

LIBRARY



TGI V

US 16474.2.10

Doane

Correspondence

US 16474.2.16



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

CORRESPONDENCE  
BETWEEN THE  
RIGHT REV. BISHOP DOANE  
OF NEW JERSEY,  
AND THE  
REV. H. A. BOARDMAN  
OF PHILADELPHIA,  
ON THE  
ALLEGED POPISH CHARACTER  
OF THE  
OXFORD TRACTS.

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
HOOKER & AGNEW,  
N. W. CORNER OF CHESTNUT AND FIFTH STREETS.

.....  
1841.

**“CORRESPONDENCE”**

**BETWEEN**

**THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP DOANE**  
**OF NEW JERSEY,**

**AND**

**THE REV. H. A. BOARDMAN**  
**OF PHILADELPHIA,**

**ON THE**

**ALLEGED POPISSH CHARACTER**

**OF THE**

**“OXFORD DIVINITY.”**

---

**PHILADELPHIA:**  
**HOOKER & AGNEW,**  
**N. W. CORNER OF CHESTNUT AND FIFTH STREETS.**

**1841.**

US 10474.2.10  
✓



---

Wm. S. Young, Printer.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE "Banner of the Cross," (a Protestant Episcopal paper, published in this city,) of the 20th Feb., contained a letter addressed to the undersigned, under the signature of the Right Rev. Dr. Doane, Bishop of New Jersey. This letter will be found below. My first letter in reply was sent to the Editor of the "Banner" on Tuesday morning, and, to my great surprise, he returned it to me on the afternoon of the same day, enclosed in a note, a copy of which is herewith published, marked (A.) The next morning, I transmitted to the editor the note marked (B.,) and soon after received his final reply, (C.)

This statement will explain the reason why the following correspondence is published in the present form. It is proper to add, that my answer to the Bishop is considerably longer than I should have felt at liberty to make it, had the editor of the "Banner" agreed to insert it in his paper.

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philadelphia, March 3d, 1841.

(A.)

(NOTE FROM THE EDITOR OF THE BANNER TO MR. BOARDMAN, RETURNING MR. B'S. FIRST LETTER TO BISHOP DOANE.)

IN returning the enclosed to Mr. Boardman, the Editor of the Banner would merely remark in explanation, that it does not appear altogether relevant to the subject of controversy. Bishop Doane did not doubt, he presumes, that Mr. B. would be able to "sustain" his charge against the Oxford writers, by quoting similar accusations by others; but this would scarcely be deemed exculpatory in a Court of Justice, and the Editor is unwilling to fill his columns, to the exclusion of better matter, with the notions of partisan writers, adopted without investigation, and maintained with a rancour unworthy of the Christianity they profess. A bare allusion to the support which Mr. B. derives from the admission of Episcopal writers, would, the Editor conceives, be all that was required on this point, and this would lead at once to, what is now made the second division of his reply,—the result of his *own* investigation. This, the Editor will insert with pleasure, and will notify his readers that Mr. B's. answer may be expected in the number next succeeding, if this course will be agreeable to Mr. Boardman.

The Editor would further state, that a copy of the Banner containing Bishop Doane's Letter was particularly directed by the Bishop to be sent to Mr. Boardman, and instructions were given to that effect.

(B.)

*To the Editor of the "Banner of the Cross."*

SIR:

I can hardly express my surprise at the tenor of the note I received from you last evening. I must think that your refusal to publish my letter, has been hasty and inconsiderate; and I wish to give you an opportunity to review the circumstances of the case.

You inserted in your paper of last week, a letter from one of the Right Reverend Prelates of your Church, in which (addressing me by name) he says: "*I call upon you distinctly and by name for your proofs*, that a large and learned body of the clergy of the Church of England, (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery, and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency to give them currency among the people."

In other parts of his letter he distinctly intimates that if I fail to substantiate this statement, (and another founded on it,) very grave imputations will rest upon my character.

I undertake to sustain the proposition; and on sending you the first part of my reply to the Bishop's peremptory call, I find your columns closed against me! Why? Not because there is any thing exceptionable in the language or tone of my communication. This is not pretended. You brand as "rancorous" the spirit of some of the respectable clergymen of your own communion, whose opinions are quoted by me, but you do not even hint that I have violated the decorum proper to such a correspondence. Why then is my letter rejected? Be-



cause, in the first place, "it does not appear (*to you*) altogether relevant to the subject of controversy;" and in the second place, you are "unwilling to fill your columns, to the exclusion of better matter," with my quotations from Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic authors.

As to the latter of these reasons, the public will be able to pronounce on its validity when they see the names of the men whom you characterize as manifesting a spirit "unworthy of the Christianity they profess," and compare with this correspondence, the extracts I have taken from their writings. In reference to the other reason, it appears to me to be founded on a very extraordinary view of the Editorial prerogative. I design no offence, sir, when I respectfully remind you that *the parties to this correspondence are Bishop Doane and myself*; and I cannot recognise your right, or that of any other individual, to prescribe to me in what manner my part in it shall be conducted. Your plan may be a wiser and better one than mine; but I must be allowed to act for myself. I do not join issue with you on the question as to the "relevancy" of my answer. I do not admit your right to raise this question (as a bar to the publication of my letter.) Had the Bishop and myself constituted you the umpire in this discussion, with plenary powers, you would have been authorized to exclude all such matter, on either side, as appeared to you irrelevant. But surely when you spread his letter before the Church and the world, you did not imagine that the questions presented in it were to be adjudicated before the bar of your private judgment: and *I* cannot consent to have them issued at that bar now. I choose that the same tribunal before which I have been cited, shall hear my defence. If I injure my own cause by introducing irrelevant matter, the responsibility is mine, not yours. And I am utterly unable to see with what justice or propriety

you can undertake to preclude me from using matter which I may deem of great weight in the argument. You have permitted me to be called to account in your columns, and when I present my vindication, you refuse to publish a large portion of it, because *you* "do not deem it relevant to the subject of controversy!"

As to the courtesy of this procedure towards a clergyman of a different denomination from your own, (and whose reputation must unavoidably suffer from it among the numerous readers of your paper to whom he is a stranger,) I have not a word to say. But is it Christian? Is it equitable? Is it just? Would you be satisfied with it if you were placed in my circumstances? Do you not perceive, will not all who read this correspondence perceive, that it would be but one step further (and that a small one) for you to claim the right to dictate the precise terms in which my letter should be couched?

I think, sir, I have reason to complain of this treatment. I do complain of it. I know how impartial men, of all denominations, will regard it. I greatly mistake the temper of the Protestant Episcopal portion of this community, (among whom I am happy to number a large circle of valued friends,) if *they* sanction it. Nay, I do not believe that the Bishop of New Jersey will approve of it. The tone of his letter to me, and his character as a man, forbid the idea that he would justify any third person in interfering with our correspondence, and suppressing a portion of my reply to him which I regard as vital to the merits of the case.

You will gather from these remarks my answer to the inquiry contained in the latter part of your note. You wish to know whether you shall announce my reply (that is, the second part of it, which, you insist, ought to be the whole,) as forthcoming in the Banner of next week. By no means, unless you publish the first part. I shall

probably have occasion to quote from other Protestant Episcopal Prelates and Pastors in *that* portion of my reply, and what guarantee have I that you would not deem my future quotations as *irrelevant* as those you have rejected, and shut them out of your columns also? My *whole* reply to Bishop Doane must be inserted in the Banner, or none at all.

If you still decline publishing the letter, you will do me the justice, I hope, to insert the enclosed Card in your paper of this week. I will wait for your final answer (both as regards the letter and the card,) until nine o'clock to-morrow morning. If I get no answer by that time, I shall consider it as importing that neither the letter nor the card will appear.

I am sir, very respectfully,

Yours, &c.,

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philadelphia, Feb. 24th, 1841.

(The "Card" referred to above, was as follows.)

#### A CARD.

The undersigned presents his compliments to the Right Reverend Bishop Doane, and begs leave to inform him, that the first part of his reply to the Bishop's letter in the Banner of the Cross of last week, on the subject of the Oxford Tracts, was sent to the office of the Banner on Tuesday morning, the 23d inst.; and that the Editor refused to insert it on these grounds, (as stated in his note,) to wit:—First, that "it did not appear to *him* (the Editor) altogether relevant to the subject of controversy;" and secondly, that he was "unwilling to fill his columns, to the exclusion of better matter," with certain quotations imbodyed in the letter, from Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic authors. The undersigned being

thus most unexpectedly, and, as he conceives, unjustly, precluded from replying (except under very unreasonable restrictions) through the columns of the paper in which he was personally and peremptorily invited to the discussion, will do himself the honour to communicate his answer to the Bishop through some other channel.

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philadelphia, Feb. 24th, 1841.

---

(C.)

The Editor of the Banner presents his compliments to the Rev. Mr. Boardman, and will publish, with pleasure, the Card which he addresses to Bishop Doane.

The Editor has no desire to interpose any obstacle to the fullest vindication of himself by Mr. Boardman, and cannot think that he does so in adhering to the decision announced in his note of yesterday. That note was written in haste, and is perhaps susceptible of a misinterpretation which Mr. Boardman has put upon it.—The word “rancour” was not intended to be applied to the gentlemen named in Mr. B’s. reply, so much as to the opponents of the Oxford writers generally.

The Editor would be sorry if the course which he has deemed it proper to pursue in this matter should be construed into any want of respect for Mr. Boardman, whose character he has ever held in high estimation.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### BISHOP DOANE'S LETTER.

TO THE REV. H. A. BOARDMAN, "PASTOR OF THE WALNUT STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH," PHILADELPHIA.

Reverend Sir,

Though I cannot claim the pleasure of your personal acquaintance, I feel myself compelled, in justice to the truth, and to the character of brethren and fellow-members of a sister Church assailed by you, to intrude myself on your attention. A little book, bearing your name, "a Lecture," delivered by you on the 27th day of December last, has just come into my hands, not by purchase, but as the gift of one of the publishers. Opening it cursorily, this morning, I am shocked to find, on pages 20 and 21, such language as this:—"These facts are sufficiently startling, but there is another feature in the present religious state of Great Britain, equally ominous, namely, *The Oxford Tract movement*. Romanism could make little headway in that country if the ministry of the established Church were all such men as Bickersteth, and Melville, and Henry Blunt, and the Noels. But, unhappily, a large and learned body of the clergy, (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery; and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency, to give them cur-

rency among the people. This state of things in England, must operate powerfully upon this country. The increase of Romanism there can hardly fail of giving a fresh impulse to it here. The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church."

Your position in the community forbids the supposition that you can under-estimate the value of reputation, and especially to "the clergy," and "ecclesiastical teachers." The office which you hold, as "Pastor of the Church" in which these words were uttered, is accepted as a sufficient pledge that you would not willingly depreciate, but from the clearest sense of duty, what you must allow to be so valuable: valuable, in the instances alluded to, not to the parties spoken of alone or chiefly, but to the cause of which they are the accredited advocates; the cause of Him whose ministers they are. I set aside, then, as impossible, the thought that these grave charges were prompted by one particle of malice; or that they are uttered, however much they may betray the want of due consideration, in any feeling of uncharitableness. I throw myself on the less offensive, because less culpable supposition, that the words which I have quoted were words not duly weighed; spoken in the fervour of excited zeal, on grounds not thoroughly investigated. And in entire frankness and courtesy, I wish to afford you an opportunity to reconsider them; and should you find them not sustained, as most assuredly they cannot be, to do what your sense of justice will, I trust, instinctively demand of you, and your Christian charity, rejoicing not in iniquity, but rejoicing in the truth, will hasten to perform—acknowledge that you were in error, and make utmost and immediate reparation.

That there may be no doubt as to my meaning, and that the present communication may suffice to bring about the only object which I have at heart, the accordance of what is due to others—and not less, permit me to add, of what is due to yourself—I call upon you distinctly and by name for your proofs, that “*a large and learned body of the clergy*” of the Church of England, (“*embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford*) *have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery, and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency to give them currency among the people.*”

Your reference to “the state of things” in this country is more guarded. By “the Oxford Tract leaven,” however, I must suppose you to mean, from the connexion in which you use it, the adoption of “some of the worst errors of Popery :” more especially, as you state that the “Roman Priests” are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church ;” by which you mean, doubtless, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Adopting this interpretation of your language, I call on you distinctly and by name for your proofs of the adoption of “some of the worst errors of Popery” into “the bosom” of that Church; and of the progress in it of any “doctrines” which, in your judgment, would justly authorize the “Roman Priests,” as such, in reality, as well as “publicly, felicitating their people.” I say *really*, for I am sure you are not ignorant of the devices of Popery; how she adapts herself to times and circumstances, taking cameleon-like the hue of every hour, yet all the while in purpose and intent unchanging and unchangeable; how skilful and how prompt she is in that old trick of tyrants, to divide and conquer; nay, how she *has* put on the very face and garb of Puri-

tanism,\* that she might undermine, what she most dreads and hates, the Church of England, and the truth as held by her.

In thus addressing you, I undertake no championship of what you are pleased to call "the Oxford Tract movement," as such; claiming, however, for myself the privilege to use and to approve, without permission and without reproach, (responsible for that alone which I adopt,) the vast amount, that is most timely and most excellent, in those calumniated writings. As little do I identify myself with any school or set of men, on either side of the Atlantic: although the names of those whom you have charged as striving to pervert their age to Popery, while they profess to stand upon the ground which Cranmer held at his life's cost, the ground of primitive antiquity, are such, for talents, learning, piety, integrity, holiness, heavenly-mindedness and charity, as would adorn the purest age the Church has ever known; and are—the Papists know it, though you do not—the boldest and the ablest living champions of the truth, against the force and fraud of fallen, frenzied Rome. I do no more than claim the application of that golden rule of mutual duty, which the Saviour taught us, in demanding, as I would that others should for me, revisal of

\* See a note to the very able article, "Romanism in Ireland," written, without a doubt, at Oxford, in the Quarterly Review, No. cxxxiii. The statement there made, that Romish priests did go to England, in 1546, and thereabouts, disguised as Presbyterians, Independents and Anabaptists, by order from Rome; and did teach the people, in these assumed characters, as Faithful Comenin, one of the most active of them confessed, to hate the liturgy, to pray extempore, to despise ceremonies, to profess tender consciences, and to call a set form of words the mass translated, is familiar to all well-informed Churchmen. A sufficient reference for the present, is to Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, vol. i. pp. 141, 459, 484.



the sentence, which, without a proper hearing, has been passed upon the innocent and absent. Nay, less, far less than this. I do but act on the indignant prompting of a heathen's sense of justice :

“ \_\_\_\_\_ *absentem qui rodit amicum ;*  
*Qui non defendit, alio culpante ;*  
\_\_\_\_\_ *hie niger est, hunc tu Romane, caveto.*”

Believe me, truly and respectfully, your friend and  
servant, G. W. DOANE.

Riverside, February 13, 1841.

## REPLY.

---

### LETTER I.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE W. DOANE, D. D.,  
BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
IN THE DIOCESS OF NEW JERSEY.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:

In the "Banner of the Cross" of the 20th instant, (for a copy of which I am indebted to the courtesy of a friend,) I find a letter addressed to me under your signature. It appears from this letter, that your feelings have been greatly wounded, and even "shocked," by a passage in relation to the Oxford Tracts, which occurs in my recently published "Lecture on Romanism." And you call upon me either to retract or substantiate the sentiments there expressed—sentiments which, you feel assured, must have been uttered "in the fervour of excited zeal, on grounds not thoroughly investigated." You do me the justice to disclaim any apprehension that these "charges" (as you characterize them) were prompted by the least feeling of "malice" or "uncharitableness." I trust I am incapable of calumniating any one—much less could I "assail," with malicious intent, the reputation of men holding (like the gentlemen at Oxford) a high and responsible situation in a

sister-branch (*sit venia verbo*) of the church of Christ. And it is a source of unaffected regret to me, that the remarks alluded to should have given pain to my respected correspondent, or any other human being.

