

son conversant with their writings. The fact is, the British Government has sufficiently expressed its views on this subject; for Churches of different external politics, the one of the Episcopal, the other of the Presbyterian, order, are ESTABLISHED BY LAW.

In his Church History, under century XVIII., Dr. Haweis, a clergyman of the Church of England, thus writes—

"The old distinction between high and low church was not yet abolished, though the latitudinarian doctrines, and the new bishops, who had the great weight in the scale, were far predominant; embraced all Protestants as their brethren; admitted true churches might subsist without episcopacy; and therefore more cordially received the dissenters, and formed very kind friendships and correspondencies with the ingenious of every denomination. But there were bigots who regarded their brethren with abhorrence; supposed they had neither ministry, nor sacraments, and belonged to no church: schismatics and in moral error. These particularly revived at the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, when the cry, that the church was in danger, was made a handle to bring in a tory ministry, (1710); and that contemptible creature, Sacheverel, became of importance."

For further information on this subject, see a late work, entitled "The Wesleyan Ministry defended," published at the Wesleyan office, in which it, with kindred subjects, is treated at large.

"Q. How long has the Church been so governed?"

"A. From the time of the Apostles, for fifteen hundred years, there was no Christian church without a Bishop."

The force of the argument in favour of episcopacy from this assertion will depend much on the character of a scriptural Bishop. If bishops and presbyters are according to the New Testament of one order, as the foregoing remarks are calculated to prove, the fact might be granted, and yet diocesan episcopacy rest, as assuredly it does, on no other foundation than that of human expediency.

"Q. Did not the Apostles commit to those, whom they had entrusted with the government of the church, the same authority which they received from Christ?"

"A. Yes. As Christ had given authority to the Apostles, so the Apostles gave authority to Timothy and others. (1 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Tim. v. 29; 2 Tim. i. 6; Tit. i. 5.)"

The fact is simply this, that the Apostle Paul employed Timothy and Titus, under the direction of the Head of the Church, as extraordinary agents, in assisting him to propagate and establish the Christian religion, and appoint and set apart proper officers of the Church. But to say from this the government of the church was entrusted with Timothy and Titus is to talk at random: where was St. Paul himself and the rest of the inspired Apostles? Is there any proof on which we can rely, that any others, beside Timothy and Titus, were employed by any of the Apostles as these two were? It does not appear then that the same authority was given to the ordinary pastors, as

was given by Christ to his Apostles. Titus and Timothy, the only instances quoted, were evidently extraordinary Assistants, employed for a special purpose, which rendered their office and powers but of temporary duration: to draw an argument from their authority, under these circumstances, in favour of a similar authority being vested in the ordinary ministers of the church, is illogical in the extreme, and attended with this difficulty,—it makes a temporary office, permanent, and all who claim this succession extraordinary instead of ordinary ministers of Christ!

"Q. Did not Timothy, so commissioned, deliver the same authority to other 'faithful men'?"

"A. Yes. (2 Tim. ii. 2.)"

This answer is much shorter than it is correct. The fallacy here lies in the phrase "same authority." To make out this higher order of ministers it is thought necessary to prove that the same extraordinary authority given to Timothy was by him given to others. Unless this proof can be adduced, there is no authority from the Scriptures to convince us that one minister has a divine right to govern a number of other ministers as well as their flocks: in a word, the very foundation is taken away on which the divine origin of episcopacy is built. This then is a matter of such importance, that the proof should be very clear and decided. The only proof offered is 2 Tim. ii. 2, which reads thus—"And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others." Is then this passage sufficient to prove the point in question with clearness and satisfaction? Some learned episcopalians regard this as an apostolic injunction to appoint bishops: others do not. Whithy, an advocate for the scriptural conformity of episcopacy, says, that he does not consider "this was a commission to St. Timothy to appoint bishops under him in the several churches of Asia." There is no reason to believe the "faithful men" in question were appointed by Timothy to constitute an order in the church superior to presbyters, and who were to have the "oversight" of them, but were simply the ordinary ministers of the churches, promiscuously called "elders," "presbyters," or "bishops," (Titus i. 5-7. 1. Pet. v. 1. 2. Acts xx. 17-28.) and invested by reason of office and appointment with the same rights and privileges. The language employed in the verse will by no means bear out the view taken of it by the compiler—he brings it to prove that Timothy committed to these "faithful men" the "same authority" that had been committed to him by the Apostles;—and yet the verse says nothing of the "same authority"—it speaks of "the things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses," and enjoins on Timothy to "commit the same to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others." No reference is made to extraordinary powers, nor to any superior order: the very terms imply no other than the ordinary duties of ordinary ministers. The "form of sound words" was to be committed to pious persons called of God to the sacred office, that they might be "able to teach others;"—and from this we may learn that none but "faithful men," (pistoi an-

thropoi) called of God to the sacred office, that they might be "able to teach others;"—and from this we may learn that none but "faithful men," (pistoi an-
ten thousand true ministers of Christ, who shall be able to teach others."
cred character upon the Timothy.
same: to that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses,"
ful men," these in Christ things that
vous, presbyters, if any be able to teach others,"
must be able to teach others."
thy was no bishops; but when their not to set a The Apostles only of the is not the same to support delivered the which had
There is the question they stand in the case of the Apostles so, therefore
Except Timothy the sacred apart to the byters; and ordinary character believe no tionable his dinations of they [Paul], ed them el Acts xiv. 33 (Acts xx. 1 order of me ordinary mi advocates d with one in mothy and son to an o have ecclesi byters and order of pe uninterrupt son of this cient entirel tian church On 2 Tim.