

THE BISHOP OF HURON'S OBJECTIONS
TO THE
THEOLOGICAL TEACHING
OF
TRINITY COLLEGE,
WITH
THE PROVOST'S REPLY.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE CORPORATION OF
TRINITY COLLEGE.

Toronto:
ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING STREET.
1862.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CORPORATION OF TRINITY COLLEGE HELD ON TUESDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1862.

Moved by the LORD BISHOP OF HURON :

That a committee be appointed to receive from him a written statement of the objections made to the doctrines contained in the three letters of the Provost, and also any answer thereto, and to report to this Corporation at a future meeting.—Carried.

The HON. MR. CAMERON moved that the Committee ordered by the foregoing resolution, be a committee of three, one to be named by the Bishop of each of the Dioceses of Toronto and Huron, and the Bishop elect of Ontario.

The following members of said Committee were then named:—

MR. HARMAN, by the LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO.

REV. J. W. MARSH, by the LORD BISHOP OF HURON.

REV. DR. LAUDER, by the BISHOP ELECT OF ONTARIO.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, 7TH OCTOBER, 1862.

MR. HARMAN presented the following report:—

The Committee appointed under Resolution of the 18th of February, to receive from the Lord Bishop of Huron a written statement of the objections made to the doctrines contained in the three letters of the Provost, and also any answer thereto, and to report to the Corporation at a future meeting, have the honour to report having received from his Lordship the Bishop of Huron and from the Provost the documents they have now the further honour to lay on the table: namely, objections to the Provost's teaching, dated London, Canada West, May, 1862, and the reply of the Provost, dated this present month.

All which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed on behalf of the Committee.)

SAMUEL B. HARMAN.

TRINITY COLLEGE,

7th October, 1862.

OBJECTIONS OF THE BISHOP OF HURON
TO THE
TEACHING OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

At the meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, which was held on the 18th of February last, I proposed the following resolution:—

“Whereas two letters have been recently published by the Provost of Trinity College, avowedly with the approval and under the authority of this Corporation, and whereas these letters contain many things which appear to a large number of the members of the Church throughout the country to be highly objectionable, and whereas, the approval of this Corporation thus claimed for these letters is calculated to alienate the minds of the people from this University, and to destroy all confidence in it, as a sound and safe institution for the education of the youth of our church in the protestant principles of the Church of England; be it resolved, therefore, that this Corporation regrets that these letters should have been published as by its authority, and desires distinctly to record that it does not hold itself responsible for the opinions maintained in these letters.”

The object of this resolution was to obtain from the Corporation an opinion on these letters which the Provost addressed to the Lord Bishop of Toronto in reply to the charges brought against the teaching of Trinity College by me. In asking for this opinion there was no attempt to judge or condemn the Provost unheard; he had been heard in his defence in these letters. His pamphlet of ninety-six pages, carefully and elaborately written upon the charges brought

against his teaching had been published avowedly under the sanction of this Corporation, and circulated throughout the country ; and it was the duty of every member of this Corporation to be thoroughly acquainted with its contents. But instead of pronouncing an opinion on the defence of the Provost contained in these letters, an amendment was adopted by the Corporation, which was moved by the Chief Justice, and seconded by the Bishop Elect of Ontario, the effect of which was to express the entire confidence of the Corporation in the teaching of the Provost, and to evade expressing any opinion on the Provost's pamphlet, which was the subject of the resolution moved by me. The following is the amendment :

“ That it be resolved that the Corporation of Trinity College does not assume either to represent or to identify itself with the views of any party in the Church. That the opinion expressed by the Corporation on the first letter of the Provost vindicated the writer from the imputation of teaching doctrines not allowed by the Church, and to that opinion the Corporation still adheres. That, although the second letter of the Provost was not submitted to the Corporation, its publication was authorized as stated by him. And, although the Corporation is not committed to its details, it is not aware that it can be shown to be contrary to the teaching of the Church ; that the Corporation cannot, therefore, entertain any proposition to condemn any portion of either of these letters without a specific statement, in writing, of the objections that are urged against them.

I then moved the following resolution :

“ That a committee be appointed to receive a written statement of the objections made to the doctrines contained in the three letters of the Provost, and, also, of any answer thereto, and to report to this Corporation at a future meeting.”

In accordance with this resolution I have prepared my written objections to the opinions contained in the letters published by the Provost of Trinity College, which were written after mature consideration, in reply to the charges brought by me

against the teaching of Trinity College, and which are, therefore, to be taken as a full and candid statement of his views, and as furnishing the best and strongest arguments which the Provost can adduce in favour of his opinions.

When at the request of the Executive Committee of the Synod of my diocese, I addressed a letter to them in August, 1860, setting forth the grounds upon which I had formed my opinion upon the teaching of Trinity College, the only documents to which I could refer were the notes which the Students had taken of the lectures delivered to them by the Provost. Several copies of these notes had come under my notice, and they agreed so entirely in all important points that I could not resist the conclusion that I had before me a correct statement of the teaching of the Provost, or, at all events, a faithful account of the ideas imparted, and of the effects produced upon the minds of the Students by the teaching to which they had been subjected.

These gentlemen, some of whom were no longer youths in the strict acceptation of the term, were fully convinced that they possessed in their note books the exact answers which the Provost required to his questions, in proof of which they distinctly stated that when examined they gave these answers precisely as they appear in their notes, and that such answers were never objected to by the Provost. The Provost has, indeed, denied the accuracy of these notes, and refuses to be held responsible for them; but he has published three letters in reply to my charges, addressed to the Lord Bishop of Toronto, in which he has fully stated his views. I now therefore appeal to his published opinions in proof that the theological teaching of Trinity College is dangerous to the young men who are subjected to it. This is the opinion which I expressed in reply to a question put to me by a lay delegate in the Synod of my diocese, held in June, 1860; and now, after the lapse of so many months, affording opportunity for more thorough investigation and careful reflection, and having before me the opinions of the Provost fully stated by himself in his three letters to the Bishop of Toronto, I feel constrained to reiterate the opinion, and to add that my

conviction is more fully established that the teaching of Trinity College is not only subversive of those Scriptural and Protestant principles which have been the glory of our Church since the Reformation, but calculated also to beget in the minds of the alumni of that institution impressions favourable to the unscriptural and superstitious doctrines and practices of the Roman Church.

The Provost, in his published letters, has not confined himself to those points to which I adverted in my letter, but on other topics also has enunciated opinions which in my view are even more unscriptural and more dangerous than those to which I objected. I shall first notice the opinions propounded by the Provost on the subjects mentioned in my letter of August, 1860, and shall then bring forward my objections to those additional statements which the Provost has introduced in his pamphlet. In adverting to the authorities quoted by the Provost, I shall be careful only to employ them as giving corroboration to the views of the Provost upon the points in question.

The first subject to which I would advert, is the undue exaltation of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of our Lord. The inspired writers of the New Testament have said but little of the Virgin Mary, as if the Holy Spirit foresaw and designed to discountenance beforehand the superstition and idolatry which, through this door, afterwards found entrance into the Church of God. The little which is said of the Virgin Mary is not calculated, in any wise, to exalt her above the level of a creature, or to encourage superstitious feelings concerning her. Our Church has wisely followed the example thus set by the inspired writers. All that she has taught upon this subject may be summed up in one brief sentence, Christ was born of a pure Virgin. The Provost has gone far beyond this in his teaching, and the effect upon the minds of students has been to make them believe that the answers in the manuscript notes which they had compiled were in accordance with the views put forth by the Provost. They, one and all, believed that they had been taught that Mary had an appointed type in the law, and that she was

“an instrument in bringing mankind into the kingdom of Heaven.” The Provost, in his pamphlet, page 25, says:— “I consider this latter clause to be open to *very dangerous* construction, as it might be understood to imply some past or permanent ministry of the Blessed Virgin tending immediately to the salvation of mankind.” This is precisely the opinion which I have formed and expressed concerning this answer. The Provost says he did not teach this. I, of course, believe him. But the students must have supposed that he did teach it, for where else could they have learned it?—not from the Holy Scriptures—not in the Church Catechism—not in the Creed—not from their parents and friends. They believed that they learned this from the Provost in his lectures, and therefore they all entered it in their notes. While, therefore, I must credit the Provost’s denial, still I must regard that teaching as singularly defective and most dangerous, which could lead intelligent students to suppose that the Provost intended to teach that which he now so emphatically repudiates as open to “*very dangerous construction*.” We cannot suppose, for one moment, that these students intentionally falsified their notes; and we have good reason to believe that those gentlemen who read and digested such instructions have gone forth into the Church and the world believing and ready to teach concerning the Virgin Mary that which the Provost now agrees with me in characterising as “very dangerous.”

With reference to the probable intercession of departed saints for us, the Provost states, in page 92 of his pamphlet: “I must still do as I have ever done, speak of it as a probable opinion, not as a truth revealed to us in Holy Scripture.” Upon his own admission then he stands, as a teacher of youth in the Church of England, inculcating, as probably true, a doctrine not found in the Word of God, and on which the Church is entirely silent. Whether the intercession of departed saints for us be a probable and pious opinion, may well be questioned. Whatever may be the sentiments of some who have ventured rashly to speculate upon things which are not revealed, and have professed

to be wise above what is written ; of this fact the Provost cannot be ignorant that there are in the Church many able divines who regard this opinion not only as unwarranted by the word of God but repugnant to it as a vain conceit and derogatory to the Redeemer's glory. And I cannot but consider it dangerous to young men thus to be led off the track laid down by the Church in a Rome-ward direction, more especially in times like the present when we have beheld large numbers of our clergy and laity forsaking the Scriptural Church of their fathers and falling victims to the corruptions and idolatries of the Church of Rome. And most, if not all, of these men commenced their downward course by just such rash speculations upon unrevealed subjects as the Provost has been in the habit of bringing before the students of Trinity College.

The next point to which I have objected in the teaching of the Provost, is his doctrine concerning priestly absolution. The Provost holds and teaches the most ultra view concerning the power of the priest to forgive sins which has ever been taught even in the Church of Rome. In the 94th page of his pamphlet he thus expresses himself: "Respecting remission of sins I must teach as I have ever done. Did I not believe as I do, I trust that I should not be still consenting to the act of past years, when I knelt before the Bishop and received, in the solemn words of our ordinal, authority to execute the office of a Priest in the Church of God. What mean these words? or are they idle words? 'Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.'"

From this it might appear that the Provost thinks that these words of Scripture, quoted in our ordinal, would be "idle" if not interpreted absolutely without any condition limitation or exception. But in page 29 of his pamphlet we find the following explanation of the power of the keys, and of the limitations and exceptions which must be understood when the words of our blessed Lord are employed in the ordinal:—"True repentance, which cannot exist apart from

true faith in Christ, is presupposed as the indispensable qualification of the recipient of the pardon which God is then asserted to bestow in the Church through the authoritative, yet simple ministerial absolution of the minister, which takes effect, not at his [the minister's] pleasure, but according to the genuineness of the repentance of those to whom it is administered." From this we learn that the Provost does limit the words of the ordinal, but that still he regards the absolution of the Priest as not merely declarative, but as effectual and necessary before pardon is recorded in heaven. If this be the honest conviction of the Provost, as he states, he is right to hold his opinion, but I cannot but regard it as dangerous that such views of judicial, effectual priestly absolution should be taught in an institution of the Church. Our Church teaches that God "hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." And in the exercise of this power they are to declare that "God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel." Thus does the Church interpret the words of the ordinal. The sinner who truly repents and believes the Gospel is fully pardoned and accepted by God: his sins and iniquities are blotted out for ever. The minister has power and authority to declare this for the comfort of the believer, and for the strengthening of his faith. How different is this from the power which the Provost and his authorities claim for the Priest, of pardoning effectually the sins of the penitent believer before they are pardoned of God. In the passage which the Provost has quoted in page 55 of his pamphlet, this judicial power to forgive sins is stated in the most repulsive and unscriptural form in the words of Chrysostom and Pope Gregory, as quoted with approval by Bishop Sparrow. "Heaven waits and expects the Priest's sentence here on earth; and the Lord follows the servant, and what the servant rightly binds or looses here on earth the Lord confirms in heaven." "The Apostles, and in them all Priests, were made God's vicegerents here on earth, in his name and stead, to retain and

remit sins. When, therefore, the priest absolves, God absolves, if we be truly penitent."

Such views of the effectual judicial power of the Priest to forgive sins I must regard as most dangerous to young men. And I know that some who have been taught in Trinity College hold them. I feel myself, therefore, bound to enter my solemn protest against the teaching of such in this institution.

The next point which I would notice in the teaching of the Provost is his doctrine concerning the sacraments. As to the number of the sacraments; I think it is dangerous for our youth to be taught that there are two *great* sacraments and other holy rites or sacraments, when our church dogmatically teaches in the catechism that there are "two *only*:" and in the articles, "there are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say Baptism and the Supper of the Lord:" and that "those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, &c." Whatever may be said concerning the ancient use of the word Sacrament, since the Reformation the word has had but one application in our Church, and it cannot be regarded as either wise or safe to lead young men to look upon other rites and ceremonies as at all to be placed on the same footing as the only two sacraments which Christ has ordained. This is well stated in a passage quoted by the Provost from Archbishop Secker: "By the early writers of the Western [*i. e.* the Papal] Church it was used to express almost any thing relating to our holy religion, at least any thing that was figurative, and signified something further than at first sight appeared. But afterwards a more confined use of the word prevailed by degrees; and in that stricter sense, which hath long been the common one, and which our catechism follows, the nature of a sacrament comprehends the following, &c." Why should our Church teachers now evince a desire to go back to the use of forms and phrases which our reformers carefully avoided?

With reference to the nature and office of the sacraments the Provost's views are open to the same objection. Our Church teaches that the sacraments are outward signs of inward grace and seals to those who truly repent and believe in God's mercy and favour towards them. The Provost evidently regards them in quite a different light. He quotes a passage from Waterland in his third letter to the Bishop of Toronto, which, he says, he had read to his class, in which the following view of baptism is given: "Are we not all of us, or nearly all, (ten thousand to one,) baptized in infancy, and therefore regenerated and justified of course." The doctrine of baptismal justification is that against which our Reformers most strenuously contended, as the root of many of the doctrinal errors in the Church of Rome. The eleventh article of our Church teaches that "we are accounted righteous [justified] before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. And in the Homily on the salvation of mankind we read that man is justified "freely by faith in Christ," and that "faith doth *directly* send us to Christ for remission of our sins." Yet the Provost propounds the opinion, and adduces sundry quotations from the writings of fallible men to prove that all baptized persons are justified, and that though our Church teaches that faith sends us *directly* to Christ for the remission of our sins, still, "the doctrine of justification by faith, rightly understood, is not inconsistent with the statement that faith sends us to Christ for the remission of our sins *through the sacraments and ordinances of his appointment.*" What the Provost means it is difficult to comprehend. How can the statements that "we are justified by faith only," and that "faith sends us directly to Christ," be understood to mean that we are justified by baptism and not by faith only, and that faith sends us to Christ, not directly, but through sacraments, &c. Here is one of the worst features in the system taught by the Provost. "Justification by faith only" has ever been regarded as the grand distinguishing feature between the reformed and corrupt Churches. And I cannot but regard it as most dangerous to endeavour to undermine it or explain it away, as has been

done in the second and third letter of the Provost, and in the quotations which he has adduced on this subject.