The passage in the Lecture which bears upon this subject is as follows:—

“These facts [namely, certain statistical facts quoted from Mr. Bickersteth, on the alarming increase of Popery in Great Britain,] are sufficiently startling; but there is another feature in the present religious state of Great Britain, equally ominous, namely, the *Oxford Tract movement*. Romanism could make little headway in that country, if the ministry of the established church were all such men as Bickersteth, and Melville, and Henry Blunt, and the Noels. But, unhappily, a large and learned body of the clergy (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery, and are employing both the pulpit and the press, with prodigious efficiency, to give them currency among the people.

“This state of things in England [the state of things disclosed in the above paragraph, and in the quotation from Mr. Bickersteth,] must operate powerfully upon this country. The increase of Romanism there, can hardly fail of giving a fresh impulse to it here. The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant church.”

To these paragraphs is appended the following

2\*

foot-note, which I regret you did not copy into your letter, as it modifies somewhat the impression which the text is adapted to produce.

“True Protestants of all denominations must rejoice at the emphatic condemnation which has been passed upon these publications by the eloquent Bishop of Ohio, and other distinguished clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. This opposition (the lecturer has been happy to learn since the lecture was delivered,) is likely to keep the circulation of these pernicious writings within very narrow limits.”

You avow it as one of the objects of your letter to “afford me an opportunity to reconsider” these strictures, that I may thereupon acknowledge that they are unfounded, and “make utmost and immediate reparation.”

I beg leave to assure you, Reverend Sir, that you are mistaken in supposing that the above passage was penned “without due consideration.” It was written (and written not in anger but in sorrow,) after mature reflection. Nevertheless, the possibility that I might have wronged the authors of those publications, (a wrong I should be as prompt to atone for, when discovered, as any friend of theirs could be to demand “reparation,”) has induced me, on your suggestion, to “reconsider” the whole subject, and reinvestigate the grounds on which the statements were made. I have examined the Oxford publications anew, (as many of them, that is, as are within my reach,) and I am only strengthened in the opinions on which you have animadverted. It is my sober, deliberate judgment, that those publications embody “some of the

worst errors of Popery," and that the whole system is more Popish than it is Protestant. And I believe, (claiming for myself the same liberty of opinion that I concede to others,) that Oxfordism, instead of preparing true Christianity for its approaching conflict with "the man of sin," is destined greatly to accelerate the progress of Romanism in England.

Alluding to the writers in question, you observe, near the close of your letter; "they are—the Papists know it, though you do not—the boldest and the ablest living champions of the truth, against the force and fraud of fallen, frenzied Rome." The remarks just made will confirm you (if confirmation were wanting) in the propriety of ascribing to me the ignorance associated with my name in this sentence. I certainly "do *not* know" what you affirm. I do not believe that any set of men can withstand Rome successfully, who have thrown away the weapons with which the Reformers vanquished her—who have spiked their cannon, and abandoned their citadel, and gone forth to meet her with small swords and pistols. Nor do I think that the Papists themselves are as well informed on this point as you suppose them to be. I have serious doubts whether the name of Oxford spreads more terror through the halls of the Vatican, than any other name in Christendom. But of this more presently.

The main question between us respects the alleged Popish character (in some particulars) of the Oxford publications. It is obvious both from the opening and the close of your letter, that you consider the various points adverted to by you, as subordinate to this. And every candid reader of the passage quoted from

my lecture, will perceive at once that the whole question hinges here. To this point, therefore, I shall direct my chief attention. After making two preliminary remarks, I will proceed to spread before you some of the grounds on which the statements in the lecture rest.

In the first place, it is important we should define what is to be understood by the phrase, "some of the *worst errors* of Popery." There may be a difference of opinion on this point. Some may hold that the Papal supremacy, the schismatic position of the church of Rome within the dioceses of the church of England, the denial of the cup to the laity, &c. &c., are the worst features of Romanism. But the author of the lecture had his eye upon what *he* deemed to be errors of a much deeper dye. He believes with the judicious Hooker, that "the grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is about the matter of JUSTIFYING RIGHTEOUSNESS." With this may be associated the NATURE AND MEANS OF REGENERATION, and the NATURE AND TRUE DESERT OF SIN. The doctrines of Rome on these and their affiliated points, together with her rejection of the Bible as the only infallible RULE OF FAITH, are, in the judgment of the writer, her "worst errors"—the prolific source of nearly all her abominations.

My second remark is this:—If you were "shocked" at the sentiments expressed in my lecture, I was surprised beyond measure that you should treat the imputation they involve against the character of the Oxford Divinity, as though it were a *novelty*. I cannot think it was so designed; but the legitimate impres-

sion conveyed by the whole tone of your letter, is, that I am the first individual who has presumed to ascribe to these Tracts a strong Popish tendency! In a matter of this sort, I neither court responsibility nor shrink from it. But it is right that the readers of this correspondence should know (if they do not know it) that these Tracts have been, and still are, the subject of a wide-spread and vigorous controversy, both in the established church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal church in this country; and that they have been denounced for their Popery in terms of solemn and indignant rebuke, by many of the ablest pastors and *Prelates* in each of these churches.

I propose to show now, that I have the authority both of Protestant Episcopalians and Roman Catholics, for all that I have said respecting the character of the Oxford publications; and having done this, I will then appeal to the Tracts themselves.

I begin by quoting a single sentence from the noble work of Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, on "Oxford Divinity." "He (the author) is constrained to say, that every further step of insight into what is indeed a thoroughly wrought, highly complex, and deep-laid scheme or system of doctrine, (much as the name of system is rejected by its advocates,) has produced but a deeper and deeper conviction on his mind, that whatever the intention or supposition of those who maintain it, it is a systematic abandonment of the vital and distinguishing principles of the Protestant faith, and a systematic adoption of that very root and heart of Romanism, whence has issued the life of all its ramified corruptions and deformities." (P. 14.)

The esteemed Rector of St. Andrew's church, in

this city, writing from Oxford, in 1838, says, "From all that I have learned since I have been here, after very free conversations with some holding the new divinity, and others who reject it, I am constrained to think that Messrs. Pusey, Newman, and Keble have started a system which, when brought out in full development, will be found to *contain all the elements of Popery.*" (Clark's "Glimpses of the Old World." Vol. II., p. 207.)

The author just named quotes (Vol. II., p. 58,) the Rev. Josiah Pratt, the biographer of Cecil, as remarking to him, that he "had attentively read the 'Tracts for the Times,' and could come to no other conclusion than that this new theology was nothing more nor less, than the *exploded errors of Popery revived.*"

Mr. Bickersteth, in his introduction to the "Testimony of the Reformers," makes this observation respecting the Oxford writers:—"With much learning and study of the Fathers, with great apparent, and, doubtless, in some cases real devotion, and a devotedness ascetic and peculiar, they seem to the author, as far as he has seen and known their course, to open another door to that land of darkness and shadow of death, where the "man of sin reigns."

You remark in your letter, that the Oxford writers "profess to stand upon the ground which Cranmer held at his life's cost, the ground of primitive antiquity," &c. Mr. Clark, in his account of them, says, "The Reformation, some of them speak of as a *prodigious evil*; and they *scout Cranmer and Ridley*, and those other English Reformers who shed their



blood for the truth, as innovators who are not to be listened to." (Vol. II., p. 49.)

On the 48th page of the same work, there is an extract from a sermon by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, which the author heard. Alluding to the Oxfordists, Mr. Noel said "there were a spirit and a class of men springing up within the bounds of their own communion, that if allowed to prevail, would bring back *some of the worst errors of Popery*—men who were the avowed apologists of the Romish church, and who spake of that corrupt body, as '*our venerable sister*,'—as '*Christ's most holy fold*.' What! (said he) is that '*our venerable sister*' and '*Christ's most holy fold*,' which God has denominated '*Babylon, the habitation of devils—the hold of every foul spirit—a cage of every unclean and hateful bird*;' and in reference to whom God says, '*Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues?*' Is that '*our most venerable sister*,' and '*Christ's most holy fold*,' which God denominates '*Anti-Christ*'—'*the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth?*'"

I might quote numerous passages to the same effect, from the (London) Christian Observer—a periodical which, as every intelligent Episcopalian knows, has sustained itself with singular consistency, ability, and devotion to the cause of truth and holiness, for forty years, and which has spoken fearlessly and solemnly on the subject of this new divinity.

But I waive this, and close my first class of testimonies, with the following extract from an article in the Episcopal Recorder of April 25th, 1840, under the signature of "Warburton," (generally understood

to be the Rev. Dr. Beasley):—"They (the Tracts) decidedly maintain the doctrine of the real presence and a real sacrifice in the eucharist, which, if not so monstrous an absurdity, is scarcely less objectionable than transubstantiation; recommend the offering of prayers for the faithful dead, as efficacious in producing an amelioration of their condition; and establish principles which lead to the necessity of a more refined purgatory than that of Rome. In imitation of Popery, they attribute a magical and miraculous influence to external ordinances, especially that of Baptism; transcend all Protestant opinions concerning the authority and prerogatives of the clergy; strike from the code of our church that fundamental tenet of justification by faith, and obscure the hopes and sap the confidence of Christians, by attributing an undue influence to the efficacy of works and external rites and ceremonies, thereby limiting the extent and blurring the truth of that great cardinal doctrine of our religion, that our salvation is the free gift of God through Christ, and the sole purchase of the Saviour's sufferings and death. . . . . They would, like the Pharisees of old and the Romanists in the present day, introduce among us a wearisome and barren routine of external observances, loading men's shoulders with a burden too heavy to be borne. . . . . Finally, so strongly are the sentiments tinged with Popery, and so close is the approximation to which they would bring us to that corrupt and abominable system, that they would have us, like Romanists, imitating apes and monkeys in our public services, bowing perpetually at the name of Jesus, and upon our approaches to the altar, turning to the east when we kneel in prayer,

tracing the sign of the cross upon public or private occasions, and soiling our beautiful, various, and sublime liturgy with more copious extracts from those "precious relics of antiquity," Roman breviaries and missals; and, to complete our filial assimilation to the Romish church, instituting associations of nuns and sisters of charity like the Romanists, an ascetical order of the ministry, an order devoted to celibacy, and given to the austerities of monastic and cenobitic life."

"Warburton" then goes on to show, that if "the plan projected by these writers was completely carried into execution," the Protestant Episcopal Church would be very little removed from "the decayed and putrid system of Popery."

Such, Sir, are some of the Protestant Episcopal authorities I rely upon for sustaining the account given in my lecture, of the Oxford Tracts.

I will now show that, however the Oxford gentlemen may consider themselves as the most successful *opposers* of Popery, they are viewed in a very different light by Romanists.

In a Roman Catholic paper now before me, dated January 2d, 1841, I find part of a speech delivered at a recent repeal meeting in Ireland, by the Rev. Mr. Hughes, a Romish priest. I quote from it a single sentence: "I hold (he says) in my possession the works of Dr. Pusey; and were I to be concerned in a discussion on religion, I would not desire to be furnished with better works, replete with Catholic authorities and Catholic arguments, than the writings of Dr. Pusey."

In another part of the same paper, there is this item of intelligence. "On the 3d instant, at Bruges, Bel-

gium, a young (English) gentleman named Biden, solemnly abjured the Protestant religion, and embraced the Catholic faith. *An attentive perusal of the writings of Dr. Pusey, was the immediate cause of his conversion.*" (I learn from another paper that two months after his conversion, "he entered a novitiate of the society of Jesus.")

The following passage from a periodical, published at Rome (two years ago,) will show with what feelings the 'Oxford Tract movement' is regarded at the head-quarters of the Hierarchy:—

"The attention of all good Catholics, and especially of the congregation for the propagation of the faith, cannot be enough excited by the present state of religion in England, in consequence of the new doctrine propagated with so much ability and success, by Messrs. Newman, Pusey, and Keble, with arguments drawn from the holy fathers, of which they have just undertaken a new edition (translation) in English. These gentlemen labour to restore the ancient Catholic liturgy—the breviary, (which many of them, to the knowledge of the writer, recite daily,) fastings, the monastic life, and many other religious practices. Moreover, they teach the insufficiency of the Bible, as a rule of faith—the necessity of tradition, and of ecclesiastical authority—the real presence—prayers for the dead—the use of images—the priests' power of absolution—the sacrifice of the mass—the devotion to the virgin, and many other Catholic doctrines, in such sort as to leave but little difference between their opinions and the true faith, and which difference becomes less and less every day. Faithful! redouble your prayers, that these happy dispositions may be increased!"

Such are some of the Roman Catholic testimonies, to which I feel authorized to appeal in vindicating the obnoxious passage in my lecture from the strictures passed upon it.

Whether I am right or wrong, then, in my estimate of the Oxford publications, I am sustained both by Romanists and Protestant Episcopalians of high repute, in affirming that their authors have "returned to some of the worst errors of Popery." The question still remains, whether I am also sustained in this allegation by the Tracts themselves. This question I propose, if Providence permit, to consider in another letter. I sincerely regret that I am obliged to trouble you with so prolix an answer; but the terms of your call upon me were such, that I could not deem it either respectful to you or just to the grave subject which has occasioned our correspondence, to respond to your requisition, without entering into some details.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir,

With much respect,

Your friend and servant,

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philad., Feb. 22d, 1841.

LETTER II.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEO. W. DOANE, D. D., BISHOP  
OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE  
DIOCESS OF NEW JERSEY.

RIGHT REV. SIR:

BEFORE proceeding to examine the Oxford publications, I beg leave to make two or three introductory observations on topics noticed in your letter, or suggested by it.

I find in your letter an eloquent passage on the *characters* of the Oxford writers, as men of distinguished "talents, learning, piety, integrity, holiness, heavenly mindedness, and charity." This is a point I do not care to discuss. If it were proper, I could easily cite other opinions, from Protestant Episcopal sources, in which few of these qualities (in any eminent degree,) are conceded to them, besides the first two named in your panegyric. And I believe some charitably disposed persons have found no small difficulty in conceiving how men of such exalted "integrity" and "holiness," could suffer their subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles to stand uncanceled, while they are publishing such sentiments as those advocated in the tracts. But this is an unpleasant subject, and I pass it.

You remark, again, that there is in these writings "a vast amount (of matter) that is most timely and most excellent." On this point we shall have no

controversy. No men could delve as long and as laboriously as these gentlemen have among the ancient fathers and the early divines of the English Church, without bringing up some fine samples of gold and gems. But this only renders their writings the more dangerous. For (if you will allow an illustration from a writer\* who, I perceive, is in high repute at Oxford, just now, and whose folio happened to be lying on my table when your letter reached me,) “to eat figs, or other more cordial food, with the infusion of subtle and deadly poison, exempts not men’s bodies from danger.” If arsenic is to be mingled with the repast, the less inviting it is made to the palate the better. Had these tracts contained fewer good things, the bad would have been less widely circulated and more cautiously received. Let the wheat be winnowed from the chaff—the truth separated from the error, and published in separate volumes, and how many among those who now purchase the whole, would buy the volume of heresy?

