

# The Theological Instructor.

No. 2.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER, 1873.

VOL. I.

## THE UNCATHOLIC THEOLOGY OF ARCHBISHOP LYNCH.

Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, gives us, in a recent number of the *Mail*, a reprint of Archbishop Manning's heresy, in relation to which we give the following from the *Church Times*, of the 26th of September last. We will guarantee that no Romanist will ever reply to the unanswerable facts given by the Rev. Dr. Nicholson.

### ARCHBISHOP MANNING'S THEOLOGY.

We should not trouble ourselves about either Archbishop Manning or his theology, were it not that he, and those who act under him, demand from us unconditional submission as the qualification for membership of what they call the Catholic Church. This being so, we cannot be straying beyond the limits of our legitimate province if we undertake to criticise the utterances of the chief representative of Roman Catholicism in this land.

And this seems all the more forced upon us by the prominence which has been given by the press to the recent pilgrimage to Paray-le-Monial. The demonstration, fortunately for itself, occurred during the "silly season," when the editors of daily newspapers are sorely put to it to fill their columns, or the probability is that the pilgrims would have had but very scant notice taken of them, or of their doings.

The greatest efforts were made by the Roman Catholic authorities to

bring their scheme before the public. Supposing that they really believed that when our Lord desired that the devotion to His Sacred Heart should be introduced into His Church, He selected a person as the repository of His will who was the least likely of all persons to be credited in a sceptical age—to wit, a sickly and hysterical nun—then we are far from blaming them. Anyway, an agitation was got up; Mr. Cook was brought into requisition; and preparatory sermons were preached. A certain amount of curiosity was roused, and, unfortunately for Archbishop Manning, amongst those who assembled on June 22nd to hear him discourse on the devotion of the Sacred Heart, was the Rev. Dr. Nicholson. More unfortunate still was it, that his Grace invited those of his hearers who desired further information to address him on the subjects connected with his sermon. And it was even yet more unfortunate for the preacher that Dr. Nicholson availed himself of the invitation. A long correspondence has appeared in the columns of the *Guardian* as having arisen out of this invitation, and to it we must beg to draw our readers' attention.

In the sermon a dogmatic statement was made by Archbishop Manning, which attracted the attention of the

Anglican theologian. It was as follows: —“That the human nature of the Blessed Redeemer was deified in consequence of it having been assumed by the Divine Son.” Immediately after the sermon Dr. Nicholson requested an ecclesiastic whom he found in the church to explain the statement. This gentleman, naturally puzzled, after fruitlessly endeavouring to reduce the declaration of his superior to some conformity with the Catholic faith, gave it up as a bad job, and referred his interrogator to the preacher himself. Dr. Nicholson did, as desired, and, through his Grace’s secretary, received the following words as accurately expressing what Dr. Manning had said: “THE SACRED HEART OF OUR LORD, BEING UNITED WITH THE DIVINITY, WAS DEIFIED, AND THEREFORE AN OBJECT OF DIVINE WORSHIP.” We print this in small capitals in order that our readers may not lose sight of the distinct point at issue, and we must remind them at the outset that they must follow our summary of the correspondence carefully, if they would appreciate its bearings. We, on our part, will do our best to make the task as easy to them as possible, stating first the true Catholic doctrine on the subject, which is: CHRIST IS TO BE WORSHIPPED WITH SUPREME ADORATION IN HIS ONE UNDIVIDED PERSON, WHEREIN THE TWO NATURES OF GOD-HEAD AND MANHOOD ARE CONJOINED. *But it is heresy to worship the mere created human body of Christ, considered apart, with Divine Worship, which is due to the whole of his Personality, not to the lower part of it; for Christ, so far as He is only Man, could not be Divinely adored.*

The Archbishop, for he, of course, must be regarded as having dictated the letters, defended his statement by reference to Perrone. Dr. Nicholson, in his reply, shewed that Perrone’s words did not support any such dogma as the deification of our Lord’s human nature. He also appealed to the Creed of St. Athanasius, and argued that Dr. Manning’s doctrine contravened the clause which lays down the dogma that Christ, in Whom are two natures, is “One, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person.” Now, “confusion of substance” means mixing up Godhead and Manhood into a compound substance, so that each partakes of the nature of the other—just Dr. Manning’s error about the Sacred Heart. Further, he repeated his original question, as to the meaning of the declaration made by the Archbishop in his sermon.

Dr. Manning proceeded to explain, and started with the following wonderfully vague definition:—“The word ‘deify’ means ordinarily ‘to exalt to an object of worship.’” But, as his opponent pointed out, this loose definition was inconsistent with the words used in the sermon, which were to this effect,—that in consequence of a certain relation to Deity, the Sacred Heart was an object of Divine Worship. And further, in the letter which began with the above mentioned vague definition, the word “deify” was used subsequently throughout, not in the vague sense, *i.e.*, the sense in which the Archbishop had used it in his sermon.

It is evident, therefore, that the loose definition of “deify” was invented in the vain hope of its helping the preacher to get out of a difficulty, and was utterly indefensible.

