

should not, in the circumstances, have been confirmed from apostolic language, such as is found in Rom. 2nd chap., or II. Thess. 1st.

It is, however, from the second part of the sermon that we most decidedly dissent. Why does not Dr. Patton bring his statements under this head also to the test of "the word and the testimony?" Is it "because there is no light in them?" or is it from a consciousness that though he may find a *shadow* (only a shadow) of evidence amidst the dimness of the third and fourth centuries; even that will disappear before the light of Scripture? The stale and oft-repeated argument about the three orders: in the Jewish Church, high priest, priest, Levite; in Christ's time, Christ, disciples, seventy disciples; thereafter of apostles, bishops, and deacons; and now bishops, priests, and deacons—is paraded *as if Scriptural*; while the preacher utterly ignores the typical character of the Jewish dispensation, and does not consider the blasphemous implication, that Bishops now take the place (which apostles never claimed) of High Priest between God and man. The mere external coincidence of number misleads a prejudiced mind, so that it cannot see the spiritual difference between Christ the Head and only High Priest between God and man, and prelates of our day.

Again he says:—"The Apostles were, under Christ, the spiritual rulers or overseers of the Church. So great was their dignity, so extensive their labors, so abundantly blessed in the conversion of vast multitudes to the faith, that as one of their number testifieth, 'The Church was built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone;' " as if these were the characteristics which made Apostles the foundation of the Christian Church. They were *inspired* men, who had seen the Lord, endowed with miraculous gifts, and appointed for the special purpose of *founding* the Church. And it is just because the Bishop of Niagara, notwithstanding that Dr. Strachan said to him, (as seems to us, foolishly,) "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands," is not inspired; has not seen the Lord and been commissioned by Him; has no apostolic gifts of the Holy Ghost; and is not sent forth to *found* the Church; that we decline to recognize him as a successor of the apostles, or as "having permanent superiority and ruling power over other ministers of the word and sacraments.

After referring to Tim. and Titus, the preacher goes on to say: "In addition to this scriptural testimony, we might, did time permit, abundantly prove from the earliest records of primitive Christianity, from the testimony of such illustrious confessors and martyrs as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Ireneus, and others, that wherever the Gospel was preached, throughout the whole of the then known world, the Church everywhere possessed the same three-fold order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, the former of whom were everywhere recognized as the spiritual rulers, and the direct successors in that office of the Holy Apostles." Our answer simply is, that while such vague assertions may mislead, they cannot convince any thinking man. They may bolster up assertions, they are no evidence. When Dr. Patton or any other goes to the fathers mentioned above, (not to Hooker's quotations) and makes a definite statement, it will be time enough to try to disprove it, as can be done *ex abundante*. Meanwhile we only give our contrary assertion, to the effect that even through these fathers it can only be shown, that *after the apostolic age* the Churches, from prudential considerations, adopted a separate order of Prelatic Bishops. This, however, is not *apostolic* fellowship. But we lay no stress on this. We say with Dr. Patton, "to the word and the testimony," and there we firmly take our position, though *all the fathers*