And this suggests another topic. The advocates of the tracts have often complained that they were condemned by individuals who had merely examined isolated extracts. I admit that this is not the fairest way to form an opinion of any work: I am fully convinced that it is not, of these publications. Whatever may have been the experience of others, I can say for myself, that I had no conception of the mischief they were calculated to do, until I *examined them in detail*. The quotations from them I had read, had left a deep impression upon my mind of their dan-

\* Dr. Thomas Jackson.

gerous tendency; but this impression became tenfold stronger, when I came to explore the system as a whole. The good and the evil must be seen in their juxta-position and mutual dependence, before the evil can be adequately appreciated.

The foregoing observations imply that there is something peculiar in the *way* in which Romanism is taught in these writings. Whoever expects to find it openly and systematically inculcated in them, will be disappointed. Nothing can be more ingenious or subtle than the principle on which the controversy with Popery is managed. Some points of it, as, for example, the supremacy of the Pontiff, the schismatical position of the Romish church in its relation to the "Anglo-Catholic church," transubstantiation, &c., they attack manfully: one broadside follows another, until the reader really begins to fancy they *are* the boldest of all the "champions" who have entered the lists against that antichristian hierarchy. But on other points, you will frequently find the case between Rome and Protestant Christendom, stated in a way much more favourable to the Papist than the Protestant: it is not so much asserted as insinuated, that Rome has the best of it. Precisely as you will sometimes hear a judge, in summing up a case, though professing to present both sides to the jury, give the whole weight of his opinion in favour of one of the parties, yet in so covert a way that the adverse party cannot charge him with having decided it. In other passages, you feel sure you are approaching, step by step, an explicit avowal of some rank Popish tenet. But just as you fancy you have reached the point, and hasten to the next sentence to seize on the develop-



ment, the writer turns off to indulge in some vague generalities or to caution you against premature judging in a case where so venerable a father as this one or that one has spoken doubtfully. Again, you are confident, after reading a sentence, that there is Popery in it; but when you return to lay hold of it, it eludes your grasp. "They are (to use the language of the London 'Christian Observer,') so scholastically constructed, that when the obvious bearing of a passage or tract is shown to be open to objection, there is some little qualifying word in a corner, which an ordinary reader would never discover, to ward off the full weight of an honest reply to the passage in its true spirit." It may be that these "traps for critics," have not been noticed by my Right Rev. correspondent: but many persons have an idea that the tracts abound with them.

One of the first characteristics of the Oxford writings which will strike an unsophisticated Protestant as indicating a strong Popish tendency, is *the extraordinary language in which the Romish and Protestant Churches are respectively spoken of*,—the former being usually mentioned with marked deference and kindness, the latter with arrogance and severity. Indeed, these gentlemen repudiate the names, "*Protestant*," and "*Protestant Episcopalian*," as descriptive of the Church of England; and *unchurch* all other Protestant denominations with as little ceremony as was ever used by "Holy Mother" herself. Let me cite a few passages:—

"The English Church, as such, is *not Protestant*, only politically, that is, externally, or so far as it has been made an establishment, and subjected to national

and foreign influences. It claims to be merely *Reformed*, not Protestant, and it repudiates any fellowship (!) with the mixed multitude which crowd together, whether at home or abroad, under a mere political banner." (Tract 71, p. 27, N. Y. Ed.)

"Of all combinations, that of Protestant Episcopal is the least pleasant. . . . . It may seem harsh thus to speak of 'Episcopacy' and 'Episcopalian,' yet we hope it will not shock any one, if we say that we wish the words, as denoting an opinion and its maintenance, never had been invented. They have done great mischief to their own cause. We are 'of the church,' not 'of the Episcopal church;' our bishops are not merely an order in her organization, but the principle of her continuance, and to call ourselves Episcopalians, is to imply that we differ from the mass of dissenters mainly in church government and form, in a matter of doctrine merely, not of fact, whereas the difference is, that we are *here* and they *there*: we in the church, and they out of it."\*

\* *British Critic*, Vol. 26, pp. 340, 341: Article on "the American Church." I make no apology for quoting from this periodical in this connexion, as it is now an acknowledged organ of the Oxford Divines, and is, therefore, equally legitimate proof with the Tracts themselves, in illustrating what is denominated in the obnoxious paragraph in my Lecture, "the Oxford Tract movement." I find also in the "*Banner of the Cross*," of the 6th Feb. (one week before the publication of your letter,) a glowing tribute to the character of the "*Critic*," which, with your permission, I will append to this note as a further warrant for the free use I may make of the work in this correspondence. It is as follows:—

*For the Banner of the Cross.*

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

It has been among my warmest wishes, that a publisher might

“So far from its being a strange thing that Protestant sects are not ‘*in Christ*’ in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world that they should *lie between us and heathenism.*” (Tract 47, p. 335.)

The Oxford School are, it is believed, the first set of men, not avowedly Papists, who have deplored the glorious Reformation as a calamity. They are not quite as explicit on this point (and many others) now, as as they probably will be hereafter. One of them, however, the late Rev. Richard H. Froude, a favourite pupil of Mr. Newman’s, and who is highly praised by the British Critic, did not hesitate to characterize that work, as “the *detestable Reformation!*” And the British Critic of Jan. 1840, speaks of “*the impieties of the 16th century,*” in obvious allusion to the same event.

be found who would give to the clergy and laity of our churches, and to all lovers of high intellect, imbued with primitive piety and consecrated at the altar of the Holy One, an American edition of this ablest of all the British periodicals, at a price accessible to all. I rejoice to say that better even than that is to be done. Wiley and Putnam, of New York, will import the British Critic, (two annual volumes of 500 pages each, in quarterly numbers,) if one hundred persons order it. It is an opportunity most auspicious to the best interests of theology and literature, and I venture, in my zealous desire for its success, to call the attention of my brethren to it under my own name. I speak advisedly, for I have been a subscriber to it from the commencement of the present series, and the whole set, now twenty-eight volumes, are on the shelves of my library, and among its choicest contents. It should be in the hands of every clergyman, and should circulate in every parish.

Faithfully, your friend,  
G. W. DQANE.

Riverside, 30th Jan. 1841.

As these writers have usurped for their own communion a title to which they have no paramount right, and which they are willing to share only with Rome, so their favourite appellatives for Protestant Christianity are, "Ultra-Protestantism," and "the New Religion."

It is superfluous for me to remind you, after these testimonies, that the Oxfordists scout the idea that the Papal power is the great "apostacy" and "Antichrist" of Prophecy. The Protestant world has, up to the rise of these writers, been, in the main, united on this point. The corner-stone of the Reformation was laid on the doctrine, that the **PAPAL CHURCH IS ANTI-CHRIST**. This was maintained by all the Reformers, Continental and British; it was incorporated in the creeds and symbols of the reformed churches; it is asserted by your church in her Homilies, by the Irish church in her Articles, (Vide Art. lxxx.) by the Presbyterian church in her Confession; and it has been held by the great body of able critics and commentators down to the present time, including the very learned Mede, Brightman, Cressener, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishops Newton and Hurd, Wm. Lowth, Dr. H. More, Vitringa, Pyle, Dr. S. Clark, and many others. It is now discovered at Oxford that all Protestant Christendom has been at fault on this point for three hundred years.

Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, says, (speaking ironically,) "It is *Popery* and disaffection to our church to doubt whether the Pope is the Antichrist, though Antichrist himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when or among whom he will appear." And the British Critic, in the No.

for last October, lays it down as "a most true and most important position," that "the prophecies concerning Antichrist are yet unfulfilled and that the predicted enemy of the church is yet to come." This is precisely the Romish doctrine. Whether the reviewers would go another step, and with Leo X. forbid any clergyman to "explain futurity or *the times of Antichrist*, under pain of excommunication," does not appear. One of the chief reasons which predispose these gentlemen to adopt the theory of Antichrist just stated, must be regarded as very curious by *Protestant* Episcopalians. They urge that their own church is so closely associated with the church of Rome, that the charge of Antichrist against the latter necessarily involves the former also. If this be true, the English Reformers were strangely reckless of the reputation and safety of the church they died for; for Latimer in prison, and Ridley in his farewell letter, and Cranmer (whom you so justly commend,) *at the stake*, declared "the Pope to be Antichrist;" and with them agreed Bradford, and Hooper, Frith, and Tyndale, and others of that noble company of martyrs—men of whom the world was not worthy, and whose names are not so much the property of your church as the common heritage of Christendom. Should the martyrs *happen* to be right and the Oxford theologians wrong, do they run no hazard who would link the destinies of the church of England with those of Papal Rome?

But these gentlemen go still further. They not only deny that the Romish church is Antichrist, but maintain that the fact of a church being *called* Antichrist, is a presumptive proof rather that it is a branch

of the true church! The logic by which this conclusion is reached, is worthy of the cause. But not to spend time in analyzing it—who does not see the bearing of this apparent determination to uphold Rome at all hazards? If that church be not Antichrist, the Reformation was wrong; for on this ground it was undertaken and carried through. And if the Reformation was wrong, Protestants are all schismatics and are bound to return to the true fold. Thus Rome argues. And thus Oxford argues—the difference being here. Rome includes the church of England among her schismatical children, while Oxford contends that she, and she alone—“the Anglo-Catholic church,”—enjoys “the apostolical succession” equally with her “venerable sister,”\* and that Rome, not England, is responsible for perpetuating the schism. So that at Rome, all are guilty of schism; and at Oxford all are guilty of schism; but it is only the Protestant sects who are dis severed from the true church.—Did the “Catholic Herald” of this city, speak at random when it said, not long ago, that “if the principles of the Oxford school had prevailed in

\* A writer in the No. of the “Banner” which contains your letter to me, speaks of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or the “American Branch of the Anglo-Catholic Church,” as the “elder sister” of the church of Rome. It would be presumptuous for a Presbyterian to hazard an opinion on this delicate question of seniority; “Non nostrum . . . tantas componere lites!” But if I may be allowed a remark on this subject, I would suggest that there is a simple and scriptural method of eluding this question altogether; namely, by declaring with the Homilies that the church of Rome is no sister at all of the church of England, but “Antichrist,” and “Babylon.” (See the Homilies on Obedience, and Peril of Idolatry, and Sermon against Wilful Rebellion.)

the 16th century, there *would have been no schism*"—that is, no Reformation?

But these writers have not merely withdrawn the charge of Antichrist against Rome: they speak of her in terms which make one rejoice that they *have* renounced the name of "Protestants." Thus, in Tract 71, pp. 25, 26, they call the Papal church their "Latin sister," and say,

"Speak gently of our sister's fall:  
Who knows but gentle love  
May win her at our patient call,  
The surer way to prove."—(*Christian Year.*)

Again: "This warning is especially seasonable to us of this day who are beset both with the clamour that 'the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants,' and with a thousand discordant views, all professedly scriptural, in illustration of its unreasonableness. . . . Whatever be our private differences with the Roman Catholics, we may join with them in condemning Socinians, Baptists, Independents, Quakers, and the like. But God forbid that we should ally ourselves with the offspring of heresy and schism in our contest with any branches of the

\* It is curious to a by-stander, to notice how these gentle assiduities are received by the "erring sister." As yet, although a good many bland words have been spoken, she manifests no disposition to recognise the tie of consanguinity so ambitiously pressed upon her attention by the theologians of Oxford. Dr. Wiseman, the ablest of her living defenders, in a late article on the subject, waiving the question as to the validity of the ordinations of the English church, denies that her Bishops have any just claim to apostolic jurisdiction, and contends that the obligation still lies on the laity to be in connexion with the Roman Hierarchy: but she may yet concede to policy, on this point, what her pride has hitherto withheld.

Holy Church which maintain the foundation, whatever may be their incidental corruptions." (Tracts Vol. I., p. 603.)

Are the men who utter this language to be regarded as the "boldest champions" of the day, "against the force and fraud of Rome?" Men who spurn all alliance with any and every (for this is the idea) Protestant denomination as "the offspring of heresy and schism"—whose contest with "the *Holy church*" of Rome involves only some "*private differences*"—and who characterize the arrogance and ambition, the falsehood and cruelty, the usurpations and heresies, the awful idolatries and blasphemies of that church, (a church which your *Homilies* brand as "the SPOILER AND DESTROYER OF THE CHURCH," and "THE BABYLONIAN BEAST OF ROME,") as mere "*incidental corruptions?*" Alas for Protestantism, and Christianity too, if their championship *has* fallen into such hands! Sure I am, that every true Protestant will exclaim, "Non tali auxilio!"

I cannot forbear adding another sentence or two from the British Critic. "It was most touching news (says a late No.) to be told, as we were lately, that Christians on the Continent were praying together for the spiritual well-being of England. We are their debtors thereby. May the prayer return abundantly into their own bosom," &c. What does this allude to? Unquestionably to the fact announced in the papers, but not by the reviewers, that the "Christians" at *Rome*, encouraged by the signs of the times, have set apart a stated season *to pray for the conversion of England to Popery!* This was "most touching news" to the divines of Oxford.



Again, in the article on "the American Church" already referred to, the reviewers congratulate themselves that "*the church of Rome is daily acquiring a more powerful hold upon the public mind, [in the United States,] since it is better to belong to any portion of the one true church, than to sectaries, who, not to dwell on their doctrines, do not even profess to belong to it.*" The plain English of this is, that they would rather see Popery increase in this country, than Protestantism—except as the latter is connected with a single one of our numerous denominations. Does this indicate their noble championship against Rome?

I beg you not to fancy that these passages excite any personal feeling in my breast, because I have the infelicity to be attached to one of these no-church organizations. I assure you that *Protestants*, (a name we cling to as cordially as our assailants spurn it,) are as little alarmed by these solemn excommunications, as Queen Elizabeth was by the "Damnatory Bull" of Pius V. Men who have heard the thunders of the Vatican unmoved, for three centuries, are not likely to be frightened by the poor imitation (the stage-thunder) they are getting up at Oxford. We mourn, indeed, to see so much arrogance associated with such lofty pretensions to "heavenly-mindedness and charity." We cannot avoid contrasting with the spirit these writers are fomenting, the harmony which prevailed between their predecessors and the Presbyterian Reformers of the Continent, when your favourite Cranmer "had Bucer called to Cambridge and Martyr to *Oxford*, to teach theology;" and when (at a later period) "Laud [the idol

of the Tractists] was formally reprov'd by *the University of Oxford*, for maintaining that there could be no true church without Bishops." The spirit of those days, we are happy to believe, still pervades a large part of the English Church and its daughter in this country. There are multitudes in both branches of the church, among her clergy and laity, who will acquiesce in the indignant rebuke pronounced by the Christian Observer upon the sentiments of the Tracts on this point: "We thank God that such is not the doctrine of the Church of England. Our most eminent divines, in her true spirit, have blessed God for our own exalted privileges, without unchurching other communions."

I think the statements which have now been presented, must satisfy every candid mind, that the Oxford school, with whatever ability or zeal they may controvert some of the Popish dogmas, have a very hearty antipathy to Protestant Christianity and an equally hearty sympathy for the Church of Rome.

Reserving what I have to say further, for another letter, (for the subject grows upon my hands,) I renew, Right Rev. Sir, the assurances of my respect and consideration, and remain,

Your friend and servant,

H. A. BOARDMAN,

Philadelphia, March 1st, 1841.

LETTER III.

TO THE RIGHT REV. GEO. W. DOANE, D. D., BISHOP  
OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE  
DIOCESS OF NEW JERSEY.

RIGHT REV. SIR:

AN able writer belonging to your own church, has very happily described the Oxford system as "*a Religion of Sacraments.*" This designation denotes at once its affiliation to Popery, and furnishes a clue by which the uninitiated may thread its mysteries.

