

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

JULY, 1833.

---

No. III.

---

---

ART. I.—*Hints on Colonization and Abolition; with reference to the black race.*

THEY who are wise enough to place implicit confidence in the statements of the Bible, as to the origin of the human race, find no difficulty in tracing the three distinct races of men who inhabit this vast continent to the patriarch Noah, as the second head and progenitor of mankind. Nor is the difficulty great, to reach the assurance that the three sons of that patriarch were respectively the heads of three races which surround us: all things concurring to prove that the North American Indians are of Asiatic, that is of Shemitish origin, whilst the origin of the white and black races is not only matter of familiar knowledge and full experience, but is stamped upon the very aspects and lineaments of the beings themselves, in characters which time is not able to erase. Indeed we think we see in the very state of things which are passing before us, the evidence of the truth of God, in the exact fulfilment of a prophecy, which, from the distance of forty-two centuries, seem to point steadfastly to us. "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his ser-

vailing impressions among the advocates of new measures? How seldom is the Spirit of God acknowledged! Protracted meetings, revival ministers, and the sinner's own act in making for himself a new heart, are the favourite agencies; these are principally depended upon; these are applauded, and sinners might long attend to the application of these measures, as they are usually employed, without so much as knowing "whether there be any Holy Ghost." But is it credible that where God the Spirit is not acknowledged as all in all, he will effect any of the great and peculiar works of his power? To us it is not credible.

Thus we have briefly and imperfectly characterized modern innovations upon church order, and adverted to their consequences,—consequences already evincing themselves, and in the rapid course of developement. And shall it now be said, where is the utility of this exposure? We reply, the truth must be told; error must be resisted; the cause of Christ is suffering; the cause of revivals is in danger of contempt; and the only hope under God, which is left, is that ministers of the Gospel, who are sentinels on the walls of Zion, and the responsible guardians of the Church of Christ, will, in full view of the impending danger, rise and bear their testimony against the encroachments of indiscreet zeal, and the devices of misjudging innovators.

---

ART. IV.—*An apology for conforming to the Protestant Episcopal Church, contained in a series of Letters addressed to the Reverend Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New York.* By Thomas S. Brittan. Second edition, with additions. New York. Swords, Stanford & Co. 12mo. pp. 134. 1833.

THIS is, in every sense of the word, a small affair. We never heard of Mr. Brittan until our attention was very recently drawn to the volume before us. And even now we have no information concerning him but that which he here gives of himself. From this source we learn, that he is a native of England; that he was educated in that country among the "Independents," or "Congregationalists;" that he was trained and regularly set apart to the work of the Gospel ministry in that denomination, in his native land; that he came, a few months before the publication of these "Letters," to the United States in the character of an Independent minister; that on his arrival he was kindly received, and respectfully treated by Presbyterians; that he continued to minister, for a short time, in Presbyterian churches;

but that, after a while, new light broke in upon his mind, and his views respecting ecclesiastical matters became so far changed that he felt constrained by a conscientious regard to truth and duty, to unite himself with the Protestant Episcopal Church. Having taken this step, he thought proper, as has been common in all ages with recent converts, for the purpose either of evincing their sincerity, or propitiating their new friends, to write and print something against his former associates, and in favour of his adopted connexion. Such is a brief history of the little volume, the title of which stands at the head of this article. Of the source, circumstances, or amount of the new light which led to the change above stated, we know nothing. The honourable and Christian character of the *motives* by which he was governed in the whole affair, we do not feel at liberty so much as to question; though he allows himself so freely to assail the motives of others. We take for granted, in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, that his inquiries have been serious, his convictions honest, and the conclusions to which he has been brought, such as satisfy his own mind.

Of his views and feelings at an early period of his life, Mr. Brittan gives the following account:—

“I had learned to regard the Established Church as the beast in the Apocalypse, of which it is said, *“it had horns like a lamb, but it spake like a dragon.”* I regarded it as a system of spiritual tyranny only—an engine of State policy, by which the tools of party were to be rewarded; in fine, as an iron rod in the hands of bigotry, by which it attempted to crush and destroy all who had the honesty or the courage to think for themselves. This prejudice, by a natural consequence, (strange as to some it may appear,) extended itself to its ritual, its ceremonies, and even its sanctuaries; these were often the object of my ridicule and derision. The official garments of its clergy; the formulary of its devotions; and even its most solemn observances were regarded as worse than unmeaning; as partaking of the nature of an impious mockery of the Almighty. I looked upon its sacred edifices with much of the same class of feelings with which I should have regarded a Pagan temple; and though, in my boyhood, curiosity led me sometimes to visit them, that I might gaze upon their Gothic architecture, admire their painted windows, and feel what was imposing in their structure—whose “dim religious light” rendered them so suitable to aid devotion; yet I always felt as if by so doing, I had contracted a sort of guilt; that I had been treading upon forbidden ground.”

A mind capable of entertaining, as he tells us he did, until mature age, views so narrow, and prejudices so truly childish, might have been expected, on the slightest inducement, to verge with characteristic weakness to the opposite extreme, and to regard with the blindest admiration what had been before regarded with puerile abhorrence.

This little volume comprises nine Letters. The *first* is *introductory*; the *second* discusses the question of Episcopacy on the ground of *expediency*; the *third* is on Episcopacy sanctioned by the *Institutions of Judaism*; the *fourth* professes to exhibit

*the testimony of Presbyterians and other anti-Episcopalians* in favour of Episcopacy; the *fifth* relates to the testimony of the *Fathers*; the *sixth* to the testimony of *Scripture*; the *seventh* on prescribed *Forms of Prayer*; the *eighth* on the SURPASSING excellence of the *American Episcopal Liturgy*; and the *ninth* and last on several miscellaneous topics, such as the remarkable accordance of prelacy with every part of the creation, from the angel to the glow-worm; the abuse of Dr. Miller, against whom he seems to have a peculiar spite; the ignorance of Presbyterians and Presbyterian ministers on the subject of parity and episcopacy, &c.

On these subjects the reader must not expect any thing *new* in Mr. Brittan's pages. We are not aware that there is a single thought in the whole book which has not been more plausibly and powerfully presented by preceding writers. Mr. B. is, for the most part, a very humble copyist. And when he ventures to proceed without his guides, he generally betrays such a want of acquaintance with the subject as plainly evinces that he is a "raw recruit," who wishes to make up in zeal what may be lacking in knowledge.

Mr. B. in his second Letter gives a very gloomy picture of the want of union among the Independents in England, and selects, as a striking instance of their want of some uniting power among themselves, a particular circumstance attending the proceedings of the London Missionary Society, a body, the affairs of which are chiefly in the hands of that denomination. On this statement, and the inference in favour of Episcopacy which the author seems disposed to derive from it, two remarks may be made, which, long as he has occupied the place of instructor to others, he seems not yet duly to have considered.

The *first* is, that *Independency* is freely granted by us not to have been the apostolic form of Church government. It is essentially lacking in all those principles which are indispensable to ecclesiastical unity. All theory and all experience concur in pronouncing, that if a number of single churches are to be bound, and to act with harmony together as one Church, there must be some other tie or authority resorted to than the system of *Independency* furnishes. But does it follow that this resort must be to *Prelacy*? This gentleman seems to forget, or not to know, that *Independency* and *Presbyterianism* are not the same thing; that they are almost as far apart as *Independency* and *Prelacy*; and that *Presbyterianism* supplies quite as powerful means for securing ecclesiastical unity as *Prelacy* ever did. The history of *Presbyterianism* in Holland, in Scotland, in Geneva, in France, and in America, will satisfy every one who reads it intelligently,

that it has power to secure energy and unity, equal to any other form of ecclesiastical order.

