

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY AN
ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN IN PRINCETON,
AND ITS VICINITY.

JANUARY 1830

Philadelphia:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
JAMES KAY, JUN & CO LIBRARY, NEAR FIFTH STREET.

SOLE AGENTS BY
TOWNE & D. W. HOLLAND, 253 MARKET ST.

Price \$3 a year, in advance.

1830.

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY, AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

FOR JANUARY 1830.

REVIEW ON THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF
THE SECOND ADVENT.

The Second Advent; or, the Glorious Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being an attempt to elucidate, in Chronological Order, the Prophecies both of the Old and New Testament which relate to that Event. By the Rev. John Fry, B.A. Rector of Desford, in Leicestershire. London, 2 vols, 8vo, 1822.

[The conductors of the Biblical Repertory and Theological Review do not desire to make the work the vehicle exclusively of their own opinions, but are desirous of extending to their correspondents the liberty of advocating their own sentiments, reserving to themselves the right of deciding how far the opinions advanced can, with propriety, through their instrumentality, be presented to the public. They are, therefore, not to be considered as adopting the views presented by the author of the article on the Second Advent. As the subject, however, is one of interest, and has long been a matter of public discussion in England, it is probable our readers will be glad to see an exhibition of the

An Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination.
By John Esten Cooke, M.D. Lexington. 8vo. Pp.
244. 1829.

Here is a new advocate of high-church principles, who has started up in Kentucky; and an advocate certainly not at all deficient either in zeal or confidence. Of "John Esten Cooke, M.D." we never heard before the appearance of this volume; and now we know nothing concerning him but what he discloses of himself in the first pages of his book. From these we learn, that for more than eighteen years he was a zealous member of the methodist church, actively and publicly engaged in promoting the interests of that denomination; that, by the perusal of a volume of sermons by a reverend gentleman of the name of Chapman, resident in Kentucky, a few months since, he was led to doubt of the validity of presbyterian ordination; that this induced him to peruse some other works on the same subject; that his inquiries terminated in a full conviction that ordination by presbyters is wholly invalid; and that this investigation was conducted with so much haste and urgency, that only *eight weeks* elapsed between the time in which he was a zealous, devoted, unwavering methodist, and that at which he sat down to write the book before us; in which he feels confident he has proved that the ordinations of the methodist and presbyterian churches are alike worthless, and prelatical episcopacy the only scriptural and valid form of ecclesiastical order.

That any man of sound and sober mind should act thus, and should be willing to publish such a story of himself, is indeed wonderful. It is true, a man's confidence in opinions which he has long and zealously maintained may be shaken, and even abandoned, in "eight weeks," or in a much shorter time. This no one will doubt. But that any one, in relation to a subject so extensive and so essentially involving a knowledge of early christian antiquity, should imagine that he was fully competent, in so short a time, not only to pronounce positively, but to turn author, and undertake the task of instructing the public in his new opinions, is one of those rare examples of weakness and presumption which must equally surprise and revolt all reflecting minds.

It cannot be denied, indeed, that Dr Cooke manifests

some talent in the work before us. He evidently thinks with a considerable degree of clearness and vigour, and expresses himself, for the most part, in a neat, perspicuous and sprightly style. Yet he writes like a man who has just acquired some smattering of the subject which he treats, but is confident that he has explored it to the bottom. He is flippant, audacious, and hardly willing to treat with respect the opinions of those, even on his own side, who happen not entirely to coincide with him. In short, in perusing the volume, we have twenty times thought of a remark of Dr Johnson, which we have somewhere met with, and which we quote from vague recollection. When it was observed to him that a certain lady had written very commendably on a particular subject,—“Why, yes, sir,” replied the caustic and unsparing critic, “the book is well enough; but she reminds me of a certain domestic quadruped, who is exhibited as standing and walking on his hind legs: the wonder is, not that he does it *pretty well*, but that he does it *at all*.”

Dr Cooke in this work thinks proper to select, as the principal object of his animadversion, the reverend Dr Miller, who, about twenty years ago, published two volumes of “Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry, addressed to the members of the Presbyterian Churches in the city of New York.” This gentleman he considers as the representative of presbyterianism; and seems to be very desirous of fastening upon him some heavy charges of *misrepresentation, want of fairness, &c.* With what success, the impartial reader must judge. In the mean time, he takes as his own guide the reverend Dr Bowden, who undertook, many years ago, to answer Dr Miller; implicitly follows his allegations; copies his mistakes; apes his confidence; and, under the cover of his erudition, with a little additional patch-work, endeavours to pass himself off as a profound ecclesiastical antiquary. Truly, it is not a little amusing to see how plausibly a convert of *eight weeks*, with the aid of a little modest assurance, can contrive to appear. We cannot undertake to predict how far Dr Miller may consider this redoubtable western assailant as demanding public notice. We should imagine, however, that he would hardly think it worth his while to enter the lists with so humble a retailer of what has been much better said by others, and quite as often refuted by the advocates of presbyterian parity, long before Dr Cooke,

or his file-leader, Dr Bowden, had an existence. It is very certain that we should never have thought of giving the present article a place in our miscellany, if we had not been informed that some humble admirers of our author, with as little acquaintance with the merits of the controversy as himself, have indulged themselves in uttering many a premature boast, that his work could not fail of proving fatal at least to Dr Miller's reputation, if not to presbyterianism.

Our author, like most of the body to which he has recently become an adherent, is evidently shy of making his primary or principal appeals to the Bible. He says not a little, indeed, of bishop Timothy, bishop Titus, bishop Barnabas, bishop Epaphroditus, &c. : but in no instance, so far as we recollect, does he find it convenient to bolster up the claims of these fancied prelates, without having recourse to uninspired aid to help out the scanty, and to his purpose, insufficient intimations of scripture. This mode of conducting his defence, we should think, cannot fail of making its appropriate impression on every candid mind. If prelacy had been an apostolical institution; and, above all, if the inspired apostles, like modern high-churchmen, had considered it as essential to the very *existence* of the church, or even to its *perfection*, it would, no doubt, have held a prominent place in every part of the New Testament. Whatever else was left in the shade, the bishop's character and claims would have been placed in a full and strong light. Now that this is acknowledged on all hands, by the most zealous prelatists, not to be the case, we may assume as proof sufficient that their view of the subject is erroneous. No rational man, we are very sure, can admit the idea, that a God of infinite wisdom and goodness, in giving to men a revelation for their instruction in divine things, would either pass in silence, or leave in obscurity, that which was essential to all the privileges and hopes of redeemed men; that without which there could be no church, no valid ordinances, no covenanted hope of mercy. To suppose that *such* a matter would be left in doubt, or liable to misapprehension, would, indeed, ill accord with the great purpose for which the Bible was given to men. Yet the learned high-churchman Dodwell, and his followers, grant that prelacy is not taught in the New Testament, because it did not *exist* until after the commencement of the *second century*. And if we are not deceived, the great mass of high-church writers, even those

who are most confident of being able to found upon divine right, with one voice concede that their favourite form of church government could not be established from *Scripture alone*; but that, in order to make it out, we must have recourse to the hints dropped by the *fathers* of the second, third and fourth centuries, and must take for granted that their views of prelacy corresponded with the facts of the apostolic age.

For our parts, were there no other facts unfavourable to the claims of prelacy, such as these would be decisive with us. We care not how soon after the close of the sacred canon this figment of clerical ambition appeared. If it is not clearly contained in the *Bible*, we will not receive it. And as long as we know, from historical records, that corruptions quite as improbable, and quite as likely to be resisted, did actually arise, and gain general prevalence in the church before the commencement of the third century, we can have no difficulty in believing that the innovation of which we speak first insinuated itself as expedient, next claimed to be indispensable to regularity, and finally became intrenched in all the solemnity of divine right, and in all the pomp of superstition and patronage.

We by no means intend to follow Dr Cooke through all the reasonings and authorities on which he appears to lay so much stress. This would be to write a volume larger than his own, a task as unnecessary as it would be unsuitable. A much shorter process will be sufficient for the writer in question. We propose nothing more than to give our readers a small specimen of the sophistry and unfounded assertions with which his book abounds; and to convince them how incompetent a guide he is, and how unworthy of confidence, in the field which he has with so little preparation undertaken to explore.

Dr Cooke repeats the thousandth time, with unabated confidence, but without the least addition of either argument or testimony, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, in the prelatial sense of the term, and that we have, of course, in this single fact, a decisive and uncontrollable proof that prelacy was of apostolical origin. Of this corner stone of the episcopal fabric Dr Miller had said, that when fairly drawn out in logical form, and exhibited in its utmost strength, it amounted to nothing more than the following syllogism—
“None but diocesan bishops, as a superior order of clergy,

have a right to ordain ministers and organize churches: but Timothy and Titus were sent to perform services of this kind: therefore Timothy and Titus were diocesan bishops." In this syllogism the major proposition, which asserts that none but bishops, as a superior order, can ordain, is taken for granted. But does not every one see that this is precisely the point to be proved? Until this fundamental proposition be first established, the whole argument is such as all logicians agree in stigmatizing as deceptive and worthless—a mere begging of the whole question in dispute."

We verily think, after all that Dr C. has said with so much positiveness and show of reasoning on this branch of the controversy, that Dr M.'s position, above stated, remains unshaken, nay, untouched. And our only wonder is, that a writer of so much natural shrewdness as Dr C. is not ashamed to multiply words on so plain a point. Surely that cause must be sadly lacking in solid support which can recur so frequently, and cleave so firmly, to testimony so perfectly fanciful and paltry!

