which now (among Episcopalians) designates the highest grade of the ministry, is not appropriated to that office in Scripture. That name, he confesses, is there *always* 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. The highest grade is there found in those called 'apostles.' And it was *after the apostolic age* that the name 'bishop' was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first." In short, the doctrine of this Tract is—that, in the days of the apostles, the title of *bishop* was applied to presbyters, that is, to ordinary pastors, or parish ministers, and to *them*

tion of the nature of the Deacon's office in the primitive church. Yet, as this testimony is not that of SCRIPTURE, it has not been thought proper to embrace it in the body of our review, but to present it in this form, that it may be estimated for what it is worth. And surely, on the principles of our Episcopal brethren, it is worth much.

alone; that, during this time, the apostles were the prelates of the church; that the apostles alone, while they lived, were invested with the power of ordination; that when they died, they were succeeded in their pre-eminent rank by ministers of a corresponding grade; that this superior class of ministers, who were the true and only successors of the apostles, thought proper to drop the name of "apostles," (whether through *modesty* or *policy* the author does not say) and to assume that of "bishop," which had before belonged to common pastors.—All this, we are given to understand, can be *demonstrated from Scripture*.*

In regard to the first step in this train of allegations—for we will not call it argument—we entirely agree with Dr. O. Nothing can be plainer than that whenever the title of "bishop" is applied in the New Testament to gospel ministers, it designates ordinary pastors. A scriptural bishop was the spiritual teacher, and guide, or "overseer" of a particular flock; and the same men were called "elders," or "presbyters," and "bishops" interchangeably, the names being common. This Dr. O. concedes, and we have no doubt with entire correctness. But in all the succeeding steps of his course, we have quite as little doubt that he proceeds without the smallest support from Scripture; nay, in direct opposition to the whole spirit and scope of the New Testament.

This writer contends—and it is essential to his cause that he be able to show—that while the apostles lived they bore a superior ecclesiastical *rank*; and were endowed with ecclesiastical *rights* superior to other ministers; that, in particular, the right of *ordaining* was *confined* to them; and

* It is worthy of notice that the author of this Tract differs widely in the ground which he assumes from one of the most learned and able advocates of Episcopacy that ever lived. We refer to the celebrated Dr. *Henry Hammond*, undoubtedly one of the most erudite and able divines of the Church of England that lived in the seventeenth century, and at least equal in learning and talent to any bishop now on the stage. He maintained, in direct opposition to Bishop Ouderdonk, that *all* the persons denominated *bishops* and *presbyters* in the New Testament (the names being then common) were *prelates*, or *bishops*, properly so called; and that the second order, that of presbyters, was not instituted until after the apostolic age. Dr. Hammond appears to have been just as confident that his doctrine was taught in Scripture as our author can be that the *opposite* to it is there found. Which of these prelatich champions shall we believe? "Who shall decide when doctors disagree?" We are persuaded that the spirit of the New Testament frowns equally upon both. In the meanwhile, it appears that our Episcopal friends are not agreed in the ground which they take for the support of their cause.

that, when their ministry terminated, they left this pre-eminent *rank*, and these peculiar *rights* to certain prelates, who were their successors in power and pre-eminence. Now the fact is, that all these points, thought brought forward with some show, and even parade of argument, are wholly without support from Scripture, and have not one of them been made out by our author. It is not denied, indeed, that the apostles bore a peculiar character, and had extraordinary powers and prerogatives imparted to them, adapted to the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed. For, until the canon of the New Testament was completed, they might be said, to a certain extent, to supply its place, and by *inspiration* and the exercise of *miraculous* powers, to be, in a peculiar sense, the authorized leaders and guides of the primitive church. "The apostolic office"—says Dr. *Barrow*, universally known to be an eminent Episcopal divine—"as such, was personal and temporary; and, therefore, according to its nature and design, *not successive*, nor communicable to others, in perpetual descendance from them. It was, as such, in all respects *extraordinary*; conferred in a *special manner*; designed for *special purposes*; discharged by *special aids*; endowed with *special privileges*, as was needful for the propagation of Christianity, and founding of churches. To that office it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; that he should be endowed with miraculous gifts and graces; that he should be able, according to his discretion, to impart spiritual gifts; and that he should govern in an absolute manner, as being guided by infallible assistance, to which he might appeal. Now such an office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges, and miraculous powers, which were requisite for the foundation of the church, was *not designed to continue by derivation*; for it contained in it divers things, which apparently were not communicated, and which no man without gross imposture and hypocrisy, could challenge to himself." *Pope's Supremacy*, p. 122, 123, *N. Y. edition*. Such was the judgment of this eminently learned and able Episcopalian, concerning the foundation of the whole argument before us. There is not a shadow of support to be found in Scripture for the alleged transmission of the pre-eminent and peculiar powers of the apostles to a set of ecclesiastical successors. As men endowed with the gifts of inspiration and miracles, and constituted the infallible guides of the

church, until the New Testament canon should be completed; their character and position were altogether extraordinary. They had no successors. Nor can the remotest hint be found in Scripture, that they had, or were ever intended to have, any such successors.

But, considering the apostles as ministers of Christ, empowered to preach the gospel, to administer Christian sacraments, and to convert the world to Christ, they *had* successors; and these successors were, manifestly, all those who were empowered to preach the gospel, and to dispense the sacramental seals of discipleship; for in the final commission which the Saviour gave to the apostles, and which must be considered as embracing their final and highest functions, they are sent forth to disciple all nations, to baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and it was in immediate connexion with the command to discharge these ordinary duties, that the promise which is considered as pointing to the ministerial succession, was given—"Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." If the friends of prelacy could produce even the semblance of testimony from Scripture, that the ordaining power is something more sacred and elevated than that of dispensing the gospel, and its sealing ordinances; if they could produce the least hint from the New Testament that the powers possessed by the apostles were, after their decease, divided; and that while one class of ministers succeeded to their lower and more ordinary functions, another succeeded to certain pre-eminent rights and powers, not specified in their commission; they would have some plausible ground on which to rest their cause. But every reader of the New Testament knows that there is not a syllable there which gives the most distant intimation of either of these alleged facts. On the contrary, the evidence against them is ample and decisive.

