





nothing but an invincible obstacle, could excuse any master for neglecting to secure to his servants the knowledge of the fundamental truths of religion. But can this excuse be pleaded, by one who is able to read the Bible, and is surrounded by his ignorant slaves? Some find no difficulty in reply...

Are the slaves of these persons more ignorant and besotted than the Sandwich Islander, or the Burman? Are their prejudices against the teaching of the white man, more obstinate than those of the Hindoo, or the Cherokees?

Yet, through the agency of the European, or American, have many of all these nations been brought to a knowledge of the Lord.

If the master lack the patience so necessary in the instruction of the ignorant and slow-minded, it is his sin, and cannot be given as an excuse for neglect of duty. It is a sin, moreover, from which the master may be rescued by the grace of God, and to the Throne of Mercy should he resort for deliverance from its power.

We must conclude, then, that every head of a family is responsible for the religious training of his servants.

The only enquiry which remains is this: What means for effecting this object may be used?

I here refer only to those which may be employed in the bosom of the family itself.

The master should first look around, to see what aid he may obtain from his own household, in the prosecution of this important work.

If a married man, he will probably find in his wife an able and willing assistant—an assistant whose sex, and perhaps gentleness of manner, might prevent her being regarded with that painful awe, which is apt to be inspired by the male head of the house.

Fraternally efficient coadjutors might be found in other members of the family. Indeed, the aid of mere children should not be despised or rejected. Cases are not wanting in which little ones, scarcely able to lip the Catechism, have delighted to impart to their colored play-fellows, the lessons received from the lips of an affectionate mother.

By such means, in most families, several catechetical classes might be formed, and the whole generation of an estate might grow up well instructed in the leading truths of morality and religion.

The justice of the prejudice against teaching slaves to read, will not be discussed at present.

But certainly it may be shown that no restrictions of this sort, could form an insuperable barrier to their reception of the Gospel.

In the age in which Christianity advanced with the greatest rapidity, copies of the Scriptures were so scarce, that few were able for themselves to examine those sacred pages. Catechetical instruction, supplied the place of private study; and yet the Christians of that age, have not been considered inferior to others, in the correctness of their doctrines, and the purity of their manners.

Nor should it be supposed that the dullness usually attributed to this people, renders their instruction a peculiarly difficult task. On the contrary, all some experience in teaching them, I am almost led to believe, that their minds are peculiarly adapted to the reception of oral instruction. As when one sense is injured or destroyed, the others become more acute, so it may be, that when the mind is shut out from one avenue to knowledge, she presses more eagerly, and with greater success, into those that remain.

One remarkable case, however, would rather lead to the conclusion, that irrespective of this conclusion, colored people are naturally endowed with superior aptitude for the acquisition of knowledge, through the medium of their ear. A young lady, well known to the writer, formed two classes, one of illiterate whites, and the other of slaves. Not an individual of either class could read, and the members of both were nearly, or quite, of adult age. Now, one would suppose, that a fair opportunity was here afforded, of testing the relative capabilities of the two races. But it was the opinion of the teacher, in this instance, that the colored class, learnt with decidedly the greater facility.

We surely would not infer from this single case, the existence of any superiority of the colored over the white man. Yet it proves at least that the former is not so stupid as he is often represented.

Several instances have come under the observation of the writer, which illustrate the remarkable strength of memory possessed by many of this people. One of these will relate. About twelve years ago, another young lady formed a class of colored children, whom she instructed for a considerable time. At length certain circumstances made it necessary for the class to be broken up, and its members to be scattered. One of these, a young girl, was sent to a distant plantation, where she remained for five or six years, under the management of an overseer, and with no opportunity of hearing the lessons to which she had once listened. At the end of this period, she was brought under the pastoral care of the writer, and became a member of a class which he had organized. In the course of this instruction, he had occasion to question her upon the commandments, when to his surprise she repeated every one verbatim, scarcely missing or misplacing a word. Being asked when she had learned them, she replied that Miss had taught her years before, and that she had never forgotten them.

To be continued.

GAMBLING.