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has been in the constant habit, for more than thirty years, of sending out missionaries to preach the gospel, ordain elders and deacons, and organize churches in the frontier settlements. For the performance of this work they are regularly authorized and commissioned under the direction of that judicatory, and receive instructions, in many respects similar to those given to Timothy and Titus. Now, suppose some ignorant ecclesiastical annalist, knowing this fact, and unacquainted with the constitution of our church, were to write thus in reference to the practice in question: "The general assembly, every year, sends forth ministers, whose duty it is to preach, ordain elders and deacons, and 'set in order what may be wanting' in parts of the country heretofore destitute of christian privileges and order; but these are duties to which none but prelatical bishops are competent; therefore, these presbyterian missionaries are, of course, all prelates." Every body sees, at once, that this would be a statement unsound in logic, and false in fact. Yet there is just as much reason for coming to this conclusion as for supposing that Timothy and Titus must have been prelates, because they were sent to Ephesus and Crete to perform similar work. It is as plain as the light of day, that they might have done all that they did upon strictly *presbyterian*

principles. We know not, indeed, that either Timothy or Titus ever ordained a single elder *alone*, as we think Dr Miller and others have often demonstrated. But even if this were granted, it would not alter the case. For, although it be admitted that, while a *single* minister of the presbyterian church may, and often does, ordain ruling elders and deacons, a *plurality* is required by the constitution of our church to ordain a teaching elder; yet this is regarded rather as a prudential rule than as a *divine law* of *necessary* obligation. There are presbyterian churches who consider the ordination of a pastor by a single pastor as valid, and act accordingly. So that, after all, under whatever aspect the mission of Timothy and Titus be viewed, there is no fact stated, or instruction given, or allusion made to those ministers of the gospel, in the whole New Testament, but what might have been exhibited just as it is, if they had gone to Ephesus and Crete as presbyterian evangelists, and had acted, while there, rigidly *upon presbyterian principles.* This may be regarded by those who take Dr C. for their guide as a strong assertion; but we make it with fearless confidence; and, although it has been, and may be again *denied*, we are very sure it can never be *refuted.*

In 1 *Timothy*, iv. 14, we find the following exhortation: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." And again, in 2 *Timothy*, i. 6, we find the following: "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." The common interpretation given of these two passages is, that they both relate to the same event, viz. the one *ordination* of Timothy; that on this occasion a body, or plurality, of presbyters were present and took a part in the transaction; and that the apostle himself *presided* as the head of the *presbytery.* Dr C. however, if we understand him, refuses to acquiesce in these views. He thinks that these passages refer to *two ordinations*, the first as *presbyter*, the second as *bishop.* That when the first epistle was written, Timothy had *consented* to become a bishop, but had not actually been made such; and, of course, that the *laying on of the hands of the presbytery* took place at his *first* ordination, as *presbyter*, a number of years before: And that he had, after this, and before the second epistle was

written, a second and higher ordination as *bishop*, in which Paul himself presided.

On these representations our *first* remark is, that they differ entirely from the opinions of the great majority of the most learned writers on Dr C.'s own side; and, we are persuaded, have not even a shadow of evidence on which to rest. And yet he asserts them with quite as much boldness and confidence as would become the most mature and profound master of the subject.

Our *second* remark is, that Dr Cooke's mode of exhibiting the prelacy of Timothy and Titus appears to us to be attended with difficulties, which we should think he could hardly have adequately considered, and which cannot fail to prostrate his whole theory.

For example, if Timothy had not been ordained a *bishop* at the time when the first epistle was addressed to him, but was only a *presbyter*, then what becomes of all the much-talked of and vaunted evidence which that epistle is said to contain, that he was actually invested with that office? The great body of writers on the side of Dr C. contend that the whole style of the epistle, the charges given, and the powers recognized in addressing Timothy, all plainly imply that he was already clothed with episcopal authority. This, however, so far as the first epistle is concerned, Dr C. appears to give up. This cannot be implied, according to him, in any thing that the epistle contains, for the young preacher was not *then*, in fact, clothed with any such power. And if the *first* epistle contains no internal evidence of the existence of any such power before *it* was written, we may, surely, with equal confidence, say the same of the *second*; for there is decisively *less* that looks like high ecclesiastical authority in the *second* than in the *first*. And thus Dr C. though he does not tell us so, in so many words, abandons for himself, and for all his partizans, this whole branch of evidence for the prelatival character of Timothy and Titus. We have long, indeed, thought that evidence perfectly worthless to the cause of the prelatists; but we did not expect so soon to see one of their number, who is certainly distinguished by *zeal*, if not by *knowledge*, unceremoniously take a stand which amounts to a virtual abandonment of this whole department of testimony. We doubt the *policy* of this. For humble as this branch of testimony is, and it is

very humble indeed, we think that prelacy can scarcely afford to part with it.

Another difficulty, upon Dr C.'s plan, here is worthy of notice. He is confident that the apostle in that injunction in 1 *Timothy*, 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," refers, not to Timothy's ordination as *bishop*, but to his first ordination as *presbyter*. Be it so. Timothy's ordination, then, as a presbyter, was performed *by a presbytery*; we read of no other ordainers. We do not forget, indeed, that Dr C. elsewhere contends that the expression "*with the laying on the hands of the presbytery*" merely implies the *assent* or *concurrence* of the presbytery, and not their real participation in the ordaining act, as an authoritative transaction; and that he considers Timothy as having been really and effectively ordained *by the laying on of Paul's hands*. But this cannot be. The reference to the *laying on of Paul's hands* is found in the *second* epistle, and not in the *first*; and refers, according to Dr C. not to the *first*, but to the *second* ordination, which he received as bishop. Unless, therefore, he is determined at all hazards to *take for granted*, without a shadow of evidence, that the *first* ordination for which he contends was performed, not by *the laying on of the hands of the presbytery*, but by the hands of Paul himself, and to assume it from the passages already quoted (and there are no others in the New Testament which speak of the subject at all) the discerning reader will be at no loss to see how far he is consistent with himself, or what his reasoning is worth. The truth is, so far as all that is said about Timothy and Titus by this writer has even the semblance of plausibility, it proceeds on a *petitio principii* throughout. This may be a very convenient method of reasoning with those who are but scantily provided with solid proofs; but its fairness, and especially its force, are quite other matters. Low as we had estimated Dr Cooke's acquaintance with the subject on which he undertook to write, we were hardly prepared to expect from him in so many instances such a barefaced resort to this mode of reasoning.

It is notorious that Timothy is no where called a bishop by Paul, in either of the epistles written to him; and even if he *had* been, it would have decided nothing, as it is granted on all hands that the titles bishop and presbyter were then

common, that is, interchangeably applied to the same office. But he is called an *evangelist*, that is, a minister of the word and sacraments, sent forth to preach, and organize churches in cities and regions destitute of such organizations. Nor is there a particle of evidence that we have ever seen, either in or out of the Bible, that he ever resided at Ephesus, in *any capacity*, for twelve months at a time. We hear of him in Lystra, in Phrygia, in Galatia, in Troas, in Macedonia, in Samothracia, in Neapolis, in Philippi, in Thessalonica, in Berea, in Athens, in Corinth, in Jerusalem, in Rome, back again in Thessalonica, &c.; so that we have nearly as good evidence that he was bishop of half a dozen other places as of Ephesus. As to Dr Cooke's assertion, repeatedly and confidently made, that we have satisfactory evidence that Timothy was *at least five years and a half* resident in Ephesus, it is not only made without proof, but is so diametrically contrary to the judgment of the best writers on the subject, episcopal as well as others, that we can find no apology for his reckless presumption but in his want of mature knowledge and reflection on the subject.

Accordingly, the manner in which Dr Whitby, a very able and learned divine of the church of England, speaks in reference to the cases of Timothy and Titus, is worthy of particular notice. In his preface to his Commentary on the Epistle to Titus, he expresses himself thus: "The great controversy concerning this, and the epistle to Timothy, is, whether Timothy and Titus were indeed made bishops, the one of Ephesus and the other of Crete. 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. To pass my judgment in this case, I assert that, if by saying Timothy and Titus were bishops, the one of Ephesus, the other of Crete, we understand that they took upon them those churches, or dioceses, as their fixed and peculiar charge, in which they were to preside for term of life, I believe Timothy and Titus were *not* thus bishops. For, first, both Timothy and Titus WERE EVANGELISTS, and therefore were *to do the work of an evangelist*. Now the work of an evangelist, saith Eusebius, was this—to lay the foundations of the faith in barbarous nations; to constitute them pastors; and having committed to them the cultivating of those new plantations, they passed on to other countries and nations. Secondly, as for Titus, he was only left in

Crete to ordain elders in every city, and to set in order the things that were wanting. Having, therefore, done that work, he had done all that was assigned to him in that station. As for Timothy, St Paul saith, he exhorted him to abide still in Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia. Now, as he writes to the church of Philippi in Macedonia, A.D. 62, and the ninth of Nero, that he hoped to be shortly with them, (*Philip.* i. 25, 26.—ii. 24), so, saith bishop Pearson, he went thither A.D. 64, and the eleventh of Nero, and writ his first epistle to him A.D. 65. Two years after this he sends for him to Rome, (*2 Tim.* iv. 9. 21), and there he continued, as *the ancients* CONJECTURE, till the martyrdom of St Paul: after which time he *must, as they suppose*, return to Ephesus. For they tell us that in the reign of Domitian he was martyred in that city, and lay buried there. But since WE READ NOT ANY THING IN SCRIPTURE of their return to either of these places afterwards, and the authorities on which this return dependeth *are not very ancient, we cannot rely much upon them.* Now I confess that these two instances, absolutely taken, afford us no convincing argument for a settled diocesan episcopacy, because there is nothing which proves they did, or were, to exercise these acts of government rather as *bishops* than *evangelists.*”

It is true, indeed, Dr Whitby, in other parts of the same preface, does express a decisive opinion that Timothy and Titus were, in fact, vested with prelatical powers, which he deduces—first, from the *acts* which they were sent to perform, and which (assuming the *petitio principii* argument before exposed) he insists none but prelates ought to perform; secondly, from the testimony of the *later fathers* of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, which, when thoroughly sifted, is found to be nothing to the purpose; and, thirdly, from the consideration, that the superiority which this office implies is “not *contrary* to the gospel rule,” and appears, on the whole, to be agreeable to the representations made respecting the government of the church in the times of the apostles. But as to the basis on which Dr Cooke places his proof of the prelacy of Timothy and Titus, Dr Whitby may be considered almost as much his adversary as Dr Miller.