With reference to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Provost has explained his views in a passage which occurs in the 77th page of his pamphlet: "Before the charge, or rather the insinuation, of the Bishop of Huron, I should have thought it quite unnecessary to explain to any one that I do not understand by the 'glorified humanity' of our Lord any thing which can be orally received; nor again do I understand, when Mr. Proctor says that 'every faithful recipient there partakes of Christ's glorified humanity,' that he dreams of any local presence of this heavenly gift in or with the earthly elements, but means simply that in faithfully receiving the sign, *we surely receive the thing signified*. By the word 'there,' I understand, as the Bishop of Huron seems to have done, 'in the sacrament,' and by the 'sacrament,' not *the outward material sign*, but *the holy celebration*"!! From this explanation it is very difficult to collect what view the Provost really entertains concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But he has quoted in page 87 of his pamphlet a charge of the Bishop of St. David's, in which his Lordship altogether condemns the propositions of Archdeacon Denison, concerning this sacrament. I therefore conclude that the Provost agrees with his Lordship in repudiating the doctrines taught by the Archdeacon. In that charge I find some wise and judicious remarks concerning the use of the term "the real presence." His Lordship says, "The phrase real presence is foreign to the language of the Church of England, and has been wisely avoided as liable to abuse, and likely to deceive or scandalize the simple and ignorant." It must be apparent to all that the term which the Provost has employed, from the writings of Mr. Proctor, and has so vehemently defended, "that every faithful recipient partakes in the Eucharist of the glorified humanity of our Lord" is much more likely to deceive and scandalize the simple and ignorant, and should therefore be regarded as dangerous and avoided in lectures addressed to young men on the Catechism. The Provost has quoted this charge with the high-

est commendation as exactly stating his own views, and in it we find language employed which is capable of being interpreted so as to express and support a view of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament which is not in accordance with the teaching of our Church. His Lordship speaks of what he ventures to call "the objective reality in the sacrament," and he says, "but they are apt to overlook the necessity for something beside the instrument and condition which is more indispensable than either, namely, the presence, the power, the spiritual agency by which the instrument is effectually applied." It would have been well had his Lordship remembered his own rule, and avoided the use of phrases which are capable of a most unscriptural interpretation. There is a passage in the Provost's pamphlet which sets the sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the reader in a light altogether different from that in which our Church teaches us to regard it. This passage occurs in page 80 of the pamphlet: "I am perfectly satisfied to admit that it speaks of a supernatural gift, which both before the institution of the Eucharist, and afterwards, *may* have been, and *may* still be received without it, but for the reception of which the holy communion is the appointed mean *and the only mean* whereby Holy Scripture assures us that *we shall* receive it if duly prepared." While our Church teaches that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a rich mean of grace to the faithful recipient, it nowhere teaches that it is "*the appointed mean and the only mean*," whereby we can be assured that we shall receive the supernatural gift promised by God to his believing people. Nay more, the Rubric at the close of the service for the communion of the sick enjoins the curate to instruct the sick man that "if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, *he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ* profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." Here is no doubt-

ful and uncertain *may* such as the Provost employs, but the fullest assurance is to be given to the penitent and believing sufferer that without the sacrament he has all the spiritual benefits signified in that ordinance.

The unqualified application of the sixth chapter of St. John to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is another feature in the teaching of the Provost which cannot but be regarded as dangerous. The times in which we live demand a caution which at another period might not be necessary. There is a strong tide of opinion, more especially amongst the young, setting towards those false doctrines and erroneous practices from which our forefathers at the Reformation freed the Church, and it is our duty to endeavour by the use of every legitimate means to save those placed under our direction from being carried away by the haste and rashness of youth towards the gulf in which so many have made shipwreck of the faith.

In my letter of August, 1860, I incidentally mentioned that I had heard from Students of Trinity College the statement, that "the Church of England lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good and tended to edification."

The Provost in his first letter, page 24th of his pamphlet, meets this, as he says, "with a flat denial of its truth," in plain English, he pronounces it a falsehood. Yet in his second letter, page 34, we find however the following passage. "I have never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting the losses we sustained at the Reformation, and there can be no possible colour for the charge, except it be that in reading of admirable early usages, which our Reformers did not venture to restore, such as that mentioned by Justin Martyr, the conveyance of the consecrated elements to all sick members of the Church after every public celebration of the Eucharist, I have said that *we might well regret that we possessed not this usage in our Church*, but that our regret should be controlled by the remembrance that a necessary consequence of the grievous abuses which preceded the Reformation was to abridge our liberty, and to deprive us of *good things* which might have been safely enjoyed in happier times."

It is not to be wondered at that students hearing such statements as the above should come to the conclusion that "at the Reformation our Church lost some good things." The Provost speaks of "admirable usages" which our Reformers did not venture to restore, and he instances the conveyance of the consecrated elements to the sick after every public celebration of the Eucharist. Now this is a usage against which our Church in her Rubric upon this subject and in her article specially protests. The Provost states that he had never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting losses sustained at the Reformation, and yet by his own showing he teaches young men that they may well regret that there are "admirable early usages" which we do not now possess, and that in the Church of England we are now deprived of "good things," which in happier times we might have enjoyed. Surely the tendency of this teaching must be to make the students dissatisfied with the Church of England as it now is, and to look with an eye of favour upon that Church which still retains those admirable usages, and in which those "good things" are now enjoyed. The Clergy of the Church of England are bound "so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same." I cannot therefore but regard it as dangerous to lead young men to look back to the Church in the period before the Reformation as possessing "admirable usages" which our reformers could not venture to restore, and as then enjoying "good things" of which we are now deprived.

The Provost has adduced the names of many eminent men, and has claimed them as his authorities for his teaching on different points. Amongst the authorities thus adduced we find Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, Hooker, Usher, Calvin, and Baxter. Can the Provost show that these men embraced and taught his system as a whole? That they taught, that the pardon of sin and justification are obtained by the penitent and believing sinner first at baptism, as the only effectual instrument of

justification, and after baptism, by the authoritative absolutions of the priest, and that the Eucharist is "the only mean" whereby the supernatural gift of Christ as the food of the soul can with certainty be obtained? Can he adduce them as teaching that "all of us or nearly all (ten thousand to one) are baptized in infancy, and therefore regenerated and justified of course? That there is no certain forgiveness of sin after baptism to the penitent believer until the priest has absolved him, and that then, and not till then, his pardon is confirmed in heaven, that when the Priest absolves God, absolves if we be truly penitent? Can he adduce them to support his view that "*admirable early usages* and good things" enjoyed by the Church before the Reformation are not now possessed by us? and that faith sends us to Christ, not directly, as our Church teaches in the Homily on Salvation, but indirectly through sacraments and other ordinances? and in fine, can he adduce any one of these great and good men in support of the system of Sacramental Salvation, which, on his own showing, he holds and teaches in the University? Of this system I would say with Bishop Burnett, "The doctrine of Sacramental Salvation is justly to be reckoned amongst the most mischievous of all the practical errors that are in the Church of Rome. Since therefore this is nowhere mentioned in all these large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it. Since also the natural consequence of this doctrine is to make men rest contented in low imperfect acts when they can be so easily made up by a sacrament, we have just reason to detest it as one of the depths of Satan." [Burnett on Articles xi. and xxv.]

Were we at liberty to range through the voluminous writings of these and other eminent men, and to select from one and another, some weak, and, perhaps, erroneous opinion which, in their fallibility, they may have written, we could construct such a system of doctrine as would be utterly repugnant to God's word, and by pleading each of these men for something in our false system we might per-

suade the unwary to believe that we had their sanction for the whole. Such a proceeding would be most fallacious. If Latimer and Ridley, if Hooper and Jewel, if Hooker and Usher are worthy of being adduced as authorities on some, perhaps minor points, their opinion on the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian system should not be utterly despised and rejected.

I have thus presented my objections to the teaching of the Provost of Trinity College. This Corporation is the only tribunal before which these charges can with propriety be brought; as a Clergyman of the Church of England, Mr. Whitaker is not under my jurisdiction, not being in my diocese, and therefore it would be not only absurd, but highly presumptuous in me, to present charges against him before any ecclesiastical tribunal, and thus to interfere with the duties of another Bishop. But as Provost of this University, of which by law I am a Member, he is subject to my supervision, and when I think there is in his conduct or teaching any thing which calls for investigation, this is the only tribunal to which I can, with propriety, appeal. The law has invested us, as a body, with plenary power to deal with all matters which concern the interests of the University, and I can never consent to throw upon others the responsibility of doing that which we are capable of doing, and which we alone are, by law, authorized to do.

BENJ^N HURON.

LONDON, C. W., May, 1862.

THE PROVOST'S REPLY.

The paper containing the charges of the Bishop of Huron against my teaching begins with a statement respecting his resolution of the 18th of February, and the amendment which was substituted for it. As this statement does not affect myself, but relates to the course adopted by the corporation, I pass it over, and proceed to the remarks which the Bishop makes (page 7) on the source from which he originally derived his information respecting my teaching—"notes which the students had taken of lectures delivered to them." I have already protested against this document being received in evidence, and I must again respectfully submit that it ought not to be alleged, even for the purpose of showing that there is *prima facie* ground for apprehension or suspicion, until the witnesses, on whose authority the Bishop relies, shall have been produced and examined as to the origin and character of these "notes of lectures."

I must further observe that the Bishop does not correctly describe the document. "Notes taken by students" would be a sufficiently precarious authority under any circumstances; but, in the book to which the Bishop refers, he is aware that such notes have been recast into a catechetical form, a form in which my lectures are not written or delivered: and it thus appears that further occasion has been given for misstatement even though unintentional.

Speaking of the students whose MSS. the Bishop has obtained he says (page 7): "These gentlemen (some of whom were no longer youths in the strict acceptance of the term) were fully convinced that they possessed in their notebooks the exact answers which the Provost required to his questions, in proof of which they distinctly stated that when

examined they gave these answers precisely as they appear in their notes, and that such answers were never objected to by the Provost."

This is a very broad assertion, which ought not to be advanced to my prejudice at second-hand. I have had no opportunity of testing its correctness further than by a letter which I received from the Rev. I. Middleton of Kincardine, dated August 4th, 1860. Till the receipt of this letter I had had no communication with Mr. Middleton since the year 1858. He writes: "He (the Bishop of Huron) has written for my catechism, which of course I have sent him in deference to his position, however with exactly the caution put forth in your letter, viz.: that it was all taken down by way of notes in your lecture-room, and might by the slightest inaccuracy in those very points lead to very erroneous conclusions."

I have been compelled to dwell on this, because, although the Bishop's charges are professedly founded on my own letters, he does, as occasion offers, revert to the authority on which his original charges were based.

I now proceed to the specific charges adduced by the Bishop.

I. THE UNDUE EXALTATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

On this point the Bishop says, (page 9) that my reply to his original objection contains "precisely the opinion which he has formed and expressed;" that is, I have condemned exactly as he would, the words found in the students' notes, as being "open to very dangerous construction." It does not however follow that they admit of no other construction, or that they were understood by the students in the sense to which the Bishop justly objects. I think that I have shown sufficiently in this controversy that I have no disposition to disguise my real opinions; but, while I fearlessly avow these, there is no reason why I should consent to lie under the imputation of viewing with any degree of approval teaching which I abhor. I have, then, never meant to teach, I have never taught, respecting the Mother

of our Lord, any thing, to use the Bishop's own words, (page 8,) "calculated in any wise to exalt her above the level of a creature, or to encourage superstitious feelings concerning her." The Bishop sums up the teaching of our church on this subject in these words, "Christ was born of a pure virgin." He adds: "The Provost has gone far beyond this," and, for his proofs, he refers, not to any thing which I have said or written, but to a possible construction of some half-dozen words in the students' MS, an authority to which, I must again repeat, he has no right to refer. I affirm this both generally, as a matter of equity, and particularly, as he is at present bound to state his objections against *my letters*.

If there is one error of the Church of Rome which I have more frequently and strongly condemned than any other, it is its undue exaltation of the Mother of our Lord. The addition made to the creed of that church in December, 1854, (viz.: the doctrine of her *immaculate conception*,) gave me occasion so to do, and I am satisfied that my old pupils will bear me out in this statement. The Bishop of Huron's present charge amounts to this, that I have taught Bishop Pearson's words in their plain meaning, and that my teaching has been reported by some who have attended my lectures in words which, while they might be intended to convey only my meaning, are so unguarded as to admit of a wrong one: just the mistake which under the circumstances of the case might be expected to occur.

Or, if again it be thought to be an undue exaltation of the Blessed Virgin to communicate to my class the opinion of Bishop Pearson in regard of her continuing in the state of virginity, the Bishop of Huron must be aware that his judgment herein differs from that of the English Church at large. "*Pearson on the Creed*" has long been a text-book at our universities, and is prescribed by the Bishops generally to candidates for Holy Orders in preparing for examination. I showed, moreover, in my second letter that Bishop Pearson is sustained in this opinion by no less than twelve authorities of the English Church, by Cranmer, Latimer, Hooper, Jewel, (all leaders in the Reformation,) by Hooker,

Jackson, Hammond, Bishops Taylor, Bull, Beveridge, Wilson, and Pearce: to these I may now add Archbishop Leighton, Archbishop Bramhall, and Field, all men of eminent learning and piety, and the first at least revered by all parties in the Church. I give the quotations from these new authorities in a note at the end, (see note A,) in order to avoid encumbering my reply unduly with such extracts.

In concluding this subject, let me state that I have never done more than inform the students of this opinion, as a reasonable and probable opinion, and as one which, in my judgment, as in that of these great men, Holy Scripture at least leaves us room to entertain. The commentary of the Rev. Thomas Scott shows that he considered the question to be thus left open by Scripture.

II. THE PROBABLE INTERCESSION OF DEPARTED SAINTS.

I believe that, on this head, some offence may have been given undesignedly by the use of the word "intercession." Any such offence I am both prepared, and most anxious, to remove. By "*intercession*" I mean nothing more than "*prayer*." The word "intercession" is used in Holy Scripture not only of the *meritorious* intercession of our Blessed Lord for men, but also of the *precatory* intercession of men for other men. Thus St. Paul says, (1 Tim. ii. 1,) "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, *intercessions*, and giving of thanks be made for all men." I used the word, then, as St. Paul uses it, but I should quite as readily have used the word "prayer."

Such prayer of departed Christians for us I have spoken of only as a *probable opinion*, and not as a "*doctrine*," as the Bishop of Huron terms it, immediately after quoting my words in which I speak of it as an *opinion*. I do not charge the Bishop with intentional misrepresentation, but it is essential that the distinction should be kept in view clearly. For *doctrines* we look to Holy Scripture, and, if it be silent, no human authority will suffice to establish a *doctrine*. In matters of *opinion* any

reasonable and modest man must feel that he ought to pay great deference to authority, and no one can have a right to denounce, as the Bishop of Huron does, as an opinion not to be tolerated in Churchmen, and as dangerous in the extreme, an opinion which has been held, as this has been, by writers of eminent attainments and piety, belonging to all schools of opinion which have prevailed from the Reformation downwards. I conceive that the right to hold and to enunciate, as probably true, opinions "not found in the Word of God, and on which the Church is entirely silent," is claimed and exercised by churchmen, whose sentiments are in general accordance with those of the Bishop of Huron, not less freely, if not more freely, than by any other section of the Church.

In my second letter I adduced no less than thirteen authorities of the English Church for this opinion. Bishop Ridley, Crakanthorp, Archbishop Ussher, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Pearson, Bishop Nicholson, Thorndike, Bishop Bull, Bishop Stillingfleet, Bishop Ken, Bishop Beveridge, Robert Nelson, Archbishop Secker. To these I may now add Bishop Latimer, Nowell's Catechism, Bishop Hall, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Dr. Tillotson, Archbishop Wake, Bishop Heber, and, as a modern and popular religionist, Dr. Cumming. (See note B.)

I fully admit that an opinion is not to be adopted merely *because* it is the opinion of these men, but surely no one has a right to condemn as "dangerous to young men," as the Bishop of Huron does, (page 10,) what they will meet with so frequently in the writings of our best divines, and I cannot but be surprised that the Bishop of Huron should think fit to characterize the array of eminent names adduced in my second letter "as some who have ventured rashly to speculate upon things which are not revealed, and have professed to be wise above what is written." (pages 9, 10.) I fully share in the Bishop's anxiety lest "in these times our young men should be led astray in a Romeward direction," but I differ from him as to the best method of guarding against this danger, and I venture to think that I am not far wrong in the company of the eminent persons to whose

writings I have referred, many of them well known as able and strenuous opponents of Rome.

