

PLAIN WORDS FOR PLAIN PEOPLE:

AN APPEAL

TO THE

LAYMEN OF CANADA,

IN BEHALF OF

COMMON SENSE AND COMMON HONESTY,

BEING A REVIEW OF THE

“STRICTURES”

ON THE TWO LETTERS OF PROVOST WHITAKER.

---

BY EDWARD H. DEWAR, M. A.,

RECTOR OF THORNHILL.

---

PRICE TWELVE AND A-HALF CENTS.

---

ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING ST., TORONTO.

1861.



## PREFACE.

---

THE writer of the following pages has had no intention of entering into any discussion of the momentous doctrines involved in the controversy respecting the teaching of Trinity College. His sole aim has been to expose some misrepresentations, and to remove some false impressions, which the "Strictures on the two letters of Provost Whitaker" have been calculated, if not intended, to create.

As a large number of the Strictures have been distributed gratuitously, the author will be glad to co-operate with any persons who sympathise in this defence of common sense and common honesty, and may be desirous to assist in circulating it gratuitously, more especially among the laity. For every dollar remitted, he will undertake to send ten copies, post-paid, and for every four dollars fifty copies, to clergymen, lay-delegates, churchwardens, and other laymen throughout the Province; or persons who wish to have copies for distribution can be supplied by Mr. Rowsell with twelve copies for a dollar, or fifty for three dollars and a half. But orders *must be sent immediately*, as it can only be kept in type for a short time.



## NOTES ON STRICTURES.

---

“The controversy respecting the teaching of Trinity College has fully brought to light that which without it, might have remained long in darkness. It is now patent to the world what kind of theology is taught in Trinity College. But for the part which the Bishop of Huron has taken, this Tractarian poison would still have been secretly and quietly infused into the minds of the students of that institution.”

On another page of these Strictures the writer says,

“It is a very bad habit in which the Provost has largely indulged in his pamphlet, that of calling names.”

And in almost the last paragraph,

“We have endeavoured to restrain our spirit, and keep under our temper, though often tried by the many hard and un-christian terms so unsparingly used by the writer, more especially when we called to mind against whom those terms were covertly directed.”

The writer of course means to imply that the Provost has spoken in hard and un-christian terms of the Bishop of Huron. If such were the case, the Provost would assuredly find no apologist in me, but I have carefully read and re-read his letters, and have failed to discover a single passage which can lend a colour to the charge. And every one who has enjoyed the privilege of being in his society is well aware, that he is perhaps the very last man in Canada, who can be charged with indulging in the “bad habit” of calling names. But what must be the astonishment of every reader of the Strictures to find such a charge proceeding from such a source.

Why, in the whole pamphlet of ninety-six pages there is scarcely a page of original matter, in which party names are not, as in the opening passage just quoted, freely applied. "Tractarianism," "Puseyism," "Semi-popish," "Popish," are terms scattered thickly throughout these pages, and unsparingly hurled at his opponent. As I do not wish to return to this subject, I am constrained now to notice, that this is not the only objectionable feature in these "Strictures." The writer asks, "Does the Provost forget that there is such a law, as 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour?'" Did he himself bear this law in mind, when he penned that passage, in which he declares that "if the Provost honestly follows out the principles contained in his pamphlet, and the convictions which he avows, he must at last (it may be distant because of obvious hindrances) take his place beside those renegades from the faith of Christ," &c. And in the next sentence we are told that these hindrances are "pride and self-interest." So then this writer, who takes the Provost of Trinity College to task for "calling names," and "for bad temper and want of common courtesy," does not scruple to assert that the vilest motives of self-interest would for a long time restrain him from following the dictates of his conscience. And this notwithstanding that a few pages further on he is obliged to admit, that he "never heard the Provost's sincerity called in question for a moment."