In the same strain speaks Dr, afterwards bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Irenicum*, p. 340, 4to, 1661. “Such were evangelists who were sent, sometimes into this country, to put the churches in order there, sometimes into another; but

wherever they were they acted as evangelists, and not as fixed officers. And such were Timothy and Titus, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one who will take an impartial survey of the argument on both sides." We are aware, indeed, that the *Irenicum* of Stillingfleet is a work not in very good odour with high-churchmen. They allege that he wrote that work in early life, when both his judgment and his information were immature; that he afterward regretted and retracted the concessions which it contains; and that, although he does, in that work, explicitly give up the *divine right* of diocesan episcopacy, and acknowledge the validity of presbyterian ordination, yet that some of his subsequent writings were rather in a different strain. This is all true. It is undoubtedly a fact, that when he became a bishop, he discovered a disposition to make higher claims for that office than he did before the mitre was placed upon his head. But, after all, did he ever attempt to prove the main principles of his book false or erroneous? He certainly never did, in the opinion of the venerable Dr White, at present bishop of the protestant episcopal church in the state of Pennsylvania. This gentleman, in 1782, published a pamphlet, entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered;" the object of which was to show that it was not necessary to wait for the regular episcopal succession from England, to the imparting of which by the English bishops some serious obstacles had occurred; but that where ordination by bishops could not be had, that by presbyters was valid, and ought to be resorted to. In a short time, however, the obstacle which this pamphlet contemplated was removed, and the author was consecrated among the first bishops of the protestant episcopal churches in this country: an office which he has continued to occupy and to adorn for more than forty years. In the course of this pamphlet the bishop, having occasion to observe that there was a great difference between saying that there are three distinct orders of clergy in the church by *divine appointment*, and that there have been, *in fact*, three distinct orders from the times of the apostles, has the following note: "The same distinction is accurately drawn and fully proved by Stillingfleet in the '*Irenicum*.' But as that learned prelate was afterwards dissatisfied with his work (though most probably not with that part of it which would

have been to our purpose) it might seem uncandid to cite the authority of his *opinion*. Burnet, his contemporary and friend, says, (History of His Own Times, anno 1661), 'To avoid the imputation that book brought on him, he went into the humours of an high sort of people, beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things.' The book, however, was, it seems, easier *retracted* than *refuted*; for though offensive to many of both parties, it was managed (says the same author) with so much learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook to answer it." P. 24, 25.

But Dr Cooke's principal reliance for proving Timothy to have been bishop of Ephesus, is on the testimony of the fathers. In arraying this testimony, as Dr Whitby had said in his own case, Dr C. is unable to find the least shred pertaining to the *first three hundred years*, excepting a single line from a lost work of Polycrates, who lived toward the close of the second century, and which is quoted by Photius in his Bibliotheca, compiled in the *ninth century*. This extract is in the following words: "Timothy was ordained bishop of Ephesus by the great Paul." Now this extract is really nothing to the purpose. If Dr C. does not know *why*, it is because he does not understand the subject sufficiently to conduct or appreciate an argument upon it. Another extract to prove the same thing is from the commentary under the name of Ambrose, an ecclesiastic of the fourth century. That extract is in these words: "Being now ordained a bishop, Timothy was instructed by the epistle of Paul how to dispose and order the church of God." But Dr C. forgot, surely, in quoting this passage, that the very same writer has elsewhere made the following statement: "The writings of the apostle do not agree in every thing with the practice which is *now* in the church; for he calls Timothy, created by him a *presbyter*, *bishop*, because at first presbyters were called bishops." Here it is perfectly evident that the latter extract completely nullifies the former, and shows how this father is to be interpreted. If he had said, in the latter passage, that Timothy was ordained to an office which was called indifferently bishop and presbyter, his meaning might have been equivocal. Or, if he had said that the apostle calls Timothy, who was ordained by him a *bishop*, *presbyter*, for so, at first, the bishops were called, it would have looked still more like realizing the

claim here asserted. But, after referring, explicitly, to a change in the state of ecclesiastical arrangements between his own time and that of the apostle, he declares that Timothy, who was ordained a *presbyter*, was called bishop, because *at first* presbyters were so called. This is plainly saying that he was ordained a presbyter, in the distinctive and appropriate sense of that word, in the age of the writer, when the names had ceased to be common. Now Dr Cooke was aware of this second extract from Ambrose, for he quotes it, and largely comments upon it in another place. We really hope, for the sake of his candour, that he forgot it again, when he gravely borrowed from Dr Bowden the former extract as a conclusive testimony to Timothy's prelatical character. For nothing can be clearer than that the former extract, when viewed in the light of the latter, is so far from affording the least support to the episcopal claim, that it really and decisively disproves it.

Dr Cooke, in speaking (p. 41) of the elders of Ephesus, mentioned in *Acts* xx. 17. 28 as overseers, (in the original *bishops*), in his zeal to show that they could not have been bishops in *his* sense of the word, ventures to say, "To these elders there is not one word said about *ruling*; the sole charge to them being to *feed* the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, and to avoid teaching perverse doctrine, &c." We read this remark with the deepest astonishment. Why, no well informed reader will be at a loss to understand. The word here translated *feed*, is $\piοιμαζειν$. The radical word signifies a *shepherd*; and in all the derivatives this is the primary idea. It is so far from being true, then, that "not one word is said about *ruling*," that no one who is acquainted with the genuine import of this word as used, both in Scripture and by profane writers, can possibly doubt that guiding, controlling, *ruling* is the *main thing intended*. The principal business of a shepherd, besides *pasturing*, is to *watch, protect* and *govern* his flock. We beg Dr Cooke to look at the decisive use of this word in *Matt.* ii. 6, in *Rev.* ii. 27, in *Rev.* xii. 5, and also in *1 Peter* v. 2.

By far the larger portion of Dr C.'s book is taken up in exhibiting and commenting upon the testimony of the *fathers*. On this testimony he lays fundamental stress, and charges Dr Miller with great partiality and want of fairness in his mode of treating it. Indeed, when we first

read some of his allegations against Dr Miller in reference to this matter, we were somewhat startled, and did not know but that the general character for integrity and candour, which that gentleman has for many years quietly sustained, was about to be seriously undermined by this new assailant. But we had not proceeded far before our fears were all dismissed. Dr Cooke has accomplished nothing more than Dr Bowden had accomplished twenty years ago. He has generally followed in the train of that writer. Wherever he has ventured to deviate from him, he writes, for the most part weakly, often wildly, and always with an indication of immature knowledge. Whatever may be thought by some episcopal partizans, who are captivated by a sort of reckless flippancy and confidence, we are inclined to think that the intelligent and sober advocates of prelacy will not consider Dr C. as having given any new or valuable aid to their cause.

It is wonderful to observe with what familiarity and confidence Dr C. canvasses the writings of the fathers, pronounces on their contents and meaning, and animadverts on the conclusions of others respecting them which do not happen to hit his own fancy. For a student of these numerous and ponderous folios of Greek and Latin, of only a *few weeks* standing, this is surely very modest. On one occasion he expresses himself thus: "It is difficult to conceive, when we read such declarations as this of Dr Miller, respecting Jerome and Chrysostom, that he could have looked into the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret." A remark of this kind, concerning a man who has devoted the last forty years of his life exclusively to the study of theology and ecclesiastical antiquity, from the pen of a medical gentleman who has but recently, from his own statement, begun to attend to subjects of this nature; who has not read a tenth part of the books which he quotes; and is, manifestly, not capable of understanding them if he did, (not for want of natural capacity, but for want of that acquaintance with ecclesiastical language and facts which is indispensable to an intelligent reading of those volumes); such a remark, we say, coming from such a source, really strikes us as so superlatively ridiculous, that we scarcely know how to feel toward the author of it that respect which we always wish to feel and to manifest toward a decent opponent.

Dr Cooke complains very loudly that Dr Miller, after promising to give a fair specimen of the testimony of the fathers on the subject of prelacy, *left out* a number of strong passages, and even omitted some stronger against presbyterianism than any which he adduced. Those who are acquainted with Dr Miller's "Letters," know that they were intended to give a brief, familiar and popular view of the episcopal controversy to the congregation under his pastoral care; that they were published, not for the purpose of attacking or depressing episcopalians, but merely to put the people of his own charge on their guard against numerous publications, about the time of their date, which, like Dr Cooke's work, violently assailed presbyterianism; that they were intended to be comprised in a single small volume; and that within these narrow limits he undertook to discuss and present all the usual branches of the subject; that is, not only the whole testimony of the earlier and later fathers, but also that of Scripture; the early witnesses for the truth; the reformers; and the most distinguished divines of later times. In these circumstances, it is obvious to every reader of common sense that a *selection* merely, and even a *small selection* of the most pointed passages from the fathers, could have been reasonably expected; and also that, in making this selection out of the great mass of passages which learned writers have quoted, there was great room for diversity of judgment, as to the relative strength of each. We have taken the trouble to compare, in detail, the selection made by Dr Miller with *all* the additional passages which Dr Cooke seems to think are still more powerful on his side; and we have not met with a single instance in which there appeared to us to be any solid ground for the charge of important, and much less of unfair omission. It is true, passages were left out by Dr M. which Dr C. thinks exceedingly strong in his own favour; and clauses omitted, probably for the sole purpose of shortening paragraphs, which Dr C. is confident were kept out of view because they were felt to be decisive against presbyterianism. But after attending to the principal cases which Dr C. views and endeavours to represent in this light, we are constrained to decide as cool spectators and self-created umpires of the conflict, that in almost, if not quite, every instance, the omission evidently resulted from a more just, enlightened, and comprehensive view of the real import and

bearing of the passage than Dr C.'s very immature knowledge of the subject enabled him to take. To explain our meaning we will give a single example.

