



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.



B. Russell

THE CRISIS COME,

BEING REMARKS ON

MR. NEWMAN'S LETTER TO DR. JELF,

AND ON

TRACT FOR THE TIMES, No. 90.

BY THE

REV. J. JORDAN, B. A.

VICAR OF ENSTONE, OXON.

OXFORD,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. L. WHEELER

1841.

(27)



THE CRISIS COME,

&c. &c.

PAINFUL as it must be to all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and Him crucified, in sincerity and truth, to contemplate the events that have been for some years past occurring, and that still are endeavouring to force an unholy progress amongst us; painful as it must be to others, who have vainly hoped and persuaded themselves that better things were intended, and that out of the School of the Tract Writers were to arise those, who were to revive in pristine vigour the presumed pure Christianity of an earlier age; it is no longer to be denied or dissembled that we have reached a Crisis the most important that has fallen upon the Church of England since the days of the Reformation itself. Not that we have now to fear the fagot and the stake, for I have no surmisings of any such extravagance as that, and therefore would at once renounce all idea of such a thing. The contest we have now to engage in is not one of blood, but of faith—one of first principles and truth: for now “when for the time we ought to be teachers,” to a world lying in darkness and the shadow of death, “we have need that one teach us again which be the first principles of the Oracles of God.” Heb. v. 12. It is for the Bible, and Bible truths, that we have again to strive, and that manfully, against “oppositions of science falsely so called, which some professing have erred from the faith,” 1 Tim. vi. 20, and would force upon us “another gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble us, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.” Gal. i. 6, 7. We have need to raise once more the banner of the Reformation, and to take our stand upon the great principle maintained by Chillingworth, the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. It is not the Church that is

in danger—the Church of Christ can never fall. The fiat has been spoken by the Eternal One upon earth, and can never be reversed—“The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” But while the Church cannot perish, we may lose our Churchism, by relinquishing its Scriptural truth, which is the life and spirit of the body. Without this we are but as the clay moulded by the hands of the Almighty workman, into the form and fashion of Adam, beautiful to behold and fair to look upon, but dead and inanimate until God breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul.

It is nothing, too, for us of the Church of England to unfurl the standard of our faith, and to point to our Scriptural Articles, as maintaining the simplicity and integrity of Scripture truth. The purity of these is the very question in dispute, and it is unblushingly affirmed that these were not intended to denounce and to repudiate the very errors they emphatically condemn; that they were directed against heresies of a different age and character, and consequently that they may include within them those who now again advance, and would propagate amongst us the very same errors which they condemn. The question, then, in dispute being what truths our Articles do contain, and what heresies they condemn; their validity in fact as standards being impugned, and their plain and simple meaning according to the words used being controverted, it is impossible to appeal to them in their own defence; and consequently we must go to that pure source and fountain whence they rise and flow. In one respect let us rejoice at this, thank God, and take courage. The appeal is to Scripture, and to its unimpeachable authority. The final issue of the contest, then, is safe. Truth must and will prevail. Her struggles may be great, her throes may be awful, but she shall at last assuredly “see of the travail of her soul, and be satisfied.”

The writings which contain such assertions and pretensions as these at the present moment, for others have before attempted this unscriptural work, are No. 90. of Tracts for the Times, and a Letter to Dr. Jelf, by Mr. Newman, the avowed author of the Tract, in explanation of it. The object of both these publications is to sap the strength of the Articles, to render them in a Romish and superstitious sense, and to claim for the author, and for those who think with him, licence from his brethren in the ministry, by

their silence and concurrence to maintain these errors, and at the same time to maintain communion with the Church of England, and to propagate these errors under the garb of her scriptural teaching. This is undisguisedly set forth in the concluding pages of the Letter; and Mr. Newman invites his brethren in the ministry to yield this to him, his coadjutors, and their views, in the following words:—"Let me now implore my brethren to submit, and not to force an agreement at the risk of a schism." p. 29. To leave such an invitation unreplyed to, to treat it with a melancholy silence, and thereby to encourage this vain hope, were treason against the Majesty of heaven, who condescended to die for us on earth, and against the supremacy of that written Word in which he has revealed himself to man. By all we hold dear in religion on earth, by all we hope for on high, by the love we have for Christ, by the charity we have for the souls of mankind, and by every fond anticipation we rejoice in of living in the presence of God for evermore; we are bound to speak out and to refuse compliance with this request.

