

root "nagosá;" and as a verb signifies "to squeeze out, extort, as money or labour," 2 Kings xxiii. 25, Isaiah lviii. 3, when used as a noun, "an extorcer of labour or money, a task master, Exod. iii. 7, Dan. xi 20. Thus the Prophet, describing the constitution, so to speak of the Christian Church, speaks of only two classes of officers or ministers. The overseers, bishops, or pastors, are the extorcers to which deacons or those who manage the temporal affairs of the church exactly correspond. It is, therefore, with great propriety, Parkhurst adds the following note: "Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, carries the matter much farther. "I will appoint their overseers (bishops) in righteousness, and their ministers (deacons) in faith;" and produces it as a prophecy of the Apostle's appointing the two offices of bishops (or presbyters,) and deacons in the Church.

Upon this Mr. McLeod observes,—“Whatever may be thought of this application of Isaiah's prophecy, one thing is certain, that Clement declares in the most express and unequivocal terms, that the Apostles appointed over the churches *bishops* and *deacons* only, and that they "provided these by the SPIRIT."

Mr. Shreve's letter does not cover quite six pages of the work before us, of which nearly two pages are employed in attempting to prove the divine authority of Diocesan Episcopacy from the *ancient Fathers*, while, as Mr. McLeod observes, "your *proofs from Scripture*, with your remarks upon them, occupy not more than *thirty lines*." page 13.

Mr. McLeod's observations on Mr. Shreve's quotations from the ancient Fathers, is worthy of an attentive perusal; they extend from page 30 to page 47, we shall quote only three paragraphs.

"Let me here remind you that the principal point in debate, and on which, in fact, the whole cause turns is, not whether three orders were in existence as early as the times of Ignatius, for he is the first Father you quote, but whether there was originally a distinction between presbyters and bishops, and that by divine appointment. This is the question; and which, I conceive, can only be truly and properly decided by the testimony of Holy Writ. But as you appeal to the primitive Fathers, I would further remind you, that to cause them to support your cause, it is not sufficient to show from their writings that three distinct orders were in existence at that time, but that they plainly attribute this distinction to *divine institution*. For though I were to grant that a distinction between presbyters and Bishops did then exist, its divine institution did not follow therefrom as a natural consequence: it might have been occasioned by mere prudential regulation." page 30.

The above paragraph certainly contains the very strength of the argument. For it is admitted that Diocesan Episcopacy came into existence at an early period of the Christian Church; and that some of the ancient Fathers in their writings, referred to it as existing in their time; but before those ancient Fathers can be fairly pleaded even as corroborative evidences for its divine authority, it must be shown that they inculcated it as a doctrine of the New Testament.

This, however, Mr. Shreve has not shown; and Mr. McLeod, after a critical examination of Mr. Shreve's quotations from the ancient Fathers, says,—“The voice of antiquity is against you, that is, against the *original inequality* or order between bishops and presbyters, and the *divine institution* of three distinct orders of bishops, priests and deacons.

This is the question at issue; and not one of the witnesses you have produced, when cross-examined, deposeth in your favour; while many of them, together with those I have adduced, speak point blank

against the divine appointment of your Episcopacy. Instead, therefore, of having only "the *dictum* of the three last centuries," to oppose to your pretensions, the appeal is "fearlessly and confidently" made to the unprejudiced reader, if instead of this being the case, the advocates of the *original equality* or order between bishops and presbyters, and the *human institution* of Episcopacy, in your sense of the word, have not in their favour the positive testimony of the New Testament, and primitive Fathers, as far as writings are free from interpolations?" page 47.

Mr. Shreve seems to have found two distinct and separate Churches, both *Episcopal*, and therefore according to him, both *Apostolical*. One is a Church in India; and the other, is *The Church of England*.

Of the Church in India, we have little more than an account of a conversation between "The celebrated Missionary Buchaman," and "Mar Dionysius, the metropolitan of the Syrian Church." Of the Church of England however, Mr. Shreve expatiates to a considerable length.

The Rev. G. Boyd of Philadelphia is quoted to prove that the Gospel was preached in Britain by St. Paul—John Le Clerk and Hugs Grotius, are quoted to prove that Episcopacy was the "*primeval form*."

It would certainly have been very satisfactory if Mr. Shreve had first proved that *St. Paul*, or indeed that *some one of the Apostles ever was in England*, before any reference was made to the *history* of the "The Church of England which was *planted by the Apostles*."

The fact is, there is no clear proof that St. Paul or any one of the Apostles ever was in England; and until this be clearly proved, to talk of the Apostles as having "planted" the Church in England, is absurd.

[To be continued.]

The Wesleyan.

HALIFAX, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1839.

TO CORRESPONDENTS

BOOK DEPOT.—The books for the establishment of a Depot in Halifax, as well as the periodicals for the Stations, have not arrived by the "Thalia" as was expected—and this must be our general answer to the numerous applications for books which have been received. The brig Fleeta sailed from London for this port, Oct. 13th, and by her they will be confidently looked for, and will be distributed immediately.

ERRATA.—Page 314, first column, line 13 from the bottom, for "question," read *quotation*; line 6 from the bottom, for "this is the opinion of the Rector of Guysborough" read, *then* is the opinion of the Rector of Guysborough; second column, for "cheirotrescuntis" read *cheirotrescuntis*.

From the Colonial Pearl.

MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.—Doctor Grigor delivered a lecture on last Wednesday evening on Phrenology, and is to continue the subject. The Doctor stated his intention to be, to treat of the opponents, the advocates, the progress and the uses of the Science. The lecture of last Wednesday evening was on the two former topics, and comprised a review of the controversy which has been going on, and the results of it. The Doctor is a zealous Phrenologist, and gave his side a complete triumph in every stage of the discussion.