[Just as the 2nd edition of this pamphlet was going through the press, the news arrived from England that Dr. Pusey had been suspended from preaching in the University of Oxford for two years. After this, it will scarcely be proper to give to the vagaries of Dr. Pusey and his followers the name of *Oxford* Divinity; inasmuch as Oxford disowns it. The *N. Y. Observer* suggests that the system be called "*Newmania*" from Mr. Newman, its most active abettor. Either this name, or "*Puseyism*," will be now the most proper appellative.]

PUSEYISM OR NEWMANIA,

EXHIBITED FROM THE DIVERSE WRITINGS

OF

BISHOP DOANE & BISHOP M'ILVAINE,

TOGETHER WITH

SOME REMARKS ON APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION—THE ABUSE OF LUTHER AND CALVIN—AND THE LITURGY AS A PRESERVATIVE OF DOCTRINAL PURITY.

BY

A PRESBYTERIAN.

[The following strong testimony from Mr. Newman, the Ajax of the new sect, must be added to that on page 65, showing that a Liturgy has never preserved doctrinal purity or unity in the English Church:

"In the English Church we shall hardly find ten or twenty neighboring clergymen who agree together; and that, not in the non-essentials of religion, *but as to what are its elementary and necessary doctrines*; or as to the fact, whether there are any necessary doctrines at all—any distinct and definite faith required for salvation."—*Newman on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, p. 294.

MODE OF OXFORD OPERATION.

DESCRIBED BY BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Should we conceive of the grand enemy, actually employing a band of men, concealed under profession of Protestants, (and we may do so for the sake of illustration, without offence) to lay open a secret road for Popery, into the very citadel of the Protestantism of England, we could readily understand that they would select the most *gradual* means, as the most *effectual*; the most *noiseless* and *unseen*, as the most *ensnaring*; that they would seem to be great opposers of Romanism, in some points, while insinuating it in others; would break ground at a distance, where they would be least feared and remarked; get their position fixed in peace, 'while men slept;' then cautiously commence approaches, gradually familiarizing the watchers upon the walls with the sound of their working, and never putting forth a new approach, till the novelty of the former was forgotten. We can readily conceive that the weapon of such a siege would not be as the Roman Catapult, hurling, in open day, its bolts and fiery darts. Some Christian Archimedes, with the bright mirror of the word, would soon burn up the engine and put the workers to confusion. But the weapon would be the *pick* of the sapper, digging at the base; and the foundation selected would be that of the bastion, which, while in reality the key of the fortress, *is least known in that importance to the multitude*, and therefore the least watched; and their object would be, like that of the gun-powder plot, under the Senate-House and Throne, to subjugate the whole, in the ruin of the head; and could they only persuade some honored and trusted men of the city, under the sincere supposition, on their part, that they were only searching after *hid treasures of Antiquity*, or endeavoring to effect some useful *restoration* in the old walls of a venerable monument of ancient prowess, *to do the digging for them*, till they themselves could work unseen in the mine, it would indeed be great gain. By and by, it would be seen that a portion of the wall was fallen—then another, but each with such interval, that all lookers-on had grown familiar with the sight of the first dilapidation, before the second was permitted. By and by, that bastion is in ruins, and the city at the mercy of the enemy, but all has gone on so gradually and imperceptibly that it excites but little apprehension." p. 30.

Doane, George Washington, Bp.

"ONE FAITH:"

OR

BISHOP DOANE vs. BISHOP M'ILVAINE,

ON

OXFORD THEOLOGY;

EXHIBITED IN EXTRACTS FROM THEIR WRITINGS.

TOGETHER WITH

SOME REMARKS ON APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION—THE ABUSE OF LUTHER AND CALVIN—AND THE LITURGY AS A PRESERVATIVE OF DOCTRINAL PURITY.

BY

A PRESBYTERIAN.

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."—*Eph.* iv. 5.
"I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it."
1 *Cor.* xi. 18.

Second Edition, with a few alterations.

Burlington:
J. L. POWELL, PRINTER.
1843.

THE CONTROVERSY IS FORCED UPON US.

"At length, however, it was thought expedient by some, that the controversy should be set up in the Church of this land, and that the publications on *one* side, viz: that of the Oxford Divines, should have a re-print here. Hence the far-famed "*Tracts for the Times*" were issued from the press in New York, preceded by the promise of the re-print of a large selection of other English publications on the same side of the question. During the progress of these works, the most zealous efforts have been made to commend the peculiarities of Oxford divinity to the diligent reading and confidential reception of the clergy and laity of this country. Thus has the controversy been forced upon those, who, while the publications were confined to a transatlantic Church, and only introduced among us by scanty importations, would have been content to leave it with those to whom it especially belonged, however deeply convinced themselves, that Oxford divinity was most justly accused."—***Bishop M'Ilvaine***, p. 10.

"I feel the importance of that Litany '*That it may please thee to beat down Satan beneath our feet.*' The signs of the times seem to indicate that the Church of England, as it has always been the strong hold of truth, is now the grand object of a special effort, in these last days, of the Ruler of the darkness of this world."—*Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 23.

"The time seems at hand, when we shall have to retreat upon the strongholds of our faith; when they that teach, and they that learn, and they that keep the watch-tower, or go forth to the battle-field, will be compelled to do for a *declining Church*, what for an advancing one the Apostle forbids to be done: to maintain 'the principles of the doctrine of Christ' instead of 'going on unto perfection;' to 'lay again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God;' *in order to preserve and strengthen and encourage those who stand, if we may not renew again unto repentance those that have fallen away.*"

INTRODUCTION.

I. The *occasion* of this Compilation on Oxford Theology.

The Compiler of these extracts having recently had occasion to examine Bishop M'Ilvaine's work on Oxford Theology, (one of the ablest, most interesting and instructive works of the age) was struck at once with the total and irreconcilable dissimilarity between his views and those of Bishop Doane. This led to a re-perusal of Bishop Doane's large pamphlet, ("Brief Examination") in connection with Bishop M'Ilvaine's book; and the result was the marking of a large number of *parallel** passages. These are collected together in the following pages.

II. The *object* of this Compilation.

1. To exhibit Oxfordism and Romanism in contrast with evangelical doctrine —a matter of great importance in these times of Popish effort, and of crafty, Tractarian theology.

2. To beseech those prelates and others, who boast of "one church," "one faith," "one Apostolic succession," &c., not to chaunt their plea of "UNITY" with notes of discord. Silence would be far more becoming, during the continuance of "divisions" among them, which are as serious as ever afflicted any Church, in any age.

3. To urge Christians of all "denominations" to renew their efforts to prevent the spread of Popery, or its equivalent, within the limits of the communities in which Providence has placed them.

III. The *manner* of this compilation.

1. The sentences are generally given *verbatim et literatim* from the two writers. In a few instances, abbreviations are made, without affecting the sense.

2. In some cases, the words of authors, whom the writers *quote with approbation*, are inserted in connection with their own. This is done to bring out their respective views more fully, and is always made known to the reader.

3. The quotations are taken from passages, which discuss *the same subject*; and consequently the passages quoted are truly "parallel passages."

4. The works quoted are "Bishop Doane's Brief Examination," and "Bishop M'Ilvaine on Oxford Divinity," unless otherwise mentioned.

In conclusion, the writer may be permitted to state that the compilation is made without intending the slightest disrespect, personally, towards either of the two divines, thus placed in *antithetical juxtaposition*. Although the Compiler very decidedly agrees with one, and "dissents" from the other, he considers himself (as the moderator of the Presbytery) quite impartial in the management of the discussion.

The remarks inserted by the Compiler, to illustrate various topics, are printed in different type, and run across the page.

Burlington, N. J., January 12, 1842.

---

* "Parallel" may be understood here in its original sense. The views of the two writers, however *indefinitely* extended, *never meet*.

TO THE CITIZENS OF BURLINGTON, N. J.

OF "ALL DENOMINATIONS" OF CHRISTIANS,

THESE PAGES,

CONTAINING EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS

OF BISHOP DOANE, THE GIFTED AND DISTINGUISHED "RECTOR OF

ST. MARY'S CHURCH,"

AND

OF BISHOP M'ILVAINE, WHOSE BIRTH-PLACE WAS OUR CITY AND

WHOSE FAME IS "IN ALL THE CHURCHES,"

—DIOCESANS, BOTH WELL KNOWN IN THIS COMMUNITY—

ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED.

BISHOP DOANE.

"My confidence in the doctrinal integrity of the Oxford writers continues unshaken."—*Br'f Ex.* p. 183.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Their mode of representing the way of Salvation is "another gospel" to us; another to the Church to whose doctrines we are pledged."—*Ox. Div.* p. 509.

OXFORD THEOLOGY.

In the following pages, the reader may expect to find a brief view of the Roman, Oxford and Protestant systems of religion, in reference to various fundamental points. The comparatively little difference between the Roman and Oxford systems, and the vast difference between both and that of the Reformers, will abundantly appear from Bishop M'Ilvaine's remarks, during the progress of the discussion.——The opinions of the two distinguished divines, from whose writings extracts are made, are classified under the theological divisions, characteristic of the Popish controversy. Their *general opinions* in regard to the "Oxford movement" and its *Popish tendencies* are first given, as introductory to the survey of the system.

General opinion of the Oxford Tractarians.

BISHOP DOANE.

"As Mr. Palmer says, 'the learned and religious authors of the Tracts for the Times need no advocacy but their own.'" p. 17.

There is a "vast amount that is most timely and most excellent in these calumniated writings." p. 10.

"The Oxford writers are such, for piety, integrity, holiness, heavenly-mindedness, charity, as would adorn the purest age the Church has ever known." p. 5.

"Before the Oxford Tracts had been *read* at all, the Trojan horse was not regarded as a more pernicious portent." p. 158.

"A portion of them were reprinted; and the well-informed said at once, 'This is not new! We knew all this before! These are the old Church principles, stated with fairness, and carried out to their just conclusions!'" p. 158.

"I am distressed by the unworthy fears, and premature misgivings, and

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"I am fully persuaded that with a truly Protestant communion, the most direct refutation of Oxford Divinity is itself." *Pref.* p. 11.

"It would be singular indeed if works so voluminous should not contain a great deal of useful knowledge. Read Cardinal Bellarmine's Defence of Popery! May not as much be said of that learned champion of the Decrees of Trent!" p. 12.

"The whole history of the Church warns us against forgetting that very good and sincere men may set on foot great errors—and thus inflict an injury of which worse men would not be capable." p. 25.

"Ten years of open attack around the walls of Troy effected nothing. But one day's delusion among the wardens at her gates; the not examining what lay concealed under an apparent *act of religion*, betrayed the city." p. 30.

"What the articles and homilies so distinctly teach, that system directly denies, most earnestly condemns, and most indignantly casts away." p. 343.

"I am deeply impressed with the grave importance of the errors, and

Bishop Doane.

equivocating censures of those, whose indolence has kept them ignorant, and whose timidity distrusts the truth." p. 181.

"The summons to the ancient faith, the ancient discipline, the ancient worship; the impulse given to ancient piety, and ancient holiness, and ancient charity—these will remain as blessings to mankind, when every name that has been mixed up in this strife of tongues shall be forgotten." *English Sermon*, p. 39.

"To the multitude of honest Christians, who love the truth, and who are naturally anxious at the appearance of division and disquiet, it may suffice to say that there is no ground for anxiety." p. 182.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

probable evil consequences to the Church, of Oxford Divinity." p. 1.

"We must take heed: there may be much restoration of what is *old* in this system, but it may be *old error*, wearing a venerable aspect to some, because antiquated; and speaking words of wisdom to some, because, like the prayers of some, in an *unknown tongue*." p. 104.

"In view of the tendencies of Oxford divinity, I cannot question that its certain results, if time and room be allowed, will be the driving of true holiness from God's house, and the surrounding of its altars and crowding of its courts, with the 'wood, hay and stubble' of a dead formality, which the Lord, when he cometh, will destroy with the breath of his mouth." p. 537.

Whoever reads the preceding quotations will begin to *suspect* that one of these divines sympathizes with the Tractarians, and that the other is determined to bear a strong testimony against them.

On the Popish tendency of Oxfordism.

The blessings of the Reformation, brought about, under God, by Luther, Cranmer, Calvin, &c., are so great and inestimable, that any system which tends to Popery, will be generally discountenanced by Protestants, as a fearful and calamitous retogradation. Hence, the only way to encourage the progress of Oxfordism in Protestant communities is to deny, or conceal, its Papistical affinities. This denial, however, does not always succeed.

"For the Oxford writers, nothing need be asked, but that they be read

Just in proportion as this is done, the outcry against them will be diminished. Not that all agree with them. Far from it! But that the *charge of Popery*, or heresy, is seen at once to be ERRONEOUS, or MALICIOUS." p. 158.

"The impression is produced on the minds of the truculent on the one hand, and of the timid on the other, of some great overwhelming *crisis*, as if the Reformation was about to retrograde!" p. 181.

"I have devoted a long time and a great deal of pains to the study of the system.

And I am constrained to say that every further step has produced but a deeper and deeper conviction on my mind, that (whatever the intention or supposition of those who maintain it) it is a systematic abandonment of the vital and distinguishing features of the Protestant faith, and a systematic adoption of the very root and heart of Romanism." p. 14.

"The difference between this divinity and the true divinity, for which our Reformers gave themselves to death, is a difference of *great vital doctrine*, not of one doctrine merely but of the system of doctrine, from corner-

Bishop Doane.

"Oxford broadsides have demolished the supremacy of the Pope, and transubstantiation (as she holds it, with an anathema on all who do not see it just as she does) and made her out to be in schism, in her relation to the Anglo-Catholic Church! A pretty Popery indeed without supremacy and transubstantiation! A very harmless monster truly! A Popery without a Pope!" p. 24.[1]

"This alone must quite suffice to do away forever the suspicion of Popery," p. 22. this outcry against the Oxford writers, as teaching Popery!" p. 29.

"Would it not be better to agree with the Quarterly Review, that they who condemn the Oxford writings, as favoring Popery, 'are speaking in utter ignorance.'" p. 35.

"Their general tendency was not (as some have imagined) to establish the dominion and superstitions of Rome, but to purify and invigorate the Church of England, and to edify the whole Catholic Church." p. 16.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

stone to roof—a difference which makes so great a gulf between, that according to the Oxford Divines themselves, it makes the one side, or the other, '*another gospel.*'" p. 178.

"The fact that these divines have written with learning against some of the more offensive and *inconvenient* developments of Popery, (for the claim of Papal Supremacy would certainly be quite *inconvenient* to the clergy of England, if allowed) puts them in the precise condition, from which, if they be wrong . . . . they will operate the more covertly and dangerously upon the Protestant community around them." p. 29.

"It is little else than Popery restrained;" *Pref.* 12—"essentially Romish divinity;" p. 18—"it is of the house and lineage of Popery;" p. 15—"not only Romanism in its essence, but will become Romanism in full manifestation." p. 18. *et passim.*

"With great truth I can say that I have diligently studied the system." p. 14.

"A more singular pretence was never conceived, than that such representations of Christian truth are capable of being squeezed into any thing but a perfect contradiction of the plainest and most repeated declarations of our own Church." p. 343.

---

[1] The worthy Bishop of *the Diocese of* N. J. seems to think that almost all the abominations of Romanism [how very "inconvenient" to kiss the foot of an Italian ecclesiastic] may be condensed into that one frightful word—POPE! But there can be a great deal of "pretty Popery" without having a Chief Bishop at Rome. Although the Pope raised himself above the Bishops, just as the Bishops did above the Presbyters, it is very possible for the three to hold even worse errors in common. The reader will find, as he goes along, that this "Pretty Popery" has a very strong resemblance to her less comely twin-brother at Rome.——"Popery without a Pope!" Yes; "*mutato nomine*"—the name being changed, there is no scarcity.

The following quotation from Rev. Mr. Palmer (whose work on "the Church" Bishop Whittingham has edited in this country, with notes which indicate that the Bishop is even *higher Church* than the Deacon, a thing not uncommon) will show that some, engaged in the Oxford "*movement*" have no objection to kissing the Pope, provided it be in the right place. Says Mr. Palmer "I should like to see the Patriarch of Constantinople and our Archbishop of Canterbury, go barefoot to Rome, and fall upon the Pope's neck, and kiss him, and never let him go till they had persuaded him to be reasonable." After such long and "Catholic" salutations, it is a supposable case that the two divines would have no objection to the "bare foot" of the Pope.

BISHOP DOANE.

"Who has not heard the sweeping charges of Popery brought, not only against the Church of which Hooker was a Presbyter, and its American Sister, but against all and singular their doctrines, rules and usages! Did they believe and teach Apostolic Succession? It was rank Popery. Popery was thus a matter of history.—Did they maintain Baptismal Regeneration? Still it was Popery. Then Popery was a doctrine. Do they use a Liturgy? Popery! Popery is a form of prayer.—Do they kneel at the communion? Popery! Popery is a posture.—Do they wear a Surplice? Popery! Popery is a garment. Do they erect a Cross upon a Church, or private dwelling? Popery! a bit of wood is Popery." p. 156.*

"This calumny of "Popery" has been thrown upon the greatest lights of the Church..... It was the cry against Jewell, Whitgift, Hooker," &c. p. 2.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"If men have cried "Popery," when there was no danger, it does not follow that whenever the cry shall be raised again, we should remain at our ease. Many groundless alarms of fire are heard in our cities. Incendiaries would be glad to persuade us hence, that all future alarms are so likely to be groundless that we need not heed them.

So would Satan rejoice in his work, and have free course to inflame the city of God with his fiery darts, could he only persuade us that because such men as Hooker and Whitgift, &c., were falsely accused of Popery, therefore we need be under no apprehension of Popery from the men of Oxford."—p. 527.

"We are not to be put to sleep by such opiates, nor blinded by such dust. Popery is on the alert. Satan is about his work." p. 527.

Both writers express their opinions of the Popish tendency of Oxfordism, with sufficient decision and earnestness. We shall now, as we proceed to view the system, be able to determine its true character, and to decide which of the two Bishops is right. The prospect now is that "the contention will be so sharp between them, that they will depart asunder one from another"—the one to verge towards Rome, and the other to pass on to Geneva and the countries of the Reformation.

Let us attend first to the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION, which was the lever that upheaved the Roman "world of iniquity."

---

*With great deference, we suggest that these lively figures of speech be converted into Presbyterian language, and applied to that "*mixed multitude*," whom "the Rector of St. Mary's Church" considers as under the "*malign influences of Calvinism?*" Do they believe in Presbyterian ordination! Calvinism! Calvinism is Scripture history.—Do they believe in regeneration by the Spirit? Still it is Calvinism! Calvinism is Bible doctrine.—Do they pray extempore? Calvinism! Calvinism is prayer without a Service Book. Do they sit at the Communion table? Calvinism! Calvinism is an Apostolic posture.—Do they wear decent apparel? Calvinism! Calvinism is a fisherman's garment.—Do they oppose "man's feasts and fasts in God's Church?" Calvinism! Calvinism is pure Anti-Popery.—Do they hold fellowship with "other denominations?" Calvinism! "Catholic charity" is Calvinism.—We think there is more Gospel in our version than in the episcopal text. The attention of the reader is directed to Bishop M'Ilvaine's commentary on these same words.

I. Justification.

"The doctrine of a sinner's justification in the sight of God, is fundamental. . . . . This is a central and a cardinal point in theoretical as well as practical religion; and the degree of error on other articles, may be inferred from the degree of departure from the truth, in regard to this. The history of the Christian Church, from the days of the Apostles, confirms the statement now given. Was any heretic ever known to hold a sound doctrine on justification?" *Dr. Alexander's Tract on Justification. p.* 4.

Do the Diocesans of New Jersey and of Ohio agree with Dr. Alexander in this estimate of the *importance* of the doctrine of Justification? If they do, it will be highly auspicious of the soundness of their general theology. Let us, then, hear their opinions.

Bishop Doane.

"Men lay the sacred platform out in triangles and parallelograms, and take their stand on this or that as *taste* or *fancy* shall direct." *Leeds Sermon*, p. 6.

"With one school, this is the great doctrine; that with another. One is extolled as fundamental. Others dwindle into non-essentials. A single truth is set up as *the test of a standing or falling Church:* while integral portions of the same 'faith once delivered to the saints' serve but to breed suspicions of their advocates; and bring on those who dare not to separate 'what God has joined together,' the name of bigots and formalists." *do*, p. 7.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

"The doctrine of justification by faith was the master-principle of the Reformation." *Pref.* p. 5.—"that same great doctrine, so mighty in the war of the Reformation, so feared and hated and libelled at Rome—Justification." p. 6.

"It was in precise accordance with the view of Hooker that *Luther* spake of the doctrine of justification as 'the Article *of a standing or falling Church;* that *Calvin* maintained that 'if this one head were yielded safe and entire, it would not pay the cost to make any great quarrel about other matters in controversy with Rome.' In this prominence of justification, there was a perfect agreement among the Protestant divines, as well of England, as of the Continent." p. 23.

The great importance of the doctrine of Justification by faith is thus fully acknowledged by Bishop McIlvaine, as indeed it is throughout his whole work; whilst the Diocesan of New Jersey[1] has no idea of setting up a "*single* truth," particularly justification [possibly the apostolic succession?] as "the test of a standing or falling Church."

We now proceed to inquire about the *nature* of justification.

Oxford Justification, like Roman, is Sanctification.

The true nature of Justification is a fundamental point in the dispute with the Tractarians, as it was at the Reformation with the Pa-

[1] "There is reason," says the *Bishop of Winchester*, who denounced the Tractarian errors in a Charge to his Clergy, "there is reason to fear that the distinctive principles of our Church would be endangered, if men should envelop in a cloud the great doctrine which sets forth the way in which we are accounted righteous before God; *if men doubt that the Protestant doctrine of Justification by faith is fundamental.*"

Bishop Doane, in his long list of Church dignitaries whom he had the happiness to see in England, places by an amusing coincidence the name of the good Bishop of Winchester *last.—Eng. Sermon*, p. 100.

pists. Oxford and Rome unite in denying the distinction between justification and sanctification, so carefully made by the Reformers and all evangelical divines. The evangelical view of the nature of justification is thus briefly stated by Dr. Alexander:

"The common, popular sense of the word Justification is exactly the same as its scriptural and theological meaning. When we speak of a person being justified, we never think of an internal change, but a declaration of the condition of that person in relation to some law or rule. The word *justify* is uniformly the opposite of the word *condemn*. When a man is condemned, no change is effected by the act on his moral character, but he is declared to be a transgressor, and obnoxious to the penalty of some law; so when a person is justified, no new moral qualities or dispositions are communicated by that act, but he is merely declared to be acquitted from every charge which may have been brought against him, and to have complied with the requisitions of the law by which his conduct is tried." p. 6.

According to this view, scriptural justification implies *no change of character*, no infusion of personal holiness, but *a change of state*, a change relative to the law,—the sinner being delivered from a state of condemnation and declared through the merits of Christ, to be in a state of justification.

It must be distinctly borne in mind that sanctification, according to the evangelical view, always follows justification. It is distinct from it in nature, although an invariable attendant upon it in fact. Moreover, this view of justification imperatively demands sanctification, as its legitimate fruit and evidence. Indeed no other view can authoritatively enjoin it. The distinction between the two doctrines is the only true basis from which to enforce scripturally their practical operation upon the hearts of men.[1] Oxford and Rome unite in rejecting this distinction.

1. Oxford, with Rome, confounds Justification and Sanctification.

Bishop Doane.

"Is it easy to draw, in the mere words of inspiration, the exact distinction between justification and sanctification?" p. 69.