THE WATCHMAN OF THE VALLEY says of an Anti-Gambling Law lately passed by the Legislature of Ohio:

Thought it does not go into effect till the first of March, its effects are already beginning to be felt, we are informed, in anticipation. The keepers and frequenters of gambling establishments, are preparing for their exit. The provisions of the law, it is thought, are wisely framed to secure their end. To perfect such a law required the assistance of one practically acquainted with the arts and expedients of the craft it was designed to suppress. Mr. Green, the Reformed Gambler, was on hand for the purpose, to whose influence and aid the State are doubtless indebted for the present law, with all its salutary influence, if it shall prove salutary.

VANITY OF HUMAN HAPPINESS.

A remarkable instance of the unsatisfactory nature of all worldly prosperity, and a confirmation of Solomon's maxim, is afforded by the Emperor Septimus Severus. "Omnia fui, et nihil exiit." "I have been all things, and all is of little value," was his declaration after having been raised from an humble station to the imperial throne of Rome, and the sovereignty of the world.

Dismissing Cassius.—Mrs. Mason, (wife of Bennett Mason, of Fox Hill, E. City County) three children and Miss Sarah Nelson, who dwelt in their residence during the late gate, the tide being so high as to effectually interdict their egress.—Norfolk Beacon, March 2d.

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW AND POPIISH BAPTISM.

NO. II.

For the Watchman & Observer.

II. The form of baptism, or that which distinguishes this species of ablution, from every other washing with water, consists in the relations which, according to the appointment of Christ, it sustains to the covenant of grace. The solemn invocation of the names of the Trinity (1) though a circumstance attending the actual application of the element, and, perhaps, an indispensable circumstance, does not constitute the whole essence of the ordinance. A Socinian may undoubtedly employ the same formula as our selves. And yet, according to repeated admissions of the Reviewer himself, (2) his want of faith in the personal distinctions of the Godhead, would be sufficient to render void the pretended sacrament. To baptize into the name of Father, Son, and Spirit, is not to pronounce these words as an idle form, or a mystical charm, but to acknowledge that solemn compact in which these glorious agents are red, from eternity, for the redemption of the Church. It is the faith of the Trinity, much more than the names of its separate Persons, that belongs to the essence of Baptism; and while this faith existed, some of the ancient Fathers contended—how justly I shall not undertake to decide—that the ordinance was validly administered, even though done without the explicit mention of all the Persons of the Godhead. "He that is baptized in Christ," says Ambrose (3) "is blessed in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; because the name is one, and the power one. The Ethiopian Eunuch, who was baptized in Christ, had the sacrament complete. If a man names only a single person expressly in words, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, so long as he does not deny in his faith, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is complete; as, on the other hand, if a man in words express all the three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in his faith diminishes the power, either of the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is void." Whatever objection may lie against the first part of this statement—that the explicit mention of all the Persons of the Trinity is not indispensable to the due administration of baptism,—none can decently deny, that to name them without believing in them, is not to celebrate but to profane the ordinance.

As, therefore, the invocation of the Trinity may take place in ablutions which it is impossible to recognize as the baptism instituted by Christ, it cannot constitute the whole form of the sacrament. In this there is no real difference between the Reviewer and myself. He only uses the word form in a different sense from that in which I have been accustomed to employ it—but, by no means, confines the essence of the sacrament to what he denominates its form. On the contrary, he makes the design or intention (4) an essential part of the ordinance, and means by it precisely what I would be understood to convey, when I resolve the form of a sacrament into the relations which its material elements, according to the appointment of Christ, sustain to the covenant of grace. To ratify bread and drink wine is not necessarily to celebrate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—to be immersed or sprinkled—a formal invocation of the names of the Trinity accompanying the deed,—is not necessarily to be baptized. There must be a reference to the economy of grace—a distinct recognition of that precious scheme of redemption, in its essential features and fundamental doctrines, without which ordinances are worthless, and duties are bondage. That which determines a specific ablution to be Christian baptism, which impresses upon the matter what may be styled the sacramental form, and which, consequently, constitutes its essence as a sacrament, is the relation which it bears to the covenant of God's unchanging mercy. To deny that relation, though all the outward appearances may be retained, is to abolish the sacrament. To tamper with the essence of an ordinance, is to tamper with its life. As the constitution of this relationship, whatever it may be, depends exclusively upon the authority of Christ, it is competent to Him alone to define the circumstances under which it may be justly conceived to exist—to specify the conditions upon which its actual institution depends. For aught we know, He might have rendered every circumstance of personal ablution, or of eating and drinking on the part of believers, a sacramental act. But He has chosen to restrain the sacramental relations within certain limits, and when his own prescriptions are not observed, no power of man, no intention of ministers can impress the sacramental form upon material elements. The purpose of a family to convert its ordinary meals into memorials of the Saviour's passion, coupled with the fact that they are despatched with the usual solemnities of the eucharistic feast, is not sufficient to make them, in truth, the supper of the Lord. The emblems of His broken body and shed blood, are not made thus common and profane. If, to be more specific, the authority to administer the sacraments is entrusted exclusively to the ministers of the word, the same matter employed, in the same way by others, would be evidently destitute of the sacramental form. The relation to the covenant of grace, which depends upon the institution of Christ could not be justly apprehended as subsisting, and the promises attached to the due celebration of the ordinance could not be legitimately expected to take effect.

