

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

JANUARY 1838.

---

No. I.

---

---

ART. I.—*Melancthon's Letters*.\*

WHOEVER feels an interest in the Reformation, feels an interest in Melancthon; and yet, to judge others by ourselves, he is comparatively little known. The noble edition of Luther's correspondence, published by De Wette, which is, in fact, the best biography of Luther, made us wish for something of the same kind, to bring us personally acquainted with *Magister Philippus*. We supposed, however, that the epistolary remains of Melancthon would probably not prove so illustrative of his history and character, as those of his more ardent and open-hearted colleague. We even doubted whether there existed a sufficient mass of his letters, to form a collection of tolerable size. We are, therefore, both surprised and pleased to see three goodly quartos, filled with the miscellaneous papers, chiefly letters, of Melancthon. While we gratify our own curiosity respecting them, we propose to take our readers with us, for the purpose of affording them a glimpse at Master Philip, through the faithful glass of his own private correspondence. Before doing this,

\* *Corpus Reformatorum* ed. C. G. Bretschneider. (Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia.) Vol. I.—III.—(Epistolae, Praefationes, Consilia, Judicia, Schedae Academicae.) 4to.

will afford much gratification. We are pleased to observe that the work is duly appreciated by the public; and that a second edition has been demanded. There is in our country a predisposition to think that nothing very good in literature can be expected from American authors; and too often second-rate British productions will pass through edition after edition among us; while works of more intrinsic value of American manufacture, lie uncalled for on the bookseller's shelves. This prejudice is certainly not patriotic; and we hope will soon give place to a more just estimate of American genius.

As our American traveller has visited many other countries, and no doubt has by him copious notes of the "incidents of travel" in those regions, we would respectfully suggest—what will occur to many who read these volumes—that another set of volumes from the same pen, would not be unacceptable to the public. We are aware, indeed, that no countries upon earth are so interesting as those, of which we have an account in these volumes; there is in the very ruins of Egypt, Arabia, and Judea, what may well be called "a religious interest;" a sacred feeling of reverence accompanies us whilst we read of the desolations which a righteous God hath produced in those regions, in punishment of the pride, luxury, cruelty, and rebellion by which they were characterized; and in fulfilment of prophecies uttered and recorded three or four thousand years ago: but still a lively description of scenes in Greece, Italy, Russia, and Poland, would be instructive and entertaining; and as our author has got the attention of the public, he may calculate upon their continued favour.

---

ART. V.—*Tracts for the Times. By members of the University of Oxford.* Second Edition. London. J. G. & F. Rivington. 1837. Three volumes.

THESE Tracts may be regarded as among the most important ephemeral productions of the day. They derive their consequence not so much from the ability with which they are written, as from the station of their authors, and the character of their contents. The title page informs us that they were written by members of the University of Oxford. The principal contributors are Dr. Pusey, the professor of He-

brew, Mr. Keble, the professor of poetry, and Mr. Newman, a fellow of Oriel college. All these gentlemen are distinguished for their talents, learning, and exemplary character. They are the modern Fenelons of the Church of England. This statement must indeed be taken with some allowance. They have the refinement, the learning, the mysticism and devotional feelings of the celebrated Catholic, but they have more of bigotry, and we fear, of self righteousness, than belonged to their amiable prototype. "If, indeed," says Mr. Newman, "there is one thing more than another that brings home to me that the Tracts are mainly on the side of truth . . . . it is this: the evidence which their writers bear about them, that they are the reviled party, not the revilers. I challenge the production of any thing in the Tracts of an unkind, satirical, or abusive character; any thing personal. . . . The writers nowhere attack the Christian Observer, or other similar publications, though they evidently as little approve of its theology, as the Observer of the Tracts. . . . We know our place and our fortunes; to give a witness and to be contemned, to be ill used and to *succeed*. Such is the law which God has annexed to the promulgation of the truth; its preachers suffer, but its cause prevails. Be it so. Joyfully will we all consent to this compact; and the more you attack us personally, the more for the omen's sake, will we exult in it."\* This sounds rather strangely, as the Observer remarks, from men who come forth as public assailants, who month after month publish tracts teaching that the majority of the members of the Church of England have cast aside her doctrines, and differ only in degree, but not in principle, from Rationalists and Socinians.† It is not a matter of surprise

\* Christian Observer, Feb. 1837. Much of Mr. Newman's letter to the Observer strikes us as not only satirical and unkind, but as supercilious and uncandid.

† The OBSERVER frequently complains of the tone of these tracts, and as we think with justice. "Under soft words they are more invidious than many hotter compositions; and their overweening tone, their unfair assumptions, their constant allusions to 'a certain class,' and so forth, without that straight-forward specification that can be grappled with, are more irritating to an ingenuous mind than even abuse." "Mr. Newman only echoes the assuming and uncharitable tone of the Tracts; which, under mild words, are supercilious to a degree that vexes a truth-loving man far more than warm expressions." "We are ashamed of the cant about the meekness, mildness, and good spirit of the Oxford Tracts. As often as we have spoken applaudingly of what is good in them, we are sure to feel ourselves immediately rebuked by some passage which stultifies our panegyrics. We abhor persecution; but we must say, that it is a hard and unequal measure, that a clergyman should be taunted and extinguished

that these publications, proceeding from such a source, many of them elaborate and learned, others popular and plausible, and all of them imbued with the spirit of ascetic devotion, should excite more than ordinary attention. The interest which they have awakened, however, is no doubt principally due to the character of their contents. The key note of the whole series is to be found in the preface to the first volume. "The sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of divine grace." The same sentiment is expressed rather more at length in the preface to the second volume. "Rationalistic, or (as they may be more properly 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 mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradistinction to the primitive view, according to which the church and her sacraments are the direct and 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 insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? and yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage. And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed this may even be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine (however the mischief may be restrained, or compensated, in the case of individuals), that faith, and not the sacraments are the instruments of justification and other gospel gifts. . . ."

for some offence against ecclesiastical etiquette, while the only censure passed upon divines who vituperate the Protestant Reformation, and take part with Rome as a sister, though we have some 'private differences' with her, is 'most excellent, respectable, and learned men, only somewhat too high church.' If these were *really* high church, by which we mean *true* church principles, the sooner the nation abolished *such* a church the better."

\* In reference to the passage quoted above, the Christian Observer asks, "Did ever any man, but the most ignorant Popish fanatic, till these modern days, write thus! Administering the Lord's Supper (by which we feed upon Christ 'by faith, with thanksgiving,' that is, in a purely spiritual banquet) to infants, or to the dying and insensible, is not superstition, if it can be proved



The Tracts avowedly aim at producing a revolution in public opinion. Their doctrines, it is said, have "become obsolete with the majority of the members" of the church, "and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them." The main doctrine in question, they tell us, is "that of the one catholic and apostolic church . . . as the storehouse and

that there were in some former age some persons weak or ignorant enough to act or advocate such folly and impiety! Why not equally vindicate the Pope's sprinkling holy water upon the horses, or St. Anthony's preaching to the fishes? . . . . . The Church of England teaches, after holy scripture, that we are 'justified by faith.' Professor Pusey [the Observer was mistaken in ascribing this particular passage to Dr. Pusey, though he abundantly teaches the doctrine complained of] teaches that the sacraments are the appointed instruments of justification. The learned professor ought to lecture at Maynooth, or the Vatican, and not in the chair of Oxford, when he puts forth this Popish doctrine. . . . . Will any one of the writers or approvers of the Oxford Tracts, venture to say that he does really believe all the doctrines of the articles and homilies of our church? . . . . . We have often asked this question in private, but could never get an answer. Will any approver of the Oxford Tracts answer it in print?" It was this appeal which produced the letters of Mr. Newman to the Observer to which we have already referred, and which are published, with remarks, in the numbers for February, March, April and May of 1837. The remarks of the Observer, which are in the form of foot notes to the letters, are very excellent; evangelical in doctrine, and cogent in argument and style. Any reader of the passage quoted in the text, would be apt to take it for granted, that the writer approved of administering the Lord's Supper to infants and to the dying and insensible. He was complaining of the low views now prevailing of the efficacy of the sacraments, and contrasted with modern notions the purer faith of primitive times, when the Lord's Supper was thus administered. And throughout the Tracts primitive usage or apostolical tradition is said to be worthy of equal reverence with the scriptures. We learn from Mr. Newman's letter, however, that the writer did not mean to "advocate" this usage, or to teach that it was now binding, inasmuch as 'a usage may be primitive, and not universal, may belong to the first ages, but only to some parts of the church. . . . . He does but say, that since it has a sanction in early times, it is not that 'absurdity,' 'irrational fanaticism,' and so forth, which the Observer says it is." The Tracts are full of traps for critics of this kind. The whole course of reasoning and statement produces a clear and strong impression of the general sentiments of the writers, but there is great difficulty in selecting distinct assertions of definite opinions. "They are," says the 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." This is true. Though we have read the three volumes with a good deal of care, we dare not pledge ourselves to any thing more than an honest report of their general doctrines. As Mr. Newman has corrected some misapprehensions into which the Observer has fallen, we regret that his promised examination of the great point of justification has not been printed. He seems to have discontinued his communications, on the ground that the Observer did not comply with his unreasonable demand to publish his letters, without note or comment.

