

STATEMENT
OF
SOME OF THE CAUSES
WHICH HAVE LED TO THE
LATE DISSENTION
IN THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
IN THE CITY OF SAINT JOHN.

BY THE REV. R. B. WIGGINS, A. M.

SAINT JOHN, N. B.

PRINTED BY HENRY CHUBB & COMPANY.
PRINCE WILLIAM-STREET.

1851.

STATEMENT.

THE idea must often strike a thoughtful and intelligent mind, that the interest felt for the subject of Religion is vastly out of proportion to Religion itself. Men know and feel that they are dying creatures, and they are told, moreover, that some are going down to everlasting torments ; and yet no one thinks of applying this frightful truth to himself.

And *why* is this ? It is *no* answer to say that people feel no concern about Spiritual things. They do feel concerned about Spiritual things, for all men are concerned for their own interests, and especially for their Eternal interests. The mere natural man would be willing to surrender every earthly good if he *felt* it to be necessary, on the absolute condition and *certainty* of eternal happiness, just as he is *now* willing to toil and suffer for a part of his life here, in the mere *hope* of rendering the closing part happy and comfortable.

What then *is* the answer to the question ? The answer is, that men are *taught* that they shall all go to Heaven, *as it is !* Is there any person walking through the streets, who thinks that *he* shall go to Hell ? And as each one thinks *thus* of himself, it follows that *all* expect to go to Heaven !

Now *how* could this impression prevail among men, except it were *taught* to them ? They must imbibe it from others ; and the question is, how came such an impression ever to prevail ? It is not merely because it is agreeable that it prevails ; for not all things that are agreeable to the mind of man are believed *certainly* to happen.

But how is such an idea taught to man ? It cannot be taught to them in the case of earthly things. Men cannot be taught that power, and honour, and affluence, and ease, will come to them, merely because they wish to receive these benefits. *Means* thereto are felt to be necessary ; and, in all such cases, there is found to be a strict relationship between cause and effect.

Now in Religion, this relationship has been dispensed with. A scheme has been invented, by which a man may go to

Heaven, by a *mental* process! He may be "justified" in an instant; and his Spiritual nature which was before dark and deformed, suddenly becomes as bright, and as beautiful as an angel's!

Upon this principle men feel *quite safe*! They hope to be "justified" before they die; they admit that Religion is essential to their final happiness; they think it too *good* a thing to be enjoyed before; and the practical working of the system is, that men are hoping to go to *that* Heaven hereafter, for which the whole tendency of their life *here* utterly unfits them.

To support this system of Religion, men have invented the Doctrine of Three Gods; that is, of three separate Beings, each of which differs, in character, from the others!

This doctrine teaches that the *Father* is arbitrary and severe; the *Son*, placable and kind; and the *Holy Spirit*, the Messenger to carry out the will of the Father and Son together. And the system, founded upon this doctrine is, that the sins of man are committed against the Father alone; that the Son pays the debt; and that the Holy Spirit conveys the message, in consequence, to the mind of the sinner!

The difficulty in supporting such a system as this, is apparent. It divides the Divine Essence, and it confounds the attributes of God. If the debt has been paid to the Father, there is no mercy on His part, in forgiving it. And if the Son is *equal* to the Father, He can no more forgive the debt than the Father can forgive it; for the sins of man are committed *equally* against them both. And the Holy Spirit in this view, becomes a God with no attributes at all! Thus one Divine Being goes out of himself to atone to another Divine Being; while *mercy*, the crowning attribute of God, is rejected and denied; the character of God is thus rendered arbitrary and severe, and the Lord Himself is made inferior to God. This is the scheme that *man* has made; and it was invented to save him from the necessity of forsaking his sins; while the blessed Saviour is made the mere victim to pay the debt:—If the debt has been paid, the sinner says, I can sin on, and he does sin on in consequence of this very system; there is enough to pay it all at last; an Infinite sacrifice is an Infinite pardon; he can wipe off the whole debt when he comes to die! These men feel *quite safe*: they are virtually taught that salvation is possible at *any* time; and the consequence is that all men expect to be saved.

