

only before and after His nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virg.:" 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"—Pearson on the Creed, vol. I. p. 272, Oxf. 1820.

To this testimony of Bishop Pearson may be added those of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Hooper, Bishop Jewel, Dr. Hammon, 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 justice of the Bishop of Huron's insinuation as to its tendency. No man can be more heartily convinced than I am of the presumptuous impety 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 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 practice 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.—See vol. III, p. 370 of Fox's Acts and Monuments, folio, London, 1681. 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 his 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 recognized 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 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 meaning 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. Procter'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 objection I am prepared to show that Mr. Procter'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 His 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*.—Usher's Works, vol. IV., p. 608.—(see also page 617.)

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 feeding in general, all who hold 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 feeding 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 Garliner, 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