I now return to a consideration of the opening sentence of the Strictures: "The controversy respecting the teaching of Trinity College has fully brought to light that which without it might have long remained in darkness; \* \* \* This Tractarian poison would still have been secretly and quietly infused," &c. Now as words are of little value unless some definite idea is attached to them, I wish that we could have been told what is the author's definition of "Tractarian." Because during the last five and twenty years I have heard and read a great deal about Tractarianism and Puseyism, and

have found that different persons attach very different meanings to these terrible words. We have read, for instance, of practices introduced by Mr. Bennett, at St. Barnabas', and by Mr. King, at St. George's in the East. Is this Tractarianism? Undoubtedly, most persons will be ready to answer. Well then, is any thing of the kind recommended in the teaching of Trinity College? A number of young clergymen have already gone forth from that institution, and are zealously labouring, some of them in the Diocese of Huron, and some of them in the Diocese of Toronto. Is there a single one of them who has introduced, has attempted to introduce, or has been even suspected of entertaining any desire to introduce any such practices? Have any of our parishes been torn by contention because attempts have been made to set up credence-tables, altar-lights, rood-screens, or even "fald-stools," by the pupils of Trinity College? Have any of them given offence to their congregations by adopting mediæval vestments, or by practising genuflexions or other gestures? Since, then, neither in the "Provost's Catechism," nor in the Provost's letters, nor in the practice of any single pupil of Trinity College, is there the slightest trace of the adoption of any such ceremonial observances, the Strictures must mean something else by "Tractarian poison." Where, then, is it to be found? So "secretly and quietly" has it been infused, that there has been no outward manifestation of it. But, it is asserted, the poison has all this time been lurking, latent and unobserved, in the doctrines inculcated. Yet why "Tractarian?" Supposing these doctrines to be exactly what the writer of the Strictures describes, why does he call them by this "name?" The word Tractarian, he is well aware, originated about thirty years ago, when certain publications called "Tracts for the Times," were issued at Oxford. Does he mean that the teaching at Trinity College, whatever it may be, is derived from these publications? Why, he shews in his own pamphlet, that, two hundred years before, it was the teaching of those, who, though he may sneer at them as

“Waterland, Crakenthrop *et hoc genus omne*,” have ever since been considered as among the soundest divines of our Church, and the ablest defenders of her faith. I am not now enquiring whether their writings are in accordance with the Holy Scriptures, or with the authoritative formularies of the Church. But I say that their teaching, which the “Strictures” declare to be the same as that of Trinity College, was accepted as the teaching of the Church of England by a large majority of the clergy and laity, ages before the “Tracts” were published. There is therefore neither common sense nor common honesty in calling it “Tractarian poison.” Be it right or wrong, that is not its “name.” No; the next paragraph reveals the object which the writer had in view. Indignant as he is with the Provost for “calling names,” he does not scruple to excite a feeling of hostility against Trinity College, among the laity of Canada, who have, thank God, a great horror of Popery, by affixing to the Provost’s teaching a “name,” which is supposed to designate a departure from the Protestant principles of our Reformed Church. “Give a dog a bad name, and hang him,” is a proverb the force of which he evidently understands. But if a hatred of Popery is one strong instinct in our people, a love of fair play is another, and they will have no sympathy with a mode of attack which is based upon misrepresentation.

“The Provost was evidently, at first, determined to deny that such a book existed as the ‘Provost’s Catechism,’ \* \* \* \* \* At length, however, when overwhelming testimony to the fact was adduced, he was compelled to admit that such was the case.”

The Provost has never admitted any such thing. Last, as well as first, he has emphatically denied that there is, or ever has been, a “Provost’s Catechism.” He admitted indeed, as soon as he was informed of the fact, that some of the students had compiled “a Catechism,” from notes taken by them of his teaching; but as he had never seen it, and was only made aware of its existence last July, he strongly urges, what is

indeed obvious to common sense, and common honesty, that he is not responsible for a single expression which it may contain. A man has a right to be judged by what he has said himself, and not by what others say for him, especially, as he most justly and forcibly observes, for "the terms in which young men, little versed in Theology, have thought fit to give expression to his teaching." Is it fair, is it honest, after such a disclaimer, to speak of the "Provost's Catechism," not in this passage only, but throughout the Strictures, as if it had really been proved that such a work exists, and to charge the Provost with having been induced only "by overwhelming testimony," "to admit that such was the case?"

"The Provost has filled his book with quotations from the writings of fallible men like himself, and he appears to think that the members of the Church will be satisfied with his teaching, because a 'Sparrow' has said this, or a 'Craken-thorp' has said that. But he will find that the laity of the Church of England know too well that the Bible is the only rule of faith to the christian man."

