

when the divine speaker himself affirmed that "his words were spirit and life?"

We dwell the more on this point, because of its vast importance; and because the other authorities quoted by Dr. Whitaker do really as little support his own view as does Cranmer,—neither Hooker does so, nor Usher, from whose writings "Presbyter" adduces the most distinct deliverances on the other side of the question. Nor can we allow the Provost to escape from the scene of his discomfiture, with the easy alternative he assumes, "that they who do not apply John 6, to the Lord's Supper, yet generally, at least explain the passage to assert the necessity now of observing the communion, as the means—the only means he in effect says—of receiving the blessing signified." They do indeed allow no such thing. The communion is one honoured means of the spiritual participation of Christ, but it is not the sacramental eating or drinking that is there affirmed to be surely saving, or the want of it damning—it is faith's communion with the Saviour; in which faith is exercised not in that ordinance only, but appropriates him in the word and the promises; nay which gives its true significance and effect, under God's blessing, and the working of his spirit, to that interesting sacramental ordinance itself. But, interesting and precious as, despite of such misrepresentations of it, that ordinance will still be to Christians, yet they would almost say of it, as the reforming king of the brazen serpent, "Nehushtan," when perverted to idolatrous uses, they see in the sacramental theory the exaltation of the ordinance, but the degradation of the Lord. So says Hooker, following Augustine, ("Strictures" p. 58),—"If his majestical body, [or, as the Trinity College Professor calls it, "glorified humanity"] have now any such new property by which it may every where really, even in substance, present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of his estate extinguished the verity of his nature. Make then no doubt or question of it, but that the man Christ Jesus is now in that very place whence he shall come in the same form and substance of flesh." Thus, according to both Hooker and Augustine, that majestical body, or glorified humanity, which we can make to be every where present doth thereby cease to have the substance of a true body. Just as Calvin also says; "We may not draw Christ's body back, or down again from heaven to earth, under the elements of bread and wine."

We are pleased to see that "Presbyter" has also brought up the Provost on the subject of the Intercession of Saints, and the glorification of the Virgin—points we had ourselves reserved for notice in this article. Of course, Dr. Whitaker pleads the great difference between holding the probable intercession of saints, and approving of the addressing of prayers to them. But, the original allegation, by the Bishop of Huron, was, that the one naturally leads to the other as an article of belief; and this connection in point of fact is matter of history. And here again, the Provost's own authorities fail him. "Presbyter" turns them against him. He quotes Archbishop Usher tracing up the invocation of saints to the doctrine of their intercession for us, and marking the gradual advance of the superstition

But who would expect it!—the Provost has set down Calvin too on the side of this probable intercession. That is, just as with Usher, he takes hold of a mere phrase used in a sort of concession way, or for the sake of argument, by the one writer or the other. But let us hear Calvin, when touching the subject directly? "What angel or devil ever announced one syllable to any human being concerning that fancied intercession of theirs? There is not one word on the subject in scripture. Intercession is the work of Christ; and though believers mutually offer up prayers to God in behalf of their brethren—the injunction is ignorantly transferred to the dead, of whom we nowhere read that they are commanded to pray for us. Again, "it is superstition that has rashly adopted intercessors who have not been divinely appointed."—Institutes, Book iii. c. 22.

