

The Bazaar.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—ACTS XVII. 11.

VOLUME III.—No. 19.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 123.]

"O LORD, I KNOW THAT IN VERY FAITHFULNESS THOU HAST AFFLICTED ME."

For what shall I praise thee, my God and my King? For what blessings the tribute of gratitude bring? Shall I praise thee for pleasure, for health, and for ease, For the spring of delight, and the sunshine of peace?

Shall I praise thee for flowers that bloom on my breast, For joys in perspective, and pleasures possessed? For the spirits that heightened my days of delight, And the slumbers that sat on my pillow by night?

For this should I praise thee! but, if only for this, I should leave half-untoiled the donation of bliss; I thank thee for sickness, for sorrow, for care, For the thorns I have gather'd, the anguish I bear.

For nights of anxiety, watchings, and tears, A present of pain, a perspective of fears; I praise thee, I bless thee, my King and my God, For the good and the evil thy hand hath bestow'd.

The flowers were sweet, but their fragrance is flown, They yielded no fruit: they are wither'd and gone; The thorn, it was poignant, but precious to me,— 'Twas the message of mercy,—it led me to thee.

Dublin Christian Journal.

CHRIST, THE EVANGELICAL ALTAR.

A SERMON,

preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, December 8th, 1844,

BY THE REV. FRANCIS JENNE, D. D. L.

Master of Pembroke College, Canon of Gloucester, and late Dean of Jersey.

HEBR. XIII. 10.

We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle.

Concluded.

Nothing less than the reply contained in the text, and such other passages, could place Christians on the same footing as the Jew; nothing less than a permanent efficacy in the sacrifice of Christ can correspond to the ever-repeated and typical ordinances of the law: nothing less than such an argument could satisfy those whom St. Paul addressed. We may safely teach, on his authority, that full and entire pardon for sins of every kind—those of the converted prodigal, as those of the saint who is near his reward—may, by all who repent and truly believe, every day be obtained by the virtue of the sacrifice offered once for all on Calvary, and must be sought through that alone. Would that the church had never lost her generous confidence in the large declarations of mercy which are found in the bible, in the love of the Father to each returning prodigal, in the rich provision made for the wants of God's children. But, alas! God's elect and baptized people was, by the narrow spirit of his ministers, brought to such a state that it might well envy the Jew. The gospel early became a system of rigorism: grace was no more grace.

This state of things is strikingly exhibited in the Commentary of Origen on Leviticus, which has been transmitted to posterity in the Latin translation of Rufinus. After dwelling on the abundant mercies vouchsafed in the Mosaic covenant, and the facilities offered there of making atonement for sin and recovering the favour of God, he thus interrupts his comments:—"But, perhaps, the hearers of the church may say, 'Surely the ancients fared better than we. Pardon was granted to them when they sinned, by the oblation of divers sacrifices. With us there is only that pardon for sins which is granted at the beginning, through the grace of baptism. After this, no mercy for sin, no pardon is bestowed.'"

Such were the impressions of the evangelical scheme which Christians received in the third century from their ministers. The heresy of Novatian was apparently little else than a formal statement of prevalent notions. Origen—actuated, perhaps, by that mistaken zeal for the interests of morality which then, as at all times, was thought to be endangered by that system of free grace which is, in truth, "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"—seems, at first, inclined to leave his readers to their despondency. "Surely the Christian, for whom Christ died, should live under stricter discipline. Sheep, goats, oxen, were slain for them: the Son of God was slain for thee; and thou canst love to sin again!" "Then, as if unwillingly," he adds, "I feel, however, these considerations should not so much inspire thee to virtue as cast thee into despair, thou hast heard what mighty sacrifices there are in the law, hear now how great remissions of sins there are in the gospel." Then, he enumerates remission in baptism, martyrdom, alms deeds, exceeding great charity, and the tears of penitence leading to confession to the priest.