Suppose, for argument's sake, that a pastor of the Presbyterian Church were sent to *China* or *Japan* to preach the gospel, and, if successful, to organize churches, agreeably to his views of truth and order. Suppose it not possible to send more than *one*, and that he were invested with power by the proper authority, in this forming state of things, to ordain ministers, and perform every ecclesiastical act necessary to complete a Christian organization. Would this man be considered, by any rational inquirer, as clothed with a *new office*, or as elevated to a peculiar or separate "*order*"

of clergy?" Surely not. He would be considered simply as an "evangelist," invested with special powers from the necessity of the case. And when the churches organized by him were prepared for a regular and mature presbyterian arrangement, would any be so absurd as to imagine that the ministers ordained by him were his "successors" in regard to the special commission and powers under which he had acted? Such an idea would be too preposterous to be entertained by any one. They would be simply his successors in respect to his original and ordinary powers; and every thing connected with his extraordinary delegation would terminate with the extraordinary circumstances which gave it birth. He would transmit, of course, to those ordained by him, nothing more than that simple office which he bore anterior to his peculiar mission.

Thus it was with the apostles. Their commission, as stated with great particularity by the evangelists, empowered them to preach, to baptize, to disciple all nations, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded. All other permanent powers were included in these; for there are none others mentioned. All ministers of the gospel bear this commission. When the apostles left the world, their inspiration, their miracles, their prerogative of guiding the churches by infallible teaching—in a word, the extraordinary character with which they were invested, died with them, and all that they transmitted was that which was embraced in their commission. That they did not transmit a large and very prominent part of their extraordinary powers, Episcopalians themselves acknowledge. We know not that any modern Protestant bishops claim to be *inspired*, to have the power of *working miracles*, or of authoritatively prescribing the will of Christ to the church, in place of the New Testament. All these adjuncts or annexations to their *general office*, constituting them APOSTLES, in the strict sense of the word, our Episcopal brethren confess, ceased when the last apostle left the world. This was, no doubt, the case. Where, then, is the evidence of which these same brethren talk so much, of their transmitting the pre-eminence and superiority of their character to a class of superior successors?

Bishop Onderdonk, from the circumstance that he finds the "Apostles and Elders" frequently distinguished from each other in the New Testament history, takes for granted that they were thus distinguished, because the former were

ministers of a superior *order* or *rank* to the latter. He also supposes that he finds evidence in the New Testament, not only that the Apostles *ordained*, but that they *alone* had the power of ordination while they lived. Now, we will venture to say that there is not a shadow of evidence in favour of either of these allegations in the word of God. As to the office of the Apostles and Elders, or Presbyters, it was undoubtedly the same in all its essential characteristics. Let any unprejudiced reader examine the commission given by our Lord to the *twelve*, and afterwards to the *seventy*, and then say, whether grades of *power*, and diversities of clerical *rank* are masked therein. Let him say whether it includes any thing (excepting the *supernatural* part of their powers,) but what belongs to every minister of the Gospel. Authority to preach the Gospel, to administer sealing ordinances, and to make disciples of all to whom they are sent, formed the substance of the apostolical commission; and the very same forms the essence of the commission of all regular ministers now. Our author, indeed, ventures to *affirm*, that the apostles were not distinguished from other ministers, while they lived—because they were appointed by Christ personally; nor because they had “seen the Lord” after his resurrection; nor because of their miraculous powers; but because they sustained a *superior office*. This, he says, “*will not be questioned.*” We certainly, however, *do* question it; and are quite sure that he has not proved it, and cannot prove it, from Scripture, or from any other credible source of evidence. In fact, it may be said with truth, that we have nothing in the pamphlet before us, adduced in favour of this position, worth mentioning, but the simple affirmation of the writer, which, on such a subject, we beg leave to decline accepting as conclusive.

The simple and plain truth of the case is this. The apostles were all *Presbyters* or *Elders*. This, and this *only*, was their proper ecclesiastical *office*. Accordingly, the Apostle *Peter*, speaks thus:—“The Elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an *Elder*, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.” Such was *Peter*, if he himself understood his office;—AN ELDER. But he was an INSPIRED Elder; an Elder ENDOWED WITH MIRACULOUS GIFTS; an Elder who had “WITNESSED the sufferings” and resurrection of Christ; an Elder chosen to be one of the number who should preside over the forming and rising church under its new

economy, before its *written* body of instructions were prepared, and even to assist in preparing those instructions; and, for that purpose, inspired of God to counsel, guide and instruct the churches for their permanent edification. Such were the Apostles generally. When they died, the *inspiration*, the *miracles*, and the *peculiar Apostolical authority* died with them, and they simply transmitted their *office* as *Elders*, or *Presbyters*, to their successors. All this is plainly to be gathered from the tenor of the New Testament; and when Bishop Onderdonk undertakes to press the testimony of Scripture into the support of any other doctrine, he fails, in our opinion, most egregiously.

Quite as little proof have we that the *ordaining* power was exercised by the Apostles *alone*, while they lived. Or rather, this position is still more directly opposed to abundant Scriptural evidence. We know that it was not so. *Timothy*, and *Titus*, and *Barnabas* all ordained; and yet they were none of them apostles, in the appropriate sense of that title. In order to surmount this difficulty, however, our author, with many others who have gone before him in this controversy, takes the liberty of supposing that *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Barnabas*, *Silvanus*, *Andronicus*, *Junia*, *Epaphroditus*, and others, *were* all apostles, in the pre-eminent sense of the word, though confessedly not of the number of the *twelve*; and that, therefore, when we read of any of these exercising the ordaining power, we are to consider it as falling in with the Episcopal claim, and as confirming the doctrine of the Traet before us. We have always considered this plea as one of the forlorn hopes of our Episcopal brethren, and as much more adapted to expose than to aid their cause. And as wielded by our author, it certainly does not appear to more advantage, than in the hands of those from whom he borrowed it. It is well known to learned men that the original Greek word which we translate *Apostle*, signifies a *messenger*, or *one who is sent* on any errand, either sacred or secular. It is well known also, that it has, in the New Testament, a *peculiar* or *appropriated*, and a *common* signification; and that its peculiar application is to that chosen band of men, who were endowed and sent in an extraordinary manner by Christ himself. Of the peculiar or restricted application of this title we need not select specific examples. They are numerous and well known. In this high and exclusive sense, we are expressly told it was confined to those who had "seen the Lord," and who were "witnesses of his sufferings

and his resurrection." In this sense it was applied to the *twelve*, and afterwards to *Matthias*, who was chosen to take the place of *Judas*, "who by transgression fell." And, in the same specific meaning of the title, *Paul* was an Apostle, who was made to "see the Lord," in a miraculous manner, and who was "chosen to be a *witness* unto all men of what he had seen and heard." Let any impartial man, who doubts whether this is the meaning of the title of *Apostle*, in its primary and pre-eminent sense, as applied to those on whom our Lord himself bestowed it; let him read the following Scriptures, and he will no longer doubt. *Matt.* x. 1—6. *Luke* vi. 12—17. *Acts* i. 21, 22. *Luke* xxiv. 48. *Acts* xxii. 14, 15. *Acts* xxiii. 11. *Acts* xxvi. 16, together with many other parallel passages, which will readily occur to all who are familiar with the Bible.