He, therefore, that would undertake to prove that the Romish ceremony possesses the form or the essential elements of Christian Baptism must not content himself with showing that Rome baptizes in the name of the Trinity. He must prove, besides, that she inculcates just views concerning the nature of the relationship which the outward washing sustains to the covenant of grace; that her conceptions of the covenant itself, that to which the ablution has reference, are substantially correct and that she employs the outward elements in conformity with the conditions prescribed by the author of the sacrament. If she is fundamentally unsound upon any of these points she abolishes the essence of the ordinance, she destroys its form. She may, for instance, be as orthodox as Princeton presents her to be, in regard to the personal and official relations of the Trinity, (5) she may teach the truth in regard to the scheme of redemption; and yet if her baptism bears a different kind of relationship to the covenant of grace from that instituted by the Redeemer, it is evident that it must be a different thing. If, on the other hand, she is sound as to the nature of the relationship and yet corrupt as to the object to which the sacrament refers (6) her baptism is only analogous to christian baptism and, therefore, cannot be the same. The relations are similar, but the things related are different. If again, she holds to the truth, both as it respects the relationship itself and the things related, and yet does not administer her ordinance according to the conditions on which the sacramental form may be expected to take place, she washes indeed, but not sacramentally—the authority of Christ is wanting. She administers no baptism. If to be unsound in any one of these points makes void a sacrament what shall be said when there is unsoundness in all? Such an ordinance is trebly void. And that this is the case with Romish baptism, I think, will be made to appear when the arguments of the Reviewer, the strongest, perhaps, that can be presented, to show that it possesses the form or retains the essence of the Christian institution shall have been duly weighed.

1. First, then, does Rome teach the truth in regard to the nature of the relationship involved in a sacrament? The answer to this question will depend upon the answer to the previous question, what the nature of the relationship is. How much we have differed upon other points, Protestant divines have generally agreed that one prime office assigned to the sacraments is to represent to the eye, as preaching unfolds to the ear, Christ as the substance of the new covenant. They are signs which teach by analogy. As water cleanses the body, so the blood of the Redeemer purges the conscience, and the Spirit of the Redeemer purifies the heart. As bread and wine constitute important articles of food, and administer strength to our feeble frame, so the atonement of Christ is the food of the spiritual man and the source of all his activity and vigour? (7) This analogy is what Augustin meant when he said, "It is sacraments had not certain likeness and representation of the things whereof they are sacraments, then indeed they were not sacraments." (8) The things themselves unquestionably are not similar. There is no likeness between the water and the Spirit, between bread and wine and the death of Jesus, but there is a resemblance in their relations. Water performs a similar office for the flesh which the blood of Christ performs for the soul. Bread and wine sustain a similar relation to our natural growth which faith in Christ bears to our spiritual health. It is obvious, that regarded simply as signs instituted by the authority of Christ, the sacraments are happily adapted to confirm our faith in the truth and reality of the divine promises. They place before us in a different form and under a different aspect, in a form and aspect adapted to our animal and corporeal nature, the same grounds and object of faith which the word presents to the understanding. They do not render the promises of the covenant in themselves considered more sure or credible, but they help us by images addressed to the senses, in apprehending what might otherwise be too refined for our gross perceptions. (9) They are a double preaching of the same Gospel; and confirm the word just as an additional witness establishes a fact. They are in short visible promises which we cannot contemplate in their true character without an increased conviction of the truth and faithfulness of God. But in addition to this, God may be regarded as declaring through them to worthy recipients that just as certainly as water purifies the body or as bread and wine sustain it, so certainly shall their consciences be purged from dead works and their spiritual strength renewed through the blood of the Redeemer. The certainty of the material phenomena, which is a matter of daily experience, is made the pledge of an equal certainty in the analogous spiritual things. It is in this way I conceive that the sacraments are seals of the covenant. They not only represent its blessings, are not only an authorized proclamation of its promises addressed to the eye, but contain, at the same time, a solemn assurance that to those who rightly apprehend the signs, the spiritual good shall be as certain as the natural consequences by which it is illustrated, that the connection between faith and salvation is as indissoluble as between washing and external purity, eating and physical strength.