Dr Cooke, with no little insinuation, complains that Dr Miller, in giving some extracts from the third book of Irenæus against the heretics, omitted the following passages: "The blessed apostles, therefore, founding and instructing the church, delivered to Linus the bishopric, TO GOVERN THE CHURCH." And again, "By this ordination and succession, that tradition in the church which is from the apostles, and the doctrine of the truth, hath come even to us." As Irenæus wrote in Greek, and as we were not content with the Latin translation of these passages which Dr C. attempts (we have no doubt ignorantly) to palm upon his readers as the original, we immediately turned to a very excellent copy of the works of that father, which happened to be within our reach, to see whether the Greek original of the passages in question were preserved or lost. Of the first extract we found the last clause to be this: *Λινω την της επισκοπης λειτουργιαν ενεχειρισαν*; a literal translation of which is: "They (that is, the apostles) delivered to Linus the ministry (or service) of the bishopric." The word *λειτουργια* is a very general term, simply signifying *ministry* or *service*. It is applied to the official ministration of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist (*Luke* i. 23); to the ministration of charitable aid to the poor (*2 Cor.* ix. 12); to the kind support or sustenance granted to ministers (*Philipp.* ii. 30); and to the ceremonial service of the Jewish economy (*Heb.* ix. 21). Its plain and undoubted meaning in the place before us is *work*, or *function*; so that the whole clause "to govern the church" has been foisted in without a shadow of authority from the original.

In like manner, when we came to scrutinize the second extract in the Greek original, we found the only clause which comes into question here to stand thus: *Τη αυτη ταξει, και τη αυτη διδαχη, ητε απο των αποστολων εν τη εκκλησια παραδοσις, &c.* That is, "by this *institution* (or *appointment*) and instruction, that tradition in the church which is from the apostles," &c. Now, even if Dr. C.'s version of this passage were adopted, it would be of no use to him; for suppose it conceded that the christian doctrines and institutions had been handed down, in a certain church, through a succession of faithful pastors, what consequence detrimental to presbyterianism

would ensue? Suppose an ecclesiastical historian of Princeton, in the state of New Jersey, were to say that the presbyterian doctrines and order in that church had been handed down through the successive incumbencies of the reverend pastors Burr, Edwards, Davies, Finley, Witherspoon and Smith; could any thing favourable to prelacy be made out from such a record? But the translation which Dr C. has given is *not* correct, and cannot be adopted. The ordinary meaning of the words $\tau\alpha\zeta\iota\varsigma$ and $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta$ is very different from what he makes it, as any one will see by attending to the import of those words both *in* and *out* of the New Testament. And the simple meaning of the clause is, that by the appointment and instruction of the pastors mentioned in the foregoing sentences, the true tradition and doctrine of the church had come down to that time. Thus it is that these passages, when closely examined, are entirely divested of that prelatival power and significance which Dr C. has laboured to set forth by round assertion, and with the "pomp of capitals;" so that they really deserved no place among the strongest extracts usually produced by the partisans of prelacy from the writings of Irenæus. Dr Miller, we presume, knew this, and acted accordingly. Dr Cooke, we charitably believe, did *not* know it; and therefore, with all the eagerness and exultation into which those are apt to be betrayed who see with the eyes of other people, he reproaches where he had reason to applaud.

The truth is, we have not found one word in Irenæus which does not appear to us perfectly and easily reconcileable with presbyterian order. What though he speaks of bishops? Shall we never have done with the palpable sophistry of taking for granted that prelatival and not presbyterian bishops are intended? What though some of these bishops are spoken of as *appointed* by the apostles, and as the *successors* of the apostles? Assuming the doctrine of presbyterian parity, might not such a statement be just as true of such ministers as of prelates? For surely they may be *appointed*, and may *succeed* those who go before them, as well as bishops, in the modern sense of the word. What though *one man only* is represented as presiding at a time as bishop in Rome, and in other large and populous cities? Is Dr C. or his readers so ill informed as not to know that before the introduction of an American episcopate there was but one rector over all the episcopal churches in the city of New

York, embracing several large places of worship, several presbyters, and perhaps seven or eight thousand hearers? yet here was no bishop, in the prelatical sense of the word. Do they forget, or did they never know, that at this hour the protestant churches of France, though presbyterian, have a consistory in each large city or district, embracing a number of pastors, and in some cases many thousand communicants; and that over these they always have one of the senior pastors as president, who not only occupies the chair at their meetings, but is also the prominent organ for receiving all applications, convening all assemblies, and conducting all their ecclesiastical affairs? so that if the ministerial *succession* were traced through their presidents, as, for certain purposes, they might not improperly be, one name only would be mentioned as occupying this chair at a time, amidst, perhaps, ten or twelve colleagues. This is not only the organization of those churches *now*, but such, in substance, has it been since the reformation. Yet they have not now, and never had, prelatical bishops. And such might have been the practice of some of the churches in the days of Irenæus.

Dr Cooke remarks with no little severity on the testimony, as produced by Dr Miller from Ignatius. We verily think that his severity is as unjust as it is unceremonious. After the most impartial survey of the epistles of Ignatius that we can take, we are decisively of the opinion that the extracts from this father which Dr Miller produced may be considered as comprising a fair specimen of those, the aspect of which is most favourable to episcopacy; nor can we see that he has really perverted or misrepresented a single sentence from the celebrated epistles of that writer. In the instance of which Dr C. so far as we recollect, most loudly complains, the case appears to stand thus. The extract from Ignatius is fairly and exactly exhibited; stated almost precisely in the words which Dr C. himself employs. But it is Dr Miller's *commentary* on the extract which gives Dr C. so much offence; particularly his insisting that the bishop spoken of by Ignatius is represented as being always present with his people when they were assembled for public worship, and as being personally acquainted with his whole flock *byname*, not even overlooking the *servant men* and *maids*, &c. We nevertheless think that Dr M. was right in his interpretation of this passage, and of course, that Dr C. had no reason to be dissatisfied, excepting with the weakness of his own cause.

And, by the way, we should desire no better evidence than the epistles of Ignatius present, that the only episcopacy which existed in the age immediately after the apostles (the time in which that father lived) was *parochial*, and not *diocesan*; that is, that the only bishop then known was the pastor of a single parish or congregation. That there were several worshipping assemblies in this parish is not improbable: for *then* such public edifices as we now call churches were unknown. Christians were neither able nor permitted to erect them; and no doubt separated themselves for social worship into as many private houses, upper chambers, and even cellars and caves, as might be necessary for their reception and accommodation. Still, in each city or town they seem to have been considered as *one body*; to have had *one pastor*, with several assistants; to have communed together as often and as unitedly as possible; and to have been fond of considering themselves one church. That this principle was carried out into practice with different degrees of success and perfection, according to the numbers and local circumstances of these little christian communities respectively, and the degree of persecution they endured, we may not only conjecture to have been the case, but we have satisfactory evidence that it was really so. Yet the general plan seems to have been to consider all the christians in the same city or town as *one church*. And hence in all the epistles of Ignatius, as well as in contemporary and immediately subsequent writings, we see abundant evidence that the bishop spoken of is represented as *always present* with the people when assembled for worship; as having *one assembly* and *one altar* or *communion table* in his parish; as eating of *one loaf*, having *one prayer*, and, in a word, *uniting* in all the acts of solemn worship. Again, the bishop is represented in the same writings as not only *present* with *his flock* whenever they were convened, as *conducting their prayers* and presiding in all their public service, but also as the only administrator of *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*; as the only person by whom *marriages* were celebrated and *children catechised*; as bound to take cognizance of the relief of every *poor person* in his parish; and as called in duty to search out and know every individual in his flock *by name*, not overlooking even the *servant men* and *maids*. We cannot suppose it can enter into the imagination of any one that it is physically possible for services of this kind to be per-

formed by a diocesan bishop, with a number of congregations and presbyters under his care. The statement can agree only with the pastor of a single parish. As to the subterfuge to which Dr C. resorts, in order to evade the force of this representation, viz. that Mr John Wesley, while he had the whole Methodist body in England under his care, was able, in travelling over the whole kingdom, to have the name of every member, however humble, brought in writing under his notice, we think it utterly inapplicable to the case, and worthy of ridicule only.

Dr Cooke makes some remarks on Dr Miller's testimony from Hilary, (sometimes called Ambrose), which appear to require a passing notice. This testimony was mentioned in a preceding page, when Hilary was brought as a witness in behalf of the prelatical claims of Timothy and Titus; but it may not be improper to bring it into view again, to present it in a clearer light, and to divest it of some of the entanglements by which Dr Cooke has attempted to make it speak a language entirely different from that which its venerable author plainly intended. The extract from Hilary is as follows: "After churches were planted in all places, and officers ordained, matters were settled *otherwise than in the beginning*. And hence it is that the apostle's 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 created a *presbyter* by him, a *bishop*; for so, at first, presbyters were called: among whom this was the course of governing churches, that, as one withdrew, another took his place; and in *Egypt*; even at this day, the presbyters *ordain* 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."—(*Comment. on Ephes. iv. 2.*) In this form Dr Miller exhibited the testimony of Hilary. Of this exhibition Dr Cooke makes much and loud complaint. He complains, in particular, that in the extract, as given by Dr Miller, clauses are picked out from a long page of Hilary, detached from their proper connection, and made to speak a language which, properly understood, they ought not to be considered as speaking; and, especially, that the word translated *ordain*, has no reference to ordination whatever, but means entirely another thing.

