

which, in accordance with the analogy of the faith, our protestant forefathers received and maintained, and should he not be satisfied with their exposition of the passage, let him take his place at the feet of the eminent men who now occupy the highest positions in our church, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Archbishop of Armagh, and the Archbishop of Dublin, from whom he will learn that these are not "idle" words, but that they convey authority to go forth as the Ambassadors of Christ, and declare his salvation and preach his gospel to every creature; and that he is not "required, as a matter of conscience," to play the hypocrite, and "to bow himself down in the house not of Rimmon, but of God."

The Provost says—

V. "On the sacraments I believe my doctrine to be that of Holy Scripture and of the church of England."

We were always assured that the Provost held and taught what he believed to be true. As to his sincerity we never heard it called in question for a moment. But this does not prove that he is right. Saul of Tarsus was sincere when he persecuted the church of God and wasted it. He verily thought that it was his duty to do many things against the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, and when he imbrued his hands in the blood of the proto-martyr, St. Stephen, he imagined that he was doing God service. In the same way we believe that the Provost and many of those who think with him have embraced doctrines opposed to the word of God and at variance with those of the church of England, and while we give them credit for sincerity, we feel ourselves constrained to denounce their errors.

The Provost says, page 95, "If I could not accept the teaching of the baptismal service and of the Catechism, in its plain and obvious sense, I would not consent for another day to discharge my duties as a minister of the church of England." We would ask the Provost whether he applies this rule to all the services of our church? When he is called to read the burial service over a careless member of his congregation, who has been suddenly snatched away without time for repentance, does he use the words of that beautiful service in their plain and obvious sense? or when he celebrates the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, does he use the words of institution in their plain and obvious sense? Or when he addresses a mixed congregation, some of whom have not, perhaps, been baptized, does he use the words "dearly beloved brethren," in their plain and obvious sense? In all these cases he must use the