With this representation of the Apostolic office, Dr. *Barrow*, the learned Episcopal divine before quoted, entirely agrees. "To the office of an apostle," says he, "it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; such as St. Paul so often doth insist upon for asserting his title to this office: *Paul, an Apostle, not from men, or by man. Not by men, saith St. Chrysostom; this is the property of the Apostles.* It was requisite that an Apostle should be able to attest concerning our Lord's resurrection or ascension, either immediately, as the twelve, or by evident consequences, as St. Paul; thus St. Peter implied, at the choice of *Matthias*:—*Wherefore of those men which have companied with us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection:—and, Am I not, saith St. Paul, an Apostle? have I not seen the Lord?* According to that of *Ananias*—*The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth; for thou shalt bear witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.*" *Pope's Supremacy*, p 122.

But the term *Apostle* (ἀποστολος) is also sometimes applied in the New Testament to men who were not thus immediately commissioned by Christ in an extraordinary manner, to be "witnesses of his sufferings and his resurrection;" but who were simply *messengers*, sent on particular occasions to perform a certain service. This distinction between the *official*, and the *lax* or *general* sense of this term, the learned translators of our English Bible, though themselves zealous Episcopalians, seldom fail to recognise. Thus Paul, in

writing to the *Philippians*, ii. 25, says—"I supposed it necessary to send unto you *Epaphroditus*, my brother and companion in labour, but your messenger, (*αποστολος*), and he that ministered to my wants." *Epaphroditus* had been sent by the *Philippians* as a messenger, or bearer of their bounty to Paul. This we learn not only from the passage just quoted, but also from chapter iv. 18, of the same Epistle. Accordingly he is styled "*their messenger*." Surely it would be preposterous to consider the original word as importing that he was an apostle in the official sense of that term. Again, the same apostle, in designating certain brethren sent with *Titus* to bear the church's bounty to *Jerusalem*, speaks of them thus—"Whether any do inquire of *Titus*, he is my partner and fellow helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers (*αποστολοι*) of the churches, and the glory of Christ." Here the very same rule of interpretation applies; and accordingly so judged the pious translators of our Bible; and therefore they rendered the word *messengers*, not "Apostles."

With regard to the alleged apostleship of *Timothy* and *Silvanus*, it is equally unsupported. They are never called Apostles in a single instance in scripture. It is true, the first Epistle to the *Thessalonians* begins thus—"Paul and *Silvanus*, and *Timotheus* unto the Church of the *Thessalonians*," &c; and in the next chapter of the same Epistle, the Apostle speaks thus—"Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome as the Apostles of Christ." In this latter verse, the Apostle, undoubtedly, either speaks of himself in the plural number, which he often does; or refers to some other of the Apostles, of whom the same might be said. That in using this language, he did not refer to *Silvanus* or *Timotheus*, is plain, because, in a verse or two before, he says,—still using the plural number—*We were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi*, &c. When the Apostle was treated with so much violence at *Philippi*, certainly *Timotheus* was not with him. Besides neither *Silvanus* nor *Timotheus* was "a witness" of the sufferings and resurrection of their Master. Neither of them was immediately commissioned by the Saviour himself, as the Apostles were: on the contrary, *Timothy* was ordained, agreeably to the simple Apostolical practice, "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." And the Apostle Paul, in other places, while he speaks affectionately of his "son in the faith," at the

same time mentions him in a manner which plainly evinces a marked distinction between his office and that of the Apostleship. Take as an example, 2 Cor. i. 1. "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, *and Timothy our brother.*" And again, *Colossians* i. 1. "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, *and Timothy our brother.*" Here we have the very same evidence of diversity of rank that our author deems so decisive when he finds mention made of Apostles *and* Elders. Surely the humble and affectionate Paul would not have spoken thus, if Timothy had possessed an equal right with himself to the title of "an Apostle of Jesus Christ," in the official and appropriate sense of that title.

The claim advanced in behalf of *Andronicus* and *Junia*,* as Apostles is not only unfounded, but really bordering on the ridiculous. The only testimony advanced in support of this claim, is the language of the Apostle Paul in the close of his Epistle to the Romans, xvi. 7. "Salute *Andronicus* and *Junia*, my kinsmen, and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles." This passage would never have been thought of as admitting the construction which the friends of prelacy attach to it, had not their cause stood greatly in need of testimony. Its obvious and simple meaning is, that these persons were "held in high estimation by the Apostles;" or were regarded by the Apostles as of note, or conspicuous among their friends. This is the general interpretation of intelligent and impartial commentators; and more cannot be made of the passage unless by those who resolve that it *shall* speak in favour of their cause.

It is evident, then, that none of these persons were *Apostles*, in the official and restricted sense of that title; and as we know that *Barnabas*, *Timothy*, and *Titus* ordained, it

* There is some reason to believe that *Junia*, one of these persons whom Bishop Onderdonk has dubbed *Apostles*, was a woman! The name, as it stands in the original is Ἰουνία, which has no article to indicate the gender, and which may come as well from Ἰουνία, as from Ἰουνίας. Father Calmet remarks—"St. Chrysostom, Theophylact, and several others, take *Andronicus* for a man, and *Junia* for a woman, perhaps his wife. The Greeks and Latins keep their festival, May 17th, as husband and wife." Rosenmueller's annotation on the passage is as follows—"καὶ Ἰουνία. Quae videtur fuisse uxor Andronici. Aliis Junias est nomen viri, pro Junius." What renders it more probable that *Junia* was a woman is, that a man and his wife, a man and his sister, and two other females, are undoubtedly saluted in the preceding and following verses of the same chapter.

follows, inevitably, that the ordaining power was not *confined* to the Apostles while they lived; and, of course, that this whole branch of our author's argument falls to the ground. Nothing can be plainer than that "pastors," "teachers," and "evangelists," even while the Apostles lived, often officiated in ordinations—not merely as humble assistants, but as principals, in investing others with the sacred office.