But Dr. Nicholson followed up this first blow by another equally severe. The Archbishop had said in his letter, "The human nature is so assumed by the Divine Person, that in Christ it is true to predicate of Him (*Homo*) the Divine attributes, and *vice versa*." If this statement had been made respecting the Whole Christ, God and man, One Christ, it would, of course, have been true, but to apply it to Christ viewed only in His humanity is undoubtedly heretical, and is the express error condemned by the Council of Ephesus. And the distinct insertion of the word "*Homo*" did so limit the statement.

It will be seen that Dr. Manning's error consisted in this—that he separated the human heart of our Blessed Lord *per se*, as the *objectum materiale* (or, subject matter) of Divine worship, whereas it is only such an object of worship when considered as part of the whole Christ in the Hypostatic union.

In defence of his position the Archbishop refers (without quoting) to the Fifth General Council; the Canon in question runs thus: "If any one says that Christ is adored in two natures, [which the Archbishop does say] from whence they introduce two adorations, separately to God the Word, and separately to the man [which is Dr. Manning's precise position] . . . but does not adore with one adoration God the Word incarnate with His proper flesh, as it was from the beginning delivered to the Church, let him be anathema."

Compare this, says Dr. Nicholson, with the dogmatic statements of Archbishop Manning in the letter aforesaid—

(1) The Divine Person is adored, and the humanity which He assumed is adored.

(2) The two natures of Christ are both objects of Divine worship, but in a different degree.

(3) They are both the *objectum materiale* of adoration.

Hence it will be seen that Archbishop Manning has attempted to defend an error of the gravest kind condemned by a General Council. His words can only be understood as rending the humanity or part of the humanity, viz., our Blessed Lord's Heart, from the Hypostatic Union, deifying it, and elevating it so as to be in itself an object of Divine worship—in other words he has been guilty of teaching, and when called to account, of attempting to defend Euty-chianism.

With this Dr. Nicholson distinctly charges the Archbishop; and in his reply, the latter manages to flounder still deeper into the mire of heresy than he was before. Here is the unfortunate sentence: "The Catholic Church teaches that the Humanity of Christ is an object of *Latria*, because, though distinct, it is indivisible from the Divine Person."

The Archbishop's inexorable antagonist quietly points out that the former clause in this statement is palpably untrue in fact, inasmuch as the direct contrary is laid down by accredited Roman Catholic theologians, nay, in all the authorized text-books used in clerical seminaries, and that the latter has been anathematized by the General Council already referred to.

After giving his authoritative proofs of these assertions, Dr. Nicholson sums up this letter as follows:—

"The Vatican Decree of Infallibility promised to the Church new aids and guidance. The pastors of the Roman Church, however, appear now to be placed in such difficulty, that they are unable to ascertain the value of a Dogmatic Constitution of the Bishop of Rome.

The advocates of Infallibility declare that the faithful by applying to a priest can always obtain the certainty of the Catholic Faith.

In the present case, however, the Chief Pastor of the Roman Church in England, from the principal pulpit of his charge, delivers himself dogmatically of a heresy which has been condemned under Catholic anathema.

When asked for an explanation the preacher quotes authorities, the sense of which he obviously misapprehends, and which are readily shown to be refutations of himself.

Besides this, statements are made in defence which are proved to be fresh heresies, and which are incompatible with the rudiments of the theology of his Church.

Finally the whole correspondence is no ordinary instance of confusion of thought and language.

In this grave matter I have no alternative, but to bring the charge of heresy against your teaching.

I should be ready to prefer the charge in the proper place and in a recognized manner, if opportunity be afforded me.

In any case unless you fully retract the heresy, I reserve to myself the right of publishing this correspondence, that impartial judgment may be formed, whether you are justifiable in the dogmatic declaration of the deification of

the human nature of Our Lord, in your representation of the theological principals and the *Cultus* of the Roman Church, and, finally, in several statements advanced in defence of opinions which are subversive of the Catholic Faith.

I have the honour to be, Most Reverend Archbishop,

Your most obedient servant,

A. NICHOLSON."

As though Archbishop Manning had not blundered enough in former letters, he blundered still more in the next, for he was unwise enough to get out of temper, and to say that the invitation to enquirers which he gave in his sermon was "not addressed to controversialists, nor to those who profess to be able to correct the theology of the Catholic clergy." He further adds that "two things are sufficiently evident—(1.) That you (Dr. Nicholson) suppose yourself better informed than the theologians of the Catholic Church to whom I have referred you; (2.) That you are in error as to the doctrines of the Catholic faith." And with this cool avowal he begs to close the correspondence.

But Dr. Nicholson was not disposed to be put off in this very cavalier manner, so he wrote again to remind his Grace that the point at issue was a purely doctrinal one, and that no mere personal considerations affected it. As to the matters which were "sufficiently evident," he replied, that as regarded the first allegation, he had no controversy whatever with Roman Catholic theologians (a hardish hit at the Archbishop by the way), but simply with certain interpretations of them which were obviously untenable,



As regarded the second allegation, he replied that however limited his knowledge, he had at least sufficient to produce quotations and arguments from recognized Roman Catholic authorities, to which the Archbishop had not ventured to reply.

