

Colonial Church Chronicle
1860.

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

It is with great and real pain that we feel bound to place on record the following report and documents.

The Third Session of the Diocese of Huron was opened in London (C. W.) on Tuesday, June 12. On Wednesday, the 13th, "the Rev. Dr. Townley brought forward the following resolution :—

'That, seeing it is greatly to be desired that the Canadian Church should unite in the upholding of one University, thereby insuring for it a high literary character and extensive religious and Church influence, this Synod respectfully requests the Lord Bishop to adopt such means as in his wisdom he may see good as shall tend to secure the hearty co-operation of all Churchmen in support of Trinity College, Toronto; which, through the energy of the Bishop of Toronto, and the liberality of Churchmen here and at home, has been for some years in successful operation, and with the high honour of possessing a royal charter.'

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Ryland.

His Lordship said he could not put the resolution to the meeting without expressing an opinion thereon. He differed with Dr. Townley in some of his remarks. He had studied the working of Trinity College, and he considered that at the present time there was no power vested in the hands of any of the Bishops to interfere in the teachings of this college. This was not the case formerly, but a late statute had altered it. He objected to the teachings of that university, and if he had a son to educate, this would be the last place he would send him to. In the present state of things, the supreme power was vested in the Chancellor; and so long as such was the case, he could not give it his support.

His Lordship put the resolution, which was lost, a large majority voting against it."¹

The following is extracted from the *Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette*, of July 15 :—

" TRINITY COLLEGE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, June 29th, 1860.

The Corporation of Trinity College, Toronto, have observed, in the public prints, a report of the proceedings of the Synod of the Diocese of Huron, on Wednesday, June 20th, containing a statement made by the Lord Bishop of Huron with reference to Trinity College; and they have ascertained from the testimony of persons present at the Synod that this report, so far as the language attributed to the Bishop

¹ From the *Echo and Protestant Episcopal Recorder*.

is concerned, is substantially correct. That statement having been made by a person occupying the prominent position of the Bishop of Huron, and in so public a manner, *ex cathedra* as it were, in an open Synod of the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese, requires to be met, on the part of the Corporation, by a statement no less public.

- I. His Lordship objects to the teaching of Trinity College, and declares that, if he had a son to educate, it would be the last place to which he would send him.
- II. He states also that there is no power vested in the hands of any of the Bishops to interfere in the teachings of the College. 'This,' he says, 'was not the case formerly, but a late statute has altered it. In the present state of things the supreme power is vested in the Chancellor, and, so long as such is the case, I cannot give it my support.'

The Corporation address themselves, in the first instance, to the latter statement :

The 'late statute,' to which the Bishop of Huron refers, was recommended by a Committee to the Corporation, and received by them, as a part of the report of the Committee, on the 12th of February, 1859. It was, with the rest of the report, forthwith transmitted to the Bishop of Huron. He was invited, before the next meeting of the Corporation for the adoption of the report, to confer privately with the Bishop of Toronto, in order to remove any possible misconception. He did so confer. On the 24th of February, 1859, he accompanied the Bishop of Toronto to a meeting of the Corporation. The Bishop of Toronto informed the meeting that the Bishop of Huron and himself were agreed on the report of the Committee, the Bishop of Huron having only one or two unimportant amendments to suggest.

These amendments were agreed to, and the report was unanimously adopted, in the presence of the Bishop of Huron, his veto being sufficient to have prevented the adoption of any portion of it.

From that day to this the Bishop of Huron has never intimated to the Corporation his dissatisfaction with any statute enacted by the adoption of that report.

It appears, therefore, that, without reference to the expediency of the existing regulations, the Bishop of Huron has no claim whatever to allege statutes which he deliberately sanctioned, and against which he has since entered no kind of protest, as a ground for discountenancing the College.

But, again, the Bishop misstates the case as to the effect of those statutes. He says that 'there is no power vested in the hands of any of the Bishops to interfere in the teachings of the College.' He might have said that the Bishops possess no *separate or exclusive* power of so interfering. But they do possess, in common with other members of the Corporation, a right of interference; while their sacred office would ever give them, especially on questions relating to religious truth or moral conduct, a powerful influence with the rest of the body.

The Bishop adds, 'In the present state of things, the supreme power is vested in the Chancellor.' This is not the case. The only statute on which the Bishop's assertion can be based is the following: 'No proposition for the removal of a provost or professor may be submitted to the Corporation except through the Chancellor, and then only on a written requisition, addressed to him by not less than five members of the Corporation.' This statute gives the Chancellor no real power at all, but merely provides that an important act should be done in a solemn manner, and through a fitting officer.

In reference to the Bishop's first statement as to the teaching of the College, accompanied by the emphatic declaration that Trinity College is the last place to which he would send a son, the Corporation observe that the charge against the teaching is most vague, and that the ordinary rules of morality, to say nothing of Christian charity, require that any man who advances such a charge should, under any circumstances, be prepared to substantiate it in detail. Much more must this be looked for in the instance of a Christian Bishop addressing his Clergy and Laity in Synod.

But, further, the Bishop is by law a member of the Corporation, and he cannot escape the responsibility which, in that character, rests upon him.

He has never, then, in his place in the Corporation, brought forward even the vague charge which he has hazarded in the meeting of his Synod, far less has he attempted to substantiate it.

Nay, more than this, he has refused to do so, when urged by the Bishop of Toronto to adopt this 'wiser and more honourable course.' And his refusal was based on this ground, that he could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University.

(Signed) JOHN TORONTO, *President.*
CHARLES MAGRATH, *Bursar and Secretary.*"

The following Pastoral has since been issued by the Bishop of Huron:—

"To the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Huron.

MY REVEREND BROTHERS AND BRETHREN,—A document, emanating from the Corporation of Trinity College, Toronto, has appeared in the extra of the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, and has been circulated amongst the Clergy and Laity of this Diocese. This document contains so many mis-statements concerning matters in which I am concerned, that I feel myself called upon to address you, and to state the circumstances therein referred to as they really did occur.

I shall treat the subjects mentioned in this document in the same order in which they are discussed in the extra. I am sorry that I am thus placed under the necessity of publicly contradicting statements put forth by a body of such high respectability as the Corpora-

tion of Trinity College ; but no other course remains to me ; justice to myself and a regard for the interests of truth compel me to do so.

With reference to the fourth paragraph of the extra, the following statement of what really did occur, previous to, and at the meeting of the 24th of February, 1859, will show how careless the Corporation of Trinity College has been in preparing the document to which I refer.

I received from the Bursar of Trinity College a circular, informing me that a meeting of the Corporation would be held on the 24th of February, at which important measures would be brought forward ; but no report of resolutions of committee was transmitted to me, and I had no intimation what these measures were. I had never attended any meetings at Trinity College up to that time. I went to Toronto, and on the morning of the 24th of February, being desirous to know what the important business was which was to be brought before the meeting, I inquired of the Rev. H. J. Grasett what the business was. He showed me a paper, on which were some resolutions ; *but the statute, which was afterwards passed at the meeting, was not one of them.* I accompanied, not the Bishop, but Mr. Grasett, to the College ; I saw the Bishop of Toronto only for a few minutes that morning ; and when the statute referred to in the extra was read by the Provost, I objected to it, and it will be remembered by the gentlemen who were present that what I objected to was, that when a requisition for the removal of a Provost or Professor was signed by five members of the Corporation, and placed in the hands of the Chancellor, the option was left to him of bringing the complaint before the Corporation or not, as he thought fit. I urged that when a requisition thus signed was presented to the Chancellor, it should be imperative on him to bring it before the governing body. I even suggested that the number of signatures necessary to the requisition should be increased to ten ; but that the Chancellor ought not to have the power of refusing to bring the requisition before the Corporation when thus placed in his hands. I have not, therefore, mis-stated the effect of these statutes, as is asserted ; but the writer of the extra has kept out of view that provision of them to which I have objected. All the members of the Corporation then present united in the desire to pass the statute, and after stating my objections I ceased to oppose. I might have pronounced my veto on the measure ; but under the circumstances, I did not think it advisable to do so. I was then, for the first time, at a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College. I had never assisted the institution in any way. I was surrounded by gentlemen who had largely contributed to the funds of the University. They, together with the Bishop of Toronto, who had done so much, and laboured so long and so energetically to establish Trinity College, were desirous that the statute should pass ; I therefore did not think it wise to use the power which I possessed, to veto their wish concerning this statute. Had I done so, I fear the epithets which would have been lavished upon me would not have been more chaste, gentle, or courteous than those which members of the Corporation of Trinity

College—a Church institution—have allowed themselves to employ concerning a Bishop when speaking of me in public and in private.

It is much to be regretted that when the Corporation of Trinity College, in their zeal, not to defend themselves, but to assail me, resolved to come before the public, they were not more careful as to the statements which they hazarded. They appear to have acted upon the principle, that a man may, to defend himself, employ any means to weaken or wound his adversary. This principle holds good with those who rely for victory on physical strength. But the use of such an expedient in literary warfare, more particularly where religion is concerned, has ever been justly regarded as unworthy of the scholar and the gentleman. A man does not defend himself, or strengthen his position, by endeavouring to inflict a wound on the reputation of his opponent. Such conduct generally recoils, with crushing force, upon the head of him who has been guilty of it.