The manner in which Bishop Onderdonk undertakes to dispose of the plain record, that Timothy was set apart to his office, "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," is one of the most singular examples of evasion and management that we remember ever to have seen. He is confident that the Apostle, when he says, (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," has no reference to Timothy's ordination. Why? For no other earthly reason, that we can perceive, than that this supposition would make against the Episcopal claim. He does not deny, indeed, that it *may* refer to that transaction; but he says, "it cannot, at least, be *proved* to do so;" and he chooses rather to consider it as "a separation of one, already in the ministry, to a particular field of duty." Indeed, his aversion to ordination by a "Presbytery," is so determined and invincible, that, rather than admit that this passage refers to Timothy's ordination; he intimates his willingness to give up another passage, in which the Apostle (2 Tim. i. 6,) speaks of "the gift of God which was in Timothy by the putting on of *his* (Paul's) hands," as also having no reference to his ordination! And he gravely remarks, that, "if it have not, then Timothy's ordination is nowhere specifically mentioned, but is to be inferred, as in other cases; and, in this view, both these passages are unconnected with the controversy before us." The truth is, if these passages refer to different transactions, it is much more probable that the former refers to Timothy's ordination than the latter, simply because in every instance in which we find a specific account given of an ordination in the New Testament, there was a *plurality of ordainers*. But the probability is, that they refer to the same transaction, viz: the one ordination of Timothy; and that Paul presided in the "Presbytery" when that ordination was performed, "laying on hands" with the rest of the brethren, which we know is every day done in our Pres-

byteries, when, as is commonly the case, one of the older members presides, and takes the lead in imposing hands, and is the mouth of the body in the ordaining prayer.

But even allowing that the Apostle, in that passage in which he speaks of the "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," refers to Timothy's ordination, still, our author insists that no argument favorable to Presbytery can be drawn from this confession. The word (*Πρεσβυτεριον*) rendered "Presbytery," he alleges *may* mean—not a body of Presbyters, but the office of the *presbyterate*, or *presbytership*, itself. So that he would propose to translate the passage thus—"with the laying on of hands to confer the presbyterate." In support of this fanciful and ridiculous translation, he quotes *Grotius*, and refers also to *Calvin*, as giving to it the countenance of his opinion. Now, it is granted that *Calvin*, in his *Institutes*, (Lib. iv. chap. 3. sect. 16,) does express himself in a manner which favours this interpretation; but afterwards, when he came to write his *Commentary on Timothy*, when on every principle of justice, we ought to consider him as expressing his more mature opinion, he delivers the following explicit judgment—"Presbytery—those who consider this as a *collective term*, intended to express a *college of presbyters*, in my opinion judge correctly."* But let this virtual misrepresentation of *Calvin* pass. It might be expected, however, that, after admitting this interpretation of the passage, as referring, not to a body of ordainers, under the name of a Presbytery, but to the office of the *Presbyterate*—it would, of course, be admitted that Timothy was now made a *Presbyter*, or invested with the office of the presbyterate. Not at all! This inference, which would seem to be irresistible, (and which, by the way, is that which *Calvin* assumes in the passage referred to by Bishop O.) must at any rate be "neutralized," to employ the significant language of our author. In order to accomplish this, he reminds us that the titles of Presbyter, Bishop, Deacon, &c., are so "loosely" and interchangeably applied in the New Testament to all classes of officers, even to Apostles, that nothing conclusive can be

* The word *Πρεσβυτεριον* occurs but three times in the New Testament, viz: in *Luke* xxii. 66, and in *Acts* xxii. 5. In each of these cases it is impossible to look at the original without perceiving, in a moment, that it refers to a bench or college of Elders. The third example of its occurrence is in the case before us; where we think the same thing is equally evident.

drawn from a name. On the whole, it is evident that such are the spectacles with which this gentleman views every object which relates to this controversy, that facts, names, and the plainest statements, if they happen to make against the claim of Episcopacy,—are nothing,—absolutely nothing. They are to be moulded, tortured, or nullified at pleasure. But the remotest hint, that can, by possibility, be pressed into the service of prelacy, is a conclusive argument. We have no doubt of the entire honesty of all this on the part of our author. But it shows the wonderful sway of prejudice. A man who has been long in the habit of gravely repeating the most irrelative and powerless representations from year to year, and calling them arguments, generally comes, at length, sincerely to believe them not only true, but irrefragable.

Bishop Onderdonk, however, after plunging from difficulty to difficulty, and from one utter failure of proof to another, in this part of his argument, still insists upon it that *Timothy* and *Titus* are represented in the New Testament as *prelates*; and that their character makes a clear case in favour of Episcopacy. He appears to satisfy himself, and evidently expects to satisfy his readers, with such reasoning as the following. We do not profess to give his exact language in the following sentences; but what, according to our perception, is the real force of his statement. “It cannot be *proved* that the apostle, when he speaks of ‘the hands of the presbytery’ being laid on Timothy, refers to his ordination at all. It is, *perhaps*, more *probable* that it refers to his being set apart to a special and temporary service: or it *may* be understood to mean, (if it *does* refer to his ordination) that he was set apart, by the laying on of hands, to ‘the *presbyterate*,’ that is to the office of *presbyter*. Yet, even if this be supposed, as the title of *presbyter*, as used in the New Testament, means any thing and every thing in ecclesiastical office, it *may* be here construed to mean something higher than a mere *presbyter*, strictly speaking; *therefore* there is at least *as much* evidence that it means a *prelate* as a *presbyter*. Besides, for any thing we know to the contrary, the ‘presbytery’ which officiated on this occasion ‘*may* have consisted of apostles only, or of one or more apostles joined with others;’ as the apostle speaks, in another place, of having laid his own hands on Timothy. *If this be so*, it cannot, *of course*, be claimed as a *presbyterian*, but was an apostolic ordination. We

may be considered, then, as having *proved*, that presbyters alone did *not* perform the ordination, granting the transaction to have been one; but that an apostle actually belonged, or else was added for this purpose, to the body called a ‘presbytery.’ It is also worthy of notice that St. Paul makes the following distinction in regard to *his own* agency and that of *others* in this supposed ordination, ‘*by* the putting on of my hands’—‘*with* the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.’ 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*. On the whole, the language here used *requires us to believe* that a minister of higher rank than an ordinary presbyter was present and officiated in this ordination—or what is *said to be* the ordination of Timothy. At any rate the Episcopal theory is *at least as good a key as that of parity* to the meaning of the word ‘presbytery;’ and considering the above distinction of ‘*by*’ and ‘*with*,’ our theory is obviously the better of the two.” See pages 18—23. In short, this wonderful jingle of words, denominated argument, when brought into a narrower compass, is to the following effect. “It is *doubtful* whether either of these famous passages refers to the ordination of Timothy or not. *If* either or both *have* such a reference, they *admit* of an interpretation *quite as favourable* to prelacy as to parity; *therefore*, as some *other* passages of Scripture *seem* to wear an aspect more favourable to prelacy than parity, we are *bound* to interpret *these*—which are acknowledged to be still more doubtful—in the *same way*.” Though these are not the *ipsissima verba* of our author, they really present no caricature of his mode of reasoning. We verily think that inferences so perfectly inconsequential and unwarranted would be driven from any enlightened and impartial tribunal on earth, as unworthy of an answer.