But it may be asked, "What have we to do with this opinion?" Even without reference to the controversy with Rome, I believe it to be a most wholesome and edifying thought, that our departed friends, who have died in the faith and fear of God, still desire our everlasting salvation, and seek it by prayer, as they did on earth. But in controversy the opinion is of very great moment. The Romanist maintains and practises the *Invocation* of Saints. This usage I utterly condemn, as an invasion of the prerogative of the Almighty, and as a dishonour done to the One Mediator. How then is this error to be met? Are we to meet it by impugning the persuasion that the righteous who are at rest pray for us; a persuasion which, as we have seen, approves itself to so many minds of all classes, which is so consolatory in itself and draws so many hearts towards the unseen world; a persuasion which all reasoning from analogy confirms—and which the Word of God, though it does not expressly sanction, goes very far to establish? Are we, I say, to undertake this task, or are we rather to show that the persuasion that the departed pray for us does in no way tend to justify, or even to palliate, the erroneous practice against which all English Churchmen contend? The Romanist, I am satisfied, would greatly prefer our adopting the former course, which is sanctioned by the Bishop of Huron: the latter is, I am assured, the correct and secure line of defence.

If it be conceded that there is a connection in reason between the opinion which so many excellent men of our own church have held and do hold, and the Romish practice of the invocation of saints—that the former is indeed only the stepping-stone to the latter, a vast advantage is given to the Romanist, which, as a faithful opponent of his error, I can never consent to yield him unnecessarily.

I should argue thus: Be the opinion of the *intercession* of saints for us true or false, the practice of the *invocation* of saints is *alike* unwarrantable and presumptuous: in invoking them you practically assign to them Omnipresence and

Omniscience, and thus invest them with the incommunicable attributes of God.

I say nothing of the additional and very serious evils connected with the Romish usage, because I am satisfied that the usage is, *in itself*, wrong. I am, however, deeply sensible of those evils.

The Bishop of Huron says, (page 10,) "The Provost cannot be ignorant that there are in the Church many able divines who regard this opinion not only as unwarranted by the Word of God, but repugnant to it as a vain conceit, and derogatory to the Redeemer's glory." I am quite aware that some writers of our Church have taken this ground, but they are not the most eminent either for learning or for piety, nor can it be matter of surprise that, in the heat of controversy, some blows have been hastily aimed and ill-delivered. I do not impugn the orthodoxy of such writers; I do not regard them as unfaithful members of the English Church; but I do think that they have unnecessarily opposed an opinion countenanced by Scripture, and I do not trust them, in this particular, as prudent and successful defenders of the bulwarks of our faith. I believe, however, that the great body of our controversial writers are on my side, and, in addition to the authorities above cited, I must be permitted to adduce the XVIIth Volume of a Series of Tracts against Popery, published at the beginning of the reign of King William the III., when the feeling against Popery was at its height. The book is entitled, "Popery not founded on Scripture," it has the *imprimatur* of Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. The introduction is written by Dr. Tenison, a man of moderate views, and always regarded as a sound Protestant, and the several tracts, though by different hands, are printed as one book with continuous pagination.

At pages 194, 195, we find the following:

"We believe as well as the Romanists, that angels and saints are in a happy and blessed state; that they have a very fervent charity, and a most tender concern for the Church on earth, and are always ready to do what they are able, especially by their good wishes and earnest prayers, to

promote its prosperity ; that they are very dear to God, in great grace and favour with Him, and likely to prevail in their intercessions for what things they ask according to His will ; that they know very well what must be in general the necessities of a militant Church, the tribulations and persecutions it is subject to ; that it is never without enemies, and consequently never without troubles ; and knowing this, that they cannot but commiserate its state, and in pity and compassion towards it, pray for its relief and succour. Farther ; though we do not make it an article of our faith, we look on it as a probable thing, that holy Bishops and Pastors, when they are gone to Heaven, have in their prayers a particular regard to that part of Christ's Church over which they presided ; that other saints also in heaven may recommend the condition of their particular friends and relations unto God, with whom they lately conversed in the body, and whose wants they then were intimately acquainted with."

But I have said that Holy Scripture goes far to make this opinion in the highest degree probable. The narrative of the rich man and Lazarus (St. Luke xvi.) points to this conclusion. If a sinful man in torment is represented by Christ Himself as *remembering* his brethren, as *desiring* their salvation, and, in order to ensure it, as even *beseeking* human aid, the only aid probably to which he had been accustomed to look, is it not in the highest degree probable that the spirits of the righteous, having no less lively a remembrance of those whom they have left behind, and no less fervent charity for them, should *continue* to commend them to the same Almighty care—to the same Spirit of grace—to whom they had from day to day commended them on earth ?

If there be any law of the kingdom of God, by which prayer for the Church on earth becomes to the departed righteous a thing impossible or sinful—any law by which such prayer ceases to be a duty, this is a law of which not the most distant intimation has been given us in Scripture, a law based on no principle of natural or revealed religion.

III. PRIESTLY ABSOLUTION.

The Bishop of Huron says, (page 10,) "The Provost holds and teaches the [highest and] * most ultra view concerning the power of the Priest to forgive sins, which has ever been taught even in the Church of Rome." Nothing is produced in proof of this charge (a charge which I cannot characterize as it deserves) except the fact that I have enquired (at page 94 of my pamphlet) whether the solemn words addressed to candidates on admission to the office of a priest have any meaning or are idle words. The Bishop says it might be inferred from my making this enquiry that I consider that the words would be idle "if not interpreted absolutely, without any condition, limitation or exception." I had good reason to put the question which I did put, for in his letter to the executive committee of his diocese, the Bishop of Huron had said, "This mode of teaching the remission of sins, in baptism, sealed by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and declared by the *authoritative absolution* of the Church, is not that which God has revealed in His Word, and which our Church teaches in her formularies, her articles, and her homilies." (See pamphlet pp. 11, 12.)

Remembering that the document which the Bishop had before him when he wrote these words, represented me as stating that sin after Baptism is forgiven "*on repentance*," and that the Bishop's objection, consequently, could not rest upon my having omitted this indispensable condition, I was, I conceive, not mistaken in considering that he did, in the language which he employed, rob the words of our Ordination Service of all their meaning.

It is, surely, one thing to believe that words mean something, and another to believe, as the Bishop intimates that I might fairly be understood to believe respecting the words in question, that they are to be taken *without any qualification whatever*. Indeed the Bishop himself afterwards shows that I do qualify them.

* Words in brackets found in pamphlet, not in MS.

I may here be permitted to observe, by the way, that in his present paper the Bishop of Huron urges no objection, so far at least as Absolution is concerned, against the statement which, in the extract given above from his letter to the Executive Committee, he so strongly condemns, as at variance with the word of God, and with the formularies of our Church. On the contrary, he now admits that the Absolution in Morning and Evening Prayer is declaratory, consequently forgiveness is *declared* in it: he admits that the minister has *power* to make the declaration, therefore it must be *authoritative*, otherwise there is no meaning in words; he enters no protest against "the sealing in the Holy Communion," probably considering that, on this point, Cranmer and Baxter are sufficiently respectable authorities, to say nothing of the general admission by Calvinistic divines of our Communion, and even by Socinians, of the "obsignatory" effect of the sacraments, viz., of their sealing to us grace previously imparted.

I have, however, no wish to disguise my conviction that the Bishop of Huron does not agree with me in the sense which he attaches to the word "declaratory." I believe that "to declare and pronounce to God's people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins," is not (whether we look to the literal and grammatical meaning of the words, or to the mind of those who framed our Liturgy,) one and the same thing with preaching or proclaiming to men generally the doctrine of the remission of sins. I have reason to think that the Bishop of Huron does regard these two acts as one and the same; in other words, that he thinks it the same thing in effect to pronounce the absolution, and to read one or more of the sentences of Holy Scripture set at the beginning of morning and evening prayer, which announce God's willingness to forgive; allowance being made for the more complete statement of the Christian doctrine of forgiveness which the absolution may be considered to contain. This is certainly a very important difference of opinion, which cannot be obviated by agreeing in the use of the same technical term. That my view is that of the

Church may be gathered from the fact that, while she permits a deacon to read the sentences of Holy Scripture, she forbids his pronouncing the absolution. It would be, I think, very difficult, from the ground which the Bishop of Huron takes on this question, to perceive any reasonable cause for this regulation of our Church. If she entrusts to ministers of the third order one act of public ministration, while she prohibits their handling another, must we not suppose that she recognizes a marked distinction between the characters of these acts, and the authority requisite in the one case and in the other for their legitimate performance? The following extract from Bishop Burnet will shew the view which he took of the meaning of our Reformers in arranging this part of our service. Speaking of the second prayer-book of Edward VI., he says: "The most considerable additions were, that in the daily service they prepared a short, but most simple and grave, form of a general confession of sins; in the use of which they intended, that those who made this confession should not content themselves with a bare recital of the words, but should join with them in their hearts a particular confession of their private sins to God. To this was added, a general absolution, *or pronouncing, in the name of God, the pardon of sin to all those who did truly repent, and unfeignedly believe the gospel.* For they judged, that, if the people did seriously practise this, it would keep up in their thoughts frequent reflections on their sins; and it was thought, that the *pronouncing a pardon upon these conditions* might have a better effect upon the people, than that *absolute and unqualified pardon which their priests were wont to give in confession*; by which absolution, in times of popery, the people were made to believe that their sins were thereupon certainly forgiven; than which nothing could be invented which would harden them into a more fatal security, when they thought a full pardon could be so easily purchased. But now they heard the terms on which only they could expect it, every day promulgated to them." (Burnet's Hist. of the Reform., vol. ii., pt. i., pp. 313, 314, Oxford, 1816.)

Here Burnet describes the public absolution as introduced to supply the place of the private absolution, and the only difference which he points out between the one and the other is this: that the private absolution was, as he states, *absolute* and *unqualified*, while the public absolution is *conditional* on the possession of the Evangelical requisites of true repentance and unfeigned faith.

But to return to the charge which has been brought against me. Does the Bishop of Huron know what that charge really involves, and is he, knowing this, prepared to sustain it?

I. Does he know that the great foundation on which the priestly power of absolution, claimed in the Church of Rome, rests, is the necessity of auricular confession—the obligation to confess, privately and particularly to the priest, every mortal sin before it can be forgiven? Has the Bishop of Huron any, the slightest, ground for imputing to me the belief that auricular confession is necessary or expedient? My belief is that, except in the few cases in which our Church recommends or allows private confession, it is dangerous to men's spiritual welfare, as relieving them of a wholesome sense of individual responsibility, and as inviting them to ignore or to evade a burthen, which, after all, God has appointed that we should bear. Has the Bishop of Huron any ground for attributing to me a contrary belief? Our Church contemplates two cases only in which private confession should be used, one referred to in the exhortation to the Holy Communion, both probably in the service for the visitation of the sick. The one is the case of a man distressed and embarrassed, either as the consequence of a sinful life, or by some particular act of sin, and unable to satisfy himself of his penitence and faith in Christ; the other is the case of a person unable, in the midst of physical weakness and consequent depression, to judge aright of his own state, or to take a sound and healthful view of the application of the general promises of God to his individual necessities. I heartily agree with the judgment of our Church in this matter, and while I think she did well to permit or advise pri-

vate confession in the exceptional cases specified, I believe that she did most wisely in substituting ordinarily public and general confession and absolution for private and particular, and, when I speak of absolution generally, I desire to be understood as speaking of the forms used in morning and evening prayer and in the service for the Holy Communion.

II. I have never taught that sin cannot be forgiven except through this ministration. I do not attribute even to this public and general absolution, the necessity which the Romanist assigns to private absolution. I believe that God forgives the sins of the penitent, when he truly confesses them, and pleads for forgiveness in the name of Christ, *under any circumstances*; but I also believe that our Lord honours and blesses the public assemblies of his Church with special privileges resulting from his special presence: I believe that, if the penitent, confessing to God in his private devotions, may rely on the general promises of God's word, and believe that his sin is pardoned; so also when he confesses in the public assembly, those promises are specially applied and conveyed to him, by a ministry which our Lord himself has appointed, and through which He may truly be said, in the words of Professor Blunt, (*Lectures on the Duties of a Parish Priest*, p. 376,) to "transmit absolution" to the penitent and believing.

This view, I admit, is utterly incompatible with the opinion which the Bishop has expressed as to the mode in which the Divine forgiveness is conveyed, when he says: "The sinner who truly repents and believes the gospel is fully pardoned and accepted by God, his sins and iniquities are blotted out for ever (page 11)." But equally incompatible with his view are the confessions which we are taught to make from day to day, not only of the sins of the day, but of the sins of our past lives. More especially in the Communion Service do we pray God to "forgive us *all that is past*," and we "acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we, *from time to time*, most grievously have committed by thought, word and deed." We are thus taught to confess again and again,

with a deeper conviction of the sinfulness of sin, our old transgressions; and to believe that it is most needful for us to receive again and again, not only the assurance of the Divine forgiveness, but also a renewed conveyance of that forgiveness, which must abound more richly towards us as we are more fully prepared to receive it.

In illustration of what I have here said, I would invite attention to the words which are found in the exhortation, at the beginning of morning and evening prayer, "and although we ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God; yet ought we *most chiefly* so to do, when we assemble and meet together, &c." We are here plainly taught that no private confession can possibly supersede the duty of public confession, but must still leave it as our "most chief" obligation in this regard; and, if this be so, can we rightly conceive of the pardon accorded on private confession to God as being other than contingent and provisional (though sufficient for our immediate necessity;) while its more full and formal conveyance is reserved to follow on that confession, to which we are instructed to regard ourselves as "most chiefly" bound, and which is offered when "we assemble and meet together," as members of a Divinely instituted organization, to receive the gifts, and to avail ourselves of the ministries, which pertain to the body of Christ.

In my pamphlet (page 91) I expressly stated that, in order to avoid the appearance of giving garbled quotations, I had introduced matter not strictly relevant, and that I wished it to be distinctly understood, that I quoted my authorities "*simply as authorities on the main point in question*," without pledging myself to the approval of all their arguments or modes of expression. I quoted Bishop Sparrow because he is well known, by those who know any thing about the matter, to be a distinguished name in the succession of English Liturgical writers, but while I accept his general statements in corroboration of my teaching, I refuse to make myself responsible for every word which he may use, far more for brief expressions or single words which appear in quotations, from such writers as Chrysostom or Gregory the

Great, which he interweaves with his text. I must however say that it does appear to me strange that the great Greek Father should have given such offence by explaining, after his rhetorical fashion, the words of our Lord, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The words excepted against are a comment on this text, and there is a sense in which they fairly represent the will of our Blessed Lord to ratify in heaven ministerial acts of His servants upon earth done by His authority and in conformity with His will.

