



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries
and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.



A REPLY
TO
CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS
OF THE
REV. GODFREY FAUSSETT, D.D.
THE LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.
IN HIS SERMON
"THE REVIVAL OF POPERY."

BY THE
REV. J. JORDAN, B.A.
CURATE OF SOMERTON, OXFORDSHIRE.

OXFORD:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,
AND SOLD BY J. L. WHEELER, HIGH STREET,
AND HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. LONDON.

1838.



A REPLY
TO
CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS
OF THE
REV. GODFREY FAUSSETT, D.D.

SIR,

IN the Sermon you have published for the benefit of the Junior Students of the University of Oxford, entitled "The Revival of Popery," and preached before the University, at St. Mary's, on Sunday, May 20, 1838, you have felt it your duty to make certain allegations against a large class of the Christian community, and to charge them with maintaining views and opinions, which, though not favouring Popery, nor tending to its dissemination amongst us, you have denounced, as unfitting those who hold them for entering the lists of controversy with the Romanist, and so rendering them incapable of taking part in the great struggle, which is unquestionably at the

present moment going on, for the support and propagation of truth;—that is the blessed contents of the Bible, the most Holy Word of the One Everlasting God, Father, Son, and Spirit.

The allegations referred to are contained in pages 9 to 12 of your Sermon. Having arrived at the conclusion laid down in page 8, “that a revival of the contest between the Churches of England and of Rome has become inevitable, or rather that it has actually commenced, and that, inasmuch as it has fallen on us almost by surprise, it has found us very imperfectly prepared for our defence;—it has overtaken us when labouring under the weakness consequent on almost unexampled disunion, both civil and religious;” you proceed in page 9 to say, that “it deeply concerns us to direct our serious thoughts to the condition of the really religious sections of our community, to their views and principles, and to the false and unfavourable position occupied by some among them with reference to the impending struggle.”

You have then very accurately defined one of these sections as follows. “Now there are notoriously existing among us a large and influential body of Christians, consisting chiefly of the dissenting sects, which fell into schism at or near the period of the Reformation; of those other deno-

minations which have more recently seceded from the Church ; and, unhappily we may add, of those also, who, though nominally members of the Church of England, have in some measure adopted sectarian views. All those persons, however widely they may differ from each other on many points, naturally constitute but one class, as far as concerns the matter now before us." Now however *unhappy* such a position may be for me, who hope that I am something more than a nominal member of the Church of England, yet mine at the present moment is that of one prepared to defend the religious section, so defined as above, from the allegations brought against it ; and to shew that upon the very principles they advocate, and upon those alone, can the lists of controversy with the Romanist be ever entered with success.

The indictment by you preferred against those whom you have so arraigned is the following : " that they despise or lightly regard Ecclesiastical Authority and Christian Unity, the claims of an Apostolical Episcopacy, the Divine commission of the Christian Priesthood ; they neglect the guidance of their appointed Pastors, put no faith in their exclusive importance as the Ministers and Stewards of God's holy mysteries, and, by a chain of consequences as

necessary as it is deplorable, degrade the Sacraments themselves to a corresponding level, either regarding them merely as initiatory and commemorative rites, or, at the best, losing more or less of their implicit reliance on them as the seals of the Christian Covenant—the efficacious means of grace and salvation. On the other hand, while they thus undervalue the authority and importance of the Church, they as proudly exalt their own, claiming the unlimited exercise of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and maintaining the undoubted capacity for such judgment in all ordinary Christians.”

In this indictment there are eight separate and distinct allegations, each of which will require an independent investigation. It will be unnecessary, however, here to weary you or the reader, by an enumeration of them, since I will set each out successively as it comes under consideration. Yet it is essential you should understand what is the great fundamental principle maintained by the several parties forming the section referred to by you; what may be said to be the bond by which they are united into one, notwithstanding their manifold differences. You have attempted to connect them together by the various specifications you have

set out, while there is one opinion which not only unites them, but which separates them from from all others. That opinion relates to the Bible. The holy word of God is received, and rejoiced in, by them, as the sole authority, independent of all others, in religious matters;— as an authority, which being free, accessible, and open to the comprehensions of all men, all have the right to refer to, and to judge for themselves of the verity or falsehood of any doctrine. All questions of discipline, or of doctrine, they submit to its paramount authority. There only is to be found the end of all controversy, and whenever it becomes necessary to appeal to an authority for judgment, that is the single and supreme one to which reference is made. With this understanding of the fundamental principle that unites us, and on which all our confidence here, and all our hopes hereafter rest, I shall proceed to examine in detail the several charges alleged against us.

