

THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ONLY,
THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS.

(Continued.)

We however have now seen that, of all Articles of the Apostles' Creed, Protestants, are only agreed in believing two—namely, the first that there is One God: and the last, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting. Nay, I might without any injustice go further. Socinians cannot be said really to hold the first Article, because if they deny God the Son, they clearly deny God the FATHER as FATHER: and Universalists do not hold the last clause, because they deny the eternity of punishment, which is implied in it. The Resurrection of the Body then is all that Protestants, as Protestants, of all sects and sorts, agree in believing—I mean of matters contained in the Apostles' Creed, and in the sense of that Creed.

There are indeed several other things to which no reference is made in that Creed, which Protestants are pretty much agreed in believing, though the belief is not universal. As for instance, that the Pope is Antichrist; that Rome is the Babylon of the Book of Revelations; that we are justified by faith only. I might mention other opinions that have been held by some Protestants: as for example, one which I was reading in an "Anti-Tractarian" book the other day: "If Tractarianism be not the last and crowning effort of the enemy, under the full knowledge that his time is short, verily the depth of his craft is unfathomable!" But from none of these opinions can we build up any positive dogmatic statement of faith which we can call Protestantism. We must try another way; and we will again refer to the sects to whom a few moments ago I alluded.

Where does the Presbyterian find that Episcopacy is not essential to the Church? In the Bible according to his interpretation of it.

Where does the Independent find that no succession of ministers was intended by our Lord?

In the Bible according to his interpretation of it.

Where does the Anabaptist learn that infants are not to be baptized?

In the Bible according to his interpretation of it.

Where does the Swiss Calvinist learn to reject the doctrine of the Atonement? Where does the Quaker learn to reject the sacraments? Where does the modern Lutheran learn that Original Sin is a mere invention of man?

In the Bible, according to their several interpretations of it.

And where does the Socinian learn that our Lord is not Very God?

In the Bible, according to his interpretation of it.

Then, I think, at last we have discovered the true and genuine principle of Protestantism. Every man has a right to interpret the Bible according to his own understanding; after giving it the best attention which his opportunities and capacity enable him to bestow.

Now, I imagine that you will willingly accept this statement; you all not only acknowledge its truth, but you all glory in it. But did it never strike you that granting this, no one, who honestly believes that he finds his creed in the Bible, is to be condemned? Suppose that a Roman Catholic tells you that he finds the doctrine of Purgatory there—that he finds the Invocation of Saints there—that he finds the all-but Divine glory of St. Mary there—or that he finds, as he certainly does find, the Union of the Sick there, what right on your own principles, have you to blame him? You may say he can there find no such thing. But that has nothing to do with the point. He will say the same of you. If he assures you that, after his fullest and most earnest consideration he does find these doctrines there, all you can say, if you are consistent, is, that he has a perfect right to his opinion. Yes; you are in this inextricable dilemma. Either you must confess Roman Catholics and, to come nearer home Tractarians—to have as good a right to their opinions as you have to yours—in which case what dreadful bigotry, intolerance, ay, and wickedness, is your denunciation of them; or, when you say that all men are bound to interpret the Scriptures according to their own private judgment, you mean that all men are bound to interpret the Scriptures according to YOUR own private judgment.

Those are the horns of the dilemma. On one or the other it is clear that you must certainly, inevitably, palpably entirely, fall, as it is that two and two make four. Choose which horn you like best.

I will tell you. You have all heard of THOMAS SCOTT the commentator. He was a man of powers of mind, indefatigable perseverance, and no learning. You may probably have read his Force of Truth. If so you will know the correctness of what I am going to say.

Before SCOTT came into public notice, he was in his belief an Arminian. Some con-

siderations induced him to think that Calvinism was the doctrine of the Bible; and he determined to study for himself, with no other help but prayer and thought, whether it were or were not. After the labour of some months, he became a confirmed Calvinist. And he argues to this effect: I know, says he that I spent vast labour in the search: I know I prayed earnestly during its course: I know that those who do so will be directed into all truth. I came to this conclusion. Therefore, I am right. Therefore all who differ from me are wrong. Therefore, as the same promise was made to them, they must either have studied insufficiently, or betrayed carelessly. If all men took the same pains that I did, they must come to the same conclusion.

Now this is at least honest and straightforward; concealed enough and presumptuous certainly, but withal, after a sort, manly. The answer is of course easy enough. Twenty thousand persons from the same premises may with equal justice arrive at very opposite conclusions: therefore the premises themselves are false. But I have not yet done with this book, the "Force of Truth." Most of you have heard of Sir JAMES STEPHEN, once a great writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, and now I am sorry to say Professor of Modern History in my own University, Cambridge. Among other articles which he contributed to that *Review*, and which he has since republished in a separate form, one treats of the character of this very man SCOTT, and of this very book, the "Force of Truth." Now Sir JAMES sees the absurdity of the conclusion, but as a good Protestant, he is compelled to admit the truth of the premises. Therefore all he can do is to endeavour to find some flaw in the chain of reasoning: and the difficulty and embarrassment into which he gets—the hopeless way in which he flounders about, make that article as amusing as it is instructive.

