





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS

✓



7.  
*Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter.*

---

A LETTER

TO

SIR WALTER FARQUHAR, BART.,

ON THE

PRESENT CRISIS IN THE CHURCH.

BY WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.

VICAR OF LEEDS.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.  
1850.

*Recent Publications by Rev. Dr. Hook.*

---

ON THE NONENTITY of the ROMISH SAINTS, and the  
INANITY OF ROMAN ORDINANCES. Two Sermons. *Third*  
*Edition, with a Preface.* 8vo., 2s. 6d.

ON THE MEANS OF RENDERING MORE EFFECTUAL  
THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE. *Tenth Edition.* 8vo.,  
2s. 6d.

FRIENDLY AND SEASONABLE ADVICE TO THE  
ROMAN CATHOLICS OF ENGLAND. By Dean COMBER.  
*New Edition, with a Preface and Notes.* 18mo., 3s.

LONDON :  
SPOTTISWOODES and SHAW,  
New-street-Square.

## L E T T E R.

---

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I have received your letter inclosing a copy of certain Resolutions which have been signed by Archdeacon Manning and others, to whose opinions that attention is due which we are ever ready to pay to persons of acknowledged learning, piety, and talent.

The Resolutions were sent to me before their publication, but I did not sign them, because they seem to me first to overstate the difficulties of our present position, and then to imply that if the sentence in favour of Mr. Gorham be not reversed, the Church of England will cease to be a true church, and that the Subscribers must quit our Communion.

It is due to some of my Friends who have subscribed the Resolutions, to state, that they disclaim the latter inference, and that they had no intention thus to commit themselves, and the cause of the Church of England.

Still, as you assert, and as I know, there are many persons who take it for granted that the Church of Rome is a true and Catholic Church, and express doubts whether this can be predicated of the Church of England, if she does not take some decided steps to extricate herself from the difficulties, in which she

appears to be involved by the judgment given in the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter.

I propose, therefore, before offering a few observations upon the exaggerated view which some persons are inclined to take of the difficulties of our position, to show that, supposing our case to be as bad as possible, there is no refuge in the Church of Rome for those who have the fear of God before their eyes, or the love of Catholic Truth in their hearts.

The question with respect to the Church of Rome is not whether it is Catholic or not; but whether it be or be not Antichrist. Let it be remembered that some of the most learned and devoted servants of Christ have regarded the Church of Rome as Antichrist. I say not whether they are right or wrong: I only state the fact. To this opinion the Church of England seems, in our Homilies, to incline.\* For my own part, I look to the coming of a personal Antichrist; and I also expect that the number of Believers — the true Church — will be reduced to a very small number before the final triumph. But still, with the Church of England, I see much of Antichrist in the Church of Rome, and I think that she will be closely connected with Antichrist when he shall appear. But be this as it may: they who talk lightly of seceding to the Church of Rome should

\* "He," the Pope, representing the system, "ought rather to be called Antichrist, and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's vicar, or St. Peter's successor; seeing that not only in this point, but also in other weighty matters of Christian religion, in matters of remission and forgiveness of sins, and of salvation, he teacheth so, directly against both St. Peter, and against our Saviour Christ." — *Homily on Obedience.*



bear this constantly in mind, that the question to be asked with respect to that Church is, whether it has not upon it “the marks of the Beast;” and as many men more holy than they, some even members of the Church of Rome, have expressed their belief that this is the case, it is a very fearful thing to contemplate the possibility of entering into a community, which *may* be Antichrist.

And then, again, when people talk lightly of joining the Church of Rome, I wish they would consider seriously what it is they will have to do. They look with a magnifying glass on every gnat which annoys them in the Church of England, and shut their eyes to the multitude of camels they will have to swallow if they join the Church of Rome.