1. *That we despise or lightly regard ecclesiastical authority.* This charge must be understood either as referring to ecclesiastical authority in the abstract, or to that in each particular case. It cannot refer to it in the abstract, because there is no section of the religious community in this land, but maintains some form or degree of eccle-

siastical discipline. That they differ extensively amongst themselves on the point is not indeed to be questioned, yet however wide may be the extremes of arch-episcopacy on the one hand, and of independency on the other, it is beyond dispute that one and all do acknowledge an ecclesiastical authority. Is it then to be charged upon us "that we despise or lightly regard" the very thing we acknowledge? I have said that we claim to be Bible Christians. That we hold ourselves bound, nay rather rejoice that we are privileged, to be submissive to the recorded ordinances and statutes of our God. We know it to be written that "He resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble;" that "the powers that be are ordained of him;" "that we should submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake;" that "whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." On such a stringent authority as this we yield ourselves gladly, each in our vocation and section, to the ecclesiastical discipline and authority to which we have conformed, and so long as the authority stands, we hope by God's grace to continue submissive to it; but this submission by no means precludes the effort on our part of seeking to obtain reform and improvement in any

particular, which we think might be more beneficially regulated ; nor is any such effort in the slightest degree incompatible with the duty which we owe and render to the authorities as at present constituted. Thus, for example, I as an episcopalian, would rejoice to see many things amended in our discipline, which I think would give renewed life and vigour to our apostolical church ; there are some things which I feel persuaded ought not to exist or be continued amongst us ; yet at the same time while I seek their amendment, or removal, I submit myself implicitly to them, hoping to see the day, or at least looking forward to it in faith, even though I should never witness it, when these blemishes will be removed, and our reformed church rendered still more pure. To charge, then, those who hold such views as these with “ despising or lightly regarding ecclesiastical authority,” is an allegation that will require proof to substantiate it. Your opinions, indeed, upon this subject, they may not coincide with ; but even these, I will undertake to say, they do not “ despise or lightly regard,” because you, and those who think with you, esteem them religiously, and as such we should respect them, however erroneous they might appear to be to us.

2. *That we despise or lightly regard Christian*

unity. There is no point upon which such great mistakes have existed as Christian unity. The Papists first, and the Church of England since, have alike fallen into the same error of imagining that uniformity is unity, and they have blindly sought to uphold and maintain the first at the expence and neglect of the second. This, however, is neither the time nor the place to enter largely into a consideration of them. I shall hope that shortly both may be afforded me. It is sufficient here to say, that the religious section, charged as above, had hoped that they were engaged in the dissemination of Christian unity; that disregarding minor differences and disagreements about non-essentials, they were "endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;"—that knowing "the differences of administrations, and diversities of operations" that exist amongst us, they believe "it is the same God which worketh all in all, and that all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." In such an unity they rejoice; such a fraternal union of Christian brethren they hope to extend and encourage; and of those so hoping it is surely not to be charged upon them that "they despise or lightly regard Christian unity."

3. *That we despise or lightly regard an apostolical episcopacy.* The great questions respecting an apostolical episcopacy are as to the nature of its existence, and the extent of its jurisdiction. These are questions, however, that need not now be opened, because we are not called upon to discuss them, but merely to consider whether we have respect for them or not, whatever we may esteem their nature or extent to be. Now all parties think their episcopacy, that is their ecclesiastical supervision, for such is the strict meaning of the term, and not that limited one in which we employ it to designate the regimen of Bishops, to be apostolical—that is, conformable to the apostolical faith and to apostolical discipline. Amongst the differences that exist who shall decide which is right? All appeal to the Bible in justification of their own views. All claim to be apostolical as being grounded and rooted in that. And until it can be demonstrated beyond dispute which is the essential one, such differences must continue. But in this at least are all agreed, that an apostolical supervision, accordant with the apostolical times and discipline, is to be acknowledged and submitted to. In this, as in a former instance, all may not coincide with your opinions, as to what are the essentials constituting an apostolical episcopacy, but all are agreed

in accounting necessary, and hoping that they maintain, apostolical discipline.