Open the Gospel pages, and this whole scheme of modern *Idolatry*, vanishes at once. There is *One Lord*; and Jesus is the Lord, (Zech. xiv. 9.) *In the beginning was the Word and the Word was God*. He created all things. Of Himself he declares—*before Abraham was I am. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; I and the Father are One*. And after he ceased to be seen of men with their *bodily* eyes, He declared—*I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*. Here is, throughout, unity and oneness in the Deity; the unseen Father dwelling in Him, and from Him proceeding the Holy Ghost. The Father of the Lord Jesus Christ was the Divine Principle *in* himself; the Holy Spirit was the Divine Principle *from* himself. The *Human* of the Lord was conceived from the Infinite *Esse* or Being (Isaiah ix. 6); and it was glorified successively on Earth till by the Passion of the Cross, it became *One* with that *Esse*. After this, and *not* before, the Holy Spirit was given from the glorified Humanity, which *then* for ever was the all in all of Heaven; *The Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified*. This is the view of the Holy Trinity taught by the Lord to His disciples before He left the World. *All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. I am with you always; teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, baptizing them in the name (not names) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Accordingly they baptized, in all cases, in the *name* of the Lord Jesus, as containing, within it, the names of the Incomprehensible Trinity. The Father dwelt in Him from conception: and in adaptation to human ignorance, He was therefore called the *Son* of God. (Luke i. 35.) The soul of the Lord Jesus was the Almighty;* and in accordance with this view, He forgave sins in his own name; (Luke v. 21) gave laws for the government of the Universe; exercised all the attributes of the Deity; and is represented as executing judgment according to his own absolute decisions.

This Gospel view of the Deity does away with that dreadful feature of *wrath* so fully portrayed in the systems of Religion that man has made; a feature which not only increases

*The Rector of Trinity Church declared in his Sermon on Sunday morning, the 12th of January, that the *Soul* of the blessed Saviour was *Human*! It might have been said from inadvertence; but it is rather singular that one who is so particular in guarding his people from heresy should be guilty of heresy himself. This doctrine is Socinianism, and nothing else.

Infidelity, but, at times, troubles even the Christian mind. There is nothing to touch the heart with the *love* of God, so long as the sufferings of Christ are looked upon merely to *appease* another Being, instead of being the love manifested, in Person, by God Himself. In that character, He submitted to His own Laws, and fulfilled the sternest requisitions of Divine justice. His love was seen in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for the ungodly; and again, *God so loved the world that he gave his only-Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.* If you view the sufferings of our blessed Saviour, as a mere debt paid to *another* Being you are *alienated* from that Being; you fear, but do not love him; there is nothing to win you back to your Father's house! God is a God of love; and when we know *Christ's* love towards the sinner, we know *God's* love towards the sinner; and this cheering influence raises man from the state into which he has fallen. Here is seen the absolute mercy of God, and the real nature of reconciliation. "*God was in Christ reconciling (atoning) the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.*" And this view of the atonement produces a moral change in man; the love of God touches his heart; and the heart is most touched when the manifestation of this love is most clearly seen. It is not only what Christ has done on the Cross, by being wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, but what he is *now* doing, that cheers the human heart, and wins it to a ready and willing obedience. Christ is thus seen not only in the visible Human sufferings that He endured for us, but in that inward Love that transcends all human comprehension; a love which not only followed us down to Earth, but which is daily felt more and more by renewed influences from Heaven.

There is no escape from such a doctrine as this. It can neither be falsified, nor perverted. It is practical to the very utmost. On this system, no man can go to Heaven, by mere *thought*, when the life is not Heavenly. It is not only thinking well but doing well, that is the test of Christ's disciples: *why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say.* And again, *he that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them.* It is not being "justified" in an instant; or clothing himself with the Infinite righteousness of Christ; or perverting the nature of the blessed atonement; or by any mode of *thought* whatever

that the sinner is saved : the precepts of Christ are the *only tests* of Christ's disciples ; it is Heaven to obey them, and it is Hell to disobey them ! This doctrine awes the careless and the impenitent into thoughtfulness. Every rational and intelligent mind feels it to be true ; he feels that *cause and effect* are both here put into operation ; that the *analogy* between the natural and spiritual world is established ; and that, upon *this* principle no one *can* go to Heaven who is not, while here, the recipient of Heavenly influences.

For preaching this doctrine—that Jesus is the Lord—and expanding the lofty truths of which it is the foundation, my services, as a Clergyman in this City, have been dispensed with, by—the Rector of Trinity Church. This system is too close and searching to suit certain minds ; it is utterly at war with that system of *modified Socinianism* which clings, like a poisoned garment, to the religious system of the day. Indeed Socinianism, or Arianism rather, is *the great heresy*, from which all other heresies have arisen, and by which they are still supported. The early Christians worshipped Jesus as the Lord, and this was the charge brought against them by the Heathen ; but when the Lord Jesus ceased to be recognized as *one* with God, the mind began to dwell upon His Human as separate from God,—that is, that He had a Human soul,—instead of recognizing the Divine Human Principle as the only possible manifestation of the God-Head : *in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the God-Head bodily*. This doctrine, I maintain, is extensively denied, even by many who are not aware of such a denial themselves ; and this denial arises from not recognizing the great Gospel fact, that the Human nature, which our Lord assumed on earth, was glorified or made Divine, by temptations and combats with the Powers of darkness. The Jehovah thus descended to the very ultimates of nature to save man, and thus became the Eternal *medium* of access to angels and to men, in the nature which He assumed. Out of the Human form God is not only inaccessible, but inconceivable : *No man cometh unto the Father but by me*. And again, *no man (no being) hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him*. Before the incarnation, the Lord appeared in the form of an Angel ; and is called the Angel—Jehovah.