If they join the Church of Rome they will have to anathematise all who do not believe that Christ has appointed seven true and proper sacraments, neither more nor less, all conferring grace, and all necessary to salvation; that is, they will have to anathematise not only all members of the Church of England, but all the Fathers of the Church:

They will have to regard, as necessary to salvation, all the ceremonies held in the Romish Church, in the administration of the sacraments; such as spittle and salt in baptism; the holding the sacrament above the priest’s head to be adored; the exposing it in the church to be worshipped by the people; the oil and chrism in confirmation; the anointing of the eyes, ears, noses, and hands of the dying:

They will have to believe that all are damned who

are opposed to the observances and constitutions of the Romish Church: such as the celibacy of the clergy; the orders of monks, friars, and nuns; the service of God in an unknown tongue; the saying of a certain number of Ave Marias by tale upon their beads; the sprinkling of themselves and of the bodies of the dead with holy water; the consecration and incensing of images; and various other observances too numerous to mention:

They will have to accept, on pain of damnation, the figment of transubstantiation, and to believe that the priest offers up his Saviour in the mass, a true, real, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead:

They will have to affirm that those are damned who do not hold that communion in one kind is sufficient and lawful, notwithstanding the Institution of our Lord in both kinds:

They will have to believe in a purgatory after this life, in which the souls of the dead are punished, and from whence they are liberated by the prayers and offerings of the living:

They will have to believe that dead men and women, whom the Pope has canonised, or shall hereafter canonise, are, or ought to be, invocated by religious prayers; and that the images of Christ and the Virgin Mary ought not only to be had and retained, but likewise to be honoured and worshipped:

They will have to receive and hold, under pain of eternal perdition, the power and use of indulgences, as they are now received and practised in the Church of Rome:

They will have to renounce the first and second commandments ; to worship the creature as well as, if not more than, the Creator ; and to bow down to wood and stone, the work of men's hands.

Nay, further ; as to this very article of the Creed now under consideration, is not the Church of Rome heretical ?

I beg to submit to you the following passage from our great authority on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration, Bishop Bethell : he says, " In common with the Church of Rome and the Lutheran Churches, we hold that Regeneration, or the New Birth, is the spiritual grace of Baptism conveyed over to the soul in the due administration of that sacrament. We hold, in common with those Churches, that in adults duly qualified by repentance and faith, the guilt of sin, both original and actual, is cancelled in Baptism ; that in infants, who have committed no actual or wilful sin, and can possess no such qualifications, the guilt of original sin is done away ; and that infants, no less than adults, are made in Baptism children of God, members of Christ, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, and partakers of the privileges and blessings of the Gospel covenant. But the Church of Rome contends that not only the guilt, but the very essence and being of original sin is removed by Baptism ; the Church of England declares that this corruption of nature remains even in the regenerate. The Church of Rome has decreed that concupiscence (or *fuel*, *fomes*, as it is called), which remains after Baptism, has *not*, properly speaking, the nature of sin ; whereas

we affirm that concupiscence *has* the nature of sin, and allege the authority of an Apostle in support of our opinion.”\*

We, in common with all Protestants, regard this as a great and fundamental heresy in the Church of Rome, laying the foundation of their grand error, viz. justification by inherent Righteousness.

Although we believe that the *guilt* of original sin is done away by Baptism, as by that act we are transplanted from the family of the first Adam into the Church of Him who is the Lord from Heaven; we expressly assert, in direct opposition to the Schoolmen and the Church of Rome, that the “infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.”†

But we may make the case even stronger against the Church of Rome. She not only has placed a wrong construction upon an article of the Creed, but she has tampered with the Creeds themselves. The Creeds of the Church of Rome are *not* merely and simply the old Catholic Creeds of the old Catholic Church. The Church of Rome in 1564 adopted a

\* Bishop Bethell on Regeneration, pref. xvii.

† Article IX.

new Creed, many articles of which are directly opposed to the articles of the ancient Catholic Creeds.

The Church of Rome adopts the Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian Creed; but, instead of the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, she has, in opposition to the Catholic Church, devised the following:

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, light of light, true God of true God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end: and in the Holy Ghost the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son: who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who spoke by the Prophets. And in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I expect the resurrection of the body, and the life of the world to come.” Amen.

“I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the said Church.

“I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

“I profess also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new Law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the Salvation of mankind, though all not necessary for every one; namely, baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and

of these baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

“I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above said sacraments.

“I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

“I profess likewise, that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

“I confess also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ, and a true sacrament is received.

“I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.

“I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them.

“I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

“I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned and anathematized by the Church.

“This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved,

which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen."

Surely this is sufficient to make us suspect that the Church of Rome has ceased to be Catholic since the year 1564.

