your ideas of their Church have thus itting the load of om to abstain from

f James makes it ty at Jerusalem. comes up to Jerus xxi. 18.) Peter i directs Mary's ediately to James ith inconsistency rtain came from

is authority and essors Scripture ealed any of the stem of Church sition of Peter it necessary to ct when Judas ed martyrdom? rmonize at the ns of which for ent? How was Churches, and of the different ing these and le or nothing. a system thus eing withheld,

can be no cause of marvel, when we think of the many splendid works, the sublime lessons, the doctrines, the precepts and the prayers of Christ and His Apostles, of which no record has come down to us. In point of fact there seems to have been no division of opinion as to the government of the Primitive Church, and therefore unlike most other of its doctrines, less cause for a formal enunciation of the same. But whenever the sacred writers do touch the subject, it is to enforce and illustrate the very opposite of the democratic idea.

But if St. Luke does not pause in penning those graphically written historical events to expound this great Church principle, the life and writings of St. Paul speak out with a clearness which only the prejudiced and Shibboleth-bound can misinterpret. Those writings are divided into classes; the first class addressed to Churches in their individual and collective capacity; the second class to individual men, Timothy and Titus. Now this is to me a most significant fact that throughout those full and elaborately written Epistles "to the Churches," there is not one word touching the choice, qualification or ordination of their ministers; nay more there is not one direction which would explicitly convey to the mind of an unprejudiced reader, that the power of discipline was committed into the hands of the individual Church members. only apparent exception to this is in such general exhortations and directions as are contained in Chap. v. of the 1 Cor. and Chap. iii. of 2 Thess.