It may be, indeed, that I have not conceived Mr. Newman aright, in supposing him to address the ministry at large, rather than his own immediate friends, whom he has possibly intended to denote by the term "my brethren." However this may be, for the passage is so far ambiguous, it is clear that whether he has directly proposed the thing here, or not, he has certainly aimed at it both in the Tract and in his Letter; and the whole scope and tenor of his teaching is steadily directed to this end, an assimilation of the minds and views of the ministry and the people to those of himself and his coadjutors.

And what is it that Mr. Newman invites us to concede? In Tract 90. first, and in his Letter to Dr. Jelf since, he would have us so explain and understand the Articles of the Church of England, as to believe and confess that they do not condemn the authoritatively taught errors of the Church of Rome according to the only authority which that Church allows, the decrees of the Council of Trent; that so far from condemning these, they mainly agree with them—that there is, therefore, no doctrinal difference between us and Rome, but that Rome is only practically in error, needing a small reformation to revive her, and to fit her for re-union with us; and that consequently those who hold and confide in the decrees of Trent, may also adhere to the Articles of the Church of England, provided that these last are

not "so closed as the received method of teaching closes them." The Letter of Mr. Newman, even more than the Tract No. 90, explicitly maintains these extraordinary proposals to the ministry of the Church of England. We will, therefore, first of all examine the former of these.

In the Letter a most unjustifiable attempt is made to draw a distinction between what is called the "authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome," and "the decrees of Trent." This "authoritative teaching" is represented as existing both before the Tridentine decrees and since, as at the present time. That there was what is technically called "authoritative teaching" in the Church of Rome before those decrees is unquestionable, for the multitude of her Councils testify of this, and bear witness to her manifold errors. But since those decrees, where has her "authoritative teaching" existed, but in the maintenance and exposition of those very decrees? They are in fact her last and most authoritative teaching, and none other is there that she will recognize and allow.

But why the desire to establish such a distinction as this?—Why any necessity at all for separating between the decrees of Trent and the teaching of Rome before and since?—It is a grievous subtilty to make a distinction where there is none, that on it may be grafted the pretence, that the Articles of the Church of England, while they deny and repudiate the "authoritatively taught" errors of Rome, do not deny and repudiate the very same identical errors in the decrees of Trent. For, it is most speciously argued, how could they?—"Whereas they were written before the decrees of Trent, they were not directed against those decrees." With as much truth and reason it might be said, "Whereas the Scripture was written before the decrees of Trent, it was not directed against those decrees."

But was ever fallacy invented so transparent as this? What if the Articles were "written" before the decrees of Trent?—What if they were "drawn up" previously?—Would this make them not condemn errors published subsequently, merely because they have been revived at a late day?—If so, the Articles are utterly valueless, for then they are of no force or validity against any revived error, however plainly and emphatically they may condemn it. And in the same way Scripture itself cannot be held to condemn errors which have originated since its publication.

But where is the TRUTH of the assertion that the Articles were "written" and "drawn up" before the decrees of Trent?—It is in letter, not in spirit. It is true in letter, it is false in spirit. The 42 Articles of Edward VI. were published in 1552, during the Sessions of the Council of Trent, which lasted from 1545 to 1563; but these Articles were modified and reduced to 39 in the reign of Elizabeth, and published in 1562. This might seem to bring them within the period of the Council, and so to favour the notion that they were not directed against its decrees. But when was the Ratification affixed to them? In 1571, after the decrees of Trent, when the errors of those decrees had been some years before the world, and when consequently the damning force of them must have been directed against the decrees themselves.

For, in truth and honesty, what matters it whether the Articles were written before or after the promulgation of those decrees? It is not the decrees, so much as the errors they contain, that are condemned, and though the Article speaks of those included in the Romish doctrine, then and since prolific of them, yet it equally condemns the same errors, whether found in the Romish Church or elsewhere, and whether existing in the Romish Church at that time or subsequently revived in it.

And here for the moment I cannot avoid noticing the contradiction that Mr. Newman has fallen into of his friend and co-adjutor Dr. Pusey. When it suited Dr. Pusey's purpose in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford to give a late date and authority to the Articles, in order that we might not appeal to the framers of them, our martyred Reformers, whose praise is in all the Churches, he set up the subtil distinction, "We have not the 42 Articles of Edward VI. but the 39 of Elizabeth; and these have their authority to us from the agreement of our Church in 1562 and 1571," p. 32. Now that Mr. Newman wishes the Articles to have an early date and authority, he tells us they were "written" and "drawn up" before the decrees of Trent. Dr. Pusey, to suit himself, will have them late; Mr. Newman, for his turn, will have them early. How are these gentlemen to be reconciled?—How are they to be pleased?—They are like children sitting in the market place, and crying one to another, and saying, "We have piped unto you and ye have not danced, we have mourned unto you and ye have not wept."