direct channel of grace, as a divine 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." This is the centre of the system around which all the other doctrines revolve and to which they tend. According to the confession of the Anglican and all other Reformed churches, the Catholic church is 'the congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered.' The Reformed churches have ever considered Christ and justification by faith in his merits, as the great centre of the Christian system. The Oxford Tract writers make the church the main point; the church as an ordinance for conveying life to all its members by means of the sacraments. The church, with them, is the great mediator between God and man, the only authorized channel of divine communication. If any one is burdened with a sense of sin, he must resort to the church and her sacraments as the means of obtaining pardon and sanctification. Hence we are told that the sacraments and not preaching, the sacraments and not faith, are the instruments of justification. Of course the question, who has authority to administer these sacraments, who have "power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost?" is one of vital importance. It is answered, of course, by saying that those who have been episcopally ordained for that purpose; hence the apostolical succession, and as Mr. Keble calls it, "Episcopal grace" is one of the most prominent themes of these tracts. The bishops, in regular succession, have received power to communicate the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. This mysterious gift does not depend for its efficacy on the character or state of mind either of the donor or recipient. The act of ordination conveys grace and power "over the gifts of the Holy Ghost." Priests are thus "entrusted with the keys of heaven and hell—with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood." As the sacraments are the channels of communicating divine grace, and the means of access to the blood and merits of the Redeemer, and are in all ordinary cases necessary to salvation, they are repeatedly called the keys to the kingdom of heaven, and those authorized to administer them are therefore entrusted with these keys, and are authorized to admit or exclude, as they deem proper, those who desire the blessings of redemption. The mode in which the sacraments are so efficacious is expressly denied to be through faith and

prayer; it is an *opus operatum* efficacy, depending neither on the state of mind of the administrator or partaker, provided there be in the latter no actual moral impediment, which, in the case of infants, it is said, can never exist. By baptism we are fully justified, which is made to include the forgiveness of sin, original and actual, the renewal of our nature, and grace to enable us to keep from falling into any deadly sin. Hence those declarations of scripture, and those articles of the church which speak of justification by faith have no reference to the case of baptised persons, they having been thus justified at the time of their baptism. Should they fall into any grievous sin, especially a second time, there is no certainty of forgiveness. It is a delusion to suppose with the Papists that penance is a *sacrament* by which such forgiveness can be secured, or with the Protestants, that we may, in faith and penitence, confidently rely on the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer. All that remains, in this case, is 'the baptism of tears' and 'doubt's galling chain;' we have "no right to appropriate again what was given plenarily in baptism." In the Lord's Supper, the priest has the mysterious power of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood. This presence of Christ's body is a real presence, not of his spiritual body, but of that which was born of the Virgin Mary, and with which he ascended to heaven. The Papists err in this matter, not in asserting the real presence, but in undertaking to determine the manner of it. The power of the priesthood extending to the things of the unseen world, to the efficacious administration of those ordinances which are the ordinary means of salvation, includes the authority to forgive sin. Absolution is not a general declaration that forgiveness is granted to the penitent and believing, nor is it a prayer for such forgiveness, it is the authoritative remission of sin. On this subject there is indeed not much said directly, but a great deal by implication. The rule of faith is not the bible merely, but the bible as interpreted, and even "limited" and corrected by tradition. It is expressly said that the controversy on this subject with the church of Rome is not as to the value of tradition, but is a mere historical question, what does tradition teach? There is no dispute as to principle, but solely as to the application. Such is the system of the Oxford Tracts. It is, as the Christian Observer tersely describes it, "Protestantism rejected, and Popery spoiled."

Before appealing to any particular passages in proof of the

correctness of this general exhibition, it may be well to refer to some general indications of the character and spirit of this system. In the first place, these writers repeatedly intimate, and often directly assert, that the doctrines, which they are engaged in advocating, have gone out of vogue; that they wish to introduce a new, or rather to bring back an old system of religion very different from that now prevailing. The tracts on baptism are therefore represented "not as an inquiry into one single isolated doctrine, but as a delineation, and serious examination of a modern system of theology, of extensive popularity and great speciousness, in its elementary principles." In the tracts entitled *Via Media*, we are taught, that the church stands in need of a second Reformation, to bring it back from its ultra Protestantism, that the great distinction between this modern system of theology and that which it is desirable to restore is, that the former makes faith and "heart-worship" the great points, the latter the "power of the church," and the efficacy of the sacraments.\* In the second place, Rome is spoken of, throughout these volumes, with the greatest tenderness and respect. The difference between Papists and the Church of England is represented as comparatively slight, while all non-episcopal churches in Great Britain and elsewhere, are treated with scorn. Even the early Reformers of the English Church, are represented as having gone much too far in their opposition to Popery; and the Reformers of the foreign churches are rejected as either allies or brethren.

\* Thus, in Tract No. 41, in order to show how different modern religion is from the right system, Protestantism is said to be "the religion of so called freedom and independence, as hating superstition, suspicious of forms, jealous of priestcraft, advocating heart-worship." Would not, it is asked, a modern Protestant, "in the Confirmation Service, have made them (the candidates) some address about the necessity of spiritual renovation, of becoming new creatures, &c. ? I do not say such warning is not very appropriate . . . is it not certain that the present *prevailing* temper in the church would have given it . . . and the Liturgy does not ? . . . Take again the catechism. . . . Why is there no mention of newness of heart, of appropriating the merits of redemption, and such like phrases, which are now common among so called Protestants ? Why no mention of justifying faith ?" Again, in the Order for Visiting the Sick . . . a modern Protestant "would rather have instituted some more searching examination (as he would call it) of the state of the sick man's heart . . . and besides, not a word said of looking to CHRIST, resting on him, and renovation of heart. Such are the expressions which modern Protestantism would have considered necessary, and would have inserted such. They are good words; still they are not those which our church considers *the* words for a sick-bed examination." This, and much more to the same effect, is said in order to show the characteristic difference between modern Protestantism, and that system which the Oxford writers are labouring to restore.



To exhibit the evidence of the tenderness of these writers to Rome, and of their severity to the Reformed churches, would render it necessary to transcribe a large part of the Tracts. We can only give a few specimens. The consideration of the difficulties and imperfections attending the English Reformation, we are told, are adapted "to turn us in affection and sympathy towards the afflicted church," which has been the "mother of our new-birth." Rome is called "our Latin sister," and we are told to

"Speak gently of our sister's fall,  
Who knows but gentle love  
May win her, at our patient call,  
The surer way to prove."

It is said to be a mischievous error "that we are one among many Protestant bodies, and that the differences between Protestants are of little consequence; whereas the English Church 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 [alas! who is guilty of schism now?] with the mixed multitude which crowd together, whether at home or abroad, under a mere political banner." To prove that this is no new doctrine, appeal is made to the fact that the lower house of convocation, in 1689, objected to the address prepared by the bishops to King William, thanking him for his "zeal for the Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular." The ground of objection was the phrase quoted, which imported "*owning common union with the foreign Protestants*," vol. 3, tr. 71. In Tract 36, there is a list of the "parties" who have separated from the church; and under the head of those "who receive and teach a part but not the whole of the truth, *erring in respect of one or more fundamental doctrines*," are enumerated Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, &c." Speaking of the Quakers, they say in Tract 41, a churchman "must consider such persons to be mere heathens, except in knowledge." "So far," says Tract 47, "from its being strange that Protestant sects are not 'in Christ,' in the same fullness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world that they should lie between us and heathenism. It would be strange if there were but two states, one absolutely of favour, one of disfavour." "Now," says Tract 74, p. 4, "the privilege of the visible church is to be herein like the ark of Noah, that, for any

thing we know to the contrary, all without it are lost sheep." In the notes to extracts from the writings of Vicentius, vol. 2, No. 24, we find such passages as the following, "Considering the high gifts and the strong claims of the Church of Rome and its dependencies, on our admiration, reverence, love and gratitude, how could we withstand it as we do; how could we refrain from being melted into tenderness, and rushing into communion with it, but for the words of truth itself, which bid us prefer it to the whole world? 'He that loveth father or mother more than ME is not worthy of ME.'" "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 holy church, which maintain the foundation, whatever may be their incidental corruptions!" They have some "private differences" with Rome, it seems, but declare open war on all non-episcopal churches. "Now that Rome has added, and we have omitted, in the catalogue of doctrines, what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to those ancient times, and, with Bishop Ken, to make it our profession to live and "die in the faith of the Catholic church before the division of the East and West." This then is what these gentlemen are aiming at, to bring things back to the state in which they were before the great schism. Rome has erred; it has some "incidental corruptions:" it had not faith enough in the efficacy of the sacraments (!!) and therefore added to their number; it pays undue reverence to images; it invokes religiously saints; it teaches that the bread and wine are actually transubstantiated; it ascribes too much power to the pope, a certain primacy these gentlemen think his due, &c. &c. These are incidental corruptions of little importance compared with the apostacy of the Reformed churches of Scotland and the continent from episcopacy. Not merely the doctrines, but the rites, ceremonies, ritual of the ancient church ought to be restored. Hence the Oxford writers have published the Catholic Breviary in extenso, omitting the invocations of the saints; they lament the omission of the practice of exorcism before baptism; they urge the propriety of praying for the dead; they insist on calling the communion table the altar, the eucharist a sacrifice; they turn their back to the congregation during the service; offer-

ing up, after the manner of a priest, prayers for them, instead of praying with them, &c. &c.

