

# The Berean.

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. 32.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 136.]

**THE FUNERAL TOLL.**  
Lines by a Clergyman upon hearing the bell toll for a Parishioner.—A solemn and suitable Reflection for Parsons, Teachers, and others, whose duty it is to watch for souls.

O should he meet me at the bar of God,  
And on my conscience charge the guilt of blood!  
My vital warmth grows chill through all my veins;  
O! wash me, blood divine, from all my stains!  
But should he meet me in that day of days,  
And tell it to the great Immanuel's praise,  
That I was made the instrument of good  
While teaching Jesus' all-atonement blood;  
Then love divine shall fill my raptured soul,  
And grace, triumphant grace, shall sound from pole to pole.

Friendly Visitor.

## THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY.

Continued.

THE REMEDY TO BE APPLIED.

How are these evils to be obviated? Not by the efficacy of any ministerial action of man's performance. This would be an impious and vain assumption. Not by any compensatory process or curative influence on the part of the sinner. It is preposterous to suppose him in possession of any resources available for such ends. Their accomplishment is utterly beyond the reach of created power and skill. No man can give a ransom for the soul—no one can say, I have made my own heart clean. For the removal of the evils of sin, the Lord must provide, or the ease is remediless. Our service here is to assure the anxious inquirer that though his condition, considered in itself, is desperate, it is not hopeless, for that the Lord has taken counsel for relief. Help has been laid upon one who is mighty and able to save to the uttermost. For this gracious purpose God sent forth his only begotten Son, the brightness of his glory and express image of his person, and He has provided an effectual remedy for the whole evil. Hence his designation—thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.\* He saves from guilt or condemnation, not by an arbitrary act of sovereignty, this was not possible, but by a suitable moral compensation for the wrong done and the insult offered to the character and government of God by sin. With this view He took upon him our nature, assumed our responsibilities, and delivered himself up into the hands of Divine Justice, to be dealt with for our redemption. This is the only satisfactory explanation of the condition in which we find the Son of God during the days of his flesh, and of the unparalleled treatment to which the Holy One was then subjected. Our sins were laid upon him—He bare them in his own body on the tree, till all the ends of punishment were answered, and the clemency of God could be consistently exercised in the forgiveness of sin.—Such is Heaven's gracious arrangement by which the guilt of man may be cancelled and one of the grand evils of sin be removed. But this is not all, or the arrangement would be incomplete and ineffectual. There is the other evil—the malady, and all the spiritual derangement and pollution which it produces. For the removal of this, Jesus has made effectual provision through the agency of the Holy Ghost, by whose exceeding great and mighty power the fatal disease of sin is broken, its subject rendered convalescent; and by this healing and renewing influence he is gradually qualified more and more for serving God upon earth, and endowed with a meekness for his presence and glory in Heaven.

The effect of this mysterious action of the Holy Ghost on the spiritual nature of the sinner is, in Scripture, expressed by terms which declare it decided and thorough nature. It is a new birth—a new creation—a resurrection from the death of trespasses and sins. Words, which, if they have any meaning, teach not a formal or superficial but a thorough renovation of the subject.

Operating in connexion with the word, the Holy Ghost, as promised by Christ, "convinceth of sin," produces that painful sense of its guilt and defilement which causes an earnest desire for deliverance, and prompts the anxious cry, "what must I do to be saved?"

At this solemn and interesting crisis, the work of the Ministry is clear—to preach Christ to the awakened sinner—to the atonement of Christ as the foundation, other than which no man can lay for pardon, and sanctification by the Spirit of Christ, as the only remedy for a depraved nature.

The natural independence and pride of man may suggest other expedients for his relief. These must be exposed in their insufficiency and repudiated as "refuges of lies." That indistinct perception of spiritual things, which characterizes the early exercises of an awakened mind, may occasion much perplexity in apprehending the arrangement of Divine Grace. They must, therefore, be patiently set forth with all possible plainness and simplicity, in their suitability, fullness, and freedom. When their adaptation to the ends for which they are designed, and their sufficiency for those who partake of them is discerned, then the further question, on the part of the person seeking salvation, becomes, "How may I attain to a personal interest in this provision of God? In what way may I avail myself of the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ for my pardon, and of the renewing power of the Holy Ghost for sanctification?"