Our author next attempts to establish, as a matter of *fact*, that Timothy was an Episcopal bishop, or prelate, at Ephesus. This he endeavours to make out in the following manner. He first recites the charge which the apostle Paul gives to the *elders* of Ephesus, with whom he had an interview at *Miletus*. (Acts xx.) He gathers from this charge the amount of ecclesiastical power committed to these elders, and exercised by them. He then goes over the Epistles to Timothy; and thinking that he perceives

larger powers and a higher authority entrusted to Timothy than to the elders, he confidently infers that Timothy was a minister of superior *rank* to the elders; in other words, a prelate. We consider all his reasoning on this subject as entirely without force, or even plausibility; and we are persuaded all impartial readers will make the same estimate, after attentively weighing the following considerations.

1. We might have expected great diversity in the mode of address in these two cases, because the circumstances of the persons addressed were essentially different. The elders of Ephesus were the officers of an organized and regular church; and were charged, simply, with carrying forward the affairs of a collected and officered flock. Whereas Timothy was obviously sent on a temporary mission to Ephesus, with a special charge to rectify disorders, to correct abuses, and to convey, immediately from the apostles, a variety of special instructions, respecting the doctrine, the worship, and the officers of that church. Surely these circumstances will abundantly account for the peculiar manner in which Timothy is instructed and exhorted, and the special powers vested in him for discharging the duties of this arduous mission. Who would expect to find the officers of a regular church addressed in the same manner with an individual "evangelist" sent on a critical mission to the same church in a state of agitation and disorder?

2. The address to the elders of Ephesus, when the apostle met them at *Miletus*, is sufficient, of itself, to destroy the Episcopal claim. We will not stop to inquire whether this interview at Miletus took place *before* or *after* the date of the First Epistle to Timothy. We care not which alternative is adopted, so far as our argument is concerned. The opinion of many learned men is that the interview recorded in Acts xx. occurred six or seven years *prior* to the date of the Epistle. This seems to be Bishop Onderdonk's opinion, and we are content to assume it as correct. Now if it were so, we have the spectacle—strange and inexplicable on Episcopal grounds—the spectacle of an inspired apostle solemnly addressing the elders of an important church, where the apostle himself had laboured for three years; reminding them of their duties; exhorting them to fidelity; and formally committing to them the rule and discipline, as well as the instruction of the flock; and all this, without so much as alluding to an ecclesiastical superior. If we understand our author, he supposes that, at this time, there

was *no prelate* at Ephesus—Timothy not having been yet sent thither. Be it so. Is it not passing strange, then, that the apostle, in addressing them, should not allude to this *defect* in their ecclesiastical situation; that he should not sympathise with them in regard to it; and promise, or, at least, hint, something about the future supply of this defect—a defect, on Episcopal principles, so essential? Not a word, like this, however, is found. On the contrary, the apostle solemnly commits the whole inspection and rule of the church to these elders, themselves, and distinctly calls them BISHOPS. “Take heed,” says he, “to yourselves, and to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, (in the original *ἐπισκοποις*) *bishops*, to feed (the original here signifies to *rule* as well as to *feed*) the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” In short, he makes no allusion to any higher authority than that which he charges *them* to exercise. On this occasion Timothy himself seems to have been present. Acts xx. 4, 5. If, on the other hand, we suppose that the First Epistle to Timothy was written *before* the interview at Miletus, and that Timothy, or any other person, was *then* the prelatical bishop of the church of Ephesus, the fair presumption against the Episcopal claim becomes still stronger. Can it be imagined, on Episcopal principles, that Paul would have addressed these elders, in the presence of their diocesan, or while he was living, if not present, and would have committed the “oversight” of the flock entirely to *them*, without so much as hinting that they owed any subjection or reverence to *him*, or to any person of superior rank? It is impossible. This fact alone does not merely render the Episcopal claim *improbable*; it *destroys* it; unless we suppose that the apostle expressly intended to deceive the elders of Ephesus; or to insult their diocesan; or that he forgot—what no modern Episcopalian ever forgets—the dignity and prerogative of the prelate.

3. It is no where said, or hinted in Scripture, that Timothy ever was bishop of Ephesus, or Titus of Crete. That is, there is no evidence whatever in the inspired history, that these men, or either of them, ever had a fixed pastoral charge, of many months, much less years, continuance, in the places in which they are alleged to have been permanently located; or that they ever sustained any title, or enjoyed any authority, which marked a prelatical character. We utterly deny that they ever did; and we are perfectly

sure that it never has been, or can be, proved from Scripture. That one of them was at Ephesus, and the other at Crete, on a special emergency, and for a short time, we are, indeed, distinctly informed. But this is *all* that appears. Timothy is represented as travelling from place to place continually; and the same was probably the case with Titus. The very Epistles themselves which were directed to those missionaries contain evidence that, as they had been recently sent to Ephesus and Crete, so they were soon to depart and go elsewhere. The *Postscript* to the second Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus, which speak of their being "bishops," are known to be spurious; that is, it is certain that they make no part of the authorised text, and that they were interpolated long after the apostolic age. Of course, they have nothing to do with this inquiry. But, though neither of these ministers is said in Scripture to have been a "bishop," in the Episcopal sense of that word, Timothy is expressly styled by the Apostle an *Evangelist*, (2 Timothy iv. 5,) and the probability is that Titus bore the same character. If it be asked, what was the nature of the *Evangelist's* office? we answer, in general, he was a *preacher of the Gospel*;—a *bearer of the Gospel* to those who had it not. But if the inquiry be, what was the nature of this office in the early church, let *Eusebius* answer. He says—“Very many of the disciples of that day travelled abroad, and performed *the work of Evangelists*, ardently ambitious of preaching Christ to those who were yet wholly unacquainted with the doctrine of faith, and to deliver to them the Scripture of the divine Gospels. These having merely laid the foundations of the faith, and *ordained other pastors*, committed to them the cultivation of the churches newly planted; while they themselves, supported by the grace and co-operation of God, proceeded to other countries and nations.” (*Lib. iii. cap. 37.*) Bishop Onderdonk, indeed, endeavours to obviate the inference drawn from the fact that Timothy is called an *Evangelist*; but without the smallest success. The considerations which he urges for refuting it, are chiefly the following. [1.] “If Timothy is called an *Evangelist*, he is also called an *Apostle*.” This, as we have seen, is a mistake; he is nowhere so called in Scripture. [2.] “It does not appear that Evangelists, as such, had any particular *rank* in the ministry. Philip, the Deacon, was an Evangelist; and in Ephes. iv. 11, Evangelists are put after Prophets.” True, in the apostolic age, they had better work to do, than to contend about the adjustment of *titles*, *precedence*, and *rank* in the