So much for the right of private judgment, which forms the positive belief of Protestants. I am not going to waste words in showing you that the Church of England openly and palpably rejects it. Why, the very fact of her having Creeds and Articles shows that she does. What business has she, or any one else, to say, "this is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved;" if she allows it not only the right, but if the right, then the duty, of every man, to interpret Scripture according to the light of his own reason? What business has she to say of one thing that it is a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit, and to stigmatize another set of men as deserving, for their opinions, to be held accursed; if she does not hold that there is a pillar and ground of the truth, differing very far indeed from every man's own private interpretation? The thing is really not worth dwelling upon. It is too plain. All this, mark you, does not in the least prove that the Church of England is right in holding this opinion; that is quite a different question, and one with which we are not at all concerned now: it only proves that, as a fact, she does hold it.

Now then; I showed you just now, that what Protestants, as Protestants, protest against, that the Church of England holds; and I have further showed you that what Protestants, as Protestants, hold, that the Church of England protests against. Take it which way you like, negatively and positively; and the fact is the same. Our Church has no claim to the epithet Protestant.

Let me show this a little more fully. Is it not very strange—I call it providential—to you it must simply appear unaccountable—that nowhere throughout the Prayer Book, nowhere in the Articles, does the Church speak of herself as Protestant? I put it to you as to honest men; if you had been called to draw up some thirty-nine articles, some fifteen of which had been directed against Rome, would it have been possible for you to avoid the use of the word Protestant, ay, and a good many times too? Should we not have heard something of Protestant doctrine, or of the true Protestant Religion? How comes it to pass then that, as it is, we have nothing of the sort?

I have a very easy explanation. The Church is Catholic, and therefore she delights to repeat that word. "I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church"; "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith"; "And the Catholic Faith is this"; "This is the Catholic Faith, which, except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved"; "more especially, we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church." The Church of England is not Protestant, and therefore she nowhere employs that term, though many of those who call themselves her children employ it for her. I remember a curious instance of this. I knew of an old Yorkshire squire, a very good man too in his way, who was not at all satisfied at the omission of the word Protestant in the Prayer Book. Therefore on Sunday, he used to stand up con-

spicuously in his pew, and in the Creed, which he repeated lustily and sturdily, thus alter the third division: "I believe in the Holy Ghost—the Holy Protestant Church."

Some of you may not be aware, that the only time the question has in any way been put to our Church, whether she will call herself Protestant, her answer was clearly in the negative. In the time of QUEEN ANNE, an address was proposed in the upper House of Convocation, which applied that term to the English Church. After a struggle between the two Houses, the lower House succeeded in altering the obnoxious phrase. All honor to those bold and persevering Priests—though now it be the fashion to calumniate them—who defended the cause of their Church against the time-serving comprehension-seeking Bishops of the upper House!

But you will say, have none of the great writers of the Church of England called themselves Protestants? Assuredly they have. But, up to the Revolution, they used the term in a very different sense to that in which you now use it.

LAUD, for example, declared on the scaffold that he died true to the Protestant religion; NICHOLAS FERRAR, who was the founder of a religious house in Huntingdonshire, called himself a Protestant. So did those who would now be termed the most ultra of CHARLES I's divines; such as MONTAGUE and WREN. Bishops who encouraged confession, set up stone altars, prayed for the dead, and employed crosses, ay, and crucifixes, called themselves Protestants; they simply meant that they were not Romanists. The word then had not its present conventional meaning; nay, it was used in the very same way that old-fashioned people use it now, in contradiction to the term Puritan. I remember that CARLETON, who was Bishop of Chichester in JAMES I's time, speaks of the difference between Protestant and Puritan doctrine. I have myself heard an old-fashioned lady express her horror that any Protestant should think of attending a Meeting House. In short, Protestantism had not then been blown upon: and therefore those great men, innocently, and without any sinister meaning, employed it.

The divines of the 18th century, that truly dark age, employed it also. When HODGLEY was denying the Sacrament, and eating the bread of a Sacramental Church; when BLACKBURN was running his career at York; when CLAYTON was consulting an adulteress as to the composition and doctrine of his charge; when LAVINGTON was persecuting the Methodists, and POTTER the Evangelicals; when CORNWALLIS was dancing away his evenings at Lambeth, till GEORGE III peremptorily interfered; then, I confess the Prelates of the Church of England gloried in the term Protestant. But I do you more justice than to believe that you would quote such men as authorities.

It is a little to wander from my immediate subject, but I should like to say a few words on what you are very fond of talking about—Protestant simplicity in worship.