The consequence of the denial of the "Divine Humanity" of the Lord, is—that the present systems of religion are losing their hold of the public mind, and have no longer power to move the moral world. I do not mean to say that there are not many sincere disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, who have very obscure views of His God-Head, and of the doctrines themselves which they profess to believe; but *they* are honest and sincere Christians, not in consequence of their views, but notwithstanding them, or rather in spite of them. At the same time, rational and intelligent minds are beginning to enquire what it is that they really *do* believe, or whether they believe at all; and they are met with the objection that reason and common sense are not applicable to religious subjects, but that the *surrender* of reason is the most worthy offering to a God of reason! But this *argument* does not meet the exigency of the case, for enlightened reason is essential to the *intelligent worship* of the Divine Being. Hitherto indeed the religious systems of the day have sufficed to stem Infidelity, because religion has been revered, even where it has not been realized or felt. But, the light now so visibly and extensively descending from Heaven upon the world at large, demands a *corresponding* exercise of the rational faculties in the study of the Holy Scriptures. Every thing in the natural world is now tested and examined, before it is placed in its own department, as a fact, or a *truth*; and unless this same principle is applied to spiritual things; unless the word of God is studied upon the principles of a rational exegesis,—that is, unless the analogy of Scripture is consulted, and spiritual things compared with spiritual, in an humble and prayerful state of mind, Infidelity will outrun Revelation, and leave the Defenders of the Faith, so called, to their own delusions.

After these preliminary remarks, which the controversy between Dr. Gray and myself involves, I proceed to state some of the particulars connected with this controversy.

Upwards of three months ago, Dr. Gray requested an interview with me in consequence of some report made to him of certain doctrines taught by myself from the Pulpit. We discussed the subjects, generally, at that time, apparently to his satisfaction, and at parting he expressed his wish to hold a conversation, at some other time, on the general principles of Scriptural interpretation. To this I was willing, and even glad

to assent ; but the request for such a conversation was never made to me afterwards. Feeling that it ought to have been made, after what had been said, I wrote to him a note a few days afterwards, (Nov. 26th, I think,) sending him a certain Book, which embraced my views, in general, on the subjects before alluded to. This was a work on "Mediums," by the Rev. J. Clowes, A. M., Rector of St. John, Manchester, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge ; it was on the instrumentality of Mediums, in the regeneration and salvation of mankind, and exhibiting their Divine origin, and the important uses thereto. To this note, I received an answer in a day or two from Dr. Gray, alluding to the subjects contained in the volume, and stating that he should be prepared to discuss them in a few days. A month or six weeks after this, (Jan. 7th,) I received a note from him, objecting to the doctrines in this work, and *distorting* them into all frightful forms ! I was only surprised that *such* objections, on his part, should have remained shut up quietly in his own heart, for so long a time ; and concluded, that in reality his alarming objection to this volume, was an *afterthought*.

The author here alluded to, propagated these opinions for about *sixty years* in his Parish, and in other places ; lived in the hallowed affections of his people for that long period ; was the author of various works in Theology, evincing deep knowledge of the Holy Scriptures ; had a wide spread reputation, throughout England ; and at his death, received encomiums on his elevated piety and talents, of a private and public nature, from the English people, and even from the daily London press. *Such* a man, you may depend upon it, was no mystic nor fanatic, much less was he a "lying spirit," for the truth—(1 Kings xxii. 8-22) : His "witness" was in Heaven. He encountered, indeed, the rabid opposition of several *Clergymen*,* at the opening of his ministry, and afterwards, who accused him of denying the Holy Trinity, and other doctrines, merely because he made these doctrines practical—involving the life, as well as a mere set of opinions,—and proved that their blessed *efficacy* was seen in elevating the Divine nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in uniting the soul to Him, by faith. These Clergymen brought distinct charges against Mr. Clowes

* Two or three of these, who were foremost in this persecution, were removed from the scene, by remarkable interpositions.

before his Diocesan, Bishop Porteus, afterwards Bishop of London, who patiently heard his *defence*, and—acquitted him! He did more, he kept Mr. Clowes informed of the designs and stratagems of these, and other enemies of his, and defended him from their machinations.