Here again the writer insinuates a charge, for which he is well aware, there is no foundation. He would make it appear that the Provost reckons the writings of fallible men as equal or superior in authority to the Bible; but he well knows that the question between the Provost and himself is not at all about the relative value of the Bible and any other writings, but simply about the relative value of different interpretations of the Bible. There are doubtless many parts of the Sacred Volume about the meaning of which there is, and can be no controversy; but there are also passages respecting which a difference of opinion exists, and will probably continue to exist until, at the second coming of our Lord, all mists of error shall be dispelled. The very existence of so many sects, each of which professes to derive its faith from the Bible, and which yet differ from each other so widely, and on points of such enormous magnitude, is a standing

proof that Christians are not agreed as to the real meaning of many portions of the Sacred Writings. And so even with regard to the exact meaning of certain parts of the formularies of the Church. Ever since they were promulgated, there have been parties which have taken somewhat different views of their meaning. When, therefore, the Provost quotes "human authorities," he has no intention, as the writer of the "Strictures" well knows, of exalting them above the Bible or above the Prayer Book; but simply intends to show that the sense in which he interprets the Holy Scriptures, and the creeds and articles of the Church, is the same sense in which they have been interpreted by many wise, learned, and pious men of past generations. Let it, therefore, be well understood that, when the writer of the Strictures asserts the supreme claims of the Bible, he means the Bible interpreted by himself, as against the Bible interpreted by Hooker, Sparrow, Waterland, and a host of the most honoured Divines of our Church.

"We must confess that we are unable to see any substantial difference between the passage found in the Catechism in the hands of the Bishop of Huron, which the Provost repudiates, and the one which he admits he finds in his own manuscript."

It is not easy to understand why the writer should be "glad that the Provost denies the correctness of the answer" attributed to him, if he can see no difference between the two answers. But surely he must be dull of comprehension, if he can see no difference between the two statements—"Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the kingdom of heaven," and "Mary bore a place instrumentally in the means of human redemption." To take his own illustration, the cross on which our Saviour hung may truly be said to have had a place among the means of human redemption, but it would be blasphemy to say that it was an instrument to bring mankind into the kingdom of heaven. "But," the writer of the

Strictures goes on to say, "it is the spirit, rather than the letter of this statement, with which we find fault, a spirit manifested in the desire to drag forward every circumstance, however trifling, that can in any possible way exalt the Blessed Virgin." So that he does not deny the literal truth of the statement, but because, in addition to this truth, the Church of Rome holds very grave errors respecting the Virgin Mary, it is "rash and presumptuous" for the Provost to teach the truth, while he most carefully guards against the errors. So too with regard to the Perpetual Virginity :

"There is no objection to the thing *per se*, but only to its being brought injudiciously forward, and made a matter of discussion in Trinity College, among young men, destined, some of them, to be lawyers, doctors, engineers and merchants."

"Some of them," perhaps, but surely the greater number are destined to be clergymen, and it cannot be injudicious or unnecessary to tell them what has been the opinion of such men as Cranmer, Latimer, Jewell, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, and Pearson, on a point respecting which they may at any time be forced into a controversy with Romanists, and ought to be able to give an answer for the faith that is in them. Or were these men all Tractarians, and did they "above all things wish the undue exaltation of the Blessed Virgin?"

"The Intercession of Saints.—Under this head the Provost proceeds to remark : 'The next article to which exception is taken is that of the Communion of Saints.' The Bishop of Huron has never taken exception to this article of our Creed. It is dishonest in the highest degree for a controversialist to impute to his opponent statements which he has never made."

No unprejudiced reader would suppose that the Provost ever thought of making such a charge, as the remainder of the sentence shows clearly what he means to say : "The next article (of my teaching) to which exception is taken, is

that of (*i. e.* relating to) the Communion of Saints, the words marked as dangerous being those which stand in italics in the following clause," &c. "It is dishonest in the highest degree for a controversialist to impute to his opponent statements which he has never made," by quoting half a sentence and suppressing the remainder, which would have made his meaning clear. \*

"The Provost professes to have derived his teaching concerning the Intercession of Saints from Bishop Pearson, but not one word does he give us from that author. But what he has conveniently left undone, we will do for him. On this subject, the Communion of Saints, Pearson says: \* \* \* 'But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth, particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, besides a reverential respect and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity.' \* \* \* So much for the Provost's unwarrantable assertion—this teaching I derive from Bishop Pearson."