"The church (we are told by the Tractists,) is the store-house and direct channel of grace—an ordinance which conveys secret strength and life to every one who shares in it, unless there be some actual moral impediment in his own mind." (Introduction to Pusey on Baptism, p. 4.) On the next page the following passage occurs:—

"Rationalistic, or (as they may more properly be called) carnal notions concerning the sacraments, and on the other hand, a superstitious apprehension of resting in them, and a slowness to believe the possibility of God's having literally blessed ordinances with invisible power, have, alas! infected a large mass of men in our communion. Hence, we have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental

energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations or [*what is called!*] communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which, the church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, *would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and apparently insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, must be, under all circumstances, and in every conceivable case, a superstition? And yet neither practice is without the sanction of primitive usage.* And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that Baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated, in the case of individuals,) to consider faith and not the sacraments as the proper instrument of justification and other gospel gifts; instead of holding that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without, (as from him, so through externals of his ordaining,) faith being but the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition, for duly receiving it."

It is intimated in the first part of this passage, that the common doctrine is, that grace is conveyed "*only* through the instrumentality of faith, prayer," &c. This is an error. Protestants have never excluded the sacraments from the "means of grace." They admit that spiritual regeneration *may* accompany baptism; but they deny that it is inseparably linked with it. They admit that the Lord's Supper may

impart spiritual edification, strength, and comfort, to the communicant: but they deny that it does this except (as your church teaches) he feeds *in his heart by faith* with thanksgiving.

The sentences I have italicised in the above quotation, disclose, I presume, the real sentiments of these writers, on the nature of the sacraments. I have met with no grosser representation of the *opus operatum* efficacy of the sacraments, in Romish authors, than is presented here. Indeed, the Catechism of the Council of Trent (see p. 227, Baltimore ed.) refers to the practice of some in the early church who gave the eucharist to infants; and, instead of sanctioning the usage, as these writers seem to do, expresses its marked disapprobation of it; so that in this matter, Oxford has even exceeded Rome.

The assertion near the close of the foregoing extract, that "faith is not the instrument of justification," will surprise those who have been accustomed to the theology of the scriptures or of the XXXIX. Articles.

Let me cite a few more passages to show that the Oxford religion is, like Popery, a sacramental religion:—

"Almighty God has said his Son's merits shall wash away all sin, and that they shall be conveyed to believers through the two sacraments." (Tract 4.)

In Tract 76, after affirming that in baptism the soul receives a "new nature, adoption, the inheritance of heaven," &c., the writers say that there are certain points respecting which the Divines cited by them, differ, among which are these, to wit: "whether grace be given *in and through the water*, or

only contemporaneously with it:" and "whether or not baptism, besides washing away past sin, admits into a state in which, for sins henceforth committed, repentance stands in place of a sacrament, so as to ensure forgiveness without specific ordinance; or whether the holy eucharist is that ordinance; or whether the full and explicit absolution of sin after baptism is altogether put off till the day of judgment." I shall have occasion before closing this letter to call your attention to the unscriptural and gloomy doctrine of Dr. Pusey in relation to one of these topics, namely, the possibility of forgiveness to those who "sin after baptism." As to the other topic, the Oxford writers are characteristically fond of "reserve" and mystery, adhering with great scrupulosity to the discreet maxim of Bishop Jebb, who observes in one of his letters; "prematurity of effort is in all matters to be deprecated, but most of all in enunciating any part of our system:"—so that it is no easy thing to ascertain precisely whether they believe or not that the *water* in baptism becomes "impregnated with a spiritual property" so as to be the physical vehicle of conveying grace to the soul. The oracle, it may be anticipated, will utter its vaticinations on this and some other mysterious questions, with less ambiguity hereafter. But no response can surprise us, however gross, on this point, when we remember that Alexander Knox, the venerated father of Oxfordism, and who is so much lauded in the British Critic,\* (lauded,

\* The Critic says of Mr. Knox, "He is an instance in rudiment of those great restorations which he foresaw in development. He shares with the eminent writers of the day, in the work of advancing what he anticipated."

notwithstanding, as the Reviewers tell us, (vol. 23, p. 3,) "*the cross was not the central object of his divinity*, but held a somewhat remote and subordinate position in his theological panorama,") has laid down the doctrine of a transfusion of gracious qualities into the bread and wine of the eucharist, in the plainest terms. In one of his letters to Dr. Jebb, he says; "I do not know whether I have ever called your attention, to the two-fold evidence afforded by St. Paul's expressions, respecting the eucharist, that the consecrated symbols are not (as Dr. Waterland maintains) the signs or pledges of a concomitant blessing, but (as the old church taught, and as Dr. Butt urges against Waterland) the *actual vehicles* through which that blessing is conveyed." Further on, commenting on the expression, "eateth and drinketh unworthily," he says, "the sacred things which he desecrates, are mysteriously their own avengers. *The divine virtue combined*, by omnipotence, *with the blessed and broken elements*, for the purpose of transfusing life and health to the soul of the qualified receiver, in the case of profane reception, still no less manifests itself to be divine, but in a contrary way, *secundum modum recipientis*." And again: "The ark [alluding to the death of Uzzah] could not, even by a figure of speech, be made the inflictor of punishment; but nothing was more natural than to make aliments which *had received a divine property* through the supernatural blessing of heaven, to become of themselves, as it were, the vehicle of curse to him, who so ate or drank as to blend sanctity with pollution." (Correspondence of Jebb and Knox, Letter 146.)

This is not Popery precisely, I grant: but is transubstantiation more revolting?

Writers who approximate so nearly to Rome in their views of the sacraments, (a subject to which I shall recur,) rival her, of course, in their notions of church-power and the authority of the clergy. They teach that a church episcopally organized "is the only way to eternal life;" that the church is "the channel of grace," its sacraments "*the* means by which justification and other gospel gifts are imparted," and these sacraments (of course) only in the hands of the clergy who are in the line of *apostolical succession*, (to wit, the clergy of the English, Roman, and Greek churches.) The bishops have received (we are taught) in regular transmission from the apostles, not merely official rank and dignity, but inward grace, ("Episcopal grace," as Dr. Pusey calls it,) which they alone can impart to others. In virtue of this miraculous (shall I call it?) endowment, they have "*power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost*," and even (to some extent) "*over the things of the unseen world*." "They are armed with the power of the apostles, to confer spiritual gifts in the church, and, in cases of necessity, to wield *their* awful weapon of rejection from the fold of Christ." (Tract 5.) "This is faith, to look at things not as seen, but as unseen; to be as sure that the Bishop is Christ's representative, as if we saw him work miracles, as St. Peter and St. Paul did.—I repeat, the bishops are apostles to us.—The meetings [how very courteous!] have no head, they are all mixed together in a confused way. . . . He (the bishop) rules the whole church here below, as Christ, the true and eternal



sovereign, rules it above. . . . He visibly chooses those whom Christ vouchsafes to choose invisibly, to serve in the word and sacraments of the church.” (Tract 10.)

The “Christian Observer” may well ask, after quoting passages like these, “How long would the bishops be tolerated, . . . in a Protestant country, if any half dozen of them should rise in their places, and say of themselves what these Tracts say of them?” The only design with which I have introduced the above extracts, is, to show how Papistical these writers are in their notions of the power of the priesthood. I think impartial men will agree that there is rank Popery in the doctrine here exhibited, however the Tractists may refuse to acknowledge the Pope’s supremacy. Where has Popery uttered any thing on this subject, more Popish than the sentiment of the Tracts, that “Episcopal authority is the very bond which unites Christians to each other and to Christ;” or of the British Critic, that “the effect of a separating from the bishop is a separating from Christ?” Why, after such language, do they tell us, that they do not mean to “exclude Presbyterians and others from salvation?” Why not meet the consequences of their doctrine like men, and tell the Protestant world, as the Jesuit Wilson told Dr. Potter, in the controversy which brought out Chillingworth’s immortal work, (that work which the Oxfordists are trying so hard to “make of none effect, by their *traditions*,”) that “Protestancy unrepented destroys salvation?” Why not carry out their principles, and affirm that the millions who have died in the communion of those reformed churches in Europe and

America, which are not under prelatical organization, not having been "united to the Episcopal authority, were not united to Christ," and so have gone down to perdition?

The time has come when consistency demands that these gentlemen should "define their position" with a little more accuracy, on this and many other points. Protestants will then know where to find them, and Roman Catholics will cease to reproach them with "endeavouring to silence the voice of conscience by half measures."

I had written thus far, when I received (very opportunely) from a gentleman of this city, a Londonderry paper of Jan. 6th, which contains an abridged report of a sermon preached on the 25th Dec. last, by DR. WHATELY, the present Archbishop of Dublin, at the consecration of the new Bishop of Meath, in Christ Church, Dublin. It is pleasant to hear the Oxford coterie rebuked by a Prelate whose reputation as a scholar and logician is co-extensive with the diffusion of English literature, and whose known principles place him above the imputation of belonging to that class in the Episcopal Church, sneeringly denominated by their opponents, "*Evangelicals.*" I quote the following passage from the sermon:—

"There is another class," observes the Archbishop, "who assert that the regulations and forms of the Christian church, which they have adopted, are to be found in the writings of the apostles, and the traditions of the early church: and affirm that all who do not adopt these regulations, and entertain their views of church order, are not included in the Christian church. *Such views seemed to him extremely danger-*

ous. THE PERSONS WHO HELD THESE SENTIMENTS REMOVED THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHURCH FROM THE ROCK ON WHICH THEY RESTED, AND PLACED THEM ON THE SAND. Such were not the views held by those who framed the articles of our church; for they say that ‘the visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.’ They clearly recognised the claim of every Christian community, who hold the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and administer the ordinances instituted by Christ, to be called a church of Christ. While they claimed the right to ordain officers, and appoint rites tending to decency and good order, they put forward no exclusive claims. *They claimed no sacramental virtue for the ordinances which they administered, on account of possessing the apostolical chain of succession, which, if one link be broken, the whole is destroyed.* They merely claimed for themselves the title of being regularly ordained ministers of a scripturally constituted church of Christ. Those who put forward any other claim were attempting to remove the foundation of the church, from the rock on which it has been built, to place it on the sand. If their exclusive principles were to be received, what would become of the other Christian churches, who did not adopt their views of church government and order? The persons who held such sentiments, and made these minor matters fundamental principles, were not only condemning themselves, but attempting to

*write the sentence of condemnation against their own church.* Such sentiments might be called Church of England principles, and the persons who held them might claim for themselves the title of high churchmen: and they might consider that in pressing these opinions upon public attention, they were obtaining a greater reverence for the institutions and ministers of the church, **BUT HE CONCEIVED THEM FRAUGHT WITH DANGER TO THE CHURCH.** *They were merely successors to the apostles, in being ministers of a regularly constituted church, and in observing the ordinances of the gospel. Successors in any other sense the apostles had none. The Reformers put forward no exclusive claims. They did not regard those who did not belong to their church as excluded from the church of Christ. They kept the mean, and avoided all extremes. They pronounced no censure or condemnation upon those who differed from them."*

I have quoted in my first letter the sentiment of the judicious Hooker, that "the grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is about the matter of **JUSTIFYING RIGHTEOUSNESS,**"<sup>a</sup> and have specified the Romish doctrine on this point, as "one of the worst errors of Popery." It would be superfluous for me to remind my Right Reverend correspondent, that it has always been a vital question between Protestants and Romanists, whether men are justified by the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ received and rested upon by faith, or by being made inwardly and subjectively righteous. The Protestant doctrine is, that justification and regeneration are inseparably associated, that is, that all who are

justified, are at the same time renewed and sanctified; but they deny that this personal holiness, which is communicated by the Holy Spirit in regeneration, constitutes any part of that righteousness on the ground of which, the sinner is pardoned and accepted of God. As our Saviour was "made sin" by having the sins of men legally imputed or reckoned to him (not transfused into him,) as their surety, so they are "made the righteousness of God," by having the Redeemer's righteousness (his perfect 'obedience unto death,') legally imputed to them—they receiving it by faith as the only ground of their hope. But I need not dwell on the distinction so explicitly recognised in the creeds and articles of all the reformed churches, between justification and sanctification.

The Church of Rome confounds these gifts, and makes our sanctification or personal righteousness, the ground of our justification:—"The instrumental cause of our justification (says the Council of Trent,) is the *sacrament of baptism*, which is the sacrament of faith, without which no one can ever obtain justification:—the sole formal cause is the righteousness of God; not that by which he himself is righteous, *but that by which he makes us righteous*; with which being endued by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only accounted righteous, but are properly called righteous, and are so, receiving righteousness in ourselves," &c. This inward righteousness of course admits of increase, that is, justification is *progressive*,—as we read in the same decree: those who are the subjects of it, "by the observance of the commandments of God, &c., "gain an increase of that righteousness which was received by the grace of Christ, and are *the more* justified."

On this doctrine Hooker remarks, "The church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace, *doth pervert the truth of Christ*; and by the hands of the apostles we have received otherwise than she teacheth."

If I am asked to prove that the doctrine of the Tracts on this vital point is substantially that of Rome, I should be disposed to refer my interrogator to the truly apostolic work of Bishop M'Ilvaine on "Oxford Divinity"—that work which the Editor of the Churchman, in his paper of last week, characterizes (in the same breath in which he confesses he has never read it,) with so much classic grace and with such profound deference towards an eminent prelate of his own church, as "the Romance of Gambier."

In this book the proofs are spread out in detail. But as you may not have it in your library, I will quote a few of the passages cited in it from the Oxford writings.

Speaking of the distinction just adverted to, between justification and renewal, Mr. Newman says, "This distinction is not scriptural." "In truth, scripture speaks of but one gift, which it sometimes calls renewal, sometimes justification, according as it views it, passing to and fro, from one to the other, so rapidly, so abruptly, as to force upon us irresistibly the inference that they are *really one*."

Again; he says, "Justification and sanctification are substantially *the same thing*;—parts of one gift; properties, qualities, or aspects of one." In another place he maintains "their *identity in matter of fact*, however we may vary our terms, or classify our ideas."

Again; "*Cleanness of heart and spirit, obedience by word and deed, this alone can constitute our justification.*" "The gift of righteousness (for justification,) is not an imputation, but an inward work." "If He (God) counts righteous, it is by *making* righteous; if he justifies, it is by *renewing*."

This indwelling righteousness, it seems, has even a *satisfying* and justifying quality in it, since he calls it, "The propitiation for our sins in God's sight."

Again; "Justification consists in God's *inward presence*." "It is the act of God imparting His divine presence to the soul, *through baptism*, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost."

What will plain readers of the Bible say to the following passage? "Christ's cross does not justify by being gazed at *in faith*, but by being actually set up within us, and that not by our act, but by God's invisible grace. Men sit and gaze and speak of the great atonement, and think this is appropriating it. Men say that faith is an apprehending and applying: **FAITH CANNOT REALLY APPLY IT**; man cannot make the Saviour of the world his own; the cross must be brought home to us not in word, but in power, and this is the work of the Spirit."

The above extracts are from Mr. Newman's work on Justification. That they involve the idea of a *progressive* justification, must be apparent to every one; but we are not left to gather this inferentially. Dr. Pusey, in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, says, "We are by baptism brought into a state of salvation or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent), . . . a *state admitting of degrees according to the degree of sanctification*."

