

Anglican theologian. It was as follows: —“That the human nature of the Blessed Redeemer was deified in consequence of it having been assumed by the Divine Son.” Immediately after the sermon Dr. Nicholson requested an ecclesiastic whom he found in the church to explain the statement. This gentleman, naturally puzzled, after fruitlessly endeavouring to reduce the declaration of his superior to some conformity with the Catholic faith, gave it up as a bad job, and referred his interrogator to the preacher himself. Dr. Nicholson did, as desired, and, through his Grace’s secretary, received the following words as accurately expressing what Dr. Manning had said: “THE SACRED HEART OF OUR LORD, BEING UNITED WITH THE DIVINITY, WAS DEIFIED, AND THEREFORE AN OBJECT OF DIVINE WORSHIP.” We print this in small capitals in order that our readers may not lose sight of the distinct point at issue, and we must remind them at the outset that they must follow our summary of the correspondence carefully, if they would appreciate its bearings. We, on our part, will do our best to make the task as easy to them as possible, stating first the true Catholic doctrine on the subject, which is: CHRIST IS TO BE WORSHIPPED WITH SUPREME ADORATION IN HIS ONE UNDIVIDED PERSON, WHEREIN THE TWO NATURES OF GOD-HEAD AND MANHOOD ARE CONJOINED. *But it is heresy to worship the mere created human body of Christ, considered apart, with Divine Worship, which is due to the whole of his Personality, not to the lower part of it; for Christ, so far as He is only Man, could not be Divinely adored.*

The Archbishop, for he, of course, must be regarded as having dictated the letters, defended his statement by reference to Perrone. Dr. Nicholson, in his reply, shewed that Perrone’s words did not support any such dogma as the deification of our Lord’s human nature. He also appealed to the Creed of St. Athanasius, and argued that Dr. Manning’s doctrine contravened the clause which lays down the dogma that Christ, in Whom are two natures, is “One, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person.” Now, “confusion of substance” means mixing up Godhead and Manhood into a compound substance, so that each partakes of the nature of the other—just Dr. Manning’s error about the Sacred Heart. Further, he repeated his original question, as to the meaning of the declaration made by the Archbishop in his sermon.

Dr. Manning proceeded to explain, and started with the following wonderfully vague definition:—“The word ‘deify’ means ordinarily ‘to exalt to an object of worship.’” But, as his opponent pointed out, this loose definition was inconsistent with the words used in the sermon, which were to this effect,—that in consequence of a certain relation to Deity, the Sacred Heart was an object of Divine Worship. And further, in the letter which began with the above mentioned vague definition, the word “deify” was used subsequently throughout, not in the vague sense, *i.e.*, the sense in which the Archbishop had used it in his sermon.

It is evident, therefore, that the loose definition of “deify” was invented in the vain hope of its helping the preacher to get out of a difficulty, and was utterly indefensible.