Our *second* remark is, that Mr. Brittan seems entirely to forget that parties, controversy, division, and strife of the most painful character, have often occurred under Episcopal government. Has he never read of the divisions and strife which agitated the Church of England, with all her bishops, and with all the power of the secular arm to help them, in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., Charles II., James II., William and Mary, and Queen Ann? And, when he was indelicate enough, in his second Letter, to reproach the Presbyterian Church in the United States with her divisions, as indicated by the proceedings of the General Assembly of 1832, had he entirely forgotten that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at the very same time, as well as for several preceding years, exhibited a state of division quite as serious, and quite as threatening? Has he forgotten, or was he never informed, that Calvinism, Arminianism, and gross Pelagianism, are known to co-exist in that body of the unity of which he boasts so much, and that, if Unitarianism be not *now* found in her clerical ranks, it certainly *was* not many years since, unless public, uncontradicted rumour be very deceptive? Nay, does not the whole history of prelacy, whether found under Protestant auspices, or under the more rigid and energetic form of Romanism, furnish quite as many materials for the annalist of division and strife, as any other form of ecclesiastical government whatever? We are altogether at a loss to imagine how a conscientious, thinking man, such as we presume Mr. Brittan to be, could have allowed himself to employ an argument which the slightest reflection might have convinced him made full as much against his favourite Church as any other, Independency always excepted. Are there no "conflicting opinions," no "antipathies and animosities of its members," no "teaching of doctrines utterly opposed to their adopted standards," in his own beloved portion of Zion? If we did not take for granted that this gentleman is in a great measure ignorant of the real state of his newly adopted Church, and that he has been led astray by vain boasters in higher stations, who have imposed on his credulity, by speaking and writing in a similar manner before, it would be impossible to avoid conclusions derogatory to his candour. As it is, we counsel him to take another survey of his present connections a little more extensive and careful than he has heretofore done, before he sends forth another edition of his book.

We have just alluded to the fact, that even prelacy is not a sovereign preventive of divisions. And, of course, that all Mr.

B.'s reproaches of other denominations, as strikingly delinquent in respect to union, compared with his own body, are as unjust as they are indelicate. We do not deny that, under Presbyterian government, diversities of opinion and party conflicts have often arisen, and now exist. But is not this an evil incident to all governments of which depraved human beings are the subjects and the administrators? And we ask again, is there any Church in the United States, of considerable extent, LESS DIVIDED than the Presbyterian?

What individual in our country, except Mr. Brittan, does not know that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, has been for years, and is at this hour, labouring under *precisely the same sort of division and strife which exist in the Presbyterian Church?* Who does not know that that Church has been agitated to its very centre, (as appears from the publications of her own ministers,) by animosities between the *evangelical* and the *anti-evangelical* party; between *high-church* and *low-church*; between the advocates of *extempore prayer*, and those who would enforce an universal and exclusive adherence to the *liturgy* in every service; between the friends of *prayer-meetings*, and those who think such services injurious to the interests of "the Church"? The members of these respective parties, indeed, all call themselves "Episcopalians," and all agree in recognising and acting upon the prelatical principle, with more or less laxness, and in using the same liturgy, with more or less strictness; and this is *the exact amount of their unity*. That there are precisely analogous parties in the Presbyterian Church is not denied: but that they do not destroy unity more than in the case of our Episcopal neighbours, is well known to all excepting here and there "a stranger in Israel."

Besides, the Roman Catholics have every thing in prelacy that Protestant Episcopalians have; and over and above all this, they profess to have one supreme head, who, as Christ's vicar, they tell us, binds their whole body together, and thus secures universal unity. And yet, these very people, amidst all the boasted efficacy of their plan of government, have been for centuries torn with division and strife, as much as any Protestant denomination on earth. Those who have the slightest knowledge of their history, and more particularly of the 'distracting controversy and division respecting the *Jansenists*, which agitated their whole body, and raged for many years, will need no other evidence that their claim is utterly delusive, and that all their boasted allegations of superior unity are notoriously false. And yet it is amusing to find these same Roman Catholics denouncing none with more severity, as "out of the true Church," and

aliens from the "covenanted mercies of God" than Protestant Episcopalians, and that, among other considerations, on the very ground that they are divided into sects and parties, and have nothing like the unity of true Catholics. We believe there is just as much force in the argument when urged by Roman Catholics against Protestant Episcopalians, as when urged by the latter against Presbyterians. In other words, we believe it is a false and shameless cavil, wholly destitute of force in both cases, and that both the accusing parties are just as liable to the imputation in question as any of those whom they denounce and abuse.

If the Episcopal feature in church government be so infallible a sign of the true Church, and so potent in its efficacy to secure ecclesiastical unity, why did the Greek and Latin Church quarrel and denounce each other with irreconcilable acrimony, and finally become rent asunder, and a monument of prelatial warfare and strife to this day? Why did the "non-juring" party in England, toward the close of the seventeenth century, form a new body, and retire to North Britain, where they used a different Liturgy, and were not acknowledged by the English establishment, for about one hundred years? These, and a thousand other similar facts which have marked the history of prelacy in every age, show as plainly as demonstration itself, that the most energetic and boasted forms of ecclesiastical order are quite as liable to the distractions which human caprice and depravity generate as some which make less pretension; and that the chief difference is, that the former are content with a mere nominal unity, which the Bible no where recognises as the true bond of the body of Christ; and presumptuously reproach others for the want of that which Christ and his inspired apostles would have regarded as of no value.

It gives us real pain to make statements and appeals of this kind; but as long as there continue to be grave writers, who are not ashamed to repeat charges so unworthy of intelligent and candid minds, and which no man, we should think, who has eyes to see and ears to hear, can really believe, we shall feel bound to expose and refute them.

In fine, on this subject, we have only to say that Mr. Brittan's anecdote on page 26, about the London Missionary Society, betrays a narrowness of views, and a want of acquaintance with radical ecclesiastical principles, as amusing as they are disreputable. It proves nothing but that the writer is not competent to discuss with adequate intelligence the subject on which he writes. The New York Missionary Society, some twenty-seven years ago, after several missionaries had been for some time established

among the North Western Indians, sent a venerable minister of the Gospel, of known wisdom, piety, and learning, to visit the several stations, to inspect and report their condition; to counsel the missionaries in all matters relating to the complicated and delicate nature of the service in which they were engaged, and, in a word, like Timothy and Titus of old, if not to "ordain elders in every city," at least to "set in order the things which were wanting." The Society never imagined, however, that this mission constituted the gentleman in question a *bishop*. And if they had thought proper to continue his mission for several years, still the idea of constituting him a prelate, in the sense, or any thing like the sense, attached to that term by our Episcopal brethren, would never have entered into their minds. We know nothing of "Dr. Thom," of whom Mr. B. speaks in connexion with this affair of the London Missionary Society; but admitting that his relation of the story is correct, which we do not doubt, we cannot wonder that a man who lent himself to an "appeal," and an "indignation" so truly blind and silly, should now have "his name scarcely if ever mentioned."