What shall we say of the honesty and candour of this writer, when we find, on turning to Bishop Pearson, that this quotation breaks off exactly where the sentence commences to which probably the Provost was referring. The writer gives us only a part of the passage and has suppressed the remainder. "But what he has conveniently left undone, we will do for him," and complete the extract: "They which first found this part of the article in the creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion, as to the Saints in heaven, than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side,—of *desires and supplications on their side.*" So much for "unwarrantable assertions," and "reckless statements and quotations"! The writer next labours hard to show that Calvin and Usher, when treating on this subject, mean something very different from what their words plainly

assert, and brings forward other passages from their writings, in which they do not speak of the intercession of Saints, in order to prove that where they do speak of it, they do not mean what they say; like the man who was about to be convicted on the testimony of two witnesses, who swore that they had seen him steal a horse, and thought that he should be acquitted because he brought forward four, who swore that they did not see him steal it. The other writers to whom the Provost refers in support of this "semi-Popish" doctrine, such as Stillingfleet, Ken, Beveridge, Nelson, Secker, &c., would, I presume, be classed with "Tractarians," and therefore "not to be confided in." I will, however, refer him to Bishop Hall, whom even he will scarcely call by this name, especially as the work from which I quote is called "No Peace with Rome," and is a powerful, and, as to its language, rather a violent refutation of Popish errors. Hall certainly would give no countenance to any "semi-Popish" doctrine. In the same chapter in which he argues against the invocation of Saints as impious and blasphemous, because Christ is the only mediator, he yet asserts in almost the same words as those quoted by the Provost from Crakanthorp, that the intercession of the Saints for us *in general* has the consent of Protestants, as well as of the fathers of the Christian Church. "The Protestants say, as Bellarmine grants, that the Saints pray for us; but only in a generality"; and in a foot note to this passage, he tells us, "the same is confessed by Luther, Oecolampadius, Melancthon, Brentius."—*No Peace with Rome*, Ed. 1852, p. 110. The Provost has never taught the students to accept "on mere human authority," a doctrine "not revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and which cannot be deduced from any principles of Christianity, and to regard this as a divine verity," if by this expression is implied that he has taught that a belief in this doctrine is in any way necessary to salvation. But he has thought it right and proper that theological students should know, that a large number, not only of the early fathers, but of the reformers

of our Church, and most determined enemies of Popery, have maintained that the intercession of Saints for us is a probable opinion, wholly distinct from the invocation of Saints by us.

“The next point to which the Bishop objects is that of the remission of sins.’ We have before remarked upon this dishonest way of stating the Bishop’s objections. The Bishop of Huron has never objected to that or any other Article of the Creed.”

“We have before remarked” that the Provost had not the remotest intention of charging the Bishop with any such objection. The very idea that the Provost could mean to charge a Bishop of the Church with objecting to the doctrine of the “remission of sins,” is too absurd to have been seriously entertained by any candid person.

“We must agree that the mode of forgiving sins taught in the Provost’s Catechism (which is the same as that taught in the catechism of the Council of Trent,) is widely different from that which we find in the eleventh article of our Church, and also in the Homily on Justification.”

“The same”!

The Tridentine Confession pronounces accursed every one who shall say that we are justified by faith only; *si quis dixerit solâ fide, &c., anathema sit.* The Provost recognises in the most explicit terms the doctrine of justification by faith only, adding that it “is not inconsistent with the statement that faith sends us to Christ for remission of our sins through sacraments and ordinances of His appointment.” The Tridentine Confession makes our works the cause of the remission of sins; the Provost makes the sacrifice of Christ the cause, and the sacraments and ordinances of His appointment channels through which it is applied. A wide distinction surely! Instead of being “the same,” the two statements are as far apart as heaven and earth! The writer

