

in 420, writes that, "*the custom of the whole Christian Church has adopted it as a law, that while persons are baptized in the inferior towns by priests and deacons, the Bishop travels out to them to lay his hands on them, and imparts the Holy Spirit.*" And again, "*the celebration of this ordinance was conferred upon the Bishops for their honor. If you ask where it is written, it is written in the Acts of the Apostles. . But if there were no authority from Scripture, the consent of the whole world, in this particular, would be equivalent to a law.*"

c. And thus down to the days of the Reformation, with a difference (that I shall presently explain) in its mode of administration between the Eastern and Western Churches, was Confirmation observed. Then we find the celebrated CALVIN, usually so violent in opposition to every custom, good or bad, that he believed peculiar to Rome, and who would have, if possible, set down Confirmation as a superstition, (for the obvious reason, that it could be administered only by the Episcopal order, which, in his revolutionary scheme of government he was forced to forego,) we find, I say, Calvin, declaring in his comment on Heb. chap. vi., that *this one passage*, (on which we have been dwelling,) *was abundantly sufficient to prove that the rite derived its origin from the Apostles.* The Reformer BEZA held the same view.

LUTHER, as is well known, retained Confirmation, and this Rite is still practised by that large body of Protestants, called Lutherans, at the present day. Indeed, before receiving any civil appointment in Prussia and Denmark, it is necessary to produce a certificate of Confirmation.

I might quote the opinions of our own most learned Bishops of the 16th and 17th centuries and many others of highest authority in the Anglican Church, but time will not permit, and I must bring to an end this part of the subject, by stating