Origen evidently contrasts these things with the sacrifice of Christ, making them co-ordinate with and independent of it—practically distinct atonements; means by which a man may save himself, when the work of Christ has become powerless as regards him. So soon was the cross lost sight of! so soon did the corruptions which Rome has since created into articles of faith fix their roots in the Church! When men have heven them out cisterns that can hold no water, they forsake the living waters. How different from the language of Origen, is that addressed by St. Paul to his baptized but grossly sinful Corinthians! "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ: as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God; for he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." He offers reconciliation as freely as when they first believed in

Christ: he knows nothing more among them than he determined to know at the first—"Jesus Christ and him crucified." He requires no conditions but those which he required before—repentance and faith. In his divinity there is no place for sacramental penance, none for purgatorial fires, for venial indulgences, for redemption by bequests on the death-bed. Neither does he so disparage the love of God and the virtue of Christ's blood as to intimate that it ever loses its power of effecting the guilt of penitents after baptism, however awful may be his language when he speaks of apostasy and final impenitence. The church of England surely has his warrant when she declares daily to the penitent and believing, the unconditional pardon of their sins—when, in her most solemn service, she sets forth Christ crucified as "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

All this is involved in our text. But we find in it also an answer to another important question: by what means on our part is the effect of Christ's sacrifice to be applied to each of us? It is implied that this is by eating: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle;" language which shews we have a right to eat, that is, to partake of the sacrifice of Christ which was undoubtedly a sacrifice for sin as freely as the Jews were permitted to partake of sin-offering. Eating is the act by which eternal substances, of a suitable kind, are incorporated into living beings, and effectually appropriated, by them—an act which implies previous sense of need, strong desire, and willing concurrence, but neither merit nor labour on the part of the recipient. By an energetic figure, this act is used in holy scripture to illustrate faith; that heartfelt desire and confidence by which spiritual benefits—especially those earned by the sacrifice of Christ—are apprehended and made our own. So, too, the object of faith, the truths, that is, which Christ has brought to light, and the grace of God, are called "water," "strong meat," "milk;" and Christ himself is, in his own precious words, the "bread from heaven—the bread of life." To eat this bread, to drink his blood, and to believe on him, are used by him as synonymous expressions in different verses of the sixth chapter of St. John's gospel. On these principles must we interpret the eating of the text. "De quo edere," says the great school-author named before, "De quo edere est fructus ejus passionis percipere et ipsi tanquam capiti incorporari." St. Paul teaches here, as in other passages, that it is by faith that the pardon obtained for all on the cross is secured by each; by faith, that habit of mind which shuts out all boasting, all dependence on ourselves, all idea of merit; for, to use Melancthon's illustration, how can the beggar who receives an alms be proud that he has extended his hand?—that habit of mind which, involving lowliness, the sense of need, fear of God, love to Christ, and dread of sin, most highly glorifies God, and necessarily produces holiness in the life, grateful obedience, mortification of the body, and deeds of charity; since it ceases to be faith, if it do not all this.

Some commentators have thought that in the text St. Paul makes special reference to the manuduction of Christ in the blessed eucharist. We are perhaps justified in concluding that such is not the case, because in the preceding verse—"It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace and not with meats"—he opposes to Jewish privileges, grace, that is, the free salvation offered in the gospel; and the participation of grace and the eating of the text appear from the continuity of the subject to be identical; and both are internal and spiritual blessings, not outward rites to which blessings may be annexed. There is, however, no reason why we should not use such a passage as we use our Lord's discourse in the sixth chapter of St. John, with reference to the communion of the body and blood of Christ, in the supper of the Lord. As faith in Christ is a spiritual manuduction, so, worthily to eat of the bread which we bless is a high act of faith; and both have respect to Christ crucified. To eat by faith, and with faith to eat, are things in their blessed effects the same; and may, in devotional language, be spoken of in similar terms. In the eucharist, then, we fear not to say that we have an altar; that we there feast on Christ as on a sin-offering, and there drink of the blood of the New Testament, which is shed for the remission of sins. As the flesh of sin-offerings was denied to the Jews, so was the blood, which is the life and means of atonement in every kind of victim, withheld, and for the same reason, namely, to show that forgiveness cannot be really due to such sacrifices. They who approach the Christian altar are allowed to partake of both, that so they may have full assurance. We cannot but think that, had the Romish church not lost sight of the sole and meritorious and perpetual source of pardon, and therefore of the real character of the eucharist, she would not have mutilated the sacrament, and refused to the laity the cup which so clearly points to that source. If she did not teach that sin, after baptism, can be pardoned only through other means; if she did not confine the remission of sins in the mass, to venial sins—that is, to sins which are so only "imperfecta et secundum quod," as Bellarmine says; to sins in fact which are not properly sins at all, and which may apparently be as readily effaced by holy water—she would not refuse that blood which, assuredly, was not shed for venial sins alone.