It should be remembered also that Absolution stands in relation, not only to the voluntary confession of sins, but also to excommunication; and that early writers, living in times when Church discipline was strictly enforced, often contemplate it chiefly, if not exclusively, under this aspect. If then it be possible (as I conceive, with the Epistles to the Corinthians in our hands, we must admit) that a just and righteous sentence of excommunication should be pronounced, a sentence which the Great Head of the Church shall approve and ratify; must we not think that, when bishops and priests thus bind sins on earth, according to Christ's command, He fulfils his own words, and Himself binds them in heaven? And on the other hand, when He has promised to these His ministers (as our Church in the ordination service leads us to believe) that whose sins they forgive they are forgiven, can we conceive a more fitting case for the application of the promise than the restoration of the repentant sinner to the communion of the Church? And, since Christ has given this promise, can we think that He does not require the penitent, who has been debarred from communion for his sins, to seek the assurance of His forgiveness, by restoration to the communion of His Church, and through the same ministry which has declared the sentence of excommunication? Is it likely that He should communicate that assurance to the soul, when it is not sufficiently humbled to seek such formal restoration, pronounced by the judgment of the appointed minister? And so may it not be strictly true, as

Chrysostom states, that the master chooses, in such a case, to wait for the decision of the servant? If it pleased God to wait for the prayer of Abraham before He would heal Abimelech and his household, (Gen. xx.,) and to wait for the prayer of Job before He would forgive his friends, (Job xlii.,) and if St. Paul makes his declaration of the forgiveness of the incestuous man "in the person of Christ," to depend on the previous forgiveness of that man by the Church of Corinth, and if the Church is right in applying the words of Christ, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," to the order of priests, (including bishops,) does it not appear that there is a sound sense in which Chrysostom might say, "Heaven waits and expects the Priest's sentence here on earth?" In short, what doctrine does Chrysostom declare beyond that which is taught in the *Confession of Faith* of the Scottish Presbyterians? In that document we read (chapter xxx. beg.) "The Lord Jesus, as king and head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of *church officers*, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to *retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel and by absolution from censures*, as occasion may require." Can any person point out any essential difference between the doctrine of the Presbyterian confession and that contained in the words of Chrysostom? And if this be Presbyterian doctrine, can it be justly stigmatized as Romanist?

The great offence taken at the quotation from Gregory, given by Bishop Sparrow, is grounded on his use of the term "vicegerent of God." Be it remembered, however, that Hooker uses the self-same term (Bk. VI., ch. VI. § 5) where he speaks of the "sentence of God's appointed officer and vicegerent." I would *not* use the term, knowing that it has been greatly abused, and made to imply in the bulls of popes and other documents proceeding from the court of Rome, far more than either Hooker or Bishop Sparrow meant

by it. Gregory himself cannot be said to use it—the Latin which it represents being “vice Dei” “in God’s place” or “stead.” Now God Himself said to Moses (Exodus iv. 16,) “He (Aaron) shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God* ;” and again St. Paul says, (2 Cor. ii., 10,) “for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it *in the person of Christ*,” and again, (2 Cor. v., 20,) “we pray you in *Christ’s stead*.” I am not concerned to maintain the strict accuracy of the English version in the last two places, if any choose to except against it; it is quite sufficient for my purpose, if it be conceded that that version is not open to condemnation as being “most repulsive and unscriptural.”

We may be assured too that Gregory himself employed the words in a modest and reverent sense, for he says, “the absolution of the minister is then real when it follows the decision of the inward judge.” He likens the restoration of Lazarus to life to the power of God in quickening the soul dead in sin, and the loosing of Lazarus by the disciples to the absolution of the Church; and, in order to point out the uselessness of ministerial absolution in the absence of Divine forgiveness, he says, “Si enim discipuli Lazarum mortuum solverent, fœtorem magis ostenderent quam virtutem.” “For if the disciples had unbound Lazarus while he was still dead they would have exhibited a stench rather than a miracle.” These words show that Gregory, like Chrysostom, contemplated absolution after Church censures, and they also prove how purely ministerial, in his estimation, the priest’s office is; how, if God’s forgiveness do not attend it, priestly absolution is but loosing the wrappings of the dead, and making yet more loathesome one whom it has not power to restore.

I have been compelled to dwell upon this point at greater length than I could have wished, because the Bishop of Huron has thought fit to say, (page 11,) “This judicial power to forgive sins is stated in the most repulsive and unscriptural form in the words of Chrysostom and Pope Gregory, as quoted with approval by Bishop Sparrow.” It

is but too easy to make these strong and sweeping assertions, and to excite by means of them fierce passions and ungrounded prejudices : but it is, I conceive, by no means easy to shew that they approve themselves, either to God or man, as “ words of truth and soberness.”

I will close this head with a quotation from Hooker, which will at once indicate the ground which I desire to occupy on this subject, and will also show how necessarily erroneous are the summary statements in which some seem to imagine that the whole truth is enshrined.

Hooker then says, (Book vi., ch. vi., sec. 4,) “ Now albeit we willingly confess with St. Cyprian, ‘ The sins that are committed against Him, He only hath power to forgive, who hath taken upon Him our sins, He which hath sorrowed and suffered for us, He whom God hath given for our offences,’ yet neither did St. Cyprian intend to deny the power of the minister, otherwise than if he presume beyond his commission to remit sin, where God’s own will is it should be retained ; for against such absolutions he speaketh (which being granted to whom they ought to have been denied, are of no validity,) and, if rightly it be considered how higher causes in operation use to concur with inferior means, His grace with our ministry, God really performing the same which man is authorized to act as in His name, there shall need for decision of this point no great labour.”

The last clause appears to me to furnish the key to the solution of the whole difficulty : the work is God’s, yet, so far as He has been pleased to commit it in any wise to human agency, it is not ordinarily perfected without that agency.

IV. THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The Bishop of Huron says, (page 12,) “ I think it dangerous for our youth to be taught that there are two *great* sacraments, and other holy rites or sacraments.” I have nothing to add here to what I have stated at page 29 of my pamphlet. I teach young men, as our Church does, to distinguish Baptism and the Lord’s Supper from all other holy rites, not merely by *calling* them *Sacraments*, but by shew-

ing that they do, while other rites do not, correspond to the *definition* of a sacrament given in our Catechism ; and, as I have stated before, I do *not* sanction by my own practice, and I should reprove in others, the customary application of the word "Sacrament" to any other rites than these. The Bishop of Huron, however, adds, (*ibid.*,) "when our Church dogmatically teaches in the Catechism that there are two *only*." Any person may test the accuracy of this statement. The Bishop represents the Church as dogmatically teaching as follows :

Q. How many Sacraments *are there* ?

A. Two only, viz. : Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. The Church *does* teach as follows :

Q. How many Sacraments *hath Christ ordained in His Church* ?

A. Two only, *as generally necessary to salvation*, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

The question, it will be seen, contains *one* restricting clause, and the answer *another* : both of which are omitted by the Bishop of Huron : and I would respectfully enquire, whether, in lecturing on the Catechism, it is my duty to elucidate *its own language*, or any *mutilation or paraphrase* of that language, which may appear to individual members of the Church to be less dangerous.

It has always been my care, moreover, to ascertain how others have interpreted our Church's formularies, or how one formulary is elucidated by other writings of authority, and, as I showed in my pamphlet, (pages 64, 65,) I have the Homilies on my side, as well as many highly esteemed writers of our Church, among whom I will mention Bishop Beveridge, in his tract, "The Church Catechism explained for the use of the Diocese of St. Asaph." Dr. Beveridge was appointed Chaplain to King William and Queen Mary, in 1690, and he "was one of those eminent divines, whose learning, wisdom, piety, and moderation caused them to be selected (in the following year) to fill the Sees vacated by the deprivation of Archbishop Sancroft,"* and the other

* See Hartwell Horne's *Life of Bishop Beveridge* prefixed to his works.

non-juring bishops. He was at this time nominated to the See of Bath and Wells, which he declined, and he was thirteen years afterwards appointed to the See of St. Asaph. The Catechism has been re-published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, a society supported by all the English Bishops, by some of the Irish, and by the great body of the Scottish and Colonial Bishops. The book has been for many years on the list of the Society's publications; it is used largely in superior schools in England, and among others at King's College in London. I gave the *text* of Bishop Beveridge, at page 65 of my pamphlet, I will now add his *questions* placed at the end of the section, and introduce the exact words of his text as answers.

Q. 1. Why do we not ask "How many Sacraments are there," but, "How many hath Christ ordained in His Church?"

A. Because "the word sacrament was used by ancient writers of the Church, for any sacred or holy mystery, rite, or ceremony; every one calling what holy thing he pleased a sacrament. By which means the number of things that have been called by this name is very great and uncertain. Wherefore the question here is not, how many Sacraments there are in general, or how many things have been, or may be, called Sacraments; but how many Sacraments hath Christ ordained, and that too in His Church, to be always observed there."

Q. 2. Why is it said that there are "two only, as generally necessary to salvation?"

A. Because "there may be other things ordained, but not as necessary to salvation: some as necessary to salvation, but not generally, as the ordination or consecration of persons to holy offices. This is necessary to salvation, because it is necessary to the right administration of the means of grace and salvation. But it is not generally necessary, it is not necessary for all men; as if none could be saved except they be in holy orders. And, therefore, neither can that be said to be ordained by Christ as generally necessary to salvation; nor any other sacred rites, but only two, that is to say, Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Am I to be held up as an object of distrust, or subjected to censure or disgrace because I teach as one teaches whose Catechism is published by authority of all the English Bishops, and who is revered by all parties in the Church?

In the XXVth Article the restriction expressed in the *question* in the Catechism is retained, "*There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel:*" the restriction involved in the *answer* in the Catechism is not expressed, probably because the first clause of the Article makes it sufficiently clear that it is treating of things "generally necessary to salvation."

The language of the Homily is open to every objection which the Bishop of Huron urges against my own: it is indeed far more open to such objections than any language which I have used or intend to use. It says, "Absolution is no such sacrament as baptism and the communion are." And again, "Though the ordering of ministers hath his visible sign and promise; yet it lacks the promise of remission of sins, *as all other sacraments besides* do. Therefore neither it, nor any other sacrament else, be such sacraments as baptism and the communion are. But in a general acception, the name of a sacrament may be attributed to any thing, whereby an holy thing is signified." (See Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments, quoted page 64 of my pamphlet.)

Might I not claim to be permitted to speak as the Homily speaks? May I not be permitted to speak, as I have done, far more cautiously than the Homily does?

The Bishop of Huron asks, (page 12,) "Why should our Church teachers now evince a desire to go back to the use of forms and phrases which our Reformers carefully avoided?" The language which I have quoted from the Homily shews whether our Reformers did carefully avoid such words and phrases.

The Bishop adds, "It cannot be regarded as either wise or safe to lead young men to look upon other rites and ceremonies as at all to be placed on the same footing as the only two Sacraments which Christ has ordained." The Bishop

of Huron has no evidence before him, however obtained, which can warrant him in making the insinuation that I have ever done this. No one ever heard me call any rite, except Baptism and the Lord's Supper, a Sacrament. I assign to these two institutions of our Blessed Lord their peculiar honour, not by making any untenable assertions, as I contend the Bishop of Huron would have me do, but by following the example of our Catechism and Homily, which shew that Baptism and the Lord's Supper differ very widely from any other sacred rite, and that the name "Sacrament," *as it is defined in the Catechism*, is applicable to them only. What we are concerned to prove against the Church of Rome is that her five additional sacraments (so called) *do not correspond to our definition of a sacrament*, and consequently do not stand on the same footing with Baptism and the Lord's Supper. *This I have always done* to the best of my ability, and I see no purpose of truth or charity which is to be answered by attempting to conceal the fact (sufficiently patent at all events) that the word "sacrament" *has* been used by our reformed church itself to signify other rites besides Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

V. THE GRACE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The Bishop of Huron says, (page 13,) that I "evidently regard the Sacraments in quite a different light" from our Church, which "teaches that the Sacraments are outward signs of inward grace, and seals to those who truly repent and believe in God's mercy and favour towards them."

This is, be it observed, the Bishop's *account* of our Church's doctrine: it may be perhaps as well to state that doctrine *in her own words*, as given us in the Catechism.

Q. What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?

A. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace *given unto us*, ordained by Christ Himself, *as a means whereby we receive the same*, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

The words which I have given in italics the Bishop has wholly overlooked.

Again, our Church asks,

Q. How many parts are there in a Sacrament? and teaches her children to reply,

A. Two; the outward visible sign, *and the inward spiritual grace.*

The Bishop of Huron does not recognize the grace as a part of the Sacrament in his statement of the Church's teaching. In order to prevent misconception it may be well to observe, as the Bishop of St. David's has done in the charge quoted in my pamphlet, that the word "sacrament" is used, sometimes in a narrower sense for the sacramental *symbol*, and sometimes in a wider sense for the sacramental *rite*. In the former of the two questions given above it is used in the narrower sense, and accordingly the answer defines the sacrament as the *sign*, pointing out however the close connection between the sacrament and the grace of the sacrament. In the latter of the two questions the word is used in the wider sense, and, accordingly, the answer defines the sacrament as comprehending two parts, the *sign* and the *grace*.

So again the XXVth Article speaks of the Sacraments, as being "effectual signs of grace," "*efficacia signa*," thus explained by Dr. Ward, one of the English delegates at the Synod of Dort, the intimate friend of Bishop Davenant and of Archbishop Ussher, men whom the Bishop of Huron and his friends appeal to as some of the most evangelical and protestant of our divines. "Those sacraments," says Dr. Ward, "which our twenty-fifth Article calls *efficacious signs*, we say *confer grace*," *i. e.*, they are not mere signs of something already done, but they are *means* by which God imparts His grace.

The Bishop then quotes a passage from Dr. Waterland, which I stated in a third letter, or postscript to the second, that I had read to my class. The Bishop's exception against this passage is grounded on the assertion there made that we are in infancy justified in the reception of Holy Baptism. He says, (page 13,) "The doctrine of Baptismal Justification is that against which our Reformers most strenuously con-

tended as the root of many of the doctrinal errors of the Church of Rome." The Bishop gives no proof whatever of his assertion, except by adducing passages from the Articles and Homilies respecting Justification by Faith, which doctrine I admit, or, I should rather say, Dr. Waterland admits, as fully as the Bishop of Huron does. After himself quoting the Homily of Salvation in support of Justification by Faith, the Bishop of Huron says, (page 13,) "yet the Provost propounds the opinion and adduces sundry quotations from the writings of fallible men to prove that all baptized persons are justified, and that though our Church teaches that faith sends us directly to Christ for the remission of our sins, still the doctrine of Justification by Faith, rightly understood, is not inconsistent with the statement that faith sends us to Christ for remission of our sins through Sacraments and ordinances of His appointment."

Immediately preceding and following the words which the Bishop quotes from my pamphlet (pages 61 and 62) are three quotations from the very same Homily which the Bishop quotes, quotations which certainly prove that the writer of that Homily held the very doctrine to which the Bishop objects. Be it observed that this Homily is specially referred to in the XIth Article as teaching the doctrine of Justification—that it states its object to be to treat of "righteousness or justification, to be received at God's own hands," "of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith," and that in so doing it uses the following language :

"Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children, and inheritors of His kingdom of heaven. And they which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification or righteousness which St. Paul speaketh of when he saith : '*No man is justified by the works of the law, but*

freely by faith in Jesus Christ.'" (Homilies, p. 25, Oxford, 1822.)

Again, page 33, we find :

"Nevertheless, *because faith doth directly send us to Christ for remission of our sins, and that by faith given us of God, we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and of the remission of our sins,* (which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth,) therefore scripture useth to say, that faith without works doth justify."

Again, page 34 :

"Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that *we are baptized or justified*, not caring how few good works we do," &c.

Thus the Homily explains how the doctrine of Justification by Faith applies to all who are baptized ; first to infants, and next to those who grow up and sin after baptism, and it states that "infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children and inheritors of His kingdom of heaven." Is not this clearly the doctrine of baptismal justification ? The last quotation from the Homily is the very sum and substance of the teaching contained in the passage of Waterland which the Bishop denounces.

The Bishop of Huron must again admit that the passage, which in my pamphlet immediately follows the quotations from the Homily, affirms in the strongest sense Baptismal Justification. This passage, which I give below, is from Bishop Jewel, and is he not justly regarded as one of the champions of the English Reformation, to whom we may look for an expression of its judgment on a point like this ?

"As for that M. Harding here toucheth as an error defended by certain I know not by whom, *that baptism giveth not full remission of sins*, he may command it home again to Louvain amongst his fellows, and join it with other of his and their vanities. For it is no part nor portion of our doctrine. We confess, and have evermore taught, that in the *sacrament of baptism*, by the death and blood of Christ,

is given remission of all manner of sins, and that not in half or in part, or by way of imagination, or by fancy, but full, whole, and perfect of all together ; so that now, as St. Paul saith, ‘ There is no damnation unto them that be in Christ Jesus.’ ” (Bishop Jewel, *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*. Works, Vol. V., pp. 37-8, Oxford, 1848.)