Is this the doctrine of the church of Rome? Does she regard her sacraments as instituted signs of spiritual things or as visible pledges of the faithfulness of God in the new and everlasting covenant? If so, she has been most grievously slandered by the most distinguished Protestant Divines, and the Princeton Review is the only work, so far as I know, of any merit, which has ventured to assert that her doctrine on this subject is precisely the same with that of the Reformed church. It is, indeed, admitted that there is a difference between Papists and Protestants as to the mode (10) in which the design of baptism is accomplished. But did it not occur to the Reviewer that there could be no difference upon this point if there were a perfect agreement as to the nature of that relation which baptism sustains to the covenant of grace? If Rome looked upon the sacraments in the same light with ourselves, as only signs and seals and nothing more than signs and seals, though she might have disputed whether the benefits which they represent are, in every instance, in which no serious obstruction exists, actually conveyed, the question as to their inherent efficacy never could have been raised. She would have taught their recipients, as we do, to look beyond the visible symbols to the personal agency of the Holy Ghost to render them effectual. As well might she have expected her children to become men in understanding by reading books in an unknown tongue as without reference to the things represented. As it is the ideas which words suggest that constitute knowledge, so it is Christ's words and his benefits that constitute the value of the sacraments; and they cannot be used with any just conception of their real nature without leading the soul directly to him. Any theory of their office which even proposes the temptation to stop at themselves is utterly destructive of their true design. The questions which have been agitated with so much zeal among the Popish Theologians, whether the consecration of a Priest imparts a mystic power to the external symbols, enabling them to produce effects which, independently of his benediction, they could not accomplish,—whether his intention bestows this magical virtue is absolutely essential to its actual communication, whether the appropriate results of the ordinances are secured ex opere operantis or ex opere operato, or by both conjointly,—questions of this sort, which have among the sainted Doctors of Rome, are too obviously absurd to be asked upon the Protestant hypothesis. And yet Princeton tells us that Rome and ourselves are precisely agreed upon the nature of the sacraments, (11) that she, as we do, makes them signs and seals of the new covenant and that she, but upon the hopes of her children, not upon them, but upon the glorious object whom they represent. So thought not Calvin (12) when he indignantly rebuked against the "pestilential and fatal nature of the opinions" which he attributed to the Sophistical schools and declares, in his *Institutes* Tract concerning the necessity of Reformation, (13) "that the sacraments of the New Law, or those now used in the Christian Church, justly, and confer grace, provided we do not obstruct their operation by any mortal sin." So thought not Turlein (14) who *videlicet* treats it as the doctrine of the Papists, that the sacraments are not signs and seals of the everlasting covenant, but true, proper, physical causes of the grace they are said to represent. This error, concerning the inherent efficacy of the sacraments, Pietist (15) also declares to be contrary to their nature. Owen (16) felt that there was a vital controversy betwixt us and Rome on this point when he renounced Popish baptism as a species of idolatry. It is impossible to read the Reformed confessions and the apologies which the Reformers made for them without being impressed with the fact, that their authors labored under a deep conviction, that the minds of the people were seduced, by the teachings of Rome, with dangerous and fatal error on the very essence of the sacraments, the nature of their relation to the covenant of grace, the precise office they discharge under the dispensation of the Gospel. This was, in fact, a standing point of controversy between the two parties. Rome represented the new doctrines concerning gratuitous justification and the work of the spirit, as derogatory to the dignity and value of the sacraments, and artfully turned the tide of prejudice, growing out of the old associations of mystery and awe with which the people

