

it be to infer that it required two separate individuals to perform these offices, merely because their names were different. We give another passage: Titus i, 5, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee." And in marking the identity of the office, he immediately adds in the 7th verse: "A *Bishop* must be blameless;" &c. The inference here is unavoidable—the ordained Presbyter is a Bishop, and possesses all the functions which belong to his brethren, who in another passage, are designated "the Presbytery." It is needless to say that this is subversive of English episcopacy, seeing a Bishop without Presbyters under him would be no Bishop at all.

It is not wonderful that High Churchmen should manifest a strong leaning to popery—their system of a diversity of ranks among the clergy leads to this. In arguing with a papist he would find it a hard matter to defend the ground he occupies. The Romanist would tell him that the Church of England was not apostolical. He would say that the Pope was the vicar of Christ on earth, and head of the church—and inasmuch as her bishops were not confirmed by his authority, they had no power to ordain—yea, the dispensation of word and ordinance by priests ordained by such men was unwarranted by Christ. The man we say who believes in a diversity of ranks among the clergy, such as exists in the Church of England, will find his mouth closed in opposing the papacy, seeing it is the very principle he sanctions which will justify the office of the Sovereign Pontiff. But on the other hand, should he, on the authority of scripture, deny the Pope's supremacy, and contend that all bishops are equal—he concedes first, the principle we contend for, namely: that scripture is of a superior force to tradition, both in matters of faith and discipline; and second, he is led to adopt another principle inconsistent with episcopacy—we mean the parity of ministers of the gospel. The Bishop in Rome has no dominion over a Bishop in any other city. His rule is simple usurpation, and so all are equal—a truth we may observe which the Primate of all England would be slow to admit. But we observe farther that the episcopal theory of church government bears on the face of it the marks of its earthly origin. It obviously supposes that ruling is more honorable than preaching, seeing they deprive the Presbyters of this power and confer it on the Bishops. Hence the Bishop must be decked up and addressed in the courtly

phrase of "my lord," and he must moreover, have his grand cathedral with its costly appendages. Honor is to be given to whom honor is due; and as ruling is more honorable than preaching, so the Bishop must needs receive *triple* honor. But what says the word of God on this matter: "Let the Elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honor, *especially* they who labor in the word and doctrine."—It is utterly preposterous with this plain declaration of the mind of the Spirit to set the Ruling Bishop above the preaching Presbytery. The obvious conclusion from such a text is, that the Bishop is *not* superior to the pastor, and therefore, seeing he does assume a superiority, yea, seeing the fabric of episcopacy rests upon this principle,—we say that it is earthly—that is, it is deduced from the maxims current among the "Princes of this world," but wholly opposed to the word of God.

The usurpation of power, by the Bishops of large towns, over the rural pastors, is easily accounted for, by the principles of corrupt human nature; but it is wholly at variance with the wisdom that is from above. When the mother of James and John asked for a lordly power over their brethren, the Lord Jesus disapproved of her petition, and the reason which Christ gives strikes at the root of the Bishop's power—"Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.*" It will be observed, that Christ does not here refer to the *tyranny* of civil rulers; he refers to them simply as exercising a lordly power over their subjects, which so far from condemning, the scriptures everywhere sanction and approve. But however salutary such power might be, when vested in a prince or a magistrate, it is to have no place among the pastors of his people. All are to stand precisely on the same footing, stripped of every mark of personal authority, which would raise them above their brethren engaged in the same work; just as a prince or a magistrate would be one of the people, if denuded of their official power and authority. He would then be of the same rank with them, which he is not so long as he possesses a power which they have not. Bishops may twist the passage to save their "dominion" and "authority" over their brethren in the ministry; but it manifests that the power which they have received over them has no countenance in scripture.

And neither is there ought of enlarged expediency to justify it—worldly expediency, doubtless there is, otherwise the office would not be