It does seem to me the very height of inconsistency for any man to express feelings of alarm about the Catholicity of the Church of England, because the Queen in Council will not permit Mr. Gorham to be deprived of a living; and to assume without questioning the Catholicity of the Church of Rome.

And this brings me to the consideration of the exaggerated view which is taken of our difficulties. Let us see what our position really is, and how it is affected by the judgment in the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter.

Those who hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, believe that certain persons are predestinated and elected, *absolutely* to grace, and *conditionally* to glory.

The sign of their having been so predestinated and elected by the sovereignty of God is not merely their having been born in a Christian land, but the fact of it having been pre-ordained that they should be baptized into the Christian Church.

The guilt, but not the infection of original sin, is at Baptism remitted: the means of grace are opened to the baptized; and, on condition of their using those means aright, in order to build themselves up in godliness, they will be received into glory; where-

as, if they neglect so great salvation, a more awful curse awaits them, than awaits the heathen, who has given no heed to the voice of God speaking to him in his natural conscience.

Now the question is, Whether those who hold this doctrine are placed in a worse position than before, by the decision of Her Majesty in Council on the question of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*?

The point in dispute was, Whether persons subscribing to the article in the Creed, that there is "one baptism for the remission of sins," but interpreting the article in a non-natural sense, may hold preferment in the Church of England?

It is notorious that they have done so for the last three hundred years; and Her Most Gracious Majesty in Council has been pleased to rule that this their liberty shall not be abridged.

Her Majesty in Council has not censured us, who hold the article of the Creed referred to, in its plain, literal, and obvious meaning. We may continue to hold the orthodox doctrine as heretofore. So far from being placed in a worse position than before, we are even in a better position than we were. The inference from the late discussion is, that ours is the right doctrine, but that those who appear to us to explain it away may still remain in the Church. The followers of Mr. Gorham have urged the principle advocated some years ago in the most celebrated of the Oxford Tracts, No. XC., and have asserted their right to place their own construction, upon the formularies they have subscribed.

Let it be clearly understood that all that Mr. Gor-



ham sought for, was toleration; and this, by the decree of the Queen in Council, he has received.

This decision has not changed or interfered with the doctrine which the Church of England has ever held on the subject of Baptism in common with the Church Universal from the earliest ages; it only shows that the civil authorities will not assist the ecclesiastical authorities in maintaining the truth: a course of conduct which must, if persevered in, lead to a separation between Church and State.

In anticipation of this, let us who love the Church of England; who believe her to be a true and living member of "the Catholic body;" who glory in our Reformation, who receive the Articles and the Prayer-book; not the Prayer-book without the Articles, nor the Articles without the Prayer-book; who regard England as the first and foremost nation in all this world, and England's Church as the bulwark of the Reformation,—let us endeavour to persuade men to be of one mind in our Sion, and to come to an agreement on this very article of Baptismal Regeneration.

Is this a hopeless case? I think not. I will appeal to your own case. You and I belong to different schools or parties in the Church of England. We still differ on some important points; and yet, though I will not commit you to all that I have stated with reference to Regeneration, or to my opinion of the conduct of the advisers of Her Majesty, I know that you have, by the prayerful study of Scripture, arrived at the conclusion, that Regeneration is the grace of Baptism.

So had the late Mr. Simeon of Cambridge: I have been accustomed to refer to his exposition of the doctrine of the Church of England with respect to the grace of Baptism, as a clear and scriptural exposition of the doctrine. I hope that, in these days, it will be extensively read. The following is to be found in vol. ii. p. 259, of the works of the late Mr. Simeon:—