The text, then, if we have rightly interpreted it, teaches that Christians are entitled to obtain remission of sins through the eternal sacrifice, whenever they feel its need. In other words, it teaches that man may always be justified by faith: it teaches that cardinal doctrine which is set forth in so many unfigurative passages of holy writ, that doctrine which, as it excluded the divers and strange doctrines of Jewish teachers—their idea that man may be justified by the works of the law, that there is efficacy in meats, and a saving power in the Mosaic ritual—so it excluded the arrogant theory of justification by an inherent and perfect righteousness, the various satisfactions for sin devised by Rome, the superstitious practices—holy cows, holy girdles, holy pardons, holy beads, holy shoes," as our homily speaks, and the countless other puerilities by which men are taught to apply God's mercy to

themselves. It is a doctrine which, if steadfastly maintained, must in the end eject every corruption from the church, as it ejected long-tolerated Judaism; a doctrine, however, which every corruption tends to obscure, and to thrust aside. Whoever would bring us back to mediæval darkness, must undermine or openly assail this article of faith. We shall never be brought to sue for re-admission to the communion of unreformed Rome, until God's ministers can be prevailed upon to reserve, or evade, or deny it; and, what is perhaps more unlikely, until God's lay-people can forget it, and the articles of the church, and the scriptures of truth.

It is not my object to meet the cavils which have been brought against that doctrine from the days of St. Paul until now, and to guard against those perversions which led St. James to write. We should have cause to suspect our orthodoxy, if our teaching were not open to the same animadversions. Let me rather exhort all to come, and taste that the Lord is gracious; let men once find peace and joy in believing, and they will confess that there is no such inducement to godly sorrow for sin as the spectacle of Christ crucified, no such preventive against sin as the freeness of God's mercy, no such motive to holiness. Every morning, then, and every night—whenever the arrows of remorse, the poison whereof drinketh up the spirit, are within me, in the struggle and pains of death, in view of judgment and the throne of God—I will lay my hand on the victim provided by him, and he will forgive the iniquity of my sin. I have an altar: of this will I eat. I have my Saviour's blood: of this will I drink. I have his sacerdotal intercession; this shall be my confidence in life and in death. I will take the advice which Anselm of Canterbury gave to exhorting Christians: "Thou believest," he said, "that thou canst be saved only by the death of Christ. Come, then, while thou hast breath, place thy trust in this death; place confidence in nothing else; to this death commit thyself wholly; in this death array thyself all over; mingle thy whole self in this death; nail thy whole self to it; wrap thy whole self in it. And, if the Lord shall seek to judge thee, say, 'Lord, I interpose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thy judgement; on other terms, I content not with thee.' And if he shall say, 'I will judge thee, because thou art a sinner,' reply, 'Lord, I interpose between thee and my sins the death of the Lord Jesus Christ.' If he shall say, 'Thou hast deserved damnation,' reply, 'Lord, I hold out the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and my ill-deserts. I offer his merits in lieu of the merits which I ought to have, and have not. If he shall say that he is wroth with thee, reply, 'Lord, I hold forth between me and thy wrath the death of my Lord Jesus Christ.' In the faith of Anselm, in the true faith of the gospel, brethren, may we all live and die.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

BY THE JUDICIOUS HOOPER.

The difference between the papists and us about justification.