It is but the fitting finish of this matter that MARY should have an important and mysterious place assigned to her as an "instrument" in human redemption; and that students of theology should be entertained with speculations on her perpetual virginity! We do not refuse the Provost's explanations here, nor desire to fix upon him opinions which he disowns. But "the straw shews, &c." What we feel is, that the leanings discovered in the very taste for such discussions are Romish—a contribution to Romanism—we almost call it an aping of it, by parties who can not, dare not, avow the logical conclusions to which such doctrine leads on. Call Mary an "instrument" of redemption, typified as well as foretold in holy scripture, and the consequences easily follow, in spite of protests; and it is truly a weak excuse for such teaching, that a Professor finds a sentence or foot note in his text-book [Pearson] shewing the fancy of the philologist as much as anything else—a little discussion on the name "Mary" and its analogy or identity with Miriam, which in the hands of Pearson suggests a remark on the relative positions of these women to the redemption from Egypt, and the redemption from sin and death. It is little worthy of Pearson; but it is after all, Dr. Whitaker, and not the author of the text-book, who makes Miriam a "type." For, as the Provost allows, Pearson does not teach that the Virgin was a divinely appointed type under the law; "nor," adds he, "do I say so." Then, Doctor, what do you say? "I say," he continues, "that she answers in some typical respect to the place Mary bore." Now, this is very like a distinction without a difference. Dr. Whitaker says it is one thing to point out a typical resemblance, and another to affirm that two things stand, by divine appointment, in the relation of type and anti-type. But we perfectly agree with "Presbyter" that if Mary was a type at all, she must have been a divinely appointed type; and we subscribe to the position taken by the Bishop of Huron, that it is "dangerous teaching" indeed to talk thus of the place which Mary bore instrumentally in the means of human redemption; and of this as foreshadowed by Miriam's instrumentality in bringing Israel into the promised land. Really the whole thing is ridiculous, we almost say irreverent. Miriam never dreamed, we dare say, of being so canonised. It is true that she was sister to Moses and Aaron, and favored with a certain prophetic impulse, as

she led the female choristers in their celebration of Israel's deliverance at the Red Sea (Ex. 15.) The prophet Micah, in one brief clause joins her with her brothers of the same family, as "sent" with Moses and Aaron, a sort of handmaid to these messengers of the Lord. For any typical character, we search her history in vain. But if Miriam must be canonised, we should have expected a Protestant Divinity teacher to have made a very different use of her history. It is in fact fitted to rebuke Mariolatry; to suggest the danger of putting forward the claims of the Virgin Mary to any share of the divine honour rendered to the Virgin's Son. The largest story of Miriam recorded in the Books of Moses, is the story of her envy and ambition, when, with Aaron, she spoke grudgingly against Moses in respect of the prerogative claimed by him, or the honor accorded to him. And how was the controversy adjusted? Did not God himself assert the honor of his servant, and condemn the envious aspirant; ay; and this type of Mary, so little will it make for the idolatry of the virgin mother, was only forgiven in answer to the prayers of Moses, not her own, and punished withal with temporary exclusion from the camp. We wish those who impiously alienate to the virgin the homage due to God, who salute her Queen of Heaven! *Mother of God! Refuge of Sinners!* &c., and who but her command her son, we wish they would look here and learn. And if the Professor in Trinity College will touch the subject at all, we wish he would not leave it without inculcating the lesson with which the episode is fraught. Let him teach that Mary is indeed that honoured mother whom ages shall call blessed. But let him also teach, that by the Saviour himself Mary, like Miriam, was taught to beware of interfering with things too high for her. The virgin, it has been remarked, is never but once (Acts 1.) so much as named throughout the Acts and Apostolic Epistles. In the gospels even, she is but rarely mentioned; and on one of the most remarkable occasions, it is on purpose to discourage any undue honoring of her, and to impress the lesson that in Christ's own estimation, fleshly ties are as nothing compared with obedience to God's will.

To have done, we must recur to the grand error of this theology, in many other respects unprotestant—the doctrine of priestly absolution. Here is the point in which we see its Romanising tendency most unequivocally. Hasty absolutions are justly ranked, by Burnet, as the chief cause of all that corruption of morals that has prevailed in the Romish Communion; "In the English Church," he says, "when we use absolution with the dying, we mean only the full peace and pardon of the church; if further, we give pardon in the name of God, this is declaratory only, or expressive of the Church's supplication in the sinner's behalf. We commend the sober and rational views set forth on this subject (on Article 25) to all who are stumbled by Provost Whitaker's attempts to set off by very inferior authorities, another and most dangerous view of that service. But, though the Provost's doctrines of human intercession are more guarded, we can not too earnestly say to all who are not willing to think that the Reformation was a blunder, "*obsta principiis.*" Do not ignore all his history, and what it deposes of the natural