But let us appeal, on this momentous question, to the formularies of our Church. Can a child be made in baptism “ a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,” as the catechism teaches him that he is, and yet not be justified ? Can he rightly be taught to call the state into which he was then introduced, “ a state of salvation,” or to pray that by “ God’s grace he may continue in the same unto his life’s end, (and this he is taught in the Catechism to do,) if it be *not* a state of Justification ?

Can he be rightly taught to say that the Holy Ghost sanctifieth him, if he be not justified ? Can he be rightly instructed to number himself among “ the elect people of God,” if he be not justified ? Yet the Catechism teaches him to do both.

If this doctrine be one against which our reformers “ most strenuously contended,” where did we get our catechism ? Where too did we get our Baptismal Service ? Do we not pray God, in that service, for the infant, “ that he, coming to Thy Holy Baptism, may receive *remission of his sins* by spiritual regeneration ? ” and do we not, after the administration of the sacrament, give God our “ hearty thanks, that *it hath pleased Him* to regenerate this infant by His Holy Spirit ? ” Can a child have been thus regenerated, and have received thereby remission of sins, and yet not have been justified ?

But the Bishop of Huron’s objection to this doctrine evidently rests upon the supposition that it is incompatible with the doctrine of Justification by Faith. My quotations from the Homily of Salvation, of which the Bishop adduces one, taken together, show that its author was of another mind, and as that Homily is specially referred to by the Church

in the XIth Article, they shew that the Church is of another mind.

When the XIth Article says that "we are justified by faith *only*," it has already explained its meaning by saying that "we are accounted righteous before God, only *for* the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, *by* faith, and not *for* our own works or deservings." In the short Catechism put forth in the reign of Edward VI., commonly called his Second Catechism, and attributed to Bishop Poyntet, we find this clearly stated: "Therefore so often as it is said, that we are justified and saved by faith only, it is so said because faith or rather trust alone apprehends, understands, and recognizes that our justification is given to us freely by God, that is, *by no merits of our own*, but of the free grace of our Almighty Father."

Yet the Bishop of Huron says that "it is difficult to comprehend what I mean" when I profess to hold the doctrine of justification through faith only and at the same time to recognise the sacrament of baptism as the instrument whereby God confers this grace.

The Bishop will, I conceive, find it equally difficult to comprehend what Hooker means in the passages which follow:

"There were of the old Valentinian heretics some, which had knowledge in such admiration, that to it they ascribed all, and so despised the Sacraments of Christ, pretending that as ignorance had made us subject to all misery, so the full redemption of the inward man, and the work of our restoration, must needs belong unto *knowledge* only. They draw very near unto this error, who fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of faith imagine that nothing but faith is necessary for the attainment of all grace. *Yet is it a branch of belief that Sacraments are in their place no less required than belief itself.* (Eccl. Pol. Bk. V., Chapter LX., § 4.)

And again: "Neither is it, as Bellarmine imagineth, a thing impossible, that we should attribute any justifying grace to sacraments, except we first renounce the doctrine of justifi-

cation by faith only. To the imputation of Christ's death for remission of sins, we teach faith alone necessary : wherein it is not our meaning, *to separate thereby faith from any other quality or duty, which God requireth to be matched therewith*, but *from faith to seclude in justification the fellowship of worth through precedent works*, as the Apostle St. Paul doth." (Ibid, Book V., Appendix No. 1, p. 553, Oxford Edition.)

I give in the notes another passage from Hooker, and one from Waterland to the same effect, the latter a specimen of conclusive reasoning from St. Mark, xvi. 16. (See note C.)

I do not venture to put asunder, I am satisfied that our Reformers never attempted to put asunder, what our Lord Himself joined together in the beginning of the Gospel, when He said : "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

The Bishop of Huron says (page 13) : "How can the statements that 'we are justified by faith only,' and that 'faith sends us directly to Christ,' be understood to mean that we are justified by baptism and not by faith only, and that faith sends us to Christ, not directly but through sacraments, &c. Here is one of the worst features in the system taught by the Provost. 'Justification by faith only' has ever been regarded as the grand distinguishing feature between the reformed and corrupt Churches. And I cannot but regard it as most dangerous to endeavour to undermine it or explain it away, as has been done in the second and third letters of the Provost, and in the quotations which he has adduced on the subject."

I trust that the quotations given above from Hooker may serve effectually to expose the gross fallacy involved in this statement of the Bishop of Huron, and to acquit me of the undeserved reproach with which he seeks to overwhelm me ; but I must be permitted to add that it would be quite as reasonable to argue that the doctrine of justification by faith alone is inconsistent with the doctrine of justification by grace (Rom. iii. 24,) as to reason that it is inconsistent with the doctrine of our justification in the use of any mean of grace which God may have appointed for that purpose.

Did Elisha send Naaman *away* from the God of Israel, when he sent him to wash in Jordan? Did our Lord send the blind man *away* from himself, when he said, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam"? Was not the use of these simple instruments in both cases a proof and exercise of humble and unreserved faith in Divine power? Especially in the former instance, was it not the very mean of eliciting this faith—the token of a transition from a state of pride and unbelief? Is faith in action less precious, less available, than an inactive faith? Again, did not St. Paul *believe* when he cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?", yet did not the answer which he received, coupled with the instruction given him three days after by Ananias, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord," prove clearly that there was something more which the Lord would have him do as a penitent and believing man; that he would have him come indeed to Christ, yet not to some abstract and imaginary Christ, detached from all the special commands and promises of the Gospel, but to *the Christ* who had said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."?

All, indeed, who know any thing of the history of the Reformation, know that the great struggle respecting Justification related to its *meritorious* cause, the Reformers maintaining, in opposition to the Romish doctrine of merit, that we are "justified freely by God's grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." Melancthon calls "justification by faith" a correlative term to "salvation by grace;" if then salvation by grace do not necessarily exclude means, whereby that grace is conveyed, so neither will justification by faith.

Observe how Bishop Jewel defines the meaning of justification by faith only: "Howbeit, if it be so horrible an heresy to say, 'We be justified before God by only faith, that is to say *only by the merits and cross of Christ*, let us see what the holy learned fathers of the church so many hundred years ago have taught us thereof." (Jewel's Defence of Apology, Works, vol. iv., p. 298. Oxford, 1848.)

The doctrine of our XIth Article I steadfastly believe, and

teach distinctly and fully, both in lectures and in sermons; understanding that doctrine to be, that the meritorious cause of our justification and acceptance with God is wholly external to ourselves, and is to be found only in the Person and Work of our Redeemer: while faith, not narrowed down either to a barren act of the understanding, or to an emotion of the mind attended by no practical results, but faith, as it is characterized by St. Paul, as "working by love," and by St. James, as "made perfect by works," is the sacred instrument, itself the gift of God, whereby man, on his part, acquires and retains his hold on the justification thus graciously vouchsafed.

I may here observe, also, that I have been taught to distinguish between justification as an *act* whereby God justifies man, and justification as a *state* in which that Divine act places him. I consider baptism to be the instrument whereby God imparts to us the grace of justification; I hold that faith, as well as repentance, is requisite in the adult recipient of baptism; and that faith is also the mean whereby we hold fast the grace of justification when it has been imparted to us, and that repentance and faith are the means by which it is recovered when it has been lost by sin.

As, however, the justification of *infants* in baptism is a question on which opinions diverge much more decidedly than in the case of adult recipients of the sacrament, I am glad on this point to avail myself of the testimony of Dr. Samuel Ward, whose name has been already mentioned as the friend of Ussher and Davenant. He is spoken of in Prynne's work against Arminianism as one of the "three famous reverend divines of special eminence, note, and credit in our church." He was also a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. He says: "When we say, then, that Sacraments confer grace on those who do not place a bar, we do not say that sacraments confer grace absolutely on every receiver, inasmuch as men who are indisposed and unworthy are not meet subjects, and, therefore by reason of their state, not capable of Divine grace. The conferring, therefore, of grace by Sacraments

must be conditional, and depend upon a certain law ; neither can there be a more suitable condition laid down, than that no bar should be found in the recipient—nothing, that is, which withstands God's grace. There are two ways in which sin puts a bar ; either by the commission of an offence, or by the omission of a bounden and possible duty. From which it may be understood what it is *not* to place a bar to the sacraments. A man is said *not* to place a bar, either—first, By not opposing the obstacle of a fresh sin, when he might oppose it ; secondly, By preparing himself properly for the reception of the sacrament, and removing hindrances. [Dr. Ward afterwards shows that this *second* mode is absolutely indispensable in adult receivers.] Thirdly, By being simply negative so far as concerns any previous dispositions, in case it is neither in his power to commit any new sin, nor to prepare himself to be a fit and worthy receiver.

“*In the third of these ways infants place no bar ; as well as all those, who are capable of grace, and yet cannot act as moral agents, from the deficiency of their understanding, and from not possessing the power of will. Their condition makes it impossible that they should oppose a bar ; and therefore, we say, that on them the Sacraments infallibly confer grace.*”

Dr. Samuel Ward's “*Determinationes Theologicæ*,” London, 1658, page 44.

I give in the notes extracts from Dr. Ward's letters to Archbishop Ussher to the same effect ; and another passage from the work quoted above, in which Dr. Ward speaks expressly of “*the justification of baptized infants.*” (See note D.)

VI. The Bishop of Huron quotes (page 14) from page 77 of my letters, some remarks of mine on the inward part or thing signified in the Lord's Supper. He appends two notes of admiration to the extract, and says that he does not understand it. I conclude that he regards it as absurd or extravagant ; but, in the absence of any distinct objection, I have, of course, no fair opportunity of replying. I will, however, extract the passage and observe upon it. The

Bishop says: "With reference to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the Provost has explained his views in a passage which occurs in the 77th page of his pamphlet, [as follows:] 'Before the charge, or rather the insinuation of the Bishop of Huron, I should have thought it quite unnecessary to explain to any one, that I do not understand by the 'glorified humanity' of our Lord any thing which can be orally received; nor, again, do I understand, when Mr. Procter says that 'every faithful recipient there partakes of Christ's glorified humanity,' that he dreams of any local presence of the heavenly gift, in or with the earthly elements; but means simply that in faithfully receiving the sign we surely receive the thing signified. By the word 'there,' I understand as the Bishop of Huron seems to have done, 'in the Sacrament,' and by the Sacrament, not the outward material sign, but the Holy celebration.'"!! "From this explanation," the Bishop adds, "it is very difficult to collect what view the Provost really entertains concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

I gave the explanation, which the Bishop of Huron quotes, because I had been told that Mr. Procter's language had, by some persons, been so misunderstood, as to be considered equivalent to an assertion that the natural body and blood of our Lord are *corporally* received in the *bread and wine*. I wished to point out Mr. Procter's real meaning, viz., that in the reception of the Holy Communion (or at the Holy celebration) the believing receiver partakes of a spiritual benefit, regarded by many writers as *identical* with eating the flesh of Christ and drinking His blood, by others rather as a *result* of that act; which benefit is the being made partaker of our Lord's glorified human nature; and I quoted a great number of authorities to show that highly esteemed writers of our church have maintained the following points: 1st. That, whenever we are said to be *united* with our Lord, it is meant that we are *immediately and directly* united with Him *as man*, as the second Adam, the new head of the human family; and 2ndly, that the Holy Communion is the great mean whereby this union with our Lord is perpetuated and matured.

Let me repeat the passage from Waterland quoted in my second letter, "The true and firm basis for the economy of man's salvation is this, that in the sacraments we are made and continued members of Christ's *body, of His flesh and of His bones*. Our union with the Deity rests entirely on our mystical union with our Lord's humanity, which is *personally* united with His divine nature, which is *essentially* united with God the Father, the head and fountain of all."

This passage from Waterland is quoted by Dean Ellicott in his commentary on Ephesians v., 30. He adds: "These are weighty words." They are, indeed, far too weighty to be easily disproved, or lightly abandoned.

The Dean observes, on the text itself: "The words are cited from Genesis ii., 23., to convey this profound truth, that our real (spiritual) being and existence is as truly, as certainly, and as actually from our Lord's glorified humanity as was the physical derivation of Eve from Adam."

The Bishop, however, adds (page 14): "It must be apparent to all that the term which the Provost has employed from the writings of Mr. Proctor, and has so vehemently defended, 'that every faithful recipient partakes in the Eucharist of the glorified humanity of our Lord,' is much more likely to deceive and scandalize the simple and ignorant, and should therefore be regarded as dangerous and avoided in lectures addressed to young men on the catechism."

The original charge was that I used a book, as a class book, which contained this expression. This was the truth and the whole truth. The book is one of the text-books in the Divinity course. I ask questions on it *viva voce* in lectures, and a paper of questions is given on it in the annual examination. It has nothing to do with the lectures on the catechism, nor have I adopted in those lectures one single expression from it. I could not have said from my own recollection, until a letter in *The Globe* drew attention to the expression quoted above, whether the book contained it or not.

But when this expression was singled out and branded as heresy, I did not hesitate to defend it, because I believed it to be intended to convey a scriptural truth of the highest

moment. Can the Bishop of Huron deny, with the extracts in my pamphlet before him, that the language of Holy Scripture has thus been interpreted by Hooker, by Andrews, by Jackson, by Ussher, by Waterland, by Ridley, and even by Calvin? If he be prepared to do so, let him do so, and show that another interpretation can undoubtedly be put upon their language. If he be not prepared to do so, it is too much to require that I should, on pain of being accounted a dangerous and heretical teacher, relinquish their authority, as interpreters of Holy Scripture, for that of the Bishop of Huron. For this it is which, in that case, his lordship is requiring me to do. I add in the notes (see note E) a second passage from Archbishop Ussher, showing how thoroughly his mind was possessed by the thought which the expression in question symbolizes. Mr. Procter has informed me that he had, to the best of his recollection, derived that expression from Archdeacon Hardwick (a name well known and deeply regretted in England, by men of no extreme views;) and in Hardwick's History of the Christian Church (Reformation) pp. 213, 214, we read respecting Cranmer: "But as early as December, 1548, when a discussion was held upon the subject anterior to the passing of Edward's Act of Uniformity, he appears to have receded far from this position, [viz., the holding of a corporal presence] and to have adopted the hypothesis of a virtual as distinguished from a local presence of Christ's glorified humanity, in close resemblance to that section of the Swiss Reformers who had acquiesced in Calvin's method of explaining the mysterious presence. In this view concurred the able and devoted Nicholas Ridley, who had acted for some time as chaplain to the archbishop."

This opinion Ridley, at least, held to the end. In his last examination before the commissioners he says: "I answer that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ *vere et realiter*, really and indeed, for [*i. e.*, because it is there] spiritually, by grace and efficacy; for so every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ. But if you mean really and indeed, so that there-

by you would include a lively and a moveable body under the forms of bread and wine, then, in that sense, is not Christ's body in the sacrament really and indeed." (Ridley's Works, Parker Soc., p. 274.)

The opinion was also held most distinctly by Martin Bucer, an eminent foreign Reformer, who was invited to England, and appointed professor of Divinity at Cambridge, which office he held till his death. He says: "If I be demanded, what maner of joynyng may be betwyxt the *glorified body* of Christ and ther [*i. e.*, in heaven] determinately placed, and the corruptible bread here in earth, contained in a sensyble place; I answer, even such as is betwyxt the regeneration and the dipping in the water, and as is betwyxt the Holy Ghost, and the breath of Christ's mouth, which I do call the *joyning in the covenant*. For so much as they that with a true and lyvely faith be partakers of these synes a bodely, spiritually receive in dede an assurance, with an increase, of the partaking of the Lord's body and blood. So they be members of Christ, *flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones*, and thereby they grow more and more into the perfection of the same." (Strype. Memorials of Cranmer, vol. ii., page 866.)