We have carefully compared the extract as given by Dr Miller with that which is given at length by Dr Cooke, and we think not only that Dr C.'s complaints have no solid foundation, but that several of them are childish. It is true that Dr M. evidently, in order to avoid giving his readers the trouble of a long and tedious extract, a very large portion of which would have been wholly irrelevant, selected those parts which were to his purpose. But in doing this he certainly did no injustice to the connection and scope of the venerable father. Had he given *the whole*, he would, undoubtedly, have *confirmed* rather than *weakened* his own argument. Not a single sentence is perverted from its genuine meaning; and although the translation, as presented by Dr M. is, in one or two cases, what may be called free, yet we are persuaded it is, in no instance, chargeable with any departure from the spirit of the original. Of this perhaps a better example cannot be given than in reference to the clause: "And in *Egypt*, even at this day, the presbyters ordain in the bishop's absence." For although there are no words in the original which strictly answer to the English words *even at this day*, yet every intelligent and candid reader will perceive, at once, that the *scope* of the original calls for this rendering; that *consignant* is in the *present tense*, and that the whole reasoning of the author would be lost if the substance of Dr M.'s version were not adopted.

As to Dr M.'s rendering the word *consignant*, *ordain*, it is of no account whatever to his argument. Some very eminent episcopal writers, indeed, have adopted the same meaning. Yet he frankly acknowledges, in his second volume of "Letters;" (p. 215), that there is some uncertainty as to its proper rendering; but remarks as follows: "whatever religious rite it is that Hilary refers to, it is something which the bishops *in his day* generally claimed as their prerogative; but which had *not* been *always* appropriated to them; and which, even in his time, in the bishop's absence, the presbyters considered themselves as empowered to perform. This is sufficient for my purpose." We concur in this opinion; and also think that the explanation ought to have been sufficient for Dr Cooke.

Our readers must not suppose, from these decisive awards in Dr Miller's favour, that we are prepared to acquiesce in every tittle, both of authority and of reasoning, which he has advanced. Amidst so great a number of quotations from

different authors, ancient and modern, and of commentaries upon them, it would be strange indeed if his vigilance and caution, which are commonly so much on the alert, had never slumbered. We verily think that, in regard to all leading and important points, both his authorities and his arguments are impregnable; yet, in a few minor cases of both, we are free to say that, if we had been at his elbow, and had been consulted, we should have advised some omissions and some modifications. Still the articles which we could have wished altered are all of them trifling. They have not, in a single instance, an unfavourable bearing on any one material point in the controversy: and, what is remarkable, Dr Cooke has not happened to notice one of them; probably for the best of all reasons, that he had not sufficient acquaintance with the subject to perceive them.

The only remaining observations we have to offer respecting the testimony of the fathers on the subject of episcopacy, shall be in relation to the extracts adduced by Dr Miller from Jerome; concerning which Dr Cooke is of the opinion that great injustice has been done to that father, as well as to the public. We shall not so far trespass, either on the patience of our readers or on the pages of this work, as to detail at length the extracts usually adduced from Jerome by the friends of presbyterianism. Their amount is generally known. Their close and their quintessence is in these words: "Our intention in these remarks is to show, that among the ancients *presbyters and bishops were the very same*. But, *by little and little*, that the plants of dissensions might be plucked up, the whole concern was devolved upon an individual. As the presbyters, therefore, know that they are subjected *by the custom of the church* to him who is set over them, so let the bishops know that they are greater than presbyters *more by custom than by any real appointment of Christ*." This extract is taken from Jerome's Commentary on *Titus*, i. 5, and in his epistle to Evagrius he expressly maintains the same doctrine, quotes at length the same passages of Scripture in support of it, and comes to the same conclusion.

Dr Cooke, however, treading in the footsteps of Dr Bowden, deals out against Dr Miller charges of gross misrepresentation and perversion in the most unceremonious manner. We should be deeply surprised at these charges, did we not recollect how completely prejudice can blind the most intel-

ligent and upright minds; and did we not see so much evidence of Dr Cooke's repeating, almost by rote, even the frivolous objections and allegations of his guide. But we have not the least fear that any candid reader who understands Latin, and who has intelligence enough to comprehend the spirit and scope of Jerome's reasoning, will charge Dr Miller with the smallest misrepresentation or perversion of either. We have neither room nor inclination to examine in detail Dr C.'s twenty closely printed pages of cavil and protest against the simple and obvious meaning of Jerome. We shall make short work of it. We agree with Dr Miller, not only in his version of this father, but likewise in the substance of all his comments, for the following reasons:

The *first* is, that we find another passage in Jerome, which Dr Miller has not quoted, but which plainly corroborates his interpretation of that father. It is from his *epistles*, the 83d in order, directed to Oceanus, a presbyter, and is in these words:—"In utraque epistola, sive episcopi sive presbyteri (quanquam, APUD VETERES, IIDEM EPISCOPI ET PRESBYTERI fuerint) quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc ætatis; jubentur monogami in clerum elegi." Here the venerable father declares, as plainly as words can enable him, that in the primitive church (for the members of the primitive church were alone the *veteres* in his day) bishop and presbyter were THE SAME; that is, the same office, the one name being expressive of *dignity*, the other of *age*.

The *second* reason is, that it is impossible to represent Jerome as speaking otherwise than Dr Miller represents him, without making him weakly and inconsistently contradict himself. The whole scope of the passage extracted from his commentary, and the occasion, purpose, and reasoning of the epistle to Evagrius, all conspire to show that he *could not* have had any other meaning than that which presbyterians ascribe to him, and which episcopalians reject and resist. To suppose that he can mean any thing *else* is to make him talk idly, and to destroy all connection between his premises and his conclusion.

Our *third* reason is, that some of the greatest and best men in the christian church, nearly contemporary with Jerome, speak in substance the *same language*, and bear testimony to the *same fact*. Augustine, undoubtedly one of the greatest names in all uninspired antiquity, for the united characteristics of intelligence, learning and piety, writing

to Jerome himself, speaks thus:—"I entreat you 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*." Some episcopal writers, in trying to evade the force of Jerome's testimony, have said that he was a cynical, snarling man, who, perhaps, dissatisfied at not being a bishop himself, was rather disposed to depreciate that order. But here is an eminently pious and learned bishop speaking to the very same purpose. Is it conceivable that an ecclesiastic so conscientious, pious, and well informed as Augustine is universally allowed to have been, could have represented the office which he bore as a *titular distinction*, founded on the "*custom of the church*," if he had considered it as a divine appointment? To the same amount is the testimony of Chrysostom, whose distinguished eloquence and learning need no voucher. In speaking on the same subject he expresses himself in the following terms: "Having spoken of bishops, and described them, declaring both what they ought to possess, and from what they ought to abstain, omitting the order of 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 the *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 (πλεονεκτησιν) the presbyters." *In Epist. ad Tim. Hom. 11.* This passage needs no comment. If there be meaning in plain words, Chrysostom distinctly

* "Rogo, ut me fidenter corrigas, ubi mihi hoc opus esse perspexeris. Quamquam enim secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major sit; tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est.—*Oper. Tom. 2, Epist. 19, ad Hieron.* It is worthy of notice that this construction of Augustine is not confined to presbyterians. Bishop Jewel, in the "Defence" of his "Apology for the Church of England," adduces the passage above cited, in order to show the original identity of bishop and presbyter, and translates it thus: "The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest, not by authority of the Scriptures, but after the names of honour which the custom of the church hath now obtained."—*Defence, 122, 123.*

conveys the idea not only that *ordination* was the *only point* concerning which bishops had gained the precedence of presbyters, but that they had gained this by *fraudulent means*. This is the evident import of the word *πλεονεκτείν*. See 1 *Thessalonians*, iv. 6. *That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter, &c.* See also 2 *Cor.* vii. 2.—xii. 17, 18, where the same word is used. The same idea is unequivocally conveyed by Hilary, in a passage before quoted and commented upon, and which need not be here repeated; and also about the same time by Aerius, a presbyter of *Sebastia*, who undoubtedly maintained the doctrine that in the primitive church bishop and presbyter were the same, and that the pre-eminence of the bishop was a matter of subsequent and human introduction. This is not denied by prelatial writers; but they tell us, by way of offset, that Aerius was accounted a heretic on account of this opinion, and that, of course, his testimony cannot be admitted. There is no reason, however, for the opinion that he was reckoned a heretic for agreeing in sentiment with Jerome that bishop and presbyter were the same by divine right; but for going further, and insisting that the prelacy actually established in his day was *contrary* to apostolic usage, and ought to be abolished. Such is the judgment of Dr (afterwards bishop) Stillingfleet. "I believe, says he, upon the strictest inquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact were all of Aerius his judgment as to the identity of both the name and order of bishops and presbyters in the primitive church. But here lay the difference. Aerius proceeded from hence to separate from bishops and their churches, because they were bishops. Whereas Jerome, though he held the same doctrine, did not think it necessary to cause a schism in the church by separating from the bishops, for his opinion is clear, that the first institution of them was for preventing schism; and, therefore, for peace and unity he thought their institution very useful in the church of God."—*Irenicum*, chap. 4. The Rev. Dr Hawkes, also, the episcopal historian, speaks of the same witness for the truth in the following terms: "Aerius made a fiercer resistance, and maintained more offensive doctrines; that bishops and presbyters, in the Scripture, are the same persons, and only different descriptions of age and office; that prayers for the dead were futile, and hopes from their intercession vain; that stated

fasts and *festivals* had no prescription in the New Testament. These, with similar assertions, roused a host of enemies, and he was quickly silenced. So superstition stalked triumphant, and no man dared open his mouth against any abuses."—*Eccelesiastical History*, vol. i. p. 340.