"The present broad separation of justification and sanctification, as if they were two gifts, is technical and unscriptural." p. 69. *Quoted by Bishop Doane.*

"Is it not possible that theological statements on this controverted sub-

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

"It is a distinction which the Church of Rome denies; and which the Church of England, with all the Churches of the Reformation, has most earnestly maintained, as fundamental in the Gospel plan of salvation." p. 65.

"The whole of Oxford Divinity is founded upon a denial of that distinction. . . . And this is the key to all the labyrinth of Oxfordism, precisely as it is also to all the sinuosities of Romanism." p. 65.

"The great matter is to keep clear the essential difference between justifi-

---

"[1] No sinner, since the fall, has ever been justified without being sanctified, or sanctified without being justified. But this does not warrant their being confounded; any more than we should be warranted to call justice mercy, and mercy justice, as they subsist in the divine nature, because the two are never found there in separation from each other."—Dr. Wardlaw.

Bishop Doane.

ject, may become technical, beyond the warrant of scripture?" p. 69.

"What is the Popish error in regard to justification? Is it taught at Oxford." p. 63.

"In truth, Scripture speaks of but one gift, which it sometimes calls renewal, sometimes justification, according as it views it—passing to and fro from one to the other, so rapidly, so abruptly, as to force upon us, irresistibly, the inference, that they are really one." *Quoted*, page 68.

"Justification and sanctification are substantially the same thing." p. 67.

"This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness (with the Romanist) not—much less—a mere imputation (with the Lutheran) but through God's mercy the very presence of Christ." p. 75.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

cation and sanctification; between the former as a restoration to favor, the latter to purity." p. 62.

"The first capital error of the Papists is that they confound justification and sanctification. . . . Oxford Divinity confounds justification and sanctification?" p. 145.

"When we ask the great question 'What is that righteousness whereby a Christian is justified?' the answer of Oxford Divinity can be nothing else than that the righteousness of renewal or sanctification, is that righteousness." p. 66.

"It is the fundamental principle of Oxford divinity that justifying righteousness . . . . is identical with sanctification—a righteousness in us and not in Christ—personal as opposed to imputed—a righteousness infused and inherent—and therefore our *own* righteousness as much as our souls, our intellects, our affections are our own." p. 77.

The last quotation of Bishop Doane develops in peculiar phraseology the Oxford view of Justification. It is "a presence!" This "presence"—if any where—is "present" with our thoughts and feelings; that is, it must be ours; something in us truly our own. It is in reality nothing more than sanctification concealed under a new name; as is evident, and as we shall further have occasion to notice.

The Tractarians themselves call this divine presence, or gift, sometimes justification and sometimes sanctification. When pressed for an explanation they do not always like to be "exact and logical."

"Is it the office of the Holy Ghost to be exact and logical? Are we not rather taught in it to choose the *mean* between what seem to be opposing propositions? As when St. Paul says (Rom. iii. 28) 'a man is justified by faith;' and St. James (ii. 24) 'by works a man is justified?'"[1] p. 69.

"One would suppose that a coast, so undefined would afford but little guidance in keeping the *middle way*, except as when mariners, under fear of hidden shoals and currents on *an unseen shore*, keep *as far away as possible*. p. 36.

---

[1] This is extraordinary language to be used by a theologian. Justification by a "*mean*"! And what does this mean? we respectfully ask. Is it that a man is justified partly by faith, and partly by works? If so, it is an "exact and logical" contradiction of the 11th Article of the Bishop's own Church, "on the Justification of man," which says: "we are accounted righteous before God, *only* for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by *Faith*, and *not for our own works*."——Or is this "mean" that which, according to Oxford, is "not faith, not holiness," but "the very presence of Christ?" If so, the language is equally contrary to the Articles and the Scriptures, which know nothing of justification by a "presence," or by a "mean." They are very "exact" in

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
"In the 17th century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours [Pusey] is. It was the true *Via Media*." p. 27.	"This *Via Media* (qu. Via Appia!) may be an old path, and yet it may not be so old as that *Via Stricta*, that narrow way that leadeth unto life, of which the Saviour spoke, in which one walks by faith, and of which it is written: 'Few there be that find it.'" p. 105.
"The *Via Media*, even Ovid knew was safest. "*Medio tutissimus ibis.*" p. 16.	
"Will any one still say, that on the subject of justification, Oxford teaches after Rome?" p. 92.	"The doctrine of Oxford divinity and that of Rome, as to what justification consists in, is precisely the same." p. 164.

It appears from the preceding that Bishop M'Ilvaine has a full conviction of the identity of Oxford and Roman justification. Even Bishop Doane has to contend that on this fundamental point, the Bible is not very "exact and logical"[1] in order to vindicate the Tractarians for moving off into the mist. And he is obliged to resort to the invisible *Via Media*, as the only refuge from the arguments of his friend, who wisely prefers the *Via Stricta* of Christ and His Apostles.

2. Oxford Justification, like Roman, is progressive; or in the language of Bishop M'Ilvaine, "Justification, according to this divinity, is progressive, increasing as sanctification increases." p. 77.

"First, justification and sanctification are substantially the same thing; next, viewed relatively to each other, justification follows on sanctification. That we are first renewed and then and therefore accepted—the doctrine which Luther strenuously opposed—is true in one sense, but not in another;—true in a popular sense, not true in an exact sense." *Quoted*, p. 67.	"According to this doctrine, some are more justified than others; the same person at various periods may be in various stages of justification." p. 88.
"Justification is a state into which we are brought of God's free mercy alone, without works, but in which, *having been placed*, we are to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling"—a state admitting of degrees, according to the degree of sanctification." *Pusey, quoted by Doane*, p. 79.	"Dr. Pusey expressly declares that he and those who bear him company, do 'exclude sanctification from having *any place in our justification*.' Where the line runs, and what it is, he does not say. But he does tell us with singular contradiction, that 'the state of justification admits of degrees according to the degree of sanctification.'"[1] p. 94.

---

ascribing justification to faith alone, and the *evidence* of a living faith to works. In the passages quoted by Bishop Doane, Paul refers to the former; and James to the latter. The "mean" between the two, no "logic," or *rhetoric*, of the most profound Scholasticism can ever analyze, without detecting Popery in elementary abundance.

[1] Bishop M'Ilvaine aptly compares the Tractarians to "mistified mariners turning round and round." "So much [he adds] for losing sight of the true cross! There is all the difference in the world between steering by an object on shore, and an object in the *boat*." p. 100.

The occasion of this contradiction is explained by Mr. Newman's language. "Justification (says he) viewed relatively to the past, is forgiveness of sin; for nothing more it *can* be; [there is no room for progress here] but considered as to the present and future, it is more; it is RENEWAL, wrought in us by the Spirit of Him, who washes away its still adhering imperfections, [*now* it can make progress] as well as blots out what is past." (Doane p. 70.) Or in the language of Dr. Pusey, "It is a state admitting of degrees (although the first act did not.") In other words, justification is progressive, *except at its beginning!*

3. It may be objected against our view of Oxford justification which confounds it with sanctification, that the Oxfordists MAKE DISTINCTIONS which separate their *tertium quid* from the errors of Popery. Let us then attend to this line of separation. In the language of Bishop M'Ilvaine, "Can it be expected that such a point of resemblance between them and Rome could be given up, without at least *an attempt* at some different showing?" p. 92.

BISHOP DOANE.

Dr. Pusey says "Justification, though productive of renewal, is distinct from it in idea." p. 65.

"This justifying principle, though *within* us—as it must be, if it is to separate us from the world—yet is not *of* us, or *in* us, not any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain divine gift in which all these qualifications are included."[1] *Quoted by Doane*, p. 66.

"Neither the imputed righteousness of Christ, nor inherent righteousness is that in which a justified state consists; but the actual presence in a mysterious way, or indwelling in the soul, through the Spirit, of the Word incarnate, in whom is the Father." *Quoted by Doane*, p. 89.

"Our justification, or our being accounted righteous by Almighty God, consists in our being grafted into the

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Of course Dr. Pusey denies it, and attempts to make such distinctions between their indwelling righteousness and what in all theology is called sanctification, as will enable them to hold to the former, without feeling convicted of going back to Rome." p. 93.

"This laborious distinction is unscriptural, unreal, mystical; in so serious a matter, it is mere trifling, and to all pretence of sober, biblical theology, disgraceful. It speaks for itself. Shadowy as it is, however, and vain, it shows to what straits these divines are driven, if they would even seem to keep clear of the downright charge of Popery." p. 97.

"By the very using of this attempted distinction (which is no other than an old device of scholastic Romanism) their doctrine is identified with that of Popery. When sick men begin to pick at the air, it is a mournful evidence that sight is failing, and that the darkness of death is at hand." p. 97.

"In Hooker's view no righteousness can be within us, whether called 'the presence of God by His Spirit,' or

---

[1] Oxford Justification is a very marvellous *quod libet*. It is within us, but not in us—it is not one thing, not another thing, not any thing, but something that includes all things!——The reader, by this time, will perhaps agree with Bishop Doane, that *Oxford* writers are not very "exact and logical." The days of scholastic puzzles have returned; and it is high time to *restore* St. Duns Scotus and St. Thomas Aquinas to the calendar. Bishop M'Ilvaine says that "Thomas Aquinas is an Oxford man." p. 223.

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
body, or made members of Christ, in God dwelling in us, and our dwelling in God, and that the Holy Ghost is the gracious agent in this wonderful work —all this has been argued from Scripture in various ways." *Quoted by Doane*, p. 72.	'a divine glory,' or 'gift,' or 'Shekinah," without being *inherent* in the same sense in which *our souls* are inherent; or without being *our own* in the same sense in which *our souls are our own*." p. 168.

The language of Hooker represents in its true light, the vain effort of Oxford to escape from Popery. Bishop M'Ilvaine shows, in one of the ablest chapters of his work, that this distinction of Oxford (whatever it be) dates from the schoolmen, and was never considered a departure from the Romish doctrine, being merely the translation of a quiddity into an unknown tongue.[1]

4. No one who reads Bishop M'Ilvaine's work, can resist the evidence, that Oxford, like Rome, places our justifying righteousness in ourselves and NOT IN CHRIST.

Dr. Pusey says, "the source of our acceptance is our union with Christ; and the Father looks on us as acceptable, as being in Him." p. 72.

Can there be more explicit reference of all to God? of all to grace? How clearly is it taught that all we are or have, that ventures to present itself before the Holy One, is not only *through, by*, and *of*, but—more endearing far—*in* Christ."[2] p. 90.

"There are no passages in Oxford writings in assertion of salvation only through Christ's merits, stronger than those in the writings of the leading divines of Rome." p. 165.

"Let them say that they attribute all to the merits of Christ and nothing to their own workings or devisings; it is nothing more than Romish writers have often done; nothing more than the *Council of Trent* has done." p. 170.

In the words of Bishop M'Ilvaine, "Like Rome, the Oxford divines ascribe the ***meritorious cause*** of justification only to Christ;

---

[1] Bishop M'Ilvaine remarks: "this distinction, instead of being a dissent from Romanism, is of Romish origin. Mr. Newman himself assures us that it was a subject of debate in the Council of Trent, and was *left undecided*, and is therefore perfectly consistent with its established creed." p. 158.

[2] Mr. Newman, in his "*Lectures on Justification*," calls the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us for justification, "an unreal righteousness and a real corruption," "bringing us into bondage to shadows;"—"another gospel." In regard to these mystical Lectures, there is some difference of opinion:

"Mr. Newman's *Lectures on Justification* is a book, which would engage and well reward the careful study of such minds, so trained, as Horace Binney's, John Sergeant's, George E. Badger's, and David B. Ogden's." *Bishop Doane*, p. 159.

"Oh this sad, misty divinity, far too scholastic for the pulpit, far too vague and unphilosophic for the study." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 97.

It may be well to mention here that Oxford has taken the Platonic philosophy under its special patronage. According to Bishop M'Ilvaine, "Platonism and the Middle Ages are quite hobbies in the Oxford school. Mr. Newman cannot account for "the close parallelism" between the Republic of Plato and the Church, without adverting to the idea of a "species of inspiration from the same Being who formed the Church!" Much of the mysticism of the Oxford school may be accounted for by its love of Plato. Enthusiasm, mysticism and fanaticism, have been the extravagancies of Platonism."

the *efficient* to the Holy Spirit; the *instrumental* to Baptism; and the *formal* (constituent or essential) cause only to a righteousness *in us*." p. 170. "The merits of Christ are applied to the sinner, according to this new way, without any knowledge or application on his part, except as he comes to the sacraments or uses other 'sacred symbols' and 'effectual signs of grace.' And this application consists in the communication of inherent righteousness; so that we are justified, not by the merits of Christ, but by an inherent righteousness of our own, which is given for his sake." p. 85.

5. The reader may now perhaps ask, where is the GREAT DANGER in adopting the Oxford view? Why is this DISTINCTION (which Oxford and Rome reject) BETWEEN JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION, between the justifying righteousness of Christ and inherent righteousness, *so strongly and perseveringly urged* by all evangelical Protestants? The following extracts from Bishop M'Ilvaine's work will assist in throwing light upon this important subject:

"Now the moment a system of religion gets thus to rest in works for justification before God, its strong tendency, unless fortuitously directed otherwise, is to run to reliance on *external* works, because they are tangible, appreciable; they can be counted and distinctly grasped for refuge, while internal holiness is just the reverse. Hence, while all corrupt systems of Christianity, have talked much of inherent righteousness, inward holiness, &c., their real working in the long run has been most grossly to neglect the inward work of religion, and make the whole business of salvation consist in external observances; and the more they have resulted in this, the more has the outward show of devotion increased, and the power and efficacy of external symbols and gestures been magnified. All this is natural. We could make the whole aspect of our congregations at once as devout and prostrate in the dust, as that of a Romish Monastery, or a Mohammedan Mosque, or a Hindoo temple, were we only to make them thoroughly believe, as Papists, Mohammedans and Hindoos, that by our works we are making ourselves acceptable. But what, in such an experiment, we should gain in outward exhibitions of devotion, we should lose in that inward holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." p 212.

"Since the age that was distinguished by the bringing in of this doctrine of inherent righteousness for Justification, was also so remarkable for the introduction of all the other chief corruptions of Romanism, such as *image worship, transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences*, &c.; and since the very men, who were foremost in the former, were also eminently distinguished as patrons of the latter, as Aquinas and Bonoventura (the latter the chief devotee of the Virgin Mary) what are we to anticipate from the introduction of precisely the same doctrine of Justification among Protestants? Is its natural strength abated? Call it by a Protestant, or a Romish name, set it up at Oxford or at Trent, is it not the same;—the old righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, and as able as ever, to lead men to go about 'establishing their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God!' This tendency seems to be at present quite as strong and active, and is doing its work quite as fast, *considering the differences of age and circumstances*, as in the days of Aquinas." p. 131.

"From imputed righteousness to *inherent*, for Justification, is a great step; but once accomplished, it makes many others easy. It would be a wonderful leap to cross at once, from *imputed* righteousness to *Purgatory*; but the middle ground of *inherent*, once gained, the rest is soon accomplished. From the righteousness of *Christ* imputed to me to the righteousness of *saints* imputed to me, is indeed a great gulf, which no leap of reforming agility could cross at a bound; but the half-way position of *man's* righteousness, for justification,

takes half the difficulty away, so that under a sense of one's need of some better righteousness than his own, the leap of the sinner is easy into the midst of the righteousness of 'All Saints,' living and dead, deposited under the keys of St. Peter, for the convenience of the Church, and *the benefit of the system of* indulgences." p. 105.

"If men work more and more (according to Rome) grace doth more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as diminish it by venial sins, it is supplied by Holy water, Ave Marias, crossings, papal salutations, and such like: which serve for reparations of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through *mortal* sin, it is supplied through the Sacrament of Penance: which Sacrament hath force to confer grace anew .... and change the punishment eternal into a temporal satisfactory punishment here, if time do serve, if not, hereafter to be endured; except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, feats, and such like; or else shortened by pardon by term, or by plenary pardon.[1] .... The Church of Rome, in teaching justification *by inherent* Grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ." *Hooker, as quoted by Bishop M'Ilvaine*, pp. 20, 21.

"A man who can never know whether his amount of inherent righteousness is sufficient, will always be excogitating some device or other by which God may be the more effectually propitiated and satisfied. In such righteousness, there is something that seems tangible, measurable, appreciable. A man can count his penances, measure his pilgrimages, weigh his gifts, and thus keep an account of his righteousness. Sinners of various descriptions will resort to different modes to establish such a righteousness; the rich will purchase what they are not willing to work out, by the prayers of priests and the merits of saints, and the virtue of indulgences, to save themselves the pains of austerities. Thus will arise the monster of Supererogatory Merit, &c."

"It is the Romish doctrine of Justification [by inherent righteousness] that gives value to Indulgences, need to Purgatory, use to the sacrament of Penance, motive to the invocation of Saints, credence to the existence of the sacred treasury of Supererogatory Merit, that makes Auricular Confession tolerable, and all the vain inventions of meritorious will-worship precious. Next come devices for the defence of these; and hence the Romish doctrine of tradition, and of infallibility, and of implicit faith." p. 22.

Such being the natural consequences of Roman and Oxford justification, who can embrace, or endorse such a system, and yet be considered an evangelical theologian?

II. Faith.

"Next to an enquiry," says Bishop M'Ilvaine, "as to the nature of the righteousness in which the sinner is to be justified, is the question, *by what means he is to become possessed of that righteousness.* The plain answer of the Scriptures is by faith." p. 178.—The Oxford writers also speak of faith; but they mean a very different thing, and assign to it a very different office. Faith *before* Baptism is, according to them, a mere historical knowledge and naked assent —a condition of justification, but not its instrument. At Baptism, Faith is regenerated and made living; but even then it is not trust

[1] The reader is requested to note that the sale of these indulgences or pardons, led to the Reformation, and was the means under God, of restoring to the Church the Apostolic doctrine of justification by faith through the imputed righteousness of Christ.

in the righteousness of Christ, but is one of the graces of sanctification, and as such, in connection with the other graces, it *sustains* the justification received in Baptism.

BISHOP DOANE.

According to Dr. Pusey, whom Bishop Doane freely quotes, it is wrong to "consider faith, as the proper instrument of justification; . . . . . faith being but the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition on our parts of receiving it." p. 53.

"This is truly and really our justification, NOT FAITH." *Newman, quoted by Bishop Doane*, p. 75.

"True faith may be called colourless, like air or water; it is but the MEDIUM through which the soul views Christ. The soul as little *really rests upon it*, and contemplates it, as the eye can see the air." *do.* p. 75 [1]

"To think of being justified by faith is to look from Christ and to fall from grace." *do.* 75.

"Christ's cross does not justify by being looked at, but by being applied; not by being gazed at in faith, but by being actually set up within us,[2] and

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"In truth what Hooker and the Homily mean by the righteousness of Christ, made ours by imputation through the instrumental agency of *faith alone*, has no place in Oxford divinity." p. 79.

"Faith, before Baptism, is in this divinity, no instrument at all, because dead." 209. "Such, according to this system, was the *dead* faith of Paul, the converted, before he was baptized; of the three thousand, who were converted at the Pentecost, before they were baptized: of Cornelius and his household and friends, although on all of them fell the Holy Ghost. Still their faith must have been dead, unregenerate, needing to be converted by Baptism, because it was faith before Baptism; and so says Dr. Pusey." p. 187.

In this divinity, "faith, when regenerate and justified by baptism, is not such a *trust* in the divine mercy as lays hold on the righteousness of

[1] Bishop Andrews calls faith "*the eye of our hope*;" and Leighton "the *seeing faculty of the soul*;" but the Tractarians degrade it from all such special agency in salvation, and consider it as a mere "*medium*." Their faith has little to do with the living organ; it is much more like the inanimate element.

[2] The Oxford writers talk much of "the cross within," a kind of phraseology with which Bishop Doane seems to sympathize. For example, in one of his last sermons (at Troy) he says, "So shall the Cross *imprint its saving signature* on your hearts and lives." p. 34. And again, "While he proclaimed the Cross as that in which alone St. Paul might glory, he was most careful to show, that *not the Cross on which the Saviour died for us was* SUFFICIENT, but the Cross *on which we die* with him." p. 24. Exactly so does Mr. Newman express himself: "The Cross in which St. Paul gloried was *not the actual sacrifice on the Cross*; but it is that sacrifice coming in power to him who has faith in it, and converting his body and soul into a *living sacrifice*. It is the Cross realized, *present*, living in him, sealing him, sanctifying him, afflicting him." Far differently does Bishop M'Ilvaine express himself: "God grant they may abundantly rejoice in Christ, in spite of the lamentable substitution of *a crucifixion within* them, as the object to be looked to for justification, instead of the sacrifice upon the cross, in which alone we are permitted to glory." p. 172. And again, "The Cross of Christ, lifted up on high for every soul to be ever looking at, as the single object of his justifying faith and foundation of his only hope, is borne away from its central position in the grand panorama of Gospel truth, and baptism is set up in its stead, having for its symbol *a name of faith*, and for its virtue's *Cross within*, Christ crucified, only in the sense of *self-mortification*."—M'Ilvaine, p. 521.

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
that not by our own act, but by God's invisible grace. Men sit, and gaze, and speak of the great atonement, and think this is appropriating it. Men say that faith is an apprehending and applying; faith cannot really apply it." *Newman, quoted by Doane*, p. 65.	Christ, and thus justifies the soul before God." p. 196. "All this is directly denied of faith in Oxford divinity. "It would seem (says Mr. Newman) that Luther's doctrine now so popular, that justifying faith is *trust*, comes first, justifies by itself, and then gives birth to all graces, is not *tenable*; such a faith *cannot be, and if it could, would not justify*." p. 198.

Bishop M'Ilvaine has a long and able chapter, in which he shows in detail that Oxford and Roman faith are the same, and concludes in the following words: "Faith *before* baptism, is in this divinity, no instrument at all, because *dead*. *In* baptism, it is no instrument at all, because not made alive till baptism is completed. *After* baptism, it is an instrument of justification, only as it *sustains* what baptism has *already effected*,[1] and which, when lost, it cannot renew. And even in *that* instrumentality, it is not a *sole* instrument, but is instrumental only as all other graces are also; and it is only *said* to be the sole instrument,[2] as a reward for something peculiar to itself, which we do not pretend to understand. Such is the whole internal and sole instrumentality of that faith, which St. Paul speaks of when he says: *Being justified by faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." p. 209.

It thus appears "that justifying *faith*, like justifying *righteousness* in this system, is a matter of works altogether; that the latter [righteousness] is sanctification, and the former [faith] is justifying only as it works by love and other graces; that is as it works by sanctification." p. 211.—"Justifying faith is literally nothing in this system but a *name*, a pretence to something which it is not." p. 510.

"Such honor, then, has faith in Oxford divinity."

III. Sacraments. Baptism.

"It is notoriously the doctrine of the Trent Decrees, that Baptism is "*the only instrumental cause*" of justification; so absolutely necessary thereto, that without it, justification is obtained by none. This is precisely the doctrine, and a great distinguishing doctrine, of the Oxford School. . . . . Justification in

---

[1] Precisely in accordance with these Oxford views is the language of Bishop Doane: "His first care was to graft them in by *holy baptism*, into the living vine; and then to *keep them there*, by grace *through faith*, unto salvation." *Trey sermon*, p. 25. Christians are first united to Christ by baptism, and then this union is sustained by faith! Here is more "pretty Popery."