On the subject of "Episcopacy sanctioned by the Institutions of Judaism," our author advances nothing new. He is, indeed, much less plausible and less forcible on this topic, than Dr. Bowden, Bishop Hobart, and several other writers on both sides of the Atlantic. When he attempts to prove that the whole of the Levitical economy was instituted by God himself; that in the sacred office in that economy there were three orders of men who ministered in holy things; that the New Testament Church is the same in substance with that of the Old Testament, having the same Head, the same design, the same hope, and the same way of salvation; in short, that the latter was the minority, and the former was the mature age of the Christian Church, he ought to know that he has no adversary among Presbyterians. These principles are all as cordially and zealously maintained by us as he can wish. But the Episcopal *inferences* from these premises, we have always thought to be as perfectly gratuitous, and even childish, as could well be imagined.

The grand principle assumed by them, upon which every thing depends, is, that the Christian ministry must be an exact copy of the Levitical priesthood. That the former must resemble the latter, not merely in its great design, but in its essential features, and more especially in the *number* of its orders. Upon the assumption of this principle, the slightest attention, we should think, to the following queries, would satisfy every mind not perfectly blinded by prejudice, that it can avail nothing to the cause which it is employed to support. For,

In the *first place*, do the Scriptures any where tell us that the parallel here supposed must exist? Do they give us any hint that the rank, the number of orders, or the functions of the ministry under the New Testament economy must correspond as *type* and *antitype*, with those of the ceremonial priesthood of the Jews? Nothing like it. Not a single passage to this amount has ever been produced, or can be produced. It is in vain to quote those passages from the New Testament which tell us that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," that "the law was a shadow of good things to come;" that the priests under the law served, or performed services which were "an example and shadow of heavenly things." There is not in all this an approach to the doctrine supposed. Now can it be imagined that the inspired writers should not be found to say one sentence on a point, which, if its advocates are to be believed, lies at the very foundation of the visible kingdom of Christ? But this is not all; for,

In the *second place*, while the New Testament says not one syllable which looks like the parallel contended for, does it not abundantly assert a doctrine which *destroys that parallel*, by establishing another altogether inconsistent with it? Let any man impartially read the New Testament, and especially the epistle to the Hebrews, and then say, whether the Saviour himself is not manifestly represented as the "great High Priest of our profession," and the only real and proper antitype of the Aaronic High Priest? The truth is, nothing but an utter disregard of Scripture could induce any body of men, Romish or Protestant, to advance the argument from the Aaronic priesthood in favour of their system. But further,

In the *third place*, is it not perfectly plain that there is not, *in fact*, even on the showing of Episcopalians themselves, *any such correspondence* between the Christian ministry and the Levitical priesthood, as their system demands, and as they assure us exists? In the Levitical priesthood there was a *single high priest* over the whole Jewish Church. But where is the antitype of this in the system of Protestant Episcopalians? Roman Catholics plead the very same parallel in support of their plan of ecclesiastical order; but *they* are, in regard to this point, consistent with themselves. *They* copy the Levitical plan with *some degree of exactness*. They have one Chief or High-Priest over the whole Catholic Church. And, truly, if the parallel of which we speak has any reality or significance among Christians, it serves the cause of Romanists alone, and not of any Protestant sect. To tell us that the Christian ministry must correspond with the Jewish priesthood; that the latter must be a

“shadow and a type” of the former; and, at the same time, to represent a single head as typifying a great number of co-ordinate heads, appear to us in the first rank of absurdities. Did any man ever hear of a single head casting a shadow of many scores of heads? No wonder that the Romanists exult over Protestants who adopt and attempt to make use of this argument, and yet apply it so inconsistently, and in a manner so much adapted to strengthen the hands of the adversary! But,

Finally; even admitting that there must be *three orders* in the New Testament ministry, in correspondence with the *three orders* in the ministry of the temple service, of which the Scriptures nowhere give the smallest intimation, and which never has been proved; yet, allowing for argument's sake, that some such parallel and correspondence must be maintained; is it not as faithfully maintained in the Presbyterian Church as in the Episcopal? Let it be borne in mind that Protestant Episcopalians do not contend that this parallel must be *exact as to every point*. For if they did, they would be obliged to show, as was before observed, one high priest over the whole Christian Church similar to the highest officer over the Old Testament Church. They seem so think that the single point to be regarded is, that there be *three orders* of ecclesiastical officers. But, in *this respect*, Presbyterians surely come quite as near as they do to the Levitical model. We have *Pastors*, (apostolical bishops,) *Elders*, and *Deacons*; *three* distinct classes of officers; all ecclesiastical men. We do not, indeed, assign to these respective classes the *same functions* which belonged to the High Priest, priests, and Levites under the ceremonial economy. But our Episcopal brethren, as every one knows, are just as far as ourselves, in this respect, from the Aaronic model. The parallel in our system is absolutely just as complete as theirs; and to represent it otherwise, is to insult the good sense of the community.

In Mr. Brittan's fourth Letter, which is devoted to the consideration of Presbyterian and other anti-episcopal testimonies in favour of prelacy, we see much to invite animadversion. But the limits to which we are confined must prevent our offering, on this branch of the argument, more than two general remarks.

The *first* is, that the greater part of these writers are most unfairly and disingenuously quoted. In most cases Mr. B. presents us with a few detached or garbled sentences, which, in the insulated form in which he exhibits them, seem to speak a language favourable to prelacy; when, if the context were fairly cited in its connexion, its whole aspect would be entirely different, and in some cases directly opposite. And especially when we come to examine those parts of the writings of these

men in which they express their opinions distinctly, fully, and unequivocally on the subject before us, it would be difficult to conceive of statements more irreconcilably opposed to the scraps here quoted. These remarks apply in all their force to Calvin, to Luther, to Beza, to Zanchy, to Pictet, and to several others from whom he presents citations. Never did men express themselves more clearly, strongly, and even zealously in favour of Presbyterian parity than these same men. If we supposed that Mr. Brittan had any other acquaintance with their writings than to take from second-hand the fragments which he so gravely and ostentatiously adduces, we should be compelled to put the most painful construction on his conduct. As it is, we excuse it as a mistake of ignorance. He has been led astray by guides who were unworthy of his confidence. Was it fair to vaunt Peter du Moulin as a man of great eminence and authority among Presbyterian divines, when it is well known that he was in part, at least, educated in one of the English Universities, which he could not have entered without conformity to the Church of England; and that he was afterwards a resident, and enjoyed preferment in that Church? Would not any man who could bring his mind to this, be likely to speak well of the ecclesiastical body to which he was attached? We ask further, Was it quite fair to bring forward as great champions of Presbytery, men who avow the belief, that there is no form of church government laid down in Scripture; that the order of the church may of course be modified according to the dictates of human prudence; and who, consequently, might without inconsistency represent prelacy as a *lawful* form of ecclesiastical order where it was preferred?