4. *That we despise or lightly regard the Divine commission of the Christian priesthood.* A Christian priesthood, in the true sense of a priest, I know not of. We have no sacrificings, and a priest is essentially a sacrificer. Substitute for the term "Christian priesthood," "Christian ministry," and I can at once join issue with you. I know not the section of English Christians that does not believe in and respect the Divine commission of their pastors, as the ministers of grace and stewards of the mysteries of God. You probably intend to claim for the ministers of the establishment, both in this charge and the two succeeding ones, a superiority over all other ministers, as *κατ' ἐξοχήν* the only true and divinely commissioned ministers in the land, and so would include all who do not receive them as such, as worthy of your objurgation. Yet whatever differences of opinion may exist, as to the form of ordination and appointment to the ministry of the word, there is no religious party but esteems and respects their ministers, because they account them to be divinely commissioned; and because, unless they did so account of them, they could not acknowledge them to be ministers and dispensers of grace. They may not be agreed as to

the channel through which their divine commission is to come, each of necessity, as we of course do, accounting their own the genuine one; but the Divine commission itself they are all agreed in esteeming as essential to a Christian ministry.

5. *That they neglect the guidance of their appointed pastors.* By appointed pastors you must of course mean here those of the establishment; because it cannot be supposed that you will alledge against some of the parties named, and who are not connected with it, that they neglect the guidance of *their* appointed pastors. They have appointed pastors of their own, and the guidance of these they submit to, according to the apostolical injunction, "obey them that have the rule over you;" that is, as the marginal reading more correctly gives it, "them that guide you." These they do not neglect, and are free therefore from the charge made against them; while with respect to those, for whom you would claim their submission, they cannot be said to neglect their guidance, since they cannot conscientiously, according to their several views, acknowledge any but their own, to whose guidance they do submit, to be their appointed pastors.

6. *That they put no faith in their (appointed pastor's) exclusive importance as the ministers and*

stewards of God's holy mysteries. It is impossible to say whether the "exclusive importance" here claimed, is that of the established ministry over all other ministries, or that of the ministry over the people amongst whom they are appointed to serve. Both of these are contended for frequently at the present day by the high church party, and the charge is so ambiguously expressed that it might mean either. Whichever is intended I must dissent from both, because I can find no warrant in Scripture for any such exclusiveness. We have seen all along that the points upon which the various sections of our religious community are not agreed, I will not say are separated, are such as "experience, the never failing and effectual guide of individual conduct, and all the lessons of history, occupying, as it may be said to do, the place of national experience*," alike assure us must continue, as they have hitherto been, matters of doubt and debate. The exclusive importance of the ministers of the establishment is one of the very points which must apparently remain debateable. I, for one, when I see what has been done by our non-conforming brethren; when I call to mind their origin, and the noble sacrifice made by them in 1662, when no less than 2000 ministers of the Church of England

* Revival of Popery, p. 5, 6.

relinquished their preferments for conscience sake; and when I reflect upon the success that has attended their efforts in disseminating Christianity amongst the heathen, cannot but feel that our plea of exclusive importance is little better than a vain and empty boast.

7. *They degrade the sacraments themselves to a corresponding level, either regarding them merely as initiatory and commemorative rites, or, at the best, losing more or less of their implicit reliance on them as the seals of the Christian covenant—the efficacious means of grace and salvation.* Did I not know too well how perturbed our vision may become by the medium through which we view any object, I should stand amazed at this allegation. I had thought, indeed, that the opinions entertained by those whom you have thus charged with degrading the sacraments, directly tended to their more faithful, more pure, and more spiritual observance. I am sure at least that this is their aim. I am sure that they regard the one as the seal of the Christian covenant, as they account the other the means of their continual refreshing and strengthening in that covenant, which having been once sealed needeth not to be renewed. I am sure that they esteem both as the most efficacious means of grace and salvation. If there be any peculiarity in their administration of

them, it is a holy jealousy lest the recipients of them should not be worthy, or lest they should fall into that grievous and destructive error of supposing that because they have been partakers of the outward form, they are so necessarily of the inward spiritual grace; accounting baptism by water regeneration by the spirit, and the eating of bread and wine a spiritual feeding on the flesh and blood of Christ. Against such damning errors we do indeed strive to guard the souls committed to our care.