[2] "This symbol, faith, [Mr. Newman adds] is *said* to justify (the italics are his) not that it really justifies more than other graces; but it has this peculiarity, that it signifies in its very nature, that nothing of ours justifies us; or it typifies the freeness of our justification. Faith *heralds* forth divine grace, and

Baptism, and only there, is the sole subject of a whole volume of Oxford Tracts, called "*Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism.*" Bishop M'Ilvaine, p. 213.

"The reader is now requested to observe that what is called the OPUS OPERATUM, in the Romish doctrine of the Sacraments, is found in all its offensive substance in Oxford Divinity."[1] p. 215.

The OPUS OPERATUM doctrine of Oxfordists is proved by their making Baptism the *only instrument* of justification.

BISHOP DOANE.

"Indeed this may be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the proper instrument of justification and other gospel gifts; instead of holding that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without (as from Him, so through the externals of his ordaining.")[2] *Pusey quoted by Doane,* p. 53.

"The question is, whether the Oxford religion is a sacramental religion in such sense as to convict itself of Popery." p. 54.

"Peter taught" (Acts ii. 38,) with Dr. Pusey, that "by baptism an individual receives the forgiveness of sin, and a new nature, and is made a *real* child of God, and a real member of Christ."—"It is what Paul constantly taught, (Titus iii. 5.—Gal. iii. 27.—1 Cor. xii. 13.) Nay, it is the very teaching of our blessed Lord himself." (John ii. 5.—Mark xvi. 16.) p. 79, 80.

"So it was understood by Archbishop Cranmer." p. 80.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Without a doubt Baptism is considered, in Oxford divinity, as efficacious to justification in the adult recipient, without any faith except such as Devils may have, as well as we. He is made *righteous* by baptism, from being up to the time of baptism, *unrighteous.*" p. 217.

"A living faith, working by love, is begotten in baptism, and is expressly said not to precede, but to follow it. Further evidence cannot be needed than this, that in the *opus operatum* of Baptism the two schemes of Rome and Oxford are one." p. 217.

"Nothing could more plainly or more impressively display the "great gulf fixed between this Divinity and that of the Scriptures, than simply this—that while the evidence of justification which the Scriptures refer to continually is that of faith, *and never to our having been baptized;* on the contrary, the evidence of Oxfordism, like that of Romanism, is simply and exclusively our baptism." p. 389.

"Now if Cranmer did hold literally and strictly, that justification cannot take place until we are baptized, how is it that he writes the Homily on Jus-

---

its name is a sort of representative of it, as opposed to works. Hence it may well be honored above the other graces, and placed nearer Christ than the rest, *as if it were* distinct from them, and before them, *though it be not.* It is suitably said to justify us, because it says itself, *that it does not*—so to speak, as a sort of reward to it." p. 205.

[1] The *opus operatum* doctrine is, that the sacraments are efficacious as instruments of salvation, without regard to the preparation of the recipient. Thus, Tract 32 says "*the gifts of grace* are *deposited in mere positive ordinances,* as if to warn us against dropping the ceremonial of Christianity!"

[2] If the Oxford view be the true one, what is to become of the members of the SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, who do not use the sacraments? Tract No. 41, speaking of the Quakers, says a churchman "*must consider such persons to be mere heathens, except in knowledge!*" This is a precious illustration of "Catholic charity."

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
	tification—and yet baptism, as having any such relation, is not hinted at!" p. 378.
"So it was understood by Bishop Hooper, p. 83.	"Bishop Hooper writes a sermon on justification, in which he speaks freely and very strongly of faith as the only mean of justification. In this sermon, the good Bishop gets so near to baptism as to speak of Nicodemus (whose case is associated with baptismal regeneration) and yet not a word about baptism occurs in the whole sermon." p. 379.
"So it was understood by Bishop Jewel." p. 84.	"According to Jewel, the Church has always held a baptism of the Spirit, independently of the outward sacrament of baptism by water." p. 386.
"Such is the teaching of the Homilies." p. 85.	"In the Homilies, Justification *is expressly limited to faith, as its only instrument of reception.* p. 374.
"Such is the teaching of the Articles." p. 86.	"The Article of Justification contains *not a word about baptism.* The only instrument it knows is *faith.*" p. 372.
"Such is the teaching of the Catechism."	"In the Catechism it is never hinted that justification is limited to baptism, as its only instrument." p. 374.
"It is to be feared that we have been over-near certain celebrated Protestant teachers, Puritan and Latitudinarian, and have suffered in consequence. Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, or (what is called) communion with God, *in contradistinction* to the primitive view, according to which *the church and her sacraments* are the ordained and the direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen." *Pusey, quoted by Doane,* p. 53.	"We positively assert that it is the doctrine of our church, that whenever a sinner *repents and believes* in the Lord Jesus Christ, *before* baptism, *at* baptism, or *after* baptism, his sins are perfectly and freely remitted, he is freely and completely justified, through the righteousness of God by faith." p. 370. "The *opus operatum* has ever been considered among Protestants, a dark and deadly plague-spot of Popery. But is not this precisely the doctrine of Oxford divinity as to the efficacy of baptism?" p. 217.

This High Church view of the Sacraments, held by Dr. Pusey and his confederates is justly characterized by Bishop M'Ilvaine as a "dark and deadly plague-spot." Bishop Burnet, on the 39 Articles, also maintains "we have just reason to detest it as *one of the depths of Satan;* and "that it looks more like the *incantations of Heathenism,* than the purity and simplicity of the Christian religion."

Another evidence of the *opus operatum* doctrine at Baptism, appears in THE ENTIRE DIFFERENCE made by Oxfordism and Romanism BETWEEN THE SACRAMENTS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS in regard to saving efficacy.

"Nothing is more notorious than the fact that the old, as well as the modern, divines of the Church of England, have regarded the sacrament of the two dispensations, *Circumcision* for example, as standing upon precisely the same footing with *Baptism* in regard to the spiritual part of the covenant sealed; in other words that the only vital difference was in the sign; the inward, spiritual grace, being precisely the same in both. . . . . But there is great inconvenience in this identity of circumcision and baptism, to those who hold the latter to be the *only instrument of justification*. Abraham was *justified*, being *uncircumcised*, says Paul. Consequently, if Circumcision and Baptism be the same, a sinner may be justified being *unbaptized*. Hence results a most inconvenient argument against baptismal justification; and how is it to be obviated? Very easily. Our Oxford divines deny that Circumcision and Baptism, do bear the spiritual resemblance mentioned above; and holding fast the *exclusive instrumentality of Baptism*, they maintain that since the Old Testament Saints were not baptized, they were not justified, but were in bondage, under the law and not under grace, and received not justification, until Christ came, and with him, the grace and gift of baptism. To this general rule, Mr. Newman makes Abraham and Elijah exceptions." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 223, 24.

BISHOP DOANE.

[Bishop D., after alluding to the "sacraments" of the ark and the rainbow, says:] "Was not the covenant made with Moses sacramental? The rite of circumcision established as its seal; the Paschal Lamb, that bleeding picture of 'our Passover;' the daily sacrifice, the blood of atonement, all fulfilled and realized, when He 'entered in once' 'by his own blood;' 'the manna, which was spiritual meat,' the water in the wilderness, their 'spiritual rock.' . . . Not that *any of these* were, in the true sense, SACRAMENTS or SALVATION, which the *two sacraments of the Gospel* are; but that they were all 'figures of the true.'" p. 50.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"The Flood and the Red Sea, are by Dr. Pusey, put on a level, as ordinances, with circumcision, in point of grace. [Just as the ark, rainbow, daily sacrifice, &c., are by Dr. Doane.] All are mere *types*. . . . From this it is manifest not only that the sacramental character is denied to circumcision, which St. Paul says was '*a seal of the righteousness of faith, which Abraham had being uncircumcised*;' but that all those who lived before the gospel, from Adam downwards, with some favored exceptions, were without *regeneration*, without *justification*, *without any promise or acceptance of Heaven*, and did not receive any, till Christ came."[1] p. 226.

---

[1] "The reader [says Bishop M'Ilvaine] may very reasonably enquire here what, in view of those who thus think concerning the Old Testament Saints, did become of their souls after death—did they go to Heaven? Romish divinity answers *Nay*—and reasonably, because they were not *regenerated* nor *justified*, since Christ had not died, and Baptism was not given. Where then? To *Limbus Patrum*, answers Romanism. Whether that Limbus is distinct from that in which infants that die without Baptism, are now believed by the Romish Church to be received, the divines do doubt, says Maldonat. The more common opinion, says Usher, is that these be two distinct places,—that of the Fathers 'now being emptied of its inhabitants.' That our Oxford divines have said any thing directly on this subject, we know not. But how they can escape a *Limbus Patrum*, substantially the same as that set apart for the accommodation of the Romish doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, we cannot conceive. . . . As to the multitude of Old Testament Saints that believed—all those, for instance, who are mentioned in Heb. 11, the 'great cloud of witnesses' who '*all died in faith*,' it must follow that they did not enter Heaven. But certainly they did not go to a place of torment. It remains that they must have gone to some place intermediate between that of the *impenitent*, and that of the *justified*, waiting the coming of Christ, and from which they were delivered when he had accomplished that, of which all their religion had been, in view of this system, but an inoperative, inefficacious shadow." p 232–234.

The Oxford Tractarians clearly teach, with the Romanists, the regeneration of the sinner by Water Baptism. The Baptismal Font is their gate of Heaven. Bishop Doane appears to agree with them fully in their views of the sacraments. In what *mode* this wonderful efficacy is conveyed, the Tractarians have some "reserve" in declaring. "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." In the dispute at the Council of Trent between the Dominicans and Franciscans, whether the sacraments operated by a grace-conferring efficacy that was inherent in the elements, or by an efficacy supernaturally attached to them of God, the Oxfordians would have probably given the casting vote in favor of their brethren of St. Francis;—unless, indeed, by their tact at distinctions, they had cut out a "Via Media," which passed straight up through antiquity to the Apostles.

It is evident that these Divines have very mistaken views of the nature of a Sacrament. Baptism, according to the view of Protestants generally, is a *sign*, or *seal*, of regeneration. But Dr. Pusey resolutely declares that "Baptism is *not a sign* but the putting on of Christ—wherefore Baptism is a thing *most powerful and efficacious*." In other words, Baptism is not the *sign*, but *regeneration itself*. This is near enough to Rome; but far away from Scripture!

The texts which Bishop Doane and others quote to sustain their extravagant views, will be readily understood in a different sense, if we remember that "the language of the New Testament was constructed with reference to adult baptism, which was almost exclusively witnessed in the first conversions to Christianity;" and moreover, that the persons, who became the subjects of baptism, were clearly understood to profess a change of heart. Baptism was to them "the *seal* of the righteousness of faith"—the covenanted pledge, that—if truly God's children, as they professed to be—their sins were forgiven, and they should be made partakers of the eternal inheritance. The *opus operatum* hypothesis is utterly irreconcilable with Scripture, and tends to death rather than to life.

With Bishop M'Ilvaine, we "conclude with a *solemn* CAUTION against such an idolatry of the Sacrament of Baptism, such a resting on the outward seal, such identification of the spiritual grace with the invisible sign, such a losing of the real nature of spiritual regeneration in our zeal for the honor of its type and shadow, as is shown in OXFORD DIVINITY—to *the great peril of immortal souls*." p. 441.

IV. Sin after Baptism. Penance.

Having examined the fundamental doctrine of Oxfordism (justification by *inherent righteousness*) and seen its effects upon the doctrine of Faith and of the Sacraments, "we proceed (says Bishop M'Ilvaine) to further ramifications;—in evidence that the tree of Romanism, planted in the classic soil of Oxford, is bringing forth Ro-

mish fruit, and is going on to do so more and more, and may thus be known to be good or evil, according as any one may consider the spreading shade of Popery to be good or bad. *Tendimus in Latium.*" *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 237.

In the Roman Catholic Church, *sin after baptism* can only be remitted through the "Sacrament of Penance." This is consistent ground. Sins *before* baptism are remitted, or taken away, by the infusion of grace at baptism. But sin *after* baptism, how shall that be remitted? The true Protestant says, "Repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." No, says the Romanist; remission can come again only through some Sacrament, as it came at first. But what sacrament? The Romish church invents one, called Penance, comprising *contrition, confession, satisfaction and absolution.* When the Priest says, "I absolve thee in the name of the Father" &c., then the sin after baptism is remitted." p. 245.

How does Oxfordism get along in this emergency?

BISHOP DOANE.

"The Church has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce a man altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, Baptism and the day of Judgment."[1] *Pusey, quoted by Doane.* p. 95.

"This modern [evangelical] system, which by an artificial, wrought-up peace, checks the deep and searching agony, whereby God, as in a furnace of fire, was purifying the whole man by the Spirit of Judgment, and the Spirit of burning—this is altogether a spurious system."[2] do. p. 94.

"This system" [the evangelical, which removes the burden of sin by "repentence and faith"] "is searing men's consciences now, as much as the 'Indulgences' of the Romish system did before." do. p. 99.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Allow this darkness about the remission of sin after baptism, and we take leave of all the consolation of Christ. Grant it, then welcome Popery! One thing or other—the sacrament of Penance for relief, or else to be all our lives subject to bondage, waiting for the judgment!" p. 248.

"Blessed be God, who has spared us such bondage, and showed us a more excellent way, even the 'new and living way,' whereby we have 'boldness of access' to his mercy-seat, and rejoice in the certainty that 'the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all* sin.'" p. 256.

"Hear what comfortable words our Saviour saith: 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and *I will give you rest.*" p. 250.

---

[1] The Oxford divines make no provision for the remission of sins after Baptism. They say "the fountain (of the Redeemer's blood) has indeed been opened for sin and for uncleanness; but it were to abuse the power of the keys entrusted to us, again to pretend to admit them thus; *now there remains only the baptism of tears.*" On which the (Episcopal) "Christian Observer" remarks: "May God forgive men who thus awfully presume to limit the virtue of the Redeemer's atonement, who substitute the penance of tears for the blood of Christ."

[2] The attention of the reader is requested to the following, from Owen's works, vol. 11, p. 105. "The contest of the Reformers with the Roman Church, was about the way and means whereby the consciences of convinced, troubled sinners might come to rest and peace with God. For at that time, they were no otherwise instructed, but that these things were to be obtained, not only by works of righteousness which men did themselves, in obedience unto the com-

BISHOP DOANE.

"Even while holding out the most solemn form of absolution, as a means of relieving the troubled conscience, our Church confesses the incompleteness of her own act." do. p. 96.

"If the Romish church had but the dregs of the system of the ancient Church, stale and unprofitable though they were, they yet had something of the strength of *the bitterness of the ancient medicine*; they, at least, testified to a system, when men made sacrifices for the good of their souls, accused and condemned themselves . . were grieved and wearied . . . . turned to God in weeping, fasting and praying, . . . acknowledged and confessed their offences, and sought to bring forth worthy fruits of penance; and in cases of notorious sins, were put to open *penance* and punishment in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord."[1] do. p. 99.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Oh, calumniated Church! that one of thine own children and pastors should teach such doctrine for thine!" p. 250.

"Dr. Pusey's eye is upon degrees and continuance of *external bodily penances*—what he elsewhere calls '*the bitterness of the ancient medicine*.' . . A broken heart, with faith in the blood of Christ, are not enough. The grand question in Dr. Pusey's sight, is how much *penance*, as distinct from *repentance*, is necessary for pardon . . . . The mind that fully sympathizes with such views, is penetrated with the essential virus of Romanism, and only needs an exciting cause, to break out all over, with a full eruption of Romanism in active development." p. 349. 352.

Oxfordism is thus in full pursuit of *Penance*. It robs the Christian of his "peace and joy in believing," and turns him out into the desert of Roman mortifications, without a star to guide him, from Baptism to the Judgment!

---

mands of God, but also by the strict observance of many inventions of what they called the Church; with an ascription of strange efficacy unto the same ends, unto missatical sacrifices, sacramental absolutions, penances, pilgrimages, and other the like superstitions. Hereby they [the reformers] observed that the consciences of men were kept in perpetual disquietments, perplexities, fears and bondage, exclusive of that rest, assurance and peace with God through the blood of Christ, which the Gospel proclaims and tenders. And when the leaders of the people in that [Roman] church had observed this, that indeed the ways and means which they proposed and presented, would never bring the souls of men to rest, nor give them the least assurance of the pardon of sins, they made it a part of their doctrine, that the belief of the pardon of our own sins, and assurance of the love of God in Christ, were false and pernicious. *For what should they else do, when they knew well enough, that in their way, and by their propositions, they were not to be attained?* Hence the principal controversy in this matter, which the reformed divines had with those of the Church of Rome was this, whether there be according unto, and by the Gospel, a state of rest and assured peace with God to be attained in this life. And having all advantages imaginable for the proof hereof, from the very nature, use, and end of the Gospel, from the grace, love and design of God in Christ, from the efficacy of his mediation in his oblation and intercession, they assigned these things to be the especial object of justifying faith, and that faith itself to be a fiduciary trust in the especial grace and mercy of God, through the blood of Christ, as proposed in the promises of the Gospel."

[1] The "Christian Observer" remarks: "The doctrine of the church of Rome, though it is in the spirit 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* doctrine is PROTESTANTISM REJECTED AND POPERY SPOILED."

V. Mortal and Venial Sins.

"It is a well known doctrine of the Romish Church that sins are divisible into mortal and venial. *Mortal* sins are those 'which are done willingly or are of any magnitude. To these eternal punishment is due;' and they can be remitted only through the Sacrament of Penance. *Venial* sins are such as arise from mere 'concupiscence' and are so light as not to destroy grace, or to deserve eternal punishment. Hence all that is necessary to remit venial sin is a little Holy Water, a Pater Noster, a Bishop's blessing, or a knock on the breast, &c." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 257.

This distinction of mortal and venial sins arises from the Roman view of Baptismal Regeneration. In this *operation*, ("opus operatum") the "supernatural grace" whereby Adam was justified, and which he lost by mortal sin, is restored to the sinner in the shape of infused righteousness. Original sin, according to this scheme, consists only in the loss of this "supernatural grace;" and as this grace is restored in Baptism, so also is original sin removed. The motions of the flesh, the remnant of the carnal man, are, therefore, not properly of the nature of sin, but are the comparatively harmless impulses of "concupiscence."

"The reader is requested to consider wherein lies any substantial difference between this doctrine and that of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman."

BISHOP DOANE.

"The church has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce a man altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, baptism and the day of Judgment."[1] *Pusey, quoted by Doane*, p. 95.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"Do the Oxford men mean that every man (for all have sinned after baptism) is beyond Justification till the day of Judgment? Incredible! Certainly not! What then? Why when they speak of sin after Baptism, they mean not such sins as are thus confessed, but MORTAL sins. Hence, such as the Christian daily confesses are VENIAL sins." p. 264.

It thus appears, says Bishop M'Ilvaine, "that, although the sins of the Christian's daily course are expressly called *sins* by the Scriptures, yet so little do they seem to Dr. Pusey to have the "*true and proper nature of sin*," that when he uses the expression "*Sin after Baptism*," he does not mean to include them therein, and does not think it worth while to hint that they exist." p. 264. The Oxford men cannot help making the distinction between "*mortal and venial*" sins, inasmuch as they adopt the Romish view of Baptismal regeneration, which takes away all sin, *original and actual*, and by the in-

[1] Dr. Pusey has the following, which is an index to his system: "A question will probably occur to many, what is the distinction between lesser and greater —VENIAL and MORTAL sins? Or if MORTAL sins be sins against the decalogue, as St. Augustine says, are they only the highest degree of those sins, or are they the lower also? *This question, as it is a very distressing one, I would gladly answer if I could or dared!*"—This impossibility of distinguishing between mortal and venial sins must be at least *as distressing* to the great mass of humble believers, as it is to the more enlightened Dr. Pusey.

fusion of inherent righteousness, leaves every one to the workings of "concupiscence," which is a sort of *defective innocence.*

BISHOP DOANE.

"The reader will do well, (Bishop Doane himself volunteers the remark) before he enters final judgment against Dr. Pusey, to bear in mind the terms of the 16th Article: *Not every deadly sin*, willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable." p. 93.[1]

[Bishop D., in reply to a remark that "*all sin is deadly*," comes to the aid of his Oxford friends, and says] "and yet St. John hath said 'If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it." p. 95.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"When our 16th Article speaks of '*deadly sin* after baptism,' it means no such distinction between sins *mortal* and *venial*. '*Every deadly sin*' in the Article means '*every sin*, for *every sin is deadly*.'" p. 264.

[Bishop M'Ilvaine could not anticipate that this text would be brought forward by the Diocesan of New Jersey to sustain the Roman distinction between *mortal* and *venial* sins; and so he has no "parallel" passage. The reader, however, is requested to look at the note.[2]]

In conclusion, says Bishop M'Ilvaine, it is an immense matter for the enquirer to settle in his mind, if he would drink of the consolations of this [Oxford] Divinity, to which class his sins belong. If they have all been venial—that is, if they have not been mortal, then they say to him, "go in peace." p. 512.

If his sins are mortal, he must "do penance" till the day of Judgment.[3]

---

[1] It looks ominous for a Bishop of the "Scoto-Anglican succession" to give a Roman interpretation to an Article of the "*Protestant* Episcopal Church."

Bishop M'Ilvaine quotes the Bishop of Exeter: "Let us beware of hardening our own hearts, and of corrupting the hearts of our brethren—by whispering to ourselves or them *which* sin is more or less deadly than others."—p. 265.

[2] This attempt of the Bishop of New Jersey to come to the aid of his "Catholic" friends, indicates that he does not always interpret scripture according to "primitive tradition." For this passage in John's Epistle is not claimed even by the *Romans* to support their distinction between mortal and venial sins! "A sin unto death is another thing than a mortal sin; for it is that mortal sin *only* whereof a man is never penitent before his death, or in which he continueth till death, and dieth in it. So likewise "a sin not unto death" is not that which we call a venial sin, but *any* that a man committeth, and continueth not therein till death." See *Rhenish Annotations.*—Protestants commonly interpret the "sin unto death" to mean an apostasy from Christianity connected with blasphemy against the Spirit. *Doddridge* adds "where it was most difficult to distinguish, *the gift of discerning spirits* might infallibly decide; where it was dubious, charity would incline to the milder extreme; and conditional prayer might however be offered."

[3] John Rogers, of the Society of Friends, remarks: "The distinction between venial and mortal sin is dangerous. Men will be apt to imagine nearly all their sins to be venial, and nearly none to be mortal. Moreover, men will be liable to fancy that there are no great sins; for having deemed them venial, they will quickly deem them small. Moreover, men will be too prone to go on from judging their sins to be venial and small, to judge them to be few; for if great can be squeezed into small, many can be squeezed into few. *Venial—small—few.*" Anti-popery, p. 240.

VI. Purgatory.

Romanism maintains a Purgatory, where the souls of the departed are detained for fiery purification. Their condition is aided by masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, "which believers living perform for believers dead." "This (says Bishop M'Ilvaine) is consistent. The Oxford system must admit as much. And here follows the reason in its own words: "The Roman Church holds that the great majority of Christians die in God's favor, yet *more or less under the bonds of their sins.* And so far [says Tract No. 79] we may unhesitatingly allow to them, or rather *we ourselves hold the same*, if we hold that after Baptism, there is no plenary pardon of sins in this life to the sinner, however penitent, *such* as in Baptism, were once vouchsafed to him." *Tracts*, vol. 3, p. 517.—*M'Ilvaine*, p. 266.

BISHOP DOANE.

"*Purgatory*—Do the Oxford writers teach it? To say, Yes, sticks in the throat. To say, No, would be to lose the benefit of a most pregnant prejudice. Hence such sentences 'about it and about it.'" p. 104.

