

"It is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." I believe that this is quite contrary to the Word of God. I believe that it contains by necessary implication, a most momentous untruth; viz. that infants being baptized, are, as a matter of course, regenerated. This false doctrine cannot, I believe, be separated from that rubric, by the most subtle ingenuity. Ingenious handling may, no doubt, make something of the other parts of the baptismal office in a sense opposed to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. But here the most refined special-pleading must ever be at fault. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is inevitably and inextricably involved in this sentence. And, therefore, seeing that I utterly reject that doctrine, as unscriptural and pernicious, I must equally reject the assertion that the Prayer-book, which contains it, "contains *nothing* that is contrary to the Word of God." I also deny the scriptural character of the form of Absolution contained in the office for Visitation of the Sick. I believe that it would be altogether an unscriptural assumption, and a downright imposture, should any clergyman presume to pronounce these words to a fellow sinner, "By Christ's authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins!" And again, I believe it to be awful profaneness, that any bishop or archbishop should use any such language as that, which is, by the Book of Common Prayer, prescribed to be used by them in ordering priests, and in consecrating bishops; to the priest, humbly kneeling, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands." To the bishop, also kneeling, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, *now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands*—and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, *which is given thee by this imposition of our hands*." I consider it to be just blasphemy, that any bishop should be made to speak, as if he had the power of conferring the third person of the Godhead, by the imposition of his hands; or, as if the Holy Ghost were ordinarily conferred, upon occasion of, or in connexion with, any such act. Such, briefly, is my judgment of *some* things in the book of Common Prayer; whereas, my continued conformity would be a daily testimony to the truth of that subscription, by which I declared, that that book "contains *nothing* contrary to the Word of God."

And then, with regard to the *third article* of the thirty-sixth canon, by which I have asserted "*every*" and all of the thirty-nine articles to be "*agreeable* to the Word of God," though valuing those articles, in the main, very highly, I cannot but remember (to mention no other cases,) that the twenty-sixth article asserts, that "evil ministers" "do minister by Christ's commission and authority;" a statement which I hold to be *not* "agreeable to the Word of God;" and that the thirty-sixth article asserts, that "the Book of Consecration of Bishops, &c., has nothing in it, which is of itself superstitious and ungodly;" which I also deny: and further, that articles, numbers twenty-five and twenty-seven, taken in connexion, involve the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as Mr. Noel has shown; which articles, therefore, so far, I also deny. All the three articles then of the thirty-sixth canon I believe to contain false propositions.

of an im  
absolute  
supposed  
benefice  
continued  
terms?  
cation of  
purchase  
then, tha  
as my fir  
the Esta  
continua  
quarrell  
a few ble  
of those  
this, tha  
inevitabl

This  
This also  
decisive  
same ret  
therefor

RE  
ingly at  
applies  
Whe  
to the sy  
be loyal  
reflect i  
parts. C  
of its p  
scriptur  
minister  
those, a  
tural an  
and spi  
obstruct  
these vic  
be they  
maintain  
variance  
condem  
judgme  
reproba  
a dutifu  
that we  
may we  
We can