

his readers that "the name is not worth a line of controversy!!" If this be true of the name, it is true of the thing." Shall we say that the difference between a *bishop of a church*, and the *bishop of a state* is not worth a line of controversy!!

"A rose," you'll say, "under any other name will smell as sweet." True; but will an Apostle, under the name *Bishop*, or a Bishop under the name *Pope*, be as acceptable and intelligible to one who makes his appeal exclusively to the law and the testimony? Our maxim is, Call Bible things by Bible names—for it is always safe; and in all important matters if the name is not in the Bible, the idea which it exactly represents will not be found there. Call Timothy and Titus *Diocesan Bishops*, and we now would understand them in the full import of these words; but as they are not so designated by the Apostles, we are confident that the designation suits not their work nor office, more than the word *Sultan* designates the Governor of Pennsylvania.

But it is not because a new name has been adopted, that we demur. This would have been comparatively innocent and harmless. You may call the thing called *rose*, by a new name; you may call it *dulcissima*, if you please; but should you take its appropriate name and apply it to a poppy, you would bewilder and distract, and might grossly deceive the whole community.

In my first letter to you I had occasion to say that all your writers, as far as known to me, assume that succession in office, by regular descent from the Apostles, is a part, an essential part of the Christian institution, and essential to the valid administration of its ordinances. But this is not the only assumption in the ground work of Diocesan Episcopacy. You assume *three orders* in the Primitive Church, making the Apostles themselves an order in the Church distinct from the Bishops and Deacons. If this should prove an assumption, it will be as fatal to the constitution of your Church as the preceeding. Might not one say, there are *seven orders* in the Church—Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Teachers, Directors, Bishops, Deacons, for the same reason that Bishop Onderdonk asserts three? The Apostles were in and of themselves all orders—not one of three, but three in one. They were for a time Bishops, Deacons, and every thing else that the Church in its infancy required.—They served tables in Jerusalem, and distributed to every one as he had need. They presided in the congregations, and performed all the duties afterwards distributed amongst the Bishops, Deacons, and Brethren.

Indeed, when the nature of a community—of any community—is better understood than it yet generally appears to be, it will be unnecessary to elaborate arguments to shew that there never can be in any society but two distinct offices in reference to its usefulness and happiness—the office of *presiding*, i. e. instructing and directing; and the office of *ministering*, i. e. of ex-