To this man's opinions, the Rector of Trinity Church in this City, not only dissents, but he brands them with infamy, and declares, that if they were defended by a "hundred Bishops" he would denounce them. Now, it is not exactly what a *hundred* Bishops (though that *is* a large number) think on the one hand, and Dr. Gray on the other, that decides this controversy; but it is—whether the opinions are *Scriptural* or not. On that ground I beg to defend the volume, though collaterally I know not why Bishop Porteus' evidence in this matter, is not equal to Dr. Gray's; and there may be others, who are in a similar state of mind to my own, on this subject.

From the very first of the present controversy with Dr. Gray, I knew the result. I had not been three or four years in this Parish, to be ignorant of the spirit that prevailed in certain quarters. The Correspondence opened very plausibly, of course, though strongly assailing the Book in question; then came the "Authority" of the Church,* independently of the authority of the Scripture, in matters of faith; then quotations from the Homilies, &c., with which I might be supposed to be already familiar; and finally the conviction expressed to me by Dr. Gray, that I ought to *leave the Church*, as *he* would most certainly do, under similar circumstances! My reply was that I had no *such* intention, nor even the intention to leave the Curacy, unless I were *driven* to do so; that he was at liberty to compel me to the latter; and that he might be governed by the dictates of his own conscience, and leave me to be governed by the dictates of mine. As this correspondence was somewhat prolonged, I do not deem it necessary to transcribe it for the public till towards the close, when it speaks for itself. Suffice it to say, that when Dr. Gray saw that I was neither to be drawn, nor to be driven, into any argument or discussion apart from *the question*, he commenced a system of annoyances, to compel me to withdraw of *my own accord*, and to release him from

This is a new idea of Dr. Gray: for when I had on some occasions urged the Spiritual claims of the Church, it was said that people ought to preach the Gospel, and not the Church.

any *responsibility* in the matter! With this view he commenced taking the *Pulpit*, on the occasions previously appointed for myself, instead of honestly and courteously declaring, as he ought to have done, upon *his own* argument, that he no longer required my services as Curate. Here is the note :

Saturday Morning, January 18, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—I purpose myself to occupy the Pulpit at St. John Church to-morrow morning. I am your's, very truly,
 Rev. R. B. WIGGINS. I. W. D. GRAY.

As he had asserted, in a note just previous to this, that he could no longer sanction my Doctrines, and implied that the connection between us must close, I was prepared to hear, of course, that he had resolved to act accordingly. From the note just received, therefore, I concluded nothing else, and that he had taken *this* mode of dispensing with my services ; and I wrote to that effect :—

St. John, January 18, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—I conclude from your note of this morning, coupled with the preceding notes, that you dispense with my services any longer. If not so, please let me know what your meaning is. I am your's, sincerely,

Rev. I. W. D. GRAY.

R. B. WIGGINS.

To this I received an immediate answer, as if he were *afraid* that I should take him at his word.

Saturday, 18th January, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—My note of this morning has reference, as the terms of it express, exclusively to *to-morrow*.

I am, your's, very truly,

Rev. R. WIGGINS.

I. W. D. GRAY.

Upon reading this note I was quite confounded. It *ought* to mean that the difference between us was only *temporary*, and I almost thought it did ; but it meant nothing of the kind. It meant, as his subsequent notes and acts indicate, that he merely wished to create annoyance. I took the Services at St. John Church, on that occasion, without any direct consciousness of this “uncourteous” mode of treatment on his part ; and without the least idea that he had *already* made the controversy known to others, and charged me publicly, through his people, with *all kinds of heresy*. Reports reached me that I was *suspended* ! It is usual, in charges of heresy, to have a trial before suspension, and even a condemnation of the heresy itself ; without this, a “hundred Bishops” could not *suspend*. Dr.

Gray did ! The Hierarchy of St. John are somewhat arbitrary in their proceedings.

In this state of things, seeing no hope of getting any thing definite from Dr. Gray, I requested my brother to call upon him, with the view of ascertaining why these rumors had come from him, (they had not come from me,) without being first communicated to me, and to know, in so many words, whether he had dispensed with my services as Curate or not. This interview only *confused* the matter, as was *predicted* by another than myself before my Brother went ; and it ended, on the part of my Brother, in proposing a personal interview between Dr. Gray and myself, on the subjects in controversy, of which my Brother was not informed. Such an interview had been declined before by Dr. Gray, when proposed by myself, to discuss these, or any other subjects, and to read to him the sermon of mine which involved them.

Here follows this note of Dr. Gray :

St. John, Jan. 31, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your Brother, Mr. Stephen Wiggins, called upon me this morning, and recommended that I should have a personal interview with you, upon the subjects involved in our late correspondence.

To this proposal I am perfectly willing to accede, and I would name Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock, which is the earliest time I can fix for it, for that purpose.