I will now direct attention to the statement which I made at the meeting of the Synod of my Diocese. A clerical member of the Synod gave notice of a motion concerning Trinity College. I told this gentleman, *before he proposed his motion, that I was opposed to it, and should be against him.* He persevered in bringing it before the Synod, and in a long speech, in which he uttered the most glowing encomiums on Trinity College, moved its adoption, and was seconded by a friend. When the resolution was thus before the Synod, a lay delegate stood up, and requested me to give my opinion on the subject of the resolution. This I did as nearly as I can remember in the following words:—

‘Being called upon by a member of the Synod to give my opinion upon the question now before the meeting, I shall do so fully and faithfully, as it is not my wish to give an opinion by halves upon so important a subject. I cannot agree with the mover of the resolution in the exaggerated eulogium which he has pronounced on Trinity College. I have taken every pains for two years to inform myself concerning the teaching of the University, and I cannot approve of it. I think it dangerous to the young men educated there, more particularly if they are educated for the Ministry. I could not comply with the request contained in the resolution, for I should thereby encourage parties to send their sons to the College, and I would not for any consideration send a son of mine to the institution. Nor do I see any prospect of affecting a change in the teaching of the University, as by a recent statute the Chancellor is interposed between the Professors and the Corporation, and power is given to suppress any complaint against a Provost or Professor, even if preferred by all the Bishops in the Corporation.’ What I intend to say in this letter concerning this statement will be contained in the remarks which I am about to make on the contents of the last paragraph of the extra.

A passage from a letter of the Bishop of Toronto to me, written in April last, when we had a correspondence on the subject of Trinity College, is quoted, and it is added, ‘That my refusal to adopt what his Lordship called the wiser and more honourable course, was based

on this ground, that I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University.' I never stated any such ground for my refusal. To prove this I have only to quote the passage from my letter in which I replied to the Bishop of Toronto. The passage is as follows :—' You say that in early life you adopted the rule, never, if possible, to allow an opportunity of doing good to pass unimproved ; all who are acquainted with the history of your life will acknowledge that few men have more fully acted upon this rule.—But there is another rule, having Divine sanction, which I feel assured you would desire to observe, and which must regulate my conduct towards Trinity College ; it is, " Abstain from all appearance of evil." I feel that I am bound to act up to this rule, and as *I cannot in my soul approve of the teaching of Trinity College*, I believe that my appearing to sanction it would be a positive evil, and would expose me to the condemnation which the Apostle says is the just portion of those who say, " Let us do evil that good may come." ' The correspondence from which I have quoted, took place in April last. From the above extract it will be seen that though I did not, in my place in the Corporation, bring forward a charge against the teaching of the University ; yet I made the charge in the most solemn form in which I could put it to the President of the Corporation, and as I received no answer to my letter, I concluded either that the President was indifferent as to what opinion I might entertain of the teaching of Trinity College, or that he concurred in the view which I expressed, in the same letter, ' that it was a wiser course for me to stand aloof from the University, than by a public protest to exhibit the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself.'

I should not even, when called upon by a member of my Synod, have given expression to the opinion which I had formed of Trinity College, had I not previously, in the most pointed and solemn manner, given expression to the same opinion to the President of that institution.

In my opinion this was the time for the Corporation of Trinity College to have applied to me to state what was the teaching to which I objected. It would have been a much more wise and honourable course, when the charge was thus made to the head of the institution, to have inquired into it, than to wait in silence until I had preferred the same charge, in compliance with a request made to me by a member of the Synod, and then to publish a document occupied in the discussion of a comparatively unimportant statute, and calculated to divert public attention from the important subject, namely, *the dangerous teaching of Trinity College*.

I do not hold myself responsible to any man for the opinions which I entertain. But, as I have in the present instance, when appealed to by a member of my Synod, expressed my opinion of Trinity College, I am prepared to submit the grounds upon which I have formed that opinion to any of my Clergy, or of the laity of my Diocese who may desire it. I am in possession of ample information

upon the subject, which I am ready to impart to those for whose satisfaction and guidance the opinion was expressed.

Amongst other documents I have in my possession a manuscript known in Trinity College by the name of 'The Provost's Catechism;' it consists of 741 questions with answers. It is placed in the hands of every student entering the University, and all are expected to learn it. Independently of the fact that such a mode of dealing with men is unheard of in any University at home, I consider the teaching of this catechism dangerous in the highest degree; the views put forth are unsound and un-Protestant. The explanations of Scripture are one-sided; the whole thing is calculated to indoctrinate the youths educated at the institution with the views of the author of 'the catechism,' and to prepare them to propagate the views amongst the members of our communion throughout the country. An institution which adopts such an expedient I cannot regard as safe. The minds of young men which are, for three or four years, forced into this mould, will not, for a long time, if ever, regain that liberty and independence of thought which are indispensable to those who are to minister the Word of Life to intelligent and reasoning men.

Let this catechism be no longer kept in manuscript, but published and circulated as the text-book of the University of Trinity College; and I will venture to predict that the same conclusion at which I have arrived will be expressed by many, namely, *that the teaching of this catechism is dangerous in the extreme.*

I have been induced, my Reverend Brethren and Brethren, to address you upon this subject because of the honoured name which is affixed to the document I have been considering; had it borne any other signature I should have allowed it to pass in silence. But such is the respect which I entertain towards the President of Trinity College Corporation, that nothing can ever weaken the feelings of veneration with which I regard him. We know that the highest faculties and the most exalted mental powers succumb to time; and if his Lordship is not now what he once was, if his memory does not faithfully record events as in years past, allowance should be made for this by his friends, and those who act with him and for him should be careful not to lead him to lend his name to any proceeding unworthy of the position he has so long filled with honour, and calculated, in the evening of his days, to bring a cloud over the high reputation he has so nobly won.

I am, my Reverend Brethren and Brethren, with earnest prayer that God's Spirit may be poured out upon us to guide us into all truth,

Your faithful Friend and Pastor,

BENJ. HURON.

London, July 21st, 1860."

(A letter has appeared from the Provost of Trinity College relative to the statement concerning "The Provost's Catechism," from which it seems that the Bishop of Huron has mistaken the facts. We have no room for it at present.)

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

WE feel it our duty to print the following document in reference to the Bishop of Huron's charges against Trinity College. We extract it from the *Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette* of August 15.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, held on Wednesday, August 8th, 1860 (present: The Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Toronto; the Hon. Sir John Beverley Robinson, Bart., Chancellor of the University; the Rev. the Provost of Trinity College; Professor Bovell, M.D.; The Ven. A. N. Bethune, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of York; the Hon. G. W. Allan; Lewis Moffatt, Esq.; the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Spragge; James M. Strachan, Esq.; the Hon. Sir Allan Napier MacNab, Bart.; Samuel Bickerton Harman, B.C.L.; the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, D.C.L.; the Rev. T. B. Fuller, D.D. D.C.L.; and the Rev. S. Givins), the following minute was unanimously adopted:

The Corporation of Trinity College have had their attention directed to a Pastoral, addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron, to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese, in reply to a statement put forth by them, bearing date June 29th, 1860.

In this pastoral the Bishop of Huron asserts that the Corporation have made "many misstatements" in the document put forth by them.

He first says, "no report of resolutions of committee was transmitted to me," intending, as it would seem, to impugn the assertion of the Corporation that the statute, to which the Bishop of Huron publicly objected in his Synod, was transmitted to him "with the rest of the report of the committee." The Corporation see no cause to retract their assertion that this report was transmitted to the Bishop of Huron. Not only was it the avowed determination of the Corporation to send the document to his Lordship, but the Corporation are satisfied that it was sent; although they admit that the transmission of the document does not necessarily imply its reception by his Lordship, if indeed this be the fact which he intends to deny, when he says that "no report of resolutions of committee was transmitted to him." The simple question is, did the Bishop of Huron, or did he not, receive, some days before the meeting, a paper containing a report of the committee on the statutes which were proposed and adopted at the meeting? If not, where did he procure the copy which he used at the meeting of the Corporation? The Corporation put this inquiry deliberately and advisedly.

The Bishop of Huron next states that, being thus in the dark as to the important business which was to be transacted, and being naturally

anxious to be informed on so grave a subject, he "inquired of the Rev. H. J. Grasett what the business was." The official summons from the Bursar was, according to the Bishop's statement, the only invitation which he received to be present at Toronto, on the 24th of February. He has evidently overlooked the following letter addressed to him, on the 18th, by the Bishop of Toronto :

(Copy.)

MY DEAR LORD,

TORONTO, February 18th, 1859.

We have been attempting for some time to make such modifications in the rules and regulations for the government of Trinity College, as your Lordship's accession to a share in the management would seem to require. But the difficulty of getting a full meeting of the Corporation, owing to the frequent absence of the Chancellor, Sir John B. Robinson, and the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, has occasioned unavoidable delay.

We have now, however, agreed to a draft of the few changes that are thought necessary, and we propose to assemble in the council chamber of Trinity, on Thursday the 24th instant, at three o'clock P.M. for their final consideration in view to their adoption.

In requesting your Lordship to take your place in the Corporation on this occasion, I may truthfully observe that Trinity College is, and was from the first, intended by all parties favourable to its establishment, to be the Church University of the Province of Upper Canada. Hence the provision in the charter, enabling the Bishops to meet for the management of its concerns, on the footing of perfect equality.

To secure this important object, we obtained the munificent patronage of the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, a permanent endowment, and frequent pecuniary donations. To the same cause we owe likewise the liberal grants of the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and the cordial support of the members of our beloved Church, not only in England, but likewise throughout the Province and in the United States.

I still hope to see the three Bishops in their seats as heads and conservators of the institution, and working cordially together in promoting its effectiveness, and extending its blessings through the colony.

If not inconvenient to your Lordship I would respectfully suggest that it might be of advantage for us to meet the Chancellor, Sir John B. Robinson, Bart. and the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, in his office, at ten or eleven o'clock, A.M. on Thursday, the 24th, the day of meeting, to talk over the business to come before the Corporation in the afternoon, and should any amendments occur, they may still be adopted, and thus secure a pleasant unity in our proceedings. I remain, my dear Lord, your's faithfully,

JOHN TORONTO.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Huron.

Of this letter his Lorasup says nothing ; yet, strange to say, on arriving in Toronto he acted upon it. He did, at the time appointed, present himself at Mr. Cameron's office, and thence go to the residence of the Bishop of Toronto. After consulting with him, he returned to Mr. Cameron, and informed him that, having seen the Bishop of Toronto, he had agreed with him respecting the report of the committee on statutes, except in a few unimportant particulars, which he thought would create no difficulty at the meeting.

