

block in our way, to lead us astray, since men would naturally use the prayer when there is not even a hint given that it was to be only temporary! Similarly they deny the existence of a sacred ministry. They set at naught all that part of the New Testament which treats of the ordination of apostles, presbyters and deacons. They ignore the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, without informing us how they can account for the Holy Spirit allowing all these things to be written when they are of no manner of use to us, but rather mislead us. Their whole system may be summed up by saying they utterly deny the Church Catechism. Indeed with them a catechism is useless, because their religious tenets can only be held by adults. Only believers are saved, say they. But children could never understand the metaphysical religion of these teachers. No one, say they, is saved till he can say, "I do believe, I will believe, that Jesus died for me," in a totally different sense from saying He "tasted death for every man," and therefore died for me. As has been well said by the present Regius Professor of Divinity in Dublin University, "The majority of these teachers hold that Jesus did not die for all; that all for whom he did die will eventually be saved, and that justifying faith is the belief that you yourself are included in that chosen number. Thus to those words, "I believe that Jesus died for me," is ascribed a transubstantiating efficacy such as that which in Roman Catholic theology is ascribed to the words "*Hoc est Corpus meum.*" The words appear only to assert a fact, but they do make the fact which they assert, and it would not be true if it were not asserted."

Again, according to these men, a Christian is under no moral or indeed any obligation to observe the Lord's Day. Being *saved* he can dispense with such a "beggarly element," as every day is to him a Lord's day. But I greatly fear that instead of the other days being elevated to the religious level of the Lord's day, that day is degraded to the secular level of other days. And we are again perplexed to know why the Holy Spirit has recorded the fact that the primitive Christians met together on *the first day of the week* for prayer and holy communion; why St. Paul selected that day as the most suitable for offertory collections in the churches of Corinth and Galatia; or why St. John is mentioned as having been "in the spirit on the *Lord's day.*" Was this information given to teach us, or to mislead us? for the Spirit must have known our liability at all events to follow the intimations of an inspired record.

II. The next error of the Brethren which I notice is their