Our *second* remark on this branch of Mr. B.'s argument is, that the array of Presbyterian concessions in favour of the *early introduction* and the *lawfulness* of prelacy, which he exhibits with so much parade and confidence, may be more than met by a still greater number of decisive concessions from eminent Episcopalians. There is scarcely a single argument which he has urged in this little volume in support of the prelatial system, which some of the most learned and eminent Episcopalians that ever lived have not formally abandoned, and pronounced utterly untenable and worthless. And let it be remembered that these concessions are much more decisive and important than those which are usually produced from eminent Presbyterians; for the amount of almost all the latter is, either that Episcopacy, as a *human institution*, introduced *after* the days of the apostles, was brought in *earlier* than a majority of that denomination suppose; or that Episcopacy, though not resting on any scriptural authority, might be *lawfully* employed by those

who preferred it; in other words, that it may be better to submit to it, though it have no divine warrant, than to break the peace of the Church. These concessions, a reasonable man would think, are not such as either to gratify or to aid a *jure divino* prelatist. Yet such are, absolutely, the great majority, nay, almost the whole of the "anti-episcopal testimonies" of which so much boast is made. But very different from this in their bearing and force are the concessions of learned Episcopalians to which we have just referred. They have taken up successively and carefully the several arguments by which prelacy professes to sustain her claims, which have almost all, in their turn, been set aside by one or another of these mature and profound Episcopal judges, and declared to be wholly insufficient to sustain the weight laid upon them. Thus the argument drawn from the alleged fact, that the Episcopal bishops are the successors of the apostles, in their official pre-eminence, is rejected by Dr. Barrow, as wholly untenable. The argument drawn from the apocalyptic angels, on which Mr. Brittan, in imitation of many others, lays so much stress, is pronounced by Dr. Henry More, the learned Joseph Mede, Bishop Stillingfleet, and Henry Dodwell, four as learned Episcopalians as ever took pen in hand, and *at least* as well qualified to judge in this matter as our author, to be perfectly inapplicable and worthless. The learned and zealous Episcopal divine, Dr. Whitby, speaking of the question whether Timothy and Titus were made bishops, the one of Ephesus, and the other of Crete, says, "Now of this matter I confess I can find nothing in any writer of the *first three centuries*, nor *any intimation* that they bore that name; and afterwards adds, concerning the whole argument, "I confess that these two instances, absolutely taken, affords us no convincing arguments in favour of a settled diocesan episcopacy, because there is nothing which proves they did or were to exercise these acts of government rather as *bishops* than as *evangelists*." It is true, it is due to candour to say, that the Dr. still supposes that Timothy and Titus were prelates, of which he thinks he finds evidence elsewhere. And finally, Bishop Croft and Bishop Stillingfleet both express the most decisive conviction that the testimony of the *Fathers* will not bear out the Episcopal claim; and evidently entertained the opinion that no particular form of Church government can be shown to rest on the foundation of *divine right*.

Mr. Brittan's assertion, in the Letter in which he treats of anti-episcopal testimonies, that the illustrious reformer Luther was an Episcopalian in sentiment; that he would have been glad, had it been possible, to establish prelacy in the Lutheran

Church; and that he did introduce superintendents into the body which he founded, "who had every thing of the Episcopal character but their consecration" is one of the most bare-faced impositions on public credulity that ever was stated. We have no doubt that there is something altogether deceptive in the scraps which he professes to quote from the writings of that reformer, which if they were examined in their connexion, would be found to speak a very different language. But as he has given us no clew by which we can find them, we cannot, at present, make the examination. We do not, however, by any means charge Mr. Brittan with designed imposition in this matter. He has followed either dishonest or ignorant guides, and suffered himself to be made the dupe of his credulity. The following quotations will at once explain and confirm our meaning.

Luther, in his treatise "*De Abroganda Missa Privata*," remarking on *Titus* i. 5, makes the following decisive remarks: "Here, if we believe that the Spirit of Christ spake and directed by Paul, we must acknowledge that it is a *divine appointment*, that in every city there be a *plurality of bishops*, or at least *one*. It is manifest also, that *by the same divine authority*, he makes *Presbyters* and *Bishops* to be *one and the same thing*; for he says the Presbyters are to be ordained in every city, if any can be found who are blameless, because a bishop ought to be blameless."\*

Again, in his treatise entitled "*Adversus Falso Nominatum Ordinem Episcoporum*," expounding the same passage of Scripture, we find him employing the following decisive language: "Paul writes to Titus that he should ordain elders in every city. Here, I think no one can deny that the apostle represents *bishops* and *elders* as *signifying the same thing*. Since he commands Titus to ordain elders in every city, and because a bishop ought to be blameless, he calls an elder by the same title.

"It is therefore plain what Paul means by the term *bishop*, viz. a man eminently good and upright, of proper age, who hath a virtuous wife and children, in subjection in the fear of God. He wills such an one to preside over the congregation, in the ministry of the word, and the administration of the sacraments. Is there any one who attends to these words of the apostle, together with those which precede and follow, so hardened as to deny this sense of them, or to pervert them to another meaning?"†

\* *Lutheri Oper.* Tom. ii.

† *Tom.* ii. p. 342. In fact, the scope of the whole treatise from which this extract is made, is to show that the office of *bishop*, as a distinct and pre-eminent order, is altogether unscriptural. He speaks strongly and zealously against the doctrine that *bishops* are an order above pastors, as a *Popish* error.

In another part of the same work he thus speaks: "But let us hear Paul concerning this divine ordination. For Luke in the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, writes concerning it in this manner. *From Melitus, having sent messengers to Ephesus, he collected the elders of the church, to whom, when they had come to him, he thus said—Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, &c.* But what new thing is this? Is Paul insane? Ephesus was but a single city; and yet Paul openly calls all the presbyters, or elders, by the common style of *bishops*. But perhaps Paul had never read the legends, the miserably patched up fables, and the sacred decretals of the Papists; for how otherwise would he have dared to place a plurality of bishops over one city, and to denominate all the *presbyters* of that one city, *bishops*; when they were not all prelates, nor supported a train of dependants and pack-horses, but were poor and humble men. But to be serious; you see plainly that the apostle Paul calls those alone bishops, who *preach the Gospel to the people, and administer the sacraments*, as in our times parish ministers and preachers are wont to do. These, therefore, though they preach the Gospel in small villages and hamlets, yet, as faithful ministers of the word, I believe, beyond all doubt, possess of right the title and name of bishop."\*

A little after, in the same work, in a commentary on *Philip. i. 1*, he says, "Behold Paul, speaking of Philippi, which was a single city, salutes all the believers, together with the *bishops*. These were, beyond all doubt, the Presbyters, whom he had been wont to appoint in every city. This is now the third instance in the writings of Paul, in which we see what God, and the Holy Spirit hath appointed, viz. that those *alone* truly and *of right*, are to be called *bishops*, who have the *care of a flock* in the ministry of the word, the care of the poor, and the administration of the sacraments, as is the case with *parish ministers* in our age."