The Corporation cannot conceive that this understanding with the Bishop of Toronto could have been arrived at in the absence of any written document in the hand of either party, or at a casual meeting which might properly be described in the terms which the Bishop of Huron employs when he says : " I saw the Bishop of Toronto only for a few minutes that morning."

The Bishop of Huron next demurs to the assertion that " he accompanied the Bishop of Toronto to the meeting of the Corporation." If these words necessarily imply more than that the Bishops presented themselves to the meeting together, the Corporation willingly withdraw them, together with any imputation which the Bishop of Huron may suppose them to convey.

At the opening of the business of the meeting the Bishop of Toronto spoke to this effect : " I am happy to inform the gentlemen present that the Bishop of Huron and myself are of one mind respecting the statutes now to be proposed for adoption ; the Bishop has one or two unimportant amendments to suggest, which I trust the Corporation will adopt." The Bishop of Huron sat by and assented to this statement. The Corporation consider it impossible that, if some new statute, of which the Bishop of Huron had never heard, had been brought forward for adoption, and brought forward as forming a part of the body of the statutes respecting which he had consulted with the Bishop of Toronto (and in this way they affirm that it must have been brought forward, if it was brought forward at all), he should not have uttered one single syllable of remonstrance or surprise.

As for the opposition offered to the statute at the time, not as introduced by surprise, but on its proper merits, the recollection of all present would show that the Bishop of Huron took no exception against the vesting of a discretionary power in the Chancellor, but merely offered some suggestions respecting details, which he by no means pressed ; and that he certainly left on the minds of all present an impression as to his feeling respecting the statute, directly opposed to that which his pastoral letter would convey.

The Corporation would desire to make every reasonable allowance for the imperfect recollection of circumstances long past of which no written record remains, but they owe it to themselves to declare that they see no reason to retract any assertion which they have put forth, and that they believe that if the Bishop of Huron had fairly availed himself of the proper means of re-calling the occurrences of that time, he could not have impugned their assertions as he has thought proper to do so.

The Corporation, however, proceed to notice one or two statements of the Bishop of Huron which they confess have greatly surprised them ; and though, in any personal controversy, they would gladly have forborne to point out so particularly, as they will now proceed to do, the just grounds of their surprise ; yet in vindicating an important institution, in which the Church of England has a deep interest, from a very injurious attack, which they feel to have been lightly and inconsiderately made, they cannot properly refrain.

The Bishop of Huron quotes from the statement of the Corporation the following words : “ And his refusal (to bring forward in his place in the Corporation his charge against the teaching of the College) was based on this ground, that he could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University ;” and he adds, “ I never stated any such ground for my refusal. To prove this I have only to quote the passage from my letter in which I replied to the Bishop of Toronto. The passage is as follows : ‘ You say that in early life you adopted the rule, never, if possible, to allow an opportunity of doing good to pass unimproved : all who are acquainted with the history of your life will acknowledge that few men have more fully acted upon this rule. But there is another rule having divine sanction, which I feel assured you would desire to observe, and which must regulate my conduct towards Trinity College ; it is, “ Abstain from all appearance of evil.” I feel that I am bound to act up to this rule, and as *I cannot in my soul approve of the teaching of Trinity College*, I believe that my appearing to sanction it, would be a positive evil, and would expose me to the condemnation which the Apostle says is the just portion of those who say, “ Let us do evil that good may come.” ’”

Here the Bishop's quotation from his letter ends, though the *very next words* of that letter are the following : “ Were I to go to the Council, as you say, would be the ‘ wiser and more honourable course,’ and enter my protest against the teaching which I disapprove, no good result would follow, as *I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University*, and the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented.”

It thus appears that, in order to disprove the assertion of the Corporation, the Bishop of Huron quotes the first half of a paragraph of his letter, stopping just when he arrives at those words, used by himself in the same letter, which would establish their assertion and disprove his own. The Corporation also invite particular attention to the fact, that, after denying the ground for his refusal which the words of his own letter, left unquoted by him, had distinctly expressed, the Bishop of Huron proceeds to quote, in his pastoral, expressions which immediately follow them, thus giving a *résumé* of the whole sentence, with the omission of the only words upon which the Bishop and the Corporation are at issue.

Once more, the Bishop of Huron says :

“ From the above extract it will be seen that though I did not, in my place in the Corporation, bring forward a charge against the teaching of the University, yet I make the charge in the most solemn

form in which I could put it to the President of the Corporation, and as I received no answer to my letter, I concluded either that the President was indifferent as to what opinion I might entertain of the teaching of Trinity College, or that he concurred in the view which I expressed in the same letter, 'that it was a wiser course for me to stand aloof from the University, than by a public protest to exhibit the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself.'

"I should not, even when called upon by a member of my Synod, have given expression to the opinion which I had formed of Trinity College, had I not, previously, in the most pointed, and solemn manner, given expression to the same opinion to the President of that Institution."

The Corporation regret that they are compelled to characterize this passage as most disingenuous. In proof of this assertion they quote below from two letters of the Bishop of Huron, and from the reply of the Bishop of Toronto to the first of those letters. In a letter, dated April 19th, 1860, the Bishop of Huron uses the words: "I disapprove of Trinity College in many things." He thus gave the Bishop of Toronto opportunity of appealing to him, in the following earnest terms, to state the grounds of his disapproval. The letter of the Bishop of Toronto bears date April 25th, 1860, and it may here be observed that the correspondence originated in a letter addressed to the Bishop of Huron by the Bursar of Trinity College, inviting him, in the name of the Corporation, to exercise his privilege of nominating five members of the College Council from his own Diocese, in accordance with a statute to which he had so recently given his assent.

MY DEAR LORD,

TORONTO, *April 25th*, 1860.

I have read your letter of the 19th inst. with very much regret, because it has been my earnest wish that you should take your place at the Council of Trinity College, as you have equal power and authority with myself, and give us your hearty and strenuous assistance in its government and direction. Suffer me therefore to entreat you to re-consider and withdraw your letter of the 19th inst., and to proceed to the nomination of those whom you desire to represent your Diocese in the University.

Trinity College being always intended for the benefit of Upper Canada, and desiring no pre-eminence in the establishment, it was provided in the charter at my desire that all the Bishops should enjoy equal authority.

There are, you say, some things which you disapprove of in the Institution, if so, permit me, as the wiser and more honourable course, to request you to come among us and point them out, that they may be fairly examined and modified if deficient, or confirmed if found correct. I feel assured, from the knowledge I have of the members of our Council, that they are not unreasonable or disposed to retain anything really objectionable.

The authorities of Trinity College are quite aware, that among the

members of the Church in Upper Canada there are in some few points differences of opinion, but they have never considered them, nor are they disposed to consider them, a just cause of separation and estrangement. The same differences, and in much the same proportion, exist in England, as they do in the Church here, but the true Christians of both parties are found associating to promote and support institutions really good, and they disapprove of those who make them grounds of contention.

This being the view which I take, and have always taken of the University's relation to the Church, I desire without offence to state, that as it seems to me, you are not at liberty to refuse to discharge the important duties of an office to which you have been appointed by competent authority without incurring a responsibility which the reasons you assign will in no way sustain or justify.

In truth, the very fact of your separation from us will inflict upon the Church and University an injury that you can never repair.

One of the rules of conduct which I adopted in early life was the following: "Never if possible to permit an opportunity of doing good to pass me unimproved." In carrying out this principle I may have frequently failed and suffered much discouragement, mortification and sorrow; but, believing that no thought or effort for good is ever lost in our Lord's kind Providence, I persevered in my course and I now find, on looking back when nearly at the end of my journey, that the balance is greatly in my favour. To bear and forbear in all situations of life, is the ordained lot and the wisdom of humanity, and our struggle after good, like prayer, should never cease. Hence, I have always strongly felt the truth of the Apostle's doctrine, "That to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

Again entreating you to re-consider and withdraw your letter, I remain, my dear Lord, your faithful Brother in Christ,

JOHN TORONTO.

To this strong and affectionate appeal of the Bishop of Toronto, the Bishop of Huron replied in a letter containing the following passage:

"I now come to that part of your letter which has caused me much anxious thought. I would preface my remarks by assuring you that, in the commencement of my Episcopal career, moved by the high opinion which I entertained of your experience and judgment, I formed the resolution to avail myself of your advice and fatherly counsel whenever I could do so, without doing violence to my own convictions, and it has caused me many unpleasant feelings, that I am not able, in the present case, to agree with the opinion which you have advanced.

You say that in early life you adopted the rule, "never, if possible, to permit an opportunity of doing good to pass unimproved." Any one at all acquainted with the history of your life will acknowledge that few men have more fully acted up to this excellent rule. But there is another rule of Divine authority, which, I feel assured, you would not desire to overlook, and which regulates my conduct towards

Trinity College. It is the Apostolic rule, "Abstain from all appearance of evil." I feel that I am bound to act up to this rule, and as I cannot, in my soul, approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction this teaching would be a positive evil, and would expose me to the condemnation which the Apostle says is the just portion of those who say, "let us do evil that good may come;" were I to go to the Council, as you say would be the "wiser and more honourable course," and enter my protest against the teaching which I disapprove, no good result would follow, as I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University, and the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented. To avoid this I have heretofore kept aloof from the University, and I am still satisfied in my own mind, that it is better for me thus to act than to introduce discussion into the Council, and thus render patent to the world the differences which unhappily exist amongst us. Praying earnestly that the Lord will grant to us both, that wisdom, which cometh down from above and which is pure and peaceable, so that we may be enabled to follow peace with all men, I remain, my dear Lord, with unabated respect and esteem, your brother in the ministry,

BENJ. HURON.