Our *fourth* reason for believing that Dr Miller's interpretation of Jerome's testimony is entirely correct and faithful is, that it perfectly harmonizes with that of some of the most illustrious divines that ever adorned the church of England. Few divines are more famous in the early martyrology of the church of England than the celebrated John Lambert, who suffered death in the cause of truth at the commencement of the reformation in that country. He is represented, even by episcopal historians, as a man of great learning, meekness and piety. Toward the close of the reign of Henry VIII. when a contest between prelacy and presbytery was not thought of, he expressed himself thus: "As touching priesthood in the primitive church, when virtue bore the most sway, there were no more officers in the church than bishops and deacons, as witnesseth, besides Scripture, full apertly Jerome, in his commentary on St Paul's epistles, where he saith that those we call priests were *all one* and no other than *bishops*, and the *bishops no other than priests*." Bishop Jewel, who for his great talents, learning, piety and zeal for the church of England, was raised to the bishopric of Salisbury in a few months after the accession of queen Elizabeth to the throne, and who, of course, ranks with the venerable reformers of that church, interpreted Jerome exactly as presbyterians do, and adduces the same passages which are quoted by Dr Miller to show that that father asserted the original equality and identity of bishops and presbyters.—*Defence of his Apology*, p. 248.

Bishop Morton, in his "*Catholic Apology*," book i. p. 118. 120, interprets Jerome precisely in the same manner. He acknowledges that Jerome represents the difference between bishop and presbyter as brought into the church, not by DIVINE, but by HUMAN authority. He also asserts that there was no substantial difference on the subject of episcopacy between Jerome and Aerius; and he farther declares, that not only ALL THE PROTESTANTS, but also ALL THE PRIMITIVE DOCTORS were of the same mind with Jerome.

Dr Willet, a very eminent divine of the church of England, in the latter part of the reign of queen Elizabeth, in

his *Synopsis Papismi*, a large and learned work, dedicated to the queen, and professedly containing the doctrines of his church, expresses himself thus: "Of the difference between bishops and priests there are three opinions: the *first* of Aerius, who did hold that all ministers should be equal, and that a bishop *was not*, neither *ought to be*, superior to a priest. The *second* opinion is the other extreme of the papists, who would have not only a difference, but a princely pre-eminence of their bishops over the clergy, and *that by the word of God*. And they urge it to be *so necessary*, they are *no true churches* which receive not their pontifical hierarchy. The *third* opinion is between both; that although this distinction of bishops and priests, as it is now received, CANNOT BE PROVED OUT OF SCRIPTURE, yet it is very necessary for the policy of the church to avoid schisms, and to preserve it in unity. Of this judgment, bishop Jewel against Harding showeth both Chrysostom, Ambrose and Jerome to have been. Jerome thus writeth: "The apostle teaches evidently that bishops were the same, but that one was *afterwards* chosen to be set over the rest as a remedy against schism." To this opinion of St Jerome subscribeth bishop Jewel and another most reverend prelate of our own church, archbishop Whitgift." P. 273.

The learned episcopal divine, Dr Whitaker, regius professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge, also in the reign of queen Elizabeth, concerning whom bishop Hall said, "No man ever saw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder," expressly concurs in the same statement. "If Aerius," says he, "was a heretic in this point, he had Jerome to be his neighbour in that heresy; and not only him, but *other fathers*, both Greek and Latin, as is confessed by Medina. Aerius thought that presbyter did not differ from bishop by *any divine law* and authority; and the same thing was contended for by Jerome, and he defended it by those very Scripture testimonies that Aerius did."—*Controv. iv. Quest. i. Cap. iii. Sect. 30.*

Bishop Croft, a prelate of the church of England, who flourished in the reign of Charles II. expresses himself concerning Jerome in the following very explicit and pointed language: "And now I desire my reader, if he understands Latin, to view the epistle of St Jerome to Evagrius; and doubtless he will wonder to see men have the confidence to quote any thing out of it for the distinction between epis-

copacy and presbytery; for *the whole epistle is to show the identity of them.*—*Naked Truth*, p. 45. The very learned episcopal divine, Dr Adrian Saravia, canon of Canterbury, and the intimate friend and companion of the “judicious Hooker,” in his work, *De Gradibus Ministerii Evangelici*, cap. 23, pointedly acknowledges that Jerome was against the divine right of episcopacy. “Jerome’s opinion,” says he, “was private, and coincided with that of Aerius.” Dr William Nichols, a learned and zealous champion for episcopacy, speaks of Jerome in the following terms: “At last came St Jerome, though not till above three centuries after the apostles’ times, who, valuing himself upon his learning, which indeed was very great, and being provoked by the insolence of some deacons, who set themselves above presbyters, to the end he might maintain the dignity of his order against such arrogant persons, he advanced a notion never heard of before, viz. that presbyters were not a different order from bishops; and that a bishop was only a more eminent presbyter, chosen out of the rest, and set over them, for preventing of schism.”—*Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England*, p. 241. Bishop Bilson, a warm friend of prelacy, in his work against *seminaries*, book i. p. 318, also expressly quotes Jerome as teaching the doctrine which we ascribe to him, viz. that “bishops must understand that they are greater than presbyters rather *by custom* than *by the Lord’s appointment*; and that bishops came in *after* the apostles’ time.” Dr (afterwards bishop) Stillingsfleet, in his *Irenicum*, as every one knows, also argues in the most pointed and conclusive manner for that interpretation of Jerome which is adopted by Dr Miller. We will only add that, in the *Articles of Smalcald*, drawn up by the reformer Luther, and signed by himself, Melancthon, and many other eminent Lutheran divines; in the *Confession of Wirtemberg*, presented to the Council of Trent in 1552 as a specimen of Lutheran doctrine; in the *Second Helvetic Confession*, drawn up by the pastors of Zurich in 1566; as well as in other public and private documents, almost innumerable, the very same view is taken of Jerome’s doctrine in reference to prelacy which Dr Cooke considers and charges in Dr Miller as gross misrepresentation! We must really be excused for believing that Luther and Melancthon and Jewel and Willet and Whitgift and Morton and Bilson and Stillingsfleet, &c. were *at least* as

learned in christian antiquity, and *at least* as capable of interpreting a Latin paragraph, as our zealous champion of Lexington, of *eight weeks* growth.

We have only to notice two or three points in reference to this testimony of Jerome, which the remarks of Dr Cooke seem to render necessary.

The first is, that the presbyterian interpretation of this father cannot be correct, because Jerome represents the pre-eminence of one presbyter over another as occasioned by division and strife, and brought in as a remedy for them. He says it happened when professing christians, by the devil's instinct, were divided into parties, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*. Hence, says Dr C. it is evident that he dates episcopacy as early as the dispute at Corinth, recorded in *1 Cor. i. 12*, to which he manifestly alludes. This is an old subterfuge, which has been a hundred times urged and refuted. One consideration is enough to show its futility. It is that Jerome produces proof that bishop and presbyter were originally the same, from portions of the New Testament, which we know to have been written *many years after* the first epistle to the Corinthians. But this is not all. It is notorious that the language of the apostle in that epistle has been proverbially applied, and is daily so applied, to actual divisions in the church in all countries. To which may be added, that Jerome himself, in fact, applies the very same passage of Scripture to some disturbers of the church in the *fourth century*.

Another cavil is, that in the epistle to Evagrius, Jerome expresses himself thus:—"For even at Alexandria, from the evangelist Mark to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always chose one of their number, placed him in a higher station, and gave him the title of bishop." From this language Dr C. exults in the conclusion, that even according to Jerome, episcopacy, in the prelatical sense of the word, was introduced as early as the time of the evangelist Mark. This inference is not only without the least support from Jerome, but is directly contrary to his express averment. The plain import of his declaration is in perfect harmony with the other parts of his reasoning, and is to this amount, that in Alexandria, from the time of the evangelist Mark to the middle of the *third century*, there were no other bishops than such as the presbyters themselves constituted; that this

consisted in nothing more than choosing one of their own number their *chairman* or *moderator*, and calling him bishop, and for the sake of order and convenience investing him with special powers. The same thing is done every day, and has been done for centuries in the presbyterian church. One thing more respecting Jerome. Dr C. seriously charges Dr Miller with *inconsistency*, in declaring that he could only admit the testimony of the fathers of the *first two hundred years* after Christ, and yet afterwards making his appeal to Jerome, who lived toward the close of the *fourth century*. This charge would not have been made by any one who understood the subject in controversy. If prelacy was introduced *by little and little*, (*paulatim*), as Jerome declares; if it was more than *two centuries* in gaining an establishment; and if toward the close of the *third* century and beginning of the *fourth* it was pretty generally received; surely nothing could be more reasonable than that one who fully believed this, should decline receiving the testimony of the fathers who lived in the third and fourth centuries, when they relate what existed in their own day as proof of what existed in the apostolic age. But if a father of the fourth or fifth century, when prelacy is acknowledged on all hands to have prevailed, while he admitted this fact in the most unequivocal terms, at the same time should declare, in terms equally unequivocal, that it was not so from the beginning, but that impurity was *gradually* introduced *after the apostolic age*; would it be either unreasonable or inconsistent to listen to such a witness? Suppose Dr C. to be engaged in controversy with a zealous Romanist respecting the pope's supremacy. Would he be willing to receive as impartial and faithful witnesses any of the fathers who lived beyond the first three hundred years? Would he consent to make his appeal to those who lived after that monstrous usurpation had actually commenced its insidious course, and especially after it had gained, by the acknowledgement of all, a complete establishment? Not if he understood what he owed either to his cause or to his Master in heaven. Yet if he met with a learned and reputable writer in the eighth or ninth century, when the triumph of "the man of sin" was nearly universal, who testified that this triumph had no divine or apostolic warrant; that it was unknown in the purest and best ages of the church; and that it arose gradually, under the promptings of human ambition; would Dr C. refuse to

hear him because he happened to live beyond the limit of the first three centuries? But we will not waste another sentence in replying to an objection so perfectly nugatory.

