





A COMPLETE
VIEW OF PUSEYISM,

EXHIBITING FROM ITS OWN WRITINGS

ITS *Twenty-two* TENETS,

WITH

A CAREFUL REFUTATION OF EACH TENET.

ALSO,

An Exposure of their Tendencies;

VIZ.

TO EXALT UNDULY THE POWER OF THE CLERGY;
TO ENSLAVE THE MINDS OF THE PEOPLE;
TO PROPAGATE A SPURIOUS RELIGION;
TO DELUDE AND DESTROY SOULS.

THE SUBJECT SO TREATED AS TO INVOLVE

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

OF THE CHURCH—OF UNIFORMITY IN RELIGION—OF JUSTIFICATION—
OF REGENERATION—OF SANCTIFICATION—OF BAPTISM—
AND OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

"Magna est veritas et prævalebit."

BY R. WEAVER,

AUTHOR OF "THE RECONCILER," "THE PAGAN ALTAR," "MONUMENTA ANTIQUA,"
ETC. ETC.

LONDON:
JACKSON AND WALFORD,
18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.

1843.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

ADVERTISEMENT.

NUMEROUS as the publications have been on the subject of Puseyism, the writer of the following sheets cannot but think notwithstanding, that a work which might give a *complete*, and, at the same time, a *detailed* view of it — which might separately and distinctly refute its several tenets, and which might expose to full view their dangerous consequences, must be a desideratum in the present day; and he has therefore ventured to make an attempt at such a work. Conceiving, also, that the proper way of dispelling the darkness of error, is to introduce the light of truth, he has adopted such method; and hence, in many of the leading subjects discussed, he has stated, in

the first place, with all the clearness of which he was capable, the true Scripture doctrine on such subject; and, throughout, he has endeavoured to write in the spirit enjoined, by the apostle Paul, upon the Ephesian church, when he says, "Speaking the truth in love."

The Table of Contents presenting to the reader the plan of the work, the author deems it unnecessary to say any more than to express his sincere desire that "The Father of lights" may shed the light of truth upon the mind of every reader!

VIEW OF PUSEYISM BY THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

"It is to me a matter of surprise and shame, that, in the nineteenth century, we should have the fundamental position of the whole system of Popery virtually reasserted in the bosom of that very Church which was reformed so determinately three centuries since from this same evil, by the doctrine, and labours, and martyrdom of Cranmer and his fellow-sufferers. What! are we to have all the fond tenets which formerly sprang from the traditions of men, reintroduced, in however modified a form, amongst us? Are we to have a refined transubstantiation; the sacraments, and not faith,

the chief means of salvation ; a confused and uncertain mixture of the merits of Christ and inherent grace, in the matter of justification ; remission of sins and the new creation in Christ Jesus confined, or almost confined, to baptism ; perpetual doubt of pardon to the penitent after that sacrament ; the duty and advantage of self-imposed austerities ; the innocency of prayers for the dead ; and similar tenets and usages, which generate a spirit of bondage, again asserted among us ? And is the paramount authority of the inspired Volume, and the doctrine of the grace of God in our justification by the merits of Jesus Christ, which reposes on that authority, to be again weakened and obscured by such human superadditions, and a new edifice of will-worship, and ‘voluntary humility,’ and ‘the rudiments of the world,’ as the apostle speaks, to be created once more, in the place of the simple gospel of a crucified Saviour ?”

VIEW OF IT BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

“ I cannot but fear the consequences for the character, the efficiency, and the very truth of our Church, if a system of teaching should become extensively popular, which dwells upon the exter-

nal and ritual parts of religious service, whilst it loses sight of their inner meaning and spiritual life; which defaces the brightest glory of the Church by forgetting the continual presence of her Lord; seeming, in effect, to depose him from his rightful pre-eminence . . . which tends to substitute, at least in unholy minds, for the worship in spirit and in truth, the observance of ‘ days, and months, and times, and years ;’ for the cheerful obedience of filial love, an aspect of hesitation, and trouble, and doubt; for the freedom of the gospel, a spirit of bondage . . . which works out salvation indeed with fear and trembling, but without any foretaste of the rest that remaineth for the people of God, and without joy in believing.”—*In D’Aubigné’s “ Geneva and Oxford.”*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| ORIGIN OF PUSEYISM, CAUSES OF IT, AND SUCCESS, WITH SOME NECESSARY CAUTIONS | 1 |

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|------------|
| THE OXFORD DOCTRINE, CONTAINING TWENTY-TWO TENETS, FULLY STATED FROM THEIR OWN WRITINGS | 12 |
| TENET I. | <i>ib.</i> |
| TRADITION, <i>primitive</i> and <i>catholic</i> , must be connected with Scripture in forming our Rule of Faith. | |
| TENET II. | 15 |
| Individuals should make a surrender of their <i>private</i> judgment to the judgment of the <i>Church</i> . | |
| TENET III. | 16 |
| The Church of England can claim an <i>Apostolical Suc- cession</i> of Ministers, who receive in Ordination <i>Apo- stolical Grace</i> . | |

| | PAGE |
|--|------------|
| TENET IV. | 19 |
| The Episcopal Clergy, as Ministers of the Apostolical Succession, have the <i>sole right</i> to administer the Word and Sacraments. | |
| TENET V. | 20 |
| The Episcopal Church, such as is the Church of England, is the <i>only true</i> Apostolical Church. | |
| TENET VI. | <i>ib.</i> |
| We are not to expect that the Word and Sacraments will be <i>effectual</i> out of the true Episcopal Church. | |
| TENET VII. | 21 |
| The Church has the gift of <i>blessing and hallowing</i> the Rites and Ceremonies that it has decreed. | |
| TENET VIII. | 22 |
| To the <i>Priests</i> belongs <i>eneration</i> in their ministrations, prayers, and absolutions, on account of their <i>office</i> , whatever be their <i>character as men</i> . | |
| TENET IX. | <i>ib.</i> |
| The Sacraments are the <i>principal</i> means of Salvation; are <i>effectual</i> to Salvation, and are <i>generally necessary</i> to it. | |
| TENET X. | 23 |
| In the Baptismal Ordinance of "water," there is communicated <i>also</i> " <i>the Spirit</i> ," and of course Regeneration. | |
| TENET XI. | 26 |
| <i>Justification</i> takes place in Baptism. | |
| TENET XII. | <i>ib.</i> |
| <i>Sanctification</i> the same. | |

| | PAGE |
|--|------------|
| TENET XIII. | 27 |
| <i>All spiritual blessings are given in Baptism.</i> | |
| TENET XIV. | 31 |
| The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper not only shows forth the Lord's death, and is commemorative of it, but it actually <i>imparts life</i> to the soul. | |
| TENET XV. | 32 |
| Justification includes <i>inherent</i> righteousness as well as <i>imputed</i> , and rather depends on the former than the latter. | |
| TENET XVI. | <i>ib.</i> |
| Christ's body and blood are <i>really present</i> in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though not locally so present as to act upon us and influence us. | |
| TENET XVII. | 34 |
| The sacrifice of the <i>Mass</i> may be used, provided it be only commemorative, and not used for emolument. | |
| TENET XVIII. | <i>ib.</i> |
| Purgatory of <i>some</i> kind may be admitted, though not the Romish Purgatory. | |
| TENET XIX. | 35 |
| A <i>veneration for Images and Relics</i> may be allowed, though not the Romish <i>adoration</i> . | |
| TENET XX. | 36 |
| <i>Invocation</i> of unseen beings <i>may</i> be allowed, though not in the idolatrous sense of the Church of Rome. They may be invoked for <i>interceding</i> , though not as <i>giving</i> . | |
| TENET XXI. | 37 |
| We are to <i>renew</i> our attention to certain <i>Forms and Ceremonies</i> that have got into disuse, considering them as <i>Means of grace</i> . | |

| | |
|---|------|
| | PAGE |
| TENET XXII. | 38 |
| Scripture must be more interpreted as <i>mystical and allegorical</i> . | |

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|---|----|
| A CAREFUL REFUTATION OF EACH TENET IN ORDER | 40 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER IV.

| | |
|--|-----|
| AN EXPOSURE OF THE TENDENCIES OF PUSEYISM AND HIGH- CHURCHISM | 161 |
|--|-----|

To exalt unduly the power of the Clergy,—to enslave the
minds of the people,—to propagate a spurious religion,
—to delude and destroy souls.

A COMPLETE
VIEW OF PUSEYISM.



CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF PUSEYISM, CAUSES OF ITS SUCCESS, WITH
SOME NECESSARY CAUTIONS.

IN the year 1833, a spirit of liberality having been evinced by government towards Dissenters and Catholics, a part at least of the Established Church of England began to take alarm, imagining that encroachments were made upon it by the civil power. This alarm was taken particularly by the Oxford clergy; who even feared that, at length, "the Apostolical Church would be forsaken, degraded, nay trampled on and despoiled by the state and people of England." And since it appeared to have been much in accordance with public opinion, such state of things was considered by them as nothing less than "National Apostasy." We have before us at this moment, a sermon preached by the Rev. John Keble, M.A., a fellow of Oriel College, in the University of Oxford, preached in St. Mary's, before His Majesty's Judge of Assize, on Sunday, July 14, 1833,

with this as its title, and containing in the sermon the words before quoted. As in the time of Queen Anne, it was judged requisite therefore again to have recourse to the doctrines of primitive tradition, apostolical succession, the exclusive right of the clergy to administer the word and sacraments, the apostolic church, and the efficacy of the sacraments. Nor were such doctrines inappropriate to the occasion; for, if men, because they have been ordained by the hand of a bishop, become the only true successors of the apostles; and as the only true successors of the apostles have alone the right of preaching the word and administering the sacraments; of course, it behoves us all to sit under their ministrations: and if they, by ministering the sacraments, can minister salvation and grace to our souls, then, what men so worthy of being regarded as our spiritual guides, and whose official regards and attentions so important for us to secure? Dissenting teachers of every name are then, of course, to be repudiated, as intruders into the sacred office, and their ministrations will be treated as invalid. To propagate such opinions, therefore, was the object of that class of the clergy, now called "Puseyites," from Dr. Pusey; with whom are to be attached the names of Newman, Keble, Palmer, Cary, &c. the authors of those tracts which for many years have been put into circulation from Oxford. These sentiments, with others bordering upon Popery, have been industriously propagated; and have obtained such a hold on the public mind, as to excite alarm in the breasts of the friends of evangelic truth, not only among Dissenters, but among a considerable portion of

the Established Church itself: and, as we shall hereafter see, not without reason.

We said just now, that these dogmas of “apostolical succession, &c.” were broached “in the time of Queen Anne,” for much as they may appear to some as *novelties*, they are not really so; for at the beginning of the eighteenth century they were maintained with great assiduity by Hicks, and Dodwell, and Brett, apparently too with the same views as now, to secure the Church of England against its supposed danger. And, as it may throw light upon our subject, and be gratifying to some of our readers, we will extract Burnet’s account of this affair. “There appeared at this time an inclination in many of the clergy to a nearer approach towards the church of Rome; Hicks, an ill-tempered man, who was now at the head of the Jacobite party, had in several books promoted a notion, that there was a proper sacrifice made in the Eucharist, and had on many occasions studied to lessen our aversion to Popery. The supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters, and the method in which the Reformation was carried, was openly condemned. One Brett had preached a sermon, in several of the pulpits of London, which he afterwards printed, in which he pressed the necessity of priestly absolution, in a strain beyond what was pretended to even in the church of Rome: he said, no repentance could serve without it, and affirmed that the priest was vested with the same power of pardoning that our Saviour himself had. A motion was made in the lower house of convocation to censure this; but it was so ill-supported, that it was let fall. Another conceit was taken up, of the

invalidity of lay-baptism, on which several books have been writ. Nor was the dispute a trifling one, since by this notion, the teachers among Dissenters passing for laymen, this went to re-baptizing them and their congregations. Dodwell gave the rise to this conceit ; he was a very learned man, and led a strict life ; he seemed to hunt after paradoxes in all his writings, and broached not a few ; he thought none could be saved, but those who, by the sacraments, had a federal right to it ; and that these were the seals of the covenant : so that he left all who died without the sacraments to the uncovenanted mercies of God. And to this he added, that none had a right to give the sacraments, but those who were commissioned to it, and those were the apostles, and after them bishops and priests ordained by them. It followed upon this that sacraments administered by others were of no value. He pursued these notions so far that he asserted that the souls of men were naturally mortal, but that the immortalizing virtue was conveyed by baptism, given by persons episcopally ordained. And yet, after all this, which carried the episcopal function so high, he did not lay the original of that government on any instruction or warrant in Scripture, but thought it was set up in the beginning of the second century, after the apostles were dead. He wrote very doubtfully of the time in which the canon of the New Testament was settled ; he thought it was not before the second century, and that an extraordinary inspiration was continued in the churches to that very time to which he ascribed the original of episcopacy. This strange and precarious system was in

great credit among us; and the necessity of the sacrament, and the invalidity of ecclesiastical functions, when performed by persons who were not episcopally ordained, were entertained by many with great applause. This made the Dissenters pass for no Christians, and put all thoughts of reconciling them to us far out of view: and several little books were spread about the nation to prove the necessity of re-baptizing them, and that they were in a state of damnation till that was done. But few were by these arguments prevailed upon to be re-baptized. This struck even at the baptism by midwives in the church of Rome; which was practised and connived at here in England, till it was objected (to) in the conference held at Hampton Court, soon after King James the First's accession to the crown, and baptism was not till then limited to persons in orders. Nothing of this kind was so much as mentioned in the year 1660, when a great part of the nation had been baptized by Dissenters; but it was now promoted with much heat."¹ Who can read this extract without recognising in it the history of our own times?

But the public, in general, have considered these doctrines as *novel*, particularly as being mixed up with those Roman Catholic tenets which the Protestant church has so long impugned. This apparent novelty, and the circumstance of such tenets originating with men of literature and science, with men matured in our halls of religion and learning, have caused them to attract a more than ordinary degree of attention. And, while the pulpit and the press, our fountains of

¹ Bp. Burnet's History of his Own Time, vol. ii. 603, 604.

instruction, have been polluted by them, no wonder that the public who drink of the streams, should, in so considerable a degree, have been also polluted.

And whence the success of these Puseyite opinions? It may not be useless before we come to the body of our work, to reply to this query, inasmuch as it may guard us against reasoning from outward appearances, a thing so fallacious, especially in matters that relate to a spiritual religion, and a "kingdom not of this world." We repeat the question, then, Whence the success of these Puseyite or Tractarian opinions? Alas, the human heart and the state of society were too well prepared for it! Sentiments that give and secure a predominance to our own party, especially if they minister to our emolument and power — sentiments that relieve from the trouble of heart-searching and heart-exercise by substituting the "form" for "the power of godliness" — sentiments that favour a religion of sense rather than a religion of faith and of inward power — such sentiments are too readily imbibed by the bulk of mankind. Nor is that all; there is an indisposition in men to think closely, at least so as to investigate truth. It was justly observed by Seneca, a heathen philosopher, "*Unusquisque mavult credere quam judicare;*" that is, "Every one would rather believe than investigate." Hence the common people too readily take for granted what their supposed accredited teachers declare to them, and indolently receive a creed made ready to their hands, without examining for themselves; or else, having received a creed, will not allow themselves to be disturbed. Would that men were more like the noble

Bereans, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles, who "searched the Scriptures daily," whether those things "declared to them by Paul and Silas" were so!

It does not follow necessarily that because men are men of literature and of science as to this world, that their *religious* views are correct, and that therefore they are fitted to be our *spiritual* guides. "For," says the apostle Paul, "where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" And, further on in the same epistle, to the "puffed-up" Corinthians, he says, "If any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise." How different is the "wisdom of this world" from the "wisdom of God!" The former may make a skilful mechanic, a sagacious tradesman, a politic statesman, an intelligent philosopher, but it can proceed no further: of the wisdom of God in the plan and operations of redemption, or of that wisdom that avails in a "kingdom" that is "not of this world," they all may be profoundly ignorant: nor is it, according to the apostle, until such "become fools" that they are likely to be "wise" subjects or servants in this kingdom. Nay, admitting that men may, from interest and convenience, theoretically learn, and in consequence subscribe, certain doctrines, which are in themselves spiritual, yet may they be doctrines, notwithstanding, of which they have no spiritual understanding, and for which they have no spiritual taste. Hence, in fact, there have been eminent philosophers and wise statesmen who have been mere dolts in the religion of Christ,

and as to the “things of the Spirit of God.” We must, therefore, refuse submission to the chair even of a university, if occupied by a man who is wise only in this world; and must appeal to the “Spirit” and “wisdom of God” in matters that relate to a “kingdom” that is “not of this world,” even though it be occupied by an uneducated Bunyan. “The natural ($\psi\upsilon\kappa\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$) man”—the man physically considered only, not having the Spirit, “receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things.” Not to “the natural man,” therefore, but to “the spiritual” man, would we look for a right judgment concerning “the things of the Spirit.” Moreover, although we would by no means disparage that mental culture and discipline which a university education imparts, yet we must demur to receiving, with implicit confidence, a religious doctrine even from the university chair of Oxford, for several reasons. 1. Because, at matriculation, those who enter at our universities are not required to give evidence of their *spiritual* regeneration, or of their having been “renewed in the spirit of their mind;” and so, in the course of their studies, do not know, and therefore cannot judge of those things that are to be only *spiritually* discerned.¹ 2. We

¹ Sir R. Inglis, in resisting the claims of the Dissenter to the endowments of the universities and the education there, makes this remark,—“That according to the standard adopted at the university, the application of six months was amply sufficient for the purpose of giving that knowledge—head knowledge, if they pleased. Why, after all, what could any public body do but give head knowledge of the subject? It rested with a different power to touch the heart; but it was the function

demur, because we have been given to understand that a very disproportionate attention has been paid in these universities to theological truth.¹—And, finally, we demur, because, that, with regard to the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek originals—the principle of all theology, and therefore branches of literature which should particularly occupy the attention of theological students—our candidates for holy orders, although they may have been familiar with the Greek classics, yet have been very deficient. On all these accounts, not to insist upon the tone of morals in these schools of learning, which corrupt the heart and blind the mind—we presume that implicit confidence must not be paid to the opinions of these Puseyite writers, although of the university of Oxford.