P.S.—I have written the above as a private communication to your Lordship, as your letter of the 25th of April appeared to me to require it.

B. H.

Such is the correspondence. In the first letter the Bishop of Huron declares that he disapproves of Trinity College in many things; in the second, the Bishop of Toronto urges him to give explicit expression to that disapproval at the proper time and place; in the third, the Bishop of Huron refuses to do this, because he considers that such interference would be useless, at the same time stating that his letter is a private communication. And yet he does not fear to commit himself to the following statement: that he had made a charge against the teaching of the College, *in the most solemn form in which he could put it to the President of the Corporation; that he received no answer to his letter*, and that he thence concluded that the President was indifferent to his opinion, or that he agreed with him in thinking that it was better that he should stand aloof from the College.

Any reader would justly infer from this statement that such a letter as that of the Bishop of Toronto could never have been addressed to the Bishop of Huron; he would, indeed, infer that the whole transaction had been utterly the reverse of what it really was; that the Bishop of Huron had openly and candidly stated objections against which the Bishop of Toronto shut his ear, rather than that the Bishop of Huron refused to state objections for which the Bishop of Toronto had most earnestly called.

The Bishop of Huron describes himself as having said in his Synod, "I have taken every pains for two years to inform myself concerning the teaching of the University;" and again, near the close of his

letter he adds, "I am in possession of ample information upon the subject, which I am ready to impart to those for whose satisfaction and guidance the opinion (given in the Huron Synod) was expressed." Yet the Bishop of Huron says elsewhere, "I was then (February 24th, 1859) for the first time at a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College." And he has never been there since. He has not only not carefully used, but studiously shunned, every open method of informing himself of the teaching of the College. He has preferred to observe and acquaint himself with the College under all the disadvantages inseparable from a distant and hostile position, while he had every opportunity of acquiring that intimate and familiar acquaintance with the details of its system, which every friend of the Church and of the University would desire that our Bishops in Upper Canada should possess, and which is indeed a part of the duty which they are bound to assume on entering upon the episcopal office.

As to the character of the instruction given in the College, the Corporation have full confidence in the teaching of the Provost, as being in entire conformity with the formularies of our Church, as elucidated by her great writers; and they now make a public demand of the Bishop of Huron, to state definitely the points on which his objections are founded. They cannot tamely suffer any officer of the College to be assailed as "unsound and unprotestant," merely because he keeps close to those formularies and summaries of doctrine which constitute the only guide which we can safely and consistently follow as members of the Church of England.

Of the closing paragraph of the Bishop of Huron's letter, the Corporation will only permit themselves to say, that if the Bishop of Huron had really entertained "the feelings of veneration," which he there affects to entertain, and which are assuredly entertained by every other member of the Corporation towards the object of his remarks, he could never have made himself responsible for language which has drawn upon him the righteous indignation, not only of every Churchman in this Diocese, but of every inhabitant of the Province to whom the Bishop of Toronto is known, either by his public services or by the virtues of his personal character.

(Signed) JOHN TORONTO, *President.*
CHARLES MAGRATH, *Bursar and Secretary.*

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

*The Bishop of Huron to the Clerical and Lay Gentlemen composing the
Executive Committee of the Synod of the Diocese of Huron.*

MY REVEREND BRETHERN AND BRETHERN,

Your resolution, requesting me to lay before the Diocese the proofs upon which I have formed the opinion which I expressed concerning the teaching of Trinity College, Toronto, has been placed in my hands. In compliance with your request, I now proceed to redeem the pledge which I gave in my pastoral, of making known to the clergy and laity of my Diocese the grounds of my opinion, whenever called upon to do so.

Some time after my return from England, in 1858, some graduates in Trinity College applied to me for ordination, and it became my duty to examine them. I perceived that the views of some of these gentlemen, more particularly concerning the character and doctrines of the Church of Rome, were not such as I had always entertained.

I sought out the cause of this, and after a good deal of examination and inquiry, I was led to the conclusion that the views held by these gentlemen were traceable to the teaching to which they had been subjected during their University course. The mode of teaching, as described to me, appeared to be highly objectionable, and the matter taught was in my view most dangerous to all students, more especially to young men preparing for the ministry. I shall now direct attention to these two points, the mode of teaching and the things taught.

In order that I should not fall into any error concerning the mode of teaching in the University, I addressed, by letter, several gentlemen who have been connected with Trinity College, and I forwarded to each of them a list of questions, to which I requested candid and plain answers. The following are the questions and answers, from which you may form your own opinion as to the mode of imparting religious instruction to young men in Trinity College.

1. Was the attendance on the lectures on catechism compulsory?
2. Did the Provost at each lecture *dictate* questions and answers from his own manuscript?
3. Did the students write both questions and answers as he dictated them?
4. Were the students expected on the next lecture day to read the answers as the Provost had dictated them?
5. Did you ever know the Provost to lend his manuscript to a student to correct his notes taken down at lecture?
6. Are there any copies of the manuscript thus corrected handed down from class to class? And is the book familiarly known among the students as "The Provost's Catechism"?
7. Did the Provost ever express his disapproval of the use of these note books?
8. Are you aware whether a proposition to publish the manuscript was ever made by any of the students, and what was the Provost's reason for disapproving of its publication?

The following answers are from a layman residing in the Diocese of Toronto. The answers are numbered to correspond with the questions.

Ans. 1.—Attendance on the lectures is fully as compulsory as on any other lecture prescribed.

Ans. 2.—Yes, it is the Provost's regular mode of proceeding to dictate questions and answers.

Ans. 3.—No; that would be impossible at the rate the Provost is accustomed to go on. One of the first things a student does after entering, is (on advice) to secure a copy of the manuscript, which invariably corresponds, almost verbatim, with that which the Provost uses, except in some instances it may not perhaps be so full. As each student enters the lecture room, he brings his own or another's copy of this manuscript, which he places on the table before him, in the presence of the Provost, leaving it closed until the questions dictated on the last lecture day are answered or disposed of. Then he opens his manuscript, and follows the Provost as far as he goes,

marking at the same time, if he notices any error or mistake. Apart from this, he writes neither questions nor answers, nor does he take notes, which must be quite apparent to the Provost.

Ans. 4.—Yes; that is the plan pursued, and never, in my experience, did I witness an answer, as recorded in these manuscripts, prove to be incorrect; but I have known other answers refused, when they did not suit the Provost's views, or, as he said, "were not the answers I gave."

Ans. 5.—No; but I have heard he did so; but whether he did or not, the perfect agreement of both proves that we have got a correct copy.

Ans. 6.—These copies now in use are positively correct copies of the Provost's so far as they go. These are handed down from class to class. The freshman (for whose benefit the catechism is designed) either copies one for himself, or has one given him by some of the students who have preceded him. I have been asked repeatedly by the students, "How do you like the Provost's catechism?"

Ans. 7.—I have never heard him do so.

Ans. 8.—I don't know. These statements are perfectly true, and can be proved in the most solemn manner.

I now proceed to give the answers of a clergyman in the Diocese of Huron.

Ans. 1.—Attendance was compulsory.

Ans. 2.—The Provost at each lecture asked questions, evidently from his manuscript, upon the notes which he had dictated at the previous lecture, and of course the answers had to be taken from his notes.

Ans. 3.—The students used every means to acquire the answers which the Provost required, and when they found they had not the exact answer in their manuscript, they took down the answer given by him.

Ans. 4.—The students were required to give correct answers, taken from the Provost's notes, to the questions asked by him.

Ans. 5.—Never; but he lent his questions sometimes.

Ans. 6.—There is a catechism, question and answer, in common use among the students, handed down from class to class, and familiarly known as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never that I know of.

Ans. 8.—I have heard the students speaking of wishing to have the catechism published, but I do not remember the Provost's objections.

The next answers are from a layman resident in the Diocese of Toronto:

Ans. 1.—Yes; the Provost required an excuse for absence on every occasion.

Ans. 2.—The Provost lectured from his manuscript, and asked questions on the next day for lecture. He has frequently said, when a question has not been answered satisfactorily, "That is not what I gave you." His questions were written as well as his lectures.

Ans. 3.—Some of them took notes; others would have their prede-

cessor's books, and would only follow him while reading, and see that they were correct.

Ans. 4.—We generally answered in his own words, and if not, as nearly as possible.

Ans. 5.—He lent his questions on the catechism on one or two occasions, and his notes on the articles. I cannot answer positively as to his notes on the catechism.

Ans. 6.—The manuscript, with an exact copy of his questions (as taken by Mr. Wm. Jones, now of Cambridge), and the answers, as collected (answer No. 3), were handed down. When I entered in 1856, I procured a book from Mr. Wm. Jones, from which to copy a manuscript for myself. It was always spoken of as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—I never heard of any disapproval, either directly or indirectly.

Ans. 8.—I on several occasions have heard students propose to have it published, and the reply generally given was "The Provost would not like it." Whether or not he was consulted, I cannot say.

The next set of answers is from a layman, now resident in the Diocese of Huron.

Ans. 1.—Attendance on the catechism lecture was compulsory.

Ans. 2.—The Provost read from his manuscript as a continuous lecture, but must have been aware that he had it either written, or took very few notes in the room, and both questions and answers were contained in his lecture, although not distinguished as such by him, being probably aware that we had both questions and answers before us.

Ans. 3.—The students had both questions and answers written before they entered the room, and only compared theirs with the Provost's while he read.

Ans. 4.—The students were expected on the lecture day to answer the questions of the preceding lecture day in the substance, and as much as possible in the words given.

Ans. 4.—I never did.

Ans.—Each student of the first year either borrows, and copies a manuscript from the borrowed copy, or purchases from a student of the second or third year his manuscript.

Ans. 7.—I never heard him say anything *pro* or *con* in the matter.

Ans. 8.—I never heard any proposition of the kind, though it might have been made without my knowledge.