It would be easy to show that these gentlemen, and those in this country who follow them with willing minds, but with unequal steps, are apostates from the true doctrine and spirit of the Church of England, as to both these points, Rome and the Protestant churches. It would, indeed, be amusing, had we space for it, to contrast the respectful and affectionate language of these Tracts, with the plain and honest language of the Homilies and Reformers respecting Oxford's "Latin sister." *They* do not speak so lightly of her fall as these gentlemen would desire. They teach that she is the mother of abominations, the mystical Babylon, the antichrist, antichristian and idolatrous, "that she is so far wide of the true church, that nothing can be more;" that she is not "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets." They apply to her language of opprobrium and contempt which we do not care to repeat. These gentlemen say she is deserving "of our admiration, reverence, love and gratitude." Surely they are men of another spirit than their fathers, degenerate and apostate children. Again, as to the Protestant churches, the Oxford gentlemen, as we have seen, utterly repudiate all fellowship with them; they call on God to forbid that they should ally themselves with such "offspring of heresy and schism" against the "holy church" of Rome.\* Were such the language and spirit of the English Reformers? Every one knows that there was scarcely an individual among them who was not in familiar and affectionate correspondence with the Reformed churches on the continent; that they sought the aid and counsel of Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, Bullinger and others; that Cranmer had Bucer called to Cambridge, and Martyr to Oxford, to teach theology; that Jewell, in his correspondence with Bullinger and Martyr, after the accession of Elizabeth, laments that the queen would not allow the thorough reformation which they desired, but, he adds, "as to doctrine, we have gone to the quick, and are not a nail's breadth from you therein;" that native clergymen, presbyterially ordained on the continent, were admitted without objection to hold preferment in England, without re-ordination; and that as it regards foreigners, instances of the same kind occur down to the civil war.

\* Those who take the trouble to refer to the Tracts will see that we state fairly the meaning of their language.

Laud was formally reprov'd as late as 1604 by the University of Oxford, for maintaining that their could be no true church without bishops. Hallam, in his Constitutional History of England, vol. i. p. 540, says that the first traces of the absolute necessity of episcopacy, are to be found about the end of the reign of Elizabeth. Lord Bacon, writing about that time, says, "Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been so bold in open preaching, to use dishonourable and derogatory speech and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far [as though it was a thing unheard of before] as some of our men ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers." Vol. i. p. 382, quoted by Hallam, who adds, that "Cranmer and most of the original founders of the Anglican church, so far from maintaining the divine and indispensable right of Episcopal government, held bishops and priests to be the same order." Indeed, as we may have occasion to show, Cranmer and his associates went much further in this matter than Presbyterians are wont to go. Such is not the language of individuals only; it is the authorized and authoritative language of the standards of the Church of England. They define the church catholic to include 'all faithful men among whom the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered.' In the twenty-third article, speaking of those who are lawfully called to preach, it is said, "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This definition, Bishop Burnet tells us was drawn with a view to the several churches which had been differently reformed. In the 55th Canon, all ministers are told, "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the churches of England, Scotland and Ireland." Scotland was then, as now, Presbyterian. The fact is, that these high-church principles, as they are called, are not the principles of the Church of England, nor of her purest and best sons. They owe their origin mainly to Archbishop Laud, and belong to his peculiar school. This is virtually admitted by Prof. Keble himself, who says, "Hooker, as well as Laud, Hammond and Leslie, in the two next generations, regarded the order of bishops as being immediately and properly of divine right . . . but he, *in common with most of contemporaries*, shrunk



from the legitimate results of his own premises. . . . The next generation of divines entered on the subject, fresh from the discovery of the genuine remains of St. Ignatius.”\* It is here admitted that it was not until the generation after Hooker (i. e. during the reign of James and Charles I.), that the absolute necessity “of the apostolical commission to the derivation of sacramental grace” was inculcated. This admission is not confined to Professor Keble; these Tracts abound in complaints of the influence allowed to the foreign Reformers by those of England; of lamentations over the omissions of popish doctrines and ceremonies in the formulas of their church; of an earnest desire “to add to the articles” and catechism, and that too specially in reference to the “power of the church” and the apostolical succession. What does all this amount to, but an admission that the English Reformers regarded their brethren on the continent in a very different manner from that in which these Oxford gentlemen do, and that they entertained very different views of the doctrines on account of the omission of which such complaints are made? The truth is, that at the time of the glorious Reformation, there was a revival of pure doctrine and genuine religion throughout Europe. The great body of the Reformers in England and on the continent were of one mind and of one heart; they regarded each other as brethren, and felt that they were engaged in the same great work. The only question which seriously divided them was the nature of the eucharist, and this might have been accommodated, had it not been for the individual peculiarities of Luther; and on this point the English sided with the Swiss, in opposition to the Lutheran divines. As to doctrines, as Bishop Jewell says, there was not a nail’s breadth between them. Calvinistic divines (Bucer and Martyr), taught theology in the universities; Calvin’s Institutes was long their principal text book; and when Arminianism first arose, it excited as much opposition in England as it did in

\* See CHRISTIAN OBSERVER April 1837. The Observer remarks on this passage, “Mr. Keble’s admission, that the discovering of ‘the genuine remains’ of St. Ignatius, in comparatively modern times, was of sufficient potency to change the aspect of theology, and to stultify the articles of the church of England, by turning Hookerism, Cranmerism and Jewelism, into Laudism, is a far better comment upon his own sermon on tradition, than any that we could offer.” “We thank God,” the Observer says, “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.”

Holland. Archbishop Whitgift published the Lambeth Articles containing the strongest assertion of Calvinism, to withstand the progress of the new doctrine. James called Vorstius an atheist, and insisted on the states of Holland persecuting him and other Remonstrants. He had previously sent a delegation to sit in the synod of Dort, where Arminianism was fully condemned. A preacher in Oxford in 1623 having expressed himself dubiously on this point, was obliged to recant, and to maintain the theses—*Decretum prædestinationis non est conditionale—Gratia sufficiens ad salutem non conceditur omnibus*. It was the rise of Laud whom these Oxford gentlemen call “Father and Martyr,” and some in this country, “that eminent martyr for Christ and his church,” but whom the Christian Observer styles, “a Protestant inquisitor,” and “ecclesiastical tyrant,” that changed so suddenly the face of things—we say the *face*, because it was for a long time nothing more. The court became high church and Arminian, and a cruel persecution was set on foot and long continued against all who ventured to differ from the Archbishop. We must not allow ourselves to be led away from our subject by the tempting field for historical detail, which here opens before us. Suffice it to say, that a majority of the bishops and clergy, and an overwhelming majority of the nation continued faithful to the doctrines and spirit of the Anglican church. From the accession of James I. to the restoration of Charles II., there was not a single parliament in which those who were stigmatised as Puritans, had not the complete ascendancy. The high church and court party were a mere faction, inconsiderable in number, though all powerful from the possession of office, and the control of those tremendous engines of tyranny, the Court of High Commission, and of the Star Chamber. We are not to suppose that all, who ultimately sided with the king in the civil war, approved of his peculiar principles of ecclesiastical and civil government. Far from it. Strafford and Laud, the one the representative of arbitrary power, and the other of High Churchism, were both impeached at the very commencement of the parliament, and by the almost unanimous consent of the house. Under James I. when episcopacy was introduced into Scotland, Presbyterian ministers were consecrated bishops, without previous re-ordination as deacons and priests. (On the restoration of prelacy under Charles II., however, Leighton and Sharp, as high-church doctrines had obtained the ascend-

ancy, were re-ordained before consecration. But as soon as they reached Edinburg, they with two associates, who had been ordained before the Commonwealth, immediately consecrated six Presbyterian ministers without presuming to re-ordain them as presbyters.)\* When the unfortunate Charles was reduced to extremity, and the enemies of episcopacy had gained the ascendancy, and demanded the abolition of prelacy as the condition of peace, he pleaded his conscientious belief of the necessity of episcopal government in the organization of the church. To this scruple his own intimate friends and counsellors replied, "If by conscience it is intended to assert that episcopacy is *jure divino* exclusive, whereby no Protestant, or rather Christian church, can be acknowledged for such, without a bishop, we must therein crave leave wholly to differ. And if we be in an error we are in good company, there not being, as we have cause to believe, six persons of the Protestant religion of the other opinion."† This may have been an exaggeration; but it proves clearly enough that the high church party, even among the royalists, was a mere faction. We have not space, nor is this the occasion, for tracing the history of these principles. They have prevailed, sometimes to a greater, and sometimes to a less extent, in the English church, but they have no claim to be considered as the principles of the church itself. In opposing these principles we are not to be accused of hostility to the church of England. We love and venerate her Reformers, we claim communion with her martyrs, we rejoice in her testimony for the truth. We are, as Presbyterians, what the editors of the *Christian Observer* are, as churchmen. We prefer our own form, but we do not denounce theirs. We shrink from the idea of renouncing communion with the Holy Catholic church, the congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world. We pity, as burdened with the guilt of schism, "those who repudiate all fellowship" with the millions of God's people who do not believe in the truth and

\* See Burnet's History of his own times, vol. I. pp. 200, 201.