I could easily multiply these quotations, but can it be necessary? Do not the above passages prove that these writers confound justification and sanctification, and, like the Romanists, advocate the doctrine of "justification by *inherent grace*," and thereby (as Hooker says) "pervert the truth of Christ?" I am aware that in the face of numerous statements, like those that have been cited, they *profess* to "exclude sanctification from having any place in our justification;" and they may fancy that they really do this. I must refer you to their works for the subtle and (I must add) sophistical distinctions by which they seek to elude the imputation of teaching the Popish doctrine on "this grand article of our religion," (the "articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ,") and to Bishop M'Ilvaine's work for a thorough sifting of these distinctions, in which they are scattered to the winds. But the readers of this correspondence may decide the question for themselves, by comparing the quotations with the Romish doctrine as exhibited above from the decrees of the Council of Trent. It will, I am sure, be no easy matter to convince people of plain common sense, who have not been trained to the dialectics of the schools; that men who familiarly use language on this subject like that which has been quoted, are materially at variance with the Romish standards. Their affinity will be more apparent as we proceed. Meanwhile, I avail myself of the testimony of a witness whose competency will be admitted on all hands,—Mr. Perceval, one of the Oxford Divines. This gentleman says, in a letter published in the London Record, Oct. 2d, 1837, "Allowing certain explanations, *there is no*



*thing in the Tridentine statements (about justification) which cannot fairly be reconciled with Gospel doctrine.*" Can the charge of Popery against this system be regarded as very uncharitable, when we hear one of its authors affirming that the Romish doctrine of justification is substantially sustained by Scripture? But let us probe a little deeper. It will be found, if I mistake not, that there is a palpable coincidence between the Oxford and Roman systems in relation to *the office of faith in justification.*

The Homilies of your Church say that "FAITH is a sure *trust* of the mercy of God through Christ;" that it "*sends* us to Christ," "*joins* us to Christ," "makes him our own, and *applies his merits.*"\* Hooker says, "This is the *only hand which putteth on Christ* for justification." The Church of Rome teaches that BAPTISM is "the *only instrument of justification.*" She distinguishes between the faith which is before, and that which is after baptism; denying that the former can be any other than a dead faith. Men are spiritually renewed by baptism, and until they are baptized, they cannot exercise "a justifying faith." She anathematizes those who affirm that "the ungodly is justified by faith only;" and those who maintain that "justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy by which sins are forgiven for Christ's sake; or that it is that confidence only by which we are justified." (See Decrees of the Council of Trent, on Justification, Canons 9 and 12.) In explaining how men are "justified

\* In a passage quoted above from Mr. Newman, he says, speaking of the atonement, "Faith cannot really apply it."

by faith," she says, (chapter VIII.) "we are said to be justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification:"—which it is "not because it apprehends the remission of sins through Christ, but because it excites the will to such motions or acts as are necessary to the obtaining of justification." Consequently, (as Bishop M'Ilvaine remarks,) "it is in no sense a direct *instrument of obtaining* justification; but only a *sine qua non*, a preparation, as the Trent Council says, 'without which it is impossible to please God.'" "Until baptism gives it some additional quality, it is a *mere naked assent*, a mere preparative for hope and charity, and all good works; not a *living* faith, but still '*divine*' as Gandolphy says, 'because founded on the testimony of God.'"

Let us now briefly compare with this doctrine the views of the Oxfordists. They have much to say about "justification by faith;" and those who are governed more by sound than sense, might at first suppose that they really believe with your articles on this point; but this is far from being the case. Keeping in view the Tridentine doctrine, let me invite your attention to the following statements:—

"Faith, *as gaining its virtue from baptism*, is one thing before that sacred ordinance; another after." "Justifying faith before baptism is not necessarily *even a moral virtue*, but when illuminated by love and ennobled by the Spirit," (in baptism) "it is a name for all graces together." Before baptism, "it is without availing power, *without life* in the sight of God, as regards our justification,"—that is, "as regards the indwelling of the Spirit," which is justification ac-

ording to this system. Until it is *baptized*, it is “full of terror and disquiet, *vague*, and dull-minded, feeble, sickly, wayward, fitful, *inoperative*,” “nothing till Christ *regenerate* it” in baptism. “When it (faith) comes *for baptism*, . . . . it comes to the fount of life to be *made alive*, as the dry bones, in the Prophet’s vision, were brought together in preparation for the breath of God to quicken them.”

“We are saved,” says Dr. Pusey, “by faith *bringing* us to baptism, and by *baptism* God saves us”—“faith being but the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition on our parts for duly receiving the grace of Christ”—and “the sacraments, not faith, being the proper instrument of our justification.”

Again; “Faith,” says Mr. Newman, “does not precede justification; but justification precedes it, and makes it justifying. Baptism is the primary instrument, and creates faith to be what it is, and otherwise, is not, giving it power and rank, and constituting it as its own successor. Each has its own office; baptism at the time, faith ever after—the sacraments, the instrumental, faith the sustaining, cause.”

I might ask, in the view of these statements, what does your catechism (as quoted by the Bishop of Ohio) mean, when it requires of those *who come to be baptized*, “repentance whereby they forsake sin, and FAITH whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament?” Is the faith here intended a “*vague*,” “*inoperative*,” “*unregenerate*,” “*dead*,” faith? For these Oxford men tell us, that such is the faith which goes “before baptism.” Was this the faith of Saul of Tarsus—of

Lydia—of the jailor—of the three thousand—before they were “baptized?” Was this the faith of the dying thief, who, as is evident, was never baptized? Is this the faith of all the godly of this and former ages, in the Church of Scotland, and most of the churches of the Continent and of the United States, who, according to the notion of these writers, have not received true baptism? But I waive these questions, and leave it for candid Episcopalians to decide, whether the passages that have been adduced, do not quadrate much better with the Romish standards than with those of the Church of England. As to the standards of your church, however, I cannot forbear adding, that Dr. Pusey in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, makes the very remarkable assertion, that your eleventh article, which is entitled, “*The justification of man,*” “*says nothing as to wherein our justification consists.*” That article I shall be excused for quoting:—

“*XI. Of the Justification of Man.*”

“We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”

Is there nothing here “as to wherein our justification consists?” Does not this article (and still more the Homily, which it recognises as a faithful exposition of itself,) set forth in express terms, the *ground* of our justification? And is it not as irreconcilable

with the views quoted from Dr. Pusey and his associates, as it is with the dogmas of Popery?\*

Justification and renewal are so confounded by these authors, that it is not easy to treat their views of either topic separately. But a few additional observations may not be amiss here on their views of baptism.

It is evident, from the passages already brought forward, that in their system there can be neither justification nor regeneration, nor saving faith, prior to baptism. Baptism is as much the sun and centre of their divinity, as "Christ and him crucified" was of the divinity of the apostles. It is the grand instrument by which men who are dead in trespasses and sins, are to be made alive, rebels restored to the favour of God, and this apostate world reclaimed from the countless evils of the fall. One would think, to hear them talk, that the New Testament must be a treatise on baptism—that baptism was the main topic of our Saviour's discourses, and the grand theme of the apostolic preaching—and that the great business of the ministry is, not to preach the Gospel, but to administer the ordinances. If this were the place it would be no difficult thing to show, that these gentlemen have no scripture warrant for thus exalting the sacraments at the expense of that ordinance

\* But it is worthy of observation (and has been noted by Bishop McIlvaine,) that this article does *not* contain a syllable about *baptism*, which these gentlemen and the Romanists hold, is *the exclusive instrument* of justification. Nay, even the Homily to which it refers, contains but two short paragraphs in which baptism is named; "and in those passages, not one word about the penitent and believing but unbaptized adult, but only about children incapable of believing, and persons repenting *after* baptism. This is strange, indeed, if there be no justification without baptism."

which has been appointed as “the wisdom and power of God unto salvation,” both to the Jew and the Greek—that when they assign so conspicuous a place to baptism and the Eucharist, and recommend that we should “*keep back* from some who are baptized *the explicit and full declaration of the doctrine of the atonement,*” (a thing which has drawn down upon them the just rebuke of their friend, the Bishop of Exeter, in his celebrated charge,) they inculcate “another Gospel” from that of the great apostle who said, “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.”

But let us appeal to the Romish doctrine, that we may see whether we wrong these writers, in alleging that they ascribe (in coincidence with it) an *opus operatum* efficacy to baptism—an efficacy which is independent of the state of the recipient, provided only (to use Dr. Pusey’s language) he “close not his own soul against God’s gift.”

The Council of Trent anathematizes all who affirm that “grace is not always conferred by the sacraments, and upon all persons, so far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received, but that it is only bestowed sometimes and on some persons”—and all who affirm, that “grace is not conferred by the sacraments by their own power, (*ex opere operato.*”) Is not this doctrine laid down in the passages that have been cited from the Oxford writings? Again, your twenty-seventh Article says, baptism “is a *sign* of regeneration or new birth—whereby the promises &c., are *visibly signed and sealed.*” But Dr. Pusey says, “Baptism is *not* a sign, but the *putting on of Christ*—wherefore baptism is a thing *most powerful*

and efficacious." "Powerful and efficacious," it is indeed, if (as these writers teach) *no individual can exercise saving faith in the Redeemer*, until he is baptized—if (as Mr. Newman maintains) "*baptism creates faith* to be what it is, and otherwise is not, giving it power and rank."

I add a few more samples from the Tracts. "Blessed is the sacrament of water, in which, when cleansed, we are released from the sins of our original blindness, unto eternal life." "*Is it not wonderful that even a bath should wash away death?* Surely; but let us ever be the more ready to believe, if its marvellousness, forsooth, is made a reason for unbelief." "Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the water; but, *by being cleansed in the water from sin and guilt*, we are prepared by the angel for the Holy Spirit." "Blessed is the water which cleanses once for all, which sinners cannot make light of, which receives no stain from the recurrence of defilement, so as to pollute those whom it washes." (Tertullian, quoted Tracts V., I. pp. 583–6.) Dr. Pusey earnestly maintains that by baptism an individual receives "*the forgiveness of sin and a new nature*," and is "*made a real child of God and a real member of Christ*; not simply an outward member of an outward body of people called Christians."—This sounds very Popish to Protestant ears. Certain it is, that the doctrine presented in each of the foregoing extracts, is repudiated by the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of this Diocese, in his *Essay on Regeneration*. "We trust it will be perceived (says Bishop Onderdonk,) that in the statement of our doctrine, a *perfect distinction* has been made between *baptism* and the *change of heart*."

The spiritual operation in each of them is, indeed, called regeneration; but it should be remembered that there are ‘diversities of operations of the same Spirit,’ and that some of his most conspicuous operations *did not include a moral effect* as inherent in them.”—Further on, the Bishop speaks of “the theory that the *seed* of sanctification, the first principle or ‘beginning of the spiritual life,’ to grow or die subsequently as the event may prove, is *deposited by the Spirit in baptism*, which deposite is regeneration.” To this opinion, he says, “*we do not accede.*” And, subsequently, “The result is that there is *no* evidence that *moral influence, or the seed of it, is the grace of baptismal regeneration.*”

But it is time to notice a kindred topic, which will in turn illustrate the one we have been considering, viz: the views of the Tractists respecting *sin committed after baptism*. It must “shock” ordinary readers of the Bible to hear that it is a matter of great doubt, in the judgment of these writers, whether any provision has been made in the glorious plan of redemption, for the remission of post-baptismal sins, and if any, where and what it is! According to their scheme, sin after baptism (“mortal sin”) destroys the virtue of the sacrament, and removes or cancels justification. Faith having now become *dead* again by sin, must be regenerated anew before it can become a second time the condition of justification. How then can the erring individual, in the case supposed, recover his justification? His faith cannot act, being “unregenerate.” His baptism (by which his faith was originally “*created*”) cannot be repeated. The Church of Rome has provided for this exigency by the sa-



crament of *Penance*, whereby “sins committed after baptism, are forgiven.” But Oxford has not even this poor, unscriptural expedient, to relieve the conscience of a trembling, heavy-laden sinner: much less does she say to him, as an apostle said to such an one, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” Far from this is her frigid and cheerless doctrine. “The Church (says Dr. Pusey) has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him (the post-baptismal sinner) altogether free from his past sins. *There are but two periods of absolute cleansing*, baptism and the day of judgment.”—Look, too, at the following: is it not humiliating to think that such a passage could have been penned by a clergyman of the Church of England,—an expounder to dying, guilty men, of that blessed volume in which God has said, “Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool?” Dr. P., commenting on one of the articles, says, “But who *truly* repent? When a man who has been guilty of sin after baptism may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to *what degree* he should all his life continue his repentance for it; wherein his penitence should consist; whether *continued repentance would efface the traces of sin in himself*; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance; whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back

degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment; these and the like are questions upon which the article does not speak.”— This is indeed “Protestantism rejected and Popery spoiled!” Let him come back to Protestantism, or rather, I should say, to the Gospel with its “unsearchable riches” of grace; or else let him go forward to Popery, and extricate himself from the meshes of the net in which he has entangled himself, by laying hold of her dogmas of penance and purgatory. Either course would grant him relief—either would be more consistent than to remain where he is—either would save him from the stern rebuke of your Homily of Repentance (as aptly quoted by Bishop M’Ilvaine,) which says; “We do not without a just cause *detest and abhor the damnable opinion* of them which do most wickedly go about to persuade the simple and ignorant people, that if we chance, after we be once come to God and grafted into his Son, to fall into some horrible sin, repentance shall be unprofitable to us; there is no more hope of reconciliation, or to be received again into the favour and mercy of God.”

The Christian Observer quotes another passage, which exceeds in presumption any thing I remember to have met with in the writings of even nominal Protestants:—“The fountain (of the Redeemer’s blood) has indeed been ‘opened for sin and uncleanness,’ but *it were to abuse the power of the keys intrusted to us, (!) again (that is, after a first offence,) to pretend to admit them thus;—now there remains only the baptism of tears.*” “May God forgive men,” adds the Observer, “who thus awfully presume to limit the virtue of the Redeemer’s atonement; who substitute the penance of tears for the blood of Christ;

and who interpose between man and his God, to admit, or shut out from the kingdom of heaven, as they see fit, just as the Popish priests did, to their own pontifical dignity and great gain, (though of this we accuse not the Oxford brethren,) till Luther spoiled Tetzels trade."

On this point again they have been reproved by their friend the Bishop of Exeter, who is well known in England as an admirer of the Oxford writings. He quotes these statements from Dr. Pusey's work on baptism, to wit: "If after having been then washed, once for all, in Christ's blood, we again sin, there is no more such complete absolution in this life"—no restoration "to the same state of undisturbed security in which God had by baptism placed us:" and then adds, "These, and passages like these, however they may be explained, tend to rob the gospel of the blessed Jesus of much of that assurance of the riches of the goodness and mercy of God in Christ, which is its peculiar message—its glad tidings of great joy, "Come unto me, *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Our church teaches us to apply this blessed promise to those who are "heavy laden" with sins committed after baptism. . . . Nor may we forget the tendency of such language, to encourage the pernicious and perilous habit of distinguishing between such sins as may destroy our state of grace, and such as we may think still leave that state secure. Let it never be absent from our minds that *every* wilful sin is *deadly*—and let us beware of hardening our own hearts, and corrupting the hearts of our brethren—by whispering to ourselves or them, *which* sin is more or less deadly than others.

That which we may deem the least, will be deadly enough, if unrepented, to work our perdition,—those which we deem the most deadly, will, if repented, have been thoroughly washed away in the blood of our Redeemer.” (Bishop of Exeter’s Charge, delivered last spring.)