Wherein do we disagree? We disagree about the nature of the essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and the power of means, which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort. When the Romanists are required to show what the righteousness is, whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer, "That it is a divine spiritual quality; which quality received into the soul, doth first make it to be one of them who are born of God: and, secondly, indueth it with a power to bring forth such works, as they do that are born of him. Even as the soul of man being joined to his body, doth first make him to be of the number of reasonable creatures, and, secondly, enable him to perform the natural functions which are proper to his kind. That it maketh the soul amiable and gracious in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed grace; that it purgeth, purifieth, and washeth out all the stains and pollutions of sin; that by it, through the merit of Christ, we are delivered as from sin, so from eternal death and condemnation, the reward of sin. This grace the Romanist will have to be applied by infusion; to the end, that as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be righteous by the inherent grace: which grace they make capable of increase; as the body may be more and more warm, so the soul more and more justified, according as grace shall be augmented; the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. Wherefore the first receipt of grace, in the divinity (of the Romanists) is the first justification; the increase thereof, the second justification. As grace may be increased by the merit of good works; so [they say] it may be diminished by the demerit of sins; it may be lost by mortal sin. Inasmuch, therefore, as it is needful in the one case to repair, in the other to recover, the loss which is made; the infusion of grace hath her sunny after-meals; for the which cause the Romanists make many ways to apply the infusion of grace. It is applied to infants through baptism, without either faith or works, and in them [they say] really it taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it; it is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first justification, through baptism without works, yet not without faith; and it taketh away both sins actual and original together, with all whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say, the first receipt of grace, [they consider] it is applied farther by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justification. If they work more and more, grace doth more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as have diminished it by venial sins, it is applied by holy water, ave marias, crossings, papal salutations, and such like, which serve for reparations of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the sacrament (as they term it) of penance; which sacrament hath force to confer grace anew, yet in such sort, that being so conferred, it hath not altogether so much power as at the first. For it only cleanseth out the stain or guilt of sin committed [as they say], and changeth the punishment eternal into a temporal satisfactory punishment here,

if time do serve; if not, hereafter to be endured, except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts, and such like; or else shortened by pardon for a term, or by plenary pardon quite removed and taken away."

This is the mystery of the man of sin. This mazes the church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way to justification. I cannot stand now to unrip this building, and to sift it piece by piece; only I will set a frame of apostolical erection by it in few words, that that may befall Babylon, in the presence of that which God hath builded, as happened unto Dagon before the ark; I Sam. v.

"Doubtless," (saith the apostle), "I have counted all things loss, and judge them to be dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having my own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith." Phil. iii. 8, 9. Whether they speak of the first or second justification, they make it the essence of a divine quality inherent, they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than please him; for if he withdraw the breath of our nostrils, we fall to dust; but the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own; therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Christ hath merited righteousness for us as many as are found in him. In him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Christ. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which is impious in himself, full of iniquity, full of sin; him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin in hatred through repentance; him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law; shall I say more perfectly righteous than if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law; shall I say more perfectly righteous than if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law? but the apostle saith, "God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. v. 21. Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself. Let it be counted folly, or frenzy, or fury, whatsoever, it is our comfort, and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered; that God hath made himself the sin of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God. You see therefore, that the church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ; and that by the hands of the apostles we have received otherwise than she teacheth. Now concerning the righteousness of sanctification, we deny it not to be inherent; we grant, that unless we work, we have it not; only we distinguish it a thing different in nature from the righteousness of justification: we are righteous the one way, by the faith of Abraham; the other way, except we do the works of Abraham, we are not righteous. Of the one, St. Paul, "To him that worketh not, but believeth, faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. iv. 5. Of the other, St. John, "He is righteous which worketh righteousness." 1 John iii. 7. Of the one, St. Paul doth prove by Abraham's example, that we have it of faith without works, Rom. iv. Of the other, St. James by Abraham's example, that by works we have it, and not only by faith, Jam. ii. St. Paul doth plainly sever these two parts of Christian righteousness one from the other. For in the sixth to the Romans thus he writeth; "Being freed from sin, and made servants to God, ye have your fruit in holiness, and the end everlasting life." Rom. vi. 22. "Ye are made free from sin, and made servants unto God;" this is the righteousness of justification. "Ye have your fruit in holiness;" this is the righteousness of sanctification. By the one we are interested in the right of inheriting, by the other we are brought to the actual possession of eternal bliss, and so the end of both is "everlasting life."