† Hallam vol. 2, p. 254. Poor Charles may have been sincere in this matter, he had been so long under the influence of Laud. Yet he had consented to the abolition of Episcopacy in Scotland, and in his letters he principally urges political reasons for his refusal. "Show me," he says, "any precedent where Presbyterian government and regal was together without perpetual rebellions. . . . And it cannot be otherwise; for the ground of their doctrine is anti-monarchical." He was constantly quoting the maxim of his father, "No bishop no king."

necessity of "Episcopal grace." If our high church friends wish to know how we feel when they unchurch and denounce us, we can inform them, by asking how they feel when they hear themselves excommunicated and denounced by the Romanists? We presume they feel neither alarm nor remorse; that there is a sentiment of pity awakened at the blindness and bigotry which such denunciations evince; a feeling of wonder that men, with any knowledge of the bible or sense of religion, can so exalt matters of form and organization above doctrinal truth and spiritual piety, can consider mint, anise and cummin as of more importance than judgment, mercy and faith. There is perhaps a little difference between the two cases. The denunciations of the Romanists come from a majority against a minority. But the reverse is the fact when high-church men denounce their fellow Protestants. And when this is done, as in this country, by a mere handful in the presence of the whole Christian community, there is an air of the absurd about the whole matter, which softens, without elevating the feelings which it excites.

It is time, however, to return to the Tracts themselves. We feel bound to substantiate the correctness of the general outline given above of the doctrines which they teach. This can be done at best in a very inadequate manner by detached quotations, and must in the present instance be done very briefly. We have already perhaps quoted enough to show the views of the Oxford writers on the church, which they consider the great fundamental doctrine. The importance of this doctrine is frequently and strongly asserted. Thus, in Tract 49, it is said, "Let it be considered that the restoration of a doctrine so evidently important in its bearings as that of the church, must necessarily produce a great change upon a system out of which it has been lost. We have been accustomed to a Ptolemaic theory of our spiritual system; . . . we find ourselves called upon to adopt an opposite theory, to take for the centre of our system that which we had been used to regard as a mere satellite about our own orb. No wonder if we feel our notions deranged; if every thing seems in a new place; that which before was primary, now made subordinate; and *vice versa*." It cannot be pretended that the doctrine of the church as taught in the standards of all the Protestant communions, has been lost out of the theological system of the great majority of the members of the Church of England; that is, that the church catholic is the



whole congregation of believers throughout the world, and a particular church is a branch of this general communion in which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered. This doctrine has not been lost, and is therefore not the one to be restored, and the restoration of which is to produce such a revolution in our system of religion. The church, according to these Tracts, is "a visible spiritual society, formed by Christ himself, a household over which he has appointed his servants and rulers to the end." There is nothing in this general statement either novel or startling. But we are taught, however, in the second place that we must not suppose that this means merely that "there is a number of sincere Christians scattered through the world," but "that there is on earth an existing society, apostolic as founded by the apostles; catholic because it spreads its branches in every place; i. e. the church visible with its bishops, priests and deacons." This church, thus organized, is the representative of Christ to the end of time. Thirdly, we are to believe in this visible episcopally organized society, because "Christ hath appointed it as the only way to eternal life. . . . Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation." Tract 2. The reason why communion with this church is so necessary is, that it is "the storehouse and direct channel of grace, a divine ordinance . . . to be approached joyfully and expectantly as a definite instrument, or rather the appointed means, of spiritual blessings." Vol. ii. p. 5. The visible church is thus "the channel of grace," not so much because its ministry preserve and preach the truth, as because they bear a commission from Christ to administer the sacraments. "The sacraments are in the hands of the clergy," and of a clergy episcopally ordained, no one has a right to take this authority on himself; "no command of an earthly king, no ordinance of an earthly legislature, could invest us with power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost . . . or over the things of the unseen world." "He alone is evidently entitled to confer the power of conveying, by the appointed means, the gifts of His Spirit, who himself, in the first instance, gave that Spirit to his church." Now, as the sacraments are *the* means of conveying justification and other gospel gifts, as these sacraments "are evidently in the hands of the church visible," it follows that, "as we betake ourselves to a dispensary for medicine . . . . in like manner we are to come to that one society,

to which Christ has entrusted the office of stewardship in the distribution of gifts of which He alone is the author and real dispenser." When tempted, therefore, to forsake the hallowed pale of this society, let us reply, "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art the minister and representative of Christ the Son of the living God." Tracts 5 and 11.

Such being the nature of the church, it is evident that the peculiar power belonging to it, and its ministry of conferring the gifts of the Holy Ghost, is to be attributed to the transmission of this mysterious prerogative in an uninterrupted line from Christ himself. Hence the apostolical succession is one of the most prominent subjects in these volumes. To understand this subject, it must be remembered that this succession does not consist in the mere regular and orderly sequence of properly appointed officers, analogous to the regular succession in a line of civil magistrates, but in the transmission by the laying on of hands, of a secret, mysterious and awful power, over the gifts of the Spirit and things of the unseen world. Ordination, therefore, is not a mere mode of appointing to office, but it is an ordinance for conferring grace, which, as it can come from no other than a bishop, is called "Episcopal grace." Hence we are told that "Ordination, or, as it is called in the case of bishops, consecration, though it does not precisely come within our definition of a sacrament, is nevertheless a rite partaking in a high degree of a sacramental character, and it is by a reference to the proper sacraments, that its nature can be most satisfactorily illustrated." The two points in which it partakes of this sacramental character, are, that it confers grace, and that its efficacy is not dependent on the moral character of the giver or receiver of the rite. "He who receives unworthily, or in an improper state of mind, either ordination or consecration, may probably receive to his own soul no saving health from the hallowed rite;" but this does not interfere with its validity. The grace or gift conferred is nothing less than the Holy Ghost, and power over his gifts. This is repeatedly and explicitly asserted. Thus, in this same Tract, speaking of worthiness, it is asked, "Who is a fit and meet dispenser of the gifts of the Holy Spirit?" "No earthly authority," it is said, "can compel him (a bishop) to lay his hands on what he may conceive an unworthy head . . . or arrogantly assume to itself the power to confer the Holy Ghost." In Tract 1, it is said, "we have confessed before

God our belief, that through the bishop that ordained us, we received the HOLY GHOST . . . are these words idle . . . or do they express merely a wish (which is surely far below their meaning), or do they not rather indicate that the speaker is conferring a gift? Surely they can mean nothing short of this.\* But whence, I ask, his right to do so? Has he any right, except as having received the power from those who consecrated him to be a bishop. He could not give what he had never received. It is plain that he but *transmits*; and that the Christian ministry is a succession—we have therefore . . . acknowledged the doctrine of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. And for the same reason, we must necessarily consider none to be *really* ordained who have not *thus* been ordained.”

The power of the priesthood resulting from this exclusive claim, and from this view of the nature of ordination, is of course tremendous, and is asserted by these writers with great boldness. The successors of the apostles, we are told, are the bishops. “They stand in the place of the apostles, as far as the office of ruling is concerned; and, whatever we ought to do, had we lived when the apostles were alive, the same ought we to do for the bishops. He that despiseth them, despiseth the apostles.” Tract 10. “They stand before their flocks as the authorized successors of the apostles; as armed with *their* power 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 actually saw him work miracles as St. Peter and St. Paul did.—I repeat, the bishops are apostles to us.—The meetings [Mr. Newman says there is nothing unkind or contemptuous in these tracts] have no head, they are all mixed together in a confused way. . . . Our Lord and Saviour confirms us with the Spirit of all goodness; the bishop is his figure and likeness . . . he 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. We do not wonder that the Observer asks, ‘How

\* Reference is here had to the Ordination Service, “Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained,” &c.

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 ?”

