

e have given
to the Shorter
cate the ex-
g for the use
er instructors
ious to com-
hoice will lie,
en the merits
ll, it deserves
as far as we

er Catechism,
e uses of the
admitted by
henever any
e Larger Cat-
; that he has

il for several
nducting ad-
Bible-classes
re the text-
extraordinary
its Answers.
in, making it
young, but
where direc-
ce. A single

Could any-
der, than the
s required of
l's Supper, in
'What is the
l the Lord's
ich are consi-
ve themselves
e and useless,
in this book,
he Catechism

isms were es-
n the Presby-
s of England
r a long time,
nd their assi-
onal brethren

have now very generally, we suppose, allowed the West-
minster Catechisms, as also their own Modifications of the
Westminster Confession, to fall into disuse among them.
With respect to *ourselves*, we have not perhaps sufficient
data to compare, quite justly, the present with the past.
There may occasionally be fears that the comparison would
not be favourable to our own time. But in any case, let
parents, and all others charged with the solemn and res-
ponsible duty of giving religious instruction to the young,
"suffer the word of exhortation;" let them prosecute
their high work with still more prayerful diligence; and
let them not dream of throwing aside, or neglect to em-
ploy, a help so valuable as the Shorter Catechism. We
greatly fear that where Presbyterians have discontinued
the use of the Shorter Catechism, it is to be attributed,
in most instances, to a spirit of carelessness about the
work in which the Catechism was meant to give assist-
ance. Let us tremble at the thought of being found
unfaithful in a matter so important as the religious train-
ing of our children—a matter on which the prosperity,
nay, the very existence, of the Church of Christ depends.

And now, in bringing this Essay to a close, we wish to
add a word respecting the obligation which rests upon
our own and the other Branches of the Church of Christ,
to regard with due appreciation those Statements and
Definitions of the great Scriptural truths which have
come down to us, some of them from an early period in
the Church's history. We shall, certainly, err if we throw
these Definitions, in a body, contemptuously aside. They
are, no doubt, human; we never claim for them an
equality with the Holy Scriptures. But they are, gene-
rally, the fruit of much study, consultation and prayer in
the Church. And while we keep away from the impious
Romish doctrine of the Church's Infallibility, we shall
not deny, surely, that the Spirit of God, in accordance
with the Saviour's promise, has been the Teacher of His
people; and that, moreover, in the Providence of God cer-
tain great truths of Scripture have been brought—now
one, now another—with peculiar clearness before the
mind of His Church, so that she has been able to express
and formulate these for coming ages. Is it not well then
that we should conserve the inheritance which has come
down to us? Is it wise, is it modest, is it quite consistent
with due recognition of the Spirit's presence in the
Church, unceremoniously to reject all that she offers us of

Are we teach-
ing the Cate-
chism as care-
fully as our
fathers did?

Obligation
resting on us
to have due
regard to the
Standards.

Nothing Rom-
ish in valuing
the careful de-
finitions of the
truth made by
the Church in
the past.