The Bishop then proceeds to censure language, quoted by me from a charge of the Bishop of St. David's, as "capable of being interpreted so as to express and support a view of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, which is not in accordance with the teaching of our Church," (page 15.) This objection I may be permitted to pass over as not affecting myself primarily or directly; it may serve however to indicate the very narrow range within which I am expected to confine, not only my teaching, but my opinions; and it is certainly comforting and reassuring to find a writer of so great ability and moderation as Bishop Thirlwall involved in a like censure with myself.

VII. APPLICATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE VITH CHAPTER OF ST. JOHN.

The Bishop of Huron objects (page 15) to what I have said on this point at page 80 of my letters. My words are:

"I am perfectly satisfied to admit that it (the chapter in question) speaks of a supernatural gift, which, both before the institution of the Eucharist and afterwards, *may* have been, and *may* still be, received without it; but for the reception of which the Holy Communion is the appointed mean, and the only mean whereby Holy Scripture assures us that we *shall* receive it if duly prepared." This language the Bishop describes as setting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the reader in a light altogether different from that in which our Church teaches us to regard it.

In reply I would say, compare our Lord's words (St. John vi., 53): "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," (even supposing that we interpret them, not of the Lord's Supper, but of spiritual feeding in the abstract,) compare these words, I would say, with 1 Cor., x., 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the Communion of the body of Christ?", and must we not infer, at least, that the Lord's Supper, duly received, *is an appointed mean of spiritual feeding* on the body and blood of Christ; and, if we search the New Testament through, *do we find any other mode or mean of such feeding prescribed, or even hinted at?* I meet this question by a negative, because I can find no other answer, and this is all which I mean, by what the Bishop calls, my *doubtful and uncertain* "*may*," when I decline to use any stronger language than that persons *may* partake of the Lord's body and blood in some other way. I condemn no one for holding the opinion that this special grace may otherwise be received, but it is at best *an opinion*, not capable of being established by Holy Scripture. The Bishop, however, will find this opinion of his broadly asserted in the Catechism of the Council of Trent; he will find directions given for spiritual communion, apart from the Lord's Supper, in books of devotion put forth by those whom he would, rightly or wrongly, regard as hovering on the verge of Romanism: for my own part, while I remember that Christians, in St. Paul's time, came together every Lord's day to break bread

—that the celebration of the Eucharist was their great act of Christian worship and service, I cannot think it strange that our own laxity of practice, our own coldness of affection, should have received no direct encouragement from the word of God. God teaches us enough to guide our practice and no more, and I should never scruple to allege the silence of Holy Scripture on this point as a warning to walk more warily and dutifully according to the light vouchsafed to us, and to be diligent in observing Christ's ordinance, if we desire to obtain the blessing which He has expressly attached to it, and, for aught we know, ordinarily restricted to it.

I observe, with great astonishment, that the Bishop of Huron proceeds to say, (page 15): "Nay more, the rubric at the close of the service for the Communion of the Sick, enjoins the curate to instruct the sick man that, if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth."

Now, I conceive, that this statement of the Bishop of Huron would give any reader the impression that the instruction mentioned is to be given *in any case* to any sick person; for otherwise there is no force in his argument. The Bishop *omits* the very important words with which the rubric begins: "But, if a man either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood." Further, it should be noted that the rubric prefixed to the service for the Communion of the Sick, besides bearing witness to the great importance which the Church assigns to the "often receiving of the Holy Communion" "to the intent" men "may be always in a readiness to die," describes the person, on whose behalf the service is

to be used, and to whom, accordingly, if need be, the comforting assurance, which the Bishop of Huron quotes, is to be given, as one who is “not able to come to the Church, *and yet is desirous to receive the communion in his house.*”

Any one who has been accustomed to visit the sick must know well what a comfort it is, *in the case supposed*, to give the sufferer this assurance; but, in so doing, you do not inform him of *any other appointed mean* whereby the benefit may be received; but you assure him, since he *desires* to receive the Holy Communion, as the first rubric implies that he does, and is *unavoidably hindered*, as is implied in the rubric which follows, that *God accepts the will for the deed*, and gives him the spiritual grace without the outward sign or mean, of which he desires to avail himself, but cannot. He is not instructed to be satisfied with repentance and faith apart from the sacrament; but to believe, as the Church has ever taught, that while *we* are tied to the use of means, as wholesome exercises of our faith and obedience, *God's* grace is not restricted to any such external form, that *He* accepts us “according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.”

When the Bishop of Huron charges others with “setting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the reader in a light altogether different from that in which our Church teaches us to regard it,” he should be careful not to support his charge by arguments and illustrations which, to say the very least, expose himself to the same imputation.

On the application of the 6th chapter of St. John to the Eucharist I say nothing. I am satisfied that any competent tribunal will declare that it is not, at least, a question perfectly open; that a teacher is not to be distrusted, far less censured, for applying its language as I have done. The Bishop of Huron* takes notice of the fact that many Divines of the Church of Rome hold the interpretation which he regards as the sound one, (denying that the language of that chapter is capable of being applied

* In his letter to the Executive Committee of the Synod of the Diocese of Huron.

to the Eucharist;) but he says nothing of the probable reason for their adopting that interpretation, viz., that being applied to the Eucharist, *this chapter condemns both the doctrinal error of transubstantiation, and the practical error of withholding the cup from the laity.* The Bishop thinks proper to speak of the interpretation which I adopt as tending "towards the gulph in which so many have made shipwreck of the faith." (page 16.) How he can thus speak of an interpretation which only tends to connect Christ's ordinance with His promised blessing, in the way in which St. Paul has connected them, and to shew how a true faith will seek the blessing, is to me inconceivable.

VIII. GOOD THINGS LOST AT THE REFORMATION.

The Bishop of Huron says, (page 16,) "The Provost in his first letter (page 24 of his pamphlet) meets this, [namely, the statement that I had spoken to the students, either in lectures or in conversation, of the Church of England having lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good and tended to edification,] as he says, 'with a flat denial of its truth,' in plain English he pronounces it a falsehood; yet in his second letter, page 34, we find however the following passage:

"I have never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting 'the losses we sustained at the Reformation,' and there can be no possible colour for the charge, except it be that, in reading of admirable early usages, which our Reformers did not venture to restore, such as that mentioned by Justin Martyr, the conveyance of the consecrated elements to all sick members of the Church after every public celebration of the Eucharist, I have said that we might well regret that we possessed not this usage in our Church, but that our regret should be controlled by the remembrance that a necessary consequence of the grievous abuses which preceded the Reformation was to abridge our liberty and to deprive us of good things which might have been safely enjoyed in happier times."

On this the Bishop makes the following comment, (page

17) "It is not to be wondered at that students hearing such statements as the above should come to the conclusion that 'at the Reformation our Church lost some good things.' The Provost speaks of 'admirable usages' which our Reformers did not venture to restore, and he instances the conveyance of the consecrated elements to the sick after every public celebration of the Eucharist. Now this is a usage against which our Church in her rubric upon this subject and in her article specially protests. The Provost states that he had never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting losses sustained at the Reformation; and yet, by his own shewing, he teaches young men that they may 'well regret' that there are 'admirable early usages' which we do not now possess; and that in the Church of England we are now deprived of 'good things' which in happier times we might have enjoyed. Surely the tendency of this teaching must be to make the students dissatisfied with the Church of England as it now is, and to look with an eye of favour upon that Church which still retains those admirable usages, and in which those 'good things' are now enjoyed. The clergy of the Church of England are bound 'so to maintain the doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and realm hath received the same.' I cannot therefore but regard it as dangerous to lead young men to look back to the Church in the period before the Reformation as possessing 'admirable usages' which our Reformers could not venture to restore, and as then enjoying 'good things' of which we are now deprived."

This passage involves so many injurious statements that I must necessarily comment upon it at some length.

I pass over the unworthy attempt to make it appear that the denial contained in my first letter is inconsistent with the statement made in the second. Their entire consistency will be abundantly shewn in what I am about to state: but, at all events, it cannot be the same thing that I should have *made* a statement to others *in express terms*, and that *they should have drawn an inference to that effect from something else* that I said.

I. First, then, in connexion with this subject the Bishop of Huron reminds us very solemnly that the Clergy of the Church of England are bound "so to minister the doctrine, and Sacraments, and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same." If this appeal to the language of our Ordination Service is, in any way pertinent to the subject of which the Bishop treats, it must imply either that I have in my own practice slighted this sacred obligation, or that I have taught others to slight it. I trust, on the contrary, that I am deeply sensible of this obligation generally; and, in the particular instance before us, I have ever been careful strictly to obey the rule of the Church, and to impress on others the duty of obedience. I have kept in mind that the rubric respecting the consecrated elements, to which the Bishop of Huron refers, was intended to check "both superstition and irreverence," * and I have considered myself bound to observe it to the letter, and to inculcate its strict observance on others. Had I not done so I freely admit that I should have deserved, as a minister of the Church of England, every imputation of disloyalty and unfaithfulness to my trust which the Bishop of Huron is at present seeking to fasten upon me.

II. But, secondly, the Bishop of Huron speaks of "a Church which still retains these admirable usages, on which the students will be taught to look with favour." His object, no doubt, is to identify the custom of the second century, which provided that, immediately after every public celebration of the Lord's Supper, the elements should be conveyed to all absent members of the Church, with the custom of the Church of Rome to reserve the Eucharist from day to day, and to convey it, if required, to the sick or dying. I can only say that I see no kind of moral resemblance between the one custom and the other. The Church of Rome, at least since she assumed her distinctive features, has not been very careful to administer the Communion either to sick or whole. Before the Reformation in

* See quotation from Bishop Burnet, page 68.

England she required every lay member to receive *once in the year*, and one of the demands of the Western rebels, in the reign of Edward VI., was as follows: "We will have the Sacrament of the altar but at Easter delivered to the lay people." The Church of Rome reserves the elements not *for*, but *from*, the purpose for which they were used in the time of Justin Martyr, viz., the carrying them to the sick immediately after the public celebration; and none but a most prejudiced mind could conceive that admiration of the care with which the Church of the second century provided for the *weekly* communion of her sick members, would induce me to look with favour, or to teach others to look with favour, on a church, of which, with the permission of the Bishop of Huron, I must assert that it does *not* "still retain these admirable usages."

III. But, thirdly, the Bishop adds, "I cannot therefore but regard it as dangerous to lead young men to look back to the Church in the period before the Reformation as possessing admirable usages which our Reformers could not venture to restore."

It is hard, indeed, to believe that the most careless perusal of my words could leave on any man's mind the impression which the Bishop represents them as calculated, if not designed, to convey. Could our Reformers possibly *restore* a usage which *existed* in their own time and country? Yet I speak of a usage which they did not venture to *restore*. If the Bishop's insinuations were just, I should have used the word *retain*. And how could the Church *lose* at the Reformation, in my apprehension, a usage which my own language clearly shews I did not believe it to *have possessed* at the time the Reformation was brought about? The case stands as follows: I read with the students a writing of the *second* century; this writing mentions a usage *of that time*, which I admit to be admirable; and I am forthwith charged with leading young men to "look back to the Church *in the period before the Reformation*." If I were disposed to deal with the Bishop of Huron as he has dealt with me, I might say that this phrase is aptly chosen to imply an unfounded state-

ment without directly making it: all I do say is, that it is calculated grievously to mislead. I still hope, however, that even the most unlearned will be capable of understanding that the second century is not the sixteenth, nor even the sixth.

The usage of which Justin Martyr speaks soon disappeared. I do not know that it is mentioned by any other writer: the removal of the consecrated elements from the Church for purposes less closely in conformity with the sacred end for which they were designed, was forbidden by the council of Laodicea, A.D. 367, and by the council of Saragossa, A.D. 380.

It is hard, indeed, if we are to be censured for regretting that difficulties have been thrown in the way of the maintenance or of the revival of any usage characteristic of primitive love and obedience, either by the puerilities of earlier days or by the grosser superstitions of later times. If, however, such a censure be just, the compilers of our Prayer Book have exposed themselves to a like censure in the opening of the Communion Service. We there find the following words: "Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was *a godly discipline*, that at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, &c.,—instead whereof, (until the said discipline *may be restored again, which is much to be wished,*") &c.

Be it observed, too, that it is one thing to *regret that there were good reasons for not restoring* an early godly usage, and another thing to *wish for its restoration*. The latter feeling is more liable to be misconstrued, as betokening an impatient spirit; and the words of this service of our Church are accordingly more open to the imputation of disaffection, unfair as it would undoubtedly be, than any words which I have ever used.

I may also remark that the "happier times" to which I referred in that extract from my letters on which the Bishop of Huron's objections are founded, are the *primitive* times, of which the Communion Service speaks, not, as the Bishop would insinuate, the "merry days," as

people called them, immediately preceding the Reformation of our own Church.

IV. But, fourthly, the Bishop of Huron has stated that the conveyance of the consecrated elements to the sick, after every public celebration of the Eucharist, is a usage "against which our Church in her rubric upon this subject, and in her article, specially protests." Does the Church make any such protest either in the Rubric or in the Article? I am prepared to show that she does not.

(1) *The Rubric.*—The Rubric to which the Bishop of Huron refers I suppose to be the following: "And if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." This rubric forbids the removal of the elements *absolutely*, and, no doubt, thus precludes their being removed for the purpose of administering them to the sick, but it says *nothing* either in commendation or disapproval of that custom in particular.

Suppose a man to be very ill, and to be absolutely forbidden by his medical attendant to leave the house, suppose that this prohibition prevents his visiting a dying mother, would it be honest to represent the physician as having "specially protested" against this act of filial duty under ordinary circumstances? Yet I beg to submit that the two cases are strictly parallel. If therefore the rubric above recited *were* found in either of the Prayer Books of King Edward VI., or in that of Queen Elizabeth, or in that of James I., we might still have argued fairly, not only that it contained no *special protest* against the usage of which Justin Martyr speaks, but also that there was no reason whatever for supposing it to condemn the usage *by implication*; inasmuch as the Church had in those days other most sufficient grounds for the prohibition, in the various superstitious uses to which the elements were applied both by priests and people.

But, in order to understand the matter clearly, we must

trace the *history* of the rubrics. In the 1st book of King Edward VI., put forth in 1549, the second rubric before the service for the Communion of the Sick reads thus: "And if the same day there be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, as shall serve the sick person and so many as communicate with him (if there be any.)" And, in the injunctions put forth by royal authority in the same year, the thirteenth is as follows: "Item.—That, going to the sick with the Sacrament, the minister shall not have with him either lights or bells." (Cardwell's Doc. Ann. Vol. I., p. 76.)

The *rubric* then shews that liberty was at that time given, larger than that which I have ventured to approve as described by Justin Martyr, inasmuch as the elements might be reserved to be conveyed to the sick *at any time* on the same day, and not only *immediately after* the public service; the *injunction* shows the apprehension which was felt as to *one mode at least* in which this liberty might be abused.

It may be observed that Martin Bucer the Reformer, to whose judgment the first Book of Common Prayer was submitted, made no objection to this rubric; and that Peter Martyr, his companion in exile, and Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in expressing to him his difference with him on this point, still urges no other objection against the rubric than that it hindered the edification which the sick man might derive from having the whole Communion Service celebrated in his presence. So that neither of these Reformers, nor any of those by whom Edward's first book was prepared, objected to the practice as being *in itself* Popish or superstitious. (For P. Martyr's letter to Bucer, see Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, Vol. II. p. 899.)

In the second book of Edward VI., put forth in 1552, this rubric was withdrawn: and the reasonable conclusion is, either that the *injunction* quoted above had not been observed, or that the liberty allowed opened the door to practices to which an ill-instructed and superstitious clergy

were, as the next reign proved, still very strongly attached. The instruction was therefore given that the minister should use in private the public form, which of course implied the consecration of the elements in the sick man's presence.