It is no part of our object to examine the grounds on which these extravagant claims are rested. These writers frequently reprove the spirit which calls for clear and decisive proof of their doctrines. They tell us, that the humble Christian is content to follow the slightest intimations of his Saviour’s will, to be guided by his eye, to rest satisfied with the crumbs which fall from his table. This is all very true. But when a system is advanced of such portentous character, and pressed on our belief as the condition of salvation, we must have scriptural reasons, or our faith will stand in ‘the wisdom of men,’ and not ‘in the power of God.’ We cannot be satisfied with being told “it is very clear, and there is no doubt about it.” We cannot consider such assertions as even crumbs of evidence. Tract 19 says, reasonably enough, “Men are sometimes disappointed with the proofs offered in behalf of some important doctrines of our religion; such especially as the necessity of episcopal ordination in order to constitute a minister of Christ.” To meet this difficulty we are told, “the faintest probabilities are strong enough to determine our conduct in a matter of duty.” As a specimen of these “faintest probabilities” reference is made to “the argument for the apostolical succession, derived from the ordination of St. Paul and St. Barnabas, Acts xiii: 2, 3.” A better specimen for faintness could hardly be selected. For in the first place Paul had been a preacher for several years before this supposed ordination, having exercised his ministry in Damascus, in Arabia, in Jerusalem, in Cilicia, and for a year in Antioch itself. In the second place, he over and over denies that he received his apostleship, or his ministerial office, from any other than Jesus Christ. It was neither ‘of man, nor by men.’ Yet Hooker, Hales, and others, would have us believe, for the sake of episcopacy, that the apostleship was conferred on him at this time by the laying on of the hands of men. In the third place, there was no apostle at Antioch to ordain him. If he was ordained at all, it was by the prophets and teachers, as ‘Simeon, that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrène, and Manaen,’ the lowest order of preachers. It was these who “ministered to the Lord,” and to whom the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul. This is surely a very faint argument for the absolute necessity for episcopal ordination. When men begin to for-



sake the scriptures for tradition, and dote about fables, they seem to lose the ordinary power of discriminating truth.

The great source of priestly power, however, is the possession of the exclusive right to administer the sacraments, and the exclusive possession of the power to render them efficacious. By their ordination by the hands of a bishop, the priests have been "intrusted with the keys of heaven and hell . . . and with the awful and mysterious privilege of dispensing Christ's body and blood," Tract 10; or as it is elsewhere expressed, "the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood." They alone have authority to admit any one to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness; the merit of Christ is applied through the sacraments which they only have the right to administer. These gentlemen say, that even on the ground of expediency, it is best to adhere to their church, for it is **THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS REALM WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE;** a sentence which they print in capitals for the sake of emphasis. The Papists never claimed higher powers for their priesthood than these writers arrogate to themselves and brethren. They claim the power of dispensing life and death, salvation or perdition, at pleasure.\*

The proofs of the extent of this priestly power, are necessarily involved in the evidence to be adduced of the correctness of the statement already given of their opinions of the nature of the sacraments.

\* To the popish "exaggerations," says the OBSERVER, "of priestly absolution, and the power of the keys, that frightful engine of despotism, the fulcrum of which was the doctrine maintained in these Tracts upon the apostolical authority, which every minister of Christ still possesses to bind and loose, the sacraments being the channels for the conveyance of divinc grace, and the priest who administers them having power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost,' 'power over the things of the unscen world;' a power never more arrogantly assumed by Rome herself, in the madness of her spiritual tyranny, when 'drunk with the blood of the saints,' than in such passages as the following, by Mr. Newman, Mr. Keble, and Dr. Pusey, who actually dare to write, '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 entrusted 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 who thus awfully presume to limit the virtue of the Redeemer's atonement, who substitute the pncance 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 Tetxel's trade): to all such presumptuous follies and unscriptural dreamings our Homilies reply as follows," &c. Christian Observer, March 1837, p. 152.

On this subject we are taught generally, as already quoted, that "the sacraments, and not faith, are the means of justification, and other gospel gifts," and in Tract 41, that "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." In Tract 73, p. 12, it is said, the sacraments are "the principal channels through which His (Christ's) merits are applied to individuals," . . . that, "regeneration, the communion of saints, the resurrection of the body (are) consequent on their administration." We are told in Tract 27, that it is "the nature of sacraments, that not only the name, but even the properties and effects of what they represent and exhibit are given to them." Accordingly, as water in baptism represents both the blood of Christ and the influences of the Spirit, to it are ascribed at once the forgiveness of sin, and the renovation of the heart. "The sacrament of baptism is not a mere sign or promise, but actually a means of grace, an instrument by which, when rightly received, the soul is admitted to the benefits of Christ's atonement, such as forgiveness of sin, original and actual, reconciliation to God, a new nature, adoption, citizenship in Christ's kingdom, and the inheritance of heaven—in a word regeneration. And next, baptism is considered to be rightly received, when there is no positive obstacle or hindrance to the reception in the recipient, such as impenitence or unbelief would be in the case of an adult; so that infants are necessarily right recipients of it, as not being capable of actual sin." Tract 76, p. 1. "Whether grace be given in and through the water, or only contemporaneously with it. . . . Whether baptism besides washing away past sin, admits into a state in which, for sins henceforth committed, repentance [penance?] stands in place of a sacrament, so as to ensure forgiveness without a specific ordinance; or whether the full and explicit absolution of sin after baptism is altogether put off till the day of judgment;" . . . these and similar questions are said to be points, about which the divines of the church of England differ. We shall see that the Tract writers teach that there is no certainty of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sins; and if we understand some of their statements they favour the theory that the water becomes "impregnated with a spiritual property,"\* to use the language of Comber, one of the

\* With regard to this point we may be mistaken, though we doubt it. The Christian Observer, however, says, "The Oxford-tract doctrine on sacramental

authors quoted in the *Catena Patrum*. In Tract 40 it is said, "Our Lord joined the two together—the high, mysterious, and spiritual doctrine of the Trinity, with the no less mysterious communication of grace by water baptism." One of the running titles of the Tracts on baptism, as we learn from the *Observer* is, "Reformed notions destroy the sacraments," and one of the heads of destruction specified is, "they deny that baptism is *the* means of remitting original sin, or of obtaining justification." "If men conceive of sacraments," it is said, "as external symbols, and acting through a moral operation, by representing to our souls the greatness of his love, his humiliation, his sufferings, and thus kindling our faith, and thereby uniting us with Him; then, and much more, will all the operations of the Holy Spirit be resolved into presenting to the mind outward motives." No believing Protestant denies that the sacraments are means of grace, or is disposed to limit the mode or measure of the operation of the Spirit in rendering them effectual. But Protestants do deny what these Tracts labour to establish, that the sacraments are the means, i. e. the ordinary and principal means of gaining access to the merits of the Saviour, so that there is "in general" no reception of the benefits of those merits either before or without them, that they constitute the keys of heaven and hell in the hands of the clergy, and give them "power over the gifts of the Holy Spirit;" that they uniformly

efficacy, we confidently assert is Romanist. The distinction which the Tracts make, to take it from the mazes of Popery, and to reduce it to a *via media*, misnamed Anglican, avails nothing. The Papists made the same distinction. At the Council of Trent the Dominicans insisted that the sacraments operated by inherent grace-conferring efficacy; the Franciscans said that the efficacy arises from God having attached it to them; whereupon long quarrels ensued, though each acknowledged *opus operatum* influence. Now we do not affirm that Dr. Pusey and his friends are Dominican, but only that they are Franciscan: and Dr. Pusey himself states that he holds the Bellarmine *opus operatum* view, which involves the Franciscan notion. If the Oxford friends are not Romanist, then are not Bellarmine and the Franciscans." May p. 322. Our collection of these Tracts, unfortunately, does not contain Dr. Pusey's three Tracts on baptism, much however is said on the subject in others of the series. While they teach clearly that the sacraments "convey grace," the mode in which they do it is left undetermined. There is an evident unwillingness to make any explanation which should lessen the mystery. That God should see fit to attend the penitent and believing performance of even an external duty, with the special influences of his Spirit is not so great a mystery. These Tracts, however, teach that the communication of grace by water baptism "is as mysterious as the doctrine of the Trinity." No less mysterious, they tell us, is "The virtue of the holy communion; how it conveys to us the body and blood of the Incarnate Son crucified, and how, by partaking it, body and soul are made spiritual." Tract 73, p. 12.

convey grace, in the absence of any actual moral impediment; or that Papists and the Church of England, to the exclusion of all Lutherans and Reformed, have the power of "imparting the Trinity in baptism."\*

That these Tracts teach that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the "holy communion," is not merely inferred from the expressions already quoted, in which they speak of "making the body and blood of Christ," of having "the mysterious privilege of dispensing" that body; or of their being the only church that have "the Lord's body to give his people," but it is fully and elaborately taught in Tract 27, which is a dissertation on the subject from the works of John Cosin, Bishop of Durham. "As to the *manner* of the presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the blessed sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries . . . . we leave it to the power and wisdom of our Lord, yielding a full and unfeigned assent to his words. Had the Romish maintainers of transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed . . . . a manner of presence, newly by them invented." "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 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. Yet our faith does not cause or make that presence, but apprehends it as truly and really effected by the words of Christ. . . . 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." The doctrine of transubstantiation is denied, yet it is admitted that "there is a conversion of the bread into the body of Christ, for . . . by virtue of the words and blessing of Christ, the condition, use, and office of the bread is wholly changed, that is, if common and ordinary, it becomes our mystical and sacramental food; whereby . . . . the true body of Christ is not only shadowed and figured, but also

\* CHRISTIAN OBSERVER, March p. 161.



given indeed, and by worthy communicants truly received. . . . This change, whereby supernatural effects are wrought by things natural, while their essence is preserved entire, doth best agree with the grace and power of God." "The words of Christ make the form of the sacrament to consist in the union of the thing signified with the sign, that is, the exhibition of the body of Christ with the consecrated bread, still remaining bread; by divine appointment these two are made one." Not merely the merits of Christ are represented, but "His very body that was crucified, and his blood that was shed for us, are truly signified and offered." "We confess the necessity of a supernatural and heavenly change, and that the signs cannot become sacraments but by the infinite power of God, whose proper right it is to institute sacraments in His church, being alone able to endue them with virtue and efficacy." This is a painful subject; strong as is the language of Calvin, and especially of Bucer in relation to it, arising partly out of the influence of their previous opinions, and partly, no doubt, from a strong desire to keep on terms with the Lutherans, (this was particularly the case with regard to Bucer, who was severely censured for his concessions), yet their doctrine was very different from that here presented. They did not hold to the real presence of the very body that was crucified, or admit any change in the elements which it required infinite power to effect; nor did they believe that these elements were "imbued with virtue and efficacy" so that "supernatural effects are produced by means natural." Professor Pusey's complaint that "Reformed notions destroy the sacraments" is of course an admission that his opinions are not those of the Reformed church.