had been accustomed to look upon the consecrated symbols, against the restorers of the church. The cry everlastingly was, you have robbed the sacraments of their glory. You have degraded them into empty shows." You have introduced your new fangled doctrines of faith and the Spirit in their place. These and similar accusations were continually alleged against the Reformers by the Papists, showing that there was a radical difference between them as to the design of the sacraments. Rome felt that one of her strongest holds upon the people was their attachment to these mysteries of her faith, and hence she was anxious, as much as possible, to make the sacraments the seat of the work. While the Papists charged the Reformers with prostituting these solemn and august ceremonies into worthless signs, the Protestants retorted upon Rome that she had converted them into charms, and had invested creatures of dust and earth, the beggarly elements of this world, with the high prerogatives of God. The question was not so much about the mode of operation, as Princeton insinuates, but about the agent that operated, it was a question whether the sacraments themselves conferred grace or whether God the Holy Spirit conferred it, employing them simply as means which had no intrinsic power to do the work. It was a question whether the sacraments were really signs or efficient agents, and if this be not a question concerning their nature, it would be hard to raise one that is. If the impression of the Reformers was right that Rome exalted the sacraments into true and proper causes of grace, there can be no doubt that whatever she may have professed in words, she did in fact deny them to be signs, and consequently changed their relations to the covenant of grace and made them essentially different things from what Christ had appointed. It is a matter of no sort of consequence that the Reformers themselves failed to deduce this inference. The full application of a principle is not always perceived at once, and the soundness of a conclusion depends upon the truth of the premises and the rigour of the reasoning and not upon human authority. If the essence of the sacraments is determined by their relation to the covenant of grace and that relation consists in their being signs and seals of its blessings, then whoever denies the reality of the signs or teaches doctrines inconsistent with it evidently destroys the very being of the sacraments, and what he presents under their names, whether charms or magic or physical causes of grace, are an impious and blasphemous substitution. This is precisely what Rome does. While she retains the ancient definitions and uses the expressive signs and seals she vacates their meaning by giving such a view of the actual offices they discharge in the economy of redemption as to make signs no more signs, seals no more seals. They cease to be, in the ordinary sense of the phrase, means of grace and become laws of grace. She teaches a mechanical theory of salvation, calculated at once to exalt her Priests and to degrade God, and fritters down the personality of the ever glorious spirit into the mere nexus which connects a cause with its effect, a law with its results. She teaches men accordingly to rely upon the sacraments and not upon Christ, to stop at the external act, as if water, bread, wine were our Saviours, instead of looking to him in whom all the truths which could be committed to sign she holds the sacraments to beal signs. These statements I shall endeavor to make good.

HENLEY.

NOTES.

- (1) "Is it then correct as to the form? Is it administered in the name of the Trinity?" Princeton Review, July 1845, p. 450.
(2) "The sacraments are signs and seals of the new covenant, and that she, but upon the hopes of her children, not upon them, but upon the glorious object whom they represent." So thought not Calvin (12) when he indignantly rebuked against the "pestilential and fatal nature of the opinions" which he attributed to the Sophistical schools and declares, in his Institutes Tract concerning the necessity of Reformation, (13) "that the sacraments of the New Law, or those now used in the Christian Church, justly, and confer grace, provided we do not obstruct their operation by any mortal sin." So thought not Turlein (14) who videlicet treats it as the doctrine of the Papists, that the sacraments are not signs and seals of the everlasting covenant, but true, proper, physical causes of the grace they are said to represent. This error, concerning the inherent efficacy of the sacraments, Pietist (15) also declares to be contrary to their nature. Owen (16) felt that there was a vital controversy betwixt us and Rome on this point when he renounced Popish baptism as a species of idolatry. It is impossible to read the Reformed confessions and the apologies which the Reformers made for them without being impressed with the fact, that their authors labored under a deep conviction, that the minds of the people were seduced, by the teachings of Rome, with dangerous and fatal error on the very essence of the sacraments, the nature of their relation to the covenant of grace, the precise office they discharge under the dispensation of the Gospel. This was, in fact, a standing point of controversy between the two parties. Rome represented the new doctrines concerning gratuitous justification and the work of the spirit, as derogatory to the dignity and value of the sacraments, and artfully turned the tide of prejudice, growing out of the old associations of mystery and awe with which the people

WATCHMAN & OBSERVER.