But when was the rubric referred to by the Bishop of Huron introduced into our Prayer Book? Not in the height of the Reformation, when Popery and superstition were the great dangers, but at the last review in 1662, and it was derived from the Scottish Liturgy, drawn up by Archbishop Laud in the reign of Charles I. It will hardly be disputed that Archbishop Laud, as well as the revisers of our Liturgy at the restoration of Charles II., dreaded Puritanism even more than Popery, and, accordingly, if we are to be guided by a reference to the "*animus imponentis*" in this case, we must conclude that the main object of the rubric was to check irreverence rather than superstition, at all events rather to prevent the consecrated elements being thrown to dogs, than to denounce their being conveyed to the sick. Dr. Cardwell (Hist. of Conferences on the Book of Common Prayer, p. 392) says: "Of the corrections in Mr. Sancroft's book, [a book containing in MS. the results of the revision,] which would seem to belong to the *Laudian school of Theology*, the following are specimens: *the rubric respecting the consecrated elements which remain after distribution,*" &c.

(2) So much for the rubric; we will now turn to the Article.

The XXVth Article says: "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them." The XXVIIIth Article says: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped."

I conceive that the Bishop of Huron would imply that the expressions "reserved" and "carried about" in these Articles, contain a "special protest" against the "early usage" which I have ventured to approve. I trust that I can clearly prove the contrary.

What did "*reservation*" mean? The Devonshire rebels

of 1549 will tell us. They say in their demands: "We will have the Sacrament hang over the high altar, and there to be worshipped as it was wont to be." (Cranmer's Works, Jenkyns, Vol. II., p. 218.) Hence we may reasonably infer what corrupt practice of the times was in the mind of the compilers of our Articles when they spoke of the Sacrament being "*reserved*."

But Cranmer will tell us yet more distinctly what *he* understood by reservation, in his replies to a series of questions addressed to the Bishops in 1548 concerning some abuses of the mass.

Question 10 is as follows: When the reservation of the Sacrament, and the hanging up of the same first began?

To which the Archbishop of Canterbury replies: "The reservation of the Sacrament began, I think, six or seven hundred years after Christ; the hanging up, I think, began of late time." (Burnet, Hist. of Ref., Vol. I., Part I., p. 114. Part II., p. 206.)

It is therefore clear that Cranmer did not consider that this objectionable custom had originated until centuries after the time of Justin Martyr: that he had no thought of branding the practice, mentioned by Justin, of conveying the elements to the sick, as being identical with the "reservation" which the English Church condemns.

Again, in his defence of the true doctrine of the Sacrament, Cranmer says:

"For Innocentius the Third, one of the most wicked men that ever was in the see of Rome, did ordain and decree that the Host should be diligently kept under lock and key. And Honorius the Third not only confirmed the same, but commanded also that the priests should diligently teach the people, from time to time, that when they lifted up the bread called the Host, the people should then reverently bow down, and that likewise they should do so, when the priest carrieth the Host unto sick folks." (Cranmer's Works, Jenkyns, Vol. II., p. 445.)

Here we see what Cranmer understood both by "reservation" and "carrying about," and the late origin which he

assigned to the prevalence of these practices under papal sanction: referring it, in both instances, to the beginning of the 13th century.

What does Burnet say? "The ancients thought it more decent, and suitable to the Communion of Saints, to consecrate the elements only in the church, and to send portions to the sick, thereby expressing their communion with the rest." (Hist. of the Reform., Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 144.)

Would a writer like Burnet, who is by many regarded as an ultra Protestant, speak thus of a usage against which our Church in her formularies had "specially protested?"

Again, Burnet says:

"Therefore, instead of consecrating a larger portion of elements than is necessary for the occasion, and the reserving what is over and above; and the setting that out with great pomp on the altar, to be worshipped, or the carrying it about with a vast magnificence in a procession, invented to put the more honour on it; or the sending it to the sick with solemnity; we choose rather to consecrate only so much as may be judged fit for the number of those who are to communicate. And when the Sacrament is over, we do, in imitation of the practice of some of the ancients, consume what is left, that there may be no occasion given either to superstition or irreverence." (Articles. Art. XXVIII., p. 412, Lond., 1840.)

Here Bishop Burnet shows that, in his apprehension, the reservation to be objected to is that whose object is to surround the elements with magnificence and make them objects of worship, and the former extract shews that he regarded with respect the usage of the ancients in sending the communion to the sick; indeed he afterwards states, as the reason why our Reformers ultimately adopted the rule of private consecration of the elements, "that they might avoid the pomp of vain processions on the one hand, and the indecencies of sending the sacrament by common hands on the other;" which is equivalent to saying that their judgment in this matter was governed, not by any objection which they entertained against the ancient usage *in itself*,

but by the desire to escape circumstantial and accidental abuses which had been connected with it.

If we turn to Bishop Jewel, he will tell us what *he* understands by "carrying about." He says, "We justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the Word of God, without the authority of the holy fathers, *without any example of antiquity, after a new guise*, do not only set before the people the Sacramental bread to be worshipped as God, but do also carry the same upon an ambling palfrey, whithersoever themselves journey." (Jewel's Apology, chap. XV., div. 1. Works, Vol. IV., p. 24, Vol. V., p. 182.)

To be "reserved" signifies to be reserved in the church or out of it, in order to be used for superstitious purposes, or to be worshipped; to be "carried about," signifies to be borne in solemn procession, and gazed on as a present Deity.

Is there, then, any ground to affirm that in our Articles the conveying of the elements to the sick *without pomp or solemnity* is "specially protested against"?

But further, Bishop Jewel, one of the leading champions of the Reformation, in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1559, quotes the passage from Justin Martyr, *including the clause which mentions the conveying of the elements to the absent*, with the view of contrasting the mode of celebrating the Eucharist in primitive times with Romish corruptions. "Here," he adds, "also we find a communion, but no private mass." Can we think that he would have quoted words, without a caution or a hint of disapproval, which described a custom against which his own church had entered its "special protest"? He quotes the same passage from Justin twice in his reply to Harding, and in the latter case, directs especial attention to this clause: "In Justin's mass," he says, "a portion was sent to the absent: in M. Harding's mass there is no portion delivered, no not unto the present." (Jewel's works by Jelf, Vol. I., pp. 24 and 25, 178, 237.)*

* Bishop Jewel's "Reply to Harding" appeared in August, 1565, two years after the Articles of Queen Elizabeth had been published by Royal authority. The Articles of Edward VI. use precisely the same language

In the year 1560, Queen Elizabeth issued letters patent (see Cardwell's *Docum. Annals*, Vol. I., p. 280) for the preparation of a Latin translation of the Book of Common Prayer, for the use of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the schools of Eton and Winchester. In this book the rubric of Edw. VIth's first Prayer Book, directing the consecrated elements to be conveyed from the church to the sick, if there were a public communion on the same day, was *restored*. On the subject of this rubric, L'Estrange observes, "This rubric therefore being so consonant to antiquity, and passing the censure of Bucer without the least reproof, had a fair plea for its continuation, had not the Eucharist so reserved been abused by superstitious carrying it about in solemn procession; and the habitual adoration frequented in the Roman practice, moved our Reformers to expunge it." He then notes the restoration of the Rubric in the Latin Prayer Book, and adds, "Now this translation being framed particularly for those learned societies, they might be the better trusted with the elements reserved, upon a rational presumption that the greater light they enjoyed, the less prone and disposed would they be to error and superstition." (L'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices*, pp. 451, 452.)

The testimonies which I have adduced from Cranmer and Jewel, the letters patent of Queen Elizabeth, and the language of Burnet, are but in accordance with the known principles of the Reformation in England. Its authors would indeed have been slow to enter their "special protest" against a usage known to have been general in the Christian Church *fifty years after the death of St. John*, for such is the date of Justin's first apology. The instructions given to the commission appointed to draw up the first English Prayer Book were that they should "draw an order of Divine Worship, having respect to the pure religion of

which has been quoted above, from the XXVth and XXVIIIth Articles, respecting superstitious uses of the consecrated elements. These Articles had been put forth seven years before the date of Jewel's sermon, which was a challenge sermon, preached three times, first at Paul's Cross, November 26th, 1559, and twice before the Court, March 17th and 31st, 1560. To this sermon Harding published an answer in 1563 or 1564.

Christ taught in the Scripture, *and to the practice of the Primitive Church.*" In the preface the compilers say, "here you have an order for Prayer, and for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, *much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers.*" The service for the ordering of Deacons, the XXIVth Article, and the Communion Service also refer us to ancient authors and the custom of the Primitive Church.

The reforming Commissioners, accordingly, attempted to restore the usage of the Primitive Church in respect of conveying the consecrated elements to the sick, and it was only after their experience that even this usage would, in the then state of men's minds, be abused to superstition, that they thought it best to abolish it. But it was afterwards restored for the benefit of those who were considered not likely to abuse it.

The Bishop of Huron says, "that the tendency of this teaching is to make the students dissatisfied with the Church of England," that is, that if I venture, in any particular, in which it differs from our own, to commend the practice of the Primitive Church, which the Church of England proposes as her model, I am disloyal to her and teach others to be so: that if I see her, urged by the sad necessity of the time, withdraw privileges granted by herself in imitation of ancient usage, and express my regret that she was compelled to do so, I am disloyal. Thus interpreted, loyalty would become identified with a blind and servile subjection, which, I am satisfied, our Church has never exacted, and which her best and truest sons could never have yielded.

I have answered this charge at great length, because an attempt has been made to prove, not only that I have expressed and inculcated disaffection to existing laws of the Church, but also that I have commended, as good and excellent, usages against which our Church has "specially protested." These groundless statements are easily made, but it is a work of time and labour to show how utterly groundless they are, how absolutely they are uncontrolled by any regard to the history of our Church or of her Formularies.

I emphatically deny the truth of both the positions which the Bishop of Huron has sought to establish; my convictions and my feelings alike revolt from either of the acts imputed to me; any thing which I may have said to the students has had no other purpose than to reconcile them to differences between the usages of the Church, in her best and purest ages, and in our own—differences which are inevitably brought before them in studying the history of the primitive church, to which our own Church refers us as her great authority next to Holy Scripture. It has been my honest endeavour to prove how little they, who undutifully repine at these differences, can have weighed either the serious difficulties with which our forefathers had to contend, or the priceless benefits which, by the blessing of God, their labours and sufferings secured to us.

In his next page the Bishop travels again over general charges, of which he had already disposed, and to which I need not revert. I will merely observe that I *can* quote, at least, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooker (at large,) Calvin, and Baxter for what the Bishop of Huron calls “a system of sacramental salvation.” I must however invite attention to the Bishop’s quotation from Bishop Burnet, (page 18.) It begins in the middle of a paragraph; I will give the whole, pointing out where the Bishop’s quotation begins.

“But there are two more material differences between us: it is a tenet in the Church of Rome, that the use of the sacraments, if men do not put a bar to them, and if they have only imperfect acts of sorrow accompanying them, does so far complete those weak acts as to *justify* us. This we do utterly deny, as a doctrine which tends to enervate all religion; and to make the sacraments, that were appointed to be the solemn acts of religion, for quickening and exciting our piety, and for conveying grace to us upon our coming devoutly to them, become means to flatten and deaden us; as if they were of the nature of charms, which if they could be come at, though with ever so slight a preparation, would make up all defects.”

Now follows the quotation made by the Bishop of Huron:

"The doctrine of Sacramental Justification is justly to be reckoned among the most mischievous of all those practical errors that are in the Church of Rome. Since, therefore, this is nowhere mentioned in all those large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it: since also the natural consequence of this doctrine is to make men rest contented in low imperfect acts, when they can so easily be made up by a sacrament, we have just reason to detest it as one of the depths of Satan;" (here the Bishop of Huron closes his quotation,* but Burnet continues,) "the tendency of it being to make those ordinances of the Gospel, which were given us as means to raise and heighten our faith and repentance, become engines to encourage sloth and negligence."

In this passage Bishop Burnet defines, in very marked terms, the doctrine which he reprobates, but his definition is omitted by the Bishop of Huron. It is obviously unsuited to his purpose. I have never held or taught that doctrine of Sacramental Justification which Burnet describes. I should deprecate, quite as strongly as this writer does, any teaching respecting the Sacraments, which would lead men to regard them "as if they were of the nature of charms," and "would make up all defects, if they could be come at, though with ever so slight a preparation."

I would refer the Bishop of Huron to Hooker, (Book v., chapter lvii., sec. 2, 3, & 4,) as representing my opinion on this subject. The passage is too long to cite in full, I will therefore only quote from sec. 4 the following words: "Seeing therefore that grace is a consequent of sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from God Himself the author of sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them, it may be hereby both understood that sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life, because they con-

* In the MS. laid before the Corporation and now printed by their order: but in the Bishop's printed pamphlet the words which follow are added.

tain *in themselves* no vital force or efficacy, they are not physical but *moral* instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable."

This is the doctrine which I hold and teach respecting the efficacy of the sacraments ; it differs very widely from that which Bishop Burnet condemns, and although it may not be more acceptable than that doctrine to the Bishop of Huron, he should at least be careful, if he censures me, to censure me for that which I avow, not for that which I repudiate.

I do not know that there is anything more in the Bishop of Huron's paper which calls for a reply. He does indeed propose to me a hard task when he challenges me to show (page 17) that Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, Hooker, Ussher, Calvin, and Baxter taught, what he is pleased to call "my system" as a whole. My system is, so far as I am able to understand the matter, the system of the Church of England, and it must be well known to the Bishop of Huron that such of the great men above named as belonged to her communion, did not all view her system under the same aspect, and that such of them as were beyond her pale strongly dissented from that system on many points.

The Bishop also speaks of my having quoted these great names as authorities, on "some, perhaps, minor points." I must observe in reply that I have quoted none of them except on points which the Bishop has urged against me as matter of serious accusation, and I think that the effect of my quotations is to show that they who object to my teaching on those points, have fallen in doctrine not only below the ordinary standard of teaching in the Church itself, but even below the Puritans and Presbyterians of earlier days.

I might, not without good reason, complain of the *form* in which the Bishop has stated his accusations. They are not distinctly and methodically proposed ; so far are they from being so that I have been left, in several instances, to conjecture what it was which the Bishop intended to except against. Again, the same charge is repeatedly advanced in different terms, and with new modifications, and this cir-

cumstance has obliged me to reply at far greater length than I should otherwise have done.

It cannot be supposed that I view with indifference the attempt which has been made to impress, not so much on the members of the Corporation as on the public at large, the persuasion that I hold and teach opinions inconsistent with my position in the Church of England and with the character of an honest man, but I forbear to enlarge on this painful subject, trusting that the truth will ultimately come to light, and assured, in the meantime, of the confidence and sympathy of the great majority of those to whom this exculpatory statement is primarily addressed.

NOTE (A.)—PAGE 24.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES ON THE PERPETUAL VIRGINITY.

(1) "The last words of the chapter (St. Matth. I.) are added for the future clearness concerning the purity of His birth. But denying for the time before, which was to the present purpose, affirms nothing at all for the time after, as is evident by abundant instances of this manner of speech, where *until* goes no further than the named term any way, yea, does rather import the perpetuity of what it speaks; as Gen. xxviii. 15. "For I will not leave thee *until I have done that* which I have spoken to thee of," &c.; and Isaiah xxii. 14. "Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you, *till ye die*;" which yet hath not been alleged, for any thing I know, for a purgatory after death." (Archbishop Leighton, Lect. on the first nine chapters of St. Matth. Gospel. Works, Vol. III. pp. 4, 5, London, 1825.)

(2) "We receive not your upstart suppositious traditions, nor unwritten fundamentals: but we admit genuine, universal, Apostolical traditions; as the Apostles' Creed—the *perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God*—the anniversary Festivals of the Church—the Lenten Fast, (yet we know that both the duration of it, and the manner of observing it, was very different in the primitive times.)"