The Dutch pride themselves, and perhaps with some truth, on being the most Protestant nation in Europe. Their worship, I confess, has a good deal of simplicity. But you would be astonished, I think, in all their great churches, to see the enormous rodscreens which separate their chancels from the nave; and these, mind you, not kept up from ancient times, but erected in many instances quite lately. There has been a good deal of nonsense talked about the screen at St. Paul's church in this town. I should be very sorry to hurt my friend Mr. WAGNER's feelings, but I am sadly afraid the Dutch Calvinist, so far from thinking it exaggerated or Popish, would consider it diminutive and not sufficiently suited to the demands of a large church. And if you went into Lutheran Germany, there, indeed, you would be astonished; you would see perhaps five or six altars in the same church, all magnificently vested—all furnished with candlesticks—all, not with crosses, but with crucifixes—images of Saints, the tapers on the altars lighted during Divine Service, and hung, in many cases, before the images—those images garlanded with flowers—all the old chants retained; and, if you went into Sweden, where, mark you, it is grievously penal to be a Roman Catholic, besides all this, you will find the old vestments also retained. So much for Protestant simplicity. The only place in Europe where you would find what you want, is in the Protestant cantons of Switzerland.

(To be continued.)

Advertisements.

J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Bac. K. C.
PROFESSOR OF THE PIANO-FORTE,
SINGING AND GUITAR,
Residence, Shuter Street.
Toronto, May 7, 1851. 41-11y

HERBERT MORTIMER

BROKER,

House, Land and General Agent,

No. 80, KING STREET EAST, TORONTO;

(Opposite St. James's Church.)

REFERENCE kindly permitted to J. Cameron, Esq., T. G. Ridout, Esq., Jas. Brown, Esq., W. McMaster, Esq., P. Paterson, Esq., Messrs. J. C. Beckett & Co., Bowes & Hall, Crawford & Hagarty, Ridout Brothers & Co., Ross, Mitchell & Co.

Twenty years' Debentures constantly on Sale, at a liberal discount.
Toronto, October 1st, 1852. 5-11

MR. WILLIAM HAY,

Architect, Civil Engineer, and Surveyor,

No. 18, King Street, Toronto.

REFERENCES permitted to the Hon. and Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Rev. John McCaul, LL. D., President of the University of Toronto—the Rev. H. J. Grasett, M. A., Rector of Toronto—the Rev. T. S. Kennedy, Secretary to the Church Society, Toronto, and the Rev. R. J. Macgeorge, of Streetsville.
Toronto, Oct. 14th, 1852. 11-2m

M. ANDERSON,

PORTRAIT PAINTER.

IN his tour of the British Provinces, has visited Toronto for a short time, and is prepared to receive Sitings at his Rooms, 108, Yonge Street.
Toronto, Dec. 10th, 1852. 25-11

T. BILTON,

MERCHANT TAILOR,

No. 2, Wellington Buildings,

King Street Toronto.

Toronto, February, 1852. 27-11

MR. S. J. STRATFORD,

SURGEON AND OCULIST,

Church Street, above Queen Street, Toronto
The Toronto Dispensary, for Diseases of the EYE, in rear of the same.
Toronto, January 13th, 1837.

WILLIAM HODGINS,

ARCHITECT and CIVIL ENGINEER,

LONDON, CANADA WEST.

February, 1852. 28-11

JOHN CRAIG,

GLASS STAINER,

Flag, Banner, and Ornamental Painter

HOUSE PAINTING, GRADING, &c., &c.

No. 7, Waterloo Buildings, Toronto.

September 4th 1851. 6

W. MORRISON,

Watch Maker and Manufacturing Jeweler,

SILVER SMITH, &c.

No. 9, KING STREET WEST, TORONTO.

A NEAT and good assortment of Jewellery
Watches, Clocks, &c. Spectacles, Jewellery
and Watches of all kinds made and repaired to order.
Utmost value given for old Gold and Silver.
Toronto, Jan. 28, 1847. 61

MR. CHARLES RAHN.

SURGEON DENTIST,

BEGS to acquaint his numerous friends, and the public generally, that he has just returned from New York, where he has been spending some time with Professor John Allen, of the College of Dental Surgeons, Cincinnati, from whom he has been acquiring a knowledge of the late great improvement in Dentistry, viz: that of uniting single teeth to each other and to the plate upon which they are set, by means of a fusible silicious cement, which is flowed in and around the base of the teeth upon the plate in such a manner, as to form a continuous artificial gum. By this method the cavities between the teeth, which are unavoidable in the old style, are completely filled up leaving no chance for secretions of any kind, and giving a perfectly natural and life-like appearance to the gum and teeth.
Specimens may be seen at his Office, on the corner of Bay and Melinda Streets. Office Hours from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.

Terms—Cash—without exception.

This important improvement has been patented by Dr. Allen in the United States, and steps have been taken to procure Patents in England and France. Dr. A. has authorized Mr. Rahn to give instructions in this beautiful art to educated gentlemen in the profession, on moderate terms.

N.B.—Mr. R. offers a friendly challenge to all the Dentists of British North America to compete with him at the approaching Provincial Exhibition, for a Gold Medal, value £12 10s. to be left to the judgment of the Professors of Toronto University, and of Trinity College.
Toronto, Sept. 17, 1852. 11

JUST RECEIVED.

THE NEW CLERK'S ASSISTANT or BOOK
OF PRACTICAL FORMS, full bound
sheep; 8s. 9d.

H. ROWSELL,

Bookseller & Stationer,

King Street, Toronto

March 3rd, 1853.