Nor will an appearance of “*holiness*” inspire us with confidence; for though we would not judge others, or refuse the claim of piety wherever there is the evidence of it, yet we remember that the Pharisees were of the

of our fellow human beings to take care that all committed to their charge for the purpose of instruction, should receive knowledge of the external doctrines and discipline of the Church of which they were members.” Very just distinction, Sir Robert, as to the knowledge of the head and heart; but ought they not to have that knowledge of the *heart* which is the effect of his divine “touch” *before they go* to the university? Most assuredly. For what if the heart be not touched after all? Then will they not be fit teachers; and what becomes of the taught?—From his Speech on Mr. Christie’s Motion, May 25th, 1843.

¹ Greater attention is paid of late years, the operation of which will now be seen; but this can hardly be said to affect much the generation that is passing away; and after all, since “knowledge puffeth up” there will be reason to fear that in all such cases, as there is head knowledge only and not the charity or “love that edifieth,” that will only cause them to despise and judge their dissenting brethren the more.

straitest sect of the Jewish religion; that they fasted twice a week; that they were very zealous as to Sabbath observance; that they gave tithes of all that they possessed, even of "anise, mint, and cummin;" and that they not only trusted in themselves that they were righteous, so as to "despise others," but were also venerated by others as such.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we will now approach the subject itself. Reverting to the tenets of these Oxford divines before mentioned, let not the reader imagine that they are all which we intend by Puseyism. There are numerous doctrines springing out from or connected with them, with which the Christian church has been annoyed, which will require our attention. And we may premise, that they seem to originate in or to derive their strength from adherence to what they call Primitive and Catholic Tradition: for, as though conscious that they could not be maintained from Scripture alone, they have thought proper to have recourse to tradition and to the ancient fathers as the true and proper interpreters of Scripture. And what has been the consequence? Not only the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but the various other errors which distinguish the systems of Puseyism and High-churchism have been propagated—a detailed account of which will soon be given—until at length, ashamed of the Reformation, they have been receding to Popery.

With reference to the public mind at present, upon a little close inspection, it would appear that some scarcely believe in, or will take notice of the actual

existence of the thing; others content themselves with vague and unsatisfactory conceptions of it; a third class suppose that it includes only some two or three erroneous doctrines; and a fourth class do not choose to trouble themselves about it: the consequence of which state of things will be, we fear, that the subtle poison will insidiously diffuse itself throughout the whole public body, until the moral and religious condition of society has become irrecoverably diseased. To prevent, or rather to counteract the mischief of such inadequate conceptions of the Oxford doctrine, as well as of such indifference to it, we shall, in the first place, state in detail, and with distinctness, the whole of the Oxford tenets, as drawn from their own writings; so having given a full whole-length portraiture of this Puseyism and High-churchism, we shall then attempt a *refutation* of them; and then, thirdly, expose the *tendencies*, the injurious tendencies of such dogmas. And as a clear statement of truth often proves the best refutation of error, we hope to include in our discussions, what are the correct and *scriptural* views of justification, of regeneration, of sanctification, of baptism, and of the Lord's Supper—all of which are more or less involved in the controversy. And in all may we be enabled to investigate and declare “the truth in love!”

CHAPTER II.

THE OXFORD DOCTRINE DISTINCTLY AND FULLY STATED FROM THEIR OWN WRITINGS.

IT is not intended in this chapter to show the *erroneousness* of the tenets, but only to give a correct *view* of them as stated by their writings.

Taking the analytical method, or dividing the subject into its several parts, we recognise no *less than twenty-two tenets*, as held by the writers of the Oxford school, that require notice in this discussion.

TENET I.

Tradition, *primitive and catholic*, must be connected with *Scripture in forming the Rule of Faith.*

Tradition is something delivered either by word of mouth or in writing; and it is usually distinguished from the inspired and canonical Scripture, distinctively so called. And that we may have clear conception of the tenet above-mentioned, we must divide the tradition here intended into two parts:—first, Primitive or Apostolic Tradition; and, secondly, Catholic Tradition:

the former intending tradition delivered by the apostle before the New Testament was written; by the latter, the tradition of the Church, as declared by the fathers and councils, and by liturgies. Now, while it is the fundamental doctrine of Protestants, that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," or the sole rule of faith, the Puseyites, or Tractarians, maintain that it is not a sufficient rule, but that we must add to it tradition. Let us then state their views particularly.

1. As to "*Apostolical Tradition*," as denominated and maintained by Keble, who has written a book on the subject, discoursing on those words of Paul to Timothy, "That good thing which was committed to thee, keep," &c. he says, "Must it not be owned, on fair consideration, that Timothy's deposit did comprise matter independent of, and distinct from, the truths which are directly scriptural? that it contained, besides the substance of christian doctrine, a certain form, arrangement, selection, methodizing the whole and distinguishing fundamentals? and also a certain system of church practice, both in government, discipline, and worship, of which, whatever portion we can prove to be still remaining, ought to be religiously guarded by us, even for the same reason that we reverence and retain that which is more properly scriptural, both being portions of the same divine treasure?" And he endeavours to establish this hypothesis upon the considerations—that "the truths and rules committed to Timothy's charge were at the time almost wholly unwritten;"—that "the Thessalonians had been exhorted to hold the traditions which they had received, whether by word or

by apostolical letter;”—that Peter exhorts the whole body of Oriental Christians to “stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance of the commandment of the apostles of the Lord and Saviour;” and also that St. John refers believers for a standard of doctrine to “the word which they had heard from the beginning.” So far for the *Apostolical* tradition. Now let us hear what they say as to *Catholic* tradition, and the insufficiency of Scripture. “In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture is *not*, on Anglican principles, the rule of faith.”¹—“How much more dutiful, with all seriousness to use our privilege of belonging to a church, which on the one hand refers us to Scripture as the standard and treasure of all necessary doctrine, on the other hand, ties her doctors, as much as the Council of Trent does, to expound Scripture according to the consent of the ancient fathers.”²—“We do not make Scripture the rule of our faith, but that other things in their kind are rulers; likewise, in such sort that it is not safe, without respect had unto them, to judge things by the Scripture alone.”³—“Adherence to Catholic tradition, as well as to Scripture,” is advocated by the Rev. H. Melvill.⁴—“Catholic tradition is a divine informant on religious matters; it is the unwritten word. These two, the Bible and Catholic tradition, form together a united rule of faith.”⁵—“Scripture and tradition taken together

¹ Tract 90, p. 11.

² Keble on Primitive Tradition, p. 149, 4th edit.

³ Field in Tract 90, p. 11.

⁴ Gentleman's Magazine, July 1839, pp. 57, 58.

⁵ Newman in D'Aubigné's Geneva and Oxford, p. 10.

are the joint rule of faith.”¹ And to these sentiments a reviewer in the Gentleman’s Magazine subscribes. Speaking of the Church of England, he says, “Her standard of appeal in matters of doctrine and discipline is Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the voice of the ancient church.”²

TENET II.

Individuals should make a surrender of their private judgment to the judgment of the Church.

Thus they speak:—“The Church of England, in freeing herself from the corruptions of Rome, did not give up her adherence to Catholic tradition, and to set every man loose to interpret Scripture for himself.”³—“More accustomed to elevate his soul in the prayers of the sanctuary and the sacrifice of the altar, than presumptuously to weigh the arguments of the preacher, and dogmatically to pronounce whether he does or does not preach what *he* would call ‘the Gospel,’ he runs not first after one preacher and then after another, but permits God in his providence to choose for him a pastor; and wherever he is, frequents his parish church.”⁴ And, again, the same writer says, “Now such is the Christian the Church would train; and many such Christians there would be, if pious men, instead

¹ Tract No. 3, in Keble’s Primitive Tradition.

² Gentleman’s Magazine for March, p. 273.

³ Melvill in Gent. Mag. July 1839, pp. 57, 58.

⁴ Dr. Hook’s Sermon on the Right Training of Children, pp. 4—6.

of relying on the assumed infallibility of their own judgments, would only defer in humility to the judgment of the Church.”¹—“ We claim to interpret God’s word, according to the teaching of the Holy Catholic church in the first ages, as it is now summed up in our Creeds and Rituals: the Dissenter twists and distorts it into all imaginable absurdities, arising from an unrestrained abuse of each man’s private judgment.”²

TENET III.

The Church of England can claim an “ Apostolical Succession of Ministers, who receive in ordination Apostolic Grace.”

By this Apostolical Succession they mean, that the bishops by whom their clergy are ordained can trace up their pedigree to the apostles, and that their authority is apostolical, as is also that of the clergy whom they ordain, and this indeed to the exclusion of other preachers and teachers in the administration of the word and sacraments.

As to this Apostolical Succession, thus they write:—“ I shall endeavour to show that the bishops of our Church are, without question, descended in a regular line from the apostles.”³—“ The only ministrations to which the Lord has promised his presence, is to those

¹ Dr. Hook’s Sermon on the Right Training of Children, p. 7.

² Knollis’ Sling and Stone, pp. 24, 25.

³ Cary’s Apostolical Succession, p. 6.

of the bishops, who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the other clergy acting under their sanction and by their authority.”¹—“The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper can only be administered by ministers duly ordained, and that, therefore, it is needful to continue in a church possessing an Apostolical Succession.”²

To give efficacy to this Apostolical Succession, they maintain also that—

The Holy Ghost dwells in the clergy, passing to them in ordination, and that this is called Apostolical or Episcopal Grace.

Thus Keble, discoursing on that passage, “That good thing which was committed to thee keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us,” says, “Now certainly the obvious meaning of the text is, that the treasure of sound doctrine was to be guarded by the grace of the apostolical succession. For St. Paul speaks of the Holy Ghost dwelling *in* us, that is, in himself and Timothy: and how it had passed from him to Timothy, had been expressed a few verses before; ‘I will that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands.’ The Church of England, you will remember, supplies full warrant for this interpretation, by directing the same phrase to be solemnly repeated at the consecration of every bishop: ‘Remember that thou stir up the grace of God which

¹ Dr. Hook’s Sermons on the Church Establishment.

² *Ibid.* Sermon on Training, p. 10.

is given thee by this imposition of our hands;’ and also where, in ordaining a bishop or presbyter, the solemn words are spoken, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ Our Church, therefore, does not teach us to consider the Holy Ghost dwelling in St. Paul and Timothy as properly miraculous, a gift of extraordinary grace, but as their portion of that Spirit which was to be poured on all apostles and successors of the apostles for ever. It was not what is commonly called miraculous, yet it was altogether supernatural; for no natural or acquired virtue or talent, though it might be called the *gift* of the Holy Ghost, would ever be designated as the Holy Ghost himself abiding in a man; neither was it the preventing or assisting grace common to all christian persons, for it was given to Timothy in particular by imposition of St. Paul’s hands. It could only be what the Church interprets it, apostolical or episcopal grace.”¹ And speaking further on of the nature and operation of this “Holy Ghost dwelling” in such, he says, “As often as misgivings and alarms come over us, we must ‘stir up the grace of God which is in us by imposition of apostolic hands,’ for ‘God hath not given a spirit of cowardice, but of power, and of love, and of brotherly correction and reproof; a Spirit that brings with him an invisible but real *power*, to open and shut the kingdom of heaven in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; a Spirit of never-failing *love* and *charity* to men’s souls, to guide us in the exercise of that more than human power; and,

¹ Keble on Primitive Tradition, pp. 42, 43.

lastly, a Spirit of kind and fatherly, yet, if need be, uncompromising and fearless rebuke.”¹

“The gift of the Holy Ghost has been preserved in the world solely by means of the episcopal succession; and that to seek communion with Christ by any other channel, is to attempt an impossibility.”²

TENET IV.

The Episcopal clergy, as ministers of the apostolical succession, have the sole right to administer the Word and Sacraments.

The passage quoted under the last tenet, to which we add the following:—“The only ministrations to which the Lord has *promised* his presence, is to those of the bishops, who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the other clergy, acting under *their* sanction, and by *their* authority.”³ “The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper can only be administered by ministers duly ordained; and that therefore it is needful to continue in a church possessing an apostolical successor.”⁴ “Bishops, priests, and deacons, who alone can administer Christ’s sacraments and ordinances.”⁵

¹ Keble on Primitive Tradition, p. 52.

² Keble’s and Newman’s Preface to the second portion of Froude’s Remains, in Evangelical Magazine, p. 68.

³ Dr. Hook’s Sermon on the Church and the Establishment.

⁴ Dr. Hook on Training, &c. p. 10.

⁵ Knollis’ Sling and Stone, p. 46.

TENET V.

The Episcopal Church, such as is the Church of England, is the only true Apostolical Church.

Thus they write:—"It is needful to continue in a church possessing an apostolical succession."¹ "The only ministrations to which the Lord has *promised* his presence, is to those of the bishops, who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the other clergy, acting under their sanction and by their authority."² "No congregation, not being under this form of government," (bishops, priests, and deacons,) "can be a true branch of Christ's holy Catholic church."³ "That body does not belong to Christ's church, in which there are not both bishops, priests, and deacons."⁴

TENET VI.

We are not to expect that the Word and Sacraments will be effectual out of the Episcopal Church.

"The gift of the Holy Ghost has been preserved in the world solely by means of the episcopal succession; and that to seek communion with Christ by any other

¹ Dr. Hook on Training, &c.

² Ibid.

³ Bishop of London, in Congregational Magazine, Nov. 1842, p. 777.

⁴ In "A Practical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Church Catechism," used in the diocesan school of Gloucester. Patriot, May 31, 1843.

channel is to attempt an impossibility.”¹ “The only ministration to which the Lord has *promised* his presence, is to those of the *bishops*, who are successors of the first commissioned apostles, and the *other clergy*, acting under *their* sanction, and by *their authority*.”² “It is needful to continue in a church possessing an apostolical succession.”³ Besides the many warnings given to people by Puseyite clergymen against attending other ministry than that of the Church, as dangerous to their souls.

TENET VII.

The Church has the gift of blessing and hallowing the rites and ceremonies that it has decreed.

“Unless the Church has the power of dispensing grace through rites of its own appointing, or is endued with the gift of blessing and hallowing the rites or ceremonies which, according to the Twentieth Article, it hath power to decree. But we may believe that the Church has this gift.”⁴

¹ Keble and Newman's Preface to the second portion of Froude's Remains, in Evangelical Magazine, p. 68.

² Dr. Hook's Two Sermons on the Church and the Establishment.

³ Dr. Hook's Sermon on Training Children, p. 10.

⁴ Tract 90, p. 43.

TENET VIII.

To the priests of the Church belongs veneration in their ministration of blessings, prayers, and absolution, on account of their office as priests, whatever be their character as men.

Addressing parents, Knollis exhorts them, in reference to their children, to ask themselves, "Have I implanted in them a deep reverence for the *office* of the priests of God, whatever may be their character as *men*? Have I led them to value their prayers, and blessings, and absolutions?"¹

TENET IX.

The Sacraments are the principal means of salvation; are effectual to salvation, and are generally necessary to it.

The *principal* means.—After mentioning "assembling ourselves together in public worship and reading the word of God, and hearing it read and preached," the Oxford Catechism adds, "but the holy sacraments are the special means of grace."² Another says, "While the subordinate means of grace are prayer, the study of the Scriptures, and meditation, the chief means of grace are Baptism, Confirmation, and the Lord's Supper."³

Efficacious means. — "This exposition again harmonizes with the true doctrine of the sacraments, in

¹ Knollis' Sling and Stone.

² Oxford Catechism, p. 20.

³ Dr. Hook on Training, &c. p. 10.

that it separates the two great sacraments of the Gospel from every thing else which God has made a means of grace: and as these two" (Baptism and the Lord's Supper) "communicate Christ to the soul,"¹ &c. And the same doctrine is taught in Tract 90: "The two sacraments of the Gospel, as they may be emphatically styled, are the instruments of inward *life*, according to our Lord's declaration, that baptism is a new *birth*, and that in the eucharist we eat the *living* bread."² "They are the only *justifying* rites or instruments of communicating the atonement, which is the one thing necessary to us."³

Means *generally necessary* to salvation.—"What we do determine is, that Christ has ordained two special sacraments as *generally necessary to salvation*."⁴ Indeed, all their writings bear that way.

TENET X.

In the baptismal ordinance of "water," there is communicated also "the Spirit" and spiritual regeneration.

On this subject we quote as follows:—"This is our new birth, an actual birth of God, of water and of the Spirit, as we were actually born of our natural parents."⁵ "Baptism is a sacrament which God hath instituted in his Church, to the end that they which receive the same might be *incorporated into Christ*, and

¹ Pusey on Holy Baptism, p. 300. ² Tract 90, p. 46.

³ Tract 90, p. 46. ⁴ Tract 90. ⁵ Pusey on Holy Baptism, p. 23.

so through his most precious merit obtàin, as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul the first disposition towards future newness of life.”¹

“ Our life in Christ is, throughout, represented as commencing when we are by baptism made members of Christ and children of God. That life may, through our negligence afterwards, decay ; or be choked, or smothered, or well-nigh extinguished, and by God’s mercy again be renewed and refreshed ; but a *commencement* of life in Christ after baptism, a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, at any other period than at that one first introduction into God’s covenant, is as little consonant with the general representation of Holy Scripture, as a commencement of physical life long after our natural birth is with the order of his providence.”²

“ Not the life only which we are to live, but the actual life which, by baptism, was infused into us.”³

“ What he worketh in us by his Spirit in baptism.”⁴

“ It is his baptism, not theirs ; they baptize as the servants, He, as the Lord ; they with water, He, with the Holy Ghost and with fire ; they touch the body, He applies it to the soul ; they visibly, He invisibly ; they in obedience to him, He accepts the obedience of his Church, and cleanseth each new member which she presents unto Him ‘ with the washing of water by the word.’ It is He who cleanseth. And this amid the imperfections of his ministers is our com-

¹ Pusey on Holy Baptism, from Hooker, p. 24.