“ In the baptismal service, *we thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by his Holy Spirit.* Now from hence it appears, that *in the opinion of our Reformers, regeneration and remission of sins did accompany Baptism.* But in what sense did they hold this sentiment? Did they maintain that there was no need for the seed then sown in the heart of the baptized person to grow up and to bring forth fruit; or that he could be saved in any other way than by a progressive renovation of his soul after the divine image? Had they asserted any such doctrine as that, it would have been impossible for any enlightened person to concur with them. But nothing can be conceived more repugnant to their sentiments than such an idea as this; so far from harbouring such a thought, they have, and that too in this very prayer, taught us to look to God for that total change both of heart and life which, *long since their days, has begun to be expressed* by the term Regeneration. *After thanking God for regenerating the infant by his Holy Spirit,* we are taught to pray ‘that he being dead unto sin and living unto righteousness may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin;’ and then declaring the total change to be the necessary mean of his obtaining salvation, we add, ‘so that finally, with the residue of thy holy Church, he *may* be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom.’ Is there (I would ask) any person that can require more than this? or does God in his word require more? There are two things to be noticed in reference to this subject, the *term* Regeneration and the *thing.* The term occurs but twice in the Scriptures; in one place it refers to Baptism, and is distinguished from the renewing of the Holy Ghost; *which, however, is represented as attendant on it:* and in the other place it has a totally distinct meaning unconnected with the subject. Now the *term* they use as the *Scripture* uses it, and the *thing*

they require as strongly as any person can require it. They do not give us any reason to imagine that an adult person can be saved without experiencing all that *modern* divines [*ultra-Protestant divines*] have included in the term Regeneration; on the contrary, they do both there and in the Liturgy insist upon a radical change of both heart and life. Here, then, the only question is, *not* ‘Whether a baptized person can be saved by that ordinance without sanctification,’ but whether God does always accompany the sign with the thing signified? Here is certainly room for difference of opinion; *but it cannot be positively decided in the negative*; because we cannot know or even judge respecting it in any case whatever, except by the fruits that follow; and therefore in all fairness it may be considered only as a doubtful point; and if he appeal, as he ought to do, to the holy Scriptures, they certainly do, in a *very remarkable way, accord with the expressions in our Liturgy*. St. Paul says, ‘By one Spirit we are ALL baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been ALL made to *drink into* one Spirit.’ And this he says of all the visible members of Christ’s Body, (1 *Cor.* xii. 13, 27.) Again; speaking of the whole nation of Israel, infants as well as adults, he says, ‘They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did ALL eat the same spiritual meat; and did ALL drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and *that Rock was Christ.*’ (1 *Cor.* x. 1, 4.) Yet, behold, in the very next verse he tells us that, ‘with many of them, God was displeased, and overthrew them in the wilderness.’ In another place he speaks yet more strongly still: ‘As many of you,’ says he, ‘as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.’ Here we see what is meant by the expression ‘baptized into Christ:’ it is precisely the same expression as that before mentioned, of the Israelites being ‘baptized unto Moses:’ the preposition *εἰς* is used in both places; it includes all that had been initiated into his religion by the rite of baptism; and of them UNIVERSALLY does the Apostle say, ‘*they have put on Christ.*’ Now, I ask, have not the persons, who scruple the use of that prayer in the baptismal service, equal reason to scruple the use of these different expressions?

“Again; St. Peter says, ‘Repent and be baptized every one of you *for the remission of sins.*’ (*Acts*, ii. 38, 39.) And in another place, ‘Baptism doth now save us.’ (1 *Pet.* iii. 21.) And speak-

ing elsewhere of baptized persons who were unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, he says, '*He hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.*' (2 Pet. i. 9.) *Does not this very strongly countenance the IDEA WHICH OUR REFORMERS ENTERTAINED, THAT THE REMISSION OF OUR SINS, AND THE REGENERATION OF OUR SOULS, IS ATTENDANT ON THE BAPTISMAL RITE?* Perhaps it will be said that the inspired writers spake of persons who had been baptized at an adult age. But if they did so in some places, they certainly did not in others; and where they did not, they must be understood as comprehending all, whether infants or adults: and therefore the language of our Liturgy, which is not a whit stronger than theirs, may be both subscribed and used without any just occasion of offence.

"Let me, then, speak the truth before God: though I am no Arminian, *I do think the refinements of Calvin have done great harm in the Church; they have driven multitudes from the plain and popular way of speaking used by the inspired writers, and have made them unreasonably and unscripturally squeamish in their modes of expression; and I conceive that the less addicted any person is to systematic accuracy, the more he will accord with the inspired writers, and the more he will approve the views of our Reformers. I do not mean, however, to say that a slight alteration in two or three instances would not be an improvement, since it would take off a burthen from many minds, and supersede the necessity of laboured explanations: but I do mean to say that there is no such objection to these expressions as to deter any conscientious person from giving his unfeigned assent and consent to the Liturgy altogether, or from using the particular expressions which we have been endeavouring to explain.*" — *Simeon's Works*, vol. ii. p. 259.

