

flaming arrows of shame and remorse, as ever and anon, while the words of the book were breathed to heaven, repugnance to their meaning lacerated the heart! No decision of Committee of Privy Council,—no authoritative legal deliverance, fixing a sense or tolerating differences, could reach the core and eradicate the causes of a disease like this! *Nothing would do but a change in the offices of the Church themselves.*”*

III. We have little space left for dwelling on the *Articles of Religion*, which must be pronounced “agreeable to the Word of God.” Certainly, an Evangelical Christian can find himself more at home among these than among the Offices just referred to. But in this very fact lies our difficulty in accepting *both*, as we are required to do. The two opposing parties in the Church take refuge, one in the Articles and the other in the Liturgy, and thence denounce each other as in deadly error. One says that the Liturgy must be interpreted by the Articles, and the other reverses this rule, both thus confessing the opposition between the two. The Liturgy is largely inherited from the Papacy. The Articles are the fruit of the Reformation. They are, on the whole, Calvinistic in their Theology. The IXth contains a strong statement of the doctrine of “Original Sin.” The Xth is equal to the Westminster Confession on the subject of “Free Will.” The XIth, XIIth and XIIIth are very clear on “Justification by Faith,” and “Good Works.” The XVIIth is most explicit on the topic of “Predestination.” On the subject of the Church, we could scarcely desire a better definition of our own views than that in the XIXth,—“*A* visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful (believing) men, in the which the pure Word of*

* *Great Gorham Case*, pp. 159, 160.

* Archbishop Whateley's rendering of the Latin, *Visibilis*.