² Ibid. p. 28.

³ Ibid. p. 93.

⁴ Ibid. p. 97.

fort, that our baptism, though ‘by man,’ is not ‘of man;’ that to whomsoever he may have committed the ministry of his sacrament, Himself retaineth and sendeth forth its power.”¹

And it seems the water having been consecrated, is sacred, and sanctified by the Spirit.—“This regeneration is the being ‘born of water and the Spirit,’ or by God’s Spirit again moving on the face of the waters and sanctifying them for our cleansing, and cleansing us thereby.”² And this moving of the Spirit on the face of the waters and cleansing them for our cleansing, is, it seems, upon pronouncing the word of consecration—“I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;” for, says Dr. Pusey, “In that he says (the apostle Paul) with the washing of water *by the word*, he means (as appears both by the force of the term and the authority of the ancient church) the divine word which renders the element of water efficacious to our regeneration.”³ “So then there is no difference between whether one be baptized in sea or lake, stream or fountain; nor is there (so far) any difference between those whom John baptized in Jordan, or Peter in the Tiber. Unless, indeed, that the eunuch, whom Philip baptized in some chance water by the way, was more or less saved. So then, all waters, when God has been invoked, from that first prerogative, at their very origin, obtain the sacramental power of sanctifying. For immediately the Spirit cometh upon them from heaven, and is upon the waters sanctifying them from himself;

¹ Pusey on Baptism, p. 192. ² Ibid. p. 53. ³ Ibid. p. 198.

and so sanctified they imbibe the power of sanctifying.”¹

As this work is designed to give a full and satisfactory view of the whole meaning of the Puseyite writers, it is hoped that these quotations will not be deemed more than desirable.

TENET XI.

Justification takes place in Baptism.

They say, “Justification is imputed to us, not through the feelings, but *through* baptism.”—“Baptism the means ordained by Christ himself for the remission of sin or for justification.”²—“Justification by faith does not exclude justification *through* or by baptism.”³—“Since they reject justification through the sacrament of baptism.”⁴—“Justification was conferred upon them through the one baptism for the remission of sins.”⁵ Tract 90, speaking of justification, says, “Baptism conveys it.”⁶—“Baptism and not faith is the primary instrument of justification.”⁷ Dr. Pusey, speaking of it as our new birth, says, “Herein, then, also are we justified, or both accounted and made righteous, since we are made members of Him who is alone righteous.”⁸

TENET XII.

Sanctification also takes place in Baptism.

Thus, Dr. Pusey, commenting on the passage where Christ is said to “sanctify the church with the washing

¹ Pusey, pp. 362-3.

² *Ibid.* p. 20.

³ *Ibid.* p. 87.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 156.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 158.

⁶ Tract 90, p. 13.

⁷ Newman on Justification.

⁸ Pusey, p. 13.

of water by the word," he says, that St. Paul in this place dwells on the value of the gift of baptism, and of the sanctification of the church thereby conveyed." "In that he says, 'with the washing of water *by the word*,' he means (as appears both by the force of the term, and the authority of the ancient church) the divine word which renders the element of water efficacious to our regeneration, our blessed Saviour's word of consecration. By what word? 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' says St. Chrysostom; and so Theodoret, 'That saying, "having cleansed in the washing of water by the word," stands for "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."'¹—"Baptism is essential to her sanctification."²

TENET XIII.

All spiritual blessings are connected with Baptism.

"Baptism," says Dr. Pusey, "as the means of our union with Christ, is the act which conveys to us either in immediate possession, or as an earnest, all our subsequent spiritual blessings."³—"Baptism is the instrument whereby God communicated to us the remission of sins, justification, holiness, life, communion with the Son and with the Father through the Spirit, the earnest of the Spirit, adoption of sons, inheritance of heaven, all which our Lord obtained for us through his incarnation and precious blood-shedding."⁴—"Is it no cause of thankfulness to our heavenly Father, to have to look back upon

¹ Pusey. ² Ibid. ³ Pusey's Holy Baptism, p. 134. ⁴ Ibid. p. 172.

a definite act of God, whereby He placed us in a state of salvation, there by his grace to continue; that, independently of any feelings of ours, which may not be so vivid as they once were, antecedently to all of error, infirmity, and sin, which there may have been in our course hitherto, and the imperfections which have cleaved, and (it is to be feared) do cleave to all our acts, marring our repentances, our faith, our works of love, there is still one bright spot whereon to look back, when God the Father chose us to be his sons in his Son, and the Holy Ghost sanctified and sealed us as his? Is it nothing to bear his mark upon us, which his mercy has been more powerful to retain, we trust, than our sins to efface?" And again, in the next page—"It is not then in vain surely, that throughout his whole church he has blended with that early past, one brighter spot, which sheds its lustre over all, and from which the light of their sun shines seven-fold our baptismal morn; an oasis, it may be, in a wilderness, but a spot on which our memory may, without misgiving, repose, because all its brightness comes directly from him, and in it the light of his countenance shone, and still shines upon us, if we look back for it. No! our baptism is of inexpressible value and comfort, even because it is the act of God; it has nothing earthly mingled with it; it was simply his, who chose us, according to his eternal purpose, to the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, and predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, making us in the Beloved his own sons, members of his Christ, heirs of the kingdom of heaven. Our comfort, our joy, our peace, our consolation, our glory, is, to have what we have purely

from him, to have the foundation of our hope out of ourselves, and conveyed by a formal act of his, whereby, not according to works of righteousness which we did, but, according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."¹—“Does he (Paul) disparage outward ordinances? or dread that the exaltation of the ordinance should lead to a depreciation of Christ? Rather he shows them how every thing which they sought, or could need, was comprised and had already been bestowed upon them in their Saviour's gift, in his ordinance: that this ordinance was, moreover, a significant rite, but contained within itself the stripping off of the body of sin, death, resurrection, new life, forgiveness, annulment of the hand-writing against us, despoiling of the strong one, triumph over the powers of darkness. We also have been thus circumcised, have been buried, raised, quickened, pardoned, filled with Christ: all this God has done for us, and are we not to prize it? not to thank God for it, established in the faith which we have been taught, and abounding therein with thanksgiving? And are we, for fear men should rest in outward privileges, to make the Lord's sacrament a mere outward gift, deny his bounty, and empty his fulness? or rather ought we not, with the apostles, to tell men of the greatness of what they have received, and repeat to them his bidding, ‘since then ye *were* raised together with Christ, seek what is above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God;’ ye did die, slay then your earthly members; ye *were* stripped of the old man, and *were* clothed with the new, and that made new in its Creator's image,

¹ Pusey, pp. 88, 89.

which has now again been restored to you: 'put ye on then, as having been chosen and loved of God,' the ornaments befitting this new creation in you, mercy, gentleness, and the other graces: ye have been forgiven, forgive. Thus does St. Paul obviate the resting in outward ordinances, by showing, namely, that the Christian ordinances are not outward; that they are full of life and honour and immortality, for that they are full of Christ; since Christ is all things and in all. Is there not danger of losing our treasures by a voluntary humility? Is not our dread of the consequences of exalting Christ's ordinances 'after the rudiments of the world' (an earthly wisdom) 'and not after Christ?'"¹

Thus does Dr. Pusey represent baptism not only as giving a right to such blessings as forgiveness, justification, adoption, &c. which may be said to be blessings *without* us, but he represents it as actually effecting a *work in us*, and that no less than of causing us to be quickened, to rise, to live, to possess the Divine image, &c.; and he felicitates the baptized on their most blessed state in having been thus baptized! Alas, that passages which related to the baptism of the Spirit, the thing signified, should be thus attributed to the baptism by water, the sign!

We would have forborne these lengthy quotations, but really the whole appears necessary to give the reader an adequate conception of the *animus* of the writer as well as of the Tenet itself.

¹ Pusey on Baptism.

TENET XIV.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper not only shows forth the Lord's death, and is commemorative of it, but it actually imparts life to the soul.

The two sacraments of the Gospel are the instruments of inward *life*, according to our Lord's declaration, that "baptism is a new birth, and that in the Eucharist we eat the *living* bread."¹ "In the holy Eucharist giving us to 'drink of his blood' and 'quickenning us by his Spirit,' and making us to 'drink into one Spirit.'"² "His sacraments the vehicles of his grace."³

Trusting thus to the conveyance of grace in and by the sacraments, they repudiate the doctrine "that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God." Indeed this may even be set down as the essence of the sectarian doctrine, to consider faith and not the sacraments as the instrument of justification and other Gospel gifts."⁴ Hence they do not appear to discountenance the administration of the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible. "And," say they, "both practices have the sanction of primitive usage."⁵ The clergy were "entrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood."⁶

¹ Tract 90, p. 46.

² Pusey, p. 300.

³ Ibid. p. 229.

⁴ Tracts for the Times in d'Aubigné's Geneva and Oxford, p. 20.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Tracts as in Home Missionary Magazine, December 1842.

TENET XV.

Justification includes inherent righteousness as well as imputed, and rather depends on the former than the latter.

“In the doctrine of Justification by Faith, a mind which should mainly fix itself on our being ‘accounted righteous,’ would, by degrees, lose sight of that other portion of it, the having righteousness actually imparted, the being made righteous.”¹

“Justification is a continuous work; it is to be held as the work of the Spirit, not of Christ. The distinction between deliverance from the guilt of sin and deliverance from sin itself is not scriptural.”²

“Justification is the indwelling in us of God the Father, and of the incarnate Word by the Holy Spirit, and that the two acts distinguished by the Bible and our theologians form in truth only one.”³

TENET XVI.

Christ's Body and Blood are really present in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though not locally. So present as to act upon and influence us.

“The true determination of all such questions may be this, that Christ's body and blood are *locally* at God's right hand, *yet* really *present* here,—present here, but

¹ Pusey on Holy Baptism, p. 19.

² Newman in D'Aubigné, p. 16.

³ Letter of Dr. Pusey to the Bishop of Oxford, in D'Aubigné, p. 17.

not here in place,—because they are spirit.”¹ — “A thing is present which is so circumstanced as to act upon and influence us, whether we are sensible of it or not. Now, this is what the Catholic Church seems to hold concerning our Lord’s presence in the sacrament, that he then personally and bodily is with us in the way an object is which we call present: how He is so, we know not, but that He should be so, though He be millions of miles away, is not more inconceivable than the influence of eyesight upon us is to a blind man.”² “In answer, then, to the problem, how Christ comes to us, while remaining on high, I answer just as much as this,—that He comes by the agency of the Holy Ghost, *in and by the sacrament*. Locomotion is the means of a material presence; the sacrament is the means of His spiritual presence. Let them but believe and act on the truth that the consecrated bread is Christ’s body, as He says, and no officious comment on His words will be attempted by any well-judging mind.” The writer admits, at least, of “a real super-local presence in the Holy Sacrament.”³ “Christ is present under the form of bread and water.”⁴ “The clergy are intrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ’s body and blood.”⁵ “One who looks upon the Lord’s Supper as little more than a commemorative sign of an absent thing, passes lightly over our Saviour’s words, ‘This is my body!’”⁶ “Receiving the body of our Lord.”⁷

¹ Tract 90, p. 56.² *Ibid.*³ Tract 90, pp. 57, 58.⁴ Linwood in *Home Missionary Magazine* for December, 1842.⁵ *Tracts in Home Missionary Magazine*.⁶ Pusey on Baptism, p. 150.⁷ *Ibid.* p. 236.

TENET XVII.

The Sacrifice of the Mass may be used, provided it be only commemorative, and not used for emolument.

Thus, Tract 90, upon this subject, concludes—"On the whole, then, it is conceived, that the article before us neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against its being an offering, though commemorative, for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin, (especially since the decree of Trent says, that the fruits of the bloody oblation are through this most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from detracting in anything from the former); but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of, or distinct from, the sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy, and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition."¹

TENET XVIII.

Purgatory of some kind may be admitted, though not the Romish Purgatory.

"Now, here there *was* a primitive doctrine, whatever its merits, concerning the fire of judgment, which is a possible, or a probable opinion, and is *not* condemned. That doctrine is this: that the conflagration of the world or the flames which attend the Judge will be an

¹ Tract 90, p. 63.

ordeal through which all men will pass: that great saints, such as St. Mary, will pass it unharmed; that others will suffer loss: but none will fall under it who are built upon the right foundation. Here is one purgatorian doctrine not Romish.”¹

“Another doctrine, purgatorian but not Romish, is that said to be maintained by the Greeks at Florence, in which the cleansing, though a punishment, was but a *pœna damni*, not a *pœna sensûs*, not a positive sensible infliction, much less the torment of fire, but the absence of God’s presence. And another purgatory is that in which the cleansing is but a progressive sanctification, and has no pain at all. None of these doctrines does the article condemn—any of them may be held by the Anglo-Catholic as a matter of private belief; not that they are here advocated, one or other, but they are adduced as an *illustration* of what the article does *not* mean, and to vindicate our Christian liberty in a matter where the Church has not confined it.”²

TENET XIX.

A veneration for Relics and Images may be allowed, though not the Romish adoration.

“That the Homilies do not altogether discard reverence towards relics, has already been shown.”³ “On the whole, then, by the Romish doctrine of the veneration

¹ Tract 90, p. 25.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

tion and worshipping of images, the article means all maintenance of those idolatrous honours which have been, and are paid to them, so commonly throughout the Church of Rome, with the superstitions, profanities, and impurities consequent thereupon;"¹ implying, that though the *sort* of regard which the Church of Rome supports is not to be encouraged, yet that some extraordinary veneration is to be paid to relics."²

TENET XX.

Invocation of unseen beings may be allowed, though not in the idolatrous sense of the Church of Rome. They may be invoked for interceding, though not as giving.

“Nor is it a fond invocation to pray that unseen beings may bless us; for this Bishop Ken does in his Evening Hymn:—

‘O may my guardian, while I sleep,
Close to my bed his vigils keep!
His love angelical *instil*,
Stop all the avenues of ill,’³ &c.”

And in the same Tract 90, there are intimations, that though we may not invoke them to give or to do,—for that is God’s,—yet that we may invoke them to pray that God may give or do so and so.⁴

¹ Tract 90.

³ *Ibid.* p. 37.

² *Ibid.* p. 37.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 42.

TENET XXI.

We are to renew our attention to certain forms and ceremonies, that have got into disuse, and consider them as means of grace.

By these we mean, besides those used in consecrations of persons, of churches, and of burying-grounds, the changes of clerical apparel, the genuflexions, the position of the altar, the turning of faces, the placing of lights on the altar, &c.

“ We must come to the conclusion,” says Dr. Hook, “ that they are not *mere forms*, that they are means of grace—means through which the Church interposes in the degree she is appointed to interpose between the soul of the individual and its God. Now, that they are not regarded as mere forms is clearly evident ; because, in ordaining a priest, the bishop gives to the person ordained the power to remit or to retain sins ; and to qualify him for so doing, confers upon him the gift of the Holy Ghost. Let us look on this subject fearlessly and honestly, since it is one of the points of attack upon the English Church by the Protestant sects around us.”¹ Speaking of the *ceremonies* of the Church, says the same writer, “ All that we would ask is this, that there should be, at least, as much of ceremony in the sanctuary as in the royal palace : until ceremony is dispensed with there, we shall insist that ceremony shall be observed here. We think it hard that we should be superstitiously forbidden to bow to the altar of the

¹ Hook's Sermons in Review in Gentleman's Magazine, Feb. 1843.

Church, styled by the ancients ‘solium Christi,’ (the throne of Christ,) while to the empty chair of our earthly sovereign, obeisance is still made in the house of peers. We like not to yield the one until the other has been discontinued; we choose not to turn our back upon the altar, while it is still deemed disrespectful to turn our back upon the throne.”¹

TENET XXII.

Scripture must be more interpreted as mystical and allegorical.

Making baptism almost the whole of religion, and adhering to the Fathers, Dr. Pusey adopts, with delight, the allegorical interpretations of the Fathers, from the third to the sixth centuries. Not content with seeing baptism in the Flood, the passage of the Red Sea, circumcision, and the Levitical washings, he remarks, “It were, however, an arbitrary and unphilosophical proceeding to stop short here, and to refuse to see other types of baptism, because Scripture *compels* us to acknowledge no more; it is a cold, stiff, and lifeless system, so to bind ourselves to take the letter of holy Scripture, as to refuse to stir hand or foot, even when that Scripture seems to beckon and invite us, and to point the way.” “Since the passage of the Red Sea figured our baptism, why should we restrain that of the Jordan, which transmitted the people of Israel from the wilderness into the promised land?” But there is no

¹ Hook’s Sermons, from Review in Gentleman’s Magazine, Feb. 1843.

end to quotation; even the very miraculous recovery of the iron from the Jordan by Elisha,—the restoration and cure of the blind man at the pool of Siloam,—the water from heaven on Elijah's sacrifice,—the waters in Ezekiel's vision, and even the waters at the Creation, are all made to connect themselves with baptism, or to represent it.¹ And, in drawing to a conclusion in his work on "Holy Baptism," he says, "Such are some specimens of the typical system of the ancient Church," lamenting, at the same time, that the moderns have suffered this mode of interpretation to drop. "Certainly," says he, "a gradual abandonment of the types, and a less reverential and thoughtful appreciation of the reality, have gone together. In both we have declined, step by step, from the ancient Church."²

¹ Pusey on Holy Baptism, pp. 344—363.

² *Ibid.* p. 391.

CHAPTER III.