Now, although there may be extreme men who hold Mr. Gorham's views, yet I think that the majority of your friends will go with you, when you accept the exposition of Mr. Simeon.

And if so, is not our dispute a merely verbal dispute? especially when we repudiate on our side the Romish view of the doctrine.

That our doctrine is misunderstood by some of your friends I feel confident; and I would refer them to Dr. Waterland and Bishop Bethell, if they desire to see how carefully we guard against that abuse of the doctrine which excites their fears, lest in asserting the Grace of Baptism, we should not preach Conversion and Renovation. Our case is thus stated by the Bishop of Bangor: --

“ 1. Grown persons coming to Baptism properly qualified, receive at once the grace of Regeneration; but however well prepared, they are not regenerate without Baptism. Afterwards, renovation grows more and more within them by the indwelling of the Spirit.

“ 2. As to infants, their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not want, and of actual faith, which they cannot have; and they are capable of being born again, and adopted by God, because they bring no obstacle. They stipulate, and the Holy Spirit translates them out of a state of nature, into a state of grace, favour, and acceptance. In their case, Regeneration precedes, and Renovation follows after, and they are the temple of the Spirit, *till they defile themselves with sin.*

“ 3. As to those who fall off after Regeneration, their covenant state abides, but without any saving effect, because without present renovation: but this saving effect may be repaired and recovered by repentance.

“ 4. With respect to those who receive Baptism in a state of hypocrisy or impenitency, though this Sacrament can only increase their condemnation, still pardon and grace are conditionally made over to them, and the saving virtue of Regeneration, *which had been hitherto suspended*, takes effect when they truly repent and unfeignedly believe the gospel.

“ This clear statement of the learned author, Dr. Waterland, contains an accurate representation of the grace conferred, and the change which takes place in Baptism: and this is what is meant by those Divines who maintain that Regeneration is, in the strict sense of the word, the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism. The identity, if I may so express myself, of Baptism and Regeneration, is a doctrine which manifestly pervades the writings of

the Fathers. It is moreover evident that they did not imagine that Baptism produces any saving effect in adults without faith and repentance, or, in other words, without some previous renewal of the inward frame. *Nor do they appear to have supposed any positive or active renewal of the soul takes place in infants* (which is the doctrine of the Church of Rome). Hence it follows that they must have maintained this distinction between Regeneration and Renovation, or Conversion, which, in the present day, has been styled, by a strange fatality, a novel contrivance. Sufficient proofs, however, of a positive kind may be collected from their own writings, that they maintained this distinction."—*Bp. Bethell on Regeneration*, pp. 14, 16.

If the decision of the Queen in Council shall lead to mutual explanations among those who really love the Church of England, and are equally opposed to Rationalism and Romanism; if it shall increase the number of those who are determined to walk in the *via media*, however much they may have hitherto been biassed, by misunderstandings and misrepresentations, to the one extreme or the other; the decision will have conduced indirectly to the strengthening of the Church, and will have formed us into a band of brothers prepared to speak the truth in love, and to promote the glory of God by the salvation of man. So be it.

Let it not, however, be supposed that those who take this view of the case, and who hope that, by the Providence of God, the judgment will be overruled for the good of His Church, regard with any feelings of approbation the line of conduct pursued by the Members of the Privy Council who were appointed to act as Her Majesty's advisers. Her Majesty's

advisers, appear to have acted as politicians rather than as judges ; and to have decided, not according to the merits of the case, but according to their notions of what was expedient. The whole subject has been perplexed, not so much by the judgment they have advised Her Majesty to give, as by the reasons they have assigned for the conclusions at which they have arrived. But, at the same time, these reasons, resting, as they do, on doctrines misunderstood, and on the misquotations of authorities, only serve to confirm us in the faith that Regeneration is the Grace of Baptism.

