

bers xvi. as to "Korah and his company." This, indeed, is not original; most high churchmen exult in this example as death to Presbyterianism. It is an old saying, that a man may make "more haste than good speed." The breathless haste with which such writers appear to run to this passage for weapons against Presbyterianism, i. e., everything but high churchmen, may possibly be the reason of their blindness when they arrive at it. The rebellion of "Korah and his company" is analogous, say these gentlemen, "to the rebellion of Presbyters against Bishops."—Indeed! Now who were "Korah and his company." Who?—Who! Yes, Mr. Perceval, were they priests or laymen? What does this mean—"Seek ye the priesthood, also!" If they were priests, how could they seek the priesthood? Dathan and Abiram were Reubenites, and could not be priests. They none of them were priests at all! Fie! fie! ye Queen's Chaplains and Oxford Tract men, to trifle thus with the public mind! But your violation of truth will return upon your own heads. The case is plain enough, it was the Levites and the people rebelling against the priests, and not the priests against the high priest.

Mr. Perceval has the same sort of egrotous trifling about the false Apostles mentioned 2 Cor. xi. 12, and about Diotrefes, p. 28. He professes to bring these as Scripture grounds for Presbyterianism. Of course he would insinuate that Presbyterians urge them as such. However censurable this conduct may be in itself, yet possibly it may be excused in Mr. Perceval. He can believe things without evidence, why should he not go a step further in his opinion of Presbyterians, as he calls them, and persuade himself that they are foolish enough to suppose that an argument from false apostles and the ministers of Satan, will be found grounds for Presbyterianism: ministers being true apostles and ministers of God!! He just refers to the Angels of the Apocalypse. He does not, however, need to prove that these angels were prototypes of high church Bishops. His authority implying this is enough, and therefore he wisely spares all proof—proofs to some people are troublesome things.

At p. 26, the subject of the names of Bishops and Presbyters being used in common, is introduced. He acknowledges they were so "at the first, but have since been, by common usage, appropriated to distinct offices." Very well. Are we then to correct our Lord and his Apostles by common usage since those times? "But," says Mr. Perceval, "our Lord himself is sometimes designated as an Apostle, 1 Peter, ii. 25, sometimes as a Deacon, Rom. xv. 8. The Apostles are not only designated by that title, Luke vi. 13, but their office is called a deaconship, Acts i. 15, 25, and a bishoprick, Acts i. 20, and they themselves frequently styled Presbyters, 1 Peter, v. 1; 2 John i.; 3 John i.; and Deacons, 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6, and vi. 7. Again, the Pastors at Ephesus whom St. Paul addresses, are called indiscriminately Bishops and Presbyters, Acts xx. 17 and 28, and the same indiscriminate use of terms is observable in St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy and in that to Titus." All this we grant is true: but then are deacons as indiscriminately called Christ?—are Deacons as indiscriminately called Apostles, as Presbyters are indiscriminately called Bishops, and as Bishops indiscriminately called Presbyters? Mr. Perceval knows they are not. Then what solemn trifling is all this! The reader will see the subject further treated at p. 80—82, of the Essay. The names thus indiscriminately common between Bishops and Presbyters, inevitably prove that their powers were common, that they were one and the same office.

The following is the best piece of reasoning in the whole book, and therefore we will give it respectful attention. "But, say the Presbyterians, in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, he sends salutation to the Bishops and Deacons, Phil. i. 2, with no allusion to any other officer, therefore there were only these two instituted by the Apostles, and any thing beyond this is of human origin. Answer 1st. So do the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, uniformly designate the Jewish ministry as Priests and Levites, with no allusion to any other office; and a man might as well argue, that therefore, at that time, there was no superior office, no high priesthood among the Jews, as that there was no superior office, no chief episcopate, among the Christians

when St. Paul wrote," p. 27, 28. The reader is requested first to turn to pages 49, 50, 66, 67 and 77 of the Essay. Besides what is said in the above pages, especially the two points, 1st, that in case of the pollution of the high priest, a common priest was appointed to officiate for him, and 2nd, that all the ordination he had was necessarily by common priests, we further remark, that this above argument is really a fallacy. The fallacy is found in putting a part for the whole. We do not build our argument upon any one passage of the New Testament, but upon the whole. We say that there is no proof in the whole of the New Testament, not that there are no more than two orders of ministers of the gospel, for, by the New Testament, Deacons, as such, are not ministers of the gospel at all, but we say, there is no proof in the whole of the New Testament of more than one standing order of ministers of the gospel. To make the argument about the high priest, therefore, a just one, it must be assumed that there is no allusion in the whole of the Scriptures to any other office than that of priest in general. Let this be done, and we declare that, supposing the premises just, the conclusion would inevitably follow, that, by divine right, there was no really and essentially distinct office of the high priest above that of the priests in general. There is, however, frequent mention of the high priest in other parts of the Scriptures, though not by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