Taking a general view of the whole correspondence, which fills above six columns in the *Guardian*, it is "sufficiently evident" that the Archbishop, very shortly after the correspondence, began to feel himself in an awkward position. It would not have been consistent with his dignity (as he probably supposed) to admit frankly that he had uttered an heretical statement, and he trusted to being able to silence his "Protestant" correspondent by off-hand and positive declarations and references, in the hope of the fallacies remaining undiscovered. In this, to his bitter cost, he found himself mistaken. Each assertion was criticized, each argument analysed, each reference quoted in full, and turned against him ruthlessly.

The result of it all must be, that every unprejudiced and intelligent mind must admit that his Grace has been convicted of unmistakable heresy in more than one respect. The strange thing is, that he does not seem to care about this, though he evidently does care very much indeed about

having been detected in such very palpable blunders as those which Dr. Nicholson has exposed. Anything more weak than the avowal of his discovery just at last that the letters were controversial, cannot be conceived.

Can it be true that Archbishop Manning has less care for the Catholic faith, as defined by the early General Councils, in matters which closely affect the doctrines of the Incarnation, than he has for the acceptance of modern notions which have the powerful patronage of Rome? We are afraid that this must actually be the case, and that the theology which he was sent to Rome to learn, after he became a 'vert, was not that which would have gained him great credit, if St. Augustine had been his examiner.

Though it is sad indeed to learn that such very loose theological notions are propagated by modern Roman Catholic preachers in England, the publication of these letters will be useful in various ways; and though we can scarcely hope that Archbishop Manning will condescend to take warning by the exposure which he has suffered, the thanks of all those who reverence and love the Catholic faith for its own sake is due to Dr Nicholson for the care which he has taken in exposing a heresy, and for the completeness with which he has effected it.

---

*For the Theological Instructor.*

### PROTESTANTISM: ITS GOOD AND EVIL RESULTS.

BY REV. JOHN CARRY, B. D.

So great an upheaval in the religious world as the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century, revolutionizing, as it

did, so large an area of the Western Church, could not but have widespread and lasting effects; and it would be

preposterously unphilosophical to expect that all those effects should be unmixedly good. Probably not the most ardent and illiterate Protestant in the world would maintain such a position. Let us then, in this brief paper, look at both sides of the question fairly; and, while we thankfully survey the advantages which have accrued, let us not shut our eyes to the mischievous compensation. Nor let any suppose that such inquiry is a Ham-like irreverence, and implies a suspicious regard for the Reformation; for Protestantism is not original Christianity, *i. e.*, historically, but professes to be a Reformation of the corrupted Church in that direction; and in examining it we only practise what it has taught us. Besides, through human infirmity, some temporary evil accretions attended Christianity in its very first and best days, and the most beneficent revolutions in history, whether in Church or State, have been followed by consequences not always in accord with their professed principles. In the present attempt nothing is aimed at but the very slightest sketch, such as may serve to stimulate the reader's thought.

I will consider the working of Reformation principles under two heads, *viz.*, Theology, and Mental Character.

1. Under the 1st head, I may observe that Christendom has gained an unmitigated good, without any drawback whatever, in the exposure and rejection of papal claims to supremacy and jurisdiction in, and over, all churches. This was an intolerable yoke; and signs are not wanting that a second mighty uprising against it is not far off, in countries once most

slavishly subject to the Roman See. Even if we, of the English Church, have to lament that the Crown stepped in to a good deal of the Pope's usurped authority, yet that was not the natural or necessary theological result of the overthrow of the Papal supremacy.

In the field of strict Theology the principal gain made was in bringing into clear relief the doctrine of Justification through the merit of our Redeemer, and exposing, as had never been done before, the inadequacy of all human works. I have nothing to say here about the many theories of faith found even among Protestants. But I insist on the fact that the notion of man's merit, which was so offensively paraded, and which so mischievously operated in the mediæval period, was corrected, we may hope, once for all; and, indeed, the Roman Church herself speedily felt the healing effects of the humbler and Christian view of the place which good works have in our justification, for the statement of the Council of Trent on justification may be accepted by any but a hair-splitting Christian. This will be admitted as our chief theological gain, especially by such as regard this doctrine as *Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesie*.

The importance of faith in the Christian system was so brought out by the Reformation, that a merely ceremonial religion was made less possible for the Christian conscience for all time to come. All must feel this to be an immense gain. Indeed, so strongly was the bow bent in the Anti-Roman direction, that ever since the danger has been of making faith all; a danger developed to its utmost in the Antinomians of the English Common-