RICHMOND, MARCH 12, 1846.

A very fair specimen of the arguments upon which Protestants rely in support of their exclusive claims to be the church of Christ is found in the following article which we copy entire from a late number of the "Southern Churchman," to which we shall append some remarks.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

The Apostles, when they first founded the Church, conformed exactly to the laws which Christ had given for a rule to his Church in every age. One law was not given for the age of the Apostles, and another for after ages. If this was the case, let those different laws be distinctly pointed out. The Apostles themselves were such officers as the Gospel constitution prescribed. Therefore, so long as the Gospel Constitution continues, there must be such officers in the Church, as the Apostles were; or the Church has not such officers as the Gospel constitution points out for her. Nor has she such officers as she had at first. And unless she has such officers she cannot be like the Church of Christ, when it was first founded. So far as any Church deviates from the order of the Church of Christ, when it was first founded, so far they have departed from the rule given to the Church from heaven.

It must be allowed, that the Apostles acquainted the world with their commission, and from whom they received it, and gave sufficient evidence that they had such a commission from Christ as they pretended to execute; and that this commission was recorded in Scripture, that all the churches might know, what their commission was, and how far it extended.

There is nothing in the commission of the Apostles, that indicates their office to be temporary; but much to the contrary. Those, who hold that the Apostolic office ceased with the Apostles, have nothing to offer in support of their assertion that has any manner of weight in it.

A proper distinction ought to be made between the evidence of the apostolic office, and the office itself. There has not been such care taken in this particular as might be wished. If there had, it might have prevented much alteration. There is a manifest distinction between the office and the evidence of the office. Yet the Presbyterians have not made the least distinction in the case. They suppose that the evidence for the office itself; at all times they take it for part of the office. By all times they take it for evidence for the foundation of the office.

or they say, "the apostolic office has ceased, because the extraordinary powers have ceased, on which it was founded."

The working of miracles was not the office of the Apostles, nor the foundation of the office.—The commission given by Christ was the foundation of the office; and the working of miracles the evidence that the religion they preached was true religion;—and that they were the chief ministers of it, under Christ the head, who gave them the authority.

If we inquire into the nature of the apostolic office, and distinguish that which belonged to the office, from that which was an evidence to the world, that there was such an office in the Church; we shall readily discern that there is the very same reason why the apostolic office should continue to the end of the world, as why it should be appointed at first.

If we recollect in what the essence of the apostolic office consisted, and remember that the working of miracles did not belong to the Apostles as part of their office; it will appear that a man's reasons are very weak indeed, who asserts that the apostolic office has ceased, because the working of miracles has ceased? Any man that reasons at this rate, confesses that he does not know how to answer his opponent's argument.

When our Saviour gave a charge to the Apostles, "that one should not be above another;" he meant that one Apostle should not be above another Apostle; that one Presbyter should not be above another Presbyter; that one Deacon should not be above another Deacon in office. We have no reason to think, that Christ had a design to forbid a subordination of officers in his Church; for if he had, it is certain the Apostles would not have assumed to themselves a character superior to the Presbyters, which they actually did. There certainly were three orders of ministers in the Church of Christ at first. St. Paul says, "God hath set some in his Church, first Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers;—after that miracles."

If it is, after God had appointed three orders of officers in his Church, he gave to these officers the power of working miracles, to evidence among other things to the world, that he had appointed these three orders of officers in his Church. The words after that, were not accidentally inserted; but with design to distinguish between the office, and the evidence of the office. Here St. Paul has told us, as plain as words can express it, that God hath appointed three orders of officers in his Church. Are we the Church of God? Then we must have the same order, that is, the Apostolic order, as well as the other two. Yet we have the Apostolic order ceased with the Apostles. Have the Apostles told us that their office was to cease? They have not given the least hint of this, which they would not have failed to have done, had they been acquainted with such a design. Therefore, unless it can be proved, that the Apostles, under inspiration, have abolished the Apostolic office, there must be three orders of Gospel ministers in Gospel Churches still, by apostolical, or which is the same, divine institution.