"The Oxford theory,' it is said, 'lacks but one feature of Purgatory, namely, suffering or discipline'—as the old lady's gun wanted nothing to make it dangerous, but a lock, a stock and a barrel!" p. 104.

"But wherein a man's penitence should consist; whether continued repentance [or something *else*] would efface the traces of sin in himself; whether he might [☞] *ever* in THIS LIFE look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by repentance; whether cessation of his *active repentance* [Penance] may not bring back degrees of sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of Judgment: these

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"The decree of the Council of Trent determines 'That there is a Purgatory, and that souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the living, and above all by the acceptable sacrifice of the Altar.' Now of this dire Romish corruption, do the Oxford writers, in Tract No. 79 on Purgatory, say 'Taken in the mere letter, there is little in it against which we shall be able to sustain formal objections.' This is consistent. The Oxford system must admit as much." p. 266.

"Now the only difference pretended to between Oxford and Romish doctrine, is that whilst both maintain a purgation from sin, or Purgatory, in the future world, the Romanist makes a definite place for it, and makes that place to be one of pain; whilst the Oxfordist contents himself with saying that it is *a purification from sin*, not determining, *but not denying*, that there is *pain* in it, and a *place* for it, such as Romanists speak of." p. 266.

"No leaning towards Purgatory discoverable in these words! If we depart this life with sin not 'entirely effaced;' if it is to meet us at the 'day of Judgment,' then what can be our hope? Nothing remains but the interval between death and the Judgment. Here, if any where after death, must the *remaining traces of sin be effaced.* How? By the efficacy of *purgatorial discipline*, of course." p. 251.

"Grave questions indeed for Protestant divines, with the Articles and Ho-

Bishop Doane.

and the *like* are questions," &c. *Pusey quoted by Doane*, p. 98.

[Bishop D. quotes as "calm words and Christian-like" the following from Tract 79.] "The pictures of Purgatory, the existence of Purgatorial societies, &c., afford a strange contrast to *the simple wording and apparent innocence of the Decree* (of Trent) by which it is made an article of faith." p. 105.

[Calm but *qu.* Christian-like?]

Again. "If we would consider Purgatory as confined to the mere opinion, that that good which is begun on earth, is perfected in the next world, the idea is tolerable. The word *detentus* (used in the Decree) indeed expresses a stronger idea; yet after all, hardly more than that the souls in Purgatory would be happier out of it than in it, and that they cannot of their own will leave it; which is not much to grant." [!!!] *Newman, quoted by Doane*, p. 205.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

milies of the Church of England and the Word of God in their hands, to be divided about! Go, and learn the alphabet of the Gospel!

"Connecting all this with what has been shown under the head of Sin after Baptism, one would suppose that the *flames* of Purgatory could hardly be prevented from soon bursting out in open day, from the "wood, hay and stubble" of Oxfordism, seeing it has such a preparatory funeral-pile of combustibles." p. 267.

[When a Bishop in a "Protestant" Church can quote such words as these and the preceding ones, quoted by Bishop Doane, without an expression of his indignation, or even of his dissent, but rather his approbation, he ought to remember, in the spirit of "the bitterness of the ancient medicine," the Articles of his Church, of which the 21st contains the following: "The Romish *doctrine*[1] concerning purgatory is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather *repugnant to the word of God*."]

The doctrine of Purgatory is not only condemned by the Bible and the Articles, but by "primitive tradition." Archbishop Usher remarks: "For extinguishing the flames of Purgatory, we need not go far to fetch water. And if we need the assistance of the ancient Fathers, behold they be here ready with full buckets in their hands." *Tout au contraire* at Oxford. When the Articles sound the alarm to put out the fire, these divines come up to the work with buckets that "hold no water."

---

[1] The Tractarians, with the characteristic subtlety of all errorists, endeavor sometimes to reconcile Popery with the 39 Articles, by making the latter merely condemn Roman *practice* and not Roman doctrine. This distinction cannot entirely avail them here, for the Article expressly says "The Romish *doctrine*, &c., is repugnant to the word of God;" and therefore Tract 90 reconciles Purgatory with the Article, by maintaining that it condemns *Roman* doctrine, not *primitive*. The primitive, Apostolic doctrine of Purgatory!

Tract 81 maintains that the sacrifice offered by the Church on earth, for the whole Church, in the Eucharist, obtains for those, who have passed into the unseen world *additional joys and satisfactions*. This is "ugly Popery"—real Purgatory.—Indeed the Romanists differ from the Oxfordists chiefly in making Purgatory a place of *so much* suffering. The Oxfordists admit that "the great majority die in God's favor, yet more or less *under the bonds of their sins*;" and that "penitents, from the time of Baptism *up to the day of Judgment*, may be considered in that double state, of which Romanists speak, their persons accepted, but *certain sins uncancelled*." If a person is "more or less under the bond of his sins," and if "certain of his sins are uncancelled," he must be more or less of a sufferer, more or less under a course of purgatorial discipline.

VII. Prayers for the Dead,

"We have seen, that in the injunction of the Trent Decree concerning sacrifices, masses, alms, and other works of piety which the living are wont to perform for dead believers," "there is little in the *letter*" against which the Oxfordists think themselves "able to sustain a formal objection."—*Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 268.

Hence Mr. Newman likens the intercession of the Christian to that of Christ, and calls it a *propitiation*.

"The Christian is plainly in his fitting place when he intercedes. He is made after the pattern of Christ. *He is what Christ is. Christ intercedes above, and he below.*"——Again. "Shall not prayers be both a *propitiation* for the world of sinners, and for his purchased Church!" p. 268.

Bishop Doane.

"Dr. Pusey, in Tract 77, has shown that the usage alluded to [prayers for the dead] was not connected with the doctrine of Purgatory." p. 107.[1]

"It has been justified by such divines as Archbishop Wake and Usher and Bishops Bull, Taylor and Andrews, to mention no more names." p. 107.

"*If* any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, 'most humbly beseeching thee to grant that we and *all thy whole Church* may obtain remission of our sins,' should think that those emphatic words *all thy whole Church* were not restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also *which is at rest*—WHY SHOULD HE BE HINDERED?"[2] *Pusey quoted by Doane*, p. 111.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

"Oh no! Prayers for the dead, &c., which are already attained in the race of this divinity, must soon cross *the invisible line that separates from Popish Purgatory.*" p. 535.

"Nor do I assent to their opinion that our Church does not discourage prayers for the dead;—on the contrary, I can hardly propose to myself any more decisive mode of discouraging the practice." p. 269.

"I lament the encouragement given by the same writers to the *dangerous* practice of prayers for the dead." *Exeter quoted by M'Ilvaine*, p. 268.

The reader will find in Bishop Doane's pamphlet, six closely printed pages in defence of prayers for the dead.[3] If it had not been for Bucer and Calvin, *par nobile fratrum*, the prayer for the dead would not have been omitted in the revision of the Liturgy. Under

[1] Prayer for the dead implies that the happiness of the departed is *defective*, and that it may be *promoted by the intervention of others*. Purgatory needs no better "hay and stubble" to build upon than such vagaries; and accordingly in practice, prayers for the dead and purgatory are harmonious parts of a corrupt system. The two cannot long be separated even by what Bishop M'Ilvaine denominates "an *invisible* line."

[2] This doctrine of Oxford, quoted by Bishop Doane, goes much beyond Usher. The latter had no idea that the "faithful departed" needed "*remission of sins.*" He expressly calls it a "private conceit" that "an augmentation of glory" may be procured for the dead by the prayers of the living.

[3] What the worthy Bishop's object is in urging this matter, we know not. Certain it is that this doctrine is as strong an "entering wedge" to split in pieces the system of the 39 Articles as could be well driven by the Episcopal staff. Without some kind of Purgatory, prayer for the dead is little else than an absurd superstition. For, if the departed are not in Purgatory, but in the enjoy-

existing circumstances, however, the Bishop must betake himself to extemporaneous prayer [!] or else be satisfied with "the admirable provisions of the *Book* of Common Prayer." When Protestants want to pray for the dead, is it not a sad evidence of a (Roman) "Catholic" partiality towards the theology of men, who, although within the pale of the Anglican Church, are "irreverent dissenters" from her Articles?

VIII. Invocation of Saints.

BISHOP DOANE.

"These ominous words (invocation of saints) seem 'confirmation strong' that these writers must be far gone in Popery. But it is not half so bad as it appears."[1] p. 114.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"The invocations to the saints are called in a late number of the British Critic, by the modest name of 'uncatholic peculiarities.' p. 270. 'The *seminal principle* of Invocation of saints affords too much ground for the fear' of further progress.'" p. 533.

If prayers for the dead are lawful, then the dead may of course

---

ment of the pure happiness of the redeemed, what can be the object of prayers in their behalf?——Scripture gives no support to the doctrine of prayers for the dead. Solomon, (a very wise man) declares of the dead: "Neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing than is done under the sun." *Eccles.* ix. 6. Least of all, do the dead who are "*in Paradise*" and "*present with the Lord*," need a "portion" in the prayers of imperfect mortals. Bishop Doane, ourselves and others have enough to do with the living. The dead are beyond our sphere. "The field is the *world*," not the *intermediate state*.

Anne Hyde, the Duchess of York, who died a convert to her husband's religion (Popish) says: "I spoke severally to two of the best Bishops we have in England, (Dr. Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Blanford, Bishop of Worcester.) who *both* told me there were many things in the Roman Church which it were very much to be wished we had kept; as confession, which was, no doubt, commanded by God: THAT PRAYING FOR THE DEAD WAS ONE OF THE MOST ANCIENT THINGS IN CHRISTIANITY; THAT FOR THEIR PARTS THEY DID IT DAILY, THOUGH THEY WOULD NOT OWN IT.[!] And afterwards pressing one of them (Dr. Blanford) very much upon the other points, he told me, that if he had been bred a Catholic he would not change his religion; but that being of another church, wherein he was sure, were all things necessary to salvation, he thought it very ill to give that scandal as to leave that church wherein he had received his baptism."—*Shuttleworth on Tradition*, p. 57.

[1] If it be not "half so bad as it appears," it is very remarkable; for Oxfordism is usually a great deal *worse* than it would *fain* be. That it is sufficiently bad, however, appears from the following "re-appropriated" prayer, found in Tract 75, which contains "selections from the Roman Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use:" And, "Therefore I beseech thee, *Blessed Mary, Ever Virgin*, the blessed *Michael Archangel*, the blessed *John Baptist*, the *Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, All Saints*, and thee, my Father, to pray the Lord our God for me." See Christian Observer, 1838, p. 745; where it is shown that such acts of idolatry are insidiously scattered up and down the Breviary Tract, No. 75, which is intended to "suggest matter for our private devotions." Of this prayer, the Oxfordians say, "It is not a simple gratuitous invocation made to them, but it is an Address to Almighty God in his heavenly court, as surrounded by his Saints and Angels, answering to St. Paul's charge to Timothy, 'before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels.'" Doubtless these things do not "appear half so bad" to *some* as to others!

pray for themselves; and if they can pray for themselves, they can pray for others too. Hence it is practicable to obtain an interest in their prayers. Hence the Invocation of Saints. Hence "*ora pro nobis!*"—Mr. Newman says that the Invocation of Saints is a question which "the Articles LEFT OPEN"! although the 22d Article condemns it distinctly and by name. He also admits that the "*ora pro nobis* was not on my showing necessarily included in that invocation of saints which the Article condemns." p. 18. The Tractarians make open doors or *holes* all round the ramparts of the 39 Articles. Nothing can resist their "primitive" battering-ram.

IX. New Saints' Days.

The Oxford men have a strong desire to carry out what they call "the *spirit* and the *principle* of those inestimable forms of devotion which are contained in our authorized Prayer Book," by adding new Saints' days to the English Calendar. They are not satisfied with one "*All* Saints day," but wish to be more *particular* in their admiration and honor.

BISHOP DOANE.

"There is no evidence at all that the authors of this system are trying the experiment of instituting new Saints' days. p. 112.

"Neither have they set apart a day to the religious commemoration of Bishop Ken." p. 112.

"Their sketches of services ('one of them for March 21st, the day on which Bishop Ken was taken from the Church below') are nothing more than exercises in liturgical composition."[1] p. 114.

"They are not in imitation of the Papists; since the models on which they are formed are older far than the corruptions of the Church of Rome." p. 114.

"They aim not at canonizing Bishop Ken, or in any way intruding upon the Calendar." p. 114.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"I cannot but deplore the rashness, which has prompted them to recommend to private Christians the dedication of particular days to the Religious Commemoration of deceased men." *Exeter, quoted by M'Ilvaine*, p. 270.

"They have even furnished a special service in honor of Bishop Ken." p. 270.

"A more bare-faced insult to all decent consistency with the principles of the Church of England was never perpetrated than the 'Matin Service for Bishop Ken's day.'" p. 271.

"The whole service, in words, and form, and parts, and arrangement, and every single feature, is most studiously adjusted to the Roman Breviary." p. 272.

"Whence have they authority to *canonize* a saint? And why should they stop at *Bishop Ken?* Cannot the principle be advantageously carried out much further?" p. 272.

---

[1] Here is another specimen of curious theological palliation. Mere "exercises in liturgical composition!" If these men had the revision of the Liturgy, how full of these "mere exercises" would it be! How quickly, too, would the 39 Calvinistic Articles (which are called "the offspring of an uncatholic age") disappear before the black marks of such Catholic scribes!

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
	"How soon will the memory of Mr. *Froude* be enshrined in a Matin service, with Nocturns and Antiphons, of the Roman Breviary?" p. 275.

"Let Daily Service, and the *keeping of holy days* be universal, (says the British Critic.) The Saints and Angels will be with us at all events."[1]

"How is this known? (adds Bishop M'Ilvaine). Are not these writers developing their system *too fast for the times?*" p. 273.

X. Transubstantiation.

"The impression sought to be produced by these Oxford writers is that there is a mysterious presence of the body of Christ in some sense, which is neither that of the Romanists, nor Protestants, but (like their doctrine of an inherent righteousness "*within* us, but not *in* us") a *substantial* presence, but not *corporeal;* a *real* presence of his *real* body, but not a *local* presence; not *transubstantiation;* but the next thing to it, and acknowledging itself to be a great deal more like transubstantiation, and evidently sympathizing with it far more than with the anti-transubstantiation doctrine of Protestants." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 220.

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
"Sensibly [says Dr. Doane] does Dr. Pusey write: 'There is a true, real, spiritual (*or rather the more real because spiritual*) presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more *real* than if we could, with Thomas, feel him with our hands, or thrust our hands into his side; this is bestowed upon	"The idea by which others [Protestants] explain the *real* presence of Christ, as distinguished from a *local* presence, viz: that he is *really* present, when he is present *effectively*, as he was to the woman who touched not *him* but his *garment;* while he was *locally* but not *effectively* present to

---

[1] Bishop Doane (who is already a very strenuous admirer of "man's feasts and fasts in God's Church") says, "It will not be long, I trust, before the *Daily* service, which the Church designs, shall gather us, with grateful hearts, within the walls of our sweet house of prayer." [See "little pastoral" for 1841, p. 2.] Far be it from us to speak disrespectfully of so pious and Catholic a design; but we would not dare to assert with quite as much confidence as the Tractarians, that "the saints and angels" would patronize an effort of this kind at all events. Such a *trust* (to use Bishop M'Ilvaine's language) is "too fast for the times." Experientia docet.

The Oxford divines not only observe days, but also "canonical *hours*." Among the instances of the "judicial humiliation" of the Church of England, they reckon "the compression of the *seven canonical hours* into our two daily services," which they consider an admonition "that we like the Jews, have fallen back from our privileges, and that if we do not take heed we shall forfeit the final inheritance also." Bishop Doane is known to have so far *risen up* to his privileges, as to affirm that the canonical hours are "according to ancient practice," and also to appoint the semi-weekly fast day services at 9 o'clock, which is *one* of the canonical hours. It has been told us, however, that this canonical hour has been here changed, during the winter season, to 10 o'clock.

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
faith, . . . but it is there *independently of faith*." p. 118.	the multitude that passed and touched him, but who derived no benefit, because *they had no faith*; this is too abstract and visionary for Oxford." p. 219–20.
"The reverential suggestion of a writer in the Tracts, that the unnecessary discussion of the Holy Eucharist should be avoided, as almost certain to lead to profane and rationalistic thoughts, has seemed to authorize a most unworthy and unwarrantable suspicion." p. 118.	"Connect with this, the anxiety of these Oxford writers that the subject should not be discussed. But while discussion has been discouraged, advancement has been made towards transubstantiation."
"That theirs is not Popish teaching, our Lord Jesus Christ himself is witness; Matt. xxvi: 26. 27." p. 118.	"Behold to what length the matter has come in the following passage, from the last British Critic: "Is the wonder wrought at the marriage of Cana, a miracle, and the change which the Holy Elements undergo, as consecrated by the Priest, and received by the faithful, no miracle, simply because the one was perceptible to the natural eye, while the other is discerned by the spiritual alone?" p. 275.

"So much has been written, (says Bishop M'Ilvaine) for the purpose of showing how near this divinity approaches to the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation in its zealous maintenance that there is not only a *real* presence of Christ at the Eucharist (in the sense of *effective* as distinguished from *local*, and through *the Spirit* and not in any *substantial* manner, which is the Protestant sense) but that there is also a "substantial presence;"[1]—"an *immediate*, unseen Presence of the Body,"—that we need not here exhibit the language of Oxford divinity any further on that head. The *tendency* at least, of such views cannot be mistaken." p. 273.

Mr. Newman thinks it "*literally* true," that "the consecrated bread is Christ's body," and that there is a real *superlocal* presence in the holy sacrament." And Tract 85 asks, "If Baalam's ass instructed Baalam, what is there fairly to startle us in the Church's doctrine, that the water of baptism cleanses from sin, and that *eating the consecrated bread is eating his body*." Bishop Doane also is evidently a believer in this "substantial" presence of the body of Christ at the sacrament. He employs ten pages in attempting to show that the Oxford doctrine is the true one; that it is the teaching

[1] The Reformers never used the term "substantial," which was one of the terms of the Romanists to express their carnal presence. Cranmer and the early English Reformers carefully avoided even the use of the term "real," as being of Popish signification. *See Strype's Annals, chap.* 3. Although more modern evangelical Protestants make use of the term "real," they carefully guard against its being considered as opposed to "spiritual." The term "substantial," which Bishop M'Ilvaine quotes as Oxfordian, and as implying something "next to transubstantiation," is not of Protestant phraseology. Like "*superlocal*," not *local*, it is the exponent of Tractarian mysticism.

of the "Lord Jesus Christ, the Apostle Paul, the Liturgy, the Catechism, the Articles, the Homilies, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooker, the Reformed Dutch Church, and the Presbyterian Church! *See Brief Ex.* pp. 115–124. A more unfair, uncandid and unsuccessful effort, it appears to us was never made. For example, the Article of his own Church says "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, *only after a heavenly and* SPIRITUAL *manner*." The Presbyterian Confession of Faith declares with like emphasis: 'Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also *inwardly by faith*, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporeally, but *spiritually*, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death." A stronger "protest" against *Oxford Substantiation* could not be given than is given by the English and Presbyterian Churches. Whether the Oxford doctrine be called transubstantiation, consubstantiation, or subtantiation, it is a departure from the spiritual views of the sacrament entertained by the English and other Reformers. It is an error, which has a close connection with the claims of the High Church Priesthood;[1] and is derogatory to the simple and edifying objects of the institution.

---

[1] The recent controversy in Baltimore between Bishop Whittingham and his Presbyter, Rev. H. V. D. Johns, was in relation to this very subject. The Bishop, who preached in the morning, took the most extravagant views of the priesthood; and Rev. Mr. Johns, who preached in the same Church on the evening of the same day, replied to his Bishop, after the scriptural style. He showed that the Lord's Supper was *not* a sacrifice, the Lord's table was not an altar, and that the Christian minister was not a priest, in the sense of the offerer of a sacrifice. He has also published, as an appendix to his sermon, a lecture from the late Bishop WHITE, sustaining to the uttermost all his positions.

Bishop Doane, on the other hand, agrees with Bishop Whittingham. In his last Conventional Address, he says, "I have been pleased to observe the introduction into several Churches of the *prothesis, credence, or side-table*, for the elements in the Holy Eucharist, before they are placed upon the *Altar* by the *Priest*. Such an arrangement, while it makes the act of offering distinct and solemn, is necessary to the strict observation of the Rubric." p. 31. Now on this passage, we most respectfully beg leave to offer a few remarks. (1) Is not the object of these terms and of this additional ceremony, in accordance with the Oxford view, to change the supper into a *sacrifice?* The elements must be first placed upon the *prothesis*, so that the *priest* of the Apostolic succession may the more solemnly transfer a portion to the *altar*, where the act of offering consecrates and *substantiates* the *sacrifice*. (2) An Episcopalian will in vain search his Prayer-Book to find the meaning of "prothesis, credence or side-table." He must bring in "*tradition*;' and then he will find that this appendage of Popery was abolished at the Reformation. *Wheatley*, whose commentary on the Prayer-Book is recommended in "the course of ecclesiastical studies established by the American, [or "Scoto-Anglican"] House of Bishops expressly declares "WE HAVE NO SIDE TABLE AUTHORIZED BY OUR CHURCH." If this prothesis, credence or side-table, be so "necessary to the strict observation of the Rubric," it is very remarkable that it was never introduced before, and still more remarkable that even now it is only introduced into "*several* churches" of the Apostolical Diocese of New Jersey! (3) The word "*Altar*," is equally foreign from the language of the Prayer-Book; the term having been studiously excluded by the Reformers, when they tore down the Popish altar, and set up, in its place, "the Lord's table." *Wheatley* shows that the change

XI. Age of Miracles.

"It is a well-known tenet of Romanism that the age of miracles has never ceased; and that miracles are a distinguishing mark of a true Church. Oxford Divinity [says Bishop M'Ilvaine] is disposed to claim thus much too." p. 276.

BISHOP DOANE.

"*Is it not true, that in these days, washing seven times in the Jordan, to cure a leprosy, would be rejected as a superstition; or Peter's shadow, or a handkerchief, or an apron from Paul's body, to cure diseases? Yet such things have been. God's power meanwhile has not been shortened, but man's faith; and who will say that Christianity or the world has been the gainer by the change?*" p. 54.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"One of the last tracts published, No. 86, asks why we should suppose that with respect to sudden and extraordinary cures, a broad line is drawn between primitive and latter ages? On which a writer in the British Critic [a Tractarian journal] says 'Surely it is *want of faith*, which is the only hindrance to these gifts, in latter times.' What is the meaning of the popular phrase 'the age of miracles'? Is not every age of the Church an age of miracles?'" p. 276.

The agreement between Bishop Doane and the Tracts seems to be both general and particular. Even in regard to miracles, the Bishop thinks the only hindrance "in these days" is the "shortening of man's faith!" But is there no sufficient faith in the Diocesan *Apostolic* Church? Cannot an APOSTLE (for the worthy Bishop frequently calls Bishops Apostles, and once even VICARS OF CHRIST! *Bf. Ex.* p. 221.) perform miracles among Churchmen, who have taken the sacraments, whereby their justification and faith are increased more and more? Nevertheless, until this power of working miracles is proved in the *visible* Apostolic manner, we must "dissent" from these extraordinary claims. Our faith is *short*.