A CAREFUL REFUTATION OF PUSEYISM AND HIGH CHURCHISM.

IN thus attempting to show the *erroneousness* of the tenets before mentioned, it is not judged necessary to re-state them at full length, as reference can easily be made to them, as stated in the preceding chapter.

TENET I.

Primitive and Catholic Tradition.

“Ye hold the tradition of men.”—Mark vii. 8.

Who can doubt that this is the great bulwark of Puseyism and High Churchism, that observes the great array of ancient Fathers brought forward in Dr. Pusey's work on “Holy Baptism,” as well as Keble's “Primitive Tradition?” Impressed with the conviction that it is so, as it was of the heretical Jewish Church, and, in later times, of the Romish, we shall spare no pains to attempt its demolition. May the Spirit of wisdom and understanding assist in this, and throughout the whole of the discussion!

It may be of some use, perhaps, if we can trace this adherence to tradition up to its origin. In Tract 90, upon the cover, you have a list of works recommended by the Tractarians; and almost at the head of the list you have "Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation;" that is, a translation of the Commonitory of Vincentius of Liren's work; a work on this very subject of tradition, and which, doubtless, these Tractarians published as the great auxiliary to the doctrine of primitive, or rather Catholic tradition. And what of this Vincentius of Liren? He was a native of Liren, an island in the Mediterranean, adjoining to France; and in the year of our Lord 434 he wrote a Commonitory concerning the rule of faith, in which, against the erroneous opinions of the Novatians, Photinians, Sabellians, Donatists, Arians, Apollinarians, and others, he endeavoured to establish the faith of the orthodox Church by an appeal to the unanimous consent of the writers and bishops of the Church at large, in the earliest times. "I have been at great pains," says he, "and often made it my particular business, to consult very many persons of the highest rank for piety and learning, about a certain general rule to distinguish the true Catholic faith from the depravations of heresy; and after repeated inquiries, the sum of all their answers amounted to this, that if I, or any other Christian, would discover the artifice of growing heretics, and keep out of their snares, and continue perfectly sound in the right faith, the way, by God's grace, is to secure it upon these two foundations:—1st, Upon the authority of holy Scriptures; and after that, upon the tradition of the Catholic Church." Then, he adds, "But

here, perhaps, a man may ask this question, 'Since the canon of the Scripture is complete, and more than sufficient in every respect, what need is there for adding the sense of the Catholic Church to such a perfect rule?' To which question I answer, That there is good reason for such addition; because the sacred writings, having a sublime sense, all understandings cannot reach it alike; but one expounds the divine oracles after this manner, and another after that; inso-much that there are almost as many opinions about the true meaning as there are expositors. For instance, Novatianus interprets one way, Photinus another, Sabelius another, Donatius another, Arius another, Eunomius, Macedonius another, Apollinaris, Priscillianus another, Jovinianus, Pelagius, Celestius another, and, in fine, Nestorius another. And, therefore, under so great difficulties, in such a perplexity of various error, I hold it extremely necessary to apply the sense of the Catholic Church to the Scriptures, as a rule to a line, and as the clue to conduct us in this labyrinth of opinions. And for us, who are in the bosom of the Catholic Church, it ought to be our first and principal care to choose such doctrines as we find to have been believed *in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful*. For there is nothing truly and properly Catholic (as the word sufficiently declares), but which fully and truly comprehends all these. And we are thus Catholic, when we follow *universality, antiquity, and unanimous consent*. But we follow universality, when we profess that only to be true faith which is professed by the Church all the world over. In like manner we are followers of antiquity when we religiously adhere to that sense of

Scripture which manifestly obtained amongst the holy Fathers, our predecessors. And, lastly, we follow *consent*, when we embrace the definitions and opinions of almost all, if not all, the bishops and teachers in the ancient Church."

Unwilling as we were to make so long an extract, yet we could not refrain from it, because it not only points us to the *origin* of this "Primitive Tradition" tenet, but presents the argument of our opponents for it in as fair a light as possible. And that it is from this writer and in this way, the Oxford school maintains its adherence to primitive tradition, at least as to the Catholic part of it, cannot well be called in question from the republication of the work, and from the repeated reference in their writers to the "*quod ubique, quod semper, et quod ab omnibus creditum est*" of Vincentius. But although it sets forth the argument—is the argument in point? or is the case parallel? Or if the argument be in point, is it satisfactory? We answer,—The case is not parallel; and if it were so, it is not satisfactory.

As to the parallelism of the case: Vincentius lived not more than three or four hundred years after the apostles, and less after their disciples Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, whose writings had come down to the Christians of that day. He wrote too at a time when the sentiments of the first Christians might be fairly gathered without that mixture of interpolations, mistakes, and alterations, with which, after the lapse of fifteen centuries, the writings of the Fathers might be corrupted. Moreover, innovations in the sentiments or practices of the churches, or of individuals, could be easily detected.

But will this justify, under circumstances so different, the Romish Church in their adherence to tradition, or our later Protestant brethren, such as Hicks and Dodwell, or those of the present day, in doing so? The Puseyites, as though conscious that Scripture will not sufficiently avail them, are appealing, either to some supposed apostolical tradition, or to the ancient fathers and councils and liturgies of the Church in the interpretation of Scripture and in support of their tenets, sheltering themselves apparently under the wing of this Vincentius; but, as noted before, Vincentius lived only three or four hundred years after the day of the apostles; we live seventeen or eighteen hundred years after them. In his days, they could trace the writings to their authors, and distinguish them from apocryphal and acknowledged heretical writers; but we, after the lapse of fourteen or fifteen hundred years from them, have an accumulation of writing, both heretical and orthodox, the genuineness of which may be disputed: and, moreover, we have fathers against fathers, bishops against bishops, council against council, pope against pope, church against church—can an appeal to such quarters then *now* be satisfactory? When can ever the test of Vincentius, the universality, the antiquity, the consent, be justly applied? Have the distinguishing sentiments of our opponents been held every where in either the ancient or modern Christian Church? Have they been held from the beginning, or were they held in the first century of the Christian Church? Were they held by universal consent in the first age or ever since? Neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative. Nor must it be overlooked that Vincentius

himself has respect to what was "set out by the holiest and wisest men in the *first* and *purest* ages of Christianity," and that he calls the Scriptures "a complete canon and more than sufficient in every respect," and a "perfect rule:" also, that he strongly censures those that cannot rest contented with the old rule of faith ("old," observe) once delivered and deposited in the primitive church, but must be every day upon new researches, and are never well, but when they are *adding*, altering, or curtailing Christianity; as if the doctrine was not from heaven, nor one revelation sufficient."

We see then how little the Commonitory of Vincencius of Liren avails the traditionists. He appears to have been a good man, and an ardent lover of truth, and probably would have been grieved if he had foreseen that his work would have been used to such a purpose.

We will now take up the question upon its own bearing. Is Scripture *and* tradition united the rule of faith, or is Scripture *alone* so? We answer, that the Scripture alone is so.

1. Against *apostolic* tradition.

What Keble means by this, and what he said in favour of it, may be seen by referring to the statement of the first tenet of Puseyism in the first chapter, to which now, as well as on future occasions, we beg the reader to refer. And, after considering all that he says, what argument, really, is there in it all for a tradition, "independent of and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural?" The very circumstance that "the truths and rules committed to Timothy's charge were at the time almost or wholly unwritten," presents us with a reason why these "truths" should be considered by

him as a sacred deposit *until* they were written; so, that "no Christian Scriptures yet existed, except perhaps St. Matthew's Gospel," supplies, too, a reason why the Thessalonians should "hold fast the traditions they had been taught," for the present only "by word or epistle;" so again, the consideration that Peter had not, as yet, provided that "after his decease" the Christians might "have the things" declared to them "always in remembrance," was the very consideration that should induce them to be "mindful" of the "commandment of the apostles;" and, finally, as to what the believers, addressed by John, had "heard from the beginning," that appears to have been no other than the law of love, which certainly all that had received the Scriptures, as these Jews had, must have "heard from the beginning." And what foundation is there then in such reasons as these for the doctrine of a tradition of the apostles, distinct from the Scripture which they afterwards wrote? Every thing of importance which they delivered by word of mouth to Timothy or to the churches, before they had written their epistles, we may reasonably conclude, they would deliver in the epistles when they did write them.

But to give weight to his argument, Keble brings forward what he calls "the direct and formal testimony of the ecclesiastical writers of the age immediately following the apostles," such as Tertullian and Irenæus. And what does it all amount to? Nothing more than this, that there would have been sufficient testimony to confute the heretics, if the Church had no Scriptures, but tradition only to rely upon, since there was sufficient evidence that such was the tradition of the apostles:

but neither does Tertullian or Irenæus intimate that, now that the Scriptures were written, they were not the true and sufficient rule of faith. Nor does Vincentius Lirinensis himself, of whom we have spoken so much already, intend anything more than that Catholic tradition might be a help, and on account of the peculiar circumstances of the case at that time, should be adhered to in the interpretation of the Scriptures. Upon a review then of the subject, we conclude that the "tradition" so called in Scripture, and the good thing committed to Timothy, of which Keble says so much, was merged in our Scriptures. If not, where indeed is it? Can Mr. Keble find us a copy of it? or if it has never been committed to writing, who would trust to it after the lapse of near eighteen hundred years?

From the *Apostolic* tradition—

2dly. We pass to the *Catholic* tradition, or to that which is delivered to us in the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of councils, and in the different liturgies of the Church. Are these to be joined with Scripture as the rule of faith? or, are we *bound* to interpret Scripture by them? We answer—No—for

1. God will not allow, in this case, of any *word* but his, of any *authority* but his.

Observe the following Scriptures. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it." "Whatsoever thing I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." "Add thou not to his words, lest he reprove thee." And see the Saviour reproving the Jews for "teaching for doctrines the

commandments of men," which they did, ever "making the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition." Of the same mind was his servant the apostle Paul, for he would not allow the Colossians to be "subject to ordinances after the doctrines and commandments of men," however they might have a "show of wisdom in will worship," and of "humility and neglecting of the body." After such prohibitions as these, will men bring forward and assert the authority of fathers, of councils, of liturgies? We must, then, ask, who gave them this authority? Besides, we are charged to call no man master but Christ, and no one our father, but our Father which is in heaven.

2. The fathers themselves denied other authority than that of the Scriptures.

Ignatius, a disciple of John, in writing to the Romans, says, "I do not as Peter and Paul command you."—"All that has been said since the apostles," says Jerome, "ought to be held as of no authority. However holy, however learned, be any one who has come after the apostles, still he has no authority." Augustine himself, of whose writings Dr. Pusey very greatly avails himself, disclaims the idea of authority. "Even now that I am old," says he in his *Retractations*, "I cannot expect to be perfect, never stumbling in my speech; how much less so, when in my youth I first began to write." "Take care," says he in another place, "that you are not submissive to my writings, as if they were canonical Scriptures." And, again, "Let us not esteem the works of catholic and venerated men as the canon of Scripture. We may, without at all prejudicing the respect justly due to them, reject whatever in their

writings we find contrary to truth. I regard the writings of others, as I should wish my readers to regard mine."¹

And, whoever will read the Epistles of Ignatius or Polycarp, or the Apology of Justin Martyr, or that of Tertullian, or the writings of Irenæus, concerning the Scriptures in the first two centuries, or Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, in the fourth century, must see that the Scriptures alone, and not tradition at all, were the rule of faith to the primitive Christians.

3. The Scriptures teach, and fact proves, that the stream of knowledge was polluted near to the fountain itself; and therefore who would drink at a fouled stream when he can drink at a pure fountain?

The very first Christians were in danger either from the Judaizing teachers or from "the philosophy and vain deceit" of the heathens. The apostle Paul evidently fears that their influence would corrupt the churches. Why else was he so much afraid lest the Corinthian church should be "corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ?" why, that the Colossians should be "spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit?" Why warn them so against being "subject to ordinances, after the doctrines and commandments of men," whatever "show of wisdom in will-worship and neglecting of the body" they might have? Why, indeed, all the warnings that the same apostle gives to Timothy and to Titus respecting the errors that were ever propagating, if the churches were not in danger of a corrupting influence from the opinions and doctrines of men?

Can any one read the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the writings of Justin Martyr, or of

¹ D'Aubigné, p. 13.

Tertullian, though within one hundred years of the apostles, and make them a just standard of doctrine? And, if not place confidence in them, how in the writings of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, when the stream of knowledge, being still more distant from the fountain, might be supposed to be still more fouled with the feet of men? Yet the Puseyites and our high-church traditionists look here principally. And then as to councils, we well know the power and influence of a few master minds in such assemblies, especially as under the influence of a powerful emperor, as were the councils called in the early ages. What says Gregory Nazianzen, one of the most eminent fathers of those days? "My mind is, if I must write the truth, to keep clear of every conference of bishops, for of conference never saw I good come, or a remedy, so much as an increase of evils. For there is strife and ambition, and these have the upper hand of reason."

4. Catholic tradition is *contradictory*.

Striking is the profession of the great Chillingworth, after stating his opinion, that "the Bible, and the Bible *alone* is the religion of Protestants"—"I, for my part," says he, "after a long, and, as I verily believe and hope, impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture

are pretended, but there are few or none to be found. No tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering men to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, have I reason to believe. This I will profess. According to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will, not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and inquire whether I believe or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, God has said it, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian; I will love no man the less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and that, therefore, men ought not to require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it." To the above testimony of the uncertainty of faith as founded upon the fathers, Dr. Sherlock's may be added, who says, "That the Scripture is all of a piece, and every part of it agrees with the rest; whereas the fathers many times contradict themselves and each other."¹

¹ Calamy, vol. i. p. 253. And the same may be said with regard to churches. Witness the churches of the East against the churches of

Upon the whole, then, we see that to admit Catholic tradition in our rule of faith, is to involve ourselves in a labyrinth of perplexities—it is to be thrown upon the wide and unstable sea of uncertainty. But to have recourse to the Bible, and the Bible *alone*, as the sole standard of truth, and to allow it to be a *self-interpreting* book, and, together with these things, admit the *right of private judgment*, we then stand upon firm ground: and, however we may happen to differ from others as to its interpretation, we feel satisfied in the assurance that we are amenable to the tribunal of our Maker, who knows the heart, and will judge with righteous judgment.

To the above-mentioned arguments we might have added another, that every one not only may, but *must*, be “persuaded in his own mind,” and must give account of himself unto God; but as this will form a distinct subject in the consideration of the next tenet, we omit it here: but we cannot close without remarking—That if we once admit Catholic tradition as a handmaid, we are in danger of having it for a mistress, at least, if in accordance with our preconceived opinions. So it was with the Jews, who made void the commandment of God by the tradition of the elders; so has it been in the Roman Catholic church; and so is it in a measure with our Protestant Established church, as is manifested by the superior regard that is paid by a con-

the West, concerning Easter; the church of England against the church of Rome; the church of England against the church of Scotland. And what says one of the Articles of the church of England? “As the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.”

siderable proportion of its members to the three festival days of Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, to that of the Lord's day, although the latter is authorized by Scripture, while the observance of the others is supported only by Catholic tradition.

SECTION ON TENET II.

On Private Judgment.

“Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.”—Rom. xiv. 5.

The doctrine that individuals should surrender their private judgment to the Church *supposes* that the Church in the aggregate is most likely to judge that which is right; and it is *urged* upon the plea of uniformity as tending to peace. But how far the former may be considered as a well-founded supposition may be seen from the foregoing Section; and we may ask in our turn whether the mischief arising from adherence to fathers and councils, or “Catholic tradition,” be not best prevented by the exercise of private judgment; and whether, in short, that very exercise be not, and was not designed, to be the *great conservative principle* of the Church? In connexion with having the Bible in free and universal circulation, as the great rule and principle of religion, we incline to think it is so, and was so intended; but we shall not stay to discuss this point here, but proceed to notice the plan upon which such surrender of private judgment to the Church is urged: that is, that by uniformity you preserve the peace. Ay, very true—such a peace as it is! If the “whole world lay in wickedness,” without any counteracting

agency, it would suit the designs of the great deceiver well—nothing would please the “prince of darkness” more than your succeeding, by throwing a veil of ignorance and error over the world, to lull them into peace! But, ye sons of light, ye “children of light and of the day,” resist his artifices, and be “valiant for the truth upon the earth.” Your Saviour, “Prince of Peace,” as He was, “came not” *thus* “to send peace on the earth”—no—“but a sword;” and his apostle James, much as he pleaded for peace, placed purity of truth before peace. We must be “*truthing*” (*αληθευοντες*), we must be investigating, buying, and declaring the truth, although it must be “in love”—in love to God, the God of truth, and to man, who can be saved alone by truth, for “the wisdom that is from above is first pure”—then, “peaceable” and “gentle.”

But, if the love of truth may not yield even to the love of peace, then uniformity *cannot*, in the present state of human nature, be maintained; and if it cannot be maintained, then the forced attempt to maintain it must, so far from “preserving the peace,” in proportion as that force is used, tend to destroy it. But is it the fact, that uniformity in modes, and forms, and views, cannot be maintained? Let us examine the subject a little. We think that diversity of opinion is unavoidable; and that, therefore, so will be diversity of modes and forms. Difference of constitutional temperament, of oral communication, as well as of the sources of information, will occasion such diversity. One, by reason of a certain constitutional temperament, will, upon a given subject, draw a hasty conclusion; another, by reason of a different temperament, will form a deli-

berate conclusion; one, on account of constant communication with a certain circle of friends, will favour this scheme of doctrine; another, having communication with a circle of friends of a contrary or different persuasion, will favour that scheme of doctrine; this may have access to a great and well-chosen library, while that may have access only to a small and ill-chosen one. And how can you avoid such occurrences, or their different results? And if you cannot, then there must be diversity—there cannot be uniformity. Doubtless, much may be done by a desire of uniformity; and, doubtless, we ought, according to the apostolic exhortation, to endeavour to be “of the same mind, and of the same judgment;” but, for the reasons above given, it cannot, in fact, be; and, therefore, the only thing that remains, is, in the present state of things, not to insist upon it, but to “endeavour to keep the *unity* of the *spirit* in the bond of peace,” notwithstanding all our differences, upon the common ground laid down by the Apostle in the connexion of the words last quoted; that “there is one body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all;” aiming to be “of the same mind and of the same judgment,” by preaching, by conversation, by writing, and all in love; edifying one another, not biting and devouring one another, “till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.”