(Archbishop Bramhall. Answer to the Epistle of M. De La Milletierre. Works, Vol. I., p. 53, Oxford, 1842.)

(3) "But they should know that this is no point of Christian faith, That she was a Virgin before, in, and after the birth of Christ, we are bound to believe as an article of our faith, and so much is delivered in Scripture. and in the Apostles' Creed: but that she continued so ever after, is a seemly truth, delivered unto us by the Church of God, fitting the sanctity of the blessed Virgin, and the honour due to so sanctified a vessel of Christ's Incarnation, as her body was: and so is *de pietate*, but not *de necessitate fidei*, as the school-men use to speak. Neither was Helvidius condemned of heresy, for the denial hereof, but because pertinaciously he urged the denial of it, upon misconstruction of Scripture, as if the denial of it had been a matter of faith."

(Field on the Church, p. 376, Oxford, 1628.)

NOTE (B.)—PAGE 25.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES ON THE INTERCESSION OF SAINTS.

(1) "As touching the saints in heaven, I said, they be not our mediators by way of redemption; for so Christ alone is our mediator and theirs both: so that the blood of martyrs hath nothing to do by way of redemption; the

blood of Christ is enough for a thousand worlds, &c. But by way of intercession, so saints in heaven may be mediators, and pray for us : as I think they do when we call not upon them ; for they be charitable and need no spurs."

(Articles imputed to Latimer, Remains of Latimer.
Parker Society's edition, p. 234.)

(2) M. Quum tamen caritas piorum animis nunquam excidat, etiam in cœlo versantes solliciti sunt de nobis, et salutem nostram expetunt.

A. Id vero negari non potest ; non tamen sequitur a nobis proinde esse invocandos, nisi putemus amicorum, quamvis longe absentium, tantum quod nobis bene velint opem atque auxilium esse implorandum.

(Noelli Catechismus, p. 122, Oxford, 1844.)

(3) "Indeed, the Protestants say, as Bellarmin grants, that the saints pray for us ; but, only in a generality."

(Bishop Hall. No peace with Rome. Works.
Vol. IX., p. 69, London, 1808.)

(4) "Aristotle said, that to affirm the dead take no thought for the good of the living, is a disparagement to the laws of that friendship, which, in their state of separation, they cannot be tempted to rescind. And the church hath taught in general, that they pray for us, they recommend to God the state of all their relatives, in the union of the intercession that our blessed Lord makes for them and us ; and St. Ambrose gave some things in charge to his dying brother Satyrus, that he should do for him in the other world : he gave it to him, I say, when he was dying, not when he was dead. And certain it is, that, though our dead friends' affection to us is not to be estimated according to our low conceptions, yet it is not less, but much more than ever it was ; it is greater in degree, and of another kind."

(Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Works, Vol. VI., p. 461, London, 1822.)

(5) "We do sometimes meet in ancient authors with the intercession of saints in general, which we also acknowledge."

(Archbishop Bramhall. Works, Vol. I., p. 38, Oxford, 1842.)

(6) "We do not deny that the saints in heaven pray for us that are here upon earth, because they may do so for any thing we know ; but that they do so, is more than can be proved, either by clear testimony of scripture, or by any convincing argument from reason, and therefore no doctrine or practice can be safely grounded upon it."

(Tillotson's Works, Vol. II., p. 121, folio, London, 1752.)

I quote this testimony from Tillotson, because it may serve to show that, little as he is inclined to adopt the opinion in question, he is not, at least, to be reckoned among "the many able divines," of whom the Bishop of Huron speaks, "who regard this opinion not only as unwarranted by the word of God, but repugnant to it as a vain conceit, and derogatory to the Redeemer's glory."

(7) "How the saints departed maintain communion with us, we cannot tell. Probable it is, that they do, in general, pray for us, as it is certain they wish well to us."

(Archbishop Wake on the Church Catechism, under Com. of Saints.)

(8) That the spirits in Paradise pray for those whom they have left behind, I cannot doubt, since I cannot suppose that they cease to love us there."

(Bishop Heber's letter to Miss Stowe, on the death of her brother. See Bp. Heber's Life.)

(9) "It is said by Roman Catholics that departed Christians pray for those that are left. It is not impossible; I do not see any thing unscriptural in the idea that saints that are in heaven may pray in heaven for those they have left upon earth. I do not assert that it is so, because the scripture does not: but I do not see any thing impossible in it."

(Dr. Cumming's Lect. on Miracles, chap. 15, p. 285.)

It has been suggested to me that some of my authorities are not so well known as they deserve to be, and that it may be useful to shew that they are not mere names, belonging to the literary history of the Church of England, but approved and valued writers. I avail myself of this suggestion in respect of one writer, whom I quoted in my second letter, under the head to which this note relates—Dr. Richard Crakanthorp, author of a "Defence of the Church of England, against the calumnies of M. Antony de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro."

Anthony Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, II., 362, edit. Bliss, says:

"This book was held for the most exact book of controversy since the Reformation."

Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, in his *Remains*, p. 86, says:

"No book I have yet seen has so rational and short an account of almost all popish controversies."

Dr. Ward, from whom I quote largely elsewhere, says, in writing to Ussher, then Bishop of Meath: "I suppose your lordship hath seen the process against the corpse, picture, and books of the Archbishop of Spalatro. Unwise man that could not easily have presaged these things. By halting between two, he hath much obscured his worth with all parties. *I have perused some of Dr. Crakanthorp's book, which is well done.*"

(Ussher's Works, Vol. XV., pp. 268, 269.)

NOTE (C).—PAGE 48.

"This is therefore the necessity of Sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of His whole Church, by Sacraments He severally deriveth into every member thereof. Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose, moral instruments, the use whereof is in our hands, the effect in His; for the use

we have His express commandment, for the effect His conditional promise : so that without our obedience to the one, there is of the other no apparent assurance, as contrariwise where the signs and sacraments of His grace are not either through contempt unreceived, or received with contempt, we are not to doubt but that they really give what they promise and are what they signify. For we take not baptism nor the eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify."

(Hooker. Book V., chapter LVII., § 5.)

"Here (viz., St. Mark xvi. 16, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,') the word *saved* amounts to the same thing in the main with *justified*, being opposed to *condemned*: and it is further observable, that the *believing* here must be understood of a *lively* faith; yet that *alone* is not said to *save*, or justify, but with the addition of *Baptism*: for whatever some may please to teach of *faith only* as *justifying*, the *exclusive term*, most certainly, is not to be understood in opposition, either to the *work* of the *Father*, or of the *Son*, or of the *Holy Ghost*; or to the standing *means* of conveyance which they have chosen. The warmest contenders for faith *alone* are content to admit that the exclusive term, *alone*, is opposed only to every thing else on *man's part* in *justifying*, not to any thing on *God's part*: now I have already noted that *Baptism* is an *instrument* in *God's* hand, who *bears his part* in it; and therefore *Baptism*, in this view, relates to *God's part* in justifying, and not to man's."

(Waterland on Justification. Works, Vol. VI., pp. 10 & 11, Oxf., 1843.)

NOTE (D.)—PAGE 51.

"My lord of Derry (Downham) is a worthy man, and whom I do much reverence; yet would I wish his Lordship to be well advised. I doubt not but the doctrine of perseverance may sufficiently be cleared, though we grant that all infants baptized be free from original guilt. The speech in Lombard, alleged as out of St. Augustine, "*Sacramenta in solis electis efficiunt quod figurant*," is no where to be found in St. Augustine. And if it were, yet it is to be understood as Lombard doth gloss it, otherwise Augustine should contradict himself, as is evident by the testimonies he there produceth out of Austin; and many more might be brought for remission of original sin in all baptized infants, out of him. I know most of our divines do make the principal end and effect of all sacraments to be ob-signatory, and all sacraments to be merely ob-signatory signs; and consequently that ablu-tion of infants from original sin, is only conditional and expectative, of which they have no benefit till they believe and repent; I cannot easily assent hereunto.

For so, 1. Infants baptized, dying in infancy, have no benefit by baptism. And all non-elect infants have no benefit at all, so that to both of these they are *nuda et inefficacia signa*.

2. What necessity of baptizing infants, if it produce no effect till years of discretion ?

3. Though our divines do most-what run upon obsignation, yet often they do expressly hold, that sacraments do offer and exhibit that grace which they signify, and as I conceive must needs offer and exhibit the grace which they signify, before they assure and confirm.

For God doth offer and exhibit grace promised in the sacrament; then we exercise our faith in relying upon God, promising, offering, and exhibiting on his part; and so according to the tenure of the covenant, receive the grace promised, and then sacraments in the second place do assure us of the grace received. And thus much is signified in the definition of a sacrament, in our short catechism, as I conceive, when it is said, "It is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

(Extract from a letter from Dr. Ward to the Archbishop of Armagh (Ussher). Ussher's Works by Elrington, Vol. XV., pp. 505, 506.)

Dr. Ward says, immediately before the passage quoted :

"I had heretofore thought upon the point somewhat, and my lord of Sarum (Davenant,) and myself, at Dort, had speech of it, when we signified in our judgment, that the case of infants was not appertaining to the question of perseverance. I considered also, that howsoever the Scripture sparingly speak of the effect of baptism in infants, yet there are general grounds, from the nature of sacraments, which may serve to inform and direct our judgments herein. Again, I considered the perpetual tradition of the Church is in no way to be slighted, where it doth not cross the scripture, but is consonant to general grounds contained in them."

(Ibid, pp. 504, 505.)

In another letter, addressed to the Bishop of Kilmore (Bedell) Dr. Ward states the same opinions in nearly the same words, quoting from Beza the saying, "Obsignari non potest, quod non habetur;" from Ursinus, "Sacramentum opus Dei est erga nos, in quo dat aliquid, scilicet, signa et res signatas, et in quo testatur et se nobis offerre ac dare sua beneficia;" and again, "Baptismus ac Cœna Domini sunt sacramenta, quia sunt opus Dei qui aliquid in iis nobis dat et se dare testatur." He then refers to Calvin Instit. Bk. IV., chap. 17, § 10, 11, and on I Cor. (chap. xi. 24,) and adds, "So that instrumental conveyance of the grace signified to the due receiver, is as true an effect of a sacrament, when it is administered, as obsignation, and is pre-existing in order of nature to obsignation. See more at large Mr. Hooker. (Bk. V., chap. 57, 59, 60, 64, and 67,) who, in my opinion, doth truly explicate the efficacy of sacraments."

(Ibid, p. 511.)

Archbishop Ussher also says in a letter to Ward, to which Ward evidently refers in his first, "You have done me a great pleasure in communicating unto me my lord of Salisbury and your own determination touching the efficacy of baptism in infants; for it is an obscure point, and such as I desire to be taught in by such as you are, rather than deliver mine own opinion thereof. My lord of Derry hath a book ready for the press, wherein he handleth at full length the controversy of perseverance, and the certainty of salvation. He there determineth that point of the efficacy of baptism far otherwise than you do: accommodating himself to the opinion more vulgarly received among us; to which he applieth sundry sentences out of St. Augustine; and among others that "*De Baptismo*:" "*Sacramenta in solis electis hoc vere efficiunt quod figurant.*"

(Ibid, p. 482.)

Dr. Ward in his "*Determinationes Theologicæ*," quoted in the text, speaks distinctly of "baptismal justification." His words are:

"It is further enquired, whether all infants rightly baptized are undoubtedly justified. Here some very learned theologians hesitate; inasmuch as they restrict this effect of justification from original sin to elect infants. We make two assertions—first, that all infants, rightly baptized, who die in their infancy, are unquestionably justified." * * * *

"This was our first assertion: our second is, that all infants, even those who are non-elect, and who will ultimately perish, if duly baptized in their infancy, are freed in Baptism from the guilt of original sin."

(*Determinationes Theologicæ*, pp. 50-53.)

Such were the opinions held by Ward and Davenant, and respectfully received by Ussher, with thanks, if not with full concurrence; at all events without remonstrance. These men lived when the Calvinistic party in the Church was stronger than it had been before, or has been since, and they all belonged to that party, though these extracts go to prove that Ward, and probably Davenant, were Augustinians rather than Calvinists, striving loyally to reconcile their private views of Predestination with the Catholic teaching of the Church on other points, not forcing Catholic truth to bend to their own theory.

NOTE (E.)—PAGE 54.

"Two special branches there be of this kingdom of our Lord and Saviour: the one of grace, whereby that part of the church is governed, which is militant upon earth; the other of Glory, belonging to that part which is triumphant in Heaven. Here upon earth, as by His prophetic office He worketh upon our mind and understanding, so by his kingly, He ruleth our will and affections: 'casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.' Where, as we must needs acknowledge, that 'it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do,' and that it is He which 'sanctifieth us wholly': so are we taught to believe,

‘both He who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one,’ namely, of one and the self-same nature, that the sanctifier might not be ashamed to call those, who are sanctified by him, his brethren, that as their nature was corrupted, and their blood tainted in the first Adam, so it might be restored again in the second Adam, and that as from the one a corrupt, so from the other a pure and undefiled nature might be transmitted unto the heirs of salvation. The same God that giveth grace, is He also that giveth glory: yet so, that the streams of both of them must run to us through the golden pipe of our Saviour’s humanity.’ ‘For since by man came death,’ it was fit that ‘by man also should come the resurrection of the dead.’ Even by that man who hath said, ‘Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life: and I will raise them up at the last day.’”

(Archbishop Ussher, On the Incarnation of the Son of God,
Works, by Elrington, Vol. IV., pp. 616, 617.)

NOTE (F.)

At page 12 of the Bishop of Huron’s objections, he cites a passage which I had quoted from Archbishop Secker, at page 66 of my pamphlet, and in so doing, where the Archbishop speaks of “the early writers of the Western Church,” he makes the following interpolation, “the early writers of the Western [*i. e.* the Papal] Church.”

Any reader of the “Objections” would naturally infer that the words between brackets form a part of the quotation; and even if they are understood to be an explanatory note, inserted by the Bishop of Huron, they either misrepresent the Archbishop’s meaning, by making him speak of writers who lived after the rise of the Papal power; or, by absolutely identifying the Western Church with the Papal Church, they concede that the claims of Rome were recognized long before they had been even advanced.

Tertullian in the second century, Cyprian in the third, St. Augustine at the beginning of the fourth, may be cited as “early writers of the Western Church” who use the word “Sacramentum” in the wide sense of which Archbishop Secker speaks; yet they all lived in times when the Papal authority, so far from being generally acknowledged, was not as yet asserted; and they all belonged to the African Church, which firmly resisted the undue pretensions, or boldly challenged the mistaken judgment, of individual occupants of the Roman See. Of this both Cyprian and Augustine furnish signal instances, the former in his dispute with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, the latter in the Pelagian controversy. When Archbishop Secker speaks of “the early writers of the Western Church, he means the *Latin* Church, the writers of which could alone have employed the word “sacramentum” at all. The effect of the interpolation of the Bishop of Huron is to represent the *primitive* use of this word as a *Romanist* abuse of it.

Again, at page 11, the Bishop of Huron speaks of Gregory the Great, under the title of *Pope* Gregory, a designation which would be equally applicable to any one of sixteen Bishops of that name, including Hildebrand.

Gregory the Great, whose Christian compassion for our heathen ancestors we would not willingly forget, lived in the sixth century ; and, although he may be styled Pope in the original sense of that title, he does not deserve to be classed among those who, under that title, have claimed a spiritual sovereignty over the universal Church. So far from this, Gregory the Great vehemently protested against John, Patriarch of Constantinople, for desiring the name of Universal Bishop, and pronounced such an assumption a proof that he who made it was *the forerunner of Antichrist*. "None," says he, "of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a word ; because, if one patriarch is called universal, the name of patriarch is taken away from the rest."

(Gregor. Magn. Epist., vii., 33, and v., 43.)