quotes a number of texts of Scripture, and several long passages from "human authorities," to prove the doctrine of justification by faith. But this he only does for the purpose of making his readers believe, that the Provost denies that doctrine; he well knows that the question at issue is a totally different one. On his own showing, Hooker is sound on this point, and yet in Hooker we read "they draw very near to this error, (the Valentinian heresy), who, fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of faith, imagine that nothing but faith is necessary for the attainment of all grace." The real question at issue may be clearly seen by contrasting the words of Hooker with those of Calvin. Calvin says, "he which is not a Christian before he comes to receive baptism, cannot be made a Christian by baptism, which is *only* the seal of the grace of God before received."—*Calvin Inst.* 4, 15. Hooker, on the contrary: "For as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God but by new birth, nor, according to the manifest ordinary course of divine dispensation, new-born, but by that baptism which *both declareth and maketh* us Christians. In which respect we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, *a seal perhaps to the grace of election, but to sanctification here a step that hath not any before it.*"—*Eccl. Pol.* 5. 60. And so concerning both the sacraments. "It is not ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of sacraments *but by the sacraments.*" This is the question at issue, and not justification by faith. The Provost teaches as Hooker does; the Strictures teach with Calvin that "Baptism is *only* the seal of the grace before received." Which is the teaching of our Church can easily be decided by any one who has a Prayer-book.

"The Provost next overwhelms us with a number of what he calls the fathers and authorities of the Church on this point, and among the rest we find Bishop Sparrow, from whose writings we shall quote but two scraps,

believing that an intelligent public will be fully satisfied after reading these that they have had enough of such divinity. These will clearly show the kind of men who are most dear to the Provost's heart, and whom he considers the fathers and expounders of our faith. 'Heaven waits and expects the priest's sentence here on earth.' Again 'the Apostles, and in them all priests, were made *God's vicegerents here on earth*, in his name and stead, to retain or remit sins.' These words the Provost puts in italics, and therefore we conclude that he has unquestionably embraced them as his own. We boldly ask the Christian world if ever any thing more Romish issued from the Vatican mint than these words." \* \* \*

"From henceforth let it be known that all the students of Trinity College are taught that so soon as they are ordained priests, they become *God's vicegerents upon earth* to remit and retain sins in His name and stead, and that where the priest absolves, God absolves."

In this passage we find several distinct proofs of the disingenuousness of the writer. In the first place the "scraps" from the writings of Sparrow are not the words of Sparrow at all, but are quotations, the former from St. Chrysostom, and the latter from St. Gregory. So that if we are to judge from these scraps the kind of men who are most dear to the Provost's heart, and who are more Romish than Rome, let it be known that they are two of the honoured fathers of the primitive Church, men who lived and wrote before Tractarianism or even Popery existed. In the second place, not only the words which in the Strictures are in italics, are so printed in the Provost's letter, but the whole of the "scraps," and that clearly, not to show that "he has unquestionably embraced them as his own," but simply to mark them as quotations. And lastly, when he asserts that the students in Trinity College are taught "that where the priest absolves, God absolves," he has carefully suppressed the conclusion of the sentence, "if we be truly penitent." With this addition the sentence is equivalent to the declaration in the Prayer-book, that God "hath given power and commandment to his ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people, being

penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." Without it there might be some ground for the assertion that "the Provost claims for himself and the clergy the *absolute* power to forgive sins."

The Provost expressly disclaims any such *absolute* power, and asserts in the unequivocal words of Archbishop Bramhall, "God remits sovereignly, imperially, primitively, *absolutely*; the priest's power is derivative, delegate, dependent, ministerial, *conditional*." Can any language be framed in which such a claim, as the Provost is charged with making, can be more strongly disavowed?

"THE SACRAMENTS.—We would not have noticed this subject, but that we may direct attention to the fact that no man, but one deeply imbued with Tractarian views, would think it necessary to agitate the question of the number of sacraments amongst the undergraduates of a University, many of whom were not intended for the sacred ministry."