In the same work, commenting on *1 Peter v. 1*, he says, "Here you see that Peter, in the same manner as Paul had done, uses the terms presbyter and bishop to signify the same thing. He represents those as bishops, who teach the people, and preach the word of God; and he makes them *all of equal power*, and forbids them to conduct themselves as if they were lords, or to indulge a spirit of domination over their flocks. He calls himself a *fellow-presbyter*, plainly teaching by this expression that *all parish ministers* and *bishops of cities* were of equal author-

\* *Tom. ii. p. 344, 345.*

ity among themselves; that in what pertained to the office of *bishop*, no one could claim *any authority over another*, having no more power in his own city than others had in theirs, or than every one of them had in his own congregation.”\*

Finally; in his commentary on 1 *Peter* v. 1, he expresses himself thus: “The word *Presbyter* signifies *Elder*. It has the same meaning as the term *Senators*, that is, men who, on account of their age, prudence, and experience, bear sway in society. In the same manner Christ calls his ministers and his senate, whose duty it is to administer spiritual government, to preach the word, and to watch over the Church, he calls them *Elders*. Wherefore, let it not surprise you if this name is *now* very differently applied; for of those who are *at present* called by this name, *the Scriptures say nothing*. Therefore banish the present order of things from your eyes, and you will be able to conceive of the fact as it was. When Peter, or either of the other apostles, came to any city where there were Christians, out of the number he chose one or more aged men, of blameless lives, who had wives and children, and were well acquainted with the Scriptures, to be set over the rest. These were called *Presbyters*, that is *Elders*, whom both Peter and Paul also style *Bishops*, that we may know that *bishops* and *presbyters* were *the same*.†

With the *sentiments* of Luther, thus expressed, which no candid reader can mistake, his *practice* uniformly coincided. He was ordained a *Presbyter* in the Romish Church in 1507, ten years before he commenced the work of Reformation; and he never received any other ordination or consecration. Yet he ordained ministers freely and frequently, and never doubted his right to do so. Nay, a few hours before his death, on the last Sabbath that he lived, when he was exceedingly feeble, and expected soon to appear before his Almighty Judge, his friend and biographer *Justus Jonas* tells us “he ordained two ministers of the word of God, after the apostles’ manner.” And even when one of the *superintendents* of his church was to be inducted into office, Luther, it would appear, *alone*, set him apart to his new office.

It is true, Luther did, in 1530, say *something like* what Mr. Brittan has ascribed to him. He said concerning the Popish bishops, “We assure them that, if they will in future tolerate our doctrine, and abstain from persecuting, and seeking to exterminate us, they shall suffer no loss of their jurisdiction from *us*. We aspire at no episcopal or any other dignity: we only desire to be Christians, whose condition ought to be a despised and af-

\* *Tom.* ii. p. 346.† LUTHERI, *Oper.* Tom. v. p. 481.

flicted one.”\* In the same manner Melancthon, in the spirit of indiscreet concession, declared in a note prefixed to his subscription to the articles of *Smalcald*, “I approve the foregoing articles as pious and Christian. As for the *Pope*, my opinion is, that if he would admit the Gospel, he might, for the peace and common tranquillity of Christians, who are, or shall hereafter be under him, *be allowed by us that superiority over the bishops which he otherwise enjoys by human right.*” Yet no one in his senses, who knows any thing of the history and writings of Melancthon, would consider him, for a moment, as friendly to the pope’s supremacy. The whole is to be considered as an occasional, but inconsistent concession. So it was in the case of Luther. He expressed himself, in 1530, in the conceding language just quoted. But three years afterwards, (1533) when he re-published his work on “private masses,” he expressly advocates the *parity of ministers by divine right*, and observes that “though, for the sake of peace, they had been willing at Augsburgh, to assign ordination to the bishops; yet this offer would not be repeated.” Of all this, we have no doubt that Mr. Brittan was entirely ignorant. Were it otherwise, we could not avoid regarding his statement with sentiments much more unfavourable than those of astonishment!

When Mr. Brittan tells his readers that the office of *Superintendent* as established by Luther, “had every thing of the Episcopal character but their consecration,” he manifests a want of knowledge of that office equally disreputable to himself and his diocesan; to *himself*, for undertaking to write on a subject which he did not understand; and to his *diocesan*, for allowing a blunder of this kind to be addressed to him, and afterwards printed, and subsequently to reach a second edition, without being corrected.

The truth is, the *Seniors*, or *Superintendents*, established by Luther, differed essentially in a variety of respects from *Bishops*, as that term is understood by prelatists. To mention but one point of difference, which, in fact, includes all. The function of *ordaining* was not *confined* to them. Nay, it was not necessary that a superintendent should *be present* at an ordination. It might proceed just as well without him as with him. Even in Sweden and Denmark, where the Lutheran Superintendents take the name of *Bishops*, this fact also exists. They are not the *only* or the *necessary* ordainers. And, to crown all, the most accredited writings, and the symbolical books of the Lutherans, from Luther to the present day, uniformly represent this office

\* *Melchior Adam*, i. 161. *Seckendorf*, ii. 192.

as resting entirely on the ground of *human prudence*, and that the identity of Bishop and Presbyter was the primitive and apostolic plan.

So much for Mr. B.'s statement concerning Luther. A more gross abuse of public credulity hardly ever occurred. But we do not accuse him of knowingly departing from historical verity. We have no doubt that it was a sin of ignorance.

Further examples might be given, from the same letter, of shameful misrepresentations; not, we are sure, intended, but arising from a deplorable want of information; but we must hasten to consider some other of the lucubrations of this superficial and confident neophyte.

In representing Episcopacy as "sustained by the testimony of the Fathers," which is the subject of his *fifth* letter, Mr. B. has laid himself open to strictures, a few of which (for to notice them all would require a discussion more than equal in extent to his whole volume) we shall attempt to exhibit in a very cursory manner.

The Rev. Dr. Bowden, of New York, some five and twenty years ago, in his Letters to Dr. Miller, on the Episcopal controversy, excited some attention among serious and thinking people by the *manner in which he arranged his testimony* in favour of Episcopacy. Instead of *beginning* with the SCRIPTURES, as the primary rule in every thing, and the only infallible one, he *began with the Fathers*, as if afraid to enter on an examination of the word of God, without having the mind so pre-occupied and biased by the language of the Fathers, as to lean naturally to a prelatical interpretation of every thing. Nor was he content even with this. As if he were afraid of examining the testimony of the Fathers *in their natural order*, beginning with those nearest to the apostolic age, and proceeding to those more remote from that age, he directly *inverted that order*; began with the Fathers of the fourth century; argued and traced authorities *backward*; assumed the principles and the language of the fourth century as truly scriptural; and then employed them to interpret the language of the earlier Fathers; thus endeavouring to make his readers believe that the order of the Church was *precisely the same* in the *fourth* that it had been in the *first* century; and, of course, that the words *bishop*, *eldèr*, and *deacon* were titles of exactly the same import in the days of *Jerome*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, and *Basil*, that they had been in the days of the apostles. This artful procedure was noticed by many at that time, besides Presbyterians, as by no means an example of that direct and candid policy which is always the best. Mr. Brittan seems to have been greatly smitten with the

wisdom of this plan. He has servilely adopted it; and, no doubt, considered it as a master stroke in ecclesiastical tactics. The argument from *Scripture* he postpones to the very close of the discussion, intending, we presume, in his *a posteriori* march, to bring his readers to the New Testament deeply imbued with prelatical prepossessions and phraseology, and ready to take for granted that the apostolical writings could not possibly contradict those records, which, though really of long *later date*, he had made to PRECEDE THE BIBLE IN ORDER AND IN INFLUENCE! The bare statement of this fact is enough for reflecting readers. We leave it without one word of comment, excepting to say, that we do hope, in time to come, that new converts to the prelatical ranks will wait at least a few months, if not years, before they undertake to turn preachers and writers on this delicate controversy. If they would consent to "tarry at Jericho until their beards be grown," they might possibly do more credit to their cause, and find less reason for subsequent regret and self-reproach.