What Mr. Perceval says about the prophets so uniformly neglecting, with very few exceptions, to make any mention of the high priest, as distinguished from the other priests, is well worth attention. The writer has no quarrel with episcopacy, simply as such, yet the following particulars are remarkable. None of the prophets, excepting Zechariah, it seems, ever mention the high priest distinctly. How striking the difference between the sacred writers, and episcopalian writers: In the word of God, we have a series of inspired writers, addressing both church and state by the authority of God for centuries, and yet they never mention the high priest, but only as included among the priests and Levites, whilst episcopalian writers, addressing the church and state, seldom mention presbyters and deacons at all, but Bishops—Bishops—Bishops! No episcopalian dare professedly claim a higher authority over the other priests, yet, in very deed, they claim it yet times a higher authority. Where the prophets mention the high priest once, they mention bishops a thousand times. When the high priest was ceremonially incapable of duty, a common priest was considered capable of performing it for him, a thing impossible for a presbyter to do for a Bishop, according to high churchmen. The consecration of the high priest was always by ordinary priests, or by Moses, who was no priest according to the law, but the consecration of a bishop by presbyters, a thing which the Reformers maintained to be lawful by the word of God, our high churchmen consider as destroying Christianity itself! Mr. Perceval says that system is accused of Judaising, but the reader will see, that, on these points, Judaising was madness itself compared with such a system.

His observation about Timothy's being admitted by the Apostles to their own order, p. 29, is completely refuted in sect. 3 subsect. 4 of the Essay. We refer therefore to that place, and pass on.

Mr. Perceval tries to say something about the Apostle Paul's address to the presbyters or Bishops of the church of Ephesus, in Acts xx. 17, &c. His opinion is, that Timothy was with Paul at the time; that Paul had already committed the superintendance of these very pastors to Timothy, and that having Timothy with him, Paul gave "this pastoral charge to the pastors at (of) Ephesus, because their chief pastor Timothy" was with him on his journey, p. 30. All this is mere conjecture, and evidently contrary to the scope of the whole address. These presbyters are charged to "obey to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers or bishops; but, according to Mr. Perceval, this charge ought to have been given to Timothy; and Paul should have taught these presbyters that Timothy was the bishop to whom the Holy Ghost had committed the government of the flock, and of themselves also; and

that they should take heed to be obedient to his lordship Timothy. But other absurdities follow Mr. Perceval's interpretation. First, on this scheme there are the Bishops of Ephesus, this the sacred canon settles beyond dispute. Secondly, here is Timothy, a bishop of bishops, a thing utterly repugnant to the first ages of the church, so Cyprian and eighty-six other Bishops in Council declare. "Neque enim quicquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit—neither does any one among us constitute himself a bishop of bishops." They account it tyranny to attempt it. Thirdly, here is an Apostle making another grade of ministers. Now high churchmen contend only for three standing orders in the church, including Apostles as one, and Deacons as another. However, Mr. Perceval can multiply orders with a dash of his pen. Here, according to Mr. Perceval, would be, 1st, Deacons, 2nd, Presbyters, except he fully grants, which he does not, that bishops and presbyters were one and the same office in the Apostles' days, 3rd, Bishops, 4th, Timothy, a Bishop of Bishops, and, 5th, Apostles. Five standing orders of ministers of the gospel!

The Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy, as pleaded by presbyterians, next come under Mr. Perceval's examination. His first argument makes Timothy a bishop of bishops, the absurdities of which scheme have just been exhibited.

As to the presbyters who ordained Timothy, all he has to say is, that commentators of the fourth and following centuries say they were bishops. We say so too, because presbyters and bishops were then one and the same. Bishops are their successors; then it follows, that they are successors of scripture bishops only, and not of the twelve Apostles. But this conclusion has more unimpaired brethren would tremble to hear mentioned. However Chrysostom, the principal commentator on whom he depends, says, on the very place, "the difference between the Presbyter and the Bishop is almost nothing." Admit the utmost, then, that they say, it will not do for Mr. Perceval's Episcopacy. But we do not admit them as authority, we admit nothing as such but the Scriptures, and the Scriptures clearly show that they who ordained Timothy were Presbyters.