In truth, what matters it whether the Articles of the Church of England were written before or since the decrees of Trent, so that they condemn and utterly repudiate as they do the damnable heresies and doctrines which those decrees contain?—This is their excellency and their glory, and it must continue to be such so long as there is truth and honesty in the Ministry, who have vowed the maintenance of them. To prove them otherwise, however, is to draw us nearer to Rome, to make our difference from that heretical Church a mere visionary fancy, and not a reality, and thus in fact to merge us once more in the swamp of her blasphemies. Such is Mr. Newman's aim, now no longer concealed beneath the veil of a pretended agreement with the Articles. He avows his "belief that the Articles *need* not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and *ought* not to be for the sake of many persons," p. 28; and that he is desirous of so opening them, that the age may pass unsuspectingly to the enjoyment of the "something" it wants, and which something is only to be found in the Church of Rome.

Here there is no disguise, and that there may be no mistake of his design, let us see it in full. At page 27 he remarks, "In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century." From the depth of my heart I echo this sentiment, with thanksgivings to God for it, but not one jot in the sense Mr. Newman intends. I believe that there is in the religious mind, not of our Church only, but of all the Churches of Christ in this kingdom, something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. Then indeed religion was well nigh dead, the great doctrines of the Gospel were unknown; its morality was disregarded, its heavenly affections were ridiculed and despised, and we had almost come to the completion of George Herbert's prophecy, for

*Religion stood a-tiptoe in the land,
Ready to pass to the American strand,*

or to find a resting place for herself wheresoever she could. But there were yet some "seven thousand left, all the men that had not bowed the knee" falsely. The day of grace came. The revival began. It has gone on and prospered. The truths and promises of Scripture are now the ground of our hope. The

Bible is in the hands of the people, millions having been circulated here at home. It is spreading the Divine seed abroad. Our missionaries are breaking up the ground for its reception. Renewed calls are made upon God for increased energies of His Spirit. They are answered by the successful ministrations of the Word. The idols are falling. The people are awaking from their sleep of ages. India, China, the isle-bespangled Pacific, even "the servant of servants," Africa, are receiving the light of truth. These great acts of our God return upon us to bless us, and to strengthen us to renewed exertions. We seek to him again for increased favour, for greater outpourings of his Spirit. While we marvel at these things, and piously exclaim, What hath not God wrought! we look at ourselves with fearfulness and trembling; we enquire whether we are keeping pace in our growth in holiness with his mercies vouchsafed to us, and thus we make progress indeed to "something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century," or even the age that has preceded us, grateful as we are to it for the blessings it has, under God, been the means of opening upon us.

But does Mr. Newman mean anything of this sort? Not at all. He looks not to the ministers or missionaries of God's Word, to test the progress that is making, but he is satisfied with "the poets and philosophers of the age!" forgetful of the exhortation of the Apostle, "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." Mr. Newman, however, sees the spirit of the times through a medium very different from that which I have represented above. In his view, "The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome." So then this same Church of Rome, who by her "authoritative teaching" at the present day of the decrees of the Council of Trent, in which she "goes beyond those decrees," is the only commu-

nion "practically in possession of the something" which the religious fervour of the age desires. How a church can have grossly corrupted and perverted her own corrupt and perverse decrees, which very decrees are admitted by Mr. Newman to have a "tendency to foster and produce" those corruptions and perversions, and yet at the same time maintain herself so far right, as, "amid all the errors and evils of her practical system," to be "practically in possession of the something" needed, it is most difficult to comprehend according to the instructions of Scripture. There we are taught, that if the fruit be good, the tree is good also, and that the tree can only be known by its fruits. How her fruits, her "practical possession" can be good, and she herself so in error as to be condemned by our Articles, it is impossible to imagine, to comprehend, or to reconcile.

We come, at length, however, to the enquiry as to what this "something" is, which poets, and philosophers, and enthusiasts bear testimony to the cravings of the age for. "Most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic." And is this all? What a melancholy picture, in sooth. Catholic all these may be, but where is Christianity in them? Where are the "weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith?" Where is the message of reconciliation to fallen man? Where is the peace of God which passeth all understanding? Where is charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues? Where is the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ? Where are the promises of free grace? Where is the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit? Where are the joy and peace of believing? In one word, where is the Gospel, its gladdening promises, its renovating principles, and its invigorating grace and truth? No gleam of its brightness can be discerned amidst the thick cloud of darkness, yea of gross darkness, with which it is thus attempted to enshroud the people. Instead of simple evangelical truth, "awe and mystery" are to be revived amongst us, and we are once more invited to taste of the golden cup in the hand of

her upon whose forehead is inscribed the name, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