Whenever a rule is given from Heaven to the Church, that rule remains in full force, till such time as it is set aside by the same authority which gave it at first. No man has had authority since the time of the Apostles, to change the constitution of the Church, formed by the Apostles. Or to say, the Church is not to be governed now, in the same manner that it was in the age of the Apostles; unless he produces an order from Heaven, sufficiently authenticated to support his assertion. I conclude, therefore, that the law given to the Church in the age of the Apostles, must be first abrogated, before the Apostolic office can be supposed to have ceased. So long as the Church is under the same law, it must be under the same discipline, and consequently Presbyters must be subject to the successors of the Apostles.

When we see the constitution of the Church in the days of the Apostles, is the very same with that of the Church of England; we must conclude, that the Church of England, in her constitution, is regulated by the same laws which were given by Christ to the Church universal at first. And, consequently, that Church, in her constitution, can be supported from Scripture.—This must appear to be the case, in the judgment of every man who is not blinded with prejudice. We have Scripture to support our position upon this point; "Let us be with you always, even to the end of the world, Amen." How could He be with the Apostles to the end of the world, unless the office was to continue to that period? As to the pretence that He could be with their ordinary office, but their extraordinary office was to cease; that is all the invention of man. If they had any office that was to cease, when they were dead, they could have told us of it. The Scripture has not given us the least intimation of it;—therefore it is a matter without foundation; and it is a great pity that any man should be led away with such

delusion. However, if any one has any evidence that the Apostolic office was to cease, let it be produced.—Lening.

We do the writer credit for starting with a true principle; but a principle which he seems strangely to forget at the conclusion of the third sentence. His whole argument rests upon the assumption that because there were Apostles at the beginning of the gospel dispensation, there must be a succession of Apostles to the end of time. But it may be asked, in reply, whether any such necessity exists? Whether the Apostles may not have been appointed with extraordinary powers for the organization of the Church, and for her instruction in the doctrines and duties of the christian dispensation; and when this was done—when this organization and instruction were completed, whether they could not resign that commission into the hands of him who gave it without appointing successors, just as an ambassador when he has finished the duties of the mission upon which he is sent, surrenders his trust to the government appointing him? When the Apostles were appointed to their office, there was, properly speaking, no gospel church state—no organized christian communion distinct from the Jewish service; and it was committed to them in special trust to set all things "in order" as Christ had commanded them. The true model of a christian church is therefore to be found in such societies as they organized. But these were complete for the purpose of instruction, and government, and discipline, under the officers whom they appointed. But what officers did they appoint? If all the models of the churches which were planted by the apostles are examined, not one will be found in which they have left a successor. The bishops, or overseers, of which there were often many in a single church, were neither singly nor collectively successors to the Apostolic Office—nor were the Presbyters or Elders, who were appointed to teach and to rule; nor were the deacons to whom were entrusted the distribution of the charities of the church, and the management of its temporal concerns. Not one of the original apostles had a successor except Judas; and the bishopric of this apostate was assigned to another by lot, before the proper organization of any christian church. (Acts i: 15-26). But when "Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword;" (Acts xii: 2)—no one was appointed to succeed him; And when the other Apostles fell one after another, till John was the only survivor, there is not the slightest intimation that their place was supplied. It thus appears that when they had finished their work which God gave them to do, they resigned their trust into his hands with their lives, without leaving any to succeed them in their extraordinary office as apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ.