8. *On the other hand, while they thus undervalue the authority and importance of the Church, they as proudly exalt their own, claiming the unlimited exercise of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and maintaining the undoubted capacity for such judgment in all ordinary Christians.* Yes, Sir, this is our boast, though made we hope in humility, that all Christians, however lowly, however simple, are capable of reading and understanding for themselves the broad scope and intention of the Scripture. He who publicly in the temple of Jerusalem upon the Sabbath day addressed himself to the assembled crowds of Israel, and challenged them to "search the Scriptures, for that they testified of him," can surely never be understood as limiting that injunction amongst us, and saying in a land

of Bibles, “search not the Scriptures, but receive what others testify to you.” This is rather the groundwork of Popery. This is what the Roman Catholics would rejoice in, because it leaves it altogether in the power of the ministry to say, what is to be believed, and what is not. The consequence of such a state of things we know but too well. Our experience of Popery tells us what superstitions may be propounded as truth, what commandments of men for doctrine. Nor has even our reformed church been free from error in this respect. Before Wesley arose, the last great reviver of our church, where was the doctrine of Justification by Faith, that sure sign, as Luther has remarked, of a rising or falling church?—What was it that made Cowper say with so much truth,

How oft, when Paul has served us with a text,
Has Epictetus, Plato, Tully, preached!

Moral teaching, moral truths, cases of conscience, and questions more suitable to the cold and calculating philosophy of ancient Greece and Rome, than to that wisdom which is from above, and which glows with divine and human love,—these were the topics that resounded from our pulpits, and spread their deadening influence over the so called Christian community. And what is it that has changed the scene, renewed the face of the

nation, and gladdened with its genial beams our sunken and desponding hearts?—The Bible;—“the wine that maketh glad the heart of man, the oil that giveth him a cheerful countenance.”

And here, as I name the Bible, let me protest against that portion of your allegation in which you charge us with “undervaluing the authority and importance of the church, and as proudly exalting our own.” It is not our own that we ever depend upon. What I say continually from the pulpit is, receive not my doctrine as mine, neither follow any man as a teacher, but take your Bibles in your hand, go along with me as I preach, look out the word of Scripture to be considered, examine the passages introduced to illustrate it, and learn to judge for yourselves of Scripture, and to depend for yourselves upon Scripture, as the one only sure and infallible guide, which, if meekly and teachably submitted to, can never lead you into error. Are the people to be for ever learning, yet never coming to the knowledge of the truth?—If they are ever to learn, what is it that they ought to learn? Scripture, and Scripture truths. If you would teach a man mathematics, would you tell him not to learn Euclid, lest he come to wrong conclusions, but to content himself with taking those he finds worked out, and not concern himself with the

methods of proof employed in demonstrating them? Why then should the Bible be used otherwise?—Why should not all who can read it be encouraged to do so for themselves, and instructed to rest in it as a sure and safe guide? It is to be read indeed in a different spirit from other books,—it is to be read with a prayerful and a faithful heart, but it is nevertheless to be read by each, and may be understood by each, of that natural ability with which God has blessed each.

This, Sir, is our grand, our fundamental principle, and it falls in most appropriately here with the next portion of your sermon that is to come under review. I have replied to the eight allegations you have made, and come now to consider the conclusion which you have deduced from them. You ask, as if the question were unanswerable, “With what prospect of success can the advocate of such views as these enter the lists of controversy with the subtle Romanist? Amid all the errors and corruptions of Popery, enormous as they are, she has not absolutely failed to retain a portion of truth; and this truth, abused though it be in her hands to the purposes of sacerdotal influence, and disguised and distorted by superstition, is precisely that which, when skilfully displayed, is calculated to put to

shame and confusion the impugnors of ecclesiastical authority, the despisers of the ministerial functions, and the desecrators of the Sacraments." How grateful must your chief opponents be to you for the admission thus made. They are striving, as you yourself charge them, for the revival of such parts of Popery as accord with their notions of truth, and you give them a helping hand by saying that there is so much truth amid all "her errors and corruptions" as, "when skilfully displayed," may put to shame the great mass of the evangelical party in the land. So powerful an admission as this was surely not to have been expected from an adversary. Let it pass, however, for what it is worth, and let those who will take advantage of it. It can in no way weaken or damage the force of the answer to be made to your question. You say, "how is the advocate of the views you repudiate to enter the lists of controversy with the subtle Romanist?" By doing as David did, and discarding altogether the weapons and the mail of Philistine warfare. Let him go to no other armoury than the divine one. Let him not concern himself with the fathers, with traditions, with counsels, with dogmas or decrees; in a word, with any less authority than that of the Bible, and to the subtle Romanist he may say, "thou comest