wealth, who are now closely followed by the Plymouthists. I may illustrate this by an anecdote, which I have just read in a biographical sketch of the very learned and good Dr. John Duncan, professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Edinburgh, by Mr. Moody Stewart. The Doctor "frequently repeated it with the names and circumstances."—"At a Highland Communion, in a meeting for 'speaking to the question,' on a Friday evening, the subject selected was Faith. One after another of the 'men' spoke in glowing terms of the power and the triumphs of Faith, and each speaker exalted it more than the one before him. At last their esteemed minister, jealous for the honour of the Lord Jesus Christ, stood up and said, 'I ask Was Faith crucified for you; or were ye baptized in the name of Faith?'" Justly used Dr. Duncan to say, "Some men's Trinity consisted of the Father, and the Son, and Faith." Truly this development as much sets Jesus Christ aside, as any mediæval doctrine of merit. Another evil effect of the undue development of faith is, that Sacraments are divested of all gracious character. If faith be all, what place can there be for sacraments as means of grace? Thus man's merit creeps in again,—so hard is it to keep it out,—and under the guise of humility man will do all, and allow God to do nothing but as we determine. Thus the professed followers of Luther and Calvin in the present day, deny totally the plainest teaching of those great leaders on the doctrine of the Sacraments as effectual seals of grace.

Again: the Reformation brought into strong relief the idea of *individual*

responsibility and duty, insisted on every Christian man's direct relation to God, and the priesthood of the laity. These had never been denied in the Christian Church, but they had been almost buried out of sight in the Romish Church under a crushing sacerdotalism, which turned the priest into a juggler, or semi-defied him with an irresponsible authority in spiritual matters, and made him an object of superstitious confidence. But, with well-nigh the exception of the English Church, the advantages gained were counterbalanced by perhaps as great a loss—the repudiation of the divinely-originated ministry of the Church, which was appointed as the organ for the administration of the Spirit in the mystical Body. Thus the organic unity of the Body being broken, and the divine priesthood lost, the necessity of both has come to be denied, and the very notion strange; and as a matter of course, endless sects have taken the place of the One organic and historic Church.

One of the sublimest benefits of the Reformation, accompanied with perhaps the fewest drawbacks, was the restoration to the Church of the true and only object of worship—the Triune God. The worship of saints and angels had half turned the Church into a pantheon, where the Trinity had hardly the highest place. How necessary the Reformation was, is now seen by the development of Mariolatry in the present day. Mary is become a goddess, and rules with sovereign sway in heaven and earth. She has really supplanted Jesus in the devotions of the modern Romish Church. And yet even here, thankful, deeply

thankful as we are for so merciful a deliverance from such an unequalled danger as worshipping the creature instead of, or more than the Creator—the benefit comes with its appendant loss. The violent wrench which was necessary to break men off from such a godless superstition, has left them looking a little askance ever since. We have come to have a rather low ideal of the saintly character, and “the Communion of Saints” holds but an inferior place among Protestants, whether in theory or practice; while, out of abhorrence of the Romish Mariology, there has come to prevail an almost positively irreverent and profane feeling towards the Blessed Virgin; and so the model of womanly perfection is largely removed from the contemplation of the Protestant world. But that is not the worst. By refusing Mary the ancient title *Theotocos*, ratified by the general Council of Ephesus, and regarding as Popish the appellation *Mother of God*, the heresy of Nestorius is countenanced, who made *two persons* in Christ, a divine and a human—and thus invalidated the incarnation and atonement. I will conclude this first head by two other anecdotes. The first is from Dr. Brown’s Memoirs of the aforesaid Dr. John Duncan, who, Mr. Moody and Mr. Stewart says, was “a man unequalled in theology by any Scotchman of his own generation, and beside whom other men seemed scarcely to be theologians.”—“If (says Dr. Brown) you wanted to rouse the whole pugnacity of his nature, you had but to provide some more zealous than accurate Christian, student or minister, and get him to cry

out, as I have heard done in his presence, against the Popish blasphemy of daring to call the Virgin Mary ‘the Mother of God.’ ‘Dare, sir, I dare; and if you knew any thing of Church history you would not venture to call that Popery, which is simply a word happily coined to express one of the most glorious of all truths. Don’t you know that of all the heresies affecting the person of Christ which the early Church had to struggle against, none was more deadly than Nestorianism; that when a presbyter of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, found such fault with that word—*Theotocos*, *Dei para*, Mother of God—and taught (or was charged with teaching,) that ‘the man Christ Jesus’ was only the Virgin’s child, to whom the Eternal Word joined Himself—so making two persons of the One Christ—Nestorius, who defended the teaching of his presbyter, was condemned and deposed by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431; the Council holding rightly that this would deprive the whole human life, actions, and sufferings of Christ, of their *Personal* character and *Divine* value. Yes, sir, and they were right; and in justifying the use of that word *Theotocos*, they were not making the Virgin the Mother of His Godhead, as you and other ignorant people suppose—they were not such fools as that—but the Mother of *Him* who was God, and who, as the Son of God, was born, lived, died, rose, and is now seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high—all in our nature.’”