There are workmen in the ministry who would here straightways apply the sacraments for the benefit of such inquirer, as if pardon comes, and purification is only to be had by these—who therefore immediately recommend Baptism, if it has not already been received, and a participation in the Lord's supper.—Such a course we conceive is still premature and delusive. Its tendency is to generate a false praise, and to settle the individual into satisfaction with a religion of form instead of securing to him a renovation of heart.

Let it be well observed that, to attain a personal interest in the death of Christ, and experience the renewing of the Holy Ghost, there must be union to Christ. That must exist which in Scripture is called, "being in him," and which is illustrated by various beautiful and significant figures—such as the relation which subsists between the branches and the vine; the materials of a building and the corner-stone; the members of a body and their head—all strikingly expressing a real intimate and vital union. To say that such union is formed by

the Sacraments, is to assert what has no foundation in Scripture, and is in the face of obvious fact. It is lamentably to mistake the signs and seals of the in-being and its benefits, for the union itself.—This union is formed by an exercise of the heart by which, being persuaded of the suitability and sufficiency of Christ as set forth and offered in the Gospel, the sinner receives, appropriates, and relies on him as all his salvation, and this is faith. This cordial acceptance of and trust in him, as to be made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, forms the union—actually instates the sinner in the covenant of grace, and gives him a personal interest in all the benefits of redemption.—Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.\* He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.\* By grace are ye saved through faith.\*

Here the work of the Ministry must be conducted with great care and discrimination, or one may be led to mistake mere fancy or feeling for faith, and thus to cry peace when God has not spoken peace. It must be distinctly observed, that though it be by faith and by faith only, that the sinner comes to Christ—is united to him, and so interested in the benefits of his redemption; yet, this is not "a faith which remaineth alone." It is not a dead but a living thing. It is not a cloistered, indolent grace, but essentially social and operative in its character, and may be certainly known by its acts and companionship.—Scripture teaches us that it works by love, and is always found in association with this sister Grace. They are of one birth, and will not bear to be parted. The presence of the one implies the presence of the other, and when one is not, the other cannot be found. From the nature of the case, it cannot be otherwise. To a heart burdened and bruised by sin, but which has found relief by the sufferings and death of the Redeemer, on whose pierced bosom it now rests in peace and comfort, that Saviour must be precious, and precious in proportion to the intelligence and power of the faith in which it reposes there.—The Right Rev. J. Johns, D. D., Assistant Bishop of Virginia.

## NO ALTAR, NO SACRIFICE IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

From Address to the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ohio, by the Right Rev. C. P. McVrairie, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese.

Continued from our last number.

But now the habit of calling the table an altar, was fast driving out the true and primitive name, as Christians, out of a most degrading disposition to conciliate the heathen by adopting their names and conforming to their customs, were getting more fond of speaking of the Lord's supper as a sacrifice, and its minister as a Priest.—Thus Jerome is quoted by a Romish Annotator, as "calling the bodies or bones of St. Peter and St. Paul, the altars of Christ, because of this sacrifice offered over and upon them." Soon churches were built over some of those tombs, and the relics were removed from others into churches, and, of course, were enshrined in tombs, as became the sepulture of the illustrious dead. And there, as before, in the open fields, the eucharistic sacrifice was offered over, and upon them; the doctrine having now grown up that "prayer was the more acceptable to God, when made before the relics of the saints." As the doctrine of the real, corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist gained prevalence, so grew that of a real sacrifice and a literal altar; and as the idea of uniting the merits of Christ's sacrifice, with the supererogatory merits of saints, for the remission of sins, made progress, so seemed it the more appropriate that in the so called sacrament of the altar, the relics of the saints, and the body of Christ, should be associated together, the one upon, the other under, the altar. Thus it came to pass that the only form, with which the Church of Rome learned to connect the idea of a christian altar, was that of a christian martyr's tomb.—Such was the form which she handed down to the age of the Reformation, and to the present; sacred now in the eyes of her children, as identified with the whole history of her Missal solemnities, and her miracle-working relics. And now, even among Protestant Christians, so is the association of ideas affected by the outward forms, which the pompous ceremonial of Romish worship exhibits, especially when they appear under the garb of antiquity, and are identified with a favourite style of ecclesiastical architecture, that when under the influence of a false architectural taste, or a wrong doctrinal sympathy, our people attempt to erect altars, instead of tables, in their churches. None ever think of copying the models which God gave to Moses for the worship of Israel, and which are hallowed, in our thoughts, by all the sacred solemnities of the Jewish Church, as divinely ordained types of the sacrifice of Christ. To imitate the brazen altar of burnt offering, or the golden altar of incense, the only real altar-forms that we know of, except those of heathen worship, would at once seem too Jewish. To have something more Christian, we go to the altar of the Church of Rome, for a model; which is christian, just so far as the idolatrous worship of the wafer, in the Mass, and of dead men's bones beneath, is christian and no more.—When one sees in a Prot. Epis. Church, instead of a proper table, such as he has a right to find, for the holy supper, what is now called an altar, an oblong chest or ark, of stone or wood, closed in on all sides, as if some sacred mysteries were concealed