With regard to the duties of Sunday next, I have no wish to interfere with your preaching in your regular course, provided you give me your word that the doctrines which have been matter of correspondence between us shall be abstained from, and all allusion to the subject be avoided on your part, on that occasion. Upon no other terms could I be justified as the Rector of this Parish, in giving my sanction to your preaching. I shall hope for a line from you this evening to intimate your acceding, or otherwise, to this proposition.

If you call upon me on Tuesday next, at 12, I would suggest to the desirableness of your bringing with you the sermons preached at Trinity, and to which allusion is made in your letter of the 11th inst.

I am, my Dear Sir,

Your's, very truly,

I. W. D. GRAY.

REV. R. B. WIGGINS.

The Reply is as follows :

St John, Jan. 31, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—The object of my Brother's visit was merely to ascertain why you had circulated the rumour, that you had

precluded me from preaching in the pulpits here, when no intimation of the fact had been given to me. We were utterly indignant at hearing this rumour, and no less so after you had declined to give my Brother any explanation of the cause of such a rumour. Common honesty demanded from you that I should have been made acquainted with the fact, instead of purposely concealing it from me, while you made it known to the public.*

The allusion in your present note to an interview with the intention of discussing the subjects between us, is out of the question, on the ground you take. You claim, virtually, that the Church is higher authority than the Bible; and I cannot contend for matters of Christian faith upon that principle. I am willing to discuss any doctrines on Scriptural authority, as I suggested to you before, and to read to you any sermons of my own with that view.

With reference to preaching in the Pulpits to-morrow, I have no intention of alluding to the subject in controversy between us, as that matter, if necessary, will be presented to the public, through the Press. As to the truths to be preached at that, or any other time, I can yield to no dictation. The subjects that I have preached are eminently practical—being repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ—and these subjects in general will, I hope, always be the theme of my discourse.

You will have the goodness to remember that I am not *asking* to preach in your pulpits, but merely wish to claim the *right* not to be debarred from preaching till I receive a *definite* assurance from yourself, in writing, that my services are no longer required as Curate in this Parish.

I am, most sincerely,

R. B. WIGGINS.

Rev. I. W. D. GRAY.

Saturday 1st March, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—You misstate the object of your Brother's visit to me: it was not to ask why I had circulated any rumour whatever, but whether some report which he had heard, as to your being suspended, was true or otherwise; and to inquire whether any kind offices on his part could be of use in the matter. You further mistake the case in saying, that I declined to give your Brother any explanation of the cause of such rumour. I declined nothing. All the information your Brother asked I freely gave.

Whatever "common honesty," and the utmost stretch of courtesy, have demanded of me, I have strictly attended to

* I alluded to the *intended* object of the visit, and not to the actual result of it. Indeed, I was not clearly informed of the result, except by Dr. Gray's note, though I knew nothing *definite* could be obtained by any *visit* or letter.

from the first. Your intimation that I have not done so is as unbecoming in you to make, as it is unfounded and unwarrantable in itself.

As you decline giving me the assurance, in regard to your preaching, which I have solicited, I shall preach myself to-morrow, at St. John Church in the morning, and at Trinity in the evening.

As to your intimation that the subject of controversy between us will be presented to the Public through the medium of the Press, I can only say, that whenever you, or others, are so unwise as to place it there, I shall know how to meet it.

I am, my dear Sir,

Your's, very truly,

I. W. D. GRAY.

Rev. R. B. WIGGINS.

St. John, 3d March, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—The course taken by you, on Sunday, coupled with the *claim* I made at the conclusion of my last note, necessarily involved the assurance *on your part*, that my services as Curate were no longer required. I acted accordingly, and considered the connexion thenceforth to be at an end.

I proceed now to reply to your note, and to add some remarks at the close.

I did not mistake the *object* of my Brother's visit, which was merely, as I stated it to be, something definite from yourself, as to your *intentions* in my case. This you eluded in your notes to me, and it was hoped you might give him some definite information on the subject. It appears that you took occasion of his visit to support your own cause at my expense, for he could have had no idea of the nature of the controversy when he proposed a formal interview between us. His object, therefore, *was* definite, though it appears he was diverted from it: *sed hæc hæctenus*.

Your claim to honesty and courtesy towards me from the "first" must be resisted, not only in the present case, but in your general course of conduct. When I *first* came to this Parish, you wished to enforce upon me the condition, that if I disagreed with Mr. Stewart, who had differed with others before me—that for the sake of peace, which was all important—I must resign quietly without assigning any cause; and this I was to do even if he were wrong. There was but one answer to this; and that answer was given. I had no idea of voluntarily submitting to injustice, and of affording him the opportunity, as I remarked to you, of bringing about a consummation to suit himself. At the same time, I added, that I was perfectly willing to leave the Curacy at any time, if I were allowed to state publicly the reason for so doing. What "honesty and courtesy" did you evince in this transaction?