The second, expresses the reverent feeling of a distinguished Presbyterian Divine, Dr. Kidd, the first religious guide of Dr. Duncan. Dr. Kidd was a



learned Hebraist; and arguing with a Jew, one day, on the evidence of Christianity, the latter "ventured to speak disparagingly of the Virgin Mary. The Doctor had patience with his arguments against the gospel, but his reproach against Mary was more than he could endure. 'Sir,' said he, shaking his massive fist in Israel's face, 'if you dare to speak evil of the Mother of my Lord, I'll knock you down.' With all his pity and partiality for the Jews, John Duncan was singularly cordial in calling Mary 'Blessed among women;' and he rehearsed the threat

with a glowing animation and sonorous depth of tone, which showed that his heart would not have recoiled from witnessing the blow in retaliation for the offence." (Moody-Stewart, page 15, 16.) We are not commending the plan of Sir Hudibras,

"Who proved his doctrine orthodox  
By orostolic blows and knocks,"

But the zealous spirit, Boanerges-like, of the honest Dr. Kidd.

The second head of my proposed subject I must refer to another number of the INSTRUCTOR.

---

#### THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER; OR WISE STUDENT.

"Give thyself wholly to them."—1 Tim. iv, 15.

In my last, as found on page 7 of *The Instructor*, I endeavoured to show what is requisite to our being in the things of God, as here referred to, and I now proceed to consider—

II. The hindrances and opposites to our being in the things of God. These are pride, sensuality, idleness, imprudence, an eagerness for vain disputations, scepticism, and lukewarmness. And, first, pride. This consists in not thinking of ourselves soberly, but more highly than we ought to think. It consists of a violent thirst for applause; attended with a scornful contempt of other persons. A young man who thinks more highly of himself than he ought to think, so long as he continues in that distempered state of mind, never can be a wise and successful student of divinity. Pride will make him think slightly and scornfully of his teachers. It will stop his ears against the wisest lectures that could possibly be deli-

vered. It will make him scorn to sit at our blessed Lord's feet to learn his will. Pride will dreadfully offend the HOLY GHOST; and if he is offended or grieved, all success in the study of divinity is at an end. All the men upon earth, and all the angels in heaven can never make a young man wise, if he despise the teaching of the SPIRIT of God. The Holy Ghost has an amazing dignity and delicacy in his whole manner of instructing souls, and HE expects we should treat HIM with infinite veneration, delight and gratitude. A novice is in great danger of pride, and of falling into the snare and condemnation of the devil, 1 Tim. iii, 6. In a word, pride renders a man quite unlike the meek and humble Saviour of mankind, and it is the first and blackest feature of the devil on the soul. There never was a great, and useful man, that was puffed up with a vain conceit of himself, there never will be

one in Christ's kingdom on earth that indulges and cherishes the disgusting and detestable sin of pride. Pride, and schism, one of the grand results of it, are condemned alike in unmeasured terms in the Holy Scriptures. There is scarcely a sect in Christendom that did not originate in pride. It was pride that drove Satan out of heaven, Luke x, 18, and caused him to set up his kingdom upon earth: and it was the very same pride that drove all the sects out of the Church, and caused them to set up altar against altar and pulpit against pulpit. They see something in the Church, the clergy and the bishops that their pride would not submit to: "Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi," Num. xvi, 7, was the united cry of the discontented spirits that first attempted to rend the garment of Christ, and distract his spouse the Church. Precisely like Satan they set up their silly judgment against thousands of holy and learned men that went before them, and against the whole Church militant. One proud man thought he knew all that was to be known, and he and his followers seceded into schism because the priests' surplice was too long and white to suit him, another because the Church taught that in baptism the child was to be marked as Christ's own. Another still knew full well that the Church did not use water enough in holy baptism, and feeling that spirit which taught him to despise his teachers, he found evil spirits to follow him, and with their aid he formed another sect. And thus pride, hateful pride, refused instruction from Christ's ministers, the lawful pastors of the people, and they must therefore make them-

selves priests of the lowest of the people. Others thought that their prayers were far better than the prayers of the Church, or than even the Lord's own prayer, and therefore they rejected both, and prayed their own prayers: and thus again formed a new sect, which they declared was far superior to the Church that Christ himself had given for the benefit of mankind, long before the sects were born. Thus wicked and hateful pride multiplied sects, and sects have done the work of Satan, continuing to sow dissention among brethren, and thereby weaken Christian influence and power in the eyes of unbelievers. There is not a sacred truth in the New Testament that the pride of sectarians does not reject. One denies our fallen state by nature, another denies the Lord that bought them, that is, the divinity of Christ, and, as a consequence, they reject his sacred atonement. Another insists that man requires no Saviour, for that he can save himself. Another rejects the whole infantile race from the gospel covenant of promise; while another says to the wicked, there is neither hell nor devil in eternity, and you need not be concerned about the Churches teaching to the contrary. And every sect in the land, however opposed they may be to each other, with every gross, and carnally, and sensually minded man, unite in their opposition to the authority of the Church of Divine Institution. They talk, and lecture, and harrangue about liberty of conscience, but they are not willing that even Churchmen should believe their own faith; and they hold every sound Christian up to ridicule for daring to believe the Great Head of

the Church on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the power of the keys which Christ himself has conferred upon his own priesthood, and every other vital truth of the Holy Gospel, simply because that in spite of them God has retained these truths in the Church only: the sects being blinded. And so long as they remain unattached to Christ's mystical body, the Church, it is impossible that they should know anything at all about them, for "Out of Zion the perfection of beauty, God hath shined."