\* Gregory Martin, Fulke's Defence, p. 516. The doctrine of any sacrifice in the Lord's supper, but as the commemoration of that of the cross was called, *metonymically*, a sacrifice, or as the prayers of communicants were figuratively called sacrifices, did not get place in the Church till long after; but there was now a dangerous use for figurative terms, and a dangerous fondness for the introduction of heathen rites with christian worship, out of which very naturally grew, by and by, the full doctrine of a literal sacrifice, altar, and priesthood. Bishop White says, "there were no sentiments, for 300 years, in the Christian Church, which threatened to lead, even by remote consequence, to such an extreme" as the Romish errors on this subject.—*Lecture on the Sacraments.*

In the 4th century, Eusebius said, that "the unbloody and reasonable sacrifices, which our blessed Saviour taught his followers to offer, were such as were to be performed by prayer, and the mystical service of blessing and praising God."—*De laudibus Constantini*, quoted by Mede.

therein; what edifying thoughts it is calculated to awaken in his mind? Is he reminded of the institution of the Lord's supper? But then there was only a common table. Does it symbolize, to his eye, the nature of the Lord's supper? He knows of no sacrifice therein, and therefore no altar. Does it teach him his privilege and duty, as a believer, spiritually to feed, by faith, upon the sacrifice of Christ once offered on the cross? He wants a table, not an altar, to suggest that lesson. Does it stand before him, surrounded with edifying and inspiring associations, arising out of the recollection of the primitive and pure ages of the gospel? Those ages had no such device. Is it even connected, in his mind, with the venerable usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church? It is a novelty among them! What then! It is fitted only to remind him of its own original, in the midst of the rankest growth of spiritual deformity, when it was a mere martyr's tomb; its top, the birth-place of the idolatry of the Mass; its interior a depository of worshipped bones; a most fit symbol of that whole system of spiritual bondage and death, all centering in the so called "sacrament of the altar," under which the Church of Rome has always, since she became what she is, buried the gospel, and imprisoned the minds of men, wherever she has held dominion. If there be anything edifying to a communicant at the Lord's board, in contemplating what suggests nothing but the remembrance of all that is false and superstitious in popery, then indeed is such an altar edifying. The primitive table is just the opposite.

We return to our history. I need not tell you that such was the altar found in the churches of England, at the period of the Reformation. But it did not remain long undisturbed. With the revival of gospel truth, concerning the nature of the Lord's supper, came the restoration of the primitive table for its celebration. In 1550, Ridley, Bishop of London, issued Injunctions to the churches of his diocese, exhorting, that all altars should be taken down, and that they should "set up the Lord's board, after the form of an honest table." And one of his reasons was, that "the form of a table may more turn away the people from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's supper."

An order, to the same effect was issued the same year. Under date of Nov. 19, we read, in King Edward's Journal, the following entry: "There were letters sent to every Bishop to pluck down the altars." Day, Bishop of Chichester, having refused compliance, was imprisoned. When Mary succeeded to the throne, Romanism was re-enthroned, and of course, tables were cast out of the churches, and altars restored. It was then made a serious charge against the Reformers that they had taken away the altars; to which Mr. Ridley, on the eve of his martyrdom, answered: "As for the taking down of the altars, it was done upon just considerations; for that they seemed to come too nigh the Jews' use; neither was the Supper of the Lord at any time ministered or more duly received than in those better days; (the reign of Edward,) when all things were brought to the rites and usages of the primitive Church."