Again: with regard to the Bishop's license for me, which was never obtained, your course of conduct was just the reverse of "honest and courteous." I came to St. John at the Bishop's request, (having been acting just before under his license at St. Andrews), at your request, and at the request of the Vestry here, by their vote, or resolution to that effect; and in each case, as it happened, without any solicitation on my own part. It is usual, I think, to have the Bishop's license in every Parish where you officiate; and, therefore, the license was considered essential by yourself. The application for it you proposed to make at once, which you neglected to do; and on the Bishop's return from England, you again alluded to the license, and proposed sending for it. It was, however, never asked for, and the result is, I never received it. I felt no concern about it myself, if they choose to waive a claim in my favour, and grant to me a privilege granted to no others. But I have a *reason* to think that you always looked upon it as a detriment to me, in case of any *contingency*. Was your conduct here either "honest or courteous?" Was your pledged word kept or broken?

I might state other cases to illustrate the subject, but they would involve names which I have no right to introduce here. Suffice it to say, that your conduct towards me from the first has been that of indirectness and circumlocution, instead of being marked by what was honest and straightforward. The remarks you have alluded to, therefore, in your last note, are *not* "unbecoming in me to make, nor are they unfounded and unwarrantable in themselves."

The very *last* act of your course of conduct towards me confirms the *first*. You then wished me to retire "quietly" in case of any disturbance with Mr. Stewart, and now you ask me to retire *quietly* after this misunderstanding with yourself. You deny me the Pulpit, except to preach at your dictation; and if I resort to the Press, either to explain the nature of the controversy, or to defend my position, a sort of threat is breathed against me; while in the meantime I am subject to any imputations which those who are interested may choose to make. Upon these terms alone am I dealt with by "the Rector of this Parish."

These terms are not consistent with my idea of civil and *religious* liberty; and I therefore beg to decline them as I did the terms proposed by you on the former occasion, to which I have alluded. The former quarrel never happened as anticipated, not from any unwillingness on the part of the person in question, to bring it on, (very far from it); but simply from my abiding by the principle I advocated from the "first," with reference to that case, and which I stated to you at the time,—that if Mr. Stewart, or any one else, sought to wrong or injure me, I was not willing to injure them in return, though I might think it necessary to provide against the injury; and this course alone has saved me from any altercation. It has, indeed, imposed upon me, as *you* have been long aware, the necessity of avoid-

ing any thing but the most distant terms of intercourse: I can, therefore, easily understand the difficulties in this respect, met with by those who have preceded me.

I beg again, in this closing note, not to question your right, abstractedly, as to the course you have taken in these matters of controversy, but only your *mode* of acting. You have a right, indeed, to your opinions, but you must be quite sure that others are wrong before you *condemn* them, in a Church so catholic as ours. There is, and has been, something deeper, however, than mere questions of doctrine; for these general doctrines have been preached by me from the first.* Doctrines will do as a source of difference; and doctrines, are *then* objected to, not so much because they are honestly thought to be wrong, as because they afford plausible ground of action when placed in distorted forms. There has been a feeling of enmity sought to be excited against me, for a long time past, by some who are of your party, and I have no reason to think that it will be diminished *now*. It is not enough to get rid of a person, but it is necessary to injure him afterwards. To all such persons I would briefly say, that feelings of that kind evinced towards one who has taken an upright and undeviating course among them, as you all admit, will bring them no peace at the last. A man may be wronged, and live; but he who *does* the wrong, who sleeps and wakes upon the deliberate purpose of thinking evil, and of wishing evil to his neighbour, and especially of doing it either directly or indirectly; he dies; and *his* death is both the first and the second death.

With regard to the doctrines I have preached in this place, after all that you can say against them, they will prevail; not, perhaps, in a week or a year, but ultimately they will prevail. They are based upon God's word, without reference to the false glosses and interpretations of man; and they have found a response, I am sure, in truthful and intelligent minds; and where they have not been recognised by the truthful, they have been seen only in a partial and disjointed view. It is not a sermon here and there that proves a system to be wrong, but it is the whole course of preaching. *All* persons are not qualified to say, that a thing is wrong, merely because it differs from *their* view of the subject. If *any* thing that I have preached here is true, *all* that I have preached is true; for these truths embrace, as a system, one consistent whole, and they have appealed not to the fancy, but to the rational powers of man. It is easy to give false *names* to persons, or to their opinions; but these names cannot turn truth into falsehood. Any decided opposition to these truths is not an opposition to me, but an opposition to Him who is Judge of all, and who has authority to execute judgment. In such a controversy there comes a blight upon man, and a desolation from which there is no escape.—Isaiah xlix., 25 and 26.