If indeed we have our fruit in holiness, notwithstanding, we must note, that the more we abound therein, the more need we have to crave that we may be strengthened and supported. Our very virtues may be snares unto us. The enemy that waiteth for all occasions to work our ruin, hath found it harder to overthrow an humble sinner, than a proud saint. There is no man's case so dangerous as his whom Satan hath persuaded that his own righteousness shall present him pure and blameless in the sight of God. If we could say, we were not guilty of any thing at all in our consciences, (we know ourselves far from this innocency; we cannot say, we know nothing by ourselves, but if we could,) should we therefore plead not guilty before the presence of our Judge, that sees further into our hearts than we ourselves can do? If our hands did never offer violence to our brethren, a bloody thought doth prove us murderers before Him; if we had never opened our mouth to utter any scandalous, offensive, or hurtful word, the cry of our secret cogitations is heard in the ears of God. If we did not commit the sins, which daily and hourly, either in deed, word, or thoughts we do commit; yet in the good things which we do, how many defects are there intermingled! God, in that which is done, respecteth the mind and intention of the doer. Cut off then all those things wherein we have regarded our own glory; those things which men do to please men, and to satisfy our own liking; those things which we do for any by-respect, not sincerely and purely for the love of God; and a small score will serve for the number of our righteous deeds. Let the holiest and best thing we do be considered; we are never better affected unto God than when we pray; yet when we pray, how are our affections many times distracted! How little reverence do we show unto

the grand majesty of God, unto whom we speak! How little remorse of our own miseries! How little taste of the sweet influence of his tender mercies do we feel! Are we not as unwillingly many times to begin, and as glad to make an end; as if in saying; "Call upon me," he had set us a very burdensome task? It may seem somewhat extreme, which I will speak; therefore let every one judge of it, even as his own heart shall tell him, and no otherwise; I will only make a demand: if God should yield unto us, as unto Abraham, if fifty, forty, thirty, twenty, or, if ten good persons could be found in a city, for their sakes that city should not be destroyed; but, and if he should not make us an offer thus large, search all the generations of men since the fall of our father Adam, find one man, that hath done one action, which hath past from him pure, without any stain or blemish at all; and for that one man's one only action, neither man nor angel shall feel the torments which are prepared for both; do you think that this ransom, to deliver men and angels, could be found to be among the sons of men? The best things which we do have somewhat in them to be pardoned. How then can we do any thing meritorious, or worthy to be rewarded?

ESTIMATE FORMED OF THE JESUITS, IN GERMANY.

From a Speech made in the Saxon Chamber of Deputies, with reference to attempts in 1844 and 1845, quoted in a work published by Partridge & Co., Paternoster Row, under the title "The Jesuits of Fact, and the Jesuits of Fiction."

"I was present," says Deputy Hanel, "in Vienna in 1820, when the Jesuits, having been expelled from Russia by the Emperor Alexander, poured in crowds into Vienna, hoping, by casting themselves at the feet of the Emperor Francis, the most kind-hearted of Monarchs, to obtain a place of refuge in Austria. I heard the expressions of detestation with which they were received by the people. I saw the anxious suspense with which the Emperor's reply was waited for; and I witnessed the triumphant joy which rang through the city when, on the following day, it was announced that Francis had not only declined to grant them an audience, but had commanded them to leave his capital within the next 24 hours. And this was in Catholic Austria! These were the sentiments of a Roman Catholic population! And shall we Protestants permit such men to nestle themselves clandestinely among us? The Jesuits are not better than they were. The order is the same to-day which it was at its first creation, nor has it varied by a hair's breadth from either its principles or practice. Its object is the persecution of Protestantism; and its motto, never to rest satisfied until the last heretic be either extirpated from the earth, or brought back to the bosom of the only true Church.

