

ark to protect us from the deep waters of unbelief; this is a lantern unto our feet, and a light unto our path; this is our rock and sure tower of defence against the craft and subtlety of those lying in wait to deceive.

But it has ever been the endeavour of the Church of Rome to seek to beguile our people of their common sense. Bishop Stillingfleet [Unreasonableness of Separation, preface, p. 19] quotes a letter of advice given a Romish agent, as to the best way of managing the papal interest in England, the third head of which is "To make it appear underhand, how near the doctrine, worship and discipline, of the Church of England comes to us (of Rome); at how little distance her common prayer is from our mass; and that the wisest and ablest men of that way (the Anglican) are so moderate, that they would willingly come over to us, or at least meet us half way."

It is distressing to resume my remarks on the pastoral letter before us, but duty compels me to do so; they shall however be very brief. Mr. Darling in page 5, says, he "can shew any of you who will take the trouble to call upon him such passages from the works of Cranmer, Latimer, and others of the Reformers as will abundantly satisfy you that they held the doctrine of baptismal regeneration." Now this is simply an evasion, Mr. D. must know that I, as stated in my letter following Holy Scripture, do so in its fullest sense, but the question is will he shew us in the Reformers later writings, after their minds were fully emancipated, from the Popish thralldom in which they had been born and educated, for they were frail fallible men, groping their way at first in darkness, struggling against feelings, prejudices and associations that had grown with their growth and increased with their strength, even after light had been vouchsafed to them, sometimes halting between two opinions, and sometimes of course erring in judgment, our only wonder is that they did so much, but the hand of God was with them, teaching, strengthening and supporting them—will however Mr. Darling shew us in the Reformers later writings their belief in the doctrine of INFANT baptismal regeneration, he can no more do so than he could shew it you in the Bible. Remember what I said in my letter about the meaning of the word *regeneration*, the meaning attached to it by the writer of the pastoral letter is not distinctly stated, but I should suppose from what he incidentally remarks that he means renovation of heart and holiness of life—if so what becomes of the doctrine of justification by faith?

With respect to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper Mr. Darling argues both for its reality and spirituality—if it be real it cannot be spiritual, and if it be spiritual it cannot be real—there is no mean between carnality and spirituality, between transubstantiation and the simple bread and wine, at least it is beyond my limited reasoning powers to understand it. I know it is a blessed means of grace, I know my heavenly Master commands me to eat the bread and drink of the cup, in remembrance of his body broken and of his blood shed, and I do so in testimony of my belief in the fullness of that atonement which he made for me on Calvary's cross. But, my friends, our church speaks of the sacraments as seals and pledges, not as instruments of salvation in a justifying sense—as eminent means of grace, inasmuch as "faith is confirmed and grace increased" (Art. xxvii)—as that they "be not only badges or tokens of Christian