The bishop was not “as one that beateth the air,” when he penned the latter part of this fine passage. For another of “the worst errors of Popery” which pervades this system, is, the distinction of **MORTAL AND VENIAL SINS**. God has taught us that “the wages of sin is death,” and that *all* sin is deadly. The Roman Catholics deny this, and so do the Oxfordists. Both teach, with the ancient Pagans, that there are two kinds of sins, mortal and venial. This is distinctly intimated by Dr. Pusey in the paragraph just quoted, but the following is more explicit—“A question, (says Dr. P.,) will probably occur to many; what is that grievous sin after baptism, which involves the falling from grace? what the distinction between lesser and greater—**VENIAL AND MORTAL** sins? or if mortal sins be sins against the decalogue, as St. Augustine says, are they only the highest degrees of those sins, or are they the lower also? *This question, as it is a very distressing one, I would gladly answer if I could or dared.* But, as with regard to the sin against the Holy Ghost, so here also, *Scripture is silent.* I certainly, much as I have laboured, have not yet been able to decide any thing. Perhaps it is, therefore, concealed, lest men’s anxiety to hold onward to the avoiding of all sin, should wax cold. But now since the degree of **VENIAL INIQUITY** (!) if persevered in, is unknown, the eagerness to

make progress by more instant continuance in prayer is quickened, and the carefulness to make holy friends of the mammon of unrighteousness is not despised.”— I know not what sort of a Protestant he must be who will assert that there is no Popery here.

Indeed, sir, I can look upon the whole representation of these writers, concerning “sins committed after baptism,” only as a libel upon the Gospel. I find it difficult to trust my own senses when I see them challenging to themselves “a power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost,” as arrogant as that assumed by Rome herself, and then, with the Gospel in their hands, presuming to say to a fellow worm like themselves, “You have sinned since you were baptized, and ‘scripture is silent’ as to the means or even the possibility of your forgiveness. Henceforth there remains for you only the baptism of tears!” Is this Christianity? Is this the doctrine of that precious book which says, “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from *all* sin?” Away with such divinity! It is stamped, not with Popery merely, (for Popery is on this point far less revolting,) but with cruelty and impiety. It dishonours God, and brings chains and bondage instead of freedom and salvation to apostate, guilty man. Let its authors set up the cross where God has placed it, (and where they have supplanted it with the baptismal font,) in the centre of the glorious system of redemption; and see *then*, whether there is “no balm in Gilead and no Physician there,” for a sin-sick soul—whether the *blood of Christ* will prove as inadequate to “take away sin,” as they confess their baptismal waters are.

Closely allied to the dogma of mortal and venial

sins, is that of PURGATORY; for it is easy to associate with the doctrine that there are no means provided in this world for cleansing those who have "sinned after baptism," the notion that some arrangement for this purpose may be provided hereafter. On this subject, again, the Tractists are reserved and enigmatical. Sometimes they condemn the Romish doctrine stoutly. But this seems to be aimed rather at its details than the principle of it. And the prevailing tone of their observations leaves the impression on the reader's mind, that their antipathy to the doctrine is not so very bitter but that they might be persuaded out of it. I will cite a passage or two. "The Creed of Pope Pius only says, 'I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that souls therein detained, are aided by the prayers of the faithful;' nothing being said of its being a place of punishment, *nothing* or all but nothing, *which does not admit of being explained of merely an intermediate state.* Now, supposing we found ourselves (no very violent supposition, by the way, for this writer,) in the Roman communion, of course it would be a great relief to find that we were not bound to believe more than this vague statement, nor should we, (I conceive,) on account of the received interpretation about purgatory superadded to it, be obliged to leave our church;" (Tract 71, 13.) Again, (Tract 79, p. 516,) we are told that, "taken in the mere *letter*, there is little in it (the Roman doctrine of purgatory,) against which we shall be able to sustain formal objections." So also, (same Tract, p. 538,) commenting on the expression in 1 Cor. iii. 15: "He shall be saved, yet so as by fire," they utter these ominous sayings: "Doubtless there is

a mystery in the word *fire* as there is a mystery in the words *day of judgment*. Yet it any how has reference to the *instrument* or *process* of judgment. And in this way the fathers seem to have understood the passage; referring it to the last judgment, as Scripture does, but at the same time religiously retaining the use of the word *fire*, as not affecting to interpret and dispense with what seems some mysterious economy, lest they should be wiser than what is written." To these I subjoin (from Bishop M'Ilvaine) the somewhat bolder avowal of Mr. Newman. "Who can tell (says Mr. N., in his Parochial Sermons,) but in God's mercy, the time of waiting between death and Christ's coming may be profitable to those who have been his true servants here, as a time of *maturing that fruit of grace*, but partly found in them in this life, a school-time of contemplation, as this world is of discipline, of active service. Such, surely, is the force of the apostle's words, that 'He that hath begun a good work in you, will perform it *until* the day of Christ'—not stopping at death, but carrying it into the resurrection,—as if the interval between death and his coming was by no means to be omitted *in the process of our preparation for heaven.*"

This theory lacks but one feature of purgatory, namely, suffering or discipline; and as this is of great efficacy in this life, in "maturing the fruit of grace" in the hearts of Christians and "preparing them for heaven," there seems no good reason why the Oxfordists should not avail themselves of it in *their* purgatory, as well as the Romanists and the pagans in theirs. It will be no marvel if some future "Tract for the Times," should tell the members of the "Anglo-Catholic

Church," in no apocryphal terms, that their pious relatives who have departed this life under the stain of "post-baptismal sin," are now undergoing that process by which, according to old Anchises, departed souls are purged from their remaining defilement and fitted for the Elysian fields:

"Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum  
Supplicia expendunt."

If the Oxford writers are shy of confessing a purgatory, no such diffidence can be imputed to them in reference to the practice of OFFERING PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD. They cite various testimonies from the early fathers in support of this practice, and the British Critic, I perceive, commends it as "truly *apostolical*." (I wish the Reviewers had pointed out the passage in the writings or lives of the apostles, which authorizes it.) I quote a single passage from several I had marked in Tract 77.

"I would venture to ask . . . whether (as Luther did) you have not prayed for the perfecting and increased blessedness of a departed friend or relation, even though you have subsequently checked yourself? whether you did not find a comfort from that prayer? and whether this dictate of human nature, warranted as it is by the early Church, and distinct from the Romish error, *may* not, after all, be implanted by the God of nature—may not be the voice of God within us?" (p. 412.)

The Bishop of Exeter's comments on this subject will answer better than any I could make. "To state (he observes) that this practice is a matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in



entertaining it,"—(and all, they seem to suggest, may 'feel themselves justified,' for 'it is warranted by the early Church')—to say, further, that "it is a solemn privilege to the mourner"—"a dictate of human nature"—nay, that "it may be implanted by the God of nature, may be the voice of God within us:"—to say all this, is surely "an encouragement" of the practice so characterized, which is very feebly counter-balanced by their admitting that "our Church does not encourage it"—by their abstaining from in "any way inculcating it"—or even by their thinking 'it expedient to bring forward such a topic in public discussion.'"—The Bishop then goes on to show that the Church *does* discourage the practice; and he says he "cannot reconcile it with Christian discretion," or "understand what justification can be offered" by these gentlemen for expressing themselves as they have done about a practice which "has been deliberately, and for such grave reasons, repudiated by the Church herself."

Another indication of the Popish tendency of this system, is to be seen in the experiment its authors are trying, of instituting NEW SAINTS' DAYS. My Right Rev. correspondent does not require to be informed that they have (in imitation of the Papists) set apart a day to the religious commemoration of Bishop Ken, and even constructed and published a *Matin Service for Bishop Ken's Day*, "formed apparently (says the Bishop of Exeter) on the model of an office in the Breviary to a Romish saint. Would it be safe for the Church itself (the Bishop proceeds)—and is it becoming in private individuals—to pronounce thus confidently on the characters of

deceased Christians—in other words, to assume the gift of ‘discerning spirits?’ To what must such a practice be expected to lead? The history of the Church of Rome has told us, and the fathers of our Reformation, in compiling the Liturgy, have marked their sense of the danger, by rejecting every portion of the Breviary which bears on such a practice, even while they adopted all that was really sound and edifying in it. Yet these writers scruple not to recommend this very practice thus deliberately rejected by those wise and holy men, and, strange to say, recommend it as ‘only completing what our Reformers have begun.’ ”

This move is certainly a bold one for these cautious leaders. No wonder some of their friends are startled by it. But perhaps they know best what the public mind will bear, and how rapidly it will answer to unfold the system. You or I may live to see the “English Calendar,” not filled up, indeed, like the “Roman,” with a Saint for every day in the year, but studded with a score or two of goodly names—each with its “Matin” or “Vesper” Service. How curious it would be, should Archbishop Laud’s name happen to be elevated to the niche adjoining Bishop Ken’s. No candidate for canonization would probably poll as many votes at the University just now. And yet it may be doubted whether the *laity* of the Church of England, are quite prepared for such an addition to their tutelary deities.

The Bishop of Exeter further censures the Tractists for the gentle terms in which they treat of “some of the worst corruptions of Popery :”—“for instance, the **INVOCATION OF SAINTS** and the **WORSHIP OF**

**IMAGES.**” I do not charge them with advocating these practices, but they are far from dealing with them in the ordinary style of Protestants. And one of them, the late Mr. Froude, already mentioned, whose ‘Remains’ were edited at Oxford, says, “I think people are injudicious to talk against Roman Catholics for worshipping of saints, and honouring the Virgin and Images, &c. These things *may perhaps* be idolatrous, I cannot make up my mind about it.”

In Tract 71, p. 7, the writers recommend that “we should *put into the back ground the controversy about the Holy Eucharist*, which is almost certain to lead to profane and rationalistic thoughts in the minds of many, and cannot well be discussed in words at all, without the sacrifice of “godly fear;”—“as if (subjoins the Bishop already quoted so freely) that tenet (transubstantiation) were not the abundant source of enormous practical evils, which the faithful advocate of truth is bound to expose.”—One is ready to suspect that there must be some other motive than the one here assigned, for wishing to arrest the controversy about transubstantiation. I offer no conjecture as to what it is; but there is a sentence or two in Knox and Jebb’s Correspondence (a work which contains not merely the ‘germs’ of this system, but, in some particulars, a fuller development of it than we have *yet* been favoured with in the Tracts,) which I beg leave to quote on this point. “Deep measures (says Mr. Knox,) have been taken for making our *re-union* (the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church,) practicable, in the fulness of time; but little less deep measures have also been taken, for keeping it off until that time should be ‘fully

come.' Such a measure I take to be the decree of the Council of Lateran in the year (I think) 1215, under Innocent III. Until then the actual tenet of transubstantiation had not been enjoined, and the believer in the real presence was equally catholic, whether he did, or did not, suppose a change in the substance of the elements . . . . *I am ready to think this will prove our last remaining barrier to coalescence.*"\* (Letter 94.)

This brings me to the doctrine of the REAL PRESENCE. The Tractists deny transubstantiation, but they hold that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist. This is implied when they tell us that the ministry in the line of "apostolical succession," have been intrusted with "the awful and mysterious gift of *making the bread and wine, Christ's body and blood;*" and affirm that their Church is "THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS (the British) REALM, WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE." (Tract 4, p. 26.) But in Tract 27, (from Bishop Cosin) the language is explicit, as the following extracts will show. "We hold by a firm belief that it is the body of Christ; of the manner how it *becomes* so, there is not a word in the Gospel. . . . We believe a *real presence* no less than you (the Romanists) do." "If it

\* I hope the Editor of the Churchman had no reference to this passage, when he contended, in his late controversy with the Catholic Herald, that the dogma of transubstantiation in its true and primitive import, had been abandoned by nearly all the Roman Catholics of the present day? The Romanist officiously called for his "proofs"—a call that has been found, it is apprehended, a little embarrassing.

seems impossible that the *flesh* of Christ should *descend*, and become our food, *through so great a distance*, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions . . . . and so make our faith to receive and believe, what our reason cannot comprehend. . . . In this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly *receive the substance of Christ's body and blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly.*" He admits that "there is a *conversion of the bread into the body of Christ,*" and says, that "the *true body* of Christ is not only shadowed and figured, but also given indeed and by worthy communicants duly received."

But I will not multiply quotations. I am well aware that unguarded language was used on this subject by some even of the Continental Reformers. But, I think, all unbiassed Protestants must see in the doctrine of the Tracts on this point, (especially when viewed in connexion with the rest of the system,) a strong Popish tendency. Nothing, certainly, could be more at variance than the sentiments just quoted, with the language of your 28th Article, which says, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after an *heavenly* and *spiritual* manner." And plain readers will wonder that men who can put forth sentiments like these, should feel any great horror of transubstantiation.

The only remaining feature of these Tracts I propose to notice, is, their doctrine concerning **THE RULE OF FAITH**. On this fundamental question, they side with the Church of Rome in maintaining the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, and

the binding obligations of "Catholic traditions." That they differ from Rome as to what these traditions are, is a matter of very subordinate moment. With her they hold, that the Bible cannot be understood without the aid of the church—nay, that "the church has ever been the *primary source* of faith." An inquirer "must go *first* to the *Church*," then, if he chooses, to the Bible. The Bible is, in the judgment of these writers, a very obscure book. Who would suppose that any one, except a Roman Catholic, could speak of the Holy Scriptures in terms like these? "If Scripture contains any religious system at all, it must contain it covertly, and teach it obscurely, because it is altogether most immethodical and irregular in its structure." (Tract 85.\*) Again; "I own it seems to me, judging antecedently, very improbable, indeed, that it (the Bible) should contain the whole of the revealed word of God. . . We do not look into Scripture for a complete history of the secular matters which it mentions; why should we look for a complete account of religious truth? . . . Both the history of its composition and its internal structure, are against its being a complete depository of the Divine will, unless the early church says it is. Now, the early church does not tell us this. It does not seem to have considered that a complete code of *morals* (!) or of Church government, or of rites, or of discipline, is in Scripture." (This is, indeed, "rancid Popery," as Dr. Beasley calls it.) Again, of the doctrines of the faith, this writer says, (in the same Tract,) "the wonder is that they are all there,

\* I have not this Tract at hand, and quote through another writer.

or can be gained indirectly from Scripture : humanly judging, they would not be there but for God's interposition ; and, therefore, *since they are there by a sort of accident*, it is not strange they should be latent there, and only indirectly producible thence. God effects his greatest ends by apparent accidents." Is not this intolerable from a professed believer in the Scriptures? from a minister of the Gospel? from a signer of those articles which say, not that the Bible is to be received and believed because it may be proved by the creeds, but that the *creeds* are to be "received and believed," because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture?" (See your 8th Art.)

The Book which God mercifully gave us, to be "a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path," having proved so inadequate, another guide must be substituted in its stead. Accordingly, we are informed, (see *British Critic*, vol. 24, p. 254,) that "the CHURCH is, in matter of fact, *our great divinely appointed guide* into saving truth, under divine grace, whatever may be the abstract power or sufficiency of the Bible." Mr. Keble, also, (according to the *Christian Observer*,) maintained, in his visitation sermon, that "church tradition is parallel to Scripture, not derived from it;" that "it fixes the interpretation of disputed texts by authority of the Holy Spirit;" and that "we are as much bound to defer to tradition as to the written word of God, which he has been pleased to give us over and above." Is this Protestant (or, if you will, Reformed) Christianity? Or is it Popery?