The following is an extract from a note received from a lay gentleman, residing at some distance:—"I do not think the Provost has ever given both questions and answers to any student to copy, but I heard when I was at College that he lent his questions on one occasion and that a copy was taken of them. Of course, as soon as the students had a copy of the questions which were to be put to them, they were able to form proper answers from the notes which they had taken down from the last or preceding lecture. I don't remember hearing any copy called "The Provost's Catechism;" I have heard of "The Provost's Questions," meaning those questions which the Provost

asks. I have heard that the Provost has been asked to publish a catechism, in order that the students might be saved the trouble of writing out copies for themselves."

The following answers are from a graduate of Trinity College, residing in the Diocese of Toronto:—

Ans. 1.—Yes; it was placed precisely on the same footing with the other subjects. Students absenting themselves from the catechism, or any other lecture given by the Provost, were *obliged* to account *satisfactorily* to the Provost on the succeeding day, for their absence therefrom.

Ans. 2.—Yes; the Provost's mode of procedure was as follows:—At his first lecture to freshmen he read to us about thirty questions (the number varied afterwards). The next Friday he questioned us on the matter of the preceding Friday, and read to us fresh questions and answers, sufficient to fill up the hour.

Ans. 3.—The students had copies of the questions and answers written, either by themselves, or students who had previously graduated in Trinity College, and as the Provost *read his lecture* they compared their manuscripts with *what read* and made alterations in the references (texts of Scripture), or anything else in which there might have been a discrepancy. They were thus assured of *perfect accuracy*.

Ans. 4.—Most assuredly they were; for I recollect that on one occasion, a student of my year expressed the answer in a manner which varied, by *two unimportant words*, from that dictated by the Provost on the preceding Friday, and was corrected for it. I remember this the more distinctly, as every student who took pains with it, used to repeat it with *literal* accuracy.

Ans. 5.—I understood, by report among the students, that the Provost did at one time lend his manuscript to a student, and I always considered that this was the origin of the almost stereotyped accuracy of our manuscripts.

Ans. 6.—Yes; generally a student, after his previous examination in his second year, at which time he passes his third and last examination in the catechism, either gives, lends, or sells his manuscript catechism to junior students. In my case I obtained the loan of a manuscript catechism, and copied it out. It is familiarly known among the students as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never to my knowledge.

Ans. 8.—No; but I often wished, for my own convenience, that it had been printed and published, as the copying of it entailed a great deal of unnecessary labour upon me, and wasted much precious time: in fact, I thought it on the whole a very strange proceeding.

I have stated fully my objections to this mode of teaching in my pastoral; I need not here repeat them.

This manuscript known as "The Provost's Catechism," with the questions copied or corrected from his own manuscript, lent for that purpose, and the answers taken down carefully from his lips, and corrected from time to time, has been handed down from class to class, and has been bought and sold by the students. I have not given the

names of those gentlemen from which I have received the above answers to my questions, but I can obtain permission to do so if necessary, and shall lay the original documents, together with the letters which accompanied them, before any member of the Synod appointed for that purpose. There was but one gentleman to whom I applied who expressed a wish "not to be at all implicated in the matter." I have therefore not made any use of his communication.

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

(Continued from p. 431.)

I NOW proceed to lay before you the teaching which I characterised as "dangerous in the extreme." I have heard, when examining graduates of Trinity College, statements which they have reported as made to them, either in the course of lectures, or in conversation with the Divinity Professor. Some of these I took down at the time I heard them, such as the following, that "the Church of England lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good, and tended to edification;" that "justification was an impertinent subject to introduce before a congregation, as there was not one man in ten thousand who was not already justified." These and such like statements I have heard from gentlemen who have been students in the University. I do not here dwell upon them; I come to the consideration of documents which I shall quote, and I think when these documents are well weighed, and compared with the articles and formularies of our Church, they will abundantly establish the conclusion to which I have come, that the teaching in Trinity College is dangerous.

I have now in my possession five copies of the catechism, which have been for years in the hands of the students of Trinity College, and which graduates of that University declare contains the questions of the Provost, corrected from his own manuscript, with the answers taken down carefully from his lips. I have collated these five copies, and their agreement is such as must convince any one that either they all had their origin from one copy, or that they were reported with wonderful fidelity from the lips of the lecturer.

The following are specimens of the dangerous teaching contained in this catechism:—

On the article "Born of the Virgin Mary," we find the following questions and answers—

Ques.—What is the Hebrew form of the name Mary?

Ans.—Miriam.

Ques.—What does the name signify?

Ans.—Exaltation.

Ques.—What signification, then, had it as borne by the mother of our Lord ?

Ans.—The exalted position resulting from her having given birth to the Redeemer of the world.

Ques.—Who is the first recorded possessor of this name ?

Ans.—Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.

Ques.—Show that she may be regarded as holding a position under the old dispensation, typical of that which Mary held under the new ?

Ans.—Miriam was an instrument in bringing the Israelites to the promised land, and Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Glory (or Heaven).

Ques.—What was the belief of the early Fathers respecting the virginity of Mary ?

Ans.—That she continued a virgin ever after.

Ques.—On what grounds did it rest ?

Ans.—Some suppose that the mother of such a son could not be mother of another.

Such teaching as this I regard as a dangerous tampering with a false doctrine of the Church of Rome, directly leading to idolatry. It will, I doubt not, be said by some that Pearson, in his "Exposition of the Creed," teaches the same thing. Even were this the case, still, I would consider the teaching as dangerous in the present time, when there is, especially in the minds of the young, such a hankering after the errors and superstitions of Rome ; but Pearson does not teach that the Virgin Mary had a *divinely appointed type under the law* ; neither does he teach that she was *an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Heaven*. He says : "As she, Miriam, was exalted to be one of those who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage, so was this Mary exalted to be the mother of that Saviour who, through the red sea of his blood, had wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type." In the questions and answers of the catechism, the undue exaltation of Mary is pushed far beyond what Pearson says upon the subject, and we see the germ of that full-blown superstition which, in its most revolting form, meets us in the late letter of the Pope to the Canadian Bishops. I fear such teaching for our young men. If they are taught to believe that Mary is typified in the law, they may soon conclude, with Bonaventura, that she is to be found in the Psalms, and thus be led to look upon the idolatrous honour done to her in the Church of Rome as natural and right.

On the article "The Communion of Saints," I find the following questions and answers :—

Ques.—With whom have the saints communion ? Prove from Holy Scripture.

Ans.—With God the Father, &c., and with God the Son, &c., and with God the Holy Ghost, &c., and with the holy angels, &c., and with all the saints of the Church Militant, &c., and with all the saints departed, &c.

Ques.—Wherein does communion with saints departed consist ?

Ans.—In union of affection, involving on our part reverential com-

memoration and imitation, and on their part interest on our behalf, and probable intercession with God for us.

I will add here a letter lately received from a clergyman who some years since graduated in Trinity College. "I will now endeavour to state, as well as I can remember, things which struck me as particularly strange in the Provost's doctrinal teaching. I cannot remember his exact words. I can only give the impression that they left on my mind at the time. In lecturing on 'The Communion of Saints,' he certainly gave us to understand, while discoursing on the interest the saints took in our spiritual welfare, that he thought that they pleaded with God for us. He did on one occasion make use of these words, or words very like them, 'This is one of the losses which we sustained,' or 'Things which we lost, at the Reformation,' and I have a very strong impression upon my mind that it was when speaking of prayers for the dead. He always spoke of baptismal regeneration, as if all divines received the doctrine in its strongest sense, without ever hinting that there was a far more evangelical view of it taken by many eminent divines in our Church. When young men are thus taught, in the creed we profess to believe, that the saints departed take an interest in our spiritual welfare, and *probably* intercede with God for us, the transition is easy to 'Holy St. Dominick, pray for us.' Can we regard that man as a sound-hearted member of the *Church of England, as she now is*, who has learned that the same Church, at the Reformation, lost certain valuable practices, which, of course, it would be our duty, if possible, to have restored?"

On the article "Remission of Sins," in the Creed, I find the following questions and answers:—

Ques.—How is remission of sins granted under the Gospel?

Ans.—In baptism past sin is forgiven, whether original or actual, in the case either of infants or adults duly prepared by faith and repentance.

Ques.—How is it granted after baptism?

Ans.—On repentance.

Ques.—In what mode is redemption declared and sealed to the penitent?

Ans.—It is declared *in the authoritative absolution*, and sealed in the reception of the Holy Communion.

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture.

Ans.—"If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John i. 8, 9.) "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also, for if I forgive anything, to whom I forgive it, for your sakes forgive I it, in the person of Christ." (2 Cor. ii. 10.)

The evident intention in quoting this passage from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, is to justify the statement that the remission of sins is declared "in the *authoritative absolution*" mentioned in the answer to the preceding question. Contrast the mode of granting remission of sins set forth in this catechism with the mode enunciated so clearly in the eleventh article of our Church, "We are

accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by faith*, and not for own works and deservings ; wherefore, that we are justified *by faith only*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification." This mode of teaching the remission of sin, 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. If baptism, the supper of our Lord, and the authoritative absolution, take away sin and seal the pardon of the transgressor, then the Church of Rome is right, and our forefathers were unjustifiable schismatics in separating from her communion.

Concerning the sacraments, I find in the catechism the following questions and answers :—

Ques.—Of what sacraments does the catechism treat ?

Ans.—Of *two only*, as generally necessary to salvation, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Ques.—What is implied by these restrictions of the term ?

Ans.—That the term sacrament may be more widely applied to mean any holy rite.

Ques.—Where, then, lies the error of the Roman Church in making seven sacraments ?

Ans.—In drawing *no due distinction* between the *two great sacraments and other holy rites*.

Ques.—The sacraments are said to be generally necessary to salvation ; what is meant by generally ?