We said just now that a *forced* attempt at uniformity, so far from preserving peace, may break it. Take an

occurrence in early church history for illustration and example. There arose, about the end of the second century, a difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western churches concerning the time of keeping Easter. "The churches of all Asia," says Eusebius, "guided by a remoter tradition, supposed that they ought to keep the fourteenth day of the moon for the festival of the Saviour's passover, in which day the Jews were commanded to kill the paschal lamb; and it was incumbent on them at all times to make an end of the fast on this day, on whatever day of the week it should happen to fall. But as it was not the custom to celebrate it in this manner in the churches throughout the rest of the world, who observe the practice that has prevailed from apostolic tradition until the present time, so that it would not be proper to terminate our fast on any other but the day of the resurrection of our Saviour." Hence there were synods and convocations of the bishops on this question; and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical *decree*, which they communicated to all the churches in all places, that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal fasts." Here, then, we see "*synods and convocations of bishops*" assuming to themselves the power of settling this point, as guided, they say, by "apostolic tradition." But now let us hear Eusebius again: "The bishops, however, of Asia, persevering in observing the custom handed down to them from their fathers, were headed by Polycrates. He, indeed, had also set forth the tradition handed down to them, in a

letter which he addressed to Victor and the church of Rome. 'We,' said he, 'therefore observe the genuine day; neither adding thereto, nor taking therefrom. For in Asia great lights have fallen asleep which shall rise again in the day of the Lord's appearing; in which he will come with glory from heaven, and will raise up all the saints.'" And then Polycrates goes on to mention the names of several who observed their custom; amongst whom, Philip and his two daughters, John the apostle, and Polycarp of Smyrna, are mentioned. "'All these,' adds he, 'observed the fourteenth day of the passover, according to the gospel; deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith. Moreover, I, Polycrates, who am the least of all of you, according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have followed. For there were seven of my relatives bishops, and I am the eighth; and my relatives always observed the day when the people (the Jews) threw away the leaven. I therefore, brethren, am now sixty-five years in the Lord, who, having conferred with the brethren throughout the world, and having studied the whole of the sacred Scriptures, am not at all alarmed at these things with which I am threatened, to intimidate me. For they who are greater than I, have said, "We ought to obey God rather than man." I could also mention the bishops that were present, whom you requested to be summoned by me, and whom I did call; whose names, did I write them, would present a great number. Who, however, seeing my slender body, consented to the epistle, well knowing that I did not bear my grey hairs for nought, but that I did at all times regulate my life in the Lord Jesus.'" Such is the account which

Eusebius gives us of the churches of Asia, and of the conduct of Polycrates as their representative; and we see how far it was from being uniform with the churches of the West, as headed by their "synods and convocations," on this subject of the time of keeping Easter. Nor was there a diversity of opinion and practice as to the time of keeping it only, but also as to the *manner* of fasting at that period. "Some think," says Irenæus, "that they ought to fast only one day, some two, some more days; some compute their days as consisting of forty hours, night and day; and this diversity existing among those who observe it, is not a matter that has just sprung up in our times, but long ago, among those before us, who, perhaps, not having ruled with sufficient strictness, established the practice that arose from their simplicity and inexperience." See, then, from all this, that uniformity could not be maintained in these early ages of Christianity. And we now proceed to show, as proposed, that a *forced* attempt to preserve it only tended to break the peace it was designed to occasion. For what did Victor the bishop of Rome do, when he found that Polycrates and the churches of Asia would not comply? He "forthwith cut off the churches of all Asia, together with the neighbouring churches, as heterodox, from the common unity; and he published abroad, by letters, and proclaimed, that all the brethren there were wholly excommunicated."¹ Such was the result of this forced attempt at uniformity in this case; and perhaps a more dreadful one happened in our own country about the year 600, when Austin, or Augustine, having been made

¹ Cruse's Eusebius, pp. 188—191.

archbishop of Canterbury, demanded that the Britons should conform to the See of Rome concerning the very same feast of Easter, in connexion with some other things. "At the borders of Worcestershire, a spot selected as being convenient to the British clergy then residing in Wales, he" (Austin) "summoned a council, and demanded from them obedience to the See of Rome, and the reception of the Romish ceremonies. But the Britons firmly opposed it. Another synod or session of the clergy was consequently agreed on, and a greater number assembled than before, and among them seven bishops. Augustine, however, could not succeed in his object; and finding them firm to their purpose, now insisted on an agreement only in three things,—the observation of Easter, the administration of baptism, and assisting him in preaching to the English Saxons. But, 'suspecting him of pride,' neither in these would they submit: and, soon after, it appears that, under Edilfrid, then the most powerful king of the English, who gathered together an army to reduce them into subjection, many hundreds of the monastery of Bangor were slain; so that the authority of the Roman See over the British churches had its foundation in cruelty and blood;"¹ and, we might add, its attempt, its *forced* attempt at uniformity, resulted in "cruelty and blood!" Shall we not add to these the attempts at uniformity since? What has been the result of them? Bonds, imprisonment, the stake, fines, cruelties, disabilities, reproach, contempt, and what not?

Nor, charitable as we have been in imputing this attempt at uniformity to a desire of peace, should we do

¹ Weaver's "Pagan Altar," &c. pp. 200, 201.

right to confine it to such a motive. Has it not sometimes proceeded from a desire to prostrate the minds of others to our own? Why did Nebuchadnezzar set up the golden image, and command all "people, nations, and languages," to "fall down and worship it?" Was it not under the supposition that to bow all minds to the mind of Darius, would be peculiarly flattering and acceptable to him, that the presidents and princes of his empire proposed the decree that no person should "ask a petition of any god or man for thirty days, save of him the king?" And we know what it was that prompted Antiochus to demand of the Jews a compliance with his religion. "Moreover," says the author of the first book of the Maccabees, "king Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom, that all should be one people, and every one should leave his laws," in which he had been brought up, and the Jews among the rest—"that they should leave their children uncircumcised—to the end that they might forget the law, and change all the ordinances." There must be uniformity—all must think as he thought—all must do as he did. And what was the result of this command for uniformity and for bowing to the arbitrary will of man in these cases? In the first, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, were "cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace"—in the second, Daniel was "cast into the den of lions"—in the last, great numbers of Jews were "tortured" and perished; and all, men too "of whom the world was not worthy," and for nothing else, moreover, than because they would "obey God rather than man!" And then come down to the Christian era: was there nothing of self-will, nothing of love of arbitrary power in

the case of Victor—in our popes—and in all the requisitions of uniformity since the Reformation in England until now?

If we would “keep the *unity of the Spirit* in the bond of peace,” we must abandon this idea of uniformity. So Paul the apostle taught, as may be seen in that remarkable, and on this subject, truly important chapter, the fourteenth to the Romans. In the church at Rome there was a great difference of opinion and practice in regard to the distinction of meats and observance of days; does the apostle quarrel with them on account of it? does he feel angry with them? does he *insist* upon uniformity? does he ever require that the minority should yield to the majority? No such thing. On the contrary, he will not allow brother to “despise” brother on account of it, nor even to “judge” his brother; but concluding that either side did it “to the Lord,” to please the Lord, he still exhorts them to “receive one another,” and that “with one mind and one mouth they glorify God.” And how was it with the primitive Christians? Why, even in the case of Victor, above-mentioned, many of the bishops “exhorted him to contemplate that course that was calculated to promote peace, unity, and love to one another.” “Among the rest, was Irenæus, who, in the name of those brethren in Gaul, over whom he presided, wrote an epistle, in which he ‘admonishes Victor not to cut off whole churches of God, who observed the tradition of ancient custom,’ and reminds him how those who differed in times ‘long ago,’ ‘maintained peace with one another,’ adding, ‘And those presbyters who governed the church before Soter, and over which you now preside, I mean Anicetus and Pius, Hyginus

with Telesphorus and Xystus, neither did themselves observe, nor did they permit those after them to observe it. And yet though themselves did not keep it, they were not the less on peace with those from churches where it was kept, whenever they came to them; although to keep it then was so much the more in opposition to those who did not. Neither at any time did they cast off any merely for the sake of the form. But those very presbyters before thee, who did not observe it, sent the eucharist to those of churches who did. And when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, and they had a little difference among themselves likewise respecting other matters, they immediately were reconciled, not disputing much with one another on this head. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it, because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles with whom he associated; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe, who said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him. Which things being so, they communed with each other; and in the church, Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, out of respect, no doubt, [to] the office of consecrating, and they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace; both those that observed, and those that did not observe, maintaining peace.”¹ So writes Irenæus to Victor; and we make the extract, to show, that until Victor, the churches understood and acted upon the principles laid down by the apostle Paul, in the chapter before-mentioned. Nor is this all; we find that Socrates Scholasticus, who fol-

¹ Cruse's Eusebius, p. 191.

lowed Eusebius in ecclesiastical history, and who wrote about the fifth century, while he gives us to understand very much at large that there existed a great diversity of opinion and practice throughout the christian world, yet, that they remained still united in communion. An extract or two shall confirm our remark. "Every sect and religion hath sundry and divers rites and ceremonies, yet conceive they no worse opinions of others than of themselves." Again—"Although all these countries, nations, and languages, thus varied one from another, yet they never divided the communion of the Church, neither break they asunder the bonds of unity." And as to these diversities, he says, "The originals and authors of great diversity were bishops which governed the churches at divers and several times. But to put on paper the infinite and divers ceremonies and customs throughout cities and countries would be a very tedious piece of work, and scarce, nay, impossible to be done."¹

To compel or enforce uniformity therefore is not only anti-scriptural, but it is directly opposed to that Catholic antiquity to which our opponents so firmly adhere, and therefore, as before remarked, we must abandon the idea; and we must abandon it, too, if we would *preserve peace*. "Let every one," says the apostolic injunction, "be fully persuaded in his own mind;" nor can the mind have rest and peace, or be free in the exercise of christian love to his brethren, without such permission; while, on the other hand, if every man be left to the free exercise of his own judgment, without fear of being "despised" or "judged" by his brother, we shall soon see that "the unity of the Spirit in the bond

¹ Socrates Scholasticus, p. 353. Harmer's translation.

of peace" is kept in a far higher degree than when uniformity of modes and forms is enforced by legal enactments; and far more likely are we, in this way, to hear again the world remark, "See how these Christians love one another."¹

Having shown the futility of those arguments upon which the surrender of our private judgments is demanded of us, we shall be better prepared to listen to such as may be advanced in favour of such right. And,

1. It arises from the very constitution of our nature, both *mental* and *moral*; that is, as endued with *understanding*, and as made *accountable*.

The great Creator has given us a nature consisting of "spirit," "soul," and "body"—of a "spirit," to think and understand; of a "soul," to be the seat of sensation, of the passions, and affections; and of a "body," as the organ of both; and he has created us free agents, forming us so as that our understanding shall influence our will and affections, and these, our actions. Moreover he has set up within us a tribunal, wherein our "conscience bears witness, and our thoughts the meanwhile accuse or else excuse us." Such being the case, as our King, he has commanded that we should think, that we should understand, and act according to our understanding, and has made us accountable for the employment of our understanding; and therefore, if this right of private judgment be not given me as the regulator of my conduct,

¹ "To reduce Christians to unity of communion there are but two ways that may be conceived probable. The one, by taking away the diversity of opinions touching matters of religion; the other, by showing that the diversity of opinions which is among the several sects of Christians ought to be no hinderance to their unity in communion." *Chillingworth in Calamy*, vol. i. pp. 233, 234.

vain in me is the conscience that bears witness, and the thoughts that judge me, in regard to the love or hatred of truth, to the compliance or non-compliance with duty—another, the Church, must judge for me what is truth and what is error; another, the Church, must determine what is right and good, and what is wrong and evil. We must all throw down the tribunal of judgment created within us; we must all shut up the court of conscience, in which we are to judge ourselves! And the apostle Paul might as well have spared his recommendation to the Corinthians to “judge themselves, that they might not be judged of the Lord,” as well as his appeal, “Judge ye not of yourselves what is right?”—But, we have understanding for ourselves, and are accountable for the use of that understanding; if not so, why amongst the catalogue of the crimes of the heathen world, do we find that one, of being “without understanding?” why are the Jews so often censured for their want of understanding and consideration? why that remarkable expression, “It is a people of no understanding: therefore He that made them will not have mercy upon them, and He that formed them will show them no favour?” Why, again, does God pronounce a “woe” against them that call “evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness?” And if we are not to judge for ourselves as to the mind of God in Scripture, why are we commanded to “search the Scriptures?” and why were the Bereans considered as “noble,” “because they searched the Scriptures daily, to see whether the things told them were so?” Whatsoever respect therefore I may have for the judgment of others—and I ought to respect the judgment of others—yet I must understand,

I must judge for myself; and if I do, as Scott the commentator said, use others' spectacles, I must after all use my own eyes. Nor is that all—whatsoever, upon consideration, I judge or believe to be right to *do*, I must do; for “he that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.”

2. This exercise of our own understanding, and this personal judgment, is not only *allowed* in Scripture, but *enjoined*.

When, in the apostles' days, the church of Rome was divided in its opinions, as to the distinction of meats and observance of days, the injunction of Paul was, “Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind;” and he taught also that, whatever persuasion any brother might possess, that he should not be “judged” or “despised” by his brother on account of that persuasion. It was enough, that, for such persuasion, and for the conduct consequent thereupon, he was to “give account of himself to God.” Nor was he to act without such persuasion; for, says the apostle, “whatsoever is not of faith, is sin:” as if he had said, We must exercise our understanding in the best manner we can; we must form our judgment as correctly as possible; for if, while when “we know how to do good, and do it not, to us it is sin;” if we do what we believe is not right to do, “it is sin:” thus showing, that we should form our judgment upon things, and act according to such judgment. And hence such exhortations as these, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good”—“Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits”—“Beware of false prophets”—“If any come unto you and receive not this doctrine, receive him not into your house;” hence also

the commendation of the Ephesian church for "trying them that said they were apostles;" and finally, hence the caution of our Lord to his disciples against blind leaders, giving them to understand that the led, as well as the leaders, would "fall into the ditch." Do not all these things—addressed to individuals as they were—prove that individuals not only are allowed, but that it is enjoined upon them, to exercise the right of private judgment?

3. This exercise of private judgment seems to be the *conservative principle* of the Church; for if men do not thus exercise this right, what *security* has the Church against rising *error*?

"There must be heresies among you," says the apostle Paul to the Corinthians, "that they which are approved may be made manifest;" but how could they be "approved" and made "manifest," if they were to yield to the heresy, without bringing it to the test? Even in the apostles' days there were "heresies" in the church at Corinth; some in the churches of Galatia "perverted the gospel of Christ;" the apostle Paul assures the elders of the Ephesian church that, "even of their own selves should men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." The same apostle deemed it necessary to warn the Colossians to "beware lest any man spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit;" he assures the Thessalonians that there would be a falling away, and that the "man of sin" would be revealed, who, in "the temple of God," the Church, "would exalt himself above all that is called God;" and even that "the mystery of iniquity was already working;" and our Lord, in his addresses to

the seven churches of Asia, plainly indicates the danger they were in from error, and from "synagogues of Satan," or assemblages of men who were the patrons of error. Now, in these cases, and under these circumstances, were not the members of the respective churches individually to watch and judge? Yes, they were to "prove all things;" they were to "try the spirits;" to bring both men and things to the test of Scripture, and thus preserve the Church from error. Hence, we conclude, that the exercise of private judgment, in connexion with the free and universal circulation of the Scriptures, is, under God, the *conservative principle* of the Christian church.

But it will be said, "Who so likely to understand the Scriptures, and to know the truth, as well-educated men, or as the Church, collectively considered?" To which we reply, in addition to what we have advanced in the former part of this work, that a poor illiterate man is as likely to know the mind of God in the Scriptures, as the literary and scientific. Nay, is he not more so? He has not the pride of worldly wisdom to overcome, as the latter have; for what says the apostle? "Let no man deceive himself: if any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." And not only was Christ's religion designed for the many as well as the few, but it is expressly said, that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea,

and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." And, if so, we cannot wonder that "the wayfaring men, though fools, should not err therein"—and that God should "reveal that unto babes," which is "hid from the wise and prudent."

As to the judgment of the *Church*, what satisfactory dependence can be placed upon it, if, instead of relying solely on the Scriptures, she has recourse to tradition, already proved to be so fallacious? Nor must we omit the testimony of the church of England herself, in one of her Articles, where she says, "As the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." To which we may add that remarkable testimony of Chillingworth, under the first Section of this chapter.

SECTION ON TENET III.

On Apostolical Succession and Apostolical Grace.

"Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."—Rev. ii. 2.

"Our bishops are successors of the apostles, and we, as ordained by them, share in the succession, and are therefore the authorized teachers of God's word, and the administrators of his sacrament." Such is the language of the English clergy of the Puseyite or High-Church school; and some will attach the word "only" to it, not only as to the administration of the

sacraments, but as to the preaching of the word: but to this latter idea we shall give a distinct consideration in our next Section.

“Successors of the apostles!”¹ High sounding words! Not, *as* apostles, of course, because they neither imme-

¹ As to the succession, after all, let us hear what has been said by some of the eminent of the succession themselves.

Bishop Hoadly.—“As far as we can judge of this, God’s providence never yet, in fact, kept up a regular uninterrupted succession of rightful bishops.”—Again, “It hath not pleased God in his providence to keep up any proof of the least probability or moral possibility of a regular uninterrupted succession; but there is a great appearance, and humanly speaking, a certainty of the contrary, that the succession hath often been interrupted.”—*Calamy*, vol. i. pp. 286, 287.