unto me with sword and with spear, but I come unto thee in the name of the Lord God of Israel." What if the Romanist appeal to the infallibility of his church as overriding and interpreting Scripture? Experience, the sure guide of nations as of men, bears a testimony against it which nothing can gainsay, and leaves the Bible to stand alone on its own sublime simplicity and truth.

The more I see of Romanist controversies the more am I satisfied that they only tend to "vanity and vexation of spirit," just because the supremacy of the Bible is not made the foundation of them. Until Protestants and Romanists can come to that, prepared to submit themselves implicitly and entirely to its dictation, without the help of foreign aid, and without the recognition of any pretended concurrent authority, either of primitive usage, testimonies of the fathers, decrees of councils, traditions of the Church, or the like, the contest must continue as interminable as it has hitherto been. And who has the advantage all the while?—The Romanist; for as long as he can keep the contest on his own ground of *a priori* argument, and thus set the Scripture for the time aside, so long will he be a gainer at the expence of Bible truth.

You, Sir, however, are one of those who will not allow this free course to the word of God, that it may run and be glorified. You are one of those who think that the great bulk of the community are not thus to be trusted with the Bible. You argue "that the arrogant claims to independent judgment in religious matters, however vaunted in theory, are ever repudiated by the general practice of mankind, and are utterly inconsistent with the wants and weaknesses of our common nature. The great bulk of every community notoriously consists of those who, from youth, or defective education, or weakness of judgment, or engrossing avocations, or other causes, which need no farther enumeration, are utterly incapacitated for originating and completing their religious inquiries for themselves. Authority of some description or other is their sole dependence:—in matters of such high interest as the awful alternatives of a future state, they cannot rest till they have reposed their confidence somewhere. And if the legitimate claim to their religious trust be coldly withheld, or, at the most, indecisively proposed to them, their most natural refuge is in the bosom of that which assumes to itself the character of an Infallible Church*."

Now if the plan of salvation, devised and exe-

* Revival of Popery, p. 11.

cuted for us by God, and taught us in his holy Word, were some ingeniously subtle and intricate contrivance, requiring great depth of penetration and intellect to comprehend it, and not that simple truth which Paul taught to the jailor at Philippi, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved;" if it were not that which God intended it to be, when he designed it for all men without exception, "for that all have sinned and come short of his glory," and so it must of necessity be obvious to every, even the very meanest, capacity; if this were not one of its greatest peculiarities, one of the proofs, in fact, that it is of God, simple yet magnificent; easy to be understood and known, yet abounding in glory, transcendent in excellency;—if these were not its special attributes, the plea you have here set up might stand unimpeached. Yet, are our youth to be taught, we put the Bible in their hand, and instruct them to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest its contents."—Are there any whose religious education has been neglected, we commend them to the word of God's grace to supply their need.—Are there those whose avocations engross much of their time, we exhort them to use family devotion, accompanied with reading of the Scripture, well knowing that they will thus from day to day

feed upon the bread of life. In a word, are there any who seem to be, as you express it, "incapacitated for originating and completing their religious inquiries for themselves," to each and all of them we say, take the Bible in your hand, and there read in your own tongue the wonderful works of God, of "Jesus the author and finisher of your faith." "Authority of some description or other," as you justly observe, must be had recourse to in religious inquiries; "in matters of such high interest as the awful alternatives of a future state, men cannot rest till they have reposed their confidence somewhere;" but since God has given them such an authority, such a resting-place, in the Bible, let them not disregard his precious gift. Let them learn to depend upon that as a sure and safe guide, and they will never be led astray by the vain infallibility of the Romanist, nor by any other human, and therefore fallible, teachers.