Intimately connected with the subject of the nature of the sacraments, is the great question of justification. It is here that the Oxford Tracts make utter shipwreck; giving up, if not in words, at least in reality, the great doctrine of the Reformation, the restoration of which from the rubbish of popery was the greatest service ever rendered to the world by uninspired men. We have already seen that these Tracts teach that we are justified in baptism. This doctrine is expressed so frequently and plainly that the passages need not be again recited. As in an ordinary Christian community the great mass of the people are baptised in infancy, are they all to be considered as justified persons? The answers given to this question do not seem to be uniform. According to one mode

of representation they are; they are not only justified, but saints, the children of God, no matter how infidel their opinions, or how profligate their lives.\* But according to another view, baptismal grace may be lost and all its privileges forfeited. Those who sin, (we suppose, who commit any mortal, or deadly sin, for the system seems to demand the distinction, between venial and mortal sins), Mr. Newman says expressly "they have no right to appropriate again what was given them plenary in baptism." He does not deny them all hope, nor forbid their looking to Christ, but he does deny them all *confidence* that their post-baptismal sins are pardoned; that is a question the decision of which must be postponed until the judgment, all that is left for them in this world is "the baptism of tears" and "doubt's galling chain."

The doctrine then is, that the merits of Christ by which we are justified, are plenary given in baptism, together with that renovation of nature, and those aids of the Spirit which are requisite to our salvation. Should we sin after baptism, there remains no more sacrifice for us; the

\* "Talk," says the OBSERVER, "of the antinomianism of Crisp and Huntington! Let the reader find if he can, in all their writings, any passage so mischievous, so soul-deluding, so provocative of licentiousness, as the following remarks of Mr. Dodworth. To tell men avowedly living in every kind of profligacy, 'intemperance and lust,' and who even 'deny the fundamental doctrines of the bible,' that they are—not merely that they ought to be, but that they actually *are*—'faithful brethren in Christ Jesus;' 'saints,' though they scoff at the name; is morally polluting, and opposed to the whole genius of pure and undefiled religion." Some of the passages quoted from Mr. Dodworth are the following. He asks, "How is the efficacy of Christian baptism to be reconciled with the actual state of those who have been baptised?" The answer is, "We cannot see that a Christian is one who is risen again," but "he is spiritually, though not ostensibly or manifestly a new man." "The testimony of human observation is to be entirely and altogether set aside." "Think of addressing those who are living in every kind of worldly folly and frivolity . . . as saints, by a name which they themselves will ridicule. Think of addressing those as *faithful brethren in Christ Jesus* . . . who are addicted to intemperance and lust, or who may be denying the fundamental truths of the bible." "It can scarcely be a subject of surprise, that an inconsistency so palpable as this should forcibly strike the mind [and conscience too, we should think], and suggest a difficulty with respect to the initiatory rite of the Christian church." "It is a point to which, above all others, we must apply the Christian rule, We walk by faith, and not by sight. We have nothing but the bare word of God to rely upon." Observer, March, p. 181. Mr. Dodworth is said to be "a devout, amiable and zealous clergyman, who, having begun with Irving and Mr. Drummond in defending modern miracles, has found for the present a resting place in the system of the Oxford Tracts." He may be a very amiable man, but if he wrote the above extracts, he is certainly a very silly one. It is proper to say that we have met with nothing in the Tracts themselves, so absurd or so revolting. They are bad enough, but this is almost insane.

merits and mercy of Christ are indeed sufficient for our forgiveness, but no sacrament has been provided for again communicating those merits, or for assuring us of that mercy. The precious invitations and promises of the gospel are not addressed to post-baptismal sinners, who have therefore no right to appropriate them to themselves. "Dr. Gardiner;" (the famous Catholic Bishop of Winchester, under Henry VIII. and Mary) says the Christian Observer, "argued (see his well known letter to Fox) that as persons are now generally baptised, and therefore justified, in infancy, the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, even if it were in theory true, is of no greater practical importance to those who were born under the Christian system, and were therefore justified in baptism, and never did any works in our unjustified state, than to discuss (—we quote the illustration with pain, but it shows the profane levity with which this cardinal doctrine of the gospel has been too often treated—) whether, &c. &c. [the illustration we omit]. Professor Pusey does not adopt Popish Gardiner's profane levity of illustration, but he makes use of his argument as his own; thus directly fraternizing with Rome and rejecting Protestantism; for he says—Dr. Pusey we mean, not Dr. Gardiner, the professor of Hebrew at Oxford in the nineteenth century, not Chancellor Gardiner in the sixteenth, 'The article on works before justification is of much importance in clearing the system, by setting forth the relation to man's natural state and unassisted powers [very true, Dr. Gardiner would have echoed]: but to us individually, who have been born within it, (the Episcopal church) [good, good, exclaims Gardiner, *rem tetigisti*—it was just what I tried to teach your ignorant Reformers], and who were never left to our mere natural powers, having had original sin remitted to us through baptism in our infancy, and having then been justified and cleansed from all sin, and had the grace of Christ given, and fresh supplies pledged to us, the statement of the character of works done before justification and the grace of Christ does not apply . . . . it does not\* speak of a state in which we ever actually were." Neither do the calls or promises of the gospel apply to baptised persons. "He who is touched with a sense of our infirmities says, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest;'—but Professor Pusey interposes between

\* CHRISTIAN OBSERVER, Feb. p. 125, as we have not seen these Tracts on Baptism, we are obliged to take our extracts from the Observer.

Christ and the penitent, saying, 'the way of repentance must not be made so easy;' and holding the keys, to open or shut, to remit sins or to retain them, he does not see his way, he says, to apply to a penitent after baptism 'the gracious words which invited those who had never known Christ, and so had never forsaken him'— . . . yet, even with this gracious promise before him, Dr. Pusey does not think he is to admit this post-baptismal penitent to a joyful hope of pardon through Christ: he tells him, that having been baptised, 'he has no fresh baptism for remission of sins to offer; and therefore tears, and fasts, and pains, and ever enduring terrors, must do the rest. Oh! it is a dreadful doctrine! And if so dreadful in the hands of a Keble or a Pusey, what must it be when administered by priests of a sterner mould.'\*

It is obvious that this system involves the most unscriptural doctrines respecting the nature of sin. It supposes that after the renovation received in baptism, we may, in virtue of the aids of the Spirit, live without sin, or without such sin as shall forfeit the divine favour, or need the renewed application of the blood of Christ. "It is enough," says bishop Jebb, as quoted in Tract 76, p. 54, "for us to believe . . . that at the time of baptism, a new nature is divinely communicated, and gracious privileges are especially vouchsafed, in such measure and degree that, whosoever are clothed with this white garment, may, through his help, 'keep their baptism pure and undefiled for the remainder of their lives, never wilfully committing any deadly sins.'" If *deadly* means any thing here, it must mean grievous, or as the papists say *mortal*. In like manner Mr. Newman speaks of the baptised living without sin, and in his letter already referred to, he says, "When the Spirit takes up his abode in us [at Baptism], we have so superabounding and awful a grace tabernacled in us, that no other words described it more nearly than to call it an angel's nature." We can see no difference between this doctrine and that of the Romanists, except that the latter makes provision for the assured forgiveness of post-baptismal sins by the sacrament of penance. The council of Trent teaches that if the regenerated had sufficient gratitude towards God, to preserve the righteousness and grace given them in baptism, there would be no need for any further provision for the remission of sins; but since we are liable to fall into such sins, God has pro-

\* OBSERVER, May, p. 333.



vided *sacramentum pœnitentiæ, quo lapsis post baptismum beneficium mortis Christi applicatur*, i. e. the sacrament of penance by which the benefit of Christ's death may be applied to those who have fallen after baptism. These Tracts teach that for such sins, no provision is made, forgiveness is not absolutely hopeless, but there is no promise of it. For a first offence there is some comfort, "there is yet one plant left after the shipwreck of baptismal grace—not, says Dr. Pusey, what 'a modern class of divines' pretend, namely, 'the appropriation of the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer,' but 'a baptism of tears' and 'pains whereby we may be restored.'"\*