Bp. Stillingfleet.—“By the loss of the records of the British churches, we cannot draw down the succession of bishops from the apostles’ times; that of the bishops of London, by Jocelyn, of Furnes, not being worth mentioning.”—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 288.

Abp. Usher frankly refers to a celebrated author, Giraldus, who declares that “the accounts given of British bishops which stand at the head of the succession, were rather agreeable to common fame and opinion than any certainty of history.”—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 288.

Abp. Whately.—“There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree.”

To show the invalidity of the argument he says, “If a bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinations are null.”—Again, he says, “We read of bishops consecrated when mere children; of men officiating who barely knew their letters; of prelates expelled, and others put into their places by violence; of illiterate and profligate laymen and habitual drunkards admitted to holy orders; and, in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder and reckless disregard of the decency which the apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one, even moderately acquainted with history, can feel a certainty, or any approach to certainty, that, amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form was, in every instance, strictly adhered to by men, many of them openly profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion, through the gross ignorance of the population among whom they lived; and that no one not duly consecrated or ordained, was admitted to the sacred offices.”—*Kingdom of Christ*, pp. 176 – 178.

diately came out from Christ, nor have "the signs of an apostle — in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds;" but it must be that they succeed to the apostles in their official right of "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ," as did the apostle Paul and the other apostles; it must be, that as servants in that kingdom, they might gather in subjects to that kingdom and subserve its interests. Now to do these things, the succession cannot be a succession by birth, as was that of the Levitical priesthood, which priesthood is "done away;" but it must be a succession of *office* that is intended, and therefore the question arises, What is that official succession which the King of Zion intended in his kingdom to succeed the apostles in advancing the interests of that kingdom? Was it the mere *appointment* to office, without regard to qualification, or an appointment with such regard? Common sense says the latter. Suppose an individual of the medical profession were to express his desire in his will that the eldest son in each successive generation from him should adhere to the same profession, would he intend it without respect to qualification? Certainly not: would he wish so to risk the lives of his fellow race? Nor could the Lord Christ, when he expressed his will that there should be a succession of individuals who should proclaim and administer his "saving health," intend that such individuals should be engaged who were not qualified for such an occupation. When, therefore, our Lord, by the expression, "Lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the world"—meaning, "the end of time"—indicated that there would be a succession of such as should

“preach the gospel,” &c. he must intend the gracious promise for persons engaged therein who were *qualified for the engagement*: nor can we, indeed, suppose that he would pledge himself to be thus graciously present with any others. We conclude, therefore, that it is not such an “official succession” as has respect only to appointment, but that it was designed to include *qualification*; and that such only would the Lord Christ consider as the successors of his immediate apostles, and that to such only the promised presence applied. Hence, we assume,

1. That no one was ever intended to be a successor of the apostles, who was *not* “reconciled to God by Jesus Christ.”

What are these successors? “Ministers of reconciliation” between God and man, to whom is “committed the ministry of reconciliation.” But, would any king or master employ an ambassador or servant to effect a reconciliation with a party at variance, when such ambassador or servant was not on terms of amity with his king or master? It is absurd to suppose it. The apostle Paul, speaking of himself and his fellow-labourers as ambassadors for Christ, and as having “committed to them the ministry of reconciliation,” takes care to inform them that God had “reconciled them to himself” first. Let no one therefore boast of the “apostolic succession,” who has not “received the reconciliation,” and is thus actually “reconciled to God.”

2. No one was ever designed by the Lord Christ to be a successor of the apostles, but one who *loves* Christ.

Not even Peter the apostle was to be commissioned to

“ feed ” Christ’s “ sheep,” or even his “ lambs,” until he had declared his *love to Christ*, and, by implication, his supreme love to him. All the apostles did supremely love Christ, nor would they have been fit to serve him or the gospel, if they had not so loved; for otherwise, they could not have endured such privations and persecutions in his cause. Do ye thus love Christ, all ye who claim the “ apostolic succession ? ”

3. No one was to be a successor of the apostles who would not act the part of a *shepherd*—love the flock, feed them, watch over them, and restore them; for such did God promise to “ *set over* ” his sheep.

Speaking of the days of Messiah the King, the Holy Spirit says, “ I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking.” Now, what is the meaning of this? That the shepherds *he* would set over his people should be persons who should not only feed their flock, but should so watch over them, so comfort, so encourage, so guard them by their good and scriptural doctrine, that they should not, at least, have occasion for “ fear ” of perishing by their enemies; and should also, under the care and blessing of the “ great Shepherd of the sheep,” so defend and preserve them by their wholesome doctrine, as that they would not be finally lost, and so be “ lacking.” And why mention such shepherds as these? Evidently to distinguish them from “ the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep,” before reprov’d—pastors that, in other places, are represented as “ no shepherds,” or as “ idol shepherds,” which are as “ nothing in the world; ” and from “ shepherds that cannot understand.” In accordance with this, our

Lord represents him who "entereth not by the door" (himself), "but climbeth up some other way," not as "the shepherd of the sheep," but as "a thief and a robber;" and declares them to be "strangers" also, whom the sheep "will not follow," and whose "voice they know not."

4. None did the Lord Christ design to be successors of his apostles, but "*faithful men, who should be able to teach others also.*"

Would Christ commit such a deposit as the gospel to men who could not be recognised as believers of that gospel, and who were unfit to be entrusted with it? He did not "put into the ministry" Paul himself, but as "counting him faithful." Would he commit to men to teach and preach it such as did not know it themselves, and were not qualified for teaching it to others? But let us hear the apostle Paul himself, speaking of the true succession: "The things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Paul, as having been "counted faithful," had committed to him the precious deposit; he committed it to Timothy, and now Timothy was to commit it to others. But who were they that were to receive it? "Faithful men," true believers and trusty; and men "able to teach others." Ah! without the faith that "works by love," that "purifies the heart," that "overcomes the world," what Christians would be faithful to their engagements? And if men have not been "taught of God" themselves, they are not "able to teach others." It will not suffice, that men should teach by sermons prepared by others, but their own "heart must indite good

matter," and their "tongue must be as the pen of a ready writer," in order that they may prove themselves "the servants of the Most High God, to show unto men the way of salvation."

5. The King of Zion would intend no persons to be *servants* in his kingdom, or to minister the "word of his kingdom," but such as would be *subjects* of his kingdom.

What king would employ aliens, even, much less *enemies*? Now, it is written, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." To be a subject of this kingdom, we must "enter:" and natural-born subjects may become *servants*, and be employed as successors to other natural-born subjects, in the required service; but not those who are not "children of the kingdom." Those, therefore, whom the King of Zion would intend to be successors of his apostles in ministering the word of his kingdom and in promoting its interests, we may naturally conclude would be, at least, subjects of it; and since none can be so but such as are "born of the Spirit," we may conclude that none would be intended by him to be the successors of the apostles who were not regenerated persons.

And, in conclusion, let us ask, at least our brethren who know that "the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power;" who know that "the kingdom of God is within" us; who know that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink," that it does not consist in the observance of certain customs, or in certain religious observances, but "in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" let us ask them, we say, two questions—the first is,

whether the apostle Paul does not say, that “he that in these things,” viz. “righteousness, peace, and joy,” *serves Christ* is “*acceptable to God?*” and the second is a question which follows from the other, whether he who, while he aims at, succeeds in bringing most of such subjects into this “kingdom of God,” ought not to be accounted the best servant in this kingdom, and most truly a successor of the apostles? and, whether such a one does not “serve Christ” better, and is not more “acceptable to God,” than thousands of those who boast of such succession?

Thus, we have endeavoured to show, not only that the successors of the apostles would be so appointed with respect to their *qualifications* for such office, but also that there are certain *requisites* to such appointment, both in the view of common sense and of Scripture. And now, then, upon a review of the whole, let a judgment be formed—let the public teachers of the Established church, of the Independents, of the Baptists, of the Wesleyans, be judged by the qualifications or requisites specified, and we shall soon see who have the fairest claim to the denomination of “successors of the apostles.” Alas, that a corrupt and filthy succession, which involves in its line popes of abominable character, numberless priests who were slaves of sin and of the world, men whom the King of Zion himself would stigmatize as “watchmen that are blind—ignorant—dumb dogs, sleeping, lying down to slumber,—greedy dogs—shepherds that cannot understand, that look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter;” alas, we say, that such should be set up as of the “holy apostolic succession,” and the only one, while thousands

of men of a totally different character should be "cast out" as unauthorized!

But, say our opponents, there is "apostolical GRACE connected with the ordination." We therefore naturally inquire, What is this *grace*? and what is its *communication*? First, what is this "*grace* of the apostolical succession?" Keble says, "It was not what is commonly called miraculous, yet it was altogether supernatural;" "neither was it the preventing or assisting grace common to all christian persons"—"it could only be what the Church interprets it, apostolical or episcopal grace." But then the question returns, What is this "apostolical or episcopal grace?" According to him, it is "the Holy Ghost dwelling in us," as a "Spirit of power, of love, and of brotherly correction and reproof; a Spirit that brings with him an invisible but real *power*, to open and shut the kingdom of heaven in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; a Spirit of never-failing *love* and *charity* to men's souls, to guide us in the exercise of that more than human power; and lastly, a Spirit of kind and fatherly, yet, if need be, uncompromising and fearless rebuke."¹ Such is Keble's statement, but it leaves us in doubt, after all, as to the nature of this "grace." But, no matter; unless this grace be such as *qualifies* for the ministry, and is given to the *persons before described*, even to such as are "reconciled to God by Jesus Christ," &c. &c. it will not set aside our views of the *true* apostolical succession.

Keble, however, founds the doctrine on that exhortation of the apostle to Timothy, "That good thing which was committed to thee, keep, by the *Holy Ghost* that

¹ See chap. i. p. 18, of this work.

dwelleth in us," in connexion with the words of our Saviour to his apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." But, 1st, It does not follow that, because Paul exhorted Timothy to "keep, &c." that Timothy would understand it of other grace than that of the Holy Spirit which dwells in all true believers. 2dly, It does not follow, that, supposing the apostle intended *peculiar* grace as dwelling in himself and Timothy, both at the time giving evidence of it, that all succeeding preachers of the word, whether giving evidence of it or not, should possess it. Nor, 3dly, does it follow that because Paul had *power to communicate* this "peculiar grace," so supposed, to Timothy, that therefore Timothy would have power to communicate it also, much less that bishops in all succeeding ages should have this power; for neither Timothy or such bishops would be apostles as Paul was, having the signs of an apostle as he. Nor, 4thly, concerning our Lord's saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," can it be inferred from thence, that bishops in succession, even to the present time, have a right to say so, or can efficiently communicate the Holy Ghost; indeed it seems to us presumption, bordering upon blasphemy, for any man to say so to his fellow-men. Who was the person who uttered these words? One, in whom the Father dwelt—one, in whom the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of the godhead, dwelt personally, and *as his own*, and therefore one, who might well give it as *his own property*; and with the words, as from *him*, "virtue" might go forth, as in his miracles: but can this authorize any mere man to say so? He "*breathed* on them" at the time, intimating that the Holy Ghost was from himself, as the breath of man is from himself: and

it was, not improbably, his design, by this “inspiration” to give an “understanding” suited to their office. But will any mere man imitate him in either the words or the breathing? indeed, dare any man do so? We really tremble at any man’s saying only—for our Anglican bishops do not, we presume, use the sign of breathing—“*Receive ye the Holy Ghost,*” for it implies that they have it to *give*; but who can bestow this inestimable gift besides God? Yet Keble teaches us that the Holy Ghost *passes* from the bishop to the candidate by the *imposition of his hands*.

This brings us, 2dly, To inquire concerning the COMMUNICATION of this “apostolical or episcopal grace.”

This grace, communicated to “dwell in” the candidate, passes to him *by the imposition of hands*; but we have proved, we think, that there is no *communication at all*, since the time of the apostles. But we will suppose, for the present, that there *is* such communication, and then we would ask another question,—What if there should not be a *receptivity* in the subject for such “apostolical grace?” If it be “grace” worth the name,—“peculiar grace,”—grace such as qualifies for the ministry, and not mere fanaticism or mysticism, it must be a compassion for souls, zeal for the glory of God, an impressive conviction of the importance of Divine truth, and its adaptedness to the great purposes of saving souls and of glorifying God,—for these are the true preparatives of the christian ministry. But how can there be compassion of souls, where there is no previous sense of the soul’s worth or danger? How can there be a zeal for the glory of God, as seen in the redemption of sinners, if there has been no prior dis-

covery of that glory to the mind? How can there be an impressive sense of the importance and adaptedness of Divine truth for the purposes of the ministry, if that truth has not been before known? We say, then, that such "grace" supposes a *receptivity* in the subject—in the candidate for holy orders; and, consequently, that where such receptivity is not, it is incongruous to imagine that such "grace" would be communicated. If the idea of Keble be, that the "grace" really passes from the person of the bishop to the person of the candidate, we might remark, that, as well might we expect that the electric fluid would pass through a chain composed of links of wood as well as of iron, as that the apostolical grace would pass in lineal succession from the apostles to the clergy of the present day; for less receptive of this grace have thousands of the ordained clergy, from the times of the apostles until now, been, than would the links of *wood*, in a long-continued chain of iron and wood, be of the electric fluid. Think of what Baronius himself, though a Roman Catholic historian, said; "that for a succession of fifty popes, not one pious or virtuous man sat in the pontifical chair; many of them were whoremongers and murderers;"—think of the long succession of bishops and priests during the official continuance of these popes;—think of the ordained during the reign of the Stuarts, and of such men as King Charles the Second;—think of the Anglican clergy during the time of their late awful defection—and then say whether the chain will have been completely receptive of this "apostolical and episcopal grace."

Or, if by this "grace" passing from the bishop to the candidate upon the imposition of hands, be intended

only that, at the bishop's official designation of the candidate, the grace is not actually communicated from his person, but that it proceeds *immediately from God*; yet, can it be supposed, that God, the infinitely holy God, would give such grace to persons, not only so unworthy, but so *unfit* for it? We read of God's "giving the Holy Ghost to them that obey him;" we read of two or three cases in which he gave the spirit of prophecy, for some particular purpose, to unregenerate men, such as Balaam, and Saul, and Caiaphas; but the Scripture will not warrant us in saying, that he would give, in common, the "grace" of the Holy Spirit to such men as are above-mentioned, much less to "*dwell in*" them.

Finally, we appeal to *fact*. How can all those ordained by bishops say, "the Holy Ghost dwelleth in us," and that by that Holy Ghost dwelling in them, they keep the sacred deposit? How could the fifty popes themselves, of whom mention has been before made, say so? how would all the worldly and corrupt priests that have taken upon them the christian ministry say so? And if not, where the "apostolical grace," and the "apostolical succession?"

SECTION ON TENET IV.

On the sole authority of the Episcopal Clergy.

"Your brethren that hated you; that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed."—Isa. lxvi. 5.

Perhaps, in speaking of the sole authority of the episcopal clergy to administer the word and sacraments, we should distinguish between the administra-

tion of the word and the administration of the sacraments; because some might admit of the former and not of the latter: but we shall not consider the distinction here as worthy of notice, but pass on to consider the general question, Have the ordained clergy of the Episcopal Church of England the *sole* right thus to administer the word and sacraments? If they have, then, ye Independent ministers, ye Baptist ministers, ye Wesleyan ministers, of every class, ye have no right to do so. No! ye are all intruders into the sacred office, and therefore resign all your pretensions; let your chapels and your schools of instruction be all shut up and sold to the best bidder; and no more, in your official capacity at least, attempt to save souls, or to advance the interests of the kingdom of Christ and of God.

But, not so! Since the validity of ordination by the bishop depends upon the apostolical succession and the apostolical grace, if we have succeeded in proving the futility of these claims in the preceding Section, we may consider this exclusive claim also as null and void. But we will attempt to show the invalidity of such an assumption, on other grounds. And, first, we will assume that dissenting ministers, even though the dogma of apostolical succession were admitted, have never been fairly EXCLUDED from it; and that, upon this ground, That the "Act of Uniformity," passed in the time of King Charles the Second, was, according to the laws of *Christ's* kingdom—the laws by which all Christians profess to be governed—an *illegal* act; and, as such, was *null and void*. Have we not, in Section II. proved that the laws of Christ require that one Christian, or that one section of the Christian church, should

allow another Christian, or another section of the Christian church, the right of private judgment, or to “be fully persuaded in its own mind;” and that, without being “judged” or “despised” on account of a differing judgment? If so, unquestionably that “Act” must have been *illegal*; for it required, it insisted upon, “an unfeigned assent and consent to every thing written in the Book of Common Prayer,” upon pain of exclusion from their situation in the Church of England; the obvious consequence of which must be, that no one *could* henceforward be ordained by a bishop, so called, who did not thus conform; and that thus they were necessarily excluded from episcopal ordination. How comes it to pass, then, that dissenting ministers are not episcopally ordained, as our opponents imagine; and as they imagine, too, are out of the apostolical succession? Why, because a certain section of that kingdom passed an act contrary to the *King and government* itself,¹ which neither that King or that government will allow to be legal. Shall any account, then, be made of such an illegal act? No; it was—it *is* null and void; nor can it operate in the sight of Christ, the King of his church, or according to the construction of his law, as an exclusion. We claim, therefore, if there be anything in this “apostolical succession,” still to belong to it; and as to the “apostolical *grace*,” we assume that we have, at least, as fair a claim as the ordained clergy of the church of England to that.

Moreover, we maintain, that dissenting ministers are, according to Christ the King, and according to his laws, *more worthy* of being considered as of the “apostolical

¹ By this we mean, Christ as King, and his government.

succession" than the ordained clergy of the church of England, whether we consider the *persons ordained*, the *ordainers*, or the *ordination* itself?