In arranging the testimony of the Fathers, Mr. Brittan, like his file-leader, Dr. Bowden, begins with *Jerome*. He arrays, with much parade some seven or eight quotations from that father, which he considers as speaking a language decisively prelatical; just as if every intelligent reader did not know that prelacy is acknowledged on all hands to have existed in the days of Jerome, who flourished in the first quarter of the fifth century, dying about the year 420. Of course, when he wrote about the state of things which *then existed*, every one would expect him to speak the language, and refer to the facts of his day. But has our author produced one quotation from Jerome which represents prelacy as a divine appointment, or as resting on apostolical authority? He has not, nor can he do it. We have never found such a passage in all his works. Accordingly, bishop Stillingfleet declares, (*Irenicum*, part ii. ch. 6,) "Among all the fifteen testimonies produced by a learned writer out of Jerome, for the superiority of bishops above presbyters, I cannot find one that does found it upon *divine right*; but only on the *convenience* of such an order for the peace and unity of the Church." This is, undoubtedly, a true verdict. So much, then, for the testimony produced with so much confidence from this learned father.

But why did Mr. Brittan so carefully withhold from his readers some OTHER testimony of a very different character from Jerome, which he must have known to exist, and which has led some of the most learned Episcopal writers that ever lived, to consider that father as a most formidable opponent of the divine right of prelacy? Why did he not give his

readers *more* of Jerome's epistle to Evagrius, as well as some pithy extracts from his commentary on the epistle to Titus? In those passages Jerome expressly declares that *in the beginning* bishop and presbyter were the *very same*; that the superiority of bishops to presbyters came in (*paulatim*) by little and little; that disorders in the Church, and ambition among the clergy gave rise to it; and that, although it then existed, yet that bishops ought to know that they were above presbyters more *by the custom of the Church*, than by any *real appointment of Jesus Christ*. This is a plain and perfectly unexaggerated statement of Jerome's testimony. He *no where* speaks of Episcopacy, in the prelatial sense of the word, as a divine institution; and when he undertakes to speak of its *real origin*, he explicitly declares that it came in *gradually*, and more by the *custom of the Church*, than by the *authority of Christ*. This Mr. Brittan knew; or else he is more grossly ignorant of the controversy than even *we* suppose him to be. Why did he conceal it? Why did he vaunt this father as a decisive and unquestionable witness in his favour? We have seldom seen a more strange example of unfairness and infatuation.

This view of the testimony of Jerome is not a Presbyterian perversion or prejudice. So he has been understood for centuries by the great mass of the most learned prelatists, both Popish and Protestant. Bishop Jewel, Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Bilson, Professor Whitaker, Bishop Stillingfleet, Bishop Croft, Dr. William Nichols, and scores of other eminent Episcopal writers, with one consent tell us, that Jerome agreed with Aerius; and that his avowed object is to show that Episcopacy is a *human* not a *divine* institution. It may not be improper also to state, that even the truly learned and able advocate of Episcopacy, the celebrated Hooker, after giving that gloss of Jerome's testimony which is not uncommon among high-toned prelatists, in order to make it speak more in their favour than its natural interpretation will admit, adds the following remarkable words: "This answer to St. Jerome seemeth dangerous; I have qualified it as I may by addition of some words of restraint; yet I satisfy not myself; in my judgment it would be altered." There seems to be no rational interpretation of these words of Hooker but that which represents him as meaning to say, that, although he adopted, and thought proper to present the usual gloss, he was by no means satisfied with it.

That our interpretation of the judgment of Jerome is correct, there is a fair presumption arising from the testimony of contemporary writers, who unequivocally testify to the same amount. Hilary, (sometimes called Ambrose,) who wrote about the year

376, has the following passage in his commentary on *Ephes.* iv. 2, "After that churches were planted in all places, and officers ordained, matters were settled *otherwise than they were in the beginning*. And hence it is, that the apostles' writings *do not in all things agree with the present constitution of the Church*; because they were written under the first rise of the Church: *for he calls Timothy, who was ordained a PRESBYTER by him, a BISHOP, for so at first the Presbyters were called*; among whom this was the course of governing churches, that as one withdrew another took his place: and in Egypt, at, present, the Presbyters ordain (or *consecrate, consignant*) in the bishop's absence. But because the following Presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the first place, the method was *changed*, the council providing that not *order* but *merit* should create a bishop." If language CAN express the idea of a *change*, brought in *after the apostles' days*, and by *human prudence and authority*, here it is undoubtedly stated.

Augustine, in writing to Jerome, conveys most distinctly the same idea. "I entreat you," says he, "to correct me faithfully when you see I need it: for although, according to *the names of honour which the CUSTOM OF THE CHURCH has now brought into use*, the office of *bishop* is greater than that of *presbyter*, nevertheless, in many respects, Augustine is inferior to Jerome." *Oper. Tom. ii. Epist. 19, ad Hieron.*

It may not be amiss to state, that this construction of Augustine is not confined to Presbyterians. Bishop Jewel, in the "Defence" of his "Apology for the Church of England," quotes the passage just cited, in order to show the original identity of bishop and presbyter, and translates it thus: "The office of a bishop is above that of a priest, not by the authority of the Scriptures, but after the names of honour which the *custom of the Church* hath now introduced." *Defence*, p. 122, 123.

Of the same general idea, Chrysostom, with all his prelatical claims, gives a very significant intimation. In speaking on the same subject, he expresses himself thus: "Having spoken of *bishops*, and described them, declaring both what they ought to possess, and from what they ought to abstain, omitting the order *presbyters*, Paul passes on to the *deacons*. But why is this? Because *between bishop and presbyter there is not much difference*; for these also in like manner have had committed to them both the *instruction and government* of the Church; and what things he has said concerning *bishops*, the same also he intended for *presbyters*; for they have *gained the ascendancy over them only in respect to ordination, and of this they seem to have defrauded* (*πλεονεξτειν*) the presbyters." *In Epist.*

*ad Tim. Hom. ii.* This passage is very significant. The eloquent father distinctly conveys the idea, not only that *ordination* was the only point concerning which they had gained the ascendancy over Presbyters; but that they had gained this by *fraudulent means*. This is, undoubtedly, the idea conveyed by the word *κλεονεκτησιν*. See 1 *Thessalonians*, iv. 6. *That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter.* And also 2 *Cor.* vii. 2. *Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have defrauded no man.* See also 2 *Cor.* ii. 11. *Lest Satan should get an advantage of us.* See further, 2 *Cor.* xii. 17, 18. *Did I make a gain of you, &c.? Did Titus make a gain of you?* In all these places the same word is employed, and very plainly conveys the idea of taking a *fraudulent advantage*,—*gaining more than one has a right to.*

It is not our intention to enter, in the present article, into the general examination of the testimony of the Fathers in reference to prelacy. We will venture, however, fearlessly to assert, that there is not to be found in all the writings of the Fathers of the *first two hundred years after Christ*, one sentence which so much as *intimates* that *Bishops*, as an order above *Presbyters* who laboured in the word and doctrine, had any existence during that period; nor a single sentence within the first *three hundred*, we believe we might say *four hundred years*, after Christ, which gives the least intimation that prelacy was *an appointment of Jesus Christ*. The assertion with which we so frequently meet in Episcopal writers, that the Fathers clearly, unanimously, and decisively declare in their favour, is an assertion so destitute of truth, that we are very sure nothing but the blindest prejudice could allow any honest, intelligent man to make it. Nor is this the opinion of Presbyterians only. Bishop Herbert Croft, in his work entitled "*Naked Truth*," after a considerable induction of the articles of evidence usually produced by the advocates of prelacy, expresses himself thus, "I hope my readers will now see what weak proofs are brought for this distinction and superiority of order. No Scripture; no primitive general council; no general consent of primitive doctors and fathers; no, not *one* primitive father of note speaking particularly and home to their purpose." *Naked Truth*, p. 47.