"Moreover," says Mr. Perceval, "in the second Epistle, St. Paul ascribes Timothy's ordination to his own act, 2 Tim. i. 6. The Presbyterians (the author of the Essay he means) would represent this last passage to relate to miraculous gifts, but as there is nothing in the context to warrant such a supposition, but the contrary, it cannot be urged," p. 33, 34. The passage is, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands." Now an English reader will perhaps be surprised to hear it said, that there is nothing relating to miraculous gifts in a passage the pith of which is "Stir up the gift of God that is in thee." His surprise will be increased when he learns that the word "gift" in this passage is the very word *charisma*, which the sacred writers use for miraculous gifts, in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 9, 28, 30, 31. The phrase, the "gift of God," never means an office in the New Testament. The expression, "stir up," is never applied to an office, and seems incapable of such an application. Stir up thy Bishopship, thy Presbytership, &c. would be strange phraseology. All these objections would also apply to the interpretation which would suppose the gift to mean not Timothy's office, but his ordination. The phrase, "the gift of God," never means ordination in the New Testament. To say "Stir up thine ordination," is as absurd as to say "Stir up thy Bishopship." The passage, therefore, cannot mean, by the "gift of God," either Timothy's office, or his ordination. It evidently means spiritual gifts, gifts of the Holy Ghost. Accordingly, it immediately follows—"For God hath not given unto us the spirit of fear: but of power, of goodness, and of love, and of a sound mind." The phrase the "Spirit of power—*spiritus fortitudinis*," most properly means the "power" of miracles; as the word *dynamis*, when related to spiritual matters, mostly means miraculous power. Chrysostom thus interprets the phrase, "the gift of God," i. e., says he, "the gift of the Holy Ghost which thou hast received, to qualify thee for superintending the church, for working miracles, and for the whole service of the church." We have shown in the Essay, p. 56, that the gift of working miracles was conferred by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, as

a prerogative of their Apostleship. Now, are we to suppose that these gifts were conferred in this manner on so many inferior individuals, (as the Presbyterians say they were, and that so eminent an individual as Timothy should not be favoured with them? This would be strange.) I still think, therefore, that the peculiar sense of the passage principally refers to the gift of God. That all other rich endowments of the Spirit for the ministry would accompany it, we need no more doubt than that others, who had these miraculous gifts, were also favoured with rich endowments of the Spirit for the personal performance of every christian duty. Understanding the passage in this manner, the exhortation has great beauty and force. "Stir up the gift of God that is in thee by the laying on of my hands."—I, as an Apostle, having been honoured as the instrument in conferring upon thee this "gift of God," these gifts of the Spirit, presume I may use some authority in exhorting thee to exert them to the uttermost in governing the flock, in miraculous operations, and in the whole service of the church.

In his fourth chapter, Mr. Perceval proceeds to examine the arguments of Presbyterianism from ecclesiastical antiquity. He first properly notices the testimony of Clement Romanus. In answer to the argument from the fact that Clement only mentions two orders, (suppose we count Deacons an order,) viz. Bishops and Deacons, or Presbyters and Deacons, he refers to what he has said about the prophets only speaking of priests and Levites, with no mention of the high priest, and we refer to the answer to what he has there said. But he finds it convenient to pass over the fact that Clement expressly says, that the section in the church was against the "Presbyters," Sect. 47; that they were "Presbyters" who had "the *κλεις οβριθων*," Sect. 51, that he speaks of "Presbyters" as having finished *totum episcopatum*, Sect. 41, and that in conclusion he exhorts the church to "be subject to their Presbyters," Sect. 57. He never says half so much about Bishops.

Clement, indeed, does occasionally use the word Bishop, as synonymous with Presbyter, for he never uses them together and distinctively, but all his authority and exhortations are applied to bring the church to submit to the government of the Presbyters. All these points Mr. Perceval forgets. However, like a drowning man, he catches at a straw. He says, "The unsoundness of the Presbyterian inference," from Clement in favour of Presbyterianism, "is beyond redemption, when we find St. Clement expressly ascribing to Divine appointment, obligatory in his time, the triple order of the ministry. These are his words: 'It will behave us, looking into the depths of divine knowledge, to do all things in order whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do. He has ordained, by his supreme will and authority, both where and by what persons they [use sacred services and oblations] are to be performed. For the Chief Priest his proper services; and to the Priests their proper place is appointed; and to the Levites appertain their proper ministries; and the layman is contained within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen.'" p. 38. Here he leaves the passage, as though it proved his point without a doubt. I wrote the Essay, but thought it too trifling to occupy space and attention; except one wished for material to make up a book. But Mr. Perceval should have gone on. Clement proceeds. "Let every one of you, therefore, brethren, love God in his proper station, with a good conscience, and with all gravity, not exceeding the rule of his service that is appointed to him. The daily sacrifices are not offered every where; nor the peace offerings, nor the sacrifices appointed for sins and transgressions; but only at Jerusalem—thou, therefore, who do any thing which is not agreeable to his will, are punished with death. Consider, brethren, that by how much the better the knowledge God has vouchsafed unto us, by so much the greater danger are we exposed to." Now Mr. Perceval considers, that, because Clement says, the Lord appointed the Jews a high priest, priests and Levites, this proves that we are to have Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. But Clement also says, that the Jewish church had, by divine appointment, "daily sacrifices, peace offerings, and sacrifices for sins and transgressions." By his argument, therefore, we must have "daily sacrifices, peace offerings,

\* The Essay, here and elsewhere referred to, is Mr. Perceval's on "Apostolical Succession," 2d edition.