sacred office. But one thing is certain—that “Evangelists” are distinguished from “Apostles” with a distinctness which precludes the possibility of our considering them as the same. [3.] “If *Timothy* were an Evangelist, there is no proof that *Titus*, and the ‘angels’ of the seven churches were Evangelists.” This, there is much reason to believe, is a mistake. It is highly probable they were. At any rate, we are very sure it cannot be made to appear that they were *not*. [4.] “Eusebius probably refers to *Bishops*, when he speaks of these Evangelists; and *if so* then Episcopacy still prevails.” This is, again, an entire mistake. Eusebius *does*, indeed, mention some as Evangelists, by *name*, who are said to have been bishops. Having done this, he goes on to speak of “many other disciples” of that day, “as going abroad, and performing the work of Evangelists;” and to *these* he explicitly informs us, was committed the *ordaining power*. His mode of speaking precludes the possibility of their being Bishops, in the sense which became current afterwards in the church. In short, the title “Evangelist” is found but *three* times in the New Testament. Once it is applied to Timothy; once to Philip, who had been one of the seven deacons at Jerusalem; and once in Ephes. iv. 11, where we read of “Apostles, prophets *evangelists*, pastors and teachers.” This is conclusive proof, as far as scriptural authority goes, that the title has no reference to prelacy.

4. There is nothing represented in Scripture as enjoined upon Timothy and Titus, or as done by them, which is not perfectly consistent with Presbyterian principle and practice. Timothy was sent to Ephesus, and Titus to Crete, to do what?—To correct abuses as to doctrine, worship and order; to see that suitable persons were selected and set apart to ecclesiastical offices; and, in general, to “set in order the things that were wanting.” It is well known that the Presbyterian Church in this country, has been in the constant practice, for more than half a century, of sending out Evangelists—just such men as *Eusebius* describes—into destitute settlements to organize churches, ordain Elders and Deacons, correct irregularities, and “set in order,” as far as possible, every thing that may be necessary for Christian edification. Now, we ask—why may not Timothy and Titus have been just such Presbyterian Evangelists? There is not a tittle, either of fact or expression, in the whole statement respecting them which is inconsistent with the supposition; nay, we have no doubt that this was the real fact. It will avail nothing with us to

reply, as our author, like all his predecessors, doubtless will reply—that this cannot be, because none but prelates ever had the power of ordaining. Shall we never have done with this constant begging of the whole question in dispute? We fearlessly assert that there is not a syllable in the New Testament which even distantly *intimates*, that either Timothy or Titus performed the work enjoined upon them rather as prelates than as “evangelists;” and that there is just as much reason to assert that all the itinerant missionaries sent out annually by the Presbyterian church into frontier settlements, are prelates, as, from any thing that is said in the New Testament, to ascribe such a superior rank to Timothy and Titus. Perhaps it will be said, that, although Presbyterian Missionaries are always empowered to organize churches, and to ordain ruling Elders and Deacons, they are never authorized, singly, to ordain teaching Elders, or ministers of the Gospel. This is no doubt, true. Yet this is only an ecclesiastical regulation, not a necessary or essential law of Christ’s house. In our church, according to her present constitution, three ordainers must always be present, and assist in a regular ordination. But there is quite as regular a Presbyterian church in our country, in which *two* ordainers are sufficient. And a third, equally regular, also in our country, according to whose form of ordination, a *single* ordainer is sufficient to complete a regular investiture with the sacred office. We may suppose, then, that Timothy and Titus might have been alone charged with the ordaining power, in the peculiar circumstances in which they acted, and might have exercised it accordingly, without the least departure from Presbyterian principle.

But *did* either Timothy or Titus ever, in a single instance, perform the work of ordination *alone*? This is constantly taken for granted by Episcopalians; and the establishment of the alleged fact, is essential to their cause. For if they only ordained in company with others, or as members, (perhaps the presiding members) of their respective Presbyteries, then we have, in each case, a simple specimen of Presbyterian ordination. But it is assumed by Episcopalians that they ordained *alone*, without a shadow of proof, and against all probability. The question, whether there were or not, at Ephesus and Crete, a body of Presbyters, at this time, who might, upon Presbyterian principles, have officiated in the work of ordination, will here be left out of view. Archbishop Potter delivers it as his opinion, that in

Crete, at least, there were none. But we shall forbear to canvass this question, as not essential to the argument of parity, however it may be answered. Let this have been as it may; there is every reason to suppose that Timothy and Titus were assisted in every ordination by *others*. We know that *Mark* was with Timothy; and that *Zenas* and *Apollos* were with Titus. Who can tell but that these ecclesiastical companions took part in every ordination? We cannot positively assert that they *did*; but it would be still more presumptuous to assert, since they were on the spot, that they *did not*. And yet, unless the patrons of Episcopacy can prove that they took no part, and that the "Evangelists" ordained alone, their whole argument, drawn from this case, falls to the ground.

Nor does it affect our reasoning to allege, that the apostle's language, through the greater part of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus is *personal*;—that is, the Epistles are addressed to them individually. For example, such language as the following frequently occurs:—"This charge I commit unto *thee* son Timothy;"—"these things write I unto *thee*, that *thou* mightest know how to behave *thyself* in the house of God;"—"that *thou* mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine;"—"lay hands suddenly on no man," &c. This language manifestly avails nothing to the cause of prelacy; for, 1. As these men went to Ephesus and Crete as a kind of special envoys, immediately from the Apostle, it was natural that the system of instructions should be addressed to them personally; for in the circumstances in which they were placed, they were to be the chief counsellors and guides in every thing that was done. 2. A Presbyterian ordination never occurs without addressing to the newly ordained minister language of precisely the same import; or rather, without exhorting him *in the very words* of Paul to Timothy. But no one ever dreams that this language is inconsistent with parity. For, although no one of our ministers can regularly ordain alone; yet as each possesses the ordaining power, it is proper that each should receive a separate and distinct charge. 3. If this argument proves any thing, it will prove too much, for it will prove that these Evangelists alone were empowered to *preach* and *pray* in the respective places to which they were sent to minister, for charges in relation to these points are given to them in the same personal style. 4. No Evangelist is ever sent forth by our church for the purpose of organizing and

“setting in order” churches, without bearing with him a body of special *instructions*, always drawn up in the form of a letter, and, of course, addressed to him personally. Are all these proofs that our Evangelists are prelates?

