

acquaintance with him and with his conduct, both in public and in private, had deepened his respect and increased his regard for him. He found a truthfulness and an honest integrity about him of which he only wished he had more examples. He found in him a deep affection for the Church of England, and a careful avoidance of errors on the one side and on the other. He found that the Provost's principles were based upon foundations which would stand unshaken. He found, the more he examined the mental character of his esteemed friend, that his was a mind which rested all its principles on foundations not liable to be shaken. There were other qualities which those who had come under his teaching could more easily estimate, and he (Dr. Beavan) had the greatest occasion to thank God that a son of his had been placed under that gentleman's care. He had reason to know that his son's character, which was of course open to amelioration, had greatly improved during the time he had studied in Trinity College. And, in looking round on the various other young men who had come out from that institution, he believed they would see that the same foundations had been laid in them of Christian character and conduct, giving promise of ever-increasing usefulness. These considerations would show, even though in some respects they might differ from the Rev. Provost, how deeply he must have felt the attacks made upon his orthodoxy in regard to teaching. Though conscious himself of his true and faithful and loyal adherence to the church of his forefathers, it could not but have pained his sincere mind, that there were many who had been taught to think differently of him. But he trusted the Synod could not help feeling sympathy with the Provost in that misapprehension of his character, which was likely to prove injurious to the institution that he had used every effort and strained every nerve to raise to a high position in the country. His motion asked the Synod to declare its continued confidence in Trinity College and in its administration. And here he would say that no teacher could expect to find the entire concurrence of every one in the teaching he brought forward. He was prepared to see, and did see teachers placed in various positions of authority over colleges, in whose opinions on various points he could not concur, whose opinions on various points he considered to be more or less injurious. But did he therefore call upon the community to put down those teachers, or did he feel called upon even to cast imputations upon the institutions with which they were connected? Far from it. He knew very well that in a Church of England institution no man could teach contrary to the doctrines of the church, the doctrines of the Bible as drawn out by the church. There were rules he had to walk by and limits beyond which he could not go. He must teach what the church teaches, and though he might upon an occasion bring forward matters in such a Professor's teaching of which he (Dr. Beavan) did not himself approve, he did not therefore think that such a Professor was to be displaced from that institution or was to be annoyed and disturbed in it. He believed in his integrity and sincerity that he was teaching what he believed to be God's truth, and that in expounding various branches of theology he must touch upon points on which they were not all agreed. And he did not expect that a teacher in those matters should teach only and in such a manner as to be acceptable to all of them. This was a point which had been overlooked. He thought the persons who had been bringing forward their impressions as to what they conceived objectionable in the teaching of Trinity College had not made allowance for the fact that we could not have entire uniformity in the teaching of theology, and we could not find any person who will

think on all subjects exactly as we wish him. At the same time he could not say that he (Dr. Beavan) found any fault with the teaching of the Rev. Provost of Trinity College. (Cheers.) The chief points objected against were things in which we differ, in which we may expatiate on the one side or on the other, on which we may honestly hold and honestly teach opinions which differ one from another. He did not think we should attempt to bind down, and did not see how it was possible to bind down honest and sincere men, so as to allow them to teach nothing but what we all ourselves approve of, and it was in that sense he desired from the Synod a declaration of its continued confidence in the College and its administration. It was because they had at the head of the institution an honest man, a good Christian, and a sound theologian, a man who knew the whole of the wide field of religious controversy, a man who could guard those whom he had to teach, by leading them up to the point where error begins, and showing them where it begins. And that was really the fact with regard to the things objected to. It was instructing the youth fully in the various branches of controversial theology—it was the bringing them up to the points at which truth ended and error began. And he did not see how it was possible to teach theology without this, and without indicating the lines which lead from the truth in which we all agree to the error we abhor. He (Dr. Beavan) could say for himself, that when he had the honour of holding the situation of Professor of Theology in King's College, that was of necessity the line he took. There might be different ways of working it out, but the man who did his duty fully and to the extent to which he ought to do it, must inform his pupils as to the limits of truth and error, and must show them to what extent a person may lawfully and consistently with Scripture and consistently with the teachings of the Church hold such and such opinions, and the point beyond which, if he goes, he goes into error. It was on this ground that he contended for the liberty which had been exercised by the Rev. Provost. And he would make another remark in regard to the manner in which his rev. friend had defended himself in the tract which he now held in his hand. It had been said that the Provost did not allege Scripture in confirmation of what he was teaching, but that he alleged the opinions of men. He thought it had not been sufficiently considered that the question was not whether his teaching was agreeable to Scripture. The issue was raised whether it was in agreement with that Protestant truth and true Catholic truth which the united church receives. And he conceived that he (Dr. Beavan) had a right to say something about Protestantism. He remembered the time when the great movement began which had gone since under the names of Tractarianism and Puseyism. His (Dr. Beavan's) theological views were formed before that time. They were formed in the great leading governing school of English Divines since the Reformation.* He had some intercourse at the time he had referred to with the leaders of the Tractarian party, and was invited to join a re-union of the party held in Oxford once a week. He wished to learn what the nature of the movement was and he went. In a second and private meeting various propositions were brought forward; but he soon perceived they were brought forward in a wrong spirit, and that they were leading in a direction in which he could not follow. And though for a moment he entertained a proposition to act with them, as soon as he got home he cut it short and repudiated it, and from nearly that time to this

