

*God is preached, and the Sacraments duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."* But Art. XX gives the Church "power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith." The XXIst forbids a General Council being gathered "without the commandment of Princes"—Royal Supremacy! Art. XXVII, on Baptism, is not free from a sacramentarian tinge, though it by no means comes up to the standard of the Liturgy. Nor are there wanting other traces of a "churchly" spirit here and there, which have opened the door to many errors.

We have now gone over the requisites to Episcopal ordination, and may be better prepared to answer the question, "Can we conform, when the approval required is so complete, but the standards are so contradictory, some of them so unscriptural, as we cannot help reading the Scriptures?" Shall we resort, in using terms so stringent, to the "unnatural sense?" Is it honest? Could we do it in secular affairs and be true men?

Will the *animus-imponentis* principle help us? according to which, not the "literal and grammatical sense" of the words, but *the intention of the Church*, is to be our guide to the import of subscription. But what *does* the Church believe, say on the fundamental question of Baptism? We have Bishop against Bishop—the Articles against the Liturgy—and the Sovereign, the Head of the Church, says *both* parties are good churchmen, and may hold their livings! To what, then, are we to subscribe as the truth on this question?

Shall we wait for *Liturgical Revision*? Even then, we must wait *outside*, not being at liberty to make declarations we do not believe in the hope that by and by they will not be required. But what is the prospect of revision? The Archbishop of Canterbury dared not encourage the peti-