Much as this article has been drawn out beyond our original intention, we cannot forbear adverting for a moment to the representation which Dr C. has given of the opinion of the venerable Calvin respecting episcopacy. We shall not repeat the long extract which he has made from Calvin's Institutes, book 4. chap. 4. sect. 2. But we boldly assert that he has *kept back* something which he ought to have connected with this extract; and that he totally *misapprehends*, and of course *misrepresents*, the scope of what he *has* given. The part *kept back* is toward the close of the section immediately preceding the extract on which he lays so much stress, and is in these words: "As we have stated that there are three kinds of ministers recommended to us in the Scripture, so the *ancient church* divided all the ministers it had into *three orders*. For from the order of presbyters they chose some for pastors and teachers; the *others* presided over the discipline and corrections. To the deacons was committed the care of the poor and the distribution of alms." Then, after a few lines, the object of which is to show that the young persons called acolyths and readers were not considered as officers at all, but only as training up for office, follows the extract which Dr C. has given. Now it is plain that the lines just quoted are so essentially connected with that extract, that its *real import* cannot be understood without them. In those lines Calvin tells us that the three orders of officers in the ancient church to which he refers were teaching elders, ruling elders, and deacons: that the first only ministered in *teaching*; and that to the deacons were committed *the care of the poor and the distribution of alms*; that is, that deacons, as such, were *not preachers*. It was surely very convenient to keep this passage out of view when Dr C. ventured to assert that Calvin fully admits the *main facts* contended for by episcopalians."

But we further maintain, that the gloss which Dr C. has put on the extract from Calvin which he gives, is a perversion of the declared sentiments of the illustrious reformer, so entire and shameful, that we are at a loss to frame an apology for it. Our meaning will be apparent by attending to the following facts: Calvin has three consecutive chapters in the fourth book of his Institutes, (the third, fourth and

fifth), in which he treats of the history of ecclesiastical government. In the first of these he treats of the truly *primitive* and *apostolic* order, which he represents as appointed by the will of Christ, and as the only proper model for the government of the church. This he pronounces to have been the presbyterian form. That is, that in every church there was a bishop or pastor, together with a bench of ruling elders, and deacons; and that all who were authorised to preach the gospel and administer sacraments sustained the highest ordinary office in the church, and were all equal in rank or order. In the next chapter (the fourth) he delineates the state of the "ancient church." By the "ancient church" he explicitly declares he means not the apostolic church, but that which arose some time after the apostles, and which continued until the rise of the papacy. His meaning in reference to this point is made sufficiently plain in the chapter itself, and, if possible, still more so in his letter to cardinal Sadolet. "Not," says he expressly, "not that form which the apostles appointed, which is the only model of a true church; but the *ancient church*, as it stood in the days of Chrysostom and Basil among the Greeks; and of Cyprian, Ambrose, &c. among the Latins." Now it is manifest that when Calvin speaks of the "ancient church" Dr Bowden, and his humble disciple Dr Cooke, suppose him to mean the primitive, apostolic church. But this is a total misrepresentation of his meaning. In this second stage of the history, Calvin says, there was a considerable departure from the apostolic plan; and this departure he represents as consisting, first, in one of the presbyters being made *chairman* or *president*, who had, as such, no new ordination or higher official rank, but was properly *primus inter pares*. To this man the title of bishop, which before had been common to all the presbyters, began now to be applied by way of eminence. With this Calvin finds no fault. Nay, he thinks it highly desirable, if not necessary; yet of *human*, not *divine* origin. Afterwards, however, he supposes that a departure still more serious and less defensible took place, which consisted in the bishop gradually grasping at more power, and after awhile being regarded as the only one competent to ordain. This he blames, and considers as having arisen from criminal ambition. And this robbing of the ordinary presbyters of their ordaining power he supposes was accompanied by another departure from the primitive model, viz.

depriving each church of its original right to elect its own bishop. This second stage he considers as having been gradually lost in the papacy, which entirely subverted the "ancient" form of government.

Thus Calvin expressly declares, that in his opinion the apostolic plan of church government was the presbyterian; that this is the only plan for which a divine appointment can be claimed; but that the seeds of prelacy were early sown, and went on gradually to grow and bring forth fruit, until the papacy gained an establishment. But through the greater part of the second stage he thinks ruling elders were retained in the church, and that deacons still continued to bear their primitive character, not as *preachers*, but as *almo-ners* and *guardians of the poor*. And, accordingly, in his letter to "cardinal Sadolet," and to "*a certain curate*," he expressly declares that the organization of the church in Geneva, which all the world knows was presbyterian, had been conducted in strict conformity with the apostolic model. In the latter epistle he has this remarkable declaration: "Nobody has yet appeared that could prove that we had altered *any one thing* which God has commanded, or that we have *appointed any new thing* contrary to his word; or that we have turned aside from the truth to follow any evil opinion. On the contrary, it is manifest that *we have reformed our church merely by God's word*, which is the ONLY RULE by which it is to be ordered, and can be lawfully defended. It is, indeed, an unpleasant work to alter what has been formerly in use, were it not that the order which God has once fixed must be esteemed by us as sacred and inviolable; insomuch that if it has for a time been laid aside, it must of necessity (and whatever the consequences may prove) be restored again. No antiquity; no prescription of custom, may be allowed to be an obstacle in this case, that the government of the church which God has appointed should not be perpetual, since the Lord himself has once fixed it."—*Epist. ad Quendam Curatum, in Calvin. Epist.* p. 386.

Accordingly, this venerable reformer, in his Commentary on *Philip.* i. 1, dated in 1541; in his Exposition of *Titus* i. 5, written in 1548; in his Commentary on 1 *Peter*, v. 1, written in 1551, and dedicated to Edward VI. of *England*; in his Commentary on the first epistle to *Timothy*, written in 1556, and dedicated to the duke of Somerset, lord pro-

tector of *England*; and in his Commentary on *Acts* xx. 28, written in 1560, a short time before his decease; in all these works, the composition of which was extended through so many years, whether addressing himself to monarchs, noblemen or the public, he speaks one language; and that is, to declare in the most decisive manner his firm belief that prelacy was a *human invention*; that the primitive form of church government was by ministers of the word, and sacraments, all of equal rank; together with ruling elders, for conducting the discipline of the church; and that a departure from this plan was a *corruption*.

As to the suggestion that Calvin and his brother reformers on the continent of Europe wished for prelacy, and excused themselves for not having it on the plea of *necessity*, it is too weak and incredible to be for a moment received by any thinking man who is acquainted with the lives and writings of those pious and faithful men. No one, we believe, has ever suspected either Luther or Calvin of being very plastic, pliable men, much less of compromising conscience, or trimming to the breeze of popular feeling. Wherein could any supposed *necessity* exist? Where was the *difficulty* of obtaining prelates, if they had chosen to have them? They might easily have been consecrated, in due form, either by the bishops in different parts of the continent who had abandoned the papacy and joined the protestants, or by sending to *England*. And if bishops had been thought of, or wished for, who in all protestant christendom would have been so certain of elevation to that office, in their respective denominations, as Luther and Calvin? Who was there to oppose them, or to be put in competition with them? The truth is, the suggestion that they yielded to *necessity* in arranging their forms of church government without prelates, is a suggestion so utterly unsupported by reasoning or fact, that it cannot fail to be discreditable either to the understanding or the candour of him who offers it.

But we are constrained to bring this long article to a close; not because we do not find matter enough for more extended animadversion; for the truth is, the greater part of Dr C.'s statements, and especially those on which he appears to place most confidence for discrediting Dr Miller and establishing prelacy, are quite as vulnerable as those which have been singled out: but because we fear that the patience of our readers will be exhausted, and that their estimate of the im-

portance of the work which we are reviewing, will scarcely bear us out in a more protracted notice. We shall, therefore, take leave of the subject, for the present, by asking a few questions, which we sincerely hope the good people of *Kentucky*, for whose special "use and behoof" Dr C. seems to have written, will ponder well before they accede to the high-church notions which this gentleman seems anxious to circulate among them.