That this is the consummation Mr. Newman desires there can be no doubt about. He advances it plainly in the following words:—"The question then is, whether we shall give them (the feelings of awe, mystery, &c.) up to the Roman Church, or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system, which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been, and is, quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say proper and natural, or even necessary, to our Church. But if we do give them up, then we must give up the men who cherish them." Here then is the issue to be joined. Here is the Crisis we are called upon to act in. We must either allow an elasticity to the Articles, in order to preserve these Romish principles and men, and suffer them to prevail until they bind us in the trammels of their destructive errors; or else, maintaining the scriptural truth and simplicity of our Articles, upholding the plain and simple truths of the Holy Scripture, we must leave these men to do what they ought long since to have done, not to "subscribe with doubt and hesitation," but to relinquish their connection with a Church from which they entirely dissent, and the doctrines of which they are endeavouring to undermine and destroy.

And now let us turn to the Tract No. 90, that we may see the manner in which Mr. Newman has attempted practically to work out his views. The object of the Tract is fully developed in the concluding sentences of the introduction. It is designed to show "that while our Prayer Book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine." I will delay no longer over the assumption made here, that the Prayer Book is of Catholic origin, further than to protest against it. I have rather to do with the avowed object and design of the Tract, which is to make out and to strain such a perversion, I will not say understanding, of the Articles, that those who are of what the author calls a Catholic spirit may subscribe them. What he intends by a Catholic spirit, "Catholic in heart and doctrine,"

there can be no difficulty in understanding from the subtle distinction he has drawn between the "authoritative teaching" of the Church of Rome and the Tridentine decrees. It is evident that they who are of his catholicity do not differ from or disagree with these decrees, and accordingly his sole object is to distort the Articles into such a form, that they may appear not to be contrary to, if they do not altogether square with the decrees of Trent.

The Articles are arranged in twelve sections, and there is a commentary upon each, conceived in the above spirit. The first, fourth, and fifth sections treat of the sixth and twentieth Articles, the nineteenth, and the twenty-first. I select these sections first, because these same Articles have been dealt with, in precisely the same manner that Mr. Newman here deals with them, by Dr. Pusey in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford in 1839, a fact which I desire may be especially noted, as a warning to those who have hitherto shut their eyes to the direct tendency of the Tracts altogether, and who have suffered the most valuable of our Protestant symbols to be explained away, and the most precious truths of the Gospel to be questioned, and only at length arouse themselves to their danger when the gross errors of Romanism are offered to us instead. Had the contest begun, as it should have begun, long since, when the sole supremacy of Scripture was first denied, when the doctrine of Justification by Faith in the alone merits of Jesus Christ was first trifled with and despoiled of its excellency and power, we should not now have heard of such questions as purgatory and comprecation with the saints, and others of a like import. It is no new thing then to read as in this Tract, "We may dispense with the phrase 'Rule of Faith,' as applied to Scripture, on the ground of its being ambiguous; and, again, "because it is then used in a novel sense; for the ancient Church made the Apostolic Tradition, as summed up in the Creed, and not the Bible, the *Regula Fidei*, or rule." And again, "In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is *not*, on Anglican principles the Rule of Faith." In this way it is attempted to get rid of Scripture, and to destroy the efficacy of our sixth Article, which affirms that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation," and consequently must be, and is, the only Rule of Faith. I intend not, however,

here to dwell upon the several sections I have cited above, because I can refer the reader to a recent publication of mine, "A Review of Tradition as taught by the Writers of the Tracts for the Times," in which he will find that I have contended with Dr. Pusey for the true and scriptural understanding of these several Articles, and have there sufficiently proved, what I am now therefore relieved from with respect to these Articles, that both himself and Mr. Newman have in vain attempted to destroy the force and value of them altogether.

I gladly, therefore, pass on to another Article, our eleventh, treated of in the second section of the Tract, because here we have to grapple with the most important doctrine of the Gospel. This is the sum and substance of the Gospel. The doctrine of Justification by Faith is the very essence of truth, and the preaching of it in simplicity and truth was justly declared by the great Luther to be the sign of a falling or rising Church. I will do what Mr. Newman has not done, and set out the Article unmutilated. I am not afraid to see it entire, and I pray God I may never cease to make it the one end, and aim, and subject of all my preaching, to His great honour and glory through His Son Jesus Christ.