In closing our remarks on the alleged prelatical character of Timothy and Titus, we have one circumstance to mention, which we cannot help regarding as decisive. The circumstance is this. Bishop Onderdonk, as we have seen, explicitly acknowledges that—“*All that we read in the New Testament concerning bishops, is to be regarded as pertaining to the “middle grade,” i. e. to “presbyters” and never to prelates. In other words, he acknowledges that the title of “bishop” is, in no case, in the New Testament, used to designate a minister of superior rank; but always to designate ordinary pastors. Of course, the term bishop, as found in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, has no reference to prelates. Now if this be so, then we have no allusion whatever, in these Epistles, to any such superior officer. Among all the counsels and laws intended to be left on permanent record, for the guidance of Christians in all ages,—there is not the remotest hint pointing to such an officer. Presbyters, or ordinary pastors, ruling Elders and Deacons, are all plainly pointed out, and the proper qualifications and duties of each carefully specified. But not a syllable is said to them about prelates, their rights, prerogatives, duties, or mode of investiture. They are never even once reminded that it is their duty to be docile and obedient to their proper diocesan. Assuming Presbyterian principles, this is perfectly natural; just what might have been expected. If no such officer existed, of course, he could not be recognized or described. But, on Episcopal principles, it appears to us utterly unaccountable. Or rather, it affords, in our opinion, conclusive proof that no such officer of superior rank was then known in the church, or intended to be established as a permanent order.*

We have only to notice one leading argument more which Bishop Onderdonk employs to make out Episcopacy from Scripture; and that is the argument drawn from the “Angels” of the seven Asiatic churches. In reference to these he reasons thus. “Each of these churches is addressed, not through its clergy at large, but through its ‘Angel,’ or chief officer.—This ‘Angel’ is addressed personally, and in a manner which implies much power and responsibility in his pastoral charge: the singular number is used in speak-

ing to him. This individual is, in each case, identified with his church, and his church with him.—Ergo these ‘Angels’ were prelates.”

Now we ask, what are all these facts to our author’s arguments? What do they prove? Why may not these “Angels” have been Presbyterian Pastors, just as well as Episcopal Bishops? Every word that is said of them applies quite as appropriately and strictly to the former, as to the latter. The term “Angel,” in itself decides nothing. It simply signifies a “messenger.” As far as we know its origin, it was derived from the Jewish Synagogue; every particular Synagogue having been furnished with an officer bearing this title, and that officer, it is well known, was not a prelate. Some of the most learned Episcopal writers, however, have been of the opinion, that the term “Angel” is a figurative expression, intended to point out the *collective ministry* in those churches respectively: and hence in addressing the Angel of the Church in *Smyrna*, it is said—“*Some of you*, I will cast into prison,” &c. Nor can we infer any thing from the addresses made, or the powers assigned to these “Angels.” They agree just as well with parochial Bishops, or Pastors, as with Prelates. And, accordingly it is notorious that some of the most learned and able writers on the Episcopal side in this controversy, have given up the argument drawn from the Apocalyptic “Angels,” as affording no real support to the claim of prelacy.

Besides, there is another difficulty respecting these “Angels” of the seven churches, when claimed as *Prelates*. Bishop O.’s theory is, that the prelates of the Church in the Apostolic age, were never called *Bishops*, but *Apostles*; and that, *after* the Apostles days, these successors to the pre-eminent Apostolical powers began to be styled *Bishops*. Now, here, according to our author, we have a title which is neither the one nor the other; and which appears, as a ministerial title, in no other part of Scripture. It will not do to reply, that, as all the Apostles’ excepting *John*, who was made the medium of address on this occasion, had passed away, we may suppose that the appointment of their prelatial *successors* had *newly* commenced, and that these “Angels” are a specimen. Why not, then, call them either *Apostles* or *Bishops*? Why give them a title intended to be applied, as it would seem, in but *one case*, and then forever dropped? We surely might have expected some intelligible intimation of what was intended concerning *so great a sub-*

ject as the names and "orders of clergy," before the sacred canon was finally closed; especially as the *transition* period from the Apostles to their "successors," had now come. But no; not a word. All is still left in doubt and obscurity. And the truth is, the aspect and character of these addresses themselves do not very well correspond with the case of *recently appointed* officers. In reference to at least *two* of them, there are indications of a long preceding incumbency in office, and of sinking down into lukewarmness and sloth. It is by no means likely that, under the eye, of inspired Apostles, men already in this state of moral *depression* would have been selected to preside over churches. In short, the more carefully we examine the case of these "Angels," the more all dreams of their affording support to prelacy, are dissipated.

Such is a cursory view of the arguments produced from Scripture, by Bishop Onderdonk in support of the Episcopal claim. Our only wonder is, that he does not see them to be, both in their individual import, and in their combined character, destitute of even the semblance of force. At every step in his progress, unless we are deceived, he has totally and manifestly failed. His method of reasoning from the beginning to the end of his pamphlet is of the following sort—"This fact *admits* of an Episcopal construction; at any rate, it cannot be *proved* that its import is in favour of parity. We may, *therefore*, take for granted, or *at least it will not be questioned*, that its meaning is more favourable to Episcopacy than to Parity. We are warranted, then, in assuming this point as *established*. To us the proof appears absolute; but it is enough for a rightly disposed mind that it only preponderate. For, let it not be forgotten, that, as it cannot be *proved*, it ought not to be *allowed*, that any but those who held the Apostolical or Episcopal office, superior to that of mere Presbyters, either performed the ordinations mentioned in scripture, or are there said to have the *right* to perform such acts."—In such misnamed reasoning as this our author abounds; and he so far deceives himself—(which we have no doubt he does sincerely)—as to call it DEMONSTRATION!

But has he really proved ANY ONE of those points, which are not merely important, but even essential to the establishment of his claim? Let us, for a moment, look back and recapitulate. Has he proved that the ordaining power was *confined* to the Apostles while they lived? He cer-