I have heard in the course of five and twenty years many strange definitions of Tractarianism. But I have never before heard it called Tractarian to teach young men, even if they are not Divinity Students, (which, however, many of them are,) that the Church of Rome makes seven sacraments, while we assert that there are *two only*. I should think that there can be few clergymen, who, while instructing the older pupils of their Sunday Schools, have not had occasion to explain to them why the word *only* is added in the Church Catechism, in answer to the question, "How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church"? If it is "Tractarian" to agitate the question of the number of the sacraments, I no longer wonder that the Provost is called a Tractarian, but I suppose that every clergyman who teaches and explains the Church Catechism is liable to the same imputation.

"The Rubric in the service for the communion of the sick which we quoted before, instructs us that if a man repent and

believe the gospel, he eats and drinks Christ's body and blood as profitably to his soul, as if he partook of the sacrament with his mouth."

This is a most unfair construction of the Rubric. On the contrary, it plainly intimates, that except in rare and extraordinary cases, such as are particularly specified, where there is a "just impediment," it is not, in Hooker's words, the will of God to bestow the grace of the sacraments, but by the sacraments. And it answers exactly to the exhortation in the office for the baptism of adults, "whereby ye may perceive the great *necessity* of this sacrament, *where it may be had.*"

"With respect to the miserable quibble of the Provost, touching the word 'generally' that it means 'generically,' that is 'universally,' it is truly beneath notice. Whatever human authorities the Provost may quote upon this subject, the meaning of our Catechism evidently is that the '*two only*' Sacraments, which Christ has ordained in His Church, while they are generally necessary, are not universally necessary to salvation; that is that salvation may in some cases be had without them."

I cannot find the word "generically" in the Provost's letters at all, although in the Strictures it is printed as a quotation; and with respect to "universally," likewise so printed, the Provost expressly says, "I do not use the word 'universally.' \* \* I have been accustomed 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.*'" With regard to the latter part of the paragraph from the Strictures, if the writer means that the Sacraments are not necessary to salvation when there is any just impediment in the way of their reception, it is exactly what the Provost says. If he means more than this, he ought to

have told us what he does mean; for it almost appears as if he thought that "generally necessary" means "not necessary."

"The last clause of the sentence, however, entirely overthrows one false position of the Provost, that the Supper of our Lord is '*the only mean*' whereby we partake of Christ."

I cannot find these words, which are given as a quotation, in either of the Provost's letters. I find "*the great mean* of Divine appointment," and "*the appointed means* of communion." The Provost has not said that "the Supper of our Lord is *the only mean* whereby we partake of Christ," and it is strange that these misquotations should be found in a writer, who charges others with quoting "disingenuously."

"The Whitaker of the present century appears peculiarly desirous 'to show that the Church of Rome holds Catholic truth with reference to the Sacraments.'"

The remarks which I have made on the last passage apply with tenfold force to this. Here are words printed in such a manner as to appear to be a quotation from the Provost's pamphlet, whereas nothing is to be found in its pages bearing even the slightest resemblance to them. It is really monstrous that a "Presbyter" should seek to destroy the usefulness of a brother clergyman, by deliberately putting words into his mouth, which he would be the first to repudiate, and then appeal to "all persons who sympathise in this defence of Protestant truth," to assist in defraying the expense of scattering these calumnious imputations broadcast over the land. He clearly intends it to be understood that the Provost avows that the doctrine which he teaches respecting the Sacraments, as Catholic truth, is the same which is held by the Church of Rome. The Provost emphatically denies that there is in his teaching even a leaning towards the fearful errors into which the Romish Church has fallen on this subject, and only asserts that it is the

errors for which she is to be condemned, and not the Catholic truths which those errors have been suffered to overlie. He says, in fact, that her doctrine is a corruption of the truth, a position which no one will be tempted to deny, and that we must take care, while we condemn the corruption, to hold fast the truth. Is that saying that "the Church of Rome holds Catholic truth respecting the Sacraments?"

Not only has the Provost not used the *words* imputed to him, but the passage upon which alone the charge can pretend to be based, plainly means the very contrary :

"We would assuredly prefer such men as Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, who have not only 'hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,' but who have actually sealed their testimony with their blood, to men who learned their religion upon the velvet cushions of ease and prosperity, and beneath the gilded canopy of royal favour and court patronage. \* \* \* \* \*

"From the days of the Reformation, up to the time of Charles I., many eminent men lived and wrote; but shortly after that period another class of writers arose, whose opinions on matters of religion are not to be confided in."

