

nel. "The Protestant religion," said they, "doth not teach us to renounce baptism received in the Church of Rome; neither is a Papist, when converted Protestant, rebaptized. Nor doth it teach us simply and absolutely to renounce ordination; but it deals with it as the Jews were to with a captive maid, when they had a mind to marry her: they must shave her head, and pair her nails, and put the raiment of her captivity off her, and then take her to wife." (*Jus Divinum Ministerii*, pp. 32—42.)

All this is very true, so far as the facts and the conclusions are concerned; but we beg to differ from the principles on which they vindicated their ordination. We conceive that they yielded too much, when they acknowledged the validity of Romish and prelatical orders; and that it is not at all necessary for upholding the lawfulness of Presbyterian ordination, to concede that the prelatical bishop is a presbyter. We are prepared to deny that such a bishop is a presbyter at all, and maintain that he is no true minister in the holy Church of Jesus Christ.

In thus carrying the war into the enemy's camp, we hope to be able to show that we are far from being guided by the spirit of modern Puseyism, and that we have neither adopted its principles, nor exposed ourselves to be justly charged with its absurd and unchristian conclusions. And it may be proper to premise, that we do not now enter into the controversy between Prelacy and Presbytery,—that we assume the Presbyterian pastor to be a minister of Christ, and have therefore to do, not so much with the Prelatist who denies our orders, as with the Presbyterian who allows the orders of the Prelatist. The Scripture presbyter, then, we take to be one who is qualified and called, according to the Word of God, to dispense the ordinances of the gospel, and to rule the Church, in common with, and in subordination to, his brethren in the same office. If this be a true definition of a Christian pastor, we cannot see that the prelate or bishop of modern times can with any justice claim the character, or with any propriety be regarded as possessing it. Not contented with teaching and ruling, according to Christ's appointment, in concert with, and subordination to, his brother presbyters, the bishop, as he is called, claims a lordly power over them, and assumes to himself, in virtue of his office, the sole power of government and jurisdiction. Now, in the first place, such an office is wholly unknown in the house of God; it is one of purely human invention; it lies beyond the range of divine institutes, and takes its place under the category of earthly things. The presbyter, therefore, who becomes a prelate, forfeits, *ipso facto*, his official standing in the Church of Christ; and the act by which he does so, is not a consecration, cut a desecration. He has wandered from his sphere; he no longer occupies a place in the solar system of revelation. Like the angels, of whom Jude speaks, "who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," he has quitted the station which the Lord of the Church recognizes, and has got into another which He "neither commanded, neither yet did it come into his mind;" and his room being thus left vacant, as that of Judas was when he "went to his place," another must be appointed to fill it up.

It will not avail here to say, that the bishop still continues to preach and to rule, and that these being presbyterial acts, he may still be regarded as a presbyter. His offence lies in his presuming to teach and rule *prelatically*, or over the heads of his brethren, and that *ex officio*; and what we say is, that there is no such order office in the Church of Christ as that of a prelatical bishop. It is in fact, so far as Christ and the gospel Church are concerned, a nonentity. The Christian pastor derives his existence as a pastor, as well as his name, from the re-