In the notice which he takes of the testimony of *Ignatius*, Mr. Brittan assails Dr. Miller in the following language:

"Still less was I pleased with the Letters of a learned Presbyterian Professor on the same side of the question. They appear to me to be written so ungraciously—to manifest such an overweening conceit of self—to be characterized with such an air of pedantry—to enforce the "dieta" of their author with such an *ex cathedra* tone—to abound with so many subterfuges—to present such mutilated, garbled quo-

tations from the fathers—in a word, to be so replete with Jesuitical “*finesse*,” that I could not but feel disgust at the exhibition. Whatever may be the state of my head I trust I have an honest heart; I was early taught to despise duplicity; and hope I almost instinctively revolt from it; but when I find this author, because it would serve his turn against Episcopalians, denouncing the shorter Epistles of Ignatius as spurious productions; and, at the same time, in another book which lay before me, found the same man, because it would serve his purpose against the Unitarians, vindicating the very same Epistles of Ignatius as genuine, I say, when I saw this, I felt that he could hardly claim my confidence; I could not repress the risings of honest indignation. If this be not verifying the old fable of blowing hot and cold with the same mouth, what is it? I was convinced that, whatever powers of reasoning he might possess, he was deficient in that candour and consistency which would alone command my respect; that, however I might view him as a subtle and wily sophist, I ought not to regard him as a sound and honest reasoner.” p. 19.

A little onward, in canvassing the testimony of Ignatius, he gives vent to his feelings against the Professor at Princeton in the following language:—

“The testimony of Dr. Miller, yes, of that very Dr. Miller, who, when writing against the Episcopalians, said, *that the shorter Epistles of Ignatius were unworthy of confidence as the genuine works of the father whose name they bear, is the opinion of many of the ablest judges in the Protestant world.* The same person, “Eheu, quantum mutatus ab illo!” in writing subsequently against the Unitarians, and wishing to urge the sentiments of the same father against them, says in words as follow: “*The great body of learned men consider the smaller Epistles of Ignatius as, in the main, the real works of the writer whose name they bear.*” Thus his real opinion has been wrung from him, if indeed, such an opinion, given under such circumstances, be of any importance at all.” p. 66.

And again, in his concluding letter, as if unwilling to lose another chance of pouring out his ire against this gentleman, who really seems very much to discompose his temper, he finally discharges his bile in the following form:—

“If of the writings of one individual I have spoken in terms which may to some appear too strong, allow me to say, I have of him no personal knowledge, and, consequently, entertain towards him no personal ill-will. I never heard his name till I became acquainted with his writings. But when I saw such unfairness in his quotations, such gross misrepresentations of historical facts, such needless vituperations of his opponents, (who seemed to me to be writing with warmth, yet not without courtesousness) that by this “*ruse de guerre*,” he might awaken the sympathy of his Presbyterian readers, of whom he knew not one in a hundred would ever read the opposite party’s statements, I confess I felt it my duty to speak plainly upon the subject. If Moses felt indignant at witnessing the misconduct of Aaron in the matter of the golden calf; if a greater than he expressed a similar feeling at the desecration of the temple; if Protestants all join in expressions of indignation at the impositions of the Romish clergy, which have been called “*pious frauds*,” then I cannot think I have acted unchristianly, in speaking in the softest terms which honesty would allow, of one who, if he be a learned man, should never have so represented facts; or, if he be not, should not so dogmatically have pretended to be master of the subject.” p. 132, 133.

The coarse and ungentlemanly character of some of this language, involving a direct charge of *dishonesty*, and evidently

*intended* to injure moral character, we pass over without remark, excepting to observe, that, notwithstanding the charge of “needless vituperation” brought against Dr. Miller by our author, we have searched in vain in all that gentleman’s replies to his numerous and fierce assailants, for any sentence half so worthy of censure, on the score of vituperation, as more than one of those which we have just cited. The man and the cause are worthy of compassion which find it necessary to resort to such weapons.

As to the charge against Dr. Miller of speaking of the Epistles of Ignatius on two different occasions, in what our author is pleased to pronounce directly opposite language, it is evidently founded on a total want of acquaintance with the history of those Epistles, and their posture before the literary and ecclesiastical public. We shall not trouble our readers with this history at present, especially as our purpose is to take an early opportunity of giving it somewhat at large. We shall now only state enough to justify what we suppose to have been Dr. Miller’s meaning in these two seemingly opposite, but perfectly reconcilable representations.

That the Epistles of Ignatius have been corrupted, that is grossly interpolated, has been the opinion, for nearly two hundred years, of the great mass of Protestant divines, and, among the rest, of some of the most learned Episcopal writers who have expressed a judgment on the subject. This interpolation, however, is generally supposed to have been *chiefly*, if not solely directed to the undue exaltation of the BISHOP’S OFFICE. We do not at present recollect to have met with a single writer of reputation who charged them with having been corrupted *as to our Lord’s divinity*, in other words, as to the points in controversy with *Unitarians*, as such. In short, our views of this matter are precisely expressed by a zealous Episcopalian, who writes in the “Christian Observer,” of London, and who expresses himself thus: “In these Epistles we have the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons marshalled with unseasonable exactness, and repeated with importunate anxiety. There appear, moreover, so many symptoms of contrivance, and such studied uniformity of expression, that these compositions will surely not be alleged by any *capable* and *candid* advocate for primitive Episcopacy, without great hesitation; by many they will be *entirely rejected*. I do not mean to insinuate that the whole of these Epistles is a forgery. On the contrary, many parts of them afford strong internal evidence of their own genuineness: but with respect to the particular passages which affect the present (the Episcopal) dispute, *there is not a single passage which I would venture to allege. The language at the earliest, is that of the fourth century.*” Christian Observer ii. 723.

We are very willing to adopt as our own the language of this writer. We do not doubt that Ignatius wrote a number of Epistles. We do not doubt that the "Shorter Epistles" are, *substantially*, the work of that father. We should not scruple to quote what they contain concerning the leading doctrines of the Gospel, confiding that, "*in the main*," as to these points, they may be considered as the real productions of the venerable man whose name they bear. But in what he writes respecting bishops and presbyters, we think, with the Episcopal writer just quoted, that there are so many marks of corrupt, unseasonable, and fulsome interpolation, that we could not venture to cite, as legitimate testimony, a single sentence.

The same view of the subject seems to have been taken by Professor Neander, an illustrious Lutheran, of Berlin, probably the most accurately learned Christian antiquary now living. While he pronounces that the Epistles of Ignatius "have *certainly* been interpolated IN FAVOUR OF THE HIERARCHY," yet, on *other subjects*, he appeals to them without reserve, as affording safe testimony. *Hist. of the Christian Religion, and Church*, I. p. 199.