1. The *first* question which we wish to ask is this: If the testimony, both from Scripture and from antiquity, in favour of the divine right of prelacy be so *unanimous*, so *demonstrable*, nay, so *unquestionable*, as Dr Cooke so often and so confidently declares it to be, how came it to pass that at the era of the reformation, *all* the protestant churches on the continent of *Europe*, *without one solitary exception*, gave up bishops, acknowledged them to be an order wholly unauthorized by Scripture, universally established presbyterial ordination among them, and to this day have no other? * While in *England* ALONE, where the reformation was chiefly conducted in its several stages by the monarch, the leading prelates, and a few of the nobility, the ecclesiastical arrangements were so made as to retain the bishops? Were the reformers more wise, more learned, or more pious in *England* than on the continent? Were they more deeply read in the *Bible* and in the early history of the church? This no one will pretend. Were Luther and Calvin and Melancthon and Zuingle and Bucer and Oecolampadius and Bullinger and Martyr and Musculus and Zanchius and

* It may be supposed by some that the Lutheran bishops in *Sweden* and *Denmark* are inconsistent with this statement. But this is by no means the case. There are no bishops in the whole Lutheran world, excepting those in the countries just named. Even *there*, those officers are scarcely more than nominal. Their having any pre-eminence by *divine right* is publicly and formally disclaimed. Their appointment is professedly a matter of *mere human authority and prudence*. And ordination is not confined to them; but proceeds just as readily and validly when no one who bears this name is present, as when he is. In short, their ordination is strictly presbyterian. The only question that can arise on this subject is concerning that small body called *Moravians* or *United Brethren*. But, even in reference to that pious and interesting people, it is notoriously true, that, whatever may have been the history of their episcopacy, (and this is by no means friendly to Dr C.'s claim), they with one voice represent it, not as a divine appointment, but as an expedient of *human prudence*.

Bugenhagius, and scores of other men, scarcely less illustrious for talents, erudition and fidelity, all blinded by prejudice, or all willing to betray their Master's cause? While they, in fact, differed about so many things, and did not scruple to differ where they could not see alike, how came they, when perfectly at liberty to establish what form of government they saw best, so marvellously to agree in maintaining the doctrine of *primitive parity* among ministers of the gospel? We must say that, if we were prelatists, this would be to us a most intractable and posing fact.

2. A *second* question which we should be glad to ask and have answered is,—How did it happen that not only *some*, but ALL the English reformers, and indeed the whole body of the ecclesiastical administration of that country, up to the close of the sixteenth century, and even up to a later period, but certainly to that time, maintained fellowship with the protestant churches on the continent of Europe, none of whom had any other than presbyterian ordination; acknowledged them by formal and official acts, as true churches of Christ; and publicly sanctioned their ordinations, by admitting to benefices in their church, ministers who had received their orders “beyond the seas?” Dr C. hints at this difficulty, but says nothing which bears the least semblance to a solution of it. No man in his senses can doubt that if the ecclesiastical rulers of England at that time had entertained the opinions which Dr C. labours to inculcate, they would have considered it much more safe and suitable to hold communion with the papists than with the continental protestants. Nay, with such opinions, they could not possibly, as honest men, have consented to any ecclesiastical intercourse with either the Lutherans or Calvinists of their day. The very fact, then, of their having actually and freely maintained such intercourse, affords proof little short of *demonstrative* that they held no such opinions. In other words, the illustrious founders of the reformed church of England *unanimously* differed from Dr C. in reference to the leading doctrine of his book.

3. A *third* question which we feel disposed to urge with earnestness is this:—Do we, in fact, find the subjects of church government, of ordination in a particular form, and of uninterrupted ecclesiastical succession, making the same figure, and urged as of equal importance in the New Testament, as in Dr C.'s book? According to the doctrine which

this gentleman adopts, and labours to inculcate, as we observed at the commencement of the present article, without episcopal ordination there can be no true ministry; no christian church; no valid sacraments; no communion of saints, either with one another, or with Christ the Head; no "covenanted mercy;" and, of course, no hope of salvation resting upon any divine promise or warrant. If all this be so, episcopacy is a VITAL MATTER. Now, we ask, does the Bible so represent it? In declaring the foundation of christian hope, and in describing the fellowship of those who are "called to be saints," and who are represented as being, all over the world, "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another," do the Scriptures really represent an uninterrupted succession of an episcopal "priesthood" as essential to the existence of the church; essential, of course, to communion with Christ; essential to all the authorized means and hopes of gospel blessing? When men are represented in the New Testament as inquiring "what they must do to be saved?" as in the prison at Philippi, at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, &c. what is the substance, invariably, of the answer given? Is it in harmony with Dr C.'s volume? Do Peter and Paul and Silas say "See, first of all, that you be united with an authorized priesthood; receive no ordinances but those which flow through the bishop's hands; separated from *him* you can have no hope?" Did their language on any occasion bear the least likeness to this?" No such thing. But repentance toward God, —faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, —love to God and man, —and holy obedience to the divine commandments, are the characteristics every where insisted on as decisive of christian character and hope. Now, we ask, not in the spirit of captiousness or cavil, but because, on Dr C.'s plan, we are unfeignedly at a loss for an answer, how could this be, if a prelatical priesthood is essential to "the body of Christ," and of course to all its most precious privileges? If Dr C. be right, the New Testament is calculated to deceive us. It is no longer a "light to our feet and a lamp to our path." For a large number of the most learned and pious episcopal writers themselves freely acknowledge that prelacy is not taught in the New Testament; and *all* (unless it be a very few "highly rectified spirits") confess that it cannot be fully made out from THE BIBLE ALONE, even as a *matter of fact*, and much less as a *divine injunction*. That is, in plain

terms, the Bible is not at all explicit in reference to that which is alleged to lie at the foundation of the visible church, and to be essential to the validity of all its ordinances! This may answer very well for papists, but for protestants, it is monstrous! For our part, though we are zealous presbyterians, and though we are very confident that this form of church government agrees far better with the Bible than any other, yet we should abhor the thought of making presbyterianism essential to the being of a church and of valid ordinances. We have no doubt that a man *may* be "born of God," *may* be a true penitent, and a true believer in Christ, and of course in covenant with God, under *any form of church order*; nay, though he never saw the face of a church officer in his life, and never had the opportunity of attending on any ordinance of the visible church. And we believe so, because it seems to us impossible to believe otherwise without taking some other guide than that word of God which is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

4. We will ask one question more. Are the members of episcopal churches in general found in fact *more* spiritual, *more* holy, *more* conformed to the example of Christ, than the mass of presbyterian, congregational, and other non-episcopal professing christians? This ought by no means to be considered as an invidious comparison. For let it be kept in mind that the fundamental principle of Dr C.'s system is, that there is no other church than the episcopal; and that, consequently, all who are not in communion with that body are entirely out of the church, "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise." The comparison, then, which our question contemplates, is not between one church and another, or a number of others, but between that which claims to be the **ONLY CHURCH**, and "the **WORLD** which lieth in wickedness." Surely it is neither unreasonable nor invidious to demand that there be more piety exhibited, that is, more of the christian spirit and practice *in* the church of Christ than *out* of it. To suppose that those who are in a state of habitual alienation from God, and rebellion against him, should be as humble, penitent, believing and obedient; as much distinguished for love to God and love to man as those who are "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," is to suppose that there is no profit in being in the

church rather than in the world; that Abbana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, are quite as good as *all the waters of Israel*. What then is the *fact*? Are the great mass of members of episcopal churches in our land *more* serious, devout, humble, prayerful and exemplary, than other professing christians; *less* "conformed to the world," *more* zealous for the cause of Christ, and *more* abundant in all works of righteousness? Are their societies found in a *higher degree* than any other to *attract* spiritual, zealous and engaged believers, and to *repel* the gay, the worldly and the openly irreligious? We bring no charge against our episcopal neighbours; we arrogate no superior excellence to ourselves. The great Searcher of hearts knows that we have no special reason for self-complacency, far less for boasting. We only say, that if episcopalians form the *only church* among us, and all others are *without*, they ought, upon every principle of reason and Scripture, to exhibit *more*, far *more* pure, elevated, consistent and devoted piety than *any other* class of religious professors. Is this, we ask again, the *FACT*? Let those who have the best opportunity of comparing the body of that church with other churches in our country, whom some of her members would deliver over to the "uncovenanted mercies of God," bear witness.

We shall here, for the present, take leave of the subject. It was with much reluctance, and constrained by a deep sense of duty, that we entered on the discussion. It is our earnest desire to live on the most amicable terms with our brethren of all denominations. We love peace; and especially in a day like this, when all the resources and energies of the christian church are put in requisition for purposes far more benign and holy than sectarian bickerings. The presbyterians in the United States never attacked their episcopal brethren; never in any one instance, as we believe, commenced a controversy with them; never called in question the validity of their orders or ministrations; never manifested the slightest disposition to draw away from them any who conscientiously preferred their government or worship. And we hope and believe that a great majority of that denomination in our country are disposed to reciprocate these feelings. But when, every now and then, such a volume as that now before us is cast forth, by one of those prelatists whom archbishop Wake calls "madmen;" and when, not content with this, its praises are trumpeted in

episcopal periodicals, and individuals attacked are called upon by name to come forth and speak in their own defence; when these things are done, we lament them; not because we have the slightest apprehension for the safety of presbyterianism; for we trust she will always have sons able and willing to come forward, in the name and strength of the King of Zion, to defend her; but because we are very sure that such conflicts among professing christians are not calculated to promote the best interests of vital piety in any denomination.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF PELAGIANISM.

With propriety the term militant has been applied to the church upon earth. No sooner was the light of truth sent down from heaven than it fell into interminable conflict with the darkness of error. And not only was it necessary to contend with the powers of darkness without the kingdom of Christ, but hideous forms of error were generated within the bosom of the church; according to the prophetic warning of our Saviour, "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing;" and that of the apostle Paul, in his solemn valedictory to the elders of Ephesus, "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Even while Paul lived the churches were exceedingly disturbed and distracted by false teachers, who brought in "another gospel," and endeavoured to overthrow from the foundation the doctrine of gratuitous justification by faith without works; and to substitute a legal system, according to which justification before God could be expected only from obedience to the ceremonial law of Moses. A large portion of the inspired writings of this apostle have direct reference to the opinions of these Judaizing heretics. Others arose in the church who denied the resurrection of the body, and maintained that all the resurrection to be expected was already past. They seem to