

other authors, upon whose authority, as regards the point at issue, the Provost so implicitly relies, I confess I am somewhat disappointed, in finding that the whole weight of the importance attached to the testimony of these writers resolves itself into what in common parlance is called matter of opinion.

But there is one point of opinion elicited in these extracts, which deserves special notice. It is the speculative enquiry, how far the saints who intercede for us, and take an interest in our concerns, are cognizant of our wants and necessities.

This seems to be a debatable question among the learned gentleman's great divines—since by consulting the quotations in pages 49, 50, 51, 52, we find one takes the affirmative, (Thorndike,) another (Bull,) the negative, a third (Ridley,) the hypothetical, and last not least, (Crakanthorp,) the conditional.

As to the case of Ridley, the Provost conceives he here adduces a perfectly conclusive argument. Affirming the truth of his doctrine, he says: "I close this long and weighty list of authorities with a testimony which presents to us no stern controversial argument—no dry enunciation of theoretical belief—but a most affecting practical adoption of the opinion condemned by the Bishop of Huron, on the part of one of our great reformers, in addressing another on his way to martyrdom." And then follow Ridley's words, the *ipsissima verba* (page 52): "And then thou, good brother, pray for the remnant which are to suffer for Christ's sake, *according to that thou then shalt know more clearly.*"

I contend that these words imply an uncertain and unknown contingency, and are much too indefinite to warrant an absolute conclusion. And even if Ridley had held this heretical dogma, that would be nothing in its favour, since many of the early reformers, emerging out of Romanism, did not altogether and at once shake off the errors of the Papal creed. We who are encompassed with infirmities, would require