Now, we presume that this was the view taken of the subject by Dr. Miller. If so, where, we ask, is the inconsistency between the two judgments which he delivers? We should be perfectly willing to adopt them both, in the connexion in which they were delivered respectively, and make them our own, precisely as they stand. Of this view of the subject, however, it is probable that Mr. Brittan was entirely ignorant. Of course, we are more disposed to pity than to upbraid him; and think that for this he ought to be "beaten with few stripes." But while we bring no imputation against his *honesty*, the account of his *presumption* and *folly* in writing with so much oracular confidence on a subject which, it would appear, he had but recently begun to study, he must adjust as he can. After all, Presbyterians have no fear of the Epistles of Ignatius. Our author seems to think that if their authenticity be acknowledged, his cause is gained. No such thing. Let any thinking man take those Epistles into his hands, and read them from beginning to end, keeping in his mind the *Bishop, Elders, and Deacons* which are found in every regularly constituted and furnished Presbyterian Church; and, if he be not blinded by prejudice, he will perceive that *all* the language of the venerable father applies to our system as perfectly as to any other; and that *some* of it cannot possibly apply to any other than *parochial*, or, in other words, *Presbyterian* Episcopacy.

The extent which our remarks have unwarily reached, forbid

our entering further into the testimony of the other fathers. We may take up this branch of the controversy before long, more at large. In the mean while, we will say, that if any enlightened, impartial reader will take up the New Testament and give it, in reference to this controversy, a serious and attentive perusal; and then go on with the fathers, *in order*, from *Clemens Romanus* to *Augustine*, he will be amazed to find how little is said at all, (out of the Epistles of Ignatius,) in reference to this subject; and how complete is the evidence that prelacy was brought into the Church, *gradually*, within the first four hundred years, *by human ambition*.

Mr. Brittan's *sixth* Letter is on "Episcopacy sustained by Scripture." This stands *at the close* in his array of proof. We shall not again recur to the *strangeness of this order* for a *Protestant*, excepting to say, that we leave it to the judgment of reflecting readers.

Our remarks on the scriptural branch of the testimony shall be short. We must again defer to a future occasion more extended strictures. Suffice it to say, that Mr. B., treading in the steps of his predecessors, asserts with confidence, as facts taught in Scripture, that Episcopal prelates succeed the apostles in their peculiar pre-eminence and authority as such; that Timothy was sent to Ephesus, and Titus to Crete, as prelatial bishops, and that this alone gave them power to ordain elders in the churches to which they were sent; that in the ordination of Timothy as a prelate, the hands of Paul *only* were imposed upon him; that there were already Elders in the churches of Ephesus and Crete, who might have ordained, on Presbyterian principles, without the interposition of Timothy and Titus; that Timothy and Titus, in their ordinations, acted *alone*; and that the "angels" of the seven churches of Asia, mentioned in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse, were undoubtedly diocesan bishops. Now, we will venture to say, that all these alleged facts are *gratuitously* alleged. He has not produced even plausible proof of one of them, nor can he produce it. The apostles were extraordinary officers. Their inspiration, and their miraculous powers marked this so distinctly and unequivocally as to preclude the necessity of other proof. They were to the primitive Church, while they lived, (at which time the New Testament was not yet collected into a volume) what the New Testament is to us; the unerring counsellors and guide of the Christian community. In this pre-eminence they had, and could have no successors. While in the ordinary office of the ministry, all were their successors who were commissioned to preach the Gospel, administer the sacraments, and govern the Church.

There is not a hint, we will be bold to say, in the whole New Testament which holds forth any thing further, or other than this. As to Timothy and Titus, the whole argument founded on them by our Episcopal brethren, is a mere and a most bare-faced begging of the whole question in dispute. They first *assume* that none but prelates can ordain, and *then* infer that Timothy and Titus being sent on an important ordaining and arranging mission, must have been, of course, prelates! But this, every one sees, is precisely the question in controversy. Why they might not have gone, and done all that they did as Presbyterian *evangelists*, no mortal can tell, except by saying that such a supposition would be contrary to the Episcopal system, and *therefore* cannot be true! Mr. Brittan too, in assuming as he does with so much confidence, that there were Presbyters already ordained at Ephesus and Crete, before Timothy and Titus went thither, who might, on Presbyterian principles, have ordained others, without the aid of those special missionaries, has not a shadow of Scripture to sustain him, and is opposed by archbishop Potter, and some other of the very highest Episcopal authorities. It is in the highest degree probable that there were no such Presbyters already there. Neither can he prove that either Timothy or Titus ever ordained a single Elder *alone*. We know, from the inspired history, that *Mark* was with Timothy, and *Zenas* and *Apollos* with Titus. Who can tell that *they* did not officiate as co-ordainers in every investiture with sacred office? Once more; Mr. B.'s assumption is equally gratuitous that the apocalyptic angels were diocesan bishops. There is not a word in the sacred volume which renders it probable; and several of the most eminently learned Episcopal divines, as before stated, have decisively rejected the supposition. In short, Mr. Brittan and his friends, with one accord, acknowledge that the term Bishop, as used in the New Testament, does not mean a prelate, but is a title applied to all ministers empowered to preach and administer sacraments, and having pastoral charges. They have never yet produced a shadow of proof that the apostles, when they withdrew from the Church, left in office any ministers of higher power than these Scripture bishops. And all their confident assertions to the contrary are absolutely nothing less than imposition on the credulity of the public. We call for PROOF, even *probable* proof—that any one of the leading facts which they allege on this subject, and which they advance with so much confidence, is a real, supported fact. They never *have* yet produced it, and they never *can* produce it. But we must postpone to another opportunity this whole argument. Our limits will not allow us to pursue it at present.

Mr. Brittan is very fond of using the term *Dissenter*, to designate all the non-episcopal professors of religion in the United States. He very gravely tells us in a note (p. 21,) that "he has LEARNED, *since his arrival in this country*, that *here* the application of the word to those who differ from the Episcopal Church is objected to; but that he has naturally adopted a mode of speech familiar to him from long habit, and has deemed it best to retain it." Really we should have thought that a man of common intelligence might have "learned," even while in England, that in ecclesiastical language, the word "dissenter" can only be used with propriety as correlate with an established Church. We can assure Mr. B., however, that his use of this term gives not the least offence to us. It only puts us in mind of the ludicrous habit of an illiterate Englishman, with whom we fell in many years ago, who had been so long accustomed to a cap-in-hand servility in approaching the noblemen of his native land, that he could never accost any respectable gentleman without saying "My Lord," and "your Lordship;" and though often reminded that there were no orders of nobility in this country, and that his mode of address was not only improper, but superlatively ridiculous, he could never be cured of his harmless but contemptible habit to the end of life.

We should be glad to make some remarks on the remaining three Letters, which afford quite as much matter for animadversion as those which we have examined. But the limits to which we are confined compel us here to take leave of our author. We can assure our readers, however, that on the subject of Liturgies he is quite as uninformed, superficial, and deceptive a guide as we have shown him to be in other matters.

---

ART. V.—*Remarks on Independence of Thought, addressed to Candidates for the Ministry.*

AMONG the many definitions given of man, to distinguish him from other animals, some have thought few more free from objection than that which defines him to be a *thinking animal*. But if it be intended by this that he is a being who originates thoughts of his own, and gives to them a shape, track, or course before unknown, we are all aware, that is inapplicable as a definition, to the mass of men. To a few in every age, men of invention, men of genius, men of penetrant minds, it will apply; but