

Commentators of the Church of England since the Reformation, and some Roman Catholic divines have interpreted the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel as having no reference whatsoever to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and one of the latter has asserted that "the Universal Church has understood this passage, ever since its promulgation, to mean spiritual eating and drinking by a living faith."

One of our most eminent reformers, when combating the doctrine of transubstantiation, thus expressed himself concerning this passage: "Christ in that place of John spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained,) but he spake of spiritual bread, many times repeating, 'I am the bread of life which came down from heaven,' and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eating of as many as believed on him although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore he said, 'Your Father did eat manna in the desert and died; but he that eateth this bread shall live forever.' Therefore, this place of St. John can in no wise be understood of the sacramental bread, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat. Nor of such bread could Christ have then presently said, 'This is my flesh,' except they will say, that Christ did then consecrate so many years before the institution of His Holy Supper."—*Cranmer*.

I cannot, therefore, think it sound divinity or good Protestantism to teach that in the sixth chapter of St. John, our Lord refers to the oral reception of the elements in the sacrament, and not to the *spiritual participation of his body and blood, by faith*; such teaching I must consider "dangerous in the extreme."

I have thus laid before you, from authentic sources, some of the teaching to which I object. The impressions conveyed to my mind by the examination of graduates of the University, I cannot of course convey to yours. The mode adopted by me to ascertain the character and effects of the teaching in Trinity College is that which common sense dictated, and which my position required me to adopt, namely, to examine the pupils. It would be quite impossible to write all I have learned in this way, but the result has been a deep-seated conviction that a large proportion of tares is mixed with the seed sown in the minds of the young men educated in the institution. In some, I know, these tares have not taken root, but this is to be attributed to the fact that their minds were pre-occupied by the good seed which had been previously sown by the care of their parents or pastors. Whether this has always been sufficient to prevent the growth of the tares, I cannot say.

Before I conclude this letter, which is the last I shall address to you on this subject, I would briefly advert to one or two passages in my late pastoral.

The resolutions of the committee, which were said to have been transmitted to me, were never received, they never came into my hands.

When the statute which has been the subject of discussion was read at the Council, I *strongly objected to it*, stating, at the same time, that if we could always depend on having a Chancellor like the gentleman who now so worthily occupies that position, there could be no objection to leave some discretionary power with him, as all knew that he would act wisely and justly, but that such discretion could not be safely intrusted to every person who might hereafter be elected Chancellor of the University.

With reference to my reasons for not appearing at the meetings of the Corporation, they are

stated by me in my letter to the Bishop of Toronto, and occupy a paragraph of that letter.

It is very unfortunate that when the corporation of Trinity College undertook to state from my letter the grounds on which I declined to take my place at the corporation, they should have selected part of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and overlooked those portions of the same paragraph which immediately precede and follow that part of a sentence which they selected. The letter is now before the public, and any one who will take the trouble to analyze the paragraph referred to will find that there are three grounds for my refusal to attend the corporation of Trinity College. The first and chief reason which I quote in my pastoral is contained in the words, "*as I cannot in my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction this teaching would be a positive evil.*" The second is in the following words:—"Were I to go to the Council, as you say would be the wiser and more honorable course, and enter my protest against the teaching which I condemn, no good result could follow, (as I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University)." The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state *this as the ground* of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reason for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is; "And the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented; to avoid this, I have heretofore kept aloof from the University, and I am still satisfied in my own mind, that it is better for me thus to act than to introduce discussion into the Council, and thus to render patent the differences which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I declined to take my place at the council (for the three reasons assigned,) which was the thing the Bishop urged me to do, I stated in the most emphatic way, "*I cannot of my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College,*" and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to particularise in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. From what I have written above, all may judge of this for themselves. The documentary evidence which I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favour of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can

now misunderstand my attendance at the council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" which I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the corporation, and of endeavouring, in my place there, to effect those changes in the institution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

I remain, my reverend brethren and brethren,
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September, 27th, 1860: (Present: the Hon. and Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beverley Robinson, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, the Rev. the Vice-Provost, the Reverend Professor Hatch, Professor Bovell, M.D., the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Spragge, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D.C.L., James Lukin Robinson, Esq., Samuel Bickerton Harman, B.C.L., the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, D.C.L., the Rev. T. B. Fuller, D.D., D.C.L., the Reverend William McMurray, D.D., D.C.L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, LL.D.)

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed letter upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued. I lay these papers before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—

MY LORD,—I have prepared, in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, together with authorities from approved writers of the Church of England; but, independently of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to some of the comments of the Bishop on the manner, matter, and tendency of that teaching. As respects the manner, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily papers, and which I here transcribe.

"It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In order to save time and to observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared, for my own use, a book of questions, omitting or adding questions at my discretion, when I use it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish, is a summary of them in the