Ans.—*Generally* here means *universally ; generally*, i. e. *to all men*. The sacraments are necessary, not to God, as instruments whereby He may save us, but to us, *as God's appointed means of salvation, the channels in which his grace flows to us.*—(*Laud.*)

Ques.—Give an instance of a *sacrament or holy rite* ordained by Christ Himself, which is not generally necessary to salvation ?

Ans.—*Orders*.

Ques.—What rites does Rome class with the *two great sacraments* ?

Ans.—Confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction.

Ques.—What is to be observed concerning confirmation ?

Ans.—Confirmation was in early times *part of the sacrament of baptism* ; it became separated from it in three ways, &c.

Ques.—What concerning orders ?

Ans.—This rite was appointed by Christ, *and was accompanied by an outward sign*, but the grace bestowed was not personal, but official, and there is no promise of remission of sins.

Ques.—What respecting penance ?

Ans.—In early times those who were subject to ecclesiastical penalties were required to confess their sins, and after having been separated from the Church, were admitted by the laying on of hands. (This rite is not attended by the remission of sins.)

Ques.—What respecting matrimony ?

Ans.—In this rite *there are outward signs*, but no spiritual grace, and no promise of remission of sins.

Is it safe to teach young men thus to regard the so-called sacraments which the Church of Rome has added to the *only* two appointed by Christ ? and not as our Church plainly teaches concerning them in the Twenty-fifth Article : “ Those five commonly-called sacraments are *not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel*, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but *yet have not like nature of sacraments, with baptism and the Lord’s Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.*” Our Church does not speak of *two great sacraments*, leaving us to infer that there are lesser sacraments, and that the Church of Rome, in adding to the sacraments appointed by Christ, has only erred in not making a “*due distinction*” between the two greater sacraments and other holy rites or sacraments. Neither does our Church trifle with her members by using the word “*generally*” when she intended to express “*universally.*” When we add to this, that those young men who are thus taught in the first year of their University course to toy with the sacraments of the Church of Rome, are further instructed that the recipient of the bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper partakes of the “*glorified humanity*” of the Son of God, I think it will be acknowledged that the teaching is dangerous in a very high degree. Moreover, in this catechism, our Lord’s words, recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John’s Gospel, are repeatedly quoted, as spoken concerning the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, as in the following answers :—

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the Lord’s Supper is generally necessary ?

Ans.—“ Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” (John vi. 53.)

Ques.—What words of our Lord show this ?

Ans.—Our Lord speaks of the spiritual benefits which should certainly flow from eating his flesh and blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be thought to partake : “ Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him.” (John vi. 54, &c.)

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the Holy Eucharist sustains the spiritual life imparted by baptism ?

Ans.—“ Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.” (John vi. 53.)

In these questions and answers, taken from different parts of the catechism, the student is unhesitatingly taught to interpret the words of our Lord, in the sixth of John, as spoken concerning the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Commentators of the Church of England since the Reformation, and some Roman Catholic divines, have interpreted

the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, as having no reference whatsoever to the Lord's Supper, and one of the latter has asserted that "the Universal Church has understood this passage, ever since its promulgation, to mean spiritual eating and drinking by a living faith."

One of our most eminent reformers, when combating the doctrine of transubstantiation, thus expressed himself concerning this passage: "Christ in that place of John spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained), but he spake of spiritual bread, many times repeating, 'I am the bread of life which came down from heaven,' and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort He was at the same present time eating of as many as believed on Him, although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore He said, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and died; but he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.' Therefore, this place of St. John can in no wise be understood of the sacramental bread, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat. Nor of such bread could Christ have presently said, 'This is my flesh,' except they will say, that Christ did then consecrate so many years before the institution of His holy supper."—*Cranmer*.

I cannot, therefore, think it sound divinity or good Protestantism to teach that in the sixth chapter of St. John, our Lord refers to the oral reception of the elements in the sacrament, and not to the *spiritual participation of his body and blood, by faith*; such teaching I must consider "dangerous in the extreme."

I have thus laid before you, from authentic sources, some of the teaching to which I object. The impressions conveyed to my mind by the examination of graduates of the University, I cannot of course convey to yours. The mode adopted by me to ascertain the character and effects of the teaching in Trinity College, is that which common sense dictated, and which my position required me to adopt, namely, to examine the pupils. It would be quite impossible to write all I have learned in this way, but the result has been a deep-seated conviction that a large portion of tares is mixed with the seed sown in the minds of the young men educated in the institution. In some I know, these tares have not taken root, but this is to be attributed to the fact, that their minds were pre-occupied by the good seed which had been previously sown by the care of their parents or pastors. Whether this has always been sufficient to prevent the growth of the tares, I cannot say.

Before I conclude this letter, which is the last I shall address to you on this subject, I would briefly advert to one or two passages in my late pastoral.

The resolutions of the committee, which were said to have been transmitted to me, were never received; they never came into my hands.

When the statute, which has been the subject of discussion, was read at the council, I *strongly objected to it*, stating at the same time, that if we could always depend on having a Chancellor like the gentleman

who now so worthily occupies that position, there could be no objection to leave some discretionary power with him, as all knew that he would act wisely and justly, but that such discretion could not be safely intrusted to every person who might hereafter be elected Chancellor of the University.

With reference to my reasons for not appearing at the meetings of the corporation, they are stated by me in my letter to the Bishop of Toronto, and occupy a paragraph of that letter.

It is very unfortunate that when the corporation of Trinity College undertook to state from my letter the grounds on which I declined to take my place at the corporation, they should have selected part of a sentence in the middle of this paragraph, and overlooked those portions of the same paragraph which immediately precede and follow that part of a sentence which they selected. The letter is now before the pupils, and any one who will take the trouble to analyse the paragraph referred to will find that there are three grounds stated for my refusal to attend the corporation of Trinity College. The first and chief reason which I quote in my pastoral is contained in the words, "*as I cannot in my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction this teaching would be a positive evil.*" The second is in the following words: "*Were I to go to the council, as you say would be the wiser and more honourable course, and enter my protest against the teaching which I condemn, no good result would follow* (as I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University)." The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the corporation, and they state *this as the ground* of my refusal to attend the meeting of the council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of my sentence, and do not express my reason for not attending the meetings of the council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is: "*And the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented; to avoid this I have heretofore kept aloof from the University, and I am still satisfied in my own mind, that it is better for me to act than to introduce discussion into the council, and thus to render patent the differences which unhappily exist among us.*" With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained *the ground* stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at the council.

This letter was written as a "private communication to the Bishop of Toronto," but it is evident it was laid before the corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th of June. In that letter, while I declined to take my place at the council (for the three reasons assigned), *which was the thing the Bishop urged me to do*, I stated in the most emphatic way, "*I cannot in my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College,*" and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to particularize in what the teaching consisted;

to my regret and surprise, he did not do so, and therefore I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. From what I have written above, all may judge of this for themselves. The documentary evidence which I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names may be quoted in favour of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can now misunderstand my attendance at the council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" which I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the corporation, and of endeavouring, in my place there, to effect those changes in the institution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese. I remain, my reverend brethren and brethren, your faithful friend and brother in the faith,
BENJ. HURON.

Aug. 29, 1860.

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

(Continued from Dec. 1860, p. 471.)

WE suppose that our readers have had enough of these documents to enable them to form their own opinions on the merits of the case. We little thought when we printed, in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for September last, the charge brought by the Bishop against the College, that the controversy would continue so long. The Provost published a letter, to which we referred in September (p. 353), which ought to have been conclusive, and which, we suppose, would have been so with any other Prelate in our communion than Bishop Cronyn. Since the following letter was in type, we have seen another from the Provost, which is meant as a postscript, and which we intend to print in February, and then we hope to have done with the matter. The Canadian correspondent of the *Guardian*, of December 27, 1860, says:—

“ Since the Provost’s overwhelming rejoinders, Bishop Cronyn has been silent,—no apologies or excuses have been offered. He stands convicted of having made groundless charges against the most important Church Institution in the Canadas, and yet he makes no sign. Were he, however, to devote all the remainder of his days to making atonement for his reckless conduct, he could not undo one-half the mischief he has done.” We recommend the letter in the *Guardian* to the notice of our readers.

At a well-attended meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, held on Thursday, September 27th, 1860, the Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting:—

“ I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received

from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed letter upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued. I lay these papers before the Council, not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost, in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—

MY LORD,—I have prepared, in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, together with authorities from approved writers of the Church of England; but independent of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to some of the comments of the Bishop on the *manner, matter, and tendency* of that teaching. As respects the *manner*, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily papers, and which I here transcribe.

"It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the Catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript, which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In order to save time and to observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared for my own use a book of questions, omitting or adding questions at my discretion, when I use it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish, is a summary of them in the note-books of the students. The contents of these books I never see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, on their plea that it would assist them to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand in the College, but so far from encouraging this I have urged young men to trust, if not exclusively, at all events mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. My wish is further, that in replying to my questions, the students should give, in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, therefore, to observe that no manuscript known by the name

of 'The Provost's Catechism,' or by any other name, is placed in the hands of *any* student entering the University, far less is any student expected to *learn* it."

The statement which I here made is fully borne out by one of the Bishop's own authorities. He says, "I do not think the Provost has ever given both questions and answers to any student to copy, but I heard when I was at College that he lent his questions on one occasion, and that a copy was taken of them. Of course, as soon as the students had a copy of the questions which were to be put to them, they were able to form proper answers from the notes which they had taken down from the last or preceding lecture. I don't remember of hearing of any copy called 'The Provost's Catechism.' I have heard of the 'Provost's questions,' meaning those questions which the Provost asks. I have heard that the Provost has been asked to publish a catechism, in order that the students might be saved the trouble of writing out copies for themselves." It may, however, be well that I should now do publicly, what I should long ago have been most ready and willing to do privately, give answers of my own to the series of questions which the Bishop of Huron has addressed to his informants. This then I proceed to do.

Ques. 1.—Was the attendance on the lectures on catechism compulsory?