On the return of the Reformation, under Elizabeth, altars were again cast out by authority, and tables were restored. In 1564-5, certain "advertisements for due order in the using of the Lord's Supper," were "set forth by public authority," in which it was ordered that each parish should provide a decent table standing on a frame, for the communion table.\*

In 1569, Archbishop Parker issued to his diocese certain Visitation Articles, one of which is thus: "Whether you have in your parish churches all things necessary for Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, especially, the Homilies, a convenient pulpit, well placed; a comely and decent table for the holy communion, and whether your altars be taken down according to the commandment in that behalf given."

In 1571, were issued the canons of the Synod of that year, which enjoined that the Church-Wardens should provide "a table of joiner's work for the administration of the holy communion."†

In the same year, Grindal, while Archbishop of York, and afterwards when in the see of Canterbury, set forth Injunctions directing the Church-Wardens to provide in every parish, a comely and decent table standing on a frame, and to see that all altars be utterly taken down.‡

Now it was with this well understood character of a table for the communion, as distinguished from an altar of sacrifice, "an honest table," "a table of joiner's work," "a table of wood standing on a frame," that in 1603, the present canon of the Church of England (the 22nd) was enacted; which requires that "there shall be a decent communion table in every church."¶ What the canon means by "a table" the injunctions I have cited perfectly determine. Contemporaneously with the Injunctions published in the reign of Elizabeth, was issued our Second Book of Homilies, in one of which we are told that "God's house is well adorned, with places convenient to sit in, with the pulpit for the Preacher, with the Lord's table for the ministrations of his holy supper, with the font to christen in," &c.¶ In those days it would have been impossible to mistake what in the laws of the Church of England was meant by a table, in distinction from an altar, as to confound a pulpit for the preacher, with a font for baptism.

It is an impressive fact, in this connexion, that whereas in the first Prayer Book of Edward vi, 1548, the word altar was retained in some places, where a literal table was meant; when that book was revised in 1552, and the second book of Edward vi, was set forth, that word was, in every case, erased, and table was put in its place. Thus has the Prayer Book of the Church of England remained to this day. The word altar is not there, in any connexion with the Lord's supper. It was struck out when it was there, as not according to the doctrine of

\* Ridley's Works, P. S. Ed. pp. 319, 324.  
† Burnet's Hist. of Ref. vol. 11, fol. 1.  
‡ Ridley's Works, P. S. Ed. pp. 280, 281.  
§ Quoted from Goode's *Altars Prohibited*, who cites Sparrow and Cardwell as his authorities.  
¶ Strype's Life of Parker, app. b. 11, No. XI.  
‡ Quoted by Goode, from Wilk. IV, 266.  
§ Grindal's Works, P. S. Ed. pp. 133, 134.  
¶ Homily on Repairing of Churches.

the Church. Every where now, the word is table. Thus, what is the law of that Church according to her rubrics and canons, as expounded by the Visitation Articles and Injunctions of her Bishops and Archbishops, by the decrees of synods, and the declarations of her greatest divines, is manifest beyond a rational question. A learned writer states it thus, "The only thing which properly answers the legal requisition of our church, must have the three following characteristics:

First, As to material, that it be made of wood.  
Secondly, as to form, that it be a table in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, a horizontal plane resting upon a frame or feet.

Thirdly, that it be unattached, in any part, to the church, so as to be a moveable table."

The recent decision of the highest ecclesiastical and judicial authority in England, commanding the altar lately erected in the Round Church in Cambridge to be removed, as illegal, fully confirms all that we have now said as to the law of the Church of England on this subject.

Before leaving this historical view, it will be edifying to reflect upon the alternate rise and fall of altars and tables, in the history of the English Church, according as Romish or Protestant principles prevailed.

With the prevalence of the Reformation under Edward, the symbol of sacrifice and of priestly mediation, fell down before the ark of Christ's holy gospel, and the primitive symbol of the communion feast at which all believers have equal rights of fellowship with their Lord and Saviour, was set up again as Christ and his Apostles left it. But with the return of the dominion of popery, under Mary, came back the priestly altars, and the casting out of the Lord's table. The restoration of the gospel to the pulpits, under Elizabeth, was the signal for the restoration of the symbol of his blessed feast of grace in Jesus Christ. When, afterwards, in the times of Archbishop Paul, there was a revival of Romish sympathies and doctrines, corresponding perfectly in spirit and principle with what we now see, in a more mature development, under the name of Tractarianism, there was an equal revival of zeal for altars, and there were those who took advantage of the favour known to be secretly felt in high quarters towards such things, and erected altars in the churches. A Bishop (Montague, of Chichester), went so far as to insert in his visitation articles, questions which were intended to suggest and promote their erection. And this same Bishop, while professedly of the Protestant Church of England, was, in his heart, an apostate to the Church of Rome, and was, at that time, holding secret interviews with the Pope's emissary, then in England, for the purpose of bringing about a union of the Church of England and Rome. His zeal for altars was fitly united with a zeal to assure Panzani, "that he was continually employed in disposing men's minds, both by word and writing, for a re-union with Rome;" and that both he and many of his brethren were prepared to conform themselves to the method and discipline of the Gallican church, where the "civil rights were well guarded; and as for the aversion (said he) we discover in our sermons and printed books, they are things of form, chiefly to humour the populace and not to be much regarded."

