

which condemned its practice. Still further, the whole Christian world for full 1500 years, saw no other regimen in the New Testament ever since the days of those who lived when Greek was a living language, and who therefore understood St. Paul's writings as we can scarcely hope to do. But I need not press the analogy farther. My object is neither controversial nor polemical, but rather to persuade you that while "The things that were written aforetime were written for our learning," the learning which results from a knowledge of the general drift and scope of Scripture, is safer than the carping criticism (however learned) which demands for every item of doctrine or discipline, a specific command, a chapter and verse; in other words, it is the man who is imbued with the spirit of the Bible that is most likely to be orthodox in doctrine, and he who is best acquainted with the genius and history of Apostolic times, and can put himself in imagination there, will be most likely to be right on the question of Church order.

And here I may remark the providential wisdom of the Church of England in never having given exclusive sanction to any translation of the Holy Scriptures. In marked contrast to the course pursued by the Church of Rome, she values the spirit more than the letter of Scripture. The Church of Rome staked her infallibility on the correctness of the Vulgate Version, and we know that sufficient errors have been