The second hindrance which I shall name is sensuality. Under this head I include all kinds of intemperance and luxury in meats and drinks, all impurity, or every species of fleshly lust that war against the soul. Intemperance in food, and insobriety in drinking, are sad enemies to the clear cool, and regular operations of reason, and most wretchedly spoil all attempts for the improvement of the mind, and much more do these lusts unfit the soul for the contemplation of the sublime truths of the gospel.

Our great Master, who knows our frame, understood what he said when he cautioned his own disciples, "Take heed, and beware, lest your heart be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness," Luke, xvi. 34. "Flee youthful lusts," 2 Tim. ii, 22. "Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul," 1 Peter. ii, 11.

Indolence of either body or mind is a fearful vice. It consists of sauntering about, doing nothing at all, or in doing things that have no respect or tendency to our main end in life, and it is hard to say which is worst, to do nothing at all, or to do nothing to good purpose.

It is a matter of eternal importance for a student, or a young clergyman to know how to employ every part of his time in a discreet and advantageous manner, so as to preserve his health of body and cheerfulness of mind, and to make all his studies subservient to the grand end, the glory of Christ and the happiness of souls.

Imprudence is another sad hindrance to our being in the things of God. Prudence will guard us from foolish actions which hurt our temper, our studies, and our usefulness.

I must pass by the imprudence of too much study, especially at night, as well as too little. An ill choice of books, and buying more than one can read and use to advantage, is another instance of imprudence to which many are very liable. The only way to avoid it is resolution, and a firm guard over ourselves, with a distrust of our own judgment. This will excite a young person particularly to seek the advice of tutors, and to abide by that advice, which if done will surely save the party from a great deal of vain expense, and repentance in future life.

The last instance of imprudence I shall mention is the neglect of reading the Holy Scriptures as the very first book every morning. Prayer without this will not be well performed, and if we think that any other good book will do as well, we shall find ourselves mistaken, and smart for our folly all the day. God is a most jealous Being; he loves his own book, and he sees whether we prefer his holy volume above all other books. He looks keenly on our temper and practice, and if we, in our great wisdom, think it more for our interest to read other books, he

silently resents our conduct, and will, as a kind Father, chastise us for our folly, by withholding success from our studies, most commonly for the whole of that day.

An eagerness for vain disputation on every occasion, flows from pride, or a high conceit of our superiority over others in wit and parts. This temper makes a young man contemptible, odious, and hateful, and it cannot make him happy in himself.

I would not, for a moment, discountenance *honest* free thinking, or the right use of our understanding in the enquiry after truth, but a violent love for disputing is not the way to attain truth; this is to be done by patient attention, and an honest resolution to search for evidence, and submit to it as fast as it shall rise. Mr. Locke on the Understanding, and Mr. Boswell's Method of Study, are excellent books to direct a young man in his enquiries after truth.

But above all things we would ex-

hort young and old never to indulge a spirit of levity and frothiness in disputing about the tremendous truths of divine Revelation. This is little better than an atheistical spirit, and has been followed by awful consequences. Scepticism and lukewarmness should be put together, because the former always produces the latter. Scepticism is a distempered state of the understanding, by which a man is inclined to doubt the most important and interesting truths. A doubt is a suspension of thought, and a propensity to withhold the assent of the mind to any truth. This very much arises from pride, darkness, and enmity, and therefore should be considered and abhorred as the sickness, or moral disease of the soul, and the very best remedy against it is fervent prayer, and an honest love of truth, with a fervent resolution to pursue it unto the end of our lives.

*(To be concluded in our next.)*

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the Theological Instructor.*

DEAR SIR,—

I was very glad to receive the first number of the THEOLOGICAL INSTRUCTOR, and have perused it with much pleasure and profit.

If the worth of the future numbers of your very valuable Magazine can be properly estimated by the present one, I have no hesitation in saying that it must soon occupy a high place in the minds of thousands of families—and of those who truly desire to be led into the paths of eternal life, and fed

upon the true bread that cometh from Heaven.

The *Introduction* of the present number is fraught with the true spirit of godliness and zeal for the advancement of eternal truth, as made known in the word of God.

I have no doubt but that you will abundantly fulfil your promises in prosecuting your labors in connection with your Magazine, and that many will be led into the ways of righteousness through your teachings.



Allow me to say, that I was very much pleased with the article entitled "Protestant: Its History and Use," by the Rev. John Carry. The subject is admirably treated; and I apprehend that many persons, who may read this production, will learn some things

which they have not before clearly understood.

I shall hope frequently to see articles from the pen of that Reverend gentleman.

You will hear from me again.

Davenport, Iowa.

D. B. N.

---

To the Editor of the Theological Instructor.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I have lately encountered an unbeliever in the Holy Bible, who called in question Prov. xxvi., 4, 5, as contradictory; and, consequently, untrue. The text reads: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly lest he be wise in his own conceit." Will you kindly furnish us with an explanation of the passage in the November number of your excellent Magazine, and oblige

A SINCERE READER OF HOLY WRIT.

ANSWER.