We cannot but be reminded, by these sad words, of certain strong expressions against Rome, put out in the earlier writings of certain leading Tractarian authors, and which had the effect, as was intended, of convincing many that those men were strong opposers, and perhaps the only effectual opposers of Romanism; which expressions having done their work, have been taken back, with the not-unintelligible intimation that they were not sincere, only words for the times, while some of their authors have apostatized to the Church of Rome, in form, and others evidently in heart.

By such men, altars were revived in the days of Paul. When those days were passed, and the Church of England had weathered the storm which, by a fierce and desolating reaction, they had raised, no more was heard of altars; except as a lingering survivor of the non-juring divines kept up the taste for sacrifices and priests. From that time, until the recent revival of Romish doctrine and feeling among some members of the English Church, it is not known that any thing but "an honest table" was placed in the churches of that land. But now, just so far as Tractarianism has extended its virus through the body of our mother church, producing its legitimate fruits in a real, though, partially, masked Romanism, has there appeared a solemn zeal for a real sacrifice in the Lord's supper; for a sacrificing priesthood in the christian ministry; for a confinement of the dispensation of gospel grace to the ministrations of a priest in the sacrifice of the Eucharist; and, by necessary consequence, an altar in the church, as the only thing at which a priest can appropriately stand, in his mediatorial office, and offer the body of Christ as a propitiation for the sins of the faithful.

This history of the alternate revival and declension of zeal for altars and tables, makes it so evident with what kind of sympathy, Romish, or Protestant, each is doctrinally connected, and how far it is from being a matter of indifference whether we have one or the other, that he who runs may read.

I am now prepared to state four reasons for the determination of which I have notified you, that I will not consecrate any church, hereafter, in which the structure for the ministrations of the Lord's supper is of an altar-form; or in which there is not, for that use, a table, in the ordinary sense, as the permanent furniture.

1st, The Rubric of our Communion Office requires such a Table.

Our Prayer Book, as originally set forth, like that of the Church of England, no where used the word altar, with reference to the Lord's supper. It contained some fifteen years in that state, every where speaking of the table. It was not until the addition of the Office for the Institution of Ministers, that the word altar obtained admission, even in a figurative sense. Of this, more by and by. Only in that office, it is now found. In the Rubric, at the head of the communion office, it is directed that "the table, in the Communion, having a fair linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel."

\* Goode's *Altars Prohibited*.  
† Gregorio Panzani, quoted by Goode in his introduction to Jackson on the Church.

It would be perfectly consistent with the order of the church, as thus set forth, were the communion-table placed in the middle of one of the aisles, if the space around were large enough to be available for communicants; and there entirely open, unprotected by rails, instead of being, as is our present custom, enclosed within the barrier of the chancel. However inexpedient this might be, it would not be inconsistent with the provisions of our Church. Consistently with those provisions, the table might be sometimes in one part of the body of the church, and sometimes in another. And while we think of it as a table, only the symbol of the spiritual feast, of the Lord's family, there is nothing intrinsically objectionable in this. But what would it be were it a real altar, with the sacrifice of the Lord's body offered thereon, and a special sacredness of a mediating, sacrificing Priest, officiating thereat? The very idea implies separation, a privileged place, ground specially holy, as the court of the Priests in the temple, in which stood the altar of sacrifice, was separated from the court of Israel.

The Rubric says "the table." It no where goes into any account of what it means by a table. Of course then we are intentionally left to understand a table in the usual sense.