---

took place at the instance of Bishop Hooper, who declared that "it would do well to turn Altars into Tables, according to the first institution of Christ; for as long as Altars remain, both the ignorant people and *the ignorant and evil-persuaded priest* will always dream of *Sacrifice*." The same thing appears from one of Bishop Ridley's injunctions: "for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, we exhort the curates, churchwardens, &c., to erect and set up the Lord's board, after the form of an honest table, decently covered." During the reign of King Edward, the Lord's table took the place of the Popish altars; but when Roman Mary came to the throne Altars again took the place of Tables, and the Missal the place of the Prayer Book. When Queen Elizabeth became "Head of the Church," Altars were again removed, and Tables set up once more in the Churches, upon the strong representations and efforts of the Reformers. (*See Strype's Annals*, chap. 12.) Since that period, various High-Church divines have longed for the Altar again, as we may infer from their phraseology. The Prayer-Book, however, puts its veto upon this "restoration." Yet they still adhere to the old Popish language; and persist in the name of "*Altar*." This unauthorized innovation upon the language of the Church Service, is especially prevalent during these days of Popish Tractarianism. Inasmuch as the Prayer-Book *never* uses the term "Altar," in the Communion Service, but *always the term* "*Table*," why do the lovers of the Prayer-Book never use "Table," but *always* "*Altar*"? And why do they now begin to use the *prothesis* or "*little Altar*"?—a phraseology dishonorable both to Prayer Book and Protestantism!

XII. Extreme Unction.

"The British Critic,[1] in the Review of the late Tract, No. 86, on Church Service, complains of the author "because he did not enter a more decided protest than he has, against the common Protestant objection to Extreme Unction." The Reviewer thinks the testimony of Scripture, unexplained and unguarded by Tradition, is in favor of it. The only reason against it is that it wants *Catholic consent.* But that [adds Bishop M'Ilvaine] may be discovered before long!" p. 277.

Bishop Doane has not advocated Extreme Unction, but his views of administering the Eucharist under certain very extreme circumstances, have been supposed by many to border on the Popish view. Extreme Unction can hardly claim higher power than that implied in the High Church estimate of the Sacraments. The Oxford, High Church party have *no need* of the additional sacrament of Extreme Unction. They maintain that "Rome has not faith enough in the efficacy of the sacraments, (!!) and therefore has added to their number." It is surely much simpler to take the Oxford plan, and add to their *power.*

XIII. Anointing at Baptism and Confirmation.

"The absence of these in the Anglican Church [says Bishop M'Ilvaine] is called '*the loss of a privilege.*' And the keeping up of the Coronation Service, in which anointing is retained, is regarded as an indication of 'special Providential care over the Church'—thus keeping up a witness to both of the Catholic truths, of which the omission of anointing at Baptism and Confirmation might seem to betoken a disparagement." p. 278.

The Oxford Tractarians, or High Churchmen, must necessarily have a partiality for *oils in religious services,* inasmuch as these oils were in constant use in the third and fourth centuries, the favorite age of Tractarianism. As soon as the Anglo-Prussian scheme of Catholic Ecclesiastical Order shall go into Continental operation (and it will assuredly also embrace a few prelates of the Scoto-Anglican succession in these parts) what is now called "*the loss of a privilege*" will be most generously supplied, according to "*Catholic consent*" and ROMAN USAGE. Things will go on smoothly then![2]

---

[1] We have heard that Bishop Doane has recently written a notice, expressing his alarm at the British Critic for speaking so leniently of the supremacy of the Pope. It will be remembered, however, that he publicly recommended this same journal to clergymen and private families, a year or two after any of the extracts, contained in these pages, were written. We do sincerely hope that a divine, of Bishop Doane's extensive influence, will be led to renounce *all* the abominable doctrines of that Tractarian journal. If any are alarmed at the "inconvenient" doctrine of Papal Supremacy, there is surely ground for alarm in the pernicious doctrines which gradually formed the *system,* over which the Pope merely presides.

[2] Tract 9, mourning almost with *commination* penitence over the "entire omission of the use of oil at baptism and confirmation," declares that "*no one can say the* GREATNESS OF THE GIFTS *which are here withdrawn;* how much

XIV. Increase of Sacramental Signs and efficacious Symbols.

By these Tractarian innovators, "the Cross [says Bishop M'Ilvaine] is called '*a sacramental sign*' and memorial to the eyes of the faithful, '*a holy efficacious emblem.*' Now this is precisely the distinguishing description given in our Article on the Sacraments, of the Sacramental character of Baptism and the Eucharist. Thus is the cross put on a level, as a sacramental sign, with Baptism and the Lord's supper." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 278.

BISHOP DOANE.

In "the Architectural description of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J., occurs the following: "On the apex of the pediment is *intended* to be fixed an acroterium, bearing an enriched Greek Cross."[1] Rector's *offering of '34*, p. 47.

The new Church in Salem, N. J., "is surmounted, as it should be, by the Cross. We honor the spirit which has thus vindicated the rightful use of that *most sacred emblem* of our religion." *Conv. Add.* 1838, p. 18.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"The half-way step to image-worship is in the present reverence to the image of the Cross." p. 533.

"From similar restorations in *doctrine*, it behoves the whole Church most earnestly to pray "*Good Lord deliver us.*" p. 56.

A Tractarian writer says, "Let us multiply the same *holy efficacious emblem* far and wide. There is no saying how many sins its awful form might scare, how many evils avert." [!!!] *Quoted by Bishop M'Ilvaine.* p. 279.

Mr. Newman, at Littlemore, erected a Cross, after the Popish fashion, over the Communion table, or *Altar!* "*Sicut ante.*"

In general, Protestant Christians, whilst they "glory in the cross," do not, and cannot adopt the badges of Romanism and superstition. One such superstition leads to another. The same writer, quoted

---

we have thereby fallen from the high appellations of a 'royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people'" No one, we think, can doubt that these theologians are a peculiar people.

[[1] In the former edition of this pamphlet, a note was inserted to explain the reason of the absence of this *intended* Cross from "the apex of the pediment" of St. Mary's Church. In giving some particulars of the curious history, an error inadvertently occurred which was corrected in most of the copies, in a Postscript. If we could have been aware of the sensitiveness which was afterwards displayed by some who supposed themselves aggrieved by our bringing to light things which made no small stir in past times (as well as present), we would have avoided so exciting a topic. Instead of entering into particulars, we will now merely state that this Greek Cross was put upon St. Mary's Church eight years ago; that in consequence of its looking very much like a *Latin* Cross, a warm opposition immediately arose in the Vestry, and in the community; so much so that it was deemed prudent by some to take the Cross down, and it was accordingly taken down in the secret hours of the night, to the wonder of the good people of "all denominations!" For a little more on this subject, see Appendix.]

above by Bishop M'Ilvaine, goes on to say "With the Cross should be associated *other* Catholic symbols still more than *even itself*, vocal to the spiritually discerning. Such are the Lamb with the standard; the descending Dove; the Anchor; the Triangle; the Pelican; the *Icthus* (Fish,) and others." "Here we see [adds Bishop M'Ilvaine] SYMBOLS for the Times as well as TRACTS." p. 279.[1]

XV. Sacrament of Marriage.

The germ of this restoration, [says Bishop M'Ilvaine, p. 281,] is quite visible in the following mystic language:

"The ordinance of Marriage has an inward and spiritual meaning, contained in it and revealed through it—as if persons to place themselves in that human relation, interested themselves, in some secret way, in the divine relation, (that of Christ and the Church) of which it is a figure."

The Bishop of New Jersey seems to have a peculiarly solemn view of matrimony, differing somewhat from that of the Prayer-Book. In regard to the solemnization of this ceremony, he says: "Marriage should always be performed *in the Church*. There is a departure in this respect from her provisions, and from Christian propriety, much to be regretted."[2] Now amongst "the admirable provisions of the Book of Common Prayer," is the Rubric, which states that "persons to be married shall come within the body of the Church, *or shall be ready in some proper house*." It is very evident that the Bishop is a "dissenter" from this Rubric.[3] His zeal for the solemnization of marriages in the Church, may possibly arise from his peculiarly solemn view of the nature of the marriage contract; and perhaps it may be an Oxford "element in rudiment," waiting to break through "reserve," and to rise with the glory of more "active development."

The Oxford men think the Church has a right to multiply sacraments to any extent; and may therefore include matrimony among the holy rites. Mr. Newman speaking of the five additional sacraments of Popery, says: "They are not Sacraments in any sense *unless* the Church has the power of dispensing grace through rites of its own appointment, or is endued with the gift of blessing and hallowing the 'rites and ceremonies,' which accord-

---

[1] "Among the divine ordinances [says Mr. Newman] are a number of more or less abstract, or (what may be called) disembodied rites, to which the Church gives a substance and a form: such as public worship, imposition of hands, benedictions, and the SIGN OF THE CROSS, which are first *elements of actual ordinances*, and *the instrumental principles of grace*."

[2] Note to *Keble's* Christian Year, p. 377.

[3] Yet in one of his sermons, *Pillar of Truth*, p. 23, Bishop Doane, speaking grandly of his Church, which he certainly loves with great sincerity, says: "Even her Canons and her *Rubrics* are drawn from Scripture." How is this! A Bishop against a Rubric, and both Scriptural! (*Quere*, queer?)

ing to the 20th Article, it 'hath power to decree.' BUT WE MAY WELL BELIEVE THAT THE CHURCH HAS THIS GIFT."[1] And that she will exercise it, as soon as she is Oxfordized!

XVI. Celibacy of the Clergy—Monasteries.

The celibacy of the Clergy is a doctrine in high repute at Oxford, where Romanism finds the most sympathizing vindication of its abominations. Mr. Newman (whom the Bishop of New Jersey calls one of "*the holy three*," the other two being Dr. Pusey and Prof. Keble) says, "As far as clerical celibacy is a duty, it is grounded, not on God's law, but on the *Church's rule* or on vow." So that the Church may at any time enjoin the duty of the celibacy of the clergy![2] It is somewhat singular that those who believe in the peculiarly holy and sacramental character of matrimony, should generally be the very persons who would have the clergy remain in the comparatively unholy (as proved by history) state of celibacy. Those Tractarian divines, who are already in the *bonds* of matrimony, are in a very undesirable dilemma, their practice having anticipated their doctrine, and given a "*Providential* homage" to the scriptural view.

Dr. Pusey praises "the height of holiness of *whole bodies of men* in the Church of Rome." Bishop M'Ilvaine remarks: "This of course can mean nothing else than *corporate religious bodies, Monastic* bodies. Then this eminent holiness of the Church of Rome is to be found in her Monasteries, among her Monks! Of course we are to look for it in those countries where Monastic Bodies flourish in all the glory and holiness of those days of monastic peace, when the sound of the trump of Luther had not yet broke upon the silence of the cell, or disturbed the quiet of the Litany of St. Mary!" p. 295.

This "height of holiness," which is attainable through those *means of grace*, the *Monasteries*, is recommended by the Tractarians to be sought for after the same Romish manner. The English papers state that a building is used at Oxford for Monastic purposes, with a convenient number of cells for young English Monks.

---

[1] This quotation and a few others have been taken from Mr. Goode's masterly exposition of Tractarianism, in his "*Case as it is.*"

[2] There have been persons, at various times, in the established Church of England, who were not unfavorable to clerical celibacy. Queen Elizabeth, the female "Head of the Church," refused to allow the marriage of priests. *Strype*, in his *Annals*, ch. 3, states: "But among the good acts of Parliament, one was wanting, tho' as it seems labored at by the Protestant divines to be brought about. It was to revive King *Edward's* Act for the Marriage of Priests, which Queen *Mary* (the Papist) had repealed. But the Queen (Elizabeth) would not be brought so far to countenance the conjugal state of the Clergy. This troubled not a little the Divines, *especially such as were married*. Of this matter *Sandys* speaks in a letter to *Parker*, telling him, 'That no law was made concerning the Marriage of Priests, but that it was left, as it were, *in medio*; [or in *via medio*] and that the Queen would wink at it, but not establish it by law. Which is nothing else, said he, but to bastard our Children.' The Inconvenience hereof was that the Clergy were fain to *get their Children legitimated*." So much for an arbitrary head of the Church! Perhaps a few years may find a Royal Head of similar views.

XVII. Novelties in the Church Service.

1. Lighted candles in the Church. "Two lights should be placed upon the Altar, according to Edward the 6th's order, ratified in our present Prayer-Book. We think it plain that these candles were meant at the Reformation, to be lighted, as had been usual, during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist." *Quoted by M'Ilvaine*, p. 280.

2. Peculiar decorations on feast days.—"There should be some special decoration on festival days; altar coverings and pulpit hangings of unusual richness; or the natural flowers of the season woven into wreaths, or placed (according to primitive custom) upon the altar. These should be chosen with especial reference to the subject of the Festival. White flowers are most proper on the days consecrated to the blessed Virgin, as emblematic of sinless purity; purple or crimson on the several Saints' days, to signify the blood of martyrdom; and on All Saints' day and the Holy Innocents, white should be intermingled, as a memorial of Virgin innocence. The decoration of the chancel should be the especial privilege of the Minister himself." p. 280.

3. Bowings, genuflections, &c. "Persons should be encouraged to make obeisance on entering Church; and the Minister should *never approach, or pass* the Altar without doing reverence, as is customary at this day in some of our Cathedrals. p. 281.

Some of these ridiculous Papal mummeries are very fashionable at Oxford; and a few of the *Highest Church* in this country have already begun to practice them. The mummeries used by Laud in *St. Catharine Creed*, London, are even now in the progress of repetition by his idolizing followers at Oxford.

The fact that these doctrines always *tend* to these outward follies proves their inward corruption, and their identity with Popery.

XVIII. Use of Romish prayer-books, and rules of Fasting.

Bishop Doane.

"It is known that their mere reprint of devotional works have brought on, already, a new era among publishers; . . . procuring a market for such books as *never sold before*." [*Very likely!*] *Bf. Ex.* p. 160.

Bishop M'Ilvaine.

"An ecclesiastical Almanac has been published, for the guidance of Oxfordists amid the riches of the ancient services as found in the *Roman* and *Parisian Breviaries*. In this is a selection from old Catholic Service books; . . with *minute rules of the Roman Church as a guide to individuals for abstinence and fasting*." 282.

The Tractarians also regard it as "a very delightful sign of the times that Parker, in Oxford, finds it his interest to import a large number of copies of the Roman and Parisian Breviaries for private devotion." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 282.

XIX. Service in an unknown tongue.

Bishop M'Ilvaine remarks: "That these writers have said any thing positively in favor of service in an unknown tongue is not asserted; but their whole system of Reserve, of sacred veils over "awful mysteries," to conceal them from the eye of the profane, and

of the use of all those sacred symbols which only the initiated are supposed to be capable of reading, indicates *the very principle* on which the Service in an Unknown Tongue in the Romish Church is defended." p. 282.

It may be added that, as early as Tract 9, the following language, expressing some regret, is used in reference to the change from the Latin to the English language: "Services were [at the Reformation] compressed into one, which had been originally distinct; the idea of united worship, with a view to which *identity* of time and *language* had been maintained in different nations *was forgotten*; the identity of time [canonical hours] had been abandoned, and the identity of language [Latin] could not be preserved. Conscious of the incongruity of primitive forms and modern feelings, our Reformers undertook to construct a service more in accordance with the spirit of their age. *They adopted the English language*; they curtailed the already compressed ritual of the early Christians," &c.

This mournful language sounds very much as though the Oxford men thought their *vernacular* anything but a privilege.

XX. Misuse of Preaching.

Bishop M'Ilvaine justly remarks "how little use there is in frequent preaching, for all the purposes of the Oxford system." "Why may not a whole congregation of such persons be equally profited by the mere contemplation and *preaching of the sacred* '*Catholic Symbols*' above described, the Triangle, the Fish, the Anchor, the Pelican, added to the manipulations and genuflexions of the Priest, his divers bowings and incensings, accompanied with the aid of rich altar-cloths, symbolic candlesticks, splendid sacerdotal vestments, and enchanting choral music?" p. 283. Bishop M'Ilvaine also quotes on same page a Tractarian writer, as saying:— "The church is out of her place, converting in a Christian country!"

Tract 87 asserts: "not that we would be thought *entirely* to deprecate preaching as a mode of doing good; it *may be necessary in a weak and languishing state*; but it is the characteristic of this system as opposed to that of the Church; and we fear the undue exaltation of an instrument, which Scripture, *to say the least, has never much recommended.*"

Tract 80 thinks that "so far from it being considered necessary to *keep persons from Church* on account of irreligious lives, it is usually thought that every thing is done if they can be brought to it."

A great deal would be gained, if there was discipline enough in the Church to keep such writers from the *pulpit*.

XXI. Reserve of Religious Knowledge.

Bishop M'Ilvaine remarks: "The author of Tract 80, considers that in the days of the Puritans great evils arose from the putting forward of divine truth 'without that *sacred reserve*,' which he has been urging. 'The consequence of this *indelicate exposure* of re-

ligion was the perpetration of crimes almost unequalled in the annals of the world.' That is, the making known of the Gospel—the preaching of the death of Christ as an atonement for the sins of the world; the calling of sinners to flee to that refuge by repentance and faith; to seek rest only in the Cross of Christ—was productive of all this ruin! What will it be [adds Bishop M'Ilvaine] when the Gospel is preached to *every creature?*" p. 83.

Mr. Newman (one of the "*holy three*") also says: "The Alexandrian father (Clement) who has been already referred to, *accurately describes the rules* which should guide the Christian in speaking and acting economically;" one of which accurate rules is: "He both thinks and speaks the truth, EXCEPT WHEN CONSIDERATION IS NECESSARY, AND THEN, AS A PHYSICIAN FOR THE GOOD OF HIS PATIENTS, HE WILL BE FALSE, OR UTTER A FALSEHOOD, AS THE SOPHISTS SAY. . . . Nothing, however, but *his neighbor's good* will lead him to do this. *He gives himself up for the Church.*"

Tract 80, says: "To require, as is sometimes done, from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable." The atonement is considered "*a great secret.*"

Bishop M'Ilvaine, with every evangelical Protestant, truly says: "Our grand message every where is: 'BE IT KNOWN UNTO YOU, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sin: and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses.' St. Paul waited not till men were well initiated into Christian mysteries, before he unveiled the grand subject of atonement and justification through the blood of Christ. No—the Gospel plan of promoting sanctification is just the opposite of holding in obscurity any feature of the doctrine of justification." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 540.

XXII. Image Worship.

We quote as usual Bishop M'Ilvaine: "That these writers have *advocated* Image worship, is not here pretended. But that they manifest a strange tenderness and tendency towards the abominable idolatry, we shall easily show. This is one of the subjects which they would exclude from discussion; but if it *must* be discussed, as with transubstantiation, they would not rest the argument on Scripture, because there may be a difference of opinion in regard to its meaning; but on Tradition. As if the simple command, '*Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image,*' &c., which any one can read for himself, were of less plainness and solemn decision than the confused folios of Tradition, for which the million must depend on the reading of the few." p. 284.

After quoting from the Bishop of Exeter, what the Oxford men say about the worship of images, viz: "*it is dangerous in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians,*" Bishop M'Ilvaine proceeds to illustrate "the singular tenderness of these writers towards the idolatry of the Romish Church." He thinks it

evident that these divines have an "extreme tenderness for corruptions, which filled our Cranmers and Hookers and Jewels with loathing;" and applies to them the following from the Homily against Peril of Idolatry: "Away, for shame, with these colored cloaks of idolatry, of images and pictures, to teach idiots, nay, to make idiots and stark fools and beasts of Christians." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 284, 291.

XXIII. Tradition.

Tradition, though really a top-stone, is converted at Oxford into a corner-stone of the system.

"We have reserved all that we have now to say about the Oxford error of Tradition for this place, because, though *theoretically* it would seem to be a starting point for all the errors of doctrine, we regard it as in practice one of the last to be adopted. The sinner first says in his *heart* there is no God, and then he goes to hunt after arguments in support of his atheism. So the Romish Church first declined into great errors, and then invented her doctrine of Tradition for a defence. So it is with Oxfordism. Its doctrine of Tradition is not practically the source of all its other peculiarities, but its wall of protection for them against the Scriptures. The need was first felt, and then the *cordon sanitaire* was drawn." *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 307.

The extracts under this important head will show that the Tractarians adopt in substance the Romish view of Tradition, rendering it authoritative in the interpretation of the Word of God.

1. *The Oxford men and Bishop Doane (with the Romanists) maintain* THE EXISTENCE OF APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS IN ADDITION TO THE WORD OF GOD.

BISHOP DOANE.

Bishop Doane asks whether, "in our zeal against the very name of 'tradition,' we forget that Paul speaks of them! As—to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 2.) 'keep the ordinances,' (or traditions,) 'as I delivered them to you.' And to the Thessalonians (2 ii. 15.) 'hold *the traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by *word* or our epistle;' and again, (2 iii. 6) 'that walked disorderly and not after the *traditions* which he received from us.'" p. 124.[1]

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"It is to me, I confess, a matter of surprise and shame, that in the 19th century, we should really have the fundamental position of the whole system of Popery re-asserted in the bosom of that very Church, which was reformed so determinately three centuries since from this very evil. What! Are we to have all the fond tenets, which formerly sprung from the traditions of men re-introduced, in however modified a form, among us!" *Quoted by Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 309.

---

[1] "It becomes incomparably more alarming when we learn with what latitude the word Tradition is understood. It includes, as we gather from the oft repeated statements of the learned author [Keble] 'unwritten as well as written,' tradition, 'certain remains or fragments of the treasure of Apostolical doctrines and Church rules;' in other words an oral law, 'independent of, and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural;' which traditions are to be received 'apart from all Scripture evidence, as traditionary or common laws ecclesiastical.' So that it appears that SCRIPTURE and UNWRITTEN as well WRITTEN TRADITION are, taken together, the joint rule of faith."—*M'Ilvaine*, p. 310.

When we consider that no allusion to unwritten injunctions is contained in the writings of the fathers of the first two centuries; (which was certainly the most probable period for their prevalence)—that the fathers of the third and fourth centuries frequently differ from each other in matters of greater or less importance, in such a way as to show the impossibility of any traditions which were infallible;—that the first appeal to floating traditions, as containing articles of belief in addition to Holy Writ, was made by the Valentinian heretics;[1]—that it was the common manœuvre of heretics to prefer this claim;[2]—and particularly when we consider that the fathers themselves always appealed to Scripture as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, it seems incredible that any person, with the Bible in his hands and its spirit in his heart, should still resort to such a phantasm of man's imagination. "This we do affirm that, having *four* different accounts of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the last written for the very purpose of making the account complete, and above *twenty* Epistles written by the Apostles to explain it still further—to say that any thing at all important has been omitted, is a libel upon that Holy Spirit by whom the Apostles were guided."[3] Let those, who are disposed to profane the word of God by exalting tradition, remember the words of our Lord against the Pharisees who were great advocates of oral communications: "Why do ye transgress the commandments of God by your *tradition?*" (Mark vii, 9.) And again, "ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your *tradition.* (vii, 13.) And again, "beware lest any man spoil you after the *traditions* of men." (Col. ii, 8.)

2. *Bishop Doane agrees with the Catholics, in maintaining that the* BIBLE IS AN OBSCURE BOOK.

BISHOP DOANE.	BISHOP M'ILVAINE.
In reply to the remark that "the Bible is, in the judgment of Oxford men, a very obscure book," Bishop D.	"Yes, you may rely upon it, brethren, this 'joint rule of faith' will never long consist with the simplicity of the

[1] *Irenæus* says of these heretics: "When they are reproved from the Scriptures, they immediately begin to accuse the Scriptures themselves; as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and that they are not consistent; and that *the truth cannot be found out from them, by those who are ignorant of tradition.*" And *Ptolemy*, the Valentinian, expressly asserts that "their doctrine was derived from Apostolical tradition, handed down to them by a successional delivery from the Apostles." *Quoted by Goode*, vol. I. p. 809.