1. As to the *persons ordained*, they are men "reconciled to God by Jesus Christ;" they are¹ such as love Christ their King; they are shepherds that love their sheep, that watch over and feed them, and restore them; they are "faithful men, able to teach others;" they were subjects of the kingdom before they were servants. And, moreover, as to the "grace" peculiar to such as are properly of the succession, they have that compassion for souls, that zeal for the glory of God, that conviction of the importance and adaptedness of the truth of the gospel for the great purposes of the gospel ministry, which should distinguish the "successors of the apostles" in "the kingdom of Christ and of God." And an impartial judge will allow, that, since the "Act of Uniformity" passed which excluded them, they have, as a body, a fairer claim to these requisites and qualifications than the Episcopal clergy, from that time until now, as a body, have had. And, if so, then they look more like *successors* of the apostles.

2. Not only do the character and qualifications of the dissenting ministry better accord with the designation of "successors of the apostles," as the ordained; but the *ORDAINERS* of the Dissenters are more like those who ordained in the apostolic and primitive times.

Who were then the ordainers? Apostles, evangelists, and afterwards bishops. But, whatever was their office, and however designated, they were men who themselves "taught and preached the kingdom of God,

¹ At least, recognised as such.

and the things that concern the Lord Jesus Christ;” they were men inflamed with love to and zeal for the extension of this kingdom of “righteousness and peace and joy,” and for the glory of Christ; they were men of God, and not of the world; men, in whom the Spirit of God dwelt, and whose “effectual fervent prayers” for the ordained might “avail much.” And, after the second century, when we read no more of evangelists, but of bishops or presbyters, these bishops were men who were pastors or shepherds over their respective flocks; men who watched over and fed their flocks; men over *one* flock, and not *many* flocks; and men, who consequently lived among them. Nor were there any other bishops in the apostolic and primitive days. For the truth of this, we need only to appeal to Archbishop Wake himself, who has given us the writings of the Apostolical Fathers. In that work we have the epistles of Clement, bishop of the church at Rome, the epistle of Polycarp, bishop of the church at Smyrna, and the epistles of Ignatius, the bishop of the church at Antioch. The former writes to the church at Corinth, the second to the church at Philippi, and the latter to the churches at Ephesus, at Magnesia, at Tralles, at Rome, at Philadelphia, at Smyrna, and another to Polycarp, as bishop of the church at Smyrna. And from all these epistles, it appears, that, not only were the writers themselves bishops of one church, but that the churches to which they wrote had each over them a bishop, as bishop of that one flock alone, and as such resided among them. And, although Clement and Ignatius and Polycarp write to these churches, yet it is not as their bishop, or as having authority over them, only as more aged,

as of longer standing, and as having been acquainted with and disciples of the apostles. By such men as these, then, were the ministers of the first churches, or the churches after the apostles and evangelists, ordained; and let the reader therefore judge, whether the bishops of the church of England, or those of the churches of the Dissenters by whom their ministers are ordained, agree best with the primitive pattern.

3. We pass on now to the *ordination* itself.

In the days of the apostles and in those succeeding the apostles, those who presided over the churches, the bishops or presbyters, were chosen by *the suffrage of the church*. Nor was it until the council of Laodicea, in the year 368,¹ that the practice was discontinued. Let those acquainted with ecclesiastical history deny this, if they can.² But the bishops and priests of the church of

¹ A council at Laodicea, in the year 368, decreed that the laity should not choose the priest.—*Hanmer's Ancient Ecclesiastical Histories*, p. 586.

² From the emperor Constantine's letter to the people of Antioch, requesting them not to withdraw Eusebius from Cesarea to be bishop of Antioch, it manifestly appears, that he considered the people as electors; for, says he, "Ecclesiastical honours should be obtained and conferred without trouble or discord; therefore the general suffrage of all men should be equally weighed and considered."—P. 52. And again, "He that is elected to a bishopric by the general suffrage and consent of wise men assembled to deliberate thereof, he ought by God's laws to enjoy it, and receive the fruit thereof, seeing he was by your free consent and approbation formally elected." And, writing to Eusebius to congratulate him on his refusal, he reverts to his being chosen at Cesarea, saying, "You are chosen by general consent to be the universal bishop." As to this "universal bishop," see note, p. 94.

Socrates Scholasticus, speaking of an election to the bishopric of Constantinople, thus remarks:—"After the decease of Atticus Marcus, great contention in the church of Constantinople arose about the election of a bishop; for some would have Philip a minister, some others Proclus, who also was a minister, preferred: but all the people with uniform consent desired Sisinius. All the laity laboured by all means to have him to their bishop, because he was counted a very godly man, and partly also for that

England do not so ordain, or are not so ordained. Ah! if the custom, the scriptural, the apostolic custom had continued, we had, most probably, never heard of many of those corruptions that have so obtained in the church of God! It might have acted as a *conservative* principle. However, amongst the general body of Dissenters, the custom of ordaining pastors by the suffrage of the church is observed; and therefore we may again put the question, Who most resemble the apostolic and primitive pattern, the established church of England, or the Dissenters?

And now, perhaps, we may conclude that, both as to the ordained, the ordainer, and the ordination, the Dissenters have a fairer claim to be of the true apostolic succession than the established church of England. And if so, let us hear no more of the exclusive right of the episcopal clergy to minister the word and sacraments.

And, what if it should appear, that the ministry of a man of good character and of the requisite qualifications should be valid, even though episcopal hands have not been laid upon him, or indeed any hands? Philip the deacon went down and preached at Samaria—who laid hands upon him? Apollos was an eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures, and eminently useful; there is no appearance of his being ordained by the imposition of hands, or of his being ordained at all; nor of the many “fellow-helpers,” and “fellow-workers,” or he endeavoured to relieve the poor beyond the reach of his substance. To be short, the laity got the upper hand, and Sisinius was consecrated.” “Philip inveighed against Sisinius that was consecrated, against the bishops who were consecrating, and especially against the laity who were electors.”—P. 390.

“labourers” with Paul. Would the gospel have been propagated as it was if they had waited for that? Moreover, it would be well for us to consider, that it is the *power* that God chiefly regards, not the *form*; the *spirit*, not the *letter*. Why else does the apostle argue as he does, in the latter end of the second chapter of his epistle to the Romans, where, although not speaking of the ministry, yet he teaches us what is most acceptable to God as a Spirit, and that persons who have the qualifications without the ceremony are ever preferred to such as have undergone the ceremony, who yet have not the qualifications? For, in the case of circumcision and uncircumcision; the man uncircumcised that kept God’s law, was to be preferred to the circumcised that kept not God’s law; and the former would be reckoned as in God’s covenant, although he had not the token of the covenant. By parity of reasoning, therefore, we may conclude, that God would consider that man as his servant, and a true successor of the apostles, who possessed the character and qualifications requisite to such office, though not regularly inducted into it by the instituted form, rather than he who, although inducted by the prescribed form, was yet destitute of those qualifications: and, for this reason, because, while “man looketh at the outward appearance, the Lord looketh at the heart;” and because he regards the “power” more than the “form.”

Upon the whole, then, we see with how little reason our Anglican clergy count themselves the only authorized teachers, and “cast out” their brethren as unauthorized. Ah! it reminds us of the conduct of the Jewish teachers towards the apostles of our Lord, as

foretold by Isaiah: "Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." And again, "Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day."

SECTION ON TENET V.

The Episcopal Church, such as is the Church of England, is the true Apostolical Church.

"I know the blasphemy of them that say they are Jews, and are not."—Rev. ii. 9.

"For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."—Rom. ii. 28, 29.

The introduction of light is the best way of dispelling darkness: let us therefore let in the light of Scripture upon this subject, "the Church." The word *ἐκκλησία*, the Greek word for "the Church," occurs seventy-five times in the Septuagint Old Testament. In more than forty of these it indicates the *whole congregation of Israel*, not always, however, as assembled for religious purposes; for it is applied to the congregation assembled for war, when David and Goliath engaged in single combat. In Psalm xxvi. 12, and lxviii. 26, it is used in the plural number for "congregations." Another view of this word is given us in 1 Sam. xix. 20, for there it is applied to the company of prophets at Naioth in Ramah, of

which Samuel was the head. More remarkable still, it is, in Psalm xxvi. 5, used for a company of evil doers. It must, then, be a generic term, signifying a *congregation*, as such, although it is usually applied to the whole congregation of Israel, and nearly always to such congregation as a "whole," or else to particular congregations of them. Indeed, the word *ἐκκλησία* is constantly rendered "congregation" in the Old Testament.

In the New Testament it occurs one hundred and eleven times. Of these, about twenty apply to the whole church of God, or all the professors of the faith and worship and practice of Christianity, "of all kindreds and tongues, and people and nations." There are about eighty in which the term is applied to particular congregations of such in a city or town, or else the aggregate of believers in such city or town, as at Jerusalem. And there are five places where it is used for an assembly of christian people meeting in a house. These include all the senses in which *ἐκκλησία* is used, as applicable to the christian religion. There yet remains, however, three places in which the word has reference to a heathen assembly, as at Ephesus, when that tumultuous cry was made, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" and where it is applied to the "assembly," either then convened or that might be convened. From these statements, we gather—

1. As the word is applied to the whole body of the people of Israel—"the church in the wilderness"—and to the whole congregation of Israel, we may perhaps apply it, as the Westminster Confession of Faith does, to "all that profess the true religion and their seed."

2. It will, without doubt, apply to the whole true

spiritual Israel, “the general assembly and church of the First-born.”

3. It applies to all congregations of professed believers, as to the church at Rome, at Corinth, “the churches of” the province of “Galatia;” and to such congregations, however small. Hence, as before noticed, there are five places where we read of a church in a house.

We have said that there are about eighty passages in the New Testament in which the term is applied to particular congregations. This, therefore, is the most prominent idea, and it is recognised in one of the Articles of the church of England, which runs thus:— It “is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.” Now, then, the question returns, Is the Episcopal church the only true Apostolical church? In replying to this question, we will show what the churches in the apostolical days were, and perhaps we shall then see, that not only is not the Episcopal church, such as is, at least, the church of England, the *only* true Apostolical church, but that the churches of the Dissenters have a far better claim to be denominated “apostolical.”

We will begin with the church at Rome, the first in order in the New Testament. This consisted of such as were “called of Jesus Christ” “called to be saints;” and if we proceed in reading the epistle, we find that they were the “justified by faith,” such as had “received the atonement,” were no longer “the servants

of sin," but "the servants of righteousness;" not now "in the flesh, but in the Spirit," having "the Spirit of God dwelling in" them. Passing on to the church of Corinth, we find, that the members which composed it were "the sanctified in Christ Jesus," were in the habit of "calling on Christ," and though notoriously wicked before, were now "washed, sanctified, justified." The churches of Galatia are represented as those who had "received the Spirit;" and as, professedly, "all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and as "sons," having "the Spirit" of God's "Son sent into their hearts." The Ephesian church was "blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus," and as "accepted in the Beloved." The church at Philippi had a "good work begun in them," and Paul thought it "meet for him to think this of them all." The Colossian church was addressed as "faithful brethren," as having "love to all the saints," and a "hope laid up for them in heaven." In the church at Thessalonica are recognised "the work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ." And, when Paul writes to Titus, speaking manifestly of the Church in general, after noticing their former state as "foolish, disobedient, &c." he represents them as now, of God's "mercy, saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, shed on them," &c. Nor is it otherwise when we come to the seven churches of Asia; but we forbear—enough has been said to prove of what materials the New Testament churches were composed. And, if we proceed forward to the churches in the apostolic times, or immediately after, as addressed by Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, we shall find them the same.

Now, look at these apostolical and primitive churches, and then at the church established by law, in its constitution, and in its several congregations, and then at the dissenting churches, and see which of these are the most "apostolical."

"But ours is the only true apostolical church," say our Anglican or Puseyite clergy, "because it has its *bishops, priests, and deacons*, as the primitive church had." By the way, was the church at Philippi a true church? The apostle Paul, in addressing himself to it, says, "with the bishops and deacons" only. Not a word about "priests!" Then, again, since "the kingdom of God" and "the church of God" is one and the same thing—the apostle, in writing to the Roman believers,¹ according to the exclusive pretensions of our high-church people, should have said, "The kingdom of God" is a society ruled by bishops, priests, and deacons; not a society under the rule of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" for, according to them, any society under the rule of "bishops, priests, and deacons," is a church—is of "the kingdom of God;" and so exclusively so, as that, out of the pale of such a church, they will scarcely allow that there is salvation! But no matter—let me abide by the apostle; if I have the rule of "righteousness, peace, and joy within me," I am of "the kingdom of God"—I am of the church; nay, more, as the same apostle tells me, "in these things I serve Christ," and am "*acceptable to God*," and I ought to be "approved of men;" yes, of these high-churchmen. But no! "unless you are of a church

¹ Chap. xiv 17, 18.

under the rule of bishops, priests, and deacons, you are not ‘acceptable to God,’ nor ‘approved by us;’ we unchristianize you—you are not of ‘the kingdom of God!’” But men, not of the established Episcopal church, who have “the kingdom” of “righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost” set up “within” them, will set at nought all such arrogance and exclusiveness, and rejoice to think that they are deemed by an apostle “in these things to *serve Christ*,” and are declared to be “*acceptable to God*.” And, “if God be for us, who can be against us?” This exclusiveness reminds us again of the passage in Isaiah lxvi. 5, “Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name’s sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed.”

But let us, however, examine this pretension. We have “bishops, priests, and deacons,” &c. First, “*bishops*.” Are they New Testament bishops? or, taking them upon their own ground, as appealing to antiquity, are they such bishops as the churches had in the apostolic days, or just after them? They are not so. Those bishops were over *one* church, were pastors of one flock, which they themselves fed, watched over, and lived with. Are Anglican bishops so? Secondly, “*priests*.” By the way, was this the appellation of the presbyters or elders in the apostolic or primitive churches? There were “*presbyters*” in a church besides the one who, by way of eminence, was called “bishop,” but they were not called “priests.” But, not to dispute about a name, these presbyters belonged to the same single congregation or church as did the bishop, and were not ministers of separate churches. And then, as to *deacons*,

they are neither in Scripture, nor in the first churches, considered as preachers of the word, but as men whose concern was about the needy and indigent, "serving tables," according to their original appointment. Now, then, put these things together, look at the bishop, presbyters, and deacons; they were very different from the three orders in the established church of this realm, and particularly in this one respect—that they all belonged to *one church or congregation*. That they did so, appears not only from the New Testament churches, most, if not all of which, had its "bishops and deacons," as the church at Philippi and at Ephesus, but from this circumstance—that, as at Corinth, they "*came together into one place*." And, as to the churches immediately after, and which were written to by Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, called by Archbishop Wake "Apostolical Fathers," the same fact appears concerning them. Thus Ignatius to the Ephesians:—"Let it be therefore your care to come oftener together, to the praise and glory of God. For when ye meet together in the same place, the powers of the devil are destroyed, and his mischief is dissolved by the unity of your faith." Again, he says, "That ye all by name come together in common in one faith, and in one Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David according to the flesh; the Son of Man and Son of God; obeying your bishop and the presbytery with an entire affection, breaking one and the same bread." The same to the Magnesians:—"So neither do ye anything without your bishop and presbyters: neither endeavour to let anything appear rational to yourselves apart; but being come together into the same place, have one common prayer, one supplication,

one mind, one hope, in charity and in joy undefiled. There is one Lord Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is better. Wherefore, come ye altogether, as unto one temple of God." The same to the Philadelphians: "But come all together, into the same place, with an undivided heart." And to show what sort of oversight these bishops had—not only that it was over one church, but over *all* in that church—this Ignatius, writing to his brother Polycarp, says, "Let your assemblies be more frequent; inquire into all by name. Overlook not the men and maid-servants."

Another thing remarkable is, that even down so low as the end of the second, and the beginning of the third century, we find no mention in Eusebius of any other bishops than such as were over the church in any given place, to feed them, to watch over them, to preside over them, and to live among them. Again and again, too, we meet with such an expression as this—"the bishops of the neighbouring churches," as though all had their distinct charges. Nor is it less remarkable, that when a church became vacant, these neighbouring churches concerned themselves about filling up the vacancy. Thus when Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, withdrew from the church, such was the case. It is expressly said, that "Narcissus having retired from the world, and no one knowing whither he had gone, it *seemed proper to the neighbouring churches to proceed to the ordination of another bishop.*" And, speaking of one Alexander, "who was bishop of another church," the historian adds, that he "was called to the office (of bishop of Jerusalem) at the same time with Narcissus," and that, "with the common consent of the bishops of

the neighbouring churches, they constrained him to stay among them," and, as afterwards appears, to be "colleague with" Narcissus. Origen is also said to have "received the ordination to the priesthood at Cesarea, from the bishops of that country." And, concerning Fabianus, bishop of Rome, Eusebius thus writes:—"When all the brethren had assembled in the church, for the purpose of ordaining him that should succeed him in the episcopate, though there were very many eminent and illustrious men in the expectation of many, Fabianus being present, no one thought of any other man." And, soon after, it is added, that "without delay they took and placed him upon the episcopal throne."

We see, then, what sort of bishops there were in the earliest ages of the Church, and how they were ordained; nor ought we to omit, as noticed before, that they were then ordained with the consent of the Church.¹

Now, reviewing this whole subject, what inferences can we draw but these?

1. That the Christians in a city or town were considered as *the* Church in that city or town, however numerous.

2. That, however great the number of the Christians, and of the presbyters or bishops over them, yet that originally there was but one *presiding* bishop.²

3. That this bishop was over *one* church only, feed

¹ See Cruse's Eusebius, p. 227.

