

cepts, are applicable and obligatory through all ages, and as to all the relations and circumstances of life. They were received and held by that Early Church as inspired and authoritative writings, and the Christian Churches since, through their whole duration and history, of eighteen hundred years, have acknowledged them as of Divine authority, and as given for their instruction and obedient observance. Yet, now, in this Nineteenth Century of such acknowledgment and continued use of these inspired Epistles for such instruction and guidance, this unbelieving Essayist, a Minister of this revealed Christianity, comes forth and tells us, in effect, that the whole of the Churches, throughout all those ages, have been in utter ignorance and error, as to the duration of the authority of these sacred writings, and that the whole of the preceptive parts of them, were only, "lessons for the time," of temporary application and authority, and merely "the fruit of current history." The presumption and impiety of these assertions are about equal. Why did he not include the doctrinal parts of the Epistles in this limitation of their authority? To these parts of them he takes no exception. Surely, if the doctrinal portions of them are of enduring authority, even on the ground of reason alone, we are bound to conclude that the preceptive portions are equally so.

On page 34, contrary to what he had just before said, as to taking the example of the Early Church, rather than her precepts, he writes, that we are not to be "servile copyists of her practices," and says, "we are not to make every supper a Sacrament, because the early Christians did so." It is strange that he should have made such an unfounded and absurd assertion. They did not make every supper a Sacrament. They observed this Sacred Ordinance on the Lord's day,—the first day of the week,—but they ate suppers as ordinary meals, on the other six days; and often, as commanded, practised hospitality one to another, at such meals.