tainly has not. The contrary most manifestly appears. In his efforts to establish this point, has he proved that Timothy, Barnabas, and others, were Apostles, in the official sense of that title, because they undoubtedly ordained? Not at all. But in attempting it, he has mangled and perverted Scripture, and entirely misapprehended the Apostolic character. Has he been able to show, from Scripture, that the Apostles, in their peculiar and pre-eminent character, had successors; and that these successors were the Bishops? He has not even pretended, so far as we recollect, to produce a single Scripture which gives the remotest countenance to either of these positions. Has he proved, or rendered even probable, that Timothy or Titus was sent to Ephesus or Crete, not on a temporary and extraordinary mission, but to occupy a fixed and permanent pastoral charge? He has not; nor can he do so. For, from the Scriptural account of the ministry of those itinerants, it is by no means likely that they were in either of those places more than a few months, or, perhaps, weeks. Has he proved that the *second* Epistle to Timothy was addressed to him *at Ephesus* at all? He has not; and some of the most learned commentators have thought it altogether improbable. Has he given us the least proof that either Timothy or Titus went to Ephesus or Crete in any higher character than that of simple "*Evangelists*," sent on a special mission, and charged, for that purpose with special powers? By no means. The whole statement concerning them agrees far better with Parity than with Prelacy; nor is there a single fact or hint in the history of either which necessarily, or even probably implies the latter. Has he shown that, before those missionaries went to Ephesus and Crete there were teaching Presbyters, or Pastors residing in both those places, who might, on Presbyterian principles, have performed the work of ordination? Or has he proved that either Timothy or Titus ever performed a single ordination *alone*? He has not produced the least proof of either, nor can he do it. Has he proved, or approached to the proof, that the "*Angels*" of the seven churches were prelates? Not at all. Neither their name, nor any facts alluded to in their case, give the least intimation that they bore this character. The same may be said of every fact and principle peculiar to Prelacy which he has attempted to establish. Instead of producing direct and palpable Scriptural testimony, he has been compelled to resort to doubtful conjec-

ture, circuitous inference, and remote probability, or even possibility. No one position is firmly supported. Even if he had been able to establish *every one* of the points above referred to as facts, still his main object would have been far from being gained. He would still be obliged to show, from *scripture*, that all this was intended to be a *permanent arrangement*. This he has not done. This, we are very sure, he cannot do. His premises and his conclusion are alike unsound.

The last remark brings again to our view a most singular part of Bishop Onderdonk's argument, to which we before alluded, but which deserves a more pointed notice. He grants, (p. 12) as we have seen, that the title of "bishop," in the New Testament, is every where applied to *ordinary pastors*; and that it was *after* the apostolic age, that the title of "bishop" was taken from the "second order of elergy, and appropriated to the first." When we came to this point in his argument, we felt curious to know what *Scripture* he would produce to attest this *last* point, viz. that "*after* the apostolic age, the title of 'bishop' was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first." But, at this principal link in his chain of proof, he abandons his professed ground. "As we learn," says he—from whom? from any *inspired writer*?—not at all—"as we learn from *Theodoret*, one of the fathers!" He does not pretend to find the slightest warrant in the Bible for this essential part of his argument. How are we to account for this? We thought we had been called to investigate the claim of Episcopacy as "TESTED BY SCRIPTURE:" and here, for an essential link in the chain of proof we are referred to a writer in the *fifth century*! We reject this proof, for several reasons: 1. Because it is not *Scripture*, and with *that alone* we have to do at present. 2. Because if this change of *title* had the sanction of divine appointment, and if the *rank* which it represents had been regarded as a matter of so much importance as modern prelatists annex to it, we might, surely, expect to find in the New Testament some intimation of what was to take place. 3. Because no one doubts that, in the fifth century, when *Theodoret* lived, prelacy had crept into the church, and was firmly established; and that the language which he employs fell in with the current claims and practice of his day. 4. Because, if the testimony of the fathers is to settle this point; (against which we enter our solemn protest; what cannot be found in the Bible is no law for Chris-

tians) if an appeal *must* be made to the fathers at all—pray let us go to those who lived nearest to “the apostolic age,” and who, of course, are the most competent witnesses of what took place immediately after that age, when this change of title is alleged by our author to have been brought in. Does *Clemens Romanus*, does *Ignatius*, does *Polycarp*, say any thing like what *Theodoret* is brought to testify? *They* lived at the very time when this transfer of titles is alleged to have taken place. Does any one of them speak of it? Not a word. But they say very much of an opposite import. *Ignatius* says, again and again, that the PRESBYTERS SUCCEED IN THE PLACE OF THE APOSTLES. *Clemens*, who was contemporary with the apostle John, speaks familiarly of the presbyters in his day, as the rulers of the church, very much in the language of the New Testament; and *Irenæus*, who flourished toward the latter part of the second century, repeatedly speaks of presbyters as being successors of the apostles. Surely the representations of these men, though not constituting our rule either of faith or practice, are much more worthy of confidence than the language of those who lived several centuries afterwards, when it is known that great corruption, growing out of ambition and worldliness, had found its way into the church, and when an erroneous nomenclature, as well as practice, was notoriously prevalent.

Such is the result of our author's appeal to the “test of Scripture.” If he has *proved* a single point peculiar to the Episcopal system, from the New Testament, then we know not what *proof* means. Surely if the inspired writers had been Episcopalians; and, especially, if they had been believers in its fundamental importance, as well as in its divine appointment; they *could* not have left the subject in their writings;—writings be it remembered, expressly intended to guide the church to the end of time;—they *could* not, we repeat, have left the subject in so lean and doubtful a plight as it would appear from our author's statement. Bishop O. has evidently examined the Scriptures with the most anxious vigilance, and with the aid of the best divines of his church who have lived for three centuries; and he has evidently collected every fact, hint and allusion that was capable of being brought to bear witness, ever so minutely or remotely, in favour of his cause. And yet the fact is, that every impartial reader must see that he has not been able, in regard to *any one point*, to produce a single Scripture

decided and "home to his purpose." Now, if Episcopacy had been meant to be taught in Scripture, as the only authorized model of church order; and if the New Testament had been intended to be a sure guide in this matter; can any reflecting man believe that the inspired writers would have written as they have done in relation to ecclesiastical order? We will venture to say, it is impossible! When they had occasion to speak so frequently concerning Christian character and hope; concerning the church, its nature, foundation, head, laws, ministers, and interests; it is truly marvellous, if they had thought as the writer of this pamphlet does, that they should not have told us something more explicit respecting "orders of clergy;" the mischiefs of "parity;" the danger of departure from the regular "succession;" and the fundamental importance of contending for an "authorized priesthood." Had their opinions been those of the author of this Tract, they *could* not have been silent, or have spoken doubtfully respecting these points. They would have dwelt upon them in every connexion; have repeated them at every turn; and have made *this subject* clear, whatever else was left in the dark. Now, as it is granted, on all sides, that they HAVE NOT DONE THIS; as Episcopalians themselves acknowledge that NO ONE of the inspired writers has done it, or is at all EXPLICIT on the subject; it is as plain as any moral demonstration can be, that the principles and claims of this pamphlet were then unknown, and, consequently, have no divine warrant.

Samuel Miller

ART. VII.—*The Annual of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: a New Year's Offering for 1835. Edited by John Breckinridge, A. M. Corresponding Secretary of the Board. Philadelphia, 1835.*

We have lately had occasion to advert to the importance of the Board of Education, as a means of promoting purity and union in the church. Recent events have led us to regard it, in another point of view, as a defence against the