

they reject the Rite of Confirmation? Assuredly we should all unite in ever maintaining Apostolic principles, and perpetuating Apostolic practices, and thus have a sure ground of confidence that we ourselves are "built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone." What other Laying-on-of-hands have we to put in its place, if we reject Confirmation? Absolutely nothing else.

It has, however, been said, that these words of S. Paul refer to the Ordination of Ministers, to what is termed Holy Orders. It is worth while to examine this interpretation of which a moment's consideration will finally dispose. Let us read the passage with attention. Now observe, that the inspired writer is here treating of *subjects that are of universal application*, and not at all confined to a limited number. All the other elementary truths he enumerates are as necessary for the people as for their teachers. They are *first principles to be taught to every Christian*. All need Repentance; all must have Faith; Baptism is intended for all; every individual believer has a hope of the Resurrection of the dead; all must stand before the Judgment-seat of Christ. On what ground then, can we refuse to the doctrine of Laying-on-of-hands the same universal application? But look at the 12th verse of chapter v. This shows us at a glance the sort of persons whom the Apostle was addressing. They were not presbyters, nor deacons, nor ministers of any order. He says, "*When for the time you ought to be teachers.*" That is, they had been professing Christians long enough, if they had profited by their opportunities, to have been able and qualified to teach. So far is he from speaking of the Laying-on-of-hands in ordination, that he tells them, in consequence of their sad backwardness in the knowledge of divine things, that it was needful to instruct them over again in the first simple truths they had learned in the beginning. And so he takes the oppor-