"In Austria Proper, and Bavaria, Jesuits do not exist de jure, but glide about under the guise of their congeners, or rather their second selves, the Redemptorists, who well perform the blessed work of sowing family and social dissension, confessional hatred and all the train of evils which have been so powerfully and vividly portrayed by the patriotic prince Von Wrede, in his late attempts to procure from the Bavarian chamber a vote for their banishment; attempts frustrated for the moment indeed, by the overweening influence of a bigoted Jesuit prime minister. Yet what is the account given of those holy fathers by the Catholic statesman Prince Louis Von Oettingen Wallerstein, from whom we have already quoted? That the Redemptorists are accused of sowing discord in families; exciting to confessional disunion and fanaticism; and commanding chastity with such unchaste expressions, that honorable Catholic matrons are frequently forced to withdraw their daughters from their churches, lest the ears of maidenly modesty should be polluted by the prurient discourses of those advocates of celibacy.

"These, be it remarked, are facts of the present day; but if we inquire why Jesuits, under their own name and character, have been banished from Catholic Bavaria, history supplies us with the answer. On the restoration of the order in 1814, they naturally enough desired to return to those rich establishments from which they had been expelled; but Bavaria was at that time blessed with the most paternal of monarchs, and most clear-sighted of prime ministers. Count Montgelas knew the history and services of the fraternity; and, unlike Mr. O'Connell, did not desire their entrance into his country; and, in consequence, advised his Sovereign to cause an examination to be made into the archives of the suppressed colleges. The Chevalier de Lang, chief secretary of the Court of Archives, was deputed to the task; and the result of his research was given to the public in a small Latin work, entitled 'Amores Marelli.' Munich, 1815 (published in French, 1837;) in which it is proved by documentary evidence, that during a very few years, thirtythree Jesuit priests had been guilty of such crimes as may not even be named among Christians, for which the culprits had been removed to other stations by their superiors (on account of their scandals), but had not suffered any other punishment whatever. The result of the inquiry was a law being passed, prohibiting Jesuits from having any establishment in Bavaria."

A STUMBLING-BLOCK LAID, WHERE BEFORE THERE WAS NONE.

It has been publicly stated, that one ground of our strenuous opposition to the lately-projected measure of public education was its obvious tendency to give to the clergy of the Established Church an unfair and undue control over the religious teaching in the schools which it would have established. We think it right to confirm this statement, not out of any hostile feeling towards the Established Church as such, for this has never been the feeling of our body, but with a view to bear our distinct and solemn testimony against those grievous errors which are now tolerated within her pale. We have been hitherto accustomed to regard her as one of the main bulwarks of the Protestant faith; but her title to be so regarded has of late been grievously shaken. Opinions concerning the insufficiency of Scripture, as the sole authoritative and universal rule of faith and practice, the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination, and the necessarily saving efficacy of the Sacraments, which can only be dis-

"Sod fortasse dicant auditores ecclesie, molius fere agebatur cum antiquis quam nobiscum, ubi oblati diverso ritu sacrificia, peccantibus venia prestabatur. Apud nos, tantummodo venia est peccatorum, que per lavacrum gratiam in illis datur. Nulla post hanc peccato misericordia; nec venia ulla conceditur."

"Decet quidem districtior esse disciplinam Christianam pro quo Christus mortuus est: pro illis oves, hirci, boves jugulabantur, pro Deo Filius jugulatus est, ut iterum in peccata decederet."

"Et tamen non tibi hinc non tam erigant animos pro virtute quam pro desperatione deficient, aut nisi quantum sint in logo sacrificia pro peccatis, audi nunc quantum sint remissiones peccatorum in evangelio."

* It is desirable to remind the reader, that this work was written before the present English Version of the Bible was made; the quotations, therefore, will not be found always to agree literally with the present authorized text. They appear to be taken principally from the two versions most used in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, usually called "The Bishops'" and "The Geneva," but occasionally with variations from them both. The words placed between brackets [] are put in by the publisher of this article in a tract-form, for the purpose of making the author's meaning clearer.