

in certain lines of business, while it is supposed that we cannot find time, or will not expend toil in understanding the gospel in the two languages in which the Holy Ghost appointed his servants to preach to mankind? The terms of general salvation are one thing, the preparation for the ministry is another. As a reader, who will allow no man to read in the church but himself, ought to read better, certainly not worse than his hearers, so an expounder of the sacred word should not be ignorant of the idioms and terms of the language which he professes to explain to the flock. And to say nothing of the gross mistakes into which both preachers and hearers sometimes fall from ignorance of all but the authorized version, it may happen that questions of doctrine are seriously affected by a mistranslation, in which no true distinction is made between the present, the aorist and the perfect tenses, or in which ignorance of a Hebrew idiom has been made the subject of an idle cavil. One thing I take to be certain, that more labour ought to be bestowed on the acquisition of Scriptural knowledge, and that in this discerning and inquisitive age, unless bishops, priests and laymen see the necessity of gradually raising the standard of knowledge in candidates for the ministry, (and bishops alone cannot enforce this) great danger will accrue to the extension and usefulness of our Church. Nor is the want of scriptural knowledge the only evil from which our clergy and laity suffer. In the preface to our Ordination service, our Prayer-book teaches us that we are an historical church. "Antient authors," that is the writings of the Christian Fathers, are referred to as sufficient to show, together with the canonical Scriptures, that our church government is of divine institution. If it be so, it should be revered accordingly. If this reference to antiquity be applied further to the ordinances and ritual of our church, it would not only supply us with a