Sir, with all due submission to yourself as one of the established authorities upon religious matters, I must beg leave to differ from you entirely as to the nature of the struggle that is impending over us. It appears to me, Sir, that you have altogether mistaken its true tendency. It is not a contest for the revival of Popery, for in this land, so highly favoured of Providence, so

richly watered by Divine grace, I have an humble faith and confidence that such a struggle is impossible. The spirit of Popery is only suited to the ages that gave it birth, and nurtured it to maturity. Its foundations are ignorance, and the dictations of a crafty and designing priesthood. The dark middle ages of the Christian æra delighted in its trammels, since it was suited to them, who "loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." But the light of Bible truth has now shone upon the world for three centuries, and though as yet its beams are but twilight, though except to ourselves as a nation it has scarcely risen above the horizon, it is still steadily, however slowly, climbing the vault of heaven; it is ascending to its zenith, and it would be a far easier task to impede the sun in his path to the meridian, than it would to check or interrupt the aspiring course of this divine and holy luminary.

The age is altogether above Popery. The nineteenth century is not that in which dogmas and decrees will be received at the word of man. We know our own liberty. "The schoolmaster is abroad." The Bible is in his hand. The people can read the pure word themselves. We know well the answer to those who would question the antiquity of the Protestant faith.

“Where was your religion,” say they, “before the reformation?”—“There,” is the reply, “where yours never was, in the Bible.” To the Bible, then, we take the people. “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” A few weak and vacillating minds there may be, as there ever will be, who are asking “by what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?”—not seeing that the Word alone is the authority, and seeking for that satisfaction which is incompatible with those who are appointed to walk by faith and not by sight, and so looking for some other to ease them of the burthen they ought themselves to bear, by authoritatively announcing to them that they are in the right way. Such as these may indeed be led to find refuge in the assumed infallibility of the Roman church. But that the great mass of the people can fall into this state is altogether impossible, unless education be checked, and the free circulation of the Bible be impeded. Under the grace and providence of an all-merciful God we may confidently trust that such calamities will not befall us.

What, then, it may well be asked, is the storm that lowers over us?—What is the struggle that impends?—It is a contest for the sole and undi-

vided supremacy of the Bible. It is a question respecting the authority upon which truth is to be received. Whether from the revealed Word of God alone, or from any other, presumed to be, concurrent testimony?—It is as to whether human traditions, human authorities, human deductions and propositions from Scripture, are to be taken in the stead of, or to stand upon an equality with, the infallible Word of God. Popery may indeed rejoice in the strife, because she knows that the triumph of the former would be the downfall of the latter, and that if the Bible can be brought into subjection to human authority and controul, she may rear boldly her front, with her true name inscribed upon her forehead, “Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.”

Of such a consummation, however, I have little fear. To reiterate a scriptural expression which has been already employed, let the Bible have free course, it must run and be glorified, and truth will prevail. At the same time much reformation is needed upon our part to ensure this. The progress of Popery in Ireland has been truly characterised by you. There, as you say, she “once more rears her mitred head, re-assumes, in defiance of violated law, her dignities and titles of

honour, re-erects the cathedral and the palace, and anticipates—and who shall say without some grounds for such anticipation—the early prostration of the Protestant establishment under her own restored supremacy.” If this be indeed her course, how shall it be stayed? Recent events, and recent attempts to improve our ecclesiastical system, would lead us to imagine that we can best oppose her re-erection of cathedrals and palaces by maintaining and upholding our own, that her dignities and titles of honour can most successfully be resisted by an array of ours, and that her mitred head may be lowered by carrying our own still higher. But is this the way that Christian men should conserve the truth? Might we not take a lesson from the world, and stoop to conquer? Might we not give up our dignities, renounce our titles, equalize our incomes, reject pluralities, eschew non-residence, and shew ourselves willing to renounce all for a master who was contented, though King of Heaven, to become a menial for us? Religion consists not in gothic tracery, or aspiring pinnacles; it needs not a palace to shelter it from the storms and malice of an evil world; the temple of Mount Sinai has stood its appointed time and perished; that of our Lord, in which he tabernacled upon earth, the second that was predicted to be more

glorious than the first, has ascended up on high ; that which now rests below is not a fabric of earthly erection, for “ who shall build me an house, saith God ?” but it is his own work, carried on by the Spirit in the hearts of men, whose plastic power, as it moulded them at first from the clay, so now it new-creates them to eternal life, making them “ temples of the Holy Ghost that is in them.” Formed of such materials, cemented by such a Spirit ; “ built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone ; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord ;” “ the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood,” shall never fail ; “ The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

THE END.