The first thing to be remarked concerning this passage is, that these two sentences are quite distinct, and in no wise dependent the one upon the other; but, like the foregoing observations of the wise man, each of them has a complete instructive meaning: viz., "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him."

A fool, in the language of scripture, means an ungodly, sinful man, who, considering the threatening of God against such, in connection with the realities of eternity, is most certainly void of understanding. The rich man in the gospel is a most incontestable proof of this. His having ac-

quired a vast fortune, and his prudent care for the security of it, show that he was not a fool in the affairs of the present life, nor consequently esteemed as such in the eyes of the world; but his amazing folly appears in a want of due concern for his eternal interests; and the appellation he obtains from the mouth of unerring Wisdom on this account, clearly demonstrate the Scripture character of a fool. Now, the text commands, "Not to answer a fool according to his folly, lest thou be like unto him." This prohibits us from entering into the same vain, sinful, covetous conversation. As for instance, to continue the allusion to the rich man before mentioned, supposing he had asked our advice in the disposal of those large sums which he had amassed, if we had said, "pull down your barns and build greater, and then lay up all your store, and take your ease, eat, drink, and be merry, for you have many years to enjoy it;" we should in this case be answering him according to his folly, and be like unto him. Whereas, if we reminded him that he was only a steward of those things, and that God was the proprietor, and that he ought therefore to improve them all to his glory,—in this case, we would not be a partaker of his sin; because we

delivered our own soul, and *did not* answer him according to his folly.

As to the second part, "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." It appears to have reference to the duty of reproof, and to be of the same import with, "Thou shalt not suffer sin upon thy brother, thou shalt in any wise reprove him." If I see any one pursuing the course that leads to sure destruction, or if my neighbour is in any grievous error, which endangers his spiritual interests, if I am more enlightened, and do not reprove or admonish him, with more or less zeal, as the

circumstances require, or as the text expresses it, "*according to his folly,*" he will be wise in his own conceit; that is, he will continue in his fatal mistake, and his blood will be required at my hands; especially if, through fear of offending him, or perhaps losing some temporal gain, I soothe him in his sin and folly. This divine caution may have reference, particularly to ministers of the gospel, parents, masters, and guardians, whose duty it is to reprove and correct according to the circumstances of those over whom they are appointed to watch, as those that must give an account of them to God

#### THE CORNER PLANTATION.

A TALE.

(Continued.)

"I'll wait till he comes in, and tell him of something that will perhaps do for him."

The bright colour rushed into Mrs. Styles's pale cheek, and she turned an anxious look into her young lady's face.

"Don't wait, miss."

"You ought not to be left alone," said Margaret quietly, without returning the anxious look; and she sat there so still that the poor woman made no farther remonstrance until the twilight shadows deepened and the darkness came on. Margaret had been talking quietly and pleasantly, and Mrs. Styles had grown almost cheerful, but now she turned uneasily again.

"Are you alone, miss?"

"No, I have Rollo with me," said the girl smiling.

"Oh, miss, you ought to go home, it is getting so late, and my lady will be vexed."

"I daresay they will send some one for me," said Margaret, soothingly, "they all know where I am, you know."

So the girl sat steadily on, until the moon had risen, and it was a little past ten o'clock. "I think I ought to go now," she said, rising, "or mamma will be vexed; but I don't like leaving you alone, Mrs. Styles; your husband ought not to leave you for so long."

"He'll be in directly miss; he will indeed," said the sick woman. "Oh, thank you miss, for coming and staying with me, it is such a comfort to see you."

"Good night," said Margaret brightly, "I'm so glad you liked it. Come along, Rollo," she added, as she opened the door, "we'll have a jolly run home!"

Again saying "good night," and followed with the blessing of her poor friend, Margaret Granton shut the door, and set off on her walk. She turned into a grassy lane, that led into the plantations which skirted the park, and soon opened the wicket-gate of the corner plantation itself; Rollo bounded on before, and she followed, whistling merrily as she cracked

the withered branches and leaves under her feet. Suddenly, the dog stopped and growled; suspecting that he had scented the game, Margaret called him, and whistled, and drew her dark cloak closer round her, for it was chilly, and whistled again.

"Come here, sir!" she called threateningly, but Rollo growled and growled again, and refused to stir.

Then Margaret too, saw in the very dim light a dark figure, and she saw the muzzle of a gun, and was half-blinded and deafened with a flash and a report; and she lay extended on the ground, while a retreating figure broke through briars and bushes and gained the road. And Rollo sat beside his mistress, moaning and whining in distress.

"Why does not Maggie come back?" asked Lady Granton anxiously, as ten o'clock struck, and they had seen nothing of the absent one.

"I don't know," replied Teresa, "I told her she ought not to go."

"I told her she might go, dear," replied the mother, gently; "but she should not have stayed so late. It is a bright night, however."

"She has Rollo with her," said Sir Robert; "but I will go and meet her, which way will she be coming back?"

"She went through the corner plantation," said one of the girls.