* Being called to Oxford, from time to time, as one of the select preachers.

had held no communication with the leaders of that party.† He might also say that he had had some testimonies which had confirmed him in the conviction that he had taken true ground in regard to Romanism, in the remarks made upon discourses which from time to time he had preached before congregations. It had been told him more than once that he never indulged in invectives against the Roman Church, he at the same time was always teaching the people grounds on which they should reject the errors of that Church. He therefore felt entitled to say that he was a Protestant (Cheers.) And it was on that ground that he begged to bear his testimony to the true Protestantism of the Provost of Trinity College. (Cheers.) The Provost had grounds for his Protestantism on which he could stand. It was not his own individual opinions he stood upon. It was on deeper, wider, and more stable foundations. He stood, he had no doubt, as he (Dr. Beavan) did himself upon the doctrines of the Word of God, as interpreted by the Church universal from the times of the Apostles to the present day, and brought out more clearly at the glorious Reformation, when we were brought into the liberty which England has for centuries enjoyed, in which she stands at present, and under which she continues to lengthen her stakes and stretch her cords, to extend the knowledge of the people, and to give them, so far as the instructions of the Church of England tend to give them, foundations on which they can stand, to keep them from sectarianism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other (Cheers.) It was in that sense he wished to support Trinity College, because he was satisfied that in that institution means were being taken for enlightening our people, by sending out among them laity and clergy, all of them as well as possible instructed in the true grounds of our faith according to the true meaning of the doctrines of our Church. Some people appeared to think there was a contrast and a clashing between different portions of our doctrines. That was an opinion he had never entertained since he was well instructed in the Scriptures. He could take the baptismal form in its literal sense, and see no clashing between it and the 17th article. The ritual and the articles of the church taught the same Catholic and Scriptural truth, and he sustained Trinity College because it was that truth which Trinity College taught. As we went on in life, if we had honest minds and clear intellects, we could not help expanding our knowledge and modifying our views. At the same time, with the views he held, no one would suppose that in submitting the resolution which he now moved, he upheld or desired the Synod to uphold a teacher of a teaching leading towards Romanism. (Cheers.)

† About the same time, a friend of his, who was some what taken with the views of that party, in a letter to him, spoke disparagingly of the term Protestant, thinking it injurious to the Church of England to be mixed up with other Protestants who might be heterodox. He (Dr. Beavan), in reply, stated his own view, that "we ought ever to be grateful for the Christian light and liberty we enjoyed in consequence of the Reformation; and that whilst Rome continued to hold and insist on her unscriptural errors, the Church of England must continue Protestant." (Cheers.)

It gave him great pain to be constrained to decline to vote for the amendments, especially the second, which so exactly expressed his own sentiments so far as it went. But, in omitting to notice the Provost of Trinity College, it was in effect, as an amendment upon his (Dr. B's) resolution, a censure of the Provost. For that reason, therefore, he was constrained to refuse to join in it; besides this, as it refused to express confidence in the administration of Trinity College, with which his Lordship the Bishop was avowedly identified, it really refused sympathy with him in a point in which his deepest feelings were engaged. It had been said that this was not a fitting time to bring up this discussion; but when could it be more necessary than at a time when such wice and such persevering attempts were being made to injure that great work in which our Bishop had engaged his warmest affections, and to discourage the able and true-hearted men employed in it, by representing their teaching