It is not surprising that the advocates of these

principles, should be engaged in a systematic effort, both in England and this country, to discredit *Chillingworth*. These gentlemen see that his great work, "The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to salvation," is, in some of its leading principles, as much in the way of their success, as it has been in that of Rome. And they have joined Rome in her effort to overthrow it. It has withstood *her* assaults for two hundred years: the sequel will show whether her new allies will be able (even by the *mining* process they are resorting to,) to prostrate this noble bulwark of Protestantism. That they come to the enterprise with a zest, is evident, as well from their ungenerous attacks upon the reputation of Chillingworth, as from the thrusts they make on all occasions at his favourite maxim, "The Bible, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants." See examples in Mr. Keble's sermon, and in the *British Critic passim*. This latter work, indeed, gives us a morceau from one of Mr. Froude's letters, (a man whose frankness every one must respect, however we may revolt at his errors,) in which he repudiates the Scriptures as a guide even in fundamentals. "Your trumpety principle (he observes) about 'Scripture being the sole rule of faith in *fundamentals*,' (I nauseate the word,) is but a mutilated edition of the Protestant principle of 'the Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants,' without the breadth and axiomatic character of the original.'" "Bible religion," is an offence to these gentlemen. They "cannot away with it." It is too simple in its doctrines, its order, its worship. Hence we hear one who was as much the god-father as Knox was



the father of the system, exclaiming, "*It is my wish and prayer that I may be saved from the simplicity of Bible religion!*"\* What a prayer for a Christian Bishop!

These writers, it is true, do not adopt the Romish doctrine of the rule of faith in all particulars: but the points on which they are at issue, are quite secondary, in importance, to those in which they agree. The following principles, for example, are (as I understand them) common to the two systems:

1. The Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and practice.
2. Catholic tradition is of equal authority with the written word.
3. The Church is "the primary source of faith."
4. The Church is the only authorized expounder of the Scriptures.
5. Controversies of faith are to be ultimately determined by an appeal, not to the Scriptures, but to Catholic tradition.

I submit whether these principles do not embody the essence of the Popish dogma on this great question?

It is not my object to argue the points involved in this question, but I cannot refrain from adding two or three sentences from an admirable address on the rule of faith, delivered in 1827, by one of the high dignitaries of the established church, the Archbishop of Dublin.

"If Scripture be the word of God, intended for our direction; and if, as such, it contains all things necessary to our salvation; and contains them like-

\* Bishop Jebb in his 126th Letter to Knox.

wise with sufficient plainness, [positions he had established in the context,]—it is manifestly a full and sufficient rule for the faith and practice of Christians; and *there can be none other*, by which we should be governed, but this alone.” After stating the Romish doctrine of tradition, he resumes: “Thus, an unwritten tradition is made necessary to supply the defects and to illustrate the obscurities of the written word of God. And, consequently, that church, which professes to be the keeper and dispenser of this tradition, becomes the only interpreter of the Christian revelation—it holds in its hands all the secrets of the Divine counsels—its rules constitute the true measure of our faith and practice, and its authority forms the immediate and true ground of Christian obligation. . . . . What is this but putting the decrees of men in place of the oracles of God, dispossessing our Lord and Saviour of the supremacy over his church, displacing that church from the foundation which has been laid, and attempting to erect it upon one removed to the greatest conceivable distance from the foundation of Jesus Christ?”

These remarks, I am aware, apply in their full extent only to the Papal doctrine; but they apply substantially to the Oxford school, as having adopted the main principle of that doctrine. With this principle Rome set out, but she could not maintain herself without adding other corruptions to it. Is there any reason to believe it will fare better with Oxford?

I have thus endeavoured, Right Reverend Sir, to establish the main position of the obnoxious passage in

my Lecture, to wit: that the Oxford Divinity im-  
bodies "some of the worst errors of Popery." If  
my time and your patience would permit, I would  
furnish additional proofs, and bring out more promi-  
nently some features of the system, which have been  
only glanced at. But I am satisfied to rest the case  
here, and to leave it to the readers of our correspon-  
dence to decide whether the charge which I, in com-  
mon with so many others, have brought against these  
tracts, is without any foundation.

The other points submitted by you are of second-  
ary importance, and can be more summarily disposed  
of. One of them relates to the efforts which, it is  
alleged in my Lecture, the Oxfordists are making  
in England to disseminate their doctrines, and to  
the measure of success with which these efforts have  
been attended. On this subject I have only to say,  
that it is a matter of general notoriety that the writ-  
ters in question "are employing both the pulpit and  
the press, to give their publications currency among  
the people." No one who sees the *British Critic*, or  
reads the quarterly list of new works from the Ox-  
ford press, can be in doubt on this point. And the  
Tractists themselves inform us in their second vol-  
ume, that "there has been much hearty and intelli-  
gent adoption" of the "primitive views" advocated  
by them. Another writer, also, (Mr. Baden Powell)  
is quoted by the *Critic* as having stated in a recent  
pamphlet, that these sentiments "have been exten-  
sively adopted and strenuously upheld, and are daily  
gaining ground among a considerable and influential  
portion of the members, as well as ministers, of the  
established Church."—But this is one of the points

on which we shall doubtless agree, and I will not dwell on it.

The other part of my statement, which you call upon me to substantiate, is in the following words:—“The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and Roman priests are publicly felicitating their people, on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church.” You have made up an issue on the latter part of this sentence, to which I might fairly except. You call upon me to prove that the Popish doctrines of the Oxford system have made such progress in your church, as to “*authorize*” the Roman priests to congratulate their people on the event. This is not what I asserted. I stated a simple fact. As to *proving* that fact, I presume my word is a sufficient voucher for it. But if you see the Roman Catholic papers (as I take it for granted you do,) you *have* all the “proof” of my statement, which could reasonably be desired—though (allow me to add) you have not all on which the statement was actually founded.

But (to come to the merits of the case) the whole question presented by the language of the Lecture, as quoted above and modified by the note (which is copied into my first lecture,) resolves itself into this, viz: whether the Oxford system, as a system, has made any progress in our cities? If it has, then, on the supposition that it is strongly imbued with Popery, (a point already examined,) the Popery that is in it, has made progress also.

In the note just alluded to, I have expressed the opinion—an opinion founded on the testimony of intelligent Protestant Episcopalians—that “the cir-

culatation of these pernicious writings" (the Oxford publications) was likely to be kept "within very narrow limits." I cordially hope this may be the case. Still, there is not wanting evidence to show that the "leaven" has been introduced. In proof of this, I need but refer to the support which specific errors of the system have received from leading periodicals, and the exertions that have been made to circulate the tracts.

Whatever may be the character of these publications, whether Protestant or Popish, or neither, it will not be denied that active measures have been taken to disseminate them. I am aware that it is customary to commend these "calumniated writings," with some reservation. The right of any individual to do this, is indisputable. But it is not easy to see how one can recommend a series of works to the public, if he believes they contain any *serious* error. There may be many sound and excellent sentiments in the Koran, in the "Fratres Poloni," in the works of Belsham or Channing,—but what pious and judicious man would advise the indiscriminate purchase and study of these books? Nay, what conscientious religious teacher would promote the circulation of a work which he believed to be pervaded with any one important error? It involves a serious imputation upon the characters of the clergymen who lend their influence to scatter the Oxford writings through the church, to admit the supposition for a moment, that they can regard the errors they may contain, in any other light than as *very trivial blemishes*.—But let me cite a few testimonies, to illustrate the estimate in which the Oxford Divinity is held in this country. This

is, I am sure, quite a work of supererogation; and instead of going into it in detail, I shall quote a few statements and facts from the "*Churchman*," (to come no nearer home,) and then respectfully refer my correspondent for further information, to the columns of that paper, *passim*, for the last eighteen months.

A correspondent of the *Churchman* thus repudiates, like his brethren at Oxford, the name "Protestant Episcopalian:"—"In the argument which I offered in your last, I must confess my chagrin at the use of the word *Episcopalians*. How can we blame those who are ignorant of Catholic principles for confounding us with the numerous sects of the age, while we sanction and encourage the delusion by taking to ourselves the inadequate designation of *Protestant Episcopalian*?"

"For one, I am willing to serve under the banner of the church, but not under the flag of a sect; I claim my right to be known as a Catholic, and I complain of the wrong which is done me by a name which does not represent my character, feelings or principles, and which obliges me to belie my profession, and appear to the world in a false character."

What a mortal antipathy this school have to the word "Protestant." It seems, with them, to taint every thing it touches.

A late No. of the same paper has the following effusion from the pen of Dodwell, a writer quoted with much favour in the Oxford Tracts. Whether the editor joins with this arrogant writer, in the summary disposition he makes of all non-Episcopalians, I do not know. Happily for us, our eternal destiny

is not suspended upon the dictum of a poor fellow-mortal so much a stranger to the true spirit of Christianity, as to give utterance to sentiments like these:—

“None but the bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow that whosoever is disunited from the visible communion of the church on earth, and particularly from that visible communion of the bishops, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible Catholic Church on earth; and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and, what is yet more, from *Christ and God himself*. It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the damned, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. The SAME is their condition also, who are *disunited* from Christ by being disunited from *his visible representative*.”

A correspondent, in the same No., gives us Dodwell's doctrine over again:—

“None but the bishops can unite us to the Father, in the way of Christ's appointment, and these bishops must be such as receive their mission from the first commissioned apostles: wherever such bishops are found dispensing the faith and sacraments of Christ, *there* is a true church: *unsound it may be*, like the Church of Rome, but still a *true or real church*, as a sick or diseased man, though unsound, is still a real or true man.”

The Churchman, it is manifest, then, is quite up to the Oxford standard, on the subject of church power and the apostolical succession.—It is equally explicit respecting the real presence; and even subscribes to

the doctrine that "the elements are *converted* into the very body and very blood of the Redeemer." In Nov. 1839, several queries were propounded to the editor, by "Warburton," in relation to the sentiments taught in the Oxford Tracts. In answer to the first question, he says, "We reply without hesitation that the Tracts teach not only the virtual, but the real and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament. In saying this, however, we wish to say as distinctly, that they totally discard the dogma of transubstantiation, as propounded by the Council of Trent: nor, so far as we have seen, do they give the least countenance to any refined modification of that doctrine. And whereas "Warburton" supposes that if they deny transubstantiation, as commonly understood, they yet teach the change of the elements into what he calls a *tertium quid*, we desire to add our belief that he does them great injustice in imputing to them any such folly or irreverence. On the contrary, they, in some places, *teach distinctly the conversion of the elements into the very body and very blood of the Redeemer.*" He subsequently adds, "To the doctrine of the real presence as stated in our answer to Warburton's first query, *we cordially accede.*"

One of his papers, for the same month, contains a long article from the "British Magazine," (one of the Oxford organs,) advocating *Prayers for the dead*. The editor thus expresses what he supposes to be the opinion of the Tractists (and what is doubtless his own) on this subject:—"We doubt whether we should be justified in saying that they *recommend* the offering of prayer for the faithful depart-



ed; although they would probably adopt with approbation the language of a bishop of the American Church, and 'lament that the Church of Rome, by grafting the absurd errors of *purgatory*, and prayers *to* departed saints, instead of *for* them, on this old, and pious, and Catholic Christian doctrine, hath almost banished it out of the minds of Protestant Christians.' ”

How far the editor coincides with the Oxfordists on the fundamental doctrines of justification, regeneration, the nature and desert of sin, and their affiliated points, together with the opus operatum efficacy of Baptism, may be gathered from his laudatory notice of Dr. Pusey's Treatise on Baptism, (forming Vol. II. of the Tracts,) in which these subjects are discussed. We have, in his notice, an example of the "reserve" so frequently exhibited on this side the Atlantic, in endorsing the new Divinity; but the feeble note of dissent that meets us in the third sentence, seems (and with reason,) ashamed to utter its tiny voice in the midst of the swelling acclamations which go up on either side of it.

**"BAPTISMAL PRIVILEGES.**—It is refreshing to turn from the cheerless and shrivelling theology of the day, to the expanded and ennobling views of our holy calling which Dr. Pusey has opened to us, in his admirable treatise on Baptism. We have read enough of this treatise to be satisfied that it is replete with pure, primitive, and truly scriptural doctrine. The points on which its correctness may, on solid grounds, be reasonably questioned, are as nothing compared with the broad, Catholic and scriptural principles which it develops with surprising

fulness, and advocates with a chastened zeal. We consider it the most extraordinary theological work of the age; and as it is divested of technicalities, and adapted to laymen as well as professional readers, we trust that it will find its way into every family in the Church. If the author seem to his readers to attach too great importance to what they perhaps are accustomed to regard as merely a significant ceremony, let them see whether he have not scriptural authority for his views; and if they still falter, let them think whether any too great things can be said of blessings conveyed to us by the sacrament, which the Redeemer has appointed as the seal and symbol of the redemption of mankind.”—(Churchman of May 9th, 1840.)

I subjoin a single sentence, from the same source, on the rule of faith:—“It will be well for the reader of Chillingworth to bear in mind the unquestioned fact, that *the Church, and not the Scriptures, is the primary source of the faith*; and that the writings of the New Testament were produced as emergencies required, and serve the purpose rather of a safeguard against error than of a first initiation into the faith of Christ.” He elsewhere insists on the authority of tradition, in harmony with the Tract writers.

But I need not dwell on particulars. We have testimony, which covers the whole ground, in a very few words. The great question about the Oxford publications, is, whether they are imbued with Popery. We are assured by this paper, that they are not only free from Popery, but even from any “*tendency*” to it. The Editor (in commenting on Dr.

Pusey's letter to the Bishop of Oxford) puts his imprimatur upon them thus:—"The members of our own Church who have been inclined to accede generally to the views set forth in the Tracts, but have feared that there might be some foundation for the violent and sweeping charges which have been brought against their authors, may now consider their fears as effectually at rest. *Every suspicion even of a tendency to Romanism, in the Oxford Divines, is removed.*"

The explicitness of this language leaves nothing further to be desired in the way of proof. In the judgment of one of your leading journals, the passages cited in this letter (I refer to these as a sample merely,) from the Oxford writings, on the power of the priesthood,\* the efficacy of the sacraments, baptismal

\* One of the powers claimed for the priesthood at Oxford, in as extravagant a degree as at Rome, has not been adverted to in this letter—I mean the power of *absolution*. A single illustration of it is all I can introduce here: and this imports (if I understand it) that in the opinion of these writers, it is at least doubtful whether a penitent sinner can obtain forgiveness through the blood of Christ, without absolution from a priest.—On p. 128 of his treatise on Baptism, Dr. Pusey quotes a brief narrative from the late excellent Mr. Williams, of the South Sea Islands Mission, the purport of which is this. Mr. W. was called to see a sick woman, (a member of the church, as I interpret his language,) who was in great distress of mind, on account of infanticides of which she had been guilty when a heathen. "I directed her (he observes) to the faithful saying, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." This imparted a little comfort, and after visiting her frequently, and directing her thoughts to that blood which cleanseth from all sin, I succeeded, by the blessing of God, in tranquillizing her troubled spirit: and she died about eight days after my first interview, animated with the hope, that her sins, though many, *would* all be forgiven her. And what but the Gos-

justification and renewal, the office of saving faith, the distinction of mortal and venial sins, the possibility of forgiveness for post-baptismal sins, the subordinate position of the doctrine of the atonement and the preaching of the Gospel, in the means of grace, the real presence, prayers for the dead, the institution of new saints' days, the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, the authority of tradition, together with the marked antipathy of the Tractists to the various Protestant denominations, their sneers at the Reformation, and their habitual tone of deference and affection towards the church of Rome—the language of the Tracts on all these points, contains nothing to justify the bare “SUSPICION of even a TENDENCY to Romanism !”