Ans.—Undoubtedly it was, and no hint has been thrown out that it was not so.

Ques. 2.—Did the Provost at each lecture *dictate* questions and answers from his own manuscript?

Ans.—Certainly not. I put questions to the students at the opening of each lecture, on the subject of the preceding lecture, to be answered by them *word for word*. Consequently, the statement that questions were read at the first lecture is absolutely untrue.

Ques. 3.—Did the students write both questions and answers as he dictated them?

Ans.—Since neither questions nor answers *were* dictated, they could not be written by the students.

Ques. 4.—Were the students expected on the next lecture day to read the answers as the Provost had dictated them?

Ans.—As the answers had neither been dictated nor written down, they could not be read.

Ques. 5.—Did you ever know the Provost to lend his manuscript to a student to correct his notes taken down at lecture?

Ans.—I have no recollection whatever of having lent my manuscript, nor is the correctness of my recollection in this particular disputed by the informants of the Bishop of Huron, but I did lend a book containing my questions. It is particularly to be noticed that these questions have no answers annexed.

Ques. 6.—Are there any copies of the manuscript thus corrected handed down from class to class, and is the book familiarly known among the students as "The Provost's Catechism?"

Ans.—I believe that a manuscript containing my questions, with

answers framed from the notes of my lectures, was compiled, soon after the opening of the College, without authority, by one of the students, and has been repeatedly copied; but I had no knowledge of the existence of such a book, until I was informed of it in July last by Dr. Bovell, who received his information from the Bishop of Huron. I have never seen such a book, and know of its existence only by report.

Ques. 7.—Did the Provost ever express his disapproval of the use of these note-books?

Ans.—I did frequently express disapproval of the servile use of the note-books of others, conceiving, however, that they contained merely an analysis of my lectures. Had I known what these note-books are said to contain, my disapproval would have been expressed more strongly; and when I lent my questions, which I have not done for some years, I cautioned students not to avail themselves of them for the purpose of reducing my lecture to a catechetical form.

Ques. 8.—Are you aware whether a proposition to publish the manuscript was ever made by any of the students, and what was the Provost's reason for disapproving of its publication?

Ans.—I was never asked to publish my manuscript on the catechism. These facts I consider to be of great importance. 1st.—So far as they relate to the *mode* of teaching, which, had it been conducted by dictated questions and answers, I should with the Bishop of Huron regard as very objectionable, and without precedent at home. 2d.—Because the fact that answers to the questions were not dictated, materially affects the authority of the manuscripts from which the Bishop of Huron derives his information. It should be remembered that at the time at which the Bishop issued his first pastoral of the 21st July, I was in utter ignorance of the contents of these manuscripts, and consequently most anxious not to be held in any way responsible for them; and it must be evident to any reasonable man that I cannot justly be held answerable for the terms in which young men, little versed in theology, have thought fit to give expression to my teaching.

In the next paragraph of the Bishop's letter he speaks of information derived by his Lordship from candidates for holy orders, respecting my opinions as expressed in my lectures or in private conversation. I must indignantly protest against the production of any such hearsay evidence; and the special instances brought forward by the Bishop, respecting "the losses sustained at the Reformation," and "the impertinence of preaching on the doctrine of justification," I meet with a flat denial of their truth. In the same way I meet the letter of a clergyman quoted by the Bishop, in which mention is made of prayers for the dead,—a practice against which every Theological student of the College must know that I have repeatedly and strongly urged every argument both from Scripture and from reason.

To proceed to the Bishop's specific objections. 1st.—Concerning the Virgin Mary. The Bishop says, "Such teaching I regard as a dangerous tampering with a false doctrine of the Church of Rome, directly leading to idolatry." I positively deny that my real teaching

is in any degree open to this censure, and I most confidently appeal to the Theological students generally, in proof of the assertion that I have ever strongly condemned those grievous errors of the Church of Rome which assign to the Blessed Virgin any other place, in the economy of human redemption, than that of a humble yet most honoured instrument in the hand of Him who made her thus instrumental by causing her to be the mother of the Lord. In my lectures on the articles, I have argued against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception from our Lord's words, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," by showing that, if that dogma were true, then *Mary would enjoy an exclusive spiritual privilege, to which the hearing and keeping of the word of God could advance no other human being.* I have often said that the one error of Mariolatry constituted, in my opinion, an impassable gulf between the Church of Rome and our own.

The answer which the Bishop of Huron cites on this subject is, "Miriam was an instrument in bringing the Israelites into the promised land, and Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the kingdom of glory (or heaven)." For this answer, as being incorrect, I am in no way responsible, and I object to it altogether, both in respect of Miriam and in respect of Mary. I consider the 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.

In explanation of my own view, I would say that I claim Bishop Pearson as a recognised authority in our Church, and his book on the creed as an unexceptionable text-book. Pearson then says: "As she (Miriam) was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage, so was this Mary exalted to become the mother of that Saviour, who, through the Red Sea of His blood, hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type." In my manuscript I find the following words: "The sister of Moses and Aaron, coupled with them by the prophets as a joint leader of Israel from Egypt (Micah vi. 4), and thus answering, in some typical respect, to the place which Mary bore instrumentally in the means of human redemption." These words are taken from Dr. Mill's analysis of Pearson, and are taken advisedly, as expressing distinctly and guardedly the Bishop's meaning. For these words only, then, can I consent to be responsible, nor can I suppose that any candid person would object to them as not correctly representing the meaning of the original author.

I trace the typical resemblance of which Pearson speaks only in the earlier recorded events of Miriam's life, when, watching the infant deliverer "to see what would become of the child," she occupies in respect of him a position analogous to that of Mary as the guardian of our Lord's infancy; and again, when leading the song of triumph at the Red Sea, she celebrated the beginning of God's temporal deliverance, as Mary celebrated, in her Eucharistic Hymn, the beginning of His great redemption.

The Bishop next quotes from the manuscript he has used, yet without any special remark, two questions and answers relating to the belief of the early Church respecting the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. In my manuscript I find only a reference to a passage in Bishop Pearson, which I here transcribe: "We believe the mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after H's nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin;" and again, "the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged as the ever Virgin Mary."¹

To this testimony of Bishop Pearson may be added those of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Hooper, Bishop Jewel, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Bull, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Wilson, and Bishop Z. Pearce, which I shall give in full in my longer letter; some of these writers maintain the perpetual virginity as a reasonable and pious opinion, while others contend that it is a necessary doctrine proved by Holy Scripture. I should be disposed to take the ground occupied by the former, and I trust that their authority, together with that of those who adopt the stricter view of the matter, will protect me from the charge of dangerous heresy or disgusting folly.

Respecting the Bishop's objection, under the heads of "the intercession of saints," I would again confidently appeal to the students of the College as to the character of my teaching, and I must indignantly deny the Bishop of Huron's insinuation as to its tendency. No man can be more heartily convinced than I am of the presumptuous impiety of the practice of the "invocation of saints"

To the question and answer quoted by the Bishop I have no objection to urge, as my manuscript contains the words "and probable intercession with God for us," though not in the form of question or answer. I will only notice that the introduction of the word "probable" shows that prayer on the part of the departed for the Church on earth is not inculcated as a necessary doctrine, proved by Holy Scripture, but is spoken of only as a pious opinion, not contrary to it.

In reply to the Bishop's objection, I have to state that the great writers of our Church in controversy with Rome, have always carefully distinguished between *the prayers of saints departed for us* and *our praying to them*. The latter they justly denounce as a presumptuous and superstitious practice, and as an invasion of the prerogative of Almighty God; the former they allow to be a probable and reasonable belief. They distinguish also between *general* and *particular* intercession, showing that the former implies no *present knowledge* of our condition on the part of saints departed, but merely a *recollection* of earthly friends. When I speak of *the saints departed*, I mean "the spirits of

¹ Pearson on the Creed, vol. i. p. 272, Oxford, 1820.

just men made perfect :” not assuming that it is possible that we should have any certain knowledge of the individuals who constitute their body, which knowledge must be assumed by those who approve or practise the “ invocation of saints.”

I can by no means admit that the transition is easy, from the belief that saints departed offer general intercession for the Church on earth, to the use of the invocation “ Holy St. Dominick, pray for us ;” and I consider the admission that such a transition *is* easy most perilous to the true faith. I subjoin an extract from a letter addressed by Bishop Ridley to the martyr Bradford, shortly after his condemnation : “ Brother Bradford, so long as I shall understand thou art in thy journey, by God’s grace, I shall call upon our heavenly Father for Christ’s sake to set thee safely home, and then, good brother, speak you and pray for the remnant which are to suffer for Christ’s sake, according to that thou then shalt know more clearly.”¹ If Bishop Ridley is to be accounted a dangerous heretic for the adoption of this language, I am well content to share his disgrace.

Respecting the remission of sins I appeal to Bishop Pearson ; his words are :—

“ And therefore the Church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also, upon the virtue of repentance ; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian.”

In these words the writer claims for the Church the power of absolving the *penitent*, not the power of absolving any transgressor *whatever*, as the Bishop of Huron implies. Dr. Mill, in his analysis, adds the means which the Church employs in the exercise of this power, and speaks of remission as declared in the authoritative *absolutions* (not absolution) pronounced by the ministers of the Church, and sealed in the reception of the Holy Communion. The whole weight of the Bishop of Huron’s objection lies in the suppression of the word “ penitent.” 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, this, the *authoritative*, yet simply *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. In special cases, of rare occurrence, the minister is indeed called upon to pronounce an absolution, which is judicial as well as ministerial ; yet here, again, the absolution is contingent, and cannot take effect except upon those who *truly* repent and believe.

