

days, to discuss the subjects therein treated. I concluded that the doctrines alluded to were in accordance with Holy Scripture; and that the revival of the subject was an after-thought.

I beg very distinctly to declare that I approve of the doctrines alluded to, simply because they are derived, as I think, from Holy Scripture: and I acknowledge *no other* authority in matters of faith, whether of the Fathers, the Reformers, or the leading men of the age: "Be ye not called Rabbi, Rabbi, for one is your master even Christ." Upon any other principle, I see no hope for the Church; no dawn of any brighter or better day.*

Your argument would go to prove that the Reformation was a *final* measure; in short, that the Church is infallible.† I have certainly assented to the definitions of the Church, and do still in general,‡ but I believe that there is more truth in the Bible than the Church *professes* to hold; while, as you well know, her "definitions," when not in the very words of Scripture, are not infallible.§ Whether I choose to remain in the Church, as she is, is a matter for *me* to consider; and whether you and others think it expedient to take any action in the matter, is a thing for you to consider. In alluding to the sanction of *man*, as to certain opinions, I merely gave it as *his* opinion: and it is merely saying, with reference to the present

* The supreme authority of Scripture, in matters of faith, is perfectly compatible with the intermediate authority of a particular Church over its ministers. If, by asserting the former authority, Mr. Wiggins means to discard the latter, he casts off all allegiance to his Church. If he does not mean to discard the latter, then the assertion of the former is quite irrelevant: it has no reference to the subject in debate, and is merely thrown in, "ad captandum," to catch the attention of the superficial reader.

† The argument was simply this,—A Clergyman's oath of subscription is binding upon him, while he continues in that capacity. How does this go to prove the Church to be infallible? Where is the connection between the premises and the conclusion?

‡ What is the value of assenting to them "in general," if such particulars as the "Holy Trinity," "the Atonement," "Justification," "the Judgment," and "the Resurrection," are the exceptions? Would an assent "in general," with such exceptions, have been deemed sufficient for his admission into the ministry of the Church of England?

§ The definitions of a Church may be perfectly *true*, though not expressed "in the words of Scripture." A Clergyman of the Church of England is supposed to have compared the definitions of his Church with Scripture, before he entered her ministry, and found them to be so. To regard them in this light, is not to consider the Church infallible, or to supercede the authority of the Bible. Had Mr. Wiggins attended to this distinction, it would have prevented much confusion in his statements.