It certainly will not *now* be an open question among American Protestants, whether the “leaven” of this divinity “is beginning to work in our cities.” How widely it will diffuse itself, is known only to Him who knoweth all things. Its fruits, however, will doubtless develop themselves with the system. Indeed, some have appeared already. May I respectfully commend a single fact to your attention? I

pel could have brought such consolation?”—On this statement, Dr. Pusey remarks, “Consolation is not the main object of the Gospel, yet the Gospel would have brought much more consolation, had this teacher known it all, and could have told her of the “one Baptism for the remission of sins,” that she “had been washed, had been cleansed;” and so could he have declared authoritatively, without altering our Lord’s own words, “Thy sins *are* forgiven.”—Here not only is baptism made a ground of confidence that our sins are forgiven, but the clergy are assumed to have the prerogative of authoritatively (for the word “are” is made emphatic by Dr. Pusey,) pronouncing the remission of sins. Does Rome go beyond this?

know of an instance in which a family of the highest respectability, *have been converted to Popery, chiefly by the reading of the Oxford publications.* Can a system which leads to such results, be free from "any tendency to Romanism?" Can a good tree bring forth such corrupt fruit? It does really appear to me, Sir, (if I may be allowed to express a private opinion,) that facts like this ought to make serious Episcopalians, who may have inadvertently countenanced this system, pause and consider whether they are not promoting a scheme which will be likely, in the end, to seduce many nominal Protestants into the church of Rome. *Can* a series of writings be adapted to advance the interests of true religion, which are already "overthrowing the faith of some," and the republication of which, in this country, was warmly encouraged by the Roman Catholics, on the ground (to use their own language) that many Protestants "would find in their pages doctrines so un-protestant as would lead them to examine the grounds on which they were asserted, and so consonant with the faith and practice of the Catholic church," as would eventually bring them back into her fold?

Such, Right Reverend Sir, are some of the grounds on which the statements in my Lecture, respecting the Oxford Divinity, must rest for their vindication. I flatter myself that I shall be exonerated, in the view of impartial men of all denominations, from the imputation of having spoken either unadvisedly or uncharitably, in alleging that there are "some of the worst errors of Popery" incorporated with that system. Or, if I have erred, it will not, I am persuaded,

be accounted as a "mortal" sin, when it is considered not only that the Roman Catholics themselves have fallen into the same misconception as to the character of the system, but that all that I have charged upon it has been charged before, by distinguished clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church, both in England and America. This is shown in my first letter, and might be confirmed by the testimony of the excellent Bishop of Chester, (one of the ablest prelates of the establishment,) who says, "this subject [Oxfordism] is daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect, and threatens a revival of *the worst evils of the Romish system*. Under the specious pretence (he adds) of deference to antiquity, and respect for primitive models, the foundations of our Protestant Church are undermined by men who dwell within her walls, and those who sit in the Reformers' seat are traducing the Reformation."\*

I am not ignorant of the plea which is set up by these writers, when the charge of Popery is advanced against their publications. They tell us, with all conceivable gravity, that the dogmas and usages which have excited so much alarm within your communion, on both sides the water, are not Popery, but "ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY." They were in the church before the rise of the Papal power, and, *therefore*, they are no part of that system, but among those "Catholic verities" and truly apostolic customs, which are to be received by the universal church. I confess, I think the logic of this argument is bad, and the doctrine worse. As to the

\* Charge of the Bishop of Chester, p. 2.

logic, it is surely a non-sequitur to say, that because an error existed in the church before the Bishop of Rome usurped the title and dignities of Supreme Pontiff, it cannot be a part of Popery. And as to the doctrine, see what it must lead to. Instead of taking the Saviour and his apostles for our guides, we are to be governed by the teaching and example of the Fathers—by men who made no claim to inspiration, and who were as liable to err as good men in any other period of the world. That the history of the early church is full of instruction—that great deference is due to the opinions of the illustrious men whose names adorn the annals of the first four centuries—that their testimony to the essential truths of Christianity is a precious legacy to the pious of all generations—and that much information may be drawn from their writings, of high value in the interpretation of the sacred volume—all this will be granted by every enlightened Christian. But still they were fallible men; and to concede to them, however distinguished for learning or sanctity, the authority which is claimed for them by the Oxford Divines, is (it is conceived) to rob the Bible of its just pre-eminence, and to open the flood-gates of error into the church. The Oxford writers encourage clerical celibacy—monastic seclusion—prayers for the dead—the giving of the eucharist to infants and to dying persons even when insensible. And when we ask for their warrant, they point us, not “to the law and the testimony”—to prophets and apostles—but to “ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY.” So, they teach baptismal justification and regeneration—the real presence—the power of absolution as vested in the priesthood—the

co-ordinate authority of tradition with the Bible, as the rule of faith. And here, again, they refer us for their warrant to "ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY." In this way, they are bringing into the church "some of the worst errors of Popery." Yes, of *Popery*:—for the Apostle, in his most formal prediction of the great apostacy, expressly assures us that its elements were in the church even in *his* time. "The mystery of iniquity (he says) *doth already work.*" (2 Thess. ii. 7.) Its seeds were already sown; nay, they were beginning to germinate. The evil could not be fully developed until the great obstacle alluded to by him in the same verse (and which is commonly supposed to have been the Roman Empire) was "taken out of the way." But it might continue to increase, and doubtless it did increase, day by day, until that time arrived. Who that has traced the rise and progress of the apostacy can doubt, that the apostle in the above cited passage, had his eye (inter alia) upon *those very heresies and corruptions* enumerated a moment ago—the *elements of Popery* that were then "working," and which were, on the fall of the Roman Empire, *organized* into that grand system of iniquity that the world has been cursed with ever since? And yet, forsooth, because these excrescences were found (or rather, are alleged to have been found, for, as to some of them, we may well stand in doubt,) upon the ancient church, we are bound to gather them up, and put them among our jewels, and enshrine them in our hearts, and guard them as we guard the precious doctrines of God's holy word!

Nor is this the whole of the process by which these gentlemen are, unwittingly, perhaps, but real-



ly, assimilating the church to Popery. They are tearing down with one hand, as well as building up with the other. It is not enough for them to bring out of the Papal Church some of her worst corruptions, and stamp them with the magic words, "ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY," and send them forth into the world as standard coinage, (vainly imagining that this specious label will give them currency, though the KING's 'image and superscription' be wanting;) but they are laying hold of glorious doctrines which *bear* his impress, and striving to efface it. They come into the Reformed Church, and sacrilegiously strike down, one after another, its grand, distinctive principles—those principles which make it what it is, and by which it has, under God, achieved its triumphs. Their watch-word, or rather, I should say, their catch-word, here, is "ULTRA PROTESTANTISM." Wherever they can set their burning brand, they leave the odious capitals; whether with the same intent, I say not, but in the same way as in Eastern countries a sign is hung out upon infected houses to mark the presence of the Plague. The sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith—justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ—the *preaching* of the Gospel as the great means of salvation—the efficacy of the Redeemer's blood to "cleanse from *all* sin,"—the nature of the sacraments, and the just authority of the ministry, as defined in the symbols of Reformed Christendom;—on all these and other momentous doctrines, they have put the base, insidious stigma, "ULTRA PROTESTANTISM." Luther and Melancthon, Bucer and Zuingle, Calvin and Knox, the heroes of the "detestable reformation," are all *ta-*

*booed* as "ULTRA PROTESTANTS." Yea, if they could collect the ashes of England's sainted martyrs—of Cranmer and Ridley, Latimer and Hooper, and their illustrious compeers, they might, in full consistency with what they are daily asserting of the principles for which they died, engrave upon the hallowed urn, as a tribute of *gratitude* to their memories, the inscription "ULTRA PROTESTANTS."

Such (to the eye of a spectator, at least,) is the grand scheme by which the Oxford theologians are carrying forward their "second Reformation"—such the process by which they are casting up that famous "VIA MEDIA," of which they are so fond of discoursing. And yet, (what would be ludicrous but for the solemnity of the subject,) they profess to wonder that they should be suspected of Popery! Do they think there is as little Protestantism left in the rest of Christendom, as there is at Oxford? Or do they fancy that the Protestants of this age are so ignorant of the features of Popery, that they do not know it when they see it—and even have it thrust upon them? True it is, the Protestantism of our day has sadly degenerated from the Protestantism of the Reformation. But it has vitality enough left to recognise the portrait that is here presented, notwithstanding the pains that have been taken to disguise it, and the venerable name it has usurped. And (if a stranger may hazard an opinion on a question which concerns mainly another communion,) the authors of this "movement" and their successors, will have many a hard-fought battle to go through, before they succeed in making the Protestant Episcopal church, as a body, fall down and worship the image of gold

and iron and clay, they are for setting up in their temples.

The Protestant world will await with solicitude the "maturer developments" of the Oxford system. That it is now in an inchoate state, is admitted on all hands. That it cannot remain stationary, must be manifest to every one who examines it: the "Via Media" has nothing but quicksands for its basis, and permanency is out of the question. *Movement* is indispensable: the only alternative is, "forward or backward?" Unhappily, there is little room to doubt which branch of the alternative will be chosen. It is painfully instructive to look through the "thirty years' correspondence" of Knox and Jebb, and note, as you go along, the onward progress of those gentlemen in error: and there is the same difference in the tone of the earlier and later productions of the men on whom their mantle has fallen. The fraternity are evidently making progress:

"Eunt obscuri sola sub nocte per umbras."

Ever and anon we meet with some mysterious intimation in their writings, which stirs our expectations of great disclosures hereafter. For example, the Reviewer of Carlyle's works, in a late No. of the London Quarterly, (an article "written, without a doubt, at Oxford," as you say of the article on "Romanism in Ireland," in the last No.\*) in "hinting" at

\* You refer to this article as an evidence of the "bold championship" of Oxford against Rome. It certainly breathes a spirit of determined opposition to the Hierarchy, and abounds with startling facts. But all this may be, and yet the main position laid down in these letters be correct. The Roman Catholics have their

the "real cause why in this day it is so hard to 'kindle soul by soul,' and re-inspire mankind with the spirit of faith," observes; "It would be well for those who are concerned in the government of man, whether infant or adult—and it would cut at once the Gordian knot of 'national education'—to think deeply on the problem, and to ask themselves steadily and calmly, what is the meaning of a *system of education* carried on without a thought of the *sacraments of the church?*" What does this mean? The writer makes no explanation, and leaves the uninitiated to divine the esoteric sense of the words, as they best can.—The numerous 'hints' of this kind scattered through the Oxford miscellanies, are doubtless (to borrow Lord Bacon's descriptive phrase) the "*seeds of things,*" which will in due time bring forth their appropriate fruit. And such seed, it is to be feared, will produce some bitter fruit for the friends of pure and undefiled religion.

I am aware that the friends of the Oxford system repel observations of this sort, as a breach of charity; and it is painful to feel obliged to make them. But

own way of accounting for the *hard names* they get at Oxford sometimes. I will let one of them speak for himself. The editor of the London Tablet, (a R. C. Journal,) in his paper of January 30th, says, "But there is another class of men who are embarrassed by the narrowness of the strip of land which separates their territory from ours; who are drawn towards us by the irresistible evidence of truth, but hate us the more for being drawn against their will; who feel bound by interest or necessity to protest against what they call our errors; but can hardly find language fine and delicate enough to distinguish our errors from their truths; and who feel that all the sleight of the most skilful posture-master can hardly enable them to maintain, without a fall, the attitude of contortion which they have chosen to assume, instead of the natural and unforced position of truth."

who can forget the history of former errors which have desolated the church? Has not heresy always come in quietly and stealthily, in the very garb, sometimes, of an angel of light? Look at the rise of Arianism—of Pelagianism—of Socinianism. Were they not all as specious—as professedly orthodox—as impatient of the imputation of heterodoxy—as is the system of Dr. Pusey and his coadjutors? And can it be wondered at that Protestants, with these facts before them, should predict that Oxfordism, unless arrested soon, will become more and more assimilated to Popery? that they should fear its ultimate coalescence with that church which the adherents of the new divinity (or to speak more accurately, of the old divinity exhumed,) tell us, is “not only in the main orthodox” now, but “was *ever distinguished as a pillar of the truth?*”<sup>\*</sup> It is my earnest prayer that these apprehensions may prove groundless—that the Oxford divines and their friends and successors in both countries, may be found “bold and able champions of the truth against the force and fraud” of Antichrist, in the day of conflict. That such a day is rapidly approaching, is manifest alike from “the sure word of prophecy” and from the signs of the times. Protestant Christianity will need all her resources, in that encounter: she can ill afford to spare the church of England, or to have her come into the field rent with intestine feuds—still less can she afford to have a powerful division of her trained and gifted chivalry, throw themselves into the ranks of her adversary, or, like

\* “It (the church of Rome) must be in the main orthodox, as it is.” “The Roman Catholic communion, whatever else it was or did, must be allowed this praise, that it was ever distinguished as a pillar of the truth.” (British Critic, Vol. 26, pp. 338, 64.)

Meroz, stand aloof and refuse to go out with her consecrated hosts to battle.

May it please God to ward off so heavy a calamity, and to preserve his Church, in all its branches, from the insidious devices and machinations of "that man of sin," "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders."

Thus, sir, I have endeavoured to lay before you, the information called for in your letter. Had it been decorous, I could have referred you for an answer to your inquiries, to many clergymen of high standing in your own communion, whose statements respecting the character of the Oxford Divinity, in perfect coincidence with the brief paragraph in my lecture, which occasioned your letter, and much more amplified, have long been before the public. But I fully recognise your right to make the requisition with which I have been honoured; and I felt that it was not only due to you and to myself, but to the cause of sound Christianity, to respond to it. My reply has been prepared in the midst of numerous engagements, incident to the pastoral charge of a large congregation; but, relying upon your candour to excuse its deficiencies, I submit it to your consideration,

And remain, Right Reverend Sir,

With much respect,

Your friend and servant,

H. A. BOARDMAN.

Philadelphia, March 4th, 1841.

# ADVERTISEMENT

Books Published by Tickler & Downer.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE CONTINENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN ADAMS. 4 VOLS. 8vo. 1800.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

### *Books Published by Hooker & Agnew.*

ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE  
OXFORD TRACTS, by Isaac Taylor.

BOARDMAN ON ROMANISM.

REV. HENRY BLUNT'S COMPLETE WORKS, in 7 vols.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST,  
in 1 vol. 12mo.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ABRAHAM  
AND JACOB.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ST. PETER  
AND THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ELISHA.

BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE  
SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

BLUNT'S SERMONS.

---

### BOOKS IN PRESS.

LIFE OF SIMEON. Edited by the Right Reverend  
Charles P. M'Ilvaine.

BICKERSTETH ON BAPTISM.

PICTURES OF RELIGION.

BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION, with Notes and  
Questions by Professor Sparrow.



**This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.**

**A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.**

**Please return promptly.**

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

### *Books Published by Hooker & Agnew.*

**ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE OXFORD TRACTS, by Isaac Taylor.**

**BOARDMAN ON ROMANISM.**

**REV. HENRY BLUNT'S COMPLETE WORKS, in 7 vols.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST, in 1 vol. 12mo.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ABRAHAM AND JACOB.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ST. PETER AND THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF ELISHA.**

**BLUNT'S LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.**

**BLUNT'S SERMONS.**

---

### BOOKS IN PRESS.

**LIFE OF SIMEON.** Edited by the Right Reverend Charles P. M'Ilvaine.

**BICKERSTETH ON BAPTISM.**

**PICTURES OF RELIGION.**

**BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION, with Notes and Questions by Professor Sparrow.**

**This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.**

**A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.**

**Please return promptly.**