Respecting the Sacraments, as his Lordship has recognised the Homilies as one of the authoritative formularies of our Church, I would submit that every detail of my teaching to which his Lordship objects is to be found in the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. I shall enter into this matter at much greater length in a letter which I am about to publish, and will here merely observe that, in speaking

¹ See vol. iii. p. 370 of Foxe’s Acts and Monuments, folio, London, 1684.

of penance, matrimony, &c., it was my purpose to indicate some one or more points in which each of the five so-called sacraments of the Church of Rome falls short of the definition of a sacrament given in the Catechism of the Church of England. It being an undoubted historical fact that the word "sacrament" was applied in early times, not to seven rites or holy things, but to things innumerable of such nature, it is most important not to rest the pre-eminence of the two great sacraments of Christ upon a vain attempt to restrict to them a term of human invention not found in Holy Scripture, but on their distinctive dignity as being ordained by Christ Himself, and as being the only outward signs in the use of which our spiritual life is communicated and sustained.

In order, however, to maintain as far as possible a verbal distinction between the two great sacraments and other holy rites—a distinction which has not been made by the appropriation to those sacraments of a distinctive name—I should in practice invariably use the word "sacrament" of baptism and the Lord's Supper *only*, and I should reprove any young man under my care for applying it to any other rite. So far am I from teaching the students of Trinity College to "toy" with the so-called sacraments of the Church of Rome.

The Bishop also complains that the words "generally necessary to salvation," are thus explained in the manuscript which he has used; "generally here means universally, generally, *i.e.* to all men." In my manuscript I find these words "generally *necessary*, not to God, as instruments whereby he is to save, but to us, as God's appointed means of salvation, necessary *generally*, that is, to all men." I do not use the word "universally," and if I err in my interpretation of the word "generally," I err with Dr. Hammond, Bishop Nicholson, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Wilson, and Dr. Nicholls, as I shall show by quotations in my longer letter. I have been accustomed also to show how this general necessity is limited, by reference to the language used respecting the sacrament of baptism in the service for the baptism of adults, "whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, *where it may be had.*" If this explanation of the word "generally" be not satisfactory, I should be glad to learn what interpretation of the term will meet at once the theory of the objector and the requirements of common sense.

There are but two other points in the Bishop of Huron's letter now remaining to be considered. On these I must touch very briefly, reserving the more full reply to them for my longer letter. They are these,—the Bishop's objection to Mr. Proctor's statement that every faithful recipient (not *the recipient* as the Bishop states) of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper partakes of the glorified humanity of the Son of God, and his Lordship's objection to my reference to St. John vi. 53, to prove the necessity of the Lord's Supper. In reply to the former object, I am prepared to show that Mr. Proctor's teaching is fully confirmed by great divines of our Church, and among the rest by Archbishop Usher, whom I now proceed to quote, "Yet was it fit also that this head should be of the same nature with the body which is

knit unto it ; and therefore that He should so be God, as that He might partake of our flesh likewise. 'For we are members of His body,' saith the same Apostle, 'of His flesh, and of His bones.' And, 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' saith our Saviour Himself, 'and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.' Declaring thereby, first, that by His mystical and supernatural union, we are as truly conjoined with Him, as the meat and drink we take is with us, when by the ordinary work of nature it is converted into our own substance ; secondly, that this conjunction *is immediately made with his human nature.*"¹

Respecting the Bishop's objection to my quoting the sixth chapter of St. John, I will only state that while a difference of opinion exists among divines as to interpreting the language of the sixth of St. John, directly of the Lord's Supper, or of spiritual feeling in general, all who held the former opinion, and most of those who hold the latter, would alike agree in urging from this chapter the necessity of the Lord's Supper as the great mean of Divine appointment, whereby the act of spiritual feeling is performed, and the benefit thence resulting received.

The passage which the Bishop quotes from Archbishop Cranmer is by no means hostile to my application of the text in question. Writing against Gardiner, and against the error of transubstantiation, he argues that our Lord did not speak in this chapter of sacramental eating, but of spiritual eating ; two acts which he conceived his antagonist to regard as almost identical, but which he regarded as distinct. It does by no means follow, however, that Cranmer did not look upon sacramental feeding as being, after the institution of the Lord's Supper, a necessary condition of spiritual feeding. A quotation, which I shall give in my longer letter, will go far to prove that he did so. Both objections appear to be raised for the purpose of throwing upon my teaching a vague suspicion of a leaning to the error of transubstantiation. This suspicion may, I believe, be completely met by the following extract from my manuscript on the catechism. "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." "Verily and indeed," no less truly because *not corporally* : "by the faithful," the wicked cannot receive 1 Cor. x. 21. St. Augustine's saying "the wicked eat 'panem Domini,' but not 'panem Dominum.'" Our Lord speaks also of spiritual benefits which shall certainly follow from eating His flesh and drinking His blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be thought to partake. St. John vi. 54, 56.

If any man supposes that a person who thus teaches can countenance in any degree the doctrines of transubstantiation, I confess myself incapable of arguing with him.

In conclusion, I wish to observe that the present controversy is very likely to convey to the public in general the impression that if false doctrine has not been taught in the College, yet at least undue pro-

¹ Usher's Works, vol. iv. pop. 605 (see also page 617).

minence and exaggerated importance have been given to matters of very secondary moment. Your Lordship is well aware that it is not my teaching, but the Bishop of Huron's strictures on it, which have given this prominence and importance to the matters in question. I do not say this by way of complaint, but simply in self-defence, and for the purpose of abating a not unreasonable prejudice. The objections are for the most part based on a few short and scattered clauses, not one of which I am prepared to retract, but which I should be very sorry to have made the principal or even prominent topics of my teaching.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obliged and faithful servant,

Trinity College, September 27, 1860.

GEORGE WHITAKER.

The letter of the Provost having been read, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted :

Moved by the Hon. G. W. Allan, seconded by S. B. Harman, Esq.,

Resolved,—That this Corporation, having heard the reply of the Provost of Trinity College to the letter of the Bishop of Huron, bearing date, August 29, 1860, desire to express their entire satisfaction with the explanations offered of the charges advanced against the theological teaching of the Institution in that letter.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, seconded by the Hon. J. H. Cameron,

Resolved,—That this Corporation feel it incumbent upon them to express their unfeigned surprise and regret at the course which has been adopted by the Bishop of Huron to obtain evidence against the theological teaching of this institution.

They naturally supposed that a gentleman in the position of the Provost would be safe from any charge of unsoundness until personally referred to for an admission or denial of hearsay statements. Had the charges been denied by the accused, this Corporation could not properly have objected to the right of his accusers to proceed to collect evidence relevant to the charge.

Apart from the theological bearing of the case, this Corporation desire to express their decided opinion as to the unprecedented manner in which grave charges have been publicly advanced against the soundness of the teaching of this College, by one in whom the law has vested large powers to inquire into and reform any thing erroneous, but who has not attempted to exercise this power in a constitutional manner.

THE BISHOP OF HURON AND TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.—THE PROVOST'S LETTER.

MY LORD,—I find myself under the necessity of troubling your Lordship with a short communication, which I wish to be regarded as a postscript to my second letter.

The Bishop of Huron states in his letter to the members of the Executive Committee of his Synod that he has heard, when examining graduates of Trinity College, that I have said that "justification was an impertinent subject to introduce before a congregation, as there was not one man in ten thousand who was not already justified." Being conscious that I had never brought such a statement before the students, I gave the charge a flat denial in my first letter. In the second I suggested a remark on which another charge might have been, however unjustly, grounded; but I could recollect, at that time, nothing which could have served as a basis for *this*. I found, however, yesterday, in *Waterland* (vol. vi. p. 32, Oxford, 1843) a passage which I have read in my class, and which no doubt gave occasion to the charge.

Dr. Waterland's words are : " Some will plead, that man is utterly unable to do good works before he is justified and regenerated : they should rather say before he receives grace ; for that is the real and the full truth. But what occasion or need is there for disturbing common Christians at all with points of this nature now ? Are we not all of us, or nearly all (ten thousand to one), baptized in infancy ; and therefore regenerated and justified of course, and thereby prepared for good works, as soon as capable of them by our years ? Good works must, in this case at least (which is our case), follow after justification and regeneration, if they are at all : and therefore how impertinent and frivolous is it, if not hurtful rather, to amuse the ignorant with such notions, which, in our circumstances, may much better be spared ? "

Observe 1st. That the words are not mine, but Dr. Waterland's, read at the time from his book.

2d. That the word " impertinent " in his writings, as those of a grave and intelligent author, signifies " out of place," unsuitable to the subject.

3d. That the writer, himself composing a treatise on justification, does not say that it is an impertinent subject to introduce before a congregation, but that, under the circumstances which *then* existed (they can hardly be said to exist *among ourselves*) it was impertinent, or rather hurtful, to amuse the ignorant with the notion that man cannot do good works before he is justified and regenerated. His meaning evidently is that it is injudicious and hurtful to lead the bulk of a Christian congregation to consider that they are lying under an incapacity to perform good works, and that he would rather have them taught as those " which have believed in God," that they should " be careful to maintain " them. (Titus iii. 8.)

4th. Dr. Waterland does not say that " there is not one man in ten thousand who is not already justified." He says, " are we not all of us, or nearly all (ten thousand to one), baptized in infancy ; and therefore regenerated and justified of course." I do not expect that his teaching, any more than that of the Prayer-Book, will escape reprobation ; but at all events he speaks with reverence ; he distinguishes between the ministration of the external rite and the reception of the inward grace, and makes the former, not the latter, the subject of his numerical calculation.

I have given this, perhaps superfluous, explanation, first, for my own sake, because if there is one error of which more than of another I would carefully avoid the appearance, it is that of disguising in any degree what I teach, or what I believe : and secondly, for the sake of the Bishop of Huron's informant, whom I would not wilfully suffer to lie under the imputation of having stated what was a pure fabrication ; it is quite sufficient that he should be conscious of having so miserably misunderstood, or so grossly misrepresented, what he heard. I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's obliged and faithful Servant,

GEORGE WHITAKER.

Trinity College, Nov. 13, 1860.