The reader will be surprised to hear after all this, that these writers still hold the doctrine of justification by faith. It is not, however, that previous doctrine which the true catholic and apostolic church in all ages, has expressed by those terms. "The article about justification does not apply to us; we are justified in baptism, by the faith of the church, which is involved in the sacrament. They do not speak of merit, or making ourselves worthy of justification, or of good works helping out the righteousness of God in Christ for effecting it; all this may safely be disallowed, and justification be predicated of faith, and not of works, by attaching it to baptism, in the virtue of the faith of the church, and not of the recipient. . . . Is it sufficient to tell the world that you believe the doctrine of justification by faith, when you mean by it something quite different to that which the expression conveys to a Protestant ear; something quite different from that which the whole body of the Reformers meant by it? . . . . We ought, however, to add, in justice both to Professor Pusey and to the Reformers, that though the article on Justification by Faith is grievously opposed to the

\* "The doctrine of the church of Rome upon these subjects [justification and post-baptismal sin], though it is in spirit that of these Tracts, is less terrific, because it makes repentance a sacrament; so that an authorized avenue of 'sacramental grace' is still afforded for the solace of the trembling penitent. The Tract writers indeed give the substance of penance, and the seal of absolution, but not in the full and consistent manner necessary to cohere with the other part of the system. . . . The Tract doctrine is Protestantism rejected, and popery spoiled. It yields the penitent neither the sacrament of penance, nor the scriptural appropriation of the blood of Christ." *Observer*, May, p. 332. In another part of the same note the *Observer* says, "We might apply the matter to the Oxford writers. What is your hope of salvation? Is it not that you were justified, cleansed, and renewed, in baptism; and that grace was then given you to work out your salvation; which grace you have not forfeited by sin; so that you are entitled to the covenanted mercies of God?" *OBSERVER*, May, p. 332.

Oxford Tract system . . . and though Professor Pusey considers that article as having been the cause of infinite mischief, by leading to 'the wildest antinomianism,' yet, that, on the whole—bountiful concession for an Oxford Professor to the glorious eleventh article of the Anglican church—it was '*innocently intended!*'"

That this is a fair exhibition of the doctrine of these Tracts on the all important subject of justification, may be inferred not only from the passages quoted, and from the authority of the Observer as a witness, but from the concession of Mr. Percival, one of the most conspicuous and accredited writers of the Oxford school. He says, in a letter published in the London Record, Oct. 2, 1837, "Allowing certain explanations there is nothing in the Tridentine statement (about justification) which cannot fairly be reconciled with gospel doctrine." Now as this, and the sufficiency of the scriptures, which these gentlemen also reject, were the two great doctrines in dispute between the Papists and Reformers, and in comparison with which all other points of difference were of minor importance, can there be a more distinct avowal of adherence to the anti-protestant faith, than is contained in this declaration of Mr. Percival, and in the extracts already given from the other Oxford writers? What is that protestanism worth which is Tridentine on the doctrine of justification, and on the rule of faith? The great secret of popish power, the great source of the long continued degradation of the hearts and consciences, the lives and fortunes of men under the Romish priesthood, was this very Oxford doctrine of baptismal justification. If after the plenary application of the merits of the Redeemer, made in that ordinance, there is no right remaining to the penitent to appropriate those merits afresh by faith, the door of heaven is closed against almost all mankind. For who has failed to commit, and that wilfully, since his infant baptism, not one, but many sins, which his own conscience, and the word of God, pronounce grievous? The only hope now is in pains, penances, alms, fastings, and priestly absolution. Who but a priest can tell when these penances are adequate—when our alms to the poor, or to the church, are sufficiently ample? He has the key of the kingdom of heaven. "As the encysted venom, or poison-bag," says Coleridge, "beneath the adder's fang, so does this doctrine lie beneath the tremendous power of the Romish Hierarchy. The demoralizing influence of this dogma, and that it curdled the very life blood in the veins of christendom,

it was given to Luther beyond all men since Paul, to see, and feel, and promulgate.”\* Yet this very doctrine, Oxford professors, in the heart of Protestant England, are now assiduously labouring to revive.

The only other doctrine belonging to this system, which it remains for us to illustrate, is that which relates to the rule of faith. It may indeed be taken for granted that men who hold such a system, would never be content with the scriptures. It is impossible that any one who adopts the principle that ‘The bible, the bible alone is the religion of Protestants’ could be led to admit such opinions. These Oxford gentlemen do not admit this principle. Dr. Pusey states in a passage already referred to, “Our controversy with Rome is not an *a priori* question on the value of tradition in itself, or at an earlier period of the church, or of such traditions, as, though not contained in scripture, are primitive, universal, and apostolical, but it is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but, on the contrary, repugnant to scripture, are not to be received.” The whole question between Protestants and Papists is, whether there is any unwritten traditionary rule of faith or practice now binding on the church? The former say there is not, the latter say there is. The Oxford gentlemen side with the Papists; and they may safely be left to contend among themselves, what that traditionary rule teaches, and what it does not. They go so far, that Protestants can have no interest in this ‘private difference’ between them and their Latin sister. “I make no scruple,” say they, in the language of Hammond, “to grant that apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as apostolical writings, are equally the matter of that Christian’s belief, who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as the one is apostolical writing, so the other is apostolical tradition.”† “At the Reformation,” it is said, Tract 45, “the authority of the church was discarded by the spirit then predominant among the Protestants, and scripture was considered as the sole document both for ascertaining and proving our faith.” This spirit is censured throughout the Tract, which is entitled “Grounds of our Faith;” we are told that even if Episcopacy were not at all mentioned in scripture, “it would be our duty to receive it” on the ground of tradition. In Tract 34, Tertullian is quoted with appro-

\* Aids to Reflection, p. 190.

† See Vol. 3. pp. 13 and 15, for the above cited passage.

bation, who says, "Let us examine, then, how far it is true that an apostolical tradition itself, unless written in scripture, is inadmissible." In illustration he refers to the ceremonies attending baptism; to the fact that the candidate renounced the devil, his pomp, and his angels; was plunged in the water thrice; after coming out, he tasted a mixture of milk and honey, and abstained for a week from his daily bath; and then adds, "If you demand a scriptural rule for these and such like observances we can give you none . . . tradition directs," and that is sufficient. Again, Basil is quoted in support of the same doctrine, who says, "Of those articles of doctrine and preaching, which are in the custody of the church, some come to us in scripture itself, some are conveyed to us by a continuous tradition in mystical depositories. Both have equal claims on our devotion, and are received by all, at least by all who are in any way churchmen. . . . To take any obvious instance; which apostle has taught us in scripture to sign believers with the cross? Where does scripture tell us to turn to the east in prayer . . . moreover, we bless the water of baptism, and the oil for anointing," &c. &c. "The Catholic ritual," we are told in the same Tract, "is a precious possession; and if we who have escaped from Popery, have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question whether we are not like men who recover from some grievous sickness with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing!" Mr. Hook, in his sermons before the University of Oxford, as we learn from the *Christian Observer*, March, p. 146, teaches, "'We are neither to trust to the bible only,' nor to 'transmissive religion only,' but are to combine 'the reciprocal influence and conjoined operation of both—the one suggesting the other confirming.' . . . We are indeed, to pray and study, 'but let us place all under the supervision and correction of Catholic tradition.'" Mr. Keble, in his famous visitation sermon, goes if possible still further. According to the *Christian Observer*, May, p. 326, "He argues that church tradition is 'parallel to scripture,' not 'derived from it;' in proof of which he quotes some of the Fathers; and that 'it fixes the interpretation of disputed texts' 'by authority of that Holy Spirit which inspired the oral teaching of which such tradition is the record,' so 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;' tradition being 'the original gift,' and the written word only something almost su-



perfluous—for what other meaning can we put upon the words ‘over and above?’” In the course of his sermon he quotes the famous passage from Chillingworth, beginning, “The bible, the bible only is the religion of Protestants,” and adds, “It is melancholy, but instructive, to reflect that the writer of these sentences is credibly reported to have been an Arian, or near it, before he died.” The homilies of the Church of England on this subject say, “Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not in the stinking puddles of men’s traditions, devised by men’s imagination, for our justification and salvation; for in holy scripture is fully contained what we ought to do and what to eschew.” Mr. Newman gets over this by saying the homilies speak of men’s traditions, whereas he contends for God’s. This must make a Papist smile. Does not he contend for tradition as being from God? The homilies do not contrast one kind of tradition with another, but tradition with the bible. A man must be very hard pressed before he can have recourse to such evasions as this. On the authority of tradition these gentlemen are for re-introducing the whole of the Catholic ritual, bating the corruptions of the middle ages; the ‘offering of the elements to God,’ since, according to the primitive church, “the offering of the altar was intercessory;”<sup>\*</sup> and various other superstitious observances. See what they quote from Tertullian and Basil as to the teachings of tradition. But this is a small part of the evil. Tradition is to fix the interpretation of scripture, and even to correct and limit its declarations: thus Dr. Pusey quotes Hermas to prove that there is no repentance for sin, or at least, a second sin, after baptism, and admits that this “limits very awfully what their (the apostles) written teaching has left undefined.”<sup>†</sup> We know not how far sincerity of conviction, and goodness of intention can free men from the charge of dreadful wickedness in thus presuming to limit the invitations and promises of the gospel. Those assurances of free forgiveness, which every sinner needs, it is said, are not addressed to those who have been

\* See Vol. 1, Tract 34.