God forbid that any son of the Church of England should fail to recognise the claims of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer upon his love and reverence. But the writer of the *Strictures* has himself shown that the opinions of Cranmer were undergoing change until nearly the close of his life. The trammels, in which the human mind had so long been held captive, had but lately been shaken off; a mighty revolution had swept away long cherished opinions, and unsettled old modes of thought and feeling; theological and political sympathies with the Protestants of France and Germany, and a natural desire to conform to their views, powerfully swayed the minds of the reformers in England; it can hardly be a matter of surprise, or detract in any way from the esteem in which we hold them, if under these circumstances we find some opinions expressed in their writings, which the church in more quiet and settled times had to unlearn.

But were there no divines after the time of Charles I., whose opinions in matters of religion are to be confided in? Were there none who did not learn their religion upon the velvet cushion of ease and prosperity, and beneath the gilded canopy of royal favour and patronage? Did the writer of that passage ever hear of Ferrar, Hammond and Wilson? Did he ever read that glorious chapter in the history of England which tells of the resistance offered to the will of Royalty by Sancroft, and Lloyd, and Ken, and the others of the noble seven, who testified the readiness of martyrs to suffer for their religion, and to whose resistance England owes it, that she was saved from Popery in 1688; or the scarce less glorious tale of the Non-jurors, who resigned "royal favour and patronage,"

"Fields which they loved, and paths they daily trod,  
And cast the future upon Providence,"

rather than abandon what they deemed a sacred principle? Shall these men be branded as "would-be corruptors of our Church?" and shall we be told that their opinion on matters of religion are not to be confided in?

"Those grave questions which formerly convulsed England to its centre, are now being agitated in the midst of us, and it becomes our laity, as well as our clergy to take the sword of the spirit which is the word of God, and to do battle against those unscriptural and soul-enslaving doctrines."

I have already shown that the teaching of Trinity College, as explained and asserted by the Provost, has nothing whatever to do with the Tractarianism, which "formerly convulsed England to its centre." The very quotations which the writer of the *Strictures* has himself adduced, when placed side by side with those in the Provost's letters, might have taught him, if he did not know it before, that from the day when the Church of England began to reform herself, there have been two schools of theology whose views on doctrinal subjects have differed from each other. There are not

wanting indications that some expressions in our Prayer-book were purposely selected so as to admit of these differences of opinion within certain limits. And it may be a matter of question whether the existence of these two schools has not been beneficial in stimulating the life and energy of the Church. For three hundred years these two parties have existed side by side in the Church, and have found ample scope for their utmost exertions in battling against the vice and infidelity around them. In Canada likewise these two parties have always been found; and although each has maintained its own opinions, firmly and conscientiously, there has hitherto been no open breach of christian charity and brotherly kindness. The venerable Bishop of Toronto has in this, as in other respects, set a noble example to his flock. His own convictions are doubtless strong and clear; yet has he ever regarded himself as the Bishop of the whole Church, and not of any party, high or low. Not one of his clergy has ever been proscribed for his opinions, and among those whom he has advanced to the highest posts of trust and dignity, are those whose views diverge probably widest from his own. Happy had it been for our Church and country had his example always been followed! Happy had it been for us, if in spite of differences of opinion we had been able to hold the great and fundamental articles of our faith, in unity of spirit, and in the bond of peace. But when we find a Presbyterian of the Church coming forward with such "Strictures" as these, when we find him calling for agitation, and endeavouring to create an unnecessary alarm, and to arouse the passions of our people by misrepresentation and virulent abuse, when we hear him stigmatising the opinions which were held by many of our most honoured divines, men of acknowledged learning and piety, human and fallible as they were, as "unscriptural and soul-enslaving doctrines," and adjuring the laity as well as the clergy to "do battle" against them,—what hope can we have, but that our divisions and jealousies will make us a by-word among the

surrounding sects, and that instead of spreading the faith of Christ, and converting the sinner and the unbeliever, we shall only confirm them in their sin and their unbelief, while reversing the words of the Pagans of old, instead of saying "See how these christians love one another," they exclaim "See how these churchmen hate one another."