And yet we are gravely told in this article that the apostles have their successors in the church. But as the historical argument gives no countenance to the assumption, in order to make assurance doubly sure that it is utterly groundless, there are other tests which may be applied to the claim. It will be remembered that Paul when he declared (2 Cor. xiii: 11) that "in nothing was he behind the very chiefest Apostles," immediately added, "Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you, in all patience and signs and wonders and mighty deeds." There seems then to have been some striking evidence of his apostleship—something that distinguished the signs and wonders and mighty deeds which he wrought in their presence, from those which were wrought by others who were endowed with miraculous gifts otherwise a "Presbyter or Deacon," might have presented as strong a claim to the Apostleship as Paul. It is manifest therefore that miraculous gifts, and miraculous gifts of an eminent kind were once an evidence of Apostleship—an evidence of the "Office." For it is peculiar to prelate that "Presbyterians have not made the least distinction" between the "Office and the evidence of the Office. It is made in the production of the evidence. For if evidence is adduced, it is adduced to prove something. When Paul refers to "the signs of an Apostle," he does it to prove that he holds the office of an Apostle—that he is not an intruder—that he has special powers conferred upon him by the Lord Jesus, which had not been conferred upon him by those who had inferior miraculous gifts. But what "signs of an Apostle" do they exhibit who now claim to be their successors?—What evidence do they afford of their being called to this exalted office? They will avail them nothing to say that "because the working of miracles have ceased," there is no necessity now of producing those credentials which the nature of the subject demands. There were those of old "who said they were Apostles but did lie." And it is but the dictate of common prudence to require proof in a matter so grave and momentous.

As the Apostles appointed no successors—as none were named among the officers of the churches which they organized—and as none but themselves exhibited the "signs of an Apostle" either in that, or in any subsequent ages, it seems to be a legitimate conclusion that the office itself ceased at their death. And this conclusion will be greatly strengthened by considering the other peculiar characteristics of the Apostolic office. And 1. The Apostles had an immediate personal call from the Lord Jesus himself. This cannot be doubted with respect to the original twelve, nor with respect to Paul, who by special revelation was designated to this office. And from the account given in the case of him who was chosen to succeed Judas, (Acts i: 26) it seems to have been an essential qualification that he should have seen Christ and been able to bear witness of his resurrection. But what evidence can they adduce who claim to be the successors of the Apostles, that they have had an immediate and personal call to this office from the Lord Jesus Christ? Have they seen him with their eyes—conversed with him face to face, and been endowed by him with the gift of being infallibly preserved from all error in doctrine and error in practice? Or does the Holy Ghost bear witness that their teaching is in strict accordance with the Word and Spirit of Christ?

2. The commission of the Apostles was equally extensive to all nations and to all churches that might be gathered through their ministry. They had no particular dioceses assigned them. Their field was the world. And under their commission they felt free to go wherever they pleased, and preach wherever they pleased—to Jews, Gentiles, Barbarians, Scythians, bond and free. And one Apostle never intimated to another that he was trespassing upon his peculiar province. And

3. Their authority was co-extensive with their commission. It was an authority that extended to all churches no matter by whom planted, or by whom watered. But none of the Prelates of our day except the Pope of Rome, lay any claim to so extensive a jurisdiction. And in his case it is a claim which cannot be sustained. But to be the successors of the Apostles it is necessary to have the same commission, and the same authority. He that holds the Apostolic Office in Virginia must have the unquestioned right of exercising it to the same extent in any other State of the Union, or in any other part of the Globe; and all that hold it elsewhere must have prerogatives equally great, and a jurisdiction equally extensive. And wherever their lot happens to be cast, it must be known by some sure and infallible signs that they are the veritable successors of the Apostles. From the nature of the Office, therefore, it is manifest that the Apostles had no successors.

But still it is insisted that there were three orders in the ministry originally, and that therefore there must be three orders still. And what is remarkable, the only passage adduced to support the Apostolic Succession is 1 Cor. xii: 28. "And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." The argument, if we understand it, seems to be this: that Apostles, prophets and teachers answer respectively to Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Bishop corresponds to Apostle—Priest to Prophet, and Deacon to Teacher. And the remainder of the passage including "helps, governments," and the like, were not officers; but evidence of the offices held by Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, *altes*, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. We will not now dispute about the interpretation of this passage. We will admit its correctness for argument's sake, and at the same time thank this advocate of Apostolic Succession for the suggestion he has made. Upon his own interpretation, the Office is one thing and the evidence of the office another; and the word, "after that" marks the distinction between them. But did it not occur to him that if they retain this office

DEPARTURE OF MISSIONARIES FROM INDIA.

We regret to state, says the Calcutta Christian Advocate, that the following Christian laborers will be compelled to leave India during the ensuing cold season: the Rev. W. Buyers, of the London Mission, Benares; the Rev. J. Macaulin, of the Episcopal Mission, Bhagalpore; the Rev. W. W. Evans, of the Baptist Mission, Orissa.