On these grounds, while I deny that the decision of the Queen in Council damages our position as a Church, while I maintain that if we were Catholic as well as Protestant before, we remain both Catholic and Protestant still, I am not precluded from uniting with good men and true in seeking for a relief from the grievous anomaly of having our final court of appeal so constituted that none of those who are appointed to advise Her Majesty, need be Churchmen or even Christians. I would deprecate intemperate expressions against the royal supremacy, but I think we have a right to take precautions against its being exerted in a reckless and arbitrary manner.

Only let us be careful, while we maintain our rights as Englishmen and Churchmen, not to Romanize ; let us remember that if, by the existence of the present court of appeal, we are suffering much inconvenience, we may, in our struggles to extricate

ourselves, fall into a position still more painful. Let us be persuaded that it is better

“ To bear the ills we have,  
Than fly to others that we know not of.”

Yours sincerely,

W. F. HOOK.

Leeds, March, 1850.

P.S. I send you a copy of the address to our Diocesan, which has been signed by thirty-nine of the clergy of Leeds:—

“ To the Right Reverend Father in God, Charles Thomas,  
Lord Bishop of Ripon.

“ We, the undersigned Clergy of your Lordship’s diocese, residing in the deanery of Leeds, approach your Lordship with an expression of our affection and respect, and venture to seek your paternal advice under the existing circumstances of the Church.

“ The undersigned receive the Articles of the Creed and the Formularies of the Church, on the subject of Baptism, in their plain, literal, and obvious sense,—in the sense in which the words have always been understood by the Church of England in common with the Universal Church from the earliest ages.

“ It may seem, therefore, that we are only remotely concerned in the late decision of Her Majesty in Council, in the question of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*: a judgment which, in our opinion, amounts only to this,—that persons receiving the Articles of the Creed and the Formularies of the Church on the subject of Baptism in a non-natural sense, shall not be disturbed in their preferments. But we beg leave to call the attention of your Lordship to the fact that the counsellors of Her Majesty, in advising the judgment, have supported it, not only by arguments which appear to us to be inconsistent with the spirit of the Church’s teaching, but by misquotations (unintentionally made) from the writings of some of our standard divines, who are made to express the very opinions, for the refutation of which those writings were composed and given to the world.



“This has caused perplexity in the minds of many of our parishioners ; and while we feel confident that your Lordship and your Right Reverend brethren will seek a suitable occasion for bringing these misstatements under the notice of Her Majesty, we ask your Lordship’s advice with respect to the proper course to be pursued by us in satisfying the minds of our parishioners.

“Leeds, 25th March, 1850.”

THE END.

MR. MURRAY'S  
LIST OF WORKS LATELY PUBLISHED.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S LETTER TO THE ARCH-  
BISHOP OF CANTERBURY. *Seventeenth Edition.* 8vo., 3s. 6d.

GORHAM v. BISHOP OF EXETER. The Speech of ED-  
WARD BADELEY, Esq., before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.  
With a Preface on the Judgment. 8vo., 5s.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. With 1000 Ornamental  
Borders, Initials, Vignettes, &c. New and smaller Edition, 8vo. 21s.  
cloth. 31s. 6d. calf. 42s. morocco.

ADDRESSES AND CHARGES. By EDWARD STANLEY,  
D.D., late Bishop of Norwich. Preceded by a Memoir of his Life. By  
the Rev. ARTHUR PENRYHN STANLEY, M.A. 8vo. (*In preparation.*)

PARISH SERMONS; on the Lessons, the Gospel, or the  
Epistle, for every Sunday in the Year. By Bishop HEBER. *Sixth Edition.*  
2 vols. post 8vo., 16s.

SERMONS ON THE LEADING DOCTRINES AND  
DUTIES TAUGHT BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.  
Preached in Cathedral Churches. By the Very Rev. Dean PELLER.  
2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY, from the Birth of Christ to  
the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By the Very Rev.  
Dean MILMAN. 3 vols. 8vo., 36s.

SUGGESTIONS TO THE STUDENT UNDER PRESENT  
THEOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES. By the Very Rev. Dean TAIT.  
Post 8vo., 6s. 6d.

ON THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH. By Archdeacon  
MANNING. *Second Edition.* 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION OF OUR  
LORD JESUS CHRIST, in its Relation to Mankind and to the Church.  
By Archdeacon WILBERFORCE. *Third Edition.* 8vo., 12s.