As you have now declined the use of my services any longer, allow me to say, in conclusion, that I have humbly sought, in my mi-

* It is only a few months since that Dr. Gray remarked to a certain person, that I adhered in my Sermons very strictly to the Scriptures.

nistry here, to approve myself to God, and not to man. No one can accuse me of favouring any party as *such*, or of being self-seeking. On the contrary, I have sacrificed much for the sake of the truth, and have merged my own interests in the general good of the Church here; and this is my solace. It is easy to talk about giving up all; and quite another thing to do it. I do it with the consciousness that I shall be misrepresented, and as far as certain persons can do it, made even perhaps to suffer want. But I am thoroughly in earnest for what I know and feel to be the truth, and am willing to declare it, and prepared to abide by it at all times, and at any sacrifice.

I am, your's, sincerely,

Rev. I. W. D. GRAY.

R. B. WIGGINS.

Here the Controversy ended by a brief note from Dr. Gray, alluding to the first paragraph only, in my last letter. In this last act of the Rector of Trinity, he betrays the same spirit that actuated him before.

With regard to this Controversy, if Dr. Gray believed the views in question to be such as he *stated* them to be, his course was plain enough; that is, honestly to dissolve the connexion at once, and assign the reason. This he was unwilling to do, but willing enough to render the connexion as disagreeable as possible to me while it lasted. It was with the greatest difficulty that he could be *brought* to the point at last, and compelled to dispense with my services as Curate, by an *overt act of his own*.

Being thus driven from the Pulpit, and denied the privilege of addressing a few words at parting to the congregations to whom I had ministered for upwards of three years, I take the only mode left of expressing to them my thoughts, after this rude and "uncourteous" severance of the tie between us.

You are aware, my Brethren, that I have from the very first adopted a style of preaching which was somewhat peculiar to myself. This I have done, not from any desire of popularity, much less to gain the reputation of novelty among you, but simply because I had imbued the truths of God's Word, without reference to the *terms or definitions* in which those truths are generally expressed. I have taught the Holy Scriptures as a *system* of truth, and this *equally* whether the subject of my Sermons was doctrinal, preceptive, or explanatory of the figurative language in which parts of the Word are written.

The foundation of this system is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Word Himself. It is very possible, owing to the disjointed and fragmentary manner in which our Sermons, as a course, followed each other,

that *this* all important feature of my preaching may not have been always distinctly seen. Allow me, therefore, to allude to it more particularly now.

All worship must have an *object*, and the quality of Divine worship will depend upon our ideas of the Divine Being. The Heathen necessarily worship God in the abstract, as a Being really "unknown;" and hence the necessity of representing Him by some form or image in the mind, or otherwise. The abstract idea is necessarily of space, *i. e.*, air or æther; and hence the Greeks *compressed* this idea into the human form, and called it Jupiter, which, in the Greek language, signifies the air, or empty space: so restless were they under the abstract idea of God. This applies to all Nations, who have not the Word; and their Gods are always the *types* of their own character. They think Him such an one as themselves, and worship Him accordingly.

Christian worship, therefore, depends upon the idea formed of God. If God is seen in the Gospel other than the Lord Jesus Christ, He is as much "unknown" to the Christian as he was to the Jew; and if God be *unknown*, He will be worshipped according to the disposition of the *worshipper*. This accounts for the worship of many Christians, so called, whose Religion goes on quite compatibly with all the lusts of the mere natural man, and is full of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. These people might as well worship Baal or Juggernaut; and the only reason that they do not, is because they are elevated by a high state of what is called civilization.

But the worship of the Lord in Person is a distinct and holy worship. They who worship *Him* become the partakers of the Divine influence; are filled out of His fullness, and evince His blessed spirit in their life and conduct; beholding as in a glass, &c. (2 Cor. iii. 18). The law is, that man is assimilated to the Being he worships, just as in human intercourse you are assimilated to the person you deeply love, which is sometimes therefore even called worship. Thus, he who can imbue the beautiful Gospel truth—that Jesus is the Lord—becomes moulded and assimilated into the likeness of the Divine Being, and is touched more and more with the inward and unwearied love of Jesus, which in *all* its fulness, transcends the comprehension of men or angels.

This worship, however, you must remember, is not from man, but from what is *in* man *from* God! Nothing ascends to Heaven, but what first comes down *from* thence; and therefore no man can worship Jesus, or even *name* Him, from the mere selfhood of man, but

from the Lord. No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. This love of Jesus to man is, however, always seeking to enter into man—(Rev. iii. 20)—pressing, as it were, for admittance—and is *then* received, and not before, when man is *willing* to receive it—that is, *opens* his heart to all its holy influences. Hence the practical nature of this doctrine, which you have so often heard from me in direct words, and which has been so interwoven into all my Sermons. *Love God supremely, and your neighbour as yourself, and do unto others as you would have others do unto you.* That is the Religion I have taught you, my Brethren, as you all know; and no other than such Christians can *name* the Lord Jesus without profanation. Hence the Lord forbade the Devils to mention His name; and the ban or interdict is really against all *men* who falsify His word by denying the *spirit* of the Gospel precepts!