[2] So usual was it for heretics to appeal to tradition, that *Jerome* says of them generally, that they were accustomed to say—"We are the sons of those wise men who, from the beginning, have delivered to us the doctrine of the Apostles." "*Filii sumus sapientium qui ab initio doctrinam nobis apostolicam tradiderunt!*" *Goode*, vol. I. p. 809.

[3] This quotation is from "*Goode's divine rule of faith and practice*," a work of pre-eminent ability, and suited to the times. This book settles the controversy with Oxford in the most scriptural style. It contains a mass of information which is of great practical utility, and ought to be in the hands of all students, as a preservative against Popish errors in regard to the relative authority of Scripture and Tradition.

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
says: "Well; did not Peter entertain very much the same judgment, not only of St. Paul's writings, but of 'the other Scriptures?' 2 Peter iii. 16.—'In which are *some things hard to be understood*, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also *the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction."[1] p. 125.	Gospel . . Already texts of inspired Scripture are weakened or contracted to the narrowest and most doubtful sense . . . All this is but too natural." p. 314.

When the Bishop of N. J. thus maintains that the Bible is an obscure book, and of course makes Peter, as one of its writers impeach his own wisdom and the wisdom of God, who inspired all the sacred writers, he endorses one of the main perversions of Romanism. On this point, our only safe course is to adopt that great principle of Protestantism that "*However obscure any of the doctrines or statements of Scripture may be, there is no plainer report of them than we can find there, that can come to us with any authority to bind the conscience to belief.*"

3. *Bishop Doane maintains, with Oxford and Rome,* THAT THE BIBLE CANNOT BE UNDERSTOOD WITHOUT THE AID OF THE CHURCH.

In support of the position that the Bible needs an interpreter, Bishop Doane says, "Was it Romish in the Ethiopian Eunuch to answer, and in St. Luke to *record* his answer, to the Deacon Philip—'Understandest thou what thou readest?'—'How can I, *except some one should guide me?*'" Acts, viii. 30. p. 125.	"I appeal to you whether we have not here a totally FALSE PRINCIPLE asserted as to the rule of faith. I appeal to you whether this is not to magnify the comments of men above the inspired words of the Holy Ghost. I appeal to you whether, this is not to make tradition an integral part of the canon of faith," p. 310.

The Bishop of New Jersey must be *pressed* in the service of Romanism to offer such singular proof. In the first place, this Ethiopian Eunuch, brought up in barbarian ignorance, was as yet unbaptized, and consequently, according to High Churchism, he was *under the condemnation of mortal sin*, and therefore unfit to be a teacher either to "irreverent dissenters" or to "Catholic Churchmen." In

[1] "It occurs to us that the danger might be as great, perhaps, of wresting the note and commentary, as of wresting the text to their own destruction. We think that of the two modes, the Bible itself is by all means the least dangerous, and *especially for the unlearned and unstable*, who would fare very badly under the guidance of notes and comments, made peradventure by men as unstable, if not as unlearned as themselves."—*S. S. Journal.*

"If it be objected that scripture does not suffice for the settling of disputes, I answer, neither does tradition, neither does anything; hence St. Paul says to the Corinthians, among whom tradition was fresh, and to whom he sent also, at the same time, a scripture, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost;" and St. Peter speaks of those who "are willingly ignorant:" in other words there are mistakes and delusions, for dispelling which, not even revelation will suffice. I further answer, that though the providential permission of errors is a mystery, it is not so great a one as the providential permission of evil: and there is no more infallible remedy for error, than there is for sin; there cannot be, so long as the mind and the will are free, and the due exercise of that freedom is part of our probation."—*Bishop Onderdonk, of Pa.*

the next place, this Ethiopian does not say "How can I understand except some *High Churchman* guide me?" but "except *some one*," that is, any one who understands the Bible.—In the third place, the Eunuch was not in possession of the New Testament, but was reading a prophecy in the Old Testament, which, if interpreted by tradition, binds us to the use of the Jewish Talmuds, including Mishna and Gemara.—In the fourth place, the ignorant Eunuch acted very wisely in calling Philip, or any one else, to his aid; and it would not be amiss if some others, who ride in their High-Church chariot, would let deacons get up and interpret Scriptures for them too, sometimes.

4. *Bishop Doane, with Oxford and Rome, places the Church even* BEFORE *the Bible.*

BISHOP DOANE.

In reply to a remark that an inquirer must go first to the Church and then to the Bible, Bishop D. says, "And is not this the VERY GROUND on which St. Luke commended the Bereans as 'more noble,' in that they 'received the word' spoken by Paul and Silas, and [*then*] searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so." p. 12.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"The false principle will go on, 'eating as doth a canker.' The inspired word of God will be neglected, and the traditions of men will take its place. Traditions and Fathers will occupy the first place, as we see in the sermons of the chief Roman Catholic authors of every age, and Christ come next or not at all." *Quoted,* p. 314.

But if inquirers must first go to the Church[1] and to Churchmen before they go to the Bible, the question arises, *which is the true Church?* "I," says the Pope! Or, which is almost the same thing, "WE," say the Tractarians! "By no means," affirm the "mixed multitude" of dissenters, "THE CHURCH IS COMPOSED OF THE FAITHFUL BELIEVERS AMONG ALL DENOMINATIONS!" So that the inquirer is more bewildered in finding out the true Church,[2] than in discovering the true meaning of the Scriptures. And that this is really the case, appears from the fact that Christians, though differing much in ecclesiastical name and order, profess generally the same fundamental truths. We have always supposed that the Bere-

---

[1] Even granting that the only true Church is the *Episcopal,* nothing could more strikingly show the folly of appealing to the Church for an infallible interpretation of Scripture than the differences of opinion between Bishop Doane and Bishop M'Ilvaine. The Bible means one thing in New Jersey; and a far different thing in Ohio! And yet Bishop D. says (*Church upon knees,* p. 8) "How could the sheep hear His voice, if the shepherds disagreed? If there were divers voices, which were they to follow?" [A question well put!]

Indeed so great and serious are these VARIATIONS OF EPISCOPACY, that we feel strongly persuaded that Bishop M'Ilvaine would not admit to *deacon's orders* a person who departed so far from Scripture as to vindicate and endorse the Tractarian system.

[2] King James II, told Bishop Burnet that the reason of his turning Papist was that he heard so much from the English divines about "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 hist. of own Times,* vol. I. p. 245, *quoted in Bib. Rep.* 1838, p. 116.

ans were commended for their noble spirit in *searching the Scriptures.* We never expected to hear them extolled as the advocates of tradition. Bishop D.'s interpretation is probably *traditional.*

5. "CATHOLIC CONSENT" *is the great standard of Biblical interpretation with Bishop Doane* (*as with Oxford and Rome.*)

BISHOP DOANE.

"The true Catholic pastor, who thus receives the word of God with the transmitted witness of the Church; who guides himself by the Holy Scriptures, *not as he understands them, but as Catholic antiquity has revealed and Catholic consent has kept their meaning*, will be chastised and schooled, by this submission of his judgment[1] to the wise and good of every age, into that childlike spirit which God will bless." *Troy Sermon*, p. 23.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"So, then, we are to search the inspired Word of God, not as the one, authoritative rule of faith, but as the document of what this Tradition teaches—we are to study the Scriptures, not in order to ascertain simply God's revealed will, but to prove tradition by Scriptural evidence—and the standard of revelation is no longer the Bible alone, that is, the inspired word of the eternal God in its plain and obvious meaning, but Scripture and Tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of faith!" p. 310.

We ask whether Romanists are not altogether satisfied with Bishop D.'s plan of asking the Fathers the meaning of the Bible? The spirit of *blind submission to Church authority, in opposition to convictions of the understanding*, (*recommended in the preceding extract*) is the very thing to bring Scripture into disrepute, and of course to overthrow the foundations of religion.—As to "*Catholic consent*," it has been well described by Mr. Goode: "It is just the consent of some half a dozen fathers falling in with the humor of the individual quoting them!" The Bible can hardly refer to this "Catholic consent," when it says "SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and THEY ARE THEY WHICH TESTIFY OF ME." The reader is particularly referred to the remarks on "Catholic consent" by Bishop Sherlock, contained in a note.[2]

---

[1] "We hear much now-a-days of the submission of our understanding to the dictation of our spiritual instructors, and to the superior wisdom of antiquity, as though the surrender of our own judgment and the blind adoption of primitive usages, were only another name for Christian faith. Let it be at least recollected, that the humility prescribed by the Gospel extends to every portion of the human race alike; to the teacher no less than to the pupil. But the humility, attempted to be taught by the dictation of uninspired men, inculcating their own theories as portions of Holy Writ, if it encourages the prostration of the understanding on the one part, is no less favorable to spiritual tyranny and dogmatism on the other." *Shuttleworth on Tradition*, p. 121.

[2] "As for expounding Scripture by the unanimous consent of primitive Fathers, this is indeed the rule which the Council of Trent gives, and which their doctors swear to observe. How well they keep this oath, they ought to consider. Now as to this, you may tell them that you would readily pay a great deference to the unanimous consent of Fathers, could you tell how to know it; and therefore in the first place you desire to know the agreement of how many Fathers makes an unanimous consent: for you have been told, that there has been 'as great variety in interpreting Scripture among the ancient Fathers as among our modern interpreters;' that there are very few, *if any*, controverted texts of Scripture which are interpreted by an unanimous consent of all the Fathers. If this unanimous consent then signify all the Fathers, we shall be

It may be proper in this connection to introduce the two following quotations of Dr. Doane, as being natural deductions of the mystical love of antiquity and tradition, which likewise prevails at Oxford:

BISHOP DOANE.

[*Speaking in reference to the P. E. Theological Seminary at N. Y., of which he is ex officio a Trustee,*] Bishop D. says: "It should be considered whether the entire omission, or casual notice, of the study of the Fathers, in training the teachers of a Church, which every where appeals to 'Holy Scripture and ancient authors,' and receives as truth only that which the first receivers witnessed of as true, be not a strange and most injurious omission."[1] *Epis. Address*, 1842, p. 9.

Also, "it should be considered," (as to the Seminary) "whether the prominence allowed in the course of study to the Evidences of Christianity, as if it were an open question, be not a laying again of the foundations, inconsistent with the position of a Church, which for eighteen hundred years has been the providential witness of its truth."(!) *do.* p. 9.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE.

"But what (saith Latimer) is to be said of the Fathers? How are they to be esteemed? St. Augustine replies, giving this rule also, that we should not therefore think it true, because they say so, though they ever so much excel in holiness and learning.—The Fathers have both herbs and weeds, and papists commonly gather the weeds, and leave the herbs." p. 308.

"Hence the stern war of the Oxford divines against the study of the Evidences of Christianity, as a way of becoming established in the truth, instead of *hearing the Church*, and trusting to an '*instinctive* faith' in her testimony." p. 194.

The study of the Evidences of Christianity is certainly quite useless in a Church, which trains up her children to avoid "open questions," and to rely with instinctive faith upon Catholic consent as interpreted by Apostolical succession. The only wonder is that the Fathers should be studied at all. Why not "*Hear* the Church?"

---

troubled to find such a consent in expounding Scripture. Must it, then, be the unanimous consent of the greatest number of Fathers? This will be a very hard thing, especially for unlearned men to tell noses: we can know the opinion only of those Fathers who were the writers in every age, and whose writings have been preserved down to us; and who can tell, whether the major number of those Fathers who did not write, or whose writings are lost, were of the same mind with those whose writings we have? And why must the major part be always the wisest and the best men? And if they were not, the consent of a few wise men is to be preferred before great numbers of other expositors. Again ask them, whether these fathers were infallible or traditionary expositors of Scripture, or whether they expounded Scripture according to their own private reason and judgment. If they were infallible expositors, and delivered the traditionary sense and interpretation of Scripture, it is a little strange how they should differ in their expositions of Scripture. . . . If they expounded Scripture *according to their own reason and judgment*, AS IT IS PLAIN THEY DID, then their authority is no more sacred than their reason is; and those are the best expositors, whether ancient or modern, whose expositions are backed with the best reasons."—*Goode's Div. Rule*, p. 214–5.

[1] If the House of Bishops intend to introduce more of the Fathers into the Seminary, we most respectfully suggest, as an excellent introduction to the same, "*Daille' on the right use of the Fathers*,"—a standard work recently published by the "Presbyterian Board of Publication."

One more quotation on the Rule of Faith and Tradition will be sufficient for the purposes of *this Brief Examination.*

Bishop Doane.	Bishop M'Ilvaine.
[*Bishop D., when speaking of the Rule of Faith, frequently appeals to*] "Holy Scripture and ancient authors," as in *Brief Ex.* p. 182, and p. 309.—*Troy Sermon*, p. 2., &c, &c., Again: "The Church *every where* appeals to 'Holy Scriptures and ancient authors.'" *Conv. Add.* 1842, p. 9.	"Not for one moment do we place tradition on the same level with the all-perfect word of God. Not for one moment do we allow it any share in the standard of revealed truth. Scripture and Tradition, taken together, are NOT the joint rule of faith." p. 312.

This "every where" appeal of Bishop Doane, is only made once (we believe) in the "Book of Common Prayer," and then in a preface to a particular service; and even then in a different sense from that which Bishop D. is so anxious it should bear.[1] Whereas the Articles of the *Protestant* Episcopal Church expressly maintain that the Bible ALONE is the rule of Faith. Read the following words of the 6th Article: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite, or necessary, to salvation." The Homilies of the Church also bear equally direct testimony: "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 the holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do and what to eschew."

If such be the doctrine of the Church in her Articles and Homilies, why is it not also the doctrine of her divines?

We agree most sincerely with *Bishop M'Ilvaine*, that in regard to the doctrine of tradition, "OXFORDISM IS THROWING ITSELF INTO THE SAME DEFENCE, AS ROMANISM, FOR THE SAME PURPOSES, IN MAINTENANCE OF THE SAME ERRORS." p. 308.

---

[1] The Preface to the "Manner of making Deacons" has these words, upon which Bishop D. lays so much stress: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading *Holy Scripture and ancient Authors*, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests and Deacons." These words, so frequently quoted by the Diocesan of New Jersey, to prove that his Church makes *tradition the interpreter of Scripture* fall many degrees short of the Oxford mark, as we think any candid mind will admit. As this is the only passage in the Articles and Ritual of the Church to prove the transcendant authority of tradition, it is not strange that it is seized with the fresh delight attending a great discovery, and quoted and re-quoted until its original and humble meaning is quite obscured in the splendor of its glorification. We have no doubt that most Episcopalians, would be willing to say, that the passage simply implied the concurrence of ancient authors in the actual existence of the Episcopacy which Scripture at first sanctioned.

For ourselves, we confess that the passage has always seemed to admit that Diocesan Episcopacy was very difficult to be found in Scripture. This interpretation derives a presumption in its favor from the fact that an appeal is no where else made to "Ancient authors." If this be the meaning attached to the passage by Bishop Doane, we rejoice heartily over our mutual agreement.

XXIV. Apostolic Succession. High-Church Claims &c.

The doctrine of Apostolic succession was one of the first points taken up by the Oxford Tractarians, as appears from Mr. Percival's letter. We deeply regret that Bishop M'Ilvaine has not exposed the absurdity of such claims. Indeed we can hardly account for his silence on this point, unless, from prudential considerations, he was induced to avoid an additional exciting topic, when he had already thoroughly overthrown the foundations of the false system. Even a calm exposition of High-Church claims might also, perhaps, have been considered too personal towards some in the "House of Bishops."——In our remarks under this head, we propose to show that the Tractarians and Bishop Doane agree, [with the Papists] 1. In the necessity of a regular Apostolic Succession of Bishops, through which channel alone, grace is transmitted. And 2d consequently that they agree in unchurching other Protestant Churches, and in abusing the Reformers. We shall also show, as we proceed, that these "Catholic peculiarities" were not entertained in the early periods of the English Church.

1. The Oxford Tracts and Bishop Doane agree in maintaining the necessity of a regular Apostolic succession of Bishops, through whom alone, as in a channel, grace descends.

Oxford Writers	agree with	Bishop Doane.
"The points we ought to put forward are the following: 1. The doctrine of Apostolic succession, as a rule of practice. The successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands." *Percival's letter.*		"The office which Timothy held and exercised by the laying on of Paul's hands, is transmitted in an unbroken line, entire and perfect to our time." *Office of a Bishop*, p. 11.
[This doctrine is continually taught throughout the Tracts. See particularly Tracts 1, 4, 7, 10, 17, 24, 33, 52, 54, 60, 74. It is one of the well-known fundamentals of Tractarianism.]		"They committed it to other 'faithful men,' who should come after them, and they again, in an unbroken line, to us." *Leeds sermon*, p. 19.
"The participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual; and it is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates." *Percival.*		"Yes, could I swell my voice, till it should reach from Canada to Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific shore, it should be lifted up to entreat all who heard it, not to be content with the word of God, without that ministry and those sacraments, which are equally his ordinances, and *equally essential to salvation*," &c. *Office of a Bishop*, p. 25.
"Episcopal authority is the very bond which unites Christians to each other and to Christ." *Tract* 10. "None but the Apostles and their deputies could be said to have Christ's warrant for blessing that bread and that cup. And		"Episcopacy is the Church's living bond of union with Christ; the channel in which the grace has been transmitted through the hands of the Apostles, which lends their virtue to her sacraments, and gives to penitent and

Oxford Writers agree with	Bishop Doane.
this is a matter *pertaining to each man's salvation.*" Tract 52, p. 7.	faithful hearts assurance of acceptance and salvation through the purchase of the blessed Cross; apart from which [Episcopacy] it [the Church] could have no connection with the Apostles, and could claim no promise made to them." *Burning Bush*, p. 28.

Quotations might be indefinitely multiplied, but it is unnecessary. In order to show the *uncertainty* hanging over the Apostolic succession, we quote, as a specimen, the following, from the 9th lecture in Smyth's admirable work on this subject:

"Hooker admits that ordinations had *oftentimes* been effected without a Bishop to ordain, 'and therefore,' he says, 'we are not simply, without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles, by continued succession of Bishops in every effectual ordination. Stillingfleet declares, that 'by *the loss of records* of the British churches, *we cannot* draw down the succession of bishops to the apostles' times.' There is, in fact, no reckoning for the first five hundred and ninety-six years, until the time when Augustine was sent from Rome to re-establish christianity in Britain. Nor is the record of these five hundred and ninety-six years, any better kept at Rome than in Britain; for if we come to Rome, says Stillingfleet, 'here the succession is as muddy as the Tiber itself,' 'and what shall we say to extricate ourselves out of this labyrinth?' Who can tell the date of the consecration of Augustine, about which a late prelatic advocate differs from himself in the small amount of fifty-four years, and in reference to which we find Baronius contradicting Bede, and Dr. Inett making confusion worse confounded? The archbishopric of Canterbury, says Dr. Inett, in his Origines Anglicanæ, had been void from the year 1089, in all, about four years, and the bishopric of Lincoln about a year. Towards the end of the eighth century, this same see was *divided* into two parts for several years. Dr. Inett himself affirms, that 'the difficulties in that see betwixt the year 768 and the year 800, *were invincible.*' Speaking of the death of Dunstan, this writer further states, that Ethelgar 'succeeded to the chair of Canterbury the year following, but dying the same year, our historians are not agreed who succeeded, some confidently pronouncing in favor of Siricius, and others of Elfricus.'"

As another specimen of the difficulties of hereditary transmission, we may mention the historical fact that, for a number of years, there were two Popes, each claiming supreme jurisdiction, and the treasury of apostolic succession. Bishop Doane, in denying that Rome is the "essential centre of unity," argues as follows against the Bishop of Arath: "*The essential centre of unity! A pretty figure, doubtless, were it true!* BUT HOW WAS IT WHEN THERE WERE TWO POPES? WERE THERE THEN TWO 'ESSENTIAL' CENTRES? OR WHICH WAS WHICH?" (*Bf. Ex.* p. 213.) Now *we* ask also, *how was it when there were two Popes?* Were there then TWO DEPOSITORIES OF APOSTOLIC GRACE? OR WHICH WAS WHICH? For ourselves we do not care *which* was "*which;*" for we abjure this ecclesiastical *witchcraft*, which professes to delineate the only course of the regular ministry and the operations of God's Spirit. But how our friend, Dr. Doane, is to decide between "which and which," is a point which we are very much at a loss to determine. We should

not advise any one to risk his salvation upon the right solution of this historical puzzle.[1]

In regard to these extravagant and absurd opinions, it has been well remarked:

"We sincerely pity the man who believes them. His chance of heaven, if we may use such language, is on his own principles, slender indeed. The man, whose title to his estate depends upon his being able to prove that there has been no invalid marriage in the line of his ancestry for two thousand years, would be well off, compared with him whose hope of salvation rests on the assumption that there has been no invalid ordination in the ecclesiastical progenitors of his parish priest since the days of the Apostles. Let it be remembered that one invalid ordination (or consecration) would, in the course of a few generations, vitiate hundreds, and then thousands. Alas, for those who have no hope but on the uninterrupted succession!" *Princeton Review for* 1841, p. 154.

Bishop Burnet remarks to the same purpose:

"The condition of Christians were very hard, if private persons must certainly know how all ministers have been ordained since the Apostles' days; for if we will raise scruples in this matter, it is impossible to satisfy them unless the authentic registers of all ages of the Church could be showed, which is impossible; for though we were satisfied that all the priests of *this* age were duly

---

[1] Some of the High Church have lately attempted to trace their genealogical table through the early English Church up to St. Paul. On this effort, we make two remarks. 1. The existence of the early English Church no one doubts; but it is not an established historical fact that Paul ever visited Britain. We quote from *Burton's Church History, used at St Mary's Hall, with a recommendation by Bishop Doane.* "We need not believe the traditions concerning its first conversion [by St. Paul]; and it is right to add that the earliest writer who speaks of Britain as having been visited *by any of the Apostles* is Eusebius, who wrote at the beginning of the *fourth century;* and the earliest writer who names St. Paul is Theodoret, who lived *a century later*"!!! Thus what was unknown, or indefinite, in the first centuries, was probability in the fifth, and certainty in the nineteenth!—2. Our *second* remark is, that notwithstanding the existence of the early British church, the Apostolic line of succession was long since diverted from that channel, and now runs through the Popish ordinations. Augustine, with 40 monks was sent by the Pope from Rome to England, where he landed in 596, and marched to Canterbury in ecclesiastical style with a waving banner and a silver crucifix! Two years after, he was made Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England; the Pope sending the Archbishop a pall, with presents for the new Cathedral, including *holy relics*, &c. Augustine did much to set the Church in Roman order; and hence he is truly called "the founder of the English Church as distinguished from the British" and "the great Apostle of England." (*Blunt*, p. 27.) After his death, great confusion prevailed, so that 60 or 70 years after, there was only one canonical Bishop in all England. We now quote from *Blunt's Hist. of Eng. Ref.*, which has a recommendatory letter *by Bishop Doane:* Two of the provincial kings, "consulted together on the actual condition of the church, and came to a determination, in which the church itself concurred, to send a priest of their common choosing to Rome, to be there *consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, who might henceforth supply the see of England canonically and set in order its ecclesiastical rites.* Theodore, a monk of Cilicia, was accordingly designated by the Pope Archbishop of Canterbury, [about the year 670] and despatched to England." (p. 31, 32.) This Popish Monk was the first Archbishop of Canterbury, "to whom the universal Church of England submitted." He ordained bishops, re-ordained those whose commission was irregular, and reduced the ecclesiastical affairs of the island to some order. The first five

ordained, yet if we be not so sure that all who ordained them had orders rightly given them, and so upward till the days of the Apostles, the doubt will still remain." *Quoted in Ch. Obs.* '38, p. 827.