† The words of Hermas are “I have heard from some teachers, that there is no other repentance than that when we descend into the water and receive remission of sins. . . . And he [the Angel of Repentance, reader!] said unto me, ‘Thou hast heard rightly.’ Hermas admits that ‘if any be tempted of the devil to sin, he has *one* repentance;’ and Dr. Pusey accordingly acknowledges one repentance after baptism, more would be “very rare, if not altogether hopeless.” See Observer, March, p. 148.

baptised:—*they* have been forgiven; for them, there is no longer ‘a sacrifice to lay upon the altar.’ Thus almost the whole of christendom is cut off from any hope of salvation founded upon the promises of God. Tradition is further made necessary to prove satisfactorily, infant baptism, the observance of Sunday, the doctrine of the Trinity, and especially Episcopacy, which it is admitted is “not *obtruded* upon us” in the bible.\*

Such then is the system of the Oxford Tracts. The church is the storehouse and channel of grace; the sacraments are the instruments of conveying this grace to individuals; these sacraments are in the hands of the clergy episcopally ordained, who alone have the awful and mysterious power of conferring the gifts of the Holy Ghost; men are justified in baptism, and for sins committed after baptism, they must do the best they can; repentance for a second offence is rare, if not altogether hopeless; the body and blood of Christ are really present in the eucharist, and in some mysterious way render our souls and bodies spiritual; the rule of faith and practice is the written and unwritten word of God, the latter interpreting, limiting and correcting the former. Whether this system is popery or not, is a mere dispute about a word. If by popery is meant, the acknowledgement of the supreme authority and jurisdiction (not mere primacy) of the Pope, and the validity of all the decrees of the council of Trent, then it is not popery. But if popery means the leading characteristic features of that system of doctrines against which the Reformers struggled and protested, then it is popery. The vital spirit of that mystery of iniquity is here. The power of the clergy, the efficacy of the sacraments, the method of justification, the rule of faith, are the same in both systems. The one has more errors than the other, but both are equally at variance with the scriptures, and with the Reformers, and equally destructive of evangelical religion and liberty of conscience.

To what extent this system has gained favour, either in the Church of England, or among Episcopalians in this country,

\* James II. when duke of York, told Bishop Burnet, that the reason of his becoming a Papist was, that he heard so much from the English divines “of the authority of the church, and of the tradition from the apostles, in support of episcopacy,” he considered that other traditions might be taken on the word of the Catholic church, as well as episcopacy on the word of the English, and he therefore thought it “reasonable to go over to the church of Rome.” Burnet’s History of his own Times, vol. 1, p. 245.

we are unable to say. As to England, we are led to infer from various circumstances that its converts are already numerous. The preface to the first volume of these Tracts speaks of the doctrines which they advocate as having almost passed into oblivion. The preface to the second, rejoices in the great change already produced in public sentiment on these points; and that to the third volume speaks still more confidently. Some of the leading organs of the high-church party, as the *British Critic*, the *Church of England Magazine*, &c. have endorsed the Oxford writers, and their doctrines, as to some points at least, and without reservation, as far as we have observed, as to others. Besides, the alarm expressed by the leaders of the evangelical party, who consider this developement of popery in the church, as by far the greatest danger which it has to contend with, would seem to indicate that these opinions are pretty widely extended. As to our own country, we are not in the way of knowing much. The Churchman defends the doctrine of baptismal justification, (the root of the whole evil) and laughs at the fears of the *London Observer* about Oxford popery. It defends and praises Archbishop Laud, a papist, (in the true sense of the word explained above) and a persecutor hardly second in cruelty to St. Dominic. The *Burlington Missionary* seldom ventures to be doctrinal. Its soft praises of Professor Keble, "as the sweetest spirit of the age," of "the eloquent and excellent Newman," disclose clearly enough which way its guiding spirit tends.\* That the system will spread

\* Perhaps our readers, if they can prevail upon themselves to peruse the following passage from the *Missionary*, may form some conjecture of the doctrines of that periodical. Complaining of the congregation remaining seated during the administration of baptism, the *Missionary* says, "This service commences with an exhortation to the whole congregation to call upon God; and yet we know of a congregation where the invitation is almost wholly disregarded, and while another is added to the sacramental host of God's elect, while a soul is born of water and the Spirit, while the water and the blood flow afresh from the side of the adorable Redeemer, while the Holy Ghost hovers over the font to sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin, the people, with a few honourable exceptions remain seated." For bad taste and irreverence we can bring no parallel to this passage; but for extravagance the following quotations from one of Mr. Newman's sermons may fairly dispute the palm with it. The reason, he says, why the Virgin Mary has not been "more fully disclosed to us in the celestial fragrance and beauty of the spirit within her," is that "it is too high a privilege for sinners like ourselves to know the best and innermost thoughts of God's servants . . . how is it possible that we should bear to gaze on the creature's holiness in its fullness . . . it is in mercy to us that so little is revealed of the blessed Virgin." "Christ derived his soul and body from her." "What, think you, was the sanctity and grace of that human nature of which God formed his sinless son; knowing, as we do, that what is born of the flesh is

both in England and in this country we have no doubt. There has always been a leaven of popery in the Episcopal church, which is to be attributed in a great measure to the political circumstances, of a 'peculiarly malignant character,' under which it was reformed. This leaven has continued to work, sometimes more, and sometimes less actively. Apart from the predisposition for these opinions arising from this source, there is no doubt weight in the remark of the Observer, "That the system of the Oxford Tracts is likely to find abettors among weak and ignorant clerics, who understand little of the matters at issue, but fancy there is something very dignified and ecclesiastically aristocratical in assuming the powers asserted for them in these Tracts." There is another and much more respectable class, among whom this system will obtain favour. It consists of sentimental religionists, whose devotion must be kindled through the imagination; and of those also, who for any reason, are led to read and reverence the fathers more than the scriptures. The danger arising from this source to the Church of England is far from being imaginary. Should the principles of these Tracts prevail, the whole evangelical party will join in its overthrow. The sooner the nation abolishes *such* a church, says the Observer, the better. If the time should come for carrying out the second (or retrograde) Reformation, for which these Oxford writers are so anxious, the true Protestants must leave the church. They have as much as they can bear already in the baptismal, communion, and burial services. If to these are to be added baptismal justification, sacramental and episcopal grace of the *opus operatum* character, and other peculiarities of this system, they must do as their fathers did, protest and dissent, even should it cost them their lives. Every thing gained at the Reformation is at stake in this controversy, and the duty of separation from Oxford is as imperative as it was three hundred years ago, to separate from Rome. The circumstances of the times greatly enhance the dangers of which we are speaking. Had Laud lived under Charles the second, instead of under his father and grandfather, he might have advocated and enforced his system without bringing either himself or his church to destruction. It was his misfortune and folly to be high-church and papistical, while the current of public feeling was increasingly in the opposite direction. Every parliament re-

flesh, and that none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" See OBSERVER, April, p. 246.



monstrated against ecclesiastical abuses and popish practices, every edict of the court confirmed and increased these causes of complaint. In this conflict it required no prophet to predict the result. In like manner, at the present day, public feeling in England is for civil and religious liberty, and against the assumptions and abuses of the church. In direct antithesis to the spirit of the age, rises up the spirit of Oxford, pushing the claims of the church and the clergy to the extreme of popish arrogance; becoming more exclusive and denunciatory as the necessity for conciliation increases. What must be the result of a conflict of a small minority,\* insolent and encroaching, against the body of the nation? If this minority should go on to array against itself not only the opposition of dissenters, but of all who retain any love for the doctrines of the Reformation, and the cause of religious liberty, the doom of the church can be neither doubtful nor distant. That liberty as well as truth is involved in this conflict we think is very plain. The principles of these Tracts have never been combined with zeal and power without leading to persecution. The men who are the apologists and eulogists of Laud, whether in this country or England, are worthy of no more confidence when they claim to be friends of civil and religious liberty, than those advocates of toleration, who are forever praising the inquisition. We have no faith in the professions of either. Our hope and prayer are, that God would so revive pure religion, both in the Church of England and her American daughter, that this baneful spirit of popish superstition and intolerance may be effectually extinguished; and the whole body of the Reformed be united in one great brotherhood, as in the days of Cranmer and Calvin.

---

ART. VI.—*Physical Theory of Another Life.* By the Author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm.* New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1836. pp. 278.

WERE it indispensable to the usefulness of all speculations on the powers and conditions of man that these speculations

\* Even the nominal members of the Church of England are less than one third of the population; about four million out of thirteen. The high-churchmen are very careful to place the duty of establishing a particular church on the ground that it is the true one, not that it is the church of the majority. *British Critic*, No. 43, p. 226.