"I hope that dog won't disturb the game," said Sir Robert to himself as he crossed the lawn lighting his cigar. He reached the little gate that led from the garden into the park, when the report of a gun disturbed his equanimity. "Those poachers!" he ejaculated impatiently, and ran back to the drawing-room windows. "Emily, send Richard and Simmonds to me directly, and tell them to bring my gun; quick."

In a few moments the two men-servants joined him, and, hastily explaining what was the matter, Sir Robert hurried with them into the park, and towards the preserves in which he fancied the shot was fired. They gained the underwood, but all was quiet and peaceful: a startled hare ran across their path, but that was all.

Baffled and discomfited, they turned, and were going across the path in another direction, when a dismal howl fell on their ears.

"Rollo!" exclaimed all three.

"It must be the corner plantation. Good heavens! he was with Maggie," cried Sir Robert, in the greatest alarm and distress; and they ran towards the enclosure from which the sound came.

"It is Rollo," said the butler, as the dog gave another dismal howl. "I'm afraid he is hurt, sir."

"I hope it may be Rollo, and not Miss Margaret," said the footman, out of breath.

The whinings grew nearer and nearer, and at last they reached the place, and Sir Robert jumped the gate, and hurried into the plantation.

"Rollo! Rollo!" he called, and the dog came bounding to his side, and then barked, and ran away again into the copse. Sir Robert followed, and by the dim light saw Margaret lying there upon the ground. He was a man with great power of repressing his feelings, but he bent down over his favourite child, and gave one short, deep groan.

"Oh, Maggie, Maggie," he said.

"Is that you, papa?" was the answer, to his great relief and surprise.

"I thought nobody would ever come; I am so glad."

"My darling, what is it?"

"Only my arm, I think; but I can't get up," she said faintly. "I tied it up with my cloak; can you carry me, papa?" for her father, with the help of the others, had raised her from the ground.

"Carry you? yes," he said tenderly; but Margaret did not hear him, for she had fainted away.

They bore her quickly to the hall, and in a few moments a man-servant galloped off on the swiftest horse for the doctor.

Before very long he was there, and the shot was extracted, and the arm was set and dressed, for it was broken.

Then, only, had they time to think of the doer of the deed.

"It must have been some of the Wortham men," said Margaret hastily, from her pillow. "I was whistling, and had the dog you know, so they must have mistaken me for the keeper."

That was all any one could get out of Margaret; she could not tell what the figure or figures were like; she was taken by surprise, he said, and she would like them to be shot in a plantation on a dim night, and then see if they could tell who it was that fired the gun: she did not know any of the Wortham men by sight, and she was quite positive that she should not know this man again, unless they were put back in exactly the same relative positions.

"It is true enough," said Sir Robert, smiling at the facetiousness of this last remark. "One man is just like another at such a time; but *Rollo will know him again*"

Margaret looked up uneasily from her bed,

"No he won't," she said; "Rollo barks at everybody."

"We shall see," said her father quietly; "I am determined that *this* time the fellows shall not get off."

And he walked away, looking very fierce indeed; whilst the patient turned uneasily, and restlessly gave a deep sigh.

Great consternation spread through the village next morning, when it was known that Miss Margaret had been shot at by one of the poachers, and that she was lying very ill with her arm broken.

The nurse-girl who came to see after the Styles's cottage, brought the news to the sick woman.

"Miss Margaret! shot!" she exclaimed in the greatest distress, "oh dear, 'tis all my fault, 'twas all along o' her seein' o' me!" and she began to cry piteously.

"What's the matter?" asked her husband, coming in at the back door with a pail of water.

"Oh, James!" exclaimed the poor woman, "here's one of them bad poachers bin and shot Miss Margaret!"

"Shot—who?" he shouted, with a horror-struck face, and dropping the pail of water.

"Now, look at you, Mr. Styles!" ejaculated the aggrieved housegirl, angrily, "who's to clean that up?"

"Clean it up yourself!" he said with an oath, and turned again to his wife. "How could she, Miss Margaret, get into the plantation that time o' night?"

"What time o'night," asked Mrs. Styles innocently. "I didn't know what time 'twas done; why Jem," she went on crying, "she came down to me, and was sitting along o' me till ten o'clock last night; but she had her dog, she said, and wouldn't take no hurt; and now she's shot! oh, deary, deary me!"

"Sitting with you!" said Jem Styles in a low voice.

"Yes, you came in almost d'rectly she was gone," replied his wife, "but you went to bed so quick, and spoke so short to me, that I never told you she had been here."

"Miss Margaret!" was all he said. "Oh Lord! Miss Margaret! of all folks!"

Mrs. Styles had never seen her husband affected so deeply before; he turned and went out of the room, shaking like an aspen-leaf, leaving his wife still sobbing, and the angry waiting-girl, muttering to herself over the extra work of "clearing up after them there careless men folks, a drop-pin' and a spillin' water in this here owdacious manner!"

Sir Robert Granton left no stone unturned, to try and find the miscreant who had wounded his daughter, but all attempts were unavailing. One man in Wortham, a notorious character, was suspected, and Rollo barked furiously at him when taken to see him, but it was proved on closer examination being made, that the man was some miles away at the time, in quite another place, so that suspicion was unfounded.

(To be Continued.)