Of the Justification of Man.—We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

But why did not Mr. Newman in commenting on the Articles set out and observe upon the whole of this the most essential one? Because, first, the Article states plainly and broadly that there is one only means of salvation "the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith," even as the Scripture says "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved;" and again, "there is no other name given amongst men whereby we must be saved, but that of the Lord Jesus Christ and Him crucified." And secondly, because Mr. Newman will have not one means of salvation only, but several. He says, "A number of means go to effect our justification. We are justified by Christ alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by faith alone, in that faith asks for it; by baptism alone, for baptism conveys it; and

by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it." The issue, then, between Mr. Newman and the Article is simply this. The Article says we are justified by Christ alone. Mr. Newman says we are justified by Christ alone, by faith alone, by baptism alone, by newness of heart alone. The Article allows only one means of salvation—Mr. Newman will have four means, and will have each of these alone, and consequently independent of one another. The Article refers us to the Homily for a more complete exposition of the truth of its assertion; and if the reader consult it, as it deserves to be consulted at large, he will find abundant proof in it from Scripture, and such a faithful explanation of the doctrine, as will both demonstrate the truth of the Article and condemn the error of Mr. Newman.

With this, however, I will not at present rest satisfied. My appeal against Mr. Newman's judgment is to Scripture, and to it only do I go to prove the fallacy of the doctrine he endeavours to maintain as that of justification. I shall proceed to shew the truth of the Article, as affirmed in the following words: "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith." It only needs that I cite Scripture itself upon the subject, without observation or comment, for its declarations are so plain as to require no human aid to enforce them. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Acts ii. 21. Rom. x. 13. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts iv. 12. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts xvi. 31. "We shall be saved from wrath through him." Rom. v. 10. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, thou shalt be saved." Rom. x. 9. "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. v. 9. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." 1 Tim. i. 15. and elsewhere frequently. "All mankind have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 23, 24. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. i. "Being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Ibid. 9. "Ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the

Spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi. 11. "A man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." Gal. ii. 16. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. iii. 24.

I have now done with Mr. Newman's Letter and Tract. I could easily extend the subject of these pages by entering in detail into the various topics treated of in the Tract. But I must leave this work to others. I have defended the great doctrine of our holy religion, Faith, which is in Christ Jesus; I have before now contended with Dr. Pusey against the same perversions of the 6th, 20th, and 21st Articles, that are here maintained by Mr. Newman; I have shewn the fallacy of the distinction he has attempted to draw between the "Tridentine decrees" and the "authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome; I have shewn the nature of the Crisis that now impends over the Church; I have raised my voice in disclaimer of the proposal made to widen our Articles for the admission of so called Catholics, but in truth of Papists in spirit though they choose not to acknowledge the name; and I would therefore humbly hope that, however unworthily I have done my part. It only remains that I invoke my brethren in the ministry to do theirs. I would implore them by our common faith, common to high and low, to rich and poor, to the sovereign in his palace, and to the beggar on the dunghill; I would entreat them by the precious gift of God's most Holy Son, by the promises in Him, and by the hope set before us of eternal life, to arouse themselves from the lethargy in which they have hitherto been sunk, and to buckle on in defence of truth the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God. Let not the present Crisis pass without completing the work. If having been aroused the Church fall once more into slumber she may awake again when it is too late. It is said by some, that we need men of the greatest ability and learning to cope with our opponents, who are themselves men of great attainments, and of indefatigable research. It is not to be denied that they are, and it makes it only the more painful to reflect that their talents are not consecrated to the honour of God and of his Christ. But to suppose that they are to be met with their own weapons, and to be controverted by wisdom such as they rejoice in, is utterly to mistake the nature of the truth for which we have to contend. It is not for what they pretend as truth, and in search of which they would

carry us through the interminable mazes of ecclesiastical antiquities and history, that we must exert ourselves, but for that which lies open to the comprehension of all, philosopher and peasant, who will seek it humbly in the revealed will of God in Scripture. If antiquity were anything we could boast a more ancient system than any that they can shew, for we can point to our Articles and say, See what our Reformers modelled in the sixteenth century from that Holy Volume which dates from the day of Moses to that of Christ. But such things as antiquity are nothing. If it were probable that God at this day should give us a new revelation of his will, its novelty would no more detract from it now than it did in the day of Abraham. Its antiquity, therefore, cannot add to it, nor make it more true now than it was eighteen hundred years since. It is its verity alone that ought to give it value in our eyes. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is, like himself, the same. The Scripture partakes of the nature of that God who gave it, and is unchangeable. Nothing can add to, nor diminish from its sanctity. Truth is still the same. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised;—but he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed to and fro by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive.