It is this *inward* love of Jesus for the sinner, this *Divine* love, which brought the Lord down from Heaven, to seek and to save the lost, and to give his life a ransom for many, that is the controlling motive of Christian obedience. That dreadful feature of wrath, which, however, is often the leading motive to arrest the impenitent, is *forgotten* as the mind rises into a higher region, and recognises the great truth that *Jesus* is the Lord, and that *He* is almighty to save! Fear then gives place to love, and the heart is set at liberty. This is the “love of Christ, which *passeth knowledge*,” and which is but dimly seen by the mere natural man. The common view taken of the sufferings of Christ to save the sinner is too often confined to the mere *natural* feelings, though even these feelings are intended to have a powerful influence upon the character; but the true nature of His suffering for sinners, and in their stead, is seen in its power to produce a change in the *moral* character of man; and instead of being confined to the mere *natural sensibilities*, its influence becomes spiritual, and touches the heart itself with a sense of the awful and mysterious love of God. There is something vast, mysterious, and awful about it then; it lays hold of the inmost feelings, controuls the religious sentiments, and originates them where they did not exist before. But, on the system that *man* has made, this motive-power is well nigh lost; he looks upon the sufferings of the blessed Saviour as demanded by *another* Being; and while the mere natural sensibilities are excited by these mysterious sufferings, the natural man still refuses to sacrifice his *sins*! The view of the atonement which I have taught, instead of

denying the efficacy of that blessed doctrine, clothes it with unutterable sanctity ; and I can only say to those who have intimated the idea of my denial of that doctrine, that they have, in my view, falsified and profaned the *Word of God*.

As to the ground taken by myself in this controversy, in discussing religious doctrines on the *authority of Scripture alone*, let me say a few words. The Church of England is based on Holy Scripture ; and she declares in her sixth Article, " that whatsoever " is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required " of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be " thought requisite or necessary to salvation." The Church, therefore, *is* the Church, because it contains the Word ; and for no other reason are the Holy Scriptures read therein every Sabbath day. This is the principle of the Reformation, and I am unwilling to surrender it for any human tradition or authority whatever. The Liturgy of the Church is beautiful beyond any description ; but it is beautiful, because it breathes the spirit of the earliest times, when the Word of God was read in its simplicity. But, as to the *terms and definitions* of the Church, we know that they were penned by men who differed from each other, and who were willing and anxious to make the Church as broad and as Catholic as possible. They gave form and expression to the religious sentiment of the time ; and the Book of Articles is not, nor is it pretended to be, as Bishop Pearson remarks, a full body of Divinity in itself. The very agitations in the Church prove this at the present time, and render *necessary* a resort again to the Bible to meet the still higher requisitions of the Religious mind. But as it is, men persuade themselves that the Bible contains *certain* doctrines, and they read to confirm themselves in this belief. So of systems, in which these doctrines are contained, the truth is perverted to suit preconceived notions ; and it is thus often rendered obscure, and even inconsistent with the acknowledged principles of the Divine Government.

As to the doctrines in controversy, they are not to be set aside by Dr. Gray and his party. The views I have declared from the Pulpit are not fanciful theories ; but solid, rational, and intelligent truths. They are based upon the Holy Scriptures, and taught expressly in the Apostle's Creed. The view of the Holy Trinity that I have taught, moreover, is distinctly recognised in the Creed of Athanasius, if you give the proper and actual meaning to the Latin word " *Persona*," there employed to express the different attributes of the Deity, or rather their different manifestations. As to the " *Pray-*

ers" of the Church, they are dearer to me than any other form of human language, and express more deeply the wants of the soul; and in my private ministrations, I have seldom adopted the custom of the other clergymen of the Church here in departing from these forms. I have the deepest love and veneration for the Church of England; and I am not to be *driven* from it for heresy, without being taught what heresy is by a *higher* authority than the Rector of Trinity Church. As to myself, I am prepared to meet with persecution for what I know to be the truth, and which I hope to promulgate as long as I live. And let me observe here, that if, in the course I have hitherto taken to enforce the Truth, I may sometimes have appeared harsh or severe, it was generally to meet the case of those who, while making great professions of Religion, have evinced very little of the spirit of Religion itself: nor is it surprizing that *such* persons should hate the Preacher, as well as the *Doctrines* he has taught.