Nothing can be more certain than that the greatest uncertainty and obscurity exist in regard to various links in the chain of Apostolic succession; and that the most vile doctrines of Anti-Christ and the most disgusting immoralities—such as cannot belong to a true Church—have thoroughly defiled the line of ancestry, which pretends to exclusive fellowship with the Apostles.—Nor is even the new American succession entirely free from all canonical doubt.[1]—In short, this theory, unsupported by Scripture, and unsupportable by fact, is a visionary idea of Popery and High-Churchism. It was never incorporated in the system of the Reformers, who framed the Articles of the Church of England, and laid the foundations of its

---

Archbishops of Canterbury were *Italians*. Blunt further states, "There is much in our [subsequent] history that is *dark, intricate and uncertain*. Many early church records have perished in the fires." (p. 43.)—such as those which consumed the documents in the "Cathedral of Canterbury soon after the Norman conquest," and "St. Paul's Cathedral with its chapter-house and the *writings contained in it*," during the great fire in London.—So that the English ordinations were thoroughly Popish, and are moreover not a little "dark, intricate and uncertain." Between the Pope and the fires, English ordinations are very far from realizing "*in medio* tutissimus ibis."

[1] The chain of the "*Scoto-Anglican*" or American succession is by no means perfect, but some of its links are certainly cracked, if not broken. For example, according to High-Churchism, Baptism is the instrument of justification; or as Bishop Doane expresses it, "*he grafts them in by holy baptism into the living vine.*" (Troy sermon p. 25.) Now two of the earliest Bishops of the American Episcopal church were never "grafted in"—never received this "sacrament of salvation"—were never canonically baptized! But can an unjustified person, who has not submitted to the ordinances of the Church of Christ, stand in the place of the Apostles? Bishop White says "If the prejudice should prevail, it is very unfortunate that two of our Bishops [Dr. Provoost and Dr. Jarvis] never received baptism from the hand of an Episcopalian administrator. So that who knows what scruples this may occasion, as to the validity of many of our ordinations? . . . There would be no certainty of a Bishop in Christendom." (Mem. of Ep. Ch. p. 282.) Now inasmuch as these two unbaptized Bishops assisted in the consecration of Bishops Hobart and Griswold in 1811, the whole of the present House of Bishops have a shadow of doubt over their glory. For Bishop D. admits that "an ordination which is merely probable, or only probably sufficient and valid, only makes a *probable Bishop*, or one who is merely probably a Bishop . . . True and valid Episcopal vocation is not merely probable, but certain and undoubted." (Brief Ex. p. 228.) Now the fact that various ways have been devised to prove that consecration without baptism is not defective, shows that there is some "doubt" on this subject. If we take one of the solutions, viz: that "baptism by a layman is valid, if the essentials are preserved"—why may not ordination by a layman be valid, if the essentials are preserved? Especially as Bishop D. tells us "the commission to *teach*, being also the commission to *baptize*." (Troy sermon p. 14.) If we take another solution, viz: that "there is a possibility of transmitting the Episcopal succession through persons who are not members of the Church"—why may not ordination be thus transmitted? Whatever solution is made, it must equally benefit Presbyterian ordination, because "the commission to baptize is also the commission to teach." But however this may be, it is very unfortunate that such an event as the consecration of Bishops who were never "grafted in," should have occurred in a Church, where every thing is claimed to be APOSTOLIC.

But what adds still another shade to the shadow is the consecration of 1811,

glory. The men of that age were too intent upon the great work which engrossed their hearts, to embrace a dogma of Popery, at variance with Scripture, reason and history. Says *Archbishop Whately:* "Those who framed the Articles of our Church claimed no sacramental virtue for the ordinances which they administered, on account of possessing the Apostolic chain of succession, which, if one link be broken, the whole is destroyed. They merely claimed for themselves the title of being regularly ordained ministers of a scripturally constituted Church of Christ. Those who put forward any other claim were attempting to remove the foundation of the Church from the rock on which it had been built to place it on the sand. The Reformers put forward no exclusive claims."——— This will more fully appear as we proceed to the remaining topic of consideration.

---

when Bishop White (as he himself tells the story) "in the imposition of hands on each of the two Bishops elect [Hobart and Griswold] omitted the words '*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*' The officiating Bishop was unconscious of the omission; and the first intimation of it to him, was by Bishop Jarvis in the way from Church." (p. 287.) Now inasmuch as great stress in favor of Episcopacy is laid upon the text "*As my father hath sent me, even so send I you,*" it is certain that those, who *make every thing* of forms, must feel a *little* uncertainty and doubt about this consecration, in which no mention is made of the Bishops being sent either by the Father or the Son. Would baptism, with no mention of the name of God, be considered free from canonical doubts? Why then otherwise with a consecration which has also a set form, the "rubric being *scriptural?*" This omission of Bishop White made no small stir at the time in New York; and led to much discussion in the newspapers, and in a pamphlet by an Episcopalian. The mind of a Churchman of the straitest sect, may well be alarmed at the omission of *any* words, especially such important words, in one of the established forms of the Church.

But the difficulty is increased by the fact that both of the errors, or variations from Episcopacy alluded to, were unfortunately concentrated upon the same two Bishops, Hobart and Griswold, the latter of whom is now the respected presiding Bishop. For not only did Bishop White omit the name of the Trinity, but the other two Bishops who assisted at the consecration, were the very two (Provoost and Jarvis) who had never been canonically baptized! Each omission by itself might well cause doubt in a conscientious advocate of *forms*; but when the two are blended, assurance of no invalidity is very far from being "doubly sure."

There is still another uncertainty in the case of *Bishop Seabury;* who failing to obtain ordination in England, was obliged to seek it in Scotland, where he obtained it. But inasmuch as several Covenanters, who had never received any other than Presbyterian baptism and ordination, were consecrated Scotch Bishops, how is it known that this bar in the channel did not prevent Episcopal virtue from reaching Bishop S.? Moreover, even *Perceval*, in his "Apostolical Succession," admits that the consecration of *Hickes*, the non-juror, was "irregular and schismatical." p. 133. But the present Scottish succession is derived through both of these sources, according to *Perceval*, pp. 136, 137, through the Scotch and English non-jurors; and as both are corrupt streams, it follows of course that so far as the American succession is "Scoto," it is void. Bishop *White* (Memoirs, p. 166.) says that "Bishop *Provoost* was opposed to having any thing to do with the Scotch succession: which he did not hesitate to pronounce irregular." So that here we have very considerable doubt about the first American Bishop, who of course has communicated great ecclesiastical uncertainty throughout the Diocese of Connecticut, and thus throughout the whole Church!

2. ***The Tractarians and Bishop Doane agree in unchurching other Protestant Churches, and in abusing the Reformers.*** This is the natural result of their pretension to Apostolic succession, as the only channel of grace.

Oxford Writers agree with	Bishop Doane.
"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." *Tract* 74.	"Those trumpet words of Paul to the Ephesians "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism," are shrunk from as discourteous to *the great Diana of our Ephesus*, which rejoices in that descriptive title, "*other denominations*." p. 161.
"The English Church claims to be merely *Reformed*, not Protestant, and it *repudiates any fellowship* with the *mixed multitude*, which crowd together, whether at home or abroad, under a mere political banner." *Tract* 71.	"The simple faith has been conceded, as the price of peace, or through the flattery of smooth words, to the *mixed multitude* of their [Luther and Calvin] discordant followers." p. 161.
"So far from its being a strange thing, that Protestant sects are not '*in Christ*,' in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world, that they should *lie between us and heathenism*. *Tract* 47.	"Aye, '*there's the rub!*' But really it cannot be avoided. The 'Protestant denominations' complained of, as *unchurched* at Oxford, may go farther (to Geneva) and fare worse." p. 36.
"We are of '*the* Church,' not 'the *Episcopal* Church;' to call ourselves Episcopalians, is to imply that we differ from the mass of dissenters mainly in church-government and form, in matter of doctrine merely, and not of fact, whereas the difference is, that we are *here* and they *there*: WE IN THE CHURCH, and they OUT OF IT." *Br. Crit.* 26. p. 341.	"The *seeming* harshness of the inference, the conclusion that the loss of salvation must follow the failure in any of these essentials, may be safely left to the depth of the riches of grace." *Office of Bishop*, p. 28.
"I repeat, the Bishops are Apostles to us.—The MEETINGERS have no head, they are all *mixed together in a confused way*." *Tract* 10.	"I shrink from the suspicion of a more profound respect for schism in a Geneva cloak than in a Roman vestment." p. 189.
"Whatever be our private differences with the Roman Catholics, we may join with them in condemning Socinians, Baptists, Independents, Quakers, and *the like*." *Tracts*, vol. I., p. 603.	"I look with equal favor on the schismatic of every form." p. 189.
	"The very heat and angriness of Protestant divisions are but the escape of acrid humours, which *relieve the system*."—*Church upon knees*, (1) p. 16.

These quotations sufficiently indicate the spirit of the Oxford Tracts, and of the Bishop of New Jersey. It is a spirit of alienation from Protestant Churches, and a rejection of their title to the fellowship of Christ.

Now, any one acquainted with the history of the Reformation, knows that a strong unity of feeling existed between the Reformers in England and on the Continent; so much so that the latter were constantly consulted by the former, in matters pertaining to the Reformation in England. John Knox, the father of Presbyterianism in Scotland, was one of King Edward's Chaplains, assisted in revising the Liturgy, and in forming the Articles;[1] and was offered a Bish-

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox.

opric, which he refused from conscientious convictions. Through the agency of Archbishop Cranmer, Bucer and Martyr, both foreign divines, were called to the theological chairs of Cambridge and Oxford, during the reign of King Edward; and on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, (*says Strype, chapt.* 21) "Peter Martyr, the great divine, was ardently invited to come again hither." Re-ordination was not considered necessary to ecclesiastical preferment during the reign of Elizabeth, for many divines who had been ordained abroad exercised their functions in the established Church. BISHOP BURNET on the 23d Article says. "We are very sure that not only those who penned the Articles, but the whole body of the Church, for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches, so constituted, to be true Churches, as to all the essentials of a Church." In 1581, when collections were taken up in the English Churches to assist GENEVA in defending herself against a Popish army, the Queen and her Council, in their letter to the Bishops, call this "a needful service to the Church," and admit that "that poor town (Geneva) hath served in this latter age, for a nursery unto God's Church." (*Strype's Grindal*, p. 279.) And Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his letter to the metropolitan clergy, commends to them this effort "for the defence of so NOTABLE AND SINCERE A CHURCH." (*Strype's Grindal*, p. 280.) ***Lord Bacon*** also writes "Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been so bold as to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the Churches abroad; and that so far as some of our men ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers." In 1609, when the Scotch Bishops were consecrated, a question was raised by the Bishop of Ely, whether they ought not first to be ordained Presbyters, as having received no ordination from a Bishop. ***Bancroft***, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was present, maintained, "that thereof there was no necessity, seeing, where Bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the Presbyters must be esteemed lawful, *otherwise* that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches." So likewise Archbishop ***Usher***, although he thought non-Episcopal Churches defective, declared: "yet for the testifying my communion with those Churches, which I do love and honor as true members of the Church universal, I do profess that ***with like affection I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, were I in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers, if I were in Charentone.***" It is moreover well known that, at the Synod of Dort, 1618, five English divines, including three Bishops, took their seats officially as the representatives of the English Church, and though they defended their own Church, they did not unchurch others. Even ***Archbishop Sancroft***, who was a non-juror, enjoined it upon his clergy, in 1680, to pray "for the ***universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches at home and abroad against our common enemies.*** ***Archbishop Wake***, in 1720, says that he would not have the "iron heart" of "***certain raving writers,***" ***who thought that "the Reformed Churches have no valid sacraments, and so***

pronounce them scarcely Christian." But it is useless to multiply testimonies. The London "Christian Observer" says "it cannot be denied that foreign Presbyterian ordination was practically, however inconsistently, reckoned valid during the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth, the Jameses and Charleses." Although Episcopal ordination since that time has been always necessary to preferment in the English Church, we do not believe that the foreign Protestant Churches have ever been disowned by any considerable number of the English divines. The present Archbishop of Canterbury only reiterated the sentiments of his predecessors, from *Cranmer downwards, with three or four exceptions*, in his recent reply to an invitation from the "Church of Geneva" to attend the jubilee in honor of the Reformation. Dating from *Lambeth*, 1835, he acknowledges on behalf of his "brother bishops" as well as himself, their "high respect for the Protestant Churches on the continent, and sincere concern for their welfare." He also alludes to the "illustrious men," who were the means of "rescuing your Church [Geneva] from the shackles of Papal domination." Dr. *Whately*, the present Archbishop of Dublin, also maintains that "those who framed the Articles of our Church, clearly recognized the claim of every Christian community, who hold the great fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and administer the ordinances instituted by Christ, to be called a Church of Christ."—Such expressions of fellowship with other Protestant Churches have been generally characteristic of the Church of England. They appear in strong and scriptural contrast with the unfriendly exclusiveness and alienation of certain Tractarian and "*Protestant* Episcopal" divines.

Let us now briefly examine the particular cases of LUTHER and CALVIN.

Oxford writers	agree with	Bishop Doane.
"Really I hate the Reformation and *the Reformers* more and more." *Froude*, p. 389.		"The simple faith has suffered compromise, through an *undue respect* for Martin Luther and John Calvin," p. 160.
"The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted." *do.* p. 433.		"While the German and Genevan *glosses* are rejected, &c., the Catholic doctrine which Paul preached, will be proclaimed again—proclaimed as at the first and owned in that one Church," &c., p. 162.
"Protestantism in its *essence* and in *all its bearings* is characteristically the religion of corrupt human nature. —The Protestant tone of doctrine and thought is essentially anti-Christian." *Br. Crit.* 1841, p. 27, 29.		"There is no ground for anxiety! It is but the ejection from the Church of the *malign influences of cant and Calvinism*, that now disturbs it; crying with a loud voice, as of old, when they come forth." p. 182.
"They will see that the cry of 'Popery' is but a feint, devised by the arch-enemy of the Church, whereby to hurry men down the steep of ultra-Protestantism to its uniform end,—the 'denial of the Lord that bought them.'" *Tract* 77, p. 36.		"Whole Babylon is down; unroofed in *Luther's* Reformation; The walls John *Calvin* overthrew; Socinus the foundation." Some, "no doubt would stop the demolition at the middle of the second line. But it is hard to jump but half way down a precipice." p. 157–8.

Oxford writers . agree with Bishop Doane.	
"The perverse anti-ecclesiastical spirit, to which the Reformation on the Continent gave birth." *Br. Mag.* 9, p. 359.	"From the work of SELF-WILLED GERMAN hands, making more haste than speed, there have proceeded countless forms of error, heresy and schism." *Elizabethtown Sermon*, p. 17.
"Then many a schism o'erleaped the banks, Genevese, Lutheran and Scotch diversities." *Quoted in Br. Mag.* 9, p. 31.	"Then many a schism o'erleaped the banks, GENEVESE, LUTHERAN and Scotch diversities." *Quoted by Doane*, do. p. 38.
"God forbid that we should ally ourselves with the offspring of heresy and schism." *Tract* 24.	"So the German Reformers take the first step with LUTHER and CALVIN, and the last with Hegel and Strauss." *Quoted by Doane*, do., p. 18.

This language and spirit, so studiously derogatory to the Continental Reformers, and especially to the great names of Luther and Calvin, are the more remarkable, when we consider the influence of these two eminent men in framing the Articles and the doctrinal opinions of the Reformed Church of England.

As to LUTHER, we request the reader to attend to the following statements given by Bishop M'Ilvaine. "All the English Reformers were wont to speak of the grave and excellent judgment of Martin Luther, that most singular and chosen instrument of setting forth the Gospel of Christ." (*Pref.* p. 6.) "The ARTICLES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH chiefly derived their origin from LUTHERAN formularies. Some of them are drawn from the Confession of Augsburg, others from that of Wittemburg, known as the Saxon Confession." "If any person could but sit down to the perusal of our Articles, in utter forgetfulness that Europe had ever been seriously agitated by the Calvinistic dispute,[1] and with nothing in his mind but the controversy between the Reformed Churches and the Church of Rome, he would then clearly perceive that those ARTICLES were constructed for the most part on the LUTHERAN system, and principally as a rampart against the almost unchristian theology of the schools. Thus we have two very important auxiliaries, in case of any difficulty in understanding the precise meaning of our standard compositions; (1) the writings of LUTHER and his associates, especially of Melancthon, together with the Augsburg Confession, which the latter composed, from materials prepared by LUTHER; and (2) the doctrines of the Church of Rome. (*See Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 321.)

From these remarks it is evident that LUTHER ought to be held in high esteem, by those who profess any attachment to the ARTICLES of the Episcopal Church!

---

[1] *Bishop Davenant* observes that Melancthon "for the substance of doctrine, acknowledged his agreement with Calvin." And *Bishop Burnet* is obliged to admit concerning Luther that "it was no wonder if he, without a strict examining of the matter, espoused all Austin's opinions." (17th Art.)

Toplady says "The plain truth is, Luther himself was an absolute predestinarian: and was as able and resolute a defender of God's eternal, irrespective decrees, as Calvin or any other." (613.)

As to CALVIN, his influence upon the theology, and even Liturgy, of the Church of England was perhaps greater than that of Luther—certainly it was very extensive. The first Liturgy under King Edward, containing a number of things at variance with the opinions of the Continental Reformers, Calvin wrote to Somerset, the Lord Protector, objecting to prayers for the dead, chrism, and extreme unction,—which were accordingly expunged at the revision of the Liturgy in 1551. Even *Heylin, a High Churchman of the strictest sort*, admits: 'Here the business might have rested [without being revised] if Calvin's pragmatical spirit had not interposed.' 'The first Liturgy, being disliked by Calvin, was brought under revision.' "This was done to give satisfaction unto Calvin's cavils." And again, says *Heylin:* 'The great business of this year was the taking down of Altars by public authority; the principal motive whereunto was in the first place, the opinion of some dislikes, which had been taken by Calvin against the first Liturgy." So high was Calvin in King Edward's favor, that Archbishop Cranmer wrote to him, saying that he could not do any thing more profitable than to write often to the King. Indeed no writer speaks disrespectfully of Calvin, until the rise of Arminianism 60 or 70 years after his death. Inasmuch as Calvin's Form of Church government, differed from that of England, the ground of the respect entertained for him must have been his doctrine.[1] Certainly the great body of our early Reformers were predestinarians. The martyrs, Tyndal, Lambert, Barnes, Patrick Hamilton, John Rogers, Bradford, &c. were all predestinarians in doctrine. So were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Bucer, Martyr, &c. The 39 Articles were drawn up by men who very evidently professed Calvin's doctrine. *Bishop Burnet*, who was himself an Arminian, says (on the 17th Article) "It is not to be denied but that the Article seems to be framed according to St. Austin's doctrine." "It is very probable that those who penned it meant the decree to be absolute." "The Calvinists have less occasion for scruple [than the Arminians;] since the Article does seem more plainly to favor them. The three cautions, that are added to it, do likewise intimate that St. Austin's doctrine was designed to be settled by the Article." p. 226. If any doubt existed as to the theology of those who framed the Article, it would be dissipated by reading *Nowell's Catechism*, a thoroughly Calvinistic production, which was sanctioned by the same Convocation that decided on the Articles, and which [*according to Bishop M'Ilvaine*, p. 473.] "*may be received as a most authentic voucher of the doctrines of the Church, as understood in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.*" *Heylin* himself admits that "it was

---

[1] Jewel, in the reign of Elizabeth, writing to some of the Continental Reformers, after regretting that the Queen would not sanction a more thorough Reformation, adds, "as to doctrine, we have gone to the quick, and are not a nail's breadth from you therein."

It is hardly necessary to state that the Presbyterians prefer a different form of Church government from that contained in the Articles; and of course that they take exceptions to those Articles which relate to this subject.

safer for any man in those times to have been looked upon as an heathen and publican than an anti-Calvinist." Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, the three Archbishops of Canterbury during the reign of Elizabeth, were all Calvinists. The celebrated LAMBETH ARTICLES put forth by Whitgift, were rooted and grounded on Scriptural Calvinism; and "whenever occasion offered, Whitgift labored to countenance his own writings by those of Calvin; and especially out of Calvin's Institutes, yielding him the title of a famous and learned man." *Strypes Whitgift*, p. 583. This Archbishop of Canterbury boldly says of the Calvinistic Lambeth Articles, "I know them to be sound doctrine and *uniformly professed in the Church of England* and agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority." *Do* p. 462. Under James I., who was himself a Calvinist, the Church of England continued to adhere to the principles of the Reformers; and the divines who represented her at the Synod of Dort were Calvinists. *Laud*, however, at this time began to broach Arminianism; but even in the following reign of Charles I., the great majority of the clergy had not swerved from the Articles. Every Archbishop of Canterbury, up to Laud, was a Calvinist; the Puritans and their supporters had still a large majority in Parliament; and the Court faction of Arminians was very inconsiderable in numbers. An Arminian clergyman was refused his degree at Cambridge as late as the 10th year of Charles I. Oxford also continued to teach the doctrines of the Reformation. Indeed the Universities taught Calvinism from the days of Elizabeth until the civil wars. *Heylin* says: "It cannot be denied but that, by the error of those times, the reputation which Calvin had attained to in both Universities, and the extreme diligence of his followers, there was a general tendency unto his opinions." He also adds that "Calvin's Book of Institutes was, for the most part, the foundation upon which the young divines of those times did build their studies." *Heylin's Hist.* 626–7. Even after the Restoration, under Charles II., BISHOP SANDERSON (who wrote the Preface to the English Prayer Book) says "Calvin's Institutes were recommended to me, as indeed they were *generally to all young scholars in those times*, as the best and perfectest system of divinity and the fittest to be laid as the groundwork of that profession. And indeed my expectation was not at all deceived, in the reading of those Institutes." In latter years, we do not doubt that Arminianism became the prevailing religion of the divines of the established Church. So that the celebrated saying of Lord Chatham has much truth in it, that the Church of England had "*Calvinistic Articles, a Popish Liturgy, and an Arminian Clergy.*" Dr. South, also, in allusion to Bishop Burnet's principle of interpretation of the 39 Articles, which opened the door not only to the Arminians but to Arians and others, declared that that prelate had given the Articles "forty stripes save one." Notwithstanding the general decline into Arminianism which has taken place since the Restoration, a large number of the most pious and learned divines in the Episcopal Church, both in England and America, revere the name of Calvin as a great theologian and a noble Reformer.

Such being the influence of LUTHER and CALVIN upon the Reformation in England, (as well as upon the revival of religion on the Continent) is it not singular that some Christian men and Churchmen should be found in the 19th century willing to unite with Papists in reviling their characters, depreciating their services and disowning their Churches?

Conclusion.

Having now exhibited the doctrines and the spirit of Oxfordism, we shall make a few concluding observations.