To say that because an altar may, in a certain accommodated sense, be called a table, it is therefore consistent with the rubric, to have a literal altar in our churches, is just as weak as to say that whatever may in any figurative, accommodated, or unusual sense, be termed a table, however perfectly unlike what all are accustomed to understand by a table, is contemplated by the Rubric. You may go out into a grave-yard and serve up your family meal upon a tombstone, and hence call it a table, because you have used it for a table. But is it a table in any ordinary or proper sense? And would it be rubricated to place it in the Church for the feast of the Lord's Passover? Would it be an appropriate symbol of the feast of the household of faith? Why not as much as a Romish altar?

But what our Rubric means by the table, is easily and perfectly settled by the sense of the Church of England. Our rubric is precisely hers. Her doctrine and practice, as to the ministrations of the Eucharist, is, by universal acknowledgment, ours. All that we have in those respects, came through her. Consequently the whole history of the removal of altars and the substitution of "honest tables, of wood standing on a frame," all the government, orders, episcopal injunctions and judicial decisions, by which the law of the Church of England is so clearly interpreted, apply with equal conclusiveness to the interpretation of ours, and establish that, what is meant by a table for the communion, cannot admit of anything but a table in the ordinary sense, requiring no ingenious eye to see how it can be considered a table, but intelligible, in this respect, to all descriptions of men.

To be concluded in our next.

## THE SCHOOL WHICH HAS TRAINED THE SECEDERS FROM THE CHURCH.

From the London Christian Observer, 1839.

As for Dr. Hook's second statement, that "no high-churchman has been perverted to Romanism," it is so notoriously unfounded that it requires no reply. The most conspicuous convert to Romanism of late years in England is the Hon. G. Spencer, and he was led to it directly through the path which Dr. Hook asserts was never trodden in the way thither. He is known to have repeatedly declared, that from what Dr. Hook calls high-church divines he learned so much that he found he needed to learn more; and most especially in regard to the questions of Tradition and the Sacraments; and thus he was led from these high-church views in the Anglican pale, to what he now considers to be the true church views in that of Rome. We will corroborate our statement by a passage from the Rev. Dr. Nolan's treatise just published, entitled "The Catholic Character of Christianity, as recognised by the Reformed Church in opposition to the corrupt Traditions of the Church of Rome." This learned and able writer, who has had the signal honour of being successively appointed to preach the Boyle, the Warburton, and the Bampton Lectures, deals rather unceremoniously with the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," declaring that "it has rarely fallen to his lot to see so much inefficiency displayed in so narrow a compass" and that "they are silly in argument, shallow in research, and pernicious in tendency." He adds:

"They do not appear to claim any merit on the score of novelty. With the whole of their views and reasons, I have been, indeed, long familiar. The writers from whom they are borrowed, without alteration or improvement, were recommended to my notice by a very worthy, well-intentioned person, not long subsequently to my entrance into the ministry. But I imbued no share of his predilections for the views or purposes of the school founded by Archbishop Laud, of which he appeared so much enamoured. I could perceive no benefit but much detriment, likely to arise to the interests of Christianity from their establishment; and the methods of proof by which they were enforced were shallow and illusory. They generally consisted of verbal sophisms, the equivocal senses of which, as lying on the surface, were easily penetrated; and which, when seen through, were incapable of imposing on the meaneast understanding. The authorities adduced in support of their favoured positions by those divines, who should be matter trusted Laudians from their founder, than Puseyans or Fordians from their revivers, consisted of familiar and ordinary tropes, which were perverted from the figurative into a literal sense, to serve the exigency of the writer, and supply the deficiency of his resources. Their doctrines possessed neither the depth nor obscurity which could exhibit, on the removal of the mystic veil, those wonders of the sanctuary which are calculated to strike the Neophyte with surprise or admiration. In their views they possessed neither that vastness nor variety of prospect, which would require the inquirer who touched upon an aspect previously unexplored, with novel scenes, or a more extended horizon. The subjects to which I now find myself introduced by them have long been familiar, and the paths by which they are reached common and beaten. In the plea which is advanced for the Church, I can perceive little more than a feeble revival of the dormant claims of my old acquaintance, the Jacobites and Nonjurors; who made a weak and ineffectual struggle to impede the advances of that sound and liberal policy, which, in bringing the native energies of the kingdom into action, has contributed, under Providence, to raise it to an unrivalled pitch of prosperity and glory."

We have digressed into this quotation upon naming Dr. Nolan's work; but our direct object was to observe