1. OXFORDISM IS A FIRE-BRAND IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. It is a system which commenced its operations with open hostility to the Protestant churches. Its flaming dogma of Apostolic succession was hurled against the temple of the "*Diana of Ephesus*,"[1] to overwhelm all "*other denominations*" with ecclesiastical fire. The spirit of the whole "movement," both in England and in this country, is martial and aggressive. It is a spirit that provokes controversy, that engenders strife even in its own communion, that arrays Bishop against Bishop, clergy against clergy, periodical against periodical;—a spirit that casts out of the pale of Christian fellowship the Churches of the Reformers, and builds itself up by the promulgation of doctrines, adverse to the principles and charity of the Bible. Such a "movement" must do incalculable injury to the cause of Protestantism in general. And among its almost necessary results is the reproach it brings upon the Episcopal Church; exciting among other Churches hostility to her institutions, and a suspicion of their legitimate tendencies. Nor can we doubt—from the rising opposition among all denominations in our land to High-Church Episcopacy, an opposition which is the antagonist of the unfriendly exclusiveness that gives it birth—that the Oxford, High-Church party are engaged in an enterprise injurious to the interests of true religion. A system which foments so much discord in its own Church, and so much resistance from other Churches, presents few scriptural claims for its adoption.

2. OXFORDISM IS DIRECTLY CONTRARY TO THE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. No Church in Christendom contains within so small a compass, such a complete protestation against the Oxford doctrines as is contained in the 39 Articles. The Articles were framed with an especial reference to that corrupt system, overthrown by the Reformers, which the Tractarians are now laboring with energetic perseverance to rebuild. The doctrines of grace, beginning with justification by faith—all drawn directly from *Scripture alone*—are in irreconcilable opposition to the doctrines of the Tracts. All the errors of Oxfordism, from Baptismal justification to the end (not of the chapter, for that is not *yet* ended) of the *present* movement, receive from the Articles the most authoritative and uncompromising condemnation. Whilst the Articles urge the sinner to go to Christ

[1] See p. 55, right hand column.

for justification, and to exhibit a holy life as its evidence, the Tractarians point to the Baptismal Register and to the List of Church communicants. The whole system of Oxfordism is, in the language of Bishop M'Ilvaine, "the very reverse of that which we have learned from the Scriptures, and which our Fathers have declared to us;"—"an abandonment of all we have been taught by our Church to believe, to be the true, the narrow, the only way that leadeth unto life." Whatever may be claimed in favor of Oxfordism from certain passages in the Liturgy, it requires a stronger opposition than No. 90 vs. 39 to break down the ARTICLES of the Protestant Reformed Church of England.

3. OXFORDISM IS ESSENTIALLY ROMISH DIVINITY. Its doctrines are Romish doctrines. Although all its followers are not prepared to bow before the Pope, they agree in the fundamental elements of the Italian plan of salvation. Luther's was a true saying of Henry VIII, that he "killed the Pope's body, but *saved his soul alive.*" The Tractarians exhibit the same royal (loyal) concern for the Papal life. They adopt in substance or in "rudiment," Baptismal justification, mortal and venial sins, Purgatory, Prayers for the dead, Saints' days, the substantial Presence, Sacramental Signs, Mummeries in Church Service, Reserve, Tradition, Apostolical Succession; &c., &c.—in short, the *distinguishing peculiarities of Romanism.* The "Pope's soul" is safe enough under such care. These doctrines are "as far asunder from Protestant doctrines as *Trent and Heaven.*" And the persons who maintain them, "unroof the edifice and deface the walls of Christian faith, leaving nothing thereof but loose altar stones for the idolatrous sacrifices of Romanists."[1] In short, Oxfordism contains "the *very soul and strength of all that is evil in* the ROMANISM against which our Reformers protested to their last breath out of the furnace of fire."—*M'Ilvaine*, p. 522.

4. OXFORDISM DEMONSTRATES THE FALLIBILITY OF FORMS, as a means of preserving purity of doctrine. There can be no question that public Standards, Articles of belief, Confessions of Faith, &c., are very important in maintaining among different Churches the true doctrines of Scripture. No Church, however, has ever yet entirely succeeded in preventing errors from creeping in unawares. Some divines have been accustomed to claim more for the Episcopal Church, on this point, than history will bear them out in affirming. Let us hear, for example, our friend *Bishop Doane:*

"Not to preach Christ *in the Church* is to frustrate the purposes of God, and make the cross of Jesus ineffectual in the salvation of sinners. Go, follow it through the world. Go to Germany, go to Switzerland, go to the Puritan pulpits of Great Britain, and come back with the pilgrim fathers to the shores of our own New England. And what, to the descendants of those unshrinking witnesses of Jesus, is his Cross now become, but as to the Greeks 'foolishness,' and as to the Jews a 'stumbling block?" Do you ask, why? I will not undertake to answer. But this I say, where the order of the Apostles has been preserved with the truth of the Apostles, there has been no such fearful exhibition; where the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ has been preserved in

[1] Jackson, quoted by Bishop M'Ilvaine.

the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, it has suffered no such degradation.—*Convocation Sermon* '38. p. 11.

"What has been the effect in Germany and Switzerland? Where are those who started on the principles of the Reformation, yet separated themselves from the Church? Where is their faith—what is it? I have lived in a land peopled by those who emigrated from this country. It is the fashion to call some of them the pilgrim fathers. . . The rankest enormities of doctrine are now rife among the descendants of the pilgrim puritans that ever festered on the face of the earth. . . This comes of the separation of God's truth from God's Church." *Address at Coventry, England.*

Again. Bishop D. speaks of the want, in other Churches, "OF THOSE INHERENT PRINCIPLES OF UNION WHICH ALONE CAN BIND IN ONE LARGE MASSES OF MANKIND;" and adds, in reference to other denominations thus destitute, "*Meanwhile they turn* INSTINCTIVELY *to* US." [!!!] *Missionary Bishop*, p. 13.

Yes, truly. By the "instinctive" power of the *association of ideas*, we turn to the unfortunate Church of England to behold the fearful divisions which now make her the object of sympathy throughout Reformed Christendom. When have "ranker enormities of doctrine" sprung up than those, which, in the language of Bishop M'Ilvaine, are making at Oxford "ANOTHER GOSPEL?" Alas, for the infallibility (for the claim amounts to that) of the Church of England! The dogma of Rome is hardly more absurd!

But let us briefly show from the history of the English Church since the Reformation, that her forms have failed to secure this boasted uniformity of doctrine.—For more than half a century after its *secession from Rome*, the leading divines of the Reformed Church, with all the Archbishops of Canterbury, were professedly Calvinistic in doctrine. This was in accordance with the 39 Articles, which were framed on the sub-lapsarian or milder form of predestination, before Arminius was born. In the reign of Charles I, and the primacy of Laud (both of whom were afterwards brought to the block) Arminianism, which had been creeping in during the preceding reign, became more and more popular under the operation of "the inherent principles of Union" in the Church. In the progress of this singular ecclesiastical revolution, "large masses of men" who became dissatisfied with Church and State, overturned both Arminianism and Royalty. The orthodox English divines were now assembled by order of Parliament at Westminster Hall to re-establish the Church upon the principles of the Reformation, and to re-model the defective government of the hierarchy. These divines, all of whom had been episcopally ordained, were unanimously Calvinistic in sentiment. They formed the Presbyterian Confession of Faith,—a noble monument of their piety and learning, whose principles, with those of the 39 Articles, will be remembered in glory, when hierarchies, Church forms, and the kingdoms of this world have all vanished away.—In the meanwhile the civil Revolution progressed; and in spite of the efforts of the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, King Charles was beheaded (without the honors of martyrdom, which were bestowed afterwards;) and Cromwell was elevated to the place that had been occupied by the former "Heads of the Church," four of whom had been male and two female. Independency, with all sorts of "heresies and schisms," was now triumphant in the midst

of the confusion of Episcopacy and Presbytery. The "inherent principles of union" contained in the 39 Articles and in the Confession of Faith were unable for a time to resist the power of "large masses of men."

After the Revolution, Arminianism and looseness of morals were introduced by the High-Church Court party under Charles II, who himself died a Papist. His successor, James II, was also a Papist; but before this "Head of the Church" had time to re-establish Romanism, he was compelled to abdicate, not without leaving many staunch friends among the Episcopalian, non-juring divines, who kept up a spirited ecclesiastical controversy about the allegiance due to a Papal King. During the reign of Queen Anne, the High-Church Tories attempted to carry out their principles by means of State penalties and disabilities of the most atrocious character, which kept the Church and nation in a state of continual agitation. On the accession of the House of Hanover, religious liberty was re-established in the State; but the Church found herself in the most mournful and humiliating condition. Arianism, which afterwards spread into the dissenting Churches, invaded the Church of England through the auspices of Dr. Samuel Clark, *Rector of St. James, Westminster*,—which station he occupied until his death. Infidelity and Atheism also exerted a pestilential influence throughout the land; the Arminianism of the age imposing few restraints against the influence of the writings of Lord Bolingbroke, Lord Shaftsbury, Collins and others. At this period, vital religion exerted but little sway in England; and the morals even of the clergy were loose and corrupt. Says the present Bishop of Calcutta: "THE DECLINE FROM THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, *which had begun under our first Charles*, and which had been lamentably increased by the fanaticism of the *Commonwealth*, and the latitudinarianism and immorality of the times *following the restoration of the Royal Family*, still chilled the warmth of public devotion, and the efficiency of parochial ministrations. The infidel writers, fostered by this state of things, had been refuted indeed by argument, but had not been sufficiently repelled by the most powerful of all weapons—the *holy doctrines and consistent lives* of the ministers of the Christian Church."

About this period, (fortunately for England and the world) there arose within the established Church, a new society, called *Methodists*, which now comprises very "large masses of mankind" indeed. The Articles, the Liturgy, the Homilies, the State Organization, the Universities, the Bishops, were no obstacles to John Wesley. His followers increased, in spite of all "the inherent principles of union" that were in the Church of "Apostolical Succession." And one great reason of the rapid progress of Methodism, was the deplorable laxity of doctrine and life in the establishment.

The London "Christian Observer" says of its own Church:

"If we advert to the days of Whitfield and Wesley, we shall find that the great charge against those "enthusiasts," as they were called, was that they

preached justification by faith instead of works; the *majority of the clergy denouncing the doctrine of justification by faith as hostile to the interests of morality.* In this shape, the dispute came down to the present century. *Our clergy had nearly lost sight of the true Protestant Scriptural doctrine...* The practice was not *then common* of using the language of Scripture and our own Articles, but of appropriating the justification, predicted in them, to baptism. . . The clergy *very generally disclaimed altogether* the doctrine of justification by faith, and earnestly [!] exhorted men to justify themselves by good living. They in fact adopted the Papists' second justification, losing sight of the first." *Vol.* 38, p. 496.

Topiady, of the established Church, bears even stronger testimony of the general decline of religion in his times, or just before the American Revolution.

"Where shall we stop? We have already forsook the good old paths trod by Christ and the Apostles: paths in which our Reformers also trod, our martyrs, our bishops, our universities, and the whole of this Protestant, *i. e.* of this once Calvinistic nation. Our Liturgy, our Articles and our Homilies, it is true, still keep possession of our Church walls: but we pray, we subscribe, we assent one way; we believe, we preach, we write another. In the desk, we are verbal Calvinists; but no sooner do we ascend a few steps above the desk, [into the pulpit] than we forget the grave character in which we appeared below, and tag the performance with a few minutes' entertainment compiled from the fragments bequeathed to us by *Pelagius and Arminius; not to say by Arius, Socinus, and others still worse than they.* . . . . Is THERE A SINGLE HERESY, THAT EVER ANNOYED THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, WHICH HAS NOT ITS PRESENT PARTIZANS AMONG THOSE WHO PROFESS CONFORMITY TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?" p. 275.

Let us hear the testimony of the immortal Wilberforce:

"Towards the close of the last century [i. e. after the restoration and before 1700] the divines of the established church professed to make it their chief object, to inculcate the moral and practical precepts of Christianity, which they conceived before to have been too much neglected; but without sufficiently maintaining, often even without justly laying, the grand foundation of a sinner's acceptance with God, or pointing out how the practical precepts of Christianity grow out of her peculiar doctrines, and are inseparably connected with them. By this fatal error, the very genius and essential nature of Christianity was imperceptibly changed. She no longer retained her peculiar characters, or produced that appropriate frame of spirit by which her followers had been characterized. *Facilis descensus.* The example thus set was followed during the present century. Thus the peculiar doctrines of Christianity went more and more out of sight; and as might naturally have been expected, the moral system itself also, being robbed of that which should have supported it with life and nutriment, began to wither and decay. At length, in our own days [1797] *these peculiar doctrines have almost altogether vanished from the view.* Even in the greater number of our sermons, *scarcely any traces of them are to be found.* Pract. Chr., chap. 6.

These testimonies are sufficiently strong and humiliating in regard to the practical variations from the Articles and Liturgy, which so generally prevailed throughout the Church.[1] But we ought not to omit mentioning the petition of nearly two hundred and fifty of the

[1] The reader is requested to note these singular variations. *First,* Calvinism prevailed under Elizabeth and Edward VI. *Secondly,* High-Church Arminianism prevailed under Charles I and II. *Thirdly,* latitudinarian formalism, (one of the worst shades of Arminianism) prevailed under George I, II and III. In

established clergy, in 1772, presented to Parliament for relief in the terms of Church subscription. This movement seems to have originated with the Socinians; but it was opposed in Parliament "entirely on political grounds." During the discussion, says Robert Hall, (in his Review of Lindsley's Memoirs) "there was not one member of Parliament who expressed his belief in the ARTICLES. Mr. H. Stanley opposed the petition, as it tended to disturb the *peace of the country*, which, in his opinion, "ought to be the subject of a fortieth Article, which would be well worth all the thirty-nine." With such levity and contempt (adds Hall) was the national Creed treated at that time. The fact is that, *through the irreligion* and secularity of the clergy, evangelical truth was nearly effaced from the minds of the members of the establishment in the higher ranks, and that an indolent acquiescence in established formularies had succeeded to the ardor, with which the great principles of religion were embraced at the Reformation."

The revival of religion in the Church of England, which followed these disastrous and evil days, was owing mainly, under God, to the instrumentality of Wilberforce, Hannah Moore and their associates, who made the "Christian Observer" the organ of their sentiments. Very great progress was made in re-modelling the practical religion of the country. Indeed no period in the history of the established Church since the Reformation has probably witnessed more evangelical piety than the period commencing with the present century. Yet, lo! in the midst of these promises, the Oxford heresy bursts forth! Like the volcanoes near Rome, its rumblings, indistinct at first, have been followed by smoke and flame, and sulphureous agitation. This development at Oxford of Italian elements presages evil to the unfortunate, and as yet we fear *unhumbled*, Church of England. It demonstrates that vain is the wisdom of man, and futile all the forms of outward defence, unless the Lord overshadow the temple with his glory.

On closing this brief view of the fallibility of liturgies as exemplified in the English Church, we do not deny that they may have exercised some beneficial influences. But we see nothing in them that is calculated to preserve religion, when the Spirit of God is not in the hearts of the clergy; nor do we see any thing in mere forms that is specially adapted to cherish spiritual influences. If the BIBLE fails to keep religion alive in the heart, man's inventions and Liturgies will accomplish nothing, except to make formalists more formal. And on the contrary, if the religion of the Bible prevails in any Church, the hearts of its members will care little for forms. To boast of forms is very natural in persons who entertain unscriptural

---

other words, there was Calvinism for the *house of Tudor*—High-Church Arminianism for the *house of Stuart*—and latitudinarian formalism for the *house of Hanover*.—At intervals, it must be remembered, occurred the Popery of Mary, and of James II, and the semi-Popery of Laud, the latter succession being kept up through the Apostolic Sacheverell and the non-jurors, until it reached "the thoughtful heads and faithful hearts" of Oxford.

and extravagant views of Church order and government; but the history of the Church of England shows that there is very little ground for such boasting there. Far better is it to follow the advice of inspiration: "Let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord."

We merely express an humble opinion in a matter of history, when we declare our conviction that the Presbyterian Churches both in this country and in Scotland, and also our Congregational Churches have, without Liturgies, possessed *at least as much* sound doctrine and true piety, during the last and present centuries, as were enjoyed in the Church of England, according to the statements of her own divines. It cannot be denied that the Episcopal Church in this country, previously to the American Revolution, was in regard to morals and evangelical truth, in a most humiliating and woful condition, notwithstanding her Articles and Liturgy. It also appears to us to be a fact in history that there has been, during the above period, *at least as much* looseness of doctrine, *including Socinianism*, in "the English Church, as in those American Churches, whose founders "it has been the fashion [according to truth] to call the Pilgrim Fathers."

Whatever may be our opinions as to the past, the Episcopal Church, both in England and America, is warned by her present agitations to refrain from boasting overmuch in regard to her "infallible" Liturgies. It is impossible to boast of "ONE FAITH," in a Church, where, notwithstanding one Liturgy, there are at this very moment TWO GOSPELS. A higher agency is needed than that of Parliament (which established the Liturgy) to preserve Christianity in its divine simplicity and power. May the Episcopal Church find strength, equal to her day, where the Reformers found it; and may she purge off the vile fruit of Romanism, which has been "grafted in" by insidious hands! May the spirit of the Reformation, which framed her Articles again appear to carry them out with God's demonstration of their own glorious truth! Then shall Tridentine doctrine no more pollute the sanctuary of England, nor Gregory stand in triumph over the grave of Cranmer!

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

APPENDIX.

[The following brief history of St. Mary's Cross is taken from the Postscript to the first edition of this pamphlet.]

A plan for improving the church, was adopted by the Vestry in 1834; a majority of them, however, *not noticing a little Cross* in the plan. When the building was finished—to their great surprise, as well as that of many in the community, of all "denominations"—lo! a Cross made quite a Catholic appearance on the apex of the pediment! Considerable opposition immediately manifested itself, both in the Vestry and out of it. Those members, who objected to the Cross, declared that they had never knowingly sanctioned it; but it was replied that, by voting to adopt the plan in general, they had sanctioned all the particulars. An adjournment having been carried without a direct vote, after a very warm meeting, one of the Vestry shortly after declared that unless the Cross was taken down very soon, it should be pulled down. This alarmed some of the more cautious, who thereupon employed a carpenter to take down Cross and acroterium *in the night*—without the knowledge of the Vestry. A very profound silence was observed for some time in regard to this most singular and mysterious disappearance. Even many members of the Vestry obtained no information whatever about it; and three of them informed me that it was only a few weeks since, that they became acquainted with the circumstances of the transaction. This "reserve in the communication of religious knowledge" may have been justifiable at the time; but in regard to that, I express no opinion. "A PRESBYTERIAN."

It ought to be added, that on the first appearance of this pamphlet, the same Cross of St. M., which had been sawed down 8 years before, was replaced, in quite a mysterious manner, on the "apex of the pediment."

The passer-by, as he looks up to the "additional restoration" on St. M.'s Church, beholds one of the "efficacious symbols" of Newmania. It is to be hoped, on one account, that the Cross will not be again removed; because this outward emblem of Popery, (which some of the wisest commentators, as Sir Isaac Newton, consider the "*mark of the beast,*") is a very consistent badge of the "Catholic" theology of Oxford. The two systems are as much alike as two Crosses. How important that the people should be instructed in regard to this *new divinity*, which in the language of Bishop M'Ilvaine, is "ANOTHER GOSPEL," and which aims at changes in the ecclesiastical edifice, both outward and spiritual, from corner-stone to pediment! Far different from *Newmania*, was the Episcopacy of the Reformers!

If a Cross on the top of a *Church* be good, it is also good (so reason some) on the top of a *house*. But if good on the top of a house, it must be equally good, if not better, *inside*. And if good for one house, of course for *all* houses. Suppose, then, that all the houses in Burlington of Friends, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, had Greek and Latin Crosses upon and within them, would the aforesaid good people become better Christians? Let the Greeks and Latins answer!

SKETCH OF THE SUPERSTITION OF THE OUTWARD CROSS.

Having given a sketch of the *rise and progress of St. Mary's Cross*, it may be interesting to extend our inquiries to the origin of the general practice. The general history of the Cross will be found hardly more evangelical or dignified than that of St. Mary's in particular.

The Cross, always an object of pious regard to the mind, was in the first corruptions of Christianity imitated externally by signs and crossings, such as are now common with Roman Catholics. Tertulian, A. D. 200, is the first to mention these puerile manipulations. He says: "Every step that we take,

It is not a very decorous insinuation against the Vice-Chancellor and his associates at Oxford (or against some of the Bishops in England and America) that their "finding fault with the religion of their neighbour," Dr. Pusey, is "in revenge for their own indifference to religion." [*Quere*, Who "find fault with the religion of their neighbours" as much as the Puseyites, who unchurch all other churches?] Particularly as Bishop Doane informs us (Eng. ver. p. 12) that "the spirit of the Universities, and most *especially of Oxford*, is a *religious* spirit." I had an idea, Mr. Editor, that the religious spirit at Oxford was so strong, until I saw it had disciplined Dr. Pusey to keep silence in its presence.

Bishop Doane, in his letter in the last Gazette, brings three considerations in favour of Dr. Pusey's innocence. *First*, "He is no nearer or wt wish to Rome than the Liturgy and Offices of the Church of England and of her sister in America, go with him." But "the word" of our friend, Bishop Doane, be it respectfully said, is not sufficient to nullify the decision of the Vice-Chancellor and the Board of Heresy; or to set aside the unanimous convictions of evangelical Episcopalians and of other churches throughout the world. Moreover, I, for one, have a high regard for "the word" of Bishop M'Ilvaine, who, in allusion to some of Dr. Pusey's vagaries, said, three years ago, (p. 251), "The germs of expiatory penances, pilgrimages, ☞ Masses, ☐ offerings, &c., yea, all the elements of purgatorial burnings are contained in, and scarcely veiled under these ominious and melancholy questionings. The mind that *fully* sympathises with such views, is *penetrated with the essential virus of Romanism*." My *word for it*, Mr. Editor, the Vice-Chancellor and Bishop M'Ilvaine are right.

Secondly, Bishop Doane, in vindicating Dr. Pusey, quotes from the Newark Daily, that we should

"Still believe that story wrong which ought not to be true."

Many a condemned man would be as glad as Dr. Pusey to avail himself of the plea that he *can't* be wrong, because he *ought* not to be. But has not the Vice-Chancellor and the Board of Heresy declared that Dr. Pusey *is* wrong?

Thirdly, Bishop Doane introduces Dr. Pusey's Protest [Dr. Pusey a Protestant!] to prove him a "true Catholic Churchman." But a "Protest" against a sentence of condemnation is not at all equivalent to innocence. Certainly it is not so in this instance. Dr. Pusey's previous writings prove him to be in doctrine a Roman Catholic sympathiser; and when his Sermon on the Mass, which ended in his being silenced, is printed (as it will be), it will be seen, I doubt not, that the University of Oxford did well to put a veto upon its heresies.

Dr. Pusey's sect in the English Church has lately received three not inconsiderable admonitions. (1) Their *Tracts* were ordered to be discontinued by the Bishop of Oxford, in consequence of Mr. Newman's attempt in No. 90 to reconcile Popery and Protestantism. (2) Their *nominal leader*, Dr. Pusey, has now been thrust out from the pulpits of Oxford University, and (3) *Sir Robert Peel*, the present ministerial Head of the Church, whose patronage is power, has substantially declared against Puseyite doctrine in the British Parliament. So that Church and State as well as the University have done *something* to stop the career of these Theological innovators.

Most respectfully yours,

AN ANTI-PUSEYITE.

"To those who shrink from controversial topics, and would shun all controversy, let it be said, in parting, it is not given to man. We hold the truth only by dint of never-flinching firmness. The price of religious, not less than civil, freedom is perpetual vigilance."—*Bishop Doane, Rf. Ex. p. 160.*