² We say "originally," because, at length, the Christians in a city became so numerous, that they had several bishops in one city. For Constantine writes to Theodosius, Theodorus, Narcissus, Actius

ing, watching, and ruling over it; exercising no authority over any *other* church. Yet—

4. That such presiding bishop was ordained by the *bishops of the neighbouring churches*. And—

5. That it was with *consent of the Church*.

Concluding Remarks.

I. In the first two hundred years of the Christian era there was no lord bishop; no “unpreaching” bishop; no bishop but such as “fed the flock over which was an overseer,” watched over it, presided in it, and, of course, resided amongst them.

II. There was no bishop over a *plurality* of churches, much less over twenty or thirty, or a hundred, or more churches, with whom, and with their ministers, he could not be cognizant; nor, indeed, that assumed authority over any church but his own.

III. That, as to “priests and deacons,” or, more properly, presbyters and deacons, they belonged to the same church as that over which the “bishop” presided, and not to other and separate churches.

IV. That the *ordination* was not by *one* bishop, but by *many* “neighbouring bishops,” who might be supposed to be acquainted both with the people, and with the bishop that was to be set over them.

V. That, in no one case, not even in the time of

Alpheus, and the other bishops at Antioch.—*Eusebius' Life of Constantine*, p. 53. And these formed a Synod. So there was a Synod at Tyre, p. 65.

In the church at Rome, in the third century, there were 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 sub-deacons, 42 acoluthi (clerks), 52 exorcists, readers, and janitors, 1,500 widows, afflicted and needy.—*Cruse's Eusebius*, p. 243.

Constantine, do we find that a bishop was chosen by the *civil authority*.

Now, from this, let the reader judge whether the argument urged by our Puseyite and High-churchmen, that the church of England, as governed by “bishops, priests, and deacons,” is the true apostolical Church, be a valid argument for it or not; yea, let him judge whether the churches amongst the Dissenters have not the best claim to be considered as “apostolical churches,” as being constituted in a way more accordant with the apostolical and primitive model. If so, let us hear no more of “The temple of the Lord are these; The temple of the Lord are these.” “We are the people, and wisdom will die with us.”



SECTION ON TENET VI.

We are not to expect a divine blessing OUT of the Episcopal Church.

“Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I.”—Matt. xviii. 20.

Puseyites would make us believe that saving benefits are not to be expected but from the episcopal clergy. Then how came it to pass that the declaring of the glad tidings of the gospel, and the discoursing of the word of salvation by the thousands that were scattered abroad at the persecution of Stephen, became so effectual? Why did Philip, a deacon only, appointed only to “serve tables,” so succeed, when he preached the “things concerning the kingdom of God” at Samaria?

How came it to pass that "Apollos, a certain Jew, born at Alexandria," "knowing only the baptism of John," who therefore had not ever been baptized with christian baptism, and who, most probably, had never seen an apostle to lay hands upon him—how came it to pass, we say, that he should so "mightily convince the Jews," showing publicly that Jesus was Christ? On none of these does it appear that apostolical or episcopal hands were laid. Eusebius, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, says that "the most of the disciples, at that time," meaning the earliest times, "animated with a more ardent love of the Divine word, had first fulfilled their Saviour's precept by distributing their substance to the needy; afterwards, leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith; whilst, with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the holy gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and co-operation of God."¹ Now, is there any probability whatever, that multitudes of disciples, thus going forth to preach the gospel, would go through the form of apostolical or episcopal ordination? And yet how effectual was their preaching! Come to modern times. During the twelve years that presbyterian government prevailed, and the government by bishops was deemed unlawful, were there none converted? Since the English church cast

¹ Cruse's Eusebius, p. 106.

out their brethren by the "Act of Uniformity," have these brethren's ministry been ineffectual? Indeed, whose ministry has been *so* effectual? Was not the ministry of such men as Watts and Doddridge effectual? Is the ministry of our Independent, Baptist, and Wesleyan brethren of no avail? Whence originated the Baptist Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, and the Wesleyan Missionary Society, but from the successful exertions and preaching of the unauthorized teachers? Are the labours of a Carey, of a Morrison, of a Philip, of a Williams, of a Moffat, to be considered as of no account? Let our self-called "apostolical-succession"-preachers produce anything like it amongst the men of their spirit. And one question more we will ask; How comes it to pass that those who have "joined themselves to the Lord," and to his people, as communicants at the Lord's table, should be so much more numerous under the preaching of the cast-out brethren, the "unauthorized teachers," than under that of the so-called "authorized teachers" at the present day? Ye "unauthorized," let them cast you out, but regard it not, since amongst you is most eminently fulfilled that promise, "I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring. And they shall spring up as among the grass, and as willows by the water-courses. One shall say, I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself with the name of Israel."

SECTION ON TENET VII.

The power of the Church to bless and hallow the rites and ceremonies that it has decreed.

“Wherefore are ye subject to ordinances—after the commandments and doctrines of men?”—Col. ii. 20—22.

“There the LORD commanded the blessing.”—Ps. cxxxiii. 3.

It is not enough, it seems, that the church of England has assumed to it the right of decreeing rites and ceremonies; but, according to the Tractarians, it must assume also the gift of *blessing and hallowing* them.

But let us first examine this right of *decreeing*, for, if it can be proved that this claim is unfounded, the other will fall to the ground, of course. Unhappy assumption this of a right to decree rites and ceremonies! What a fruitful source of offence and division has it been in the church of Christ! No sooner does the Church think proper to exercise this right, but, through supineness, or love of honour or emolument, or, it may be, from a mistaken regard to unity and peace, the major part of the community will comply. But, what if another part of the christian community, through fidelity to their Lord, who has taught them not to “add to” or “diminish” from his laws, not to “add to his words,” not to receive “the doctrines and commandments of men”—what, we say, if another part of the christian community should see it their duty to refuse compliance? The obvious result will be “division and offence.” And who that is conversant with the history of the Church, knows not that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, divisions did

take place, and divisions that are even yet far from being healed? But is such decreeing in accordance with Scripture? No such thing. Look at the church of Rome in the days of the apostle Paul. There, some of the church were for abstaining from certain meats, and for observing certain days, while others were maintaining no such distinction concerning either meats or days; and it so happened, that those who were for making no distinction *despised* those who did distinguish as inferior in knowledge and weaker in faith; while, on the other hand, those who did distinguish *judged* those who did not as offending their Lord in eating things forbidden. And how does Paul decide concerning these dissentients? Does he say that this party should “*decree*” what was to be done, and that the other party must conform? Does he even say, that the weaker party must give way to the stronger? No; so far from it, he judges that since each party acted “to the Lord,” that is, acted, as appeared to them, to be the Lord’s will, neither of them should enforce compliance on the other, and, that “every one should be fully persuaded in his own mind,” and act accordingly. Nor, indeed, would he suffer either party to judge or despise the other in thus doing; but requires every one to leave the judgment to God, seeing that “every one must give account of himself to God.” Nay, so much stress does he lay upon every one acting according to his own conscientious conviction, that he insists upon it that a man *must* act according to it; “For,” says he, “whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.” As if he had said, “Whatsoever a man does that he does not believe to be right, to him it is sin.” How far is all this from one part of the

christian church *decreeing* for another part! How far from decreeing at all! See what we have before written on Uniformity in Section II.

But, if assuming to decree be an error, the assumption to *bless and hallow* must be another error. As the former cannot be proved from Scripture, so neither can the latter; and the same objection lies to the one as to the other; for how can a Bible Christian accede to such a proposition as that the Church hath the gift of blessing and hallowing its rites and ceremonies? If the Church can decree as she pleases, and then bless and hallow as she pleases, then the injunction of the apostle Paul, "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," is nugatory. Nor indeed can the direction, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," be availing. Power thus assumed is quite contrary to the mind of the Holy Spirit, as thus speaking by Paul; and it is contrary to Paul's own spirit and practice, for he would not have "dominion over the faith of the Corinthians." Is it not "lording it over God's heritage"—a thing forbidden by the apostle Peter? Besides, the church of Christ, in its aggregate capacity, and in its best state, is only the *body* of which Christ is the head; and who would think of the body "decreeing;" and who would think of the body "blessing and hallowing?" By the way, if not the Church, much less the State.

We object the rather to this power of decreeing rites and ceremonies, and of blessing and hallowing them, because it so favours the pomp and pageantry and processions of the church of Rome, and the introduction of them hereafter into the church of England. Alas! much as it may please the multitude, a religion of this

kind withers and destroys the religion of the heart: and every one who would not be “corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ,” should be upon his guard against it.

SECTION ON TENET VIII.

On Veneration for the Priest on account of his office, whatever be his character as man.

“Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”—Matt. xxiii. 33. (N.B. Said to office-bearers.)

First, we object to ministers being called “priests” at all, under the christian dispensation. It is true, Isaiah, looking forward to the christian dispensation, says, “Ye shall be named priests of the Lord,” but this relates to Christians in common. “*Your* ploughmen and *your* vine-dressers” implies, that they whose the ploughmen were, whose the vine-dressers were, should be called “The priests,” &c. And so we find it, in fact, in the New Testament. “Ye are a holy priesthood,” says Peter to the believers in common. Paul, in the epistle to the Hebrews, represents believers as persons who draw nigh to God, and offer sacrifices. Peter says that Christians are “Elect—unto the sprinkling of blood”—a thing which none but priests under the Jewish economy dared to do. And the whole church of God are represented to be celebrating the praises of the Saviour as having made them priests unto God. “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God.” “And they sang a new song, saying, Thou

art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." And, says John, further, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ." To the saints, then, under the christian dispensation, is this appellation to be given, and to them alone, for to no others is it applied in the New Testament. It is not, then, on account of their being "priests," that the ministers of the Anglican church are to be venerated.

But are they, on account of their *office* as dispensers of the word and sacraments? Because the Scribes and Pharisees "sat in Moses' seat," and from thence declared the mind of God, as far as they did declare it, their instructions were to be received, but not when they became "blind leaders." And so far only are the instructions of those who sit in Christ's seat to be regarded. And we, if called unhappily to hear the word of God from a minister who was intoxicated at the time, would venerate and receive the *word* that came out of his lips, but we could not venerate the *man*. Did our Saviour teach his disciples to reverence or to "greet" the Scribes and Pharisees "in the markets," merely because of their office? Far from it. What! to reverence "hypocrites," and such as "devoured widows' houses?" On the contrary, he often warned them against them and their doctrine, calling them "blind leaders," "blind guides;" and, as common sense teaches us not to follow blind leaders in the literal sense, so he cautioned his

disciples from following these guides, lest they, as well as the leaders, should fall into the ditch. If, then, they were to view them as "blind leaders," how could they reverence them? There is an appalling description of certain leaders of the Jews given us by Isaiah; let us advert to it. "His watchmen are blind: they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink, and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant!" Can we venerate, can we "greet" such characters? When we meet with "men of God," who "labour among us, and are over us in the Lord, and admonish us," we would "esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake;" but for what "works" can we thus esteem the contrary character? Besides, if we are to "try the spirits whether they are of God," and to try such as say "they are apostles and are not," of course we are to try them as to their office, and whether respect is to be paid to that. And the apostle John teaches us, that, supposing a man comes to our house, pleading his office as a teacher, if he teach not according to the apostolic doctrine, we are not to "receive him or bid him God-speed." I want to be led to Christ, to God, to heaven, by them; but, if they know not the way to either, how can they show it to me? If they themselves are not in the way, but are going in an opposite direction, I surely can owe them no regard as "guides." They

may, indeed, as Mr. Henry says, be “so proud as to think that they see better and further than any, and therefore undertake to be leaders of others, to show others the way to heaven, when they themselves know not one step of the way, and accordingly prescribe to all, and proscribe those who will not follow them;” but, however, the counsel of Jesus is to be taken how much soever they may be offended. Yet, they should be prayed for, that their eyes may be opened, and their hearts changed.

Alas for the cause of truth, alas for the purity of faith, of worship, of discipline, and of practice, too, in the church of God, if we are to venerate, or even to receive, all teachers that are sent us, when those who send are of the worldly and carnal! How, as led by such leaders, shall the people avoid falling into the ditch? So that we may say, Alas, for the people also! This Puseyite, this High-church doctrine, that we are to listen to, that we are to venerate our teachers, and respect their ministrations, their prayers, their absolutions, and their blessings, whatever be their character, in connexion with the doctrine that the people are to receive whatsoever ministers are sent to them, sets aside the exhortations of Scripture to “beware of false prophets,” to “try the spirits,” and to “prove all things, and hold that which is good.” It even reproves the great Head of the Church himself for praising the church of Ephesus, that they “tried them which said they were apostles and were not.” Moreover, where is the *conservative principle* of “the church of the living God?” Ah, mischievous decree of the council of Laodicea, in the year 368, that “the laity should not

choose the priest!" Self-elected bodies will not long preserve their purity, either in ecclesiastical or civil communities.

SECTION ON TENET IX.

On the superior importance, efficacy, and general necessity of the SACRAMENTS.

"Ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, but have omitted the weightier matters."—Matt. xxiii. 23.

"The sacraments are the principal means of salvation!"¹ What! are they to be exalted above the *word*, and meditation upon it? Did David think so when he penned the first Psalm, the nineteenth Psalm, and the hundred and nineteenth Psalm? According to him, it is "the law of the Lord" that "converteth the soul," and that "maketh wise the simple;" and where does he attribute such effects to the sacraments of circumcision or the passover? Did David's "Lord" think so when he prayed that his disciples might be "sanctified through the truth," even God's "word?" And, by the way, for whom did he pray? Not for those who should receive the sacraments, but for them "who should believe on him through their word." Did the apostle Paul think that the sacraments were superior to the word? Did he not say, that "the gospel was the power of God unto salvation," and that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God?" And, as to *prayer*, we are told, that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" and that our

¹ See Tenet IX. p. 22.

Heavenly Father will “give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him;” but where do we find such saving blessings connected with the baptismal ordinance, or the reception of the Lord’s Supper, when the passages of Scripture concerning them are rightly understood? Of the former ordinance Simon Magus partook; and of the latter, Judas; yet were neither of them saved, nor was it promised them that they should be saved, in consequence of such participation. Oh! to set the sacraments above the word and prayer runs counter to the whole Scripture. They are instructive signs—they are appendages to the word; but they neither bring to faith, as the word “searched” and “heard” is said to do; nor is there in them a natural or constituted “power” “to salvation.”

“But they are *effectual* means,” say our opponents. But why should Baptism and the Lord’s Supper be any more effectual means to Christians, than were Circumcision and the Passover to Jews? If grace was communicated with circumcision, why is Israel so often upbraided with being “uncircumcised in heart,” with being “uncircumcised in heart and ears;” and why “punished,” though “circumcised, with the uncircumcised?” If, again, grace were communicated by or in taking the Passover, why should “the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah” be denounced as a people that “would not hear?” Grace was not, then, communicated in those ordinances, though denoting the same things as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper; why should we conclude that grace is communicated in these latter? Fact does not prove that it is so, but both fact and Scripture prove the contrary. As to fact, we need say

nothing, it is so manifest: and, as to Scripture, a Simon Magus and a Judas may be again mentioned, and so may all those passages that indicate a want of saving faith, a living faith, in the professors of faith, even in those baptized, and in those who were in the habit of receiving the Lord's Supper amongst the churches to which the apostles wrote. Thus, for instance, the apostle Paul knew that the Corinthian church had all been baptized, had all received the Lord's Supper, yet he plainly intimates to them that, as in the case of Israel, they might many of them fail of salvation. After having reminded them, that they which run in a race, run all, yet one receiveth the prize, he proceeds to caution them by saying, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that *all* our fathers were under the cloud, and *all* passed through the sea, and 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;) but with *many* of them God was not well-pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." As if he had said, "Ye, Corinthians, have been baptized unto Christ, as Israel was baptized unto Moses; ye eat of bread which may be called 'spiritual bread,' inasmuch as it signifies the broken body of Christ, as the manna was called 'spiritual meat,' as signifying Christ the bread of life; and ye drink of wine, which may be called 'spiritual drink,' inasmuch as it signifies the shed blood of Christ, as the water from the rock was called 'spiritual drink,' as signifying 'the water of life' from Christ: but, consider this, that as the participation of

those outward signs did not save many of them, because they possessed not the things signified, but they were destroyed in the wilderness, so, in your case, although you have been made partakers of the signs, you, for want of the things signified, may not be saved, but, after all, be destroyed." What else can be the meaning of the apostle? And, if so, does it not prove that the signs of themselves do not communicate grace? Who participated more fully in the signs and sacraments of the Jewish religion than the Scribes and Pharisees; and yet had they the grace communicated to them? Ah, righteous as they were in their own eyes, and righteous as they were too in the eyes of the people, our Lord calls them a "generation of vipers," "hypocrites," "fools and blind," "children of hell," who could not "escape the damnation of hell!"

The passages of Scripture which our opponents cite to prove the efficacy of the sacraments will be noticed when we come to treat of them respectively in the following Sections.

Moreover, the Oxford school represents the sacraments as *necessary* to salvation, or, at least, as "generally necessary." That to observe all divine ordinances is the duty of a Christian, there cannot be a doubt; and that the omission of them, when they can be observed, might fairly induce a question as to the sincerity of the Christianity of the individual thus omitting them, must be admitted; but to insist upon their observance, as the Puseyites do, is unscriptural and uncharitable. If they communicated grace, and were the *sole* means of communicating it, there would be some colour for the sentiment; but we have shown, not only that they are not the

sole means of communicating grace, but that they do not necessarily communicate it at all; and we hope to show it more fully still when we come to treat of the sacraments themselves. If these were thus necessary to salvation, why did not our Lord, when he said, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved," say also, He that believeth not, "*and is not baptized*, shall be damned?" And why omit it in all other similar conditional expressions? Besides, if there be any meaning in the passage before quoted from the close of the second chapter of the epistle to the Romans, it is to teach us the doctrine, that God regards the thing signified rather than the sign, the circumcision and baptism of the heart by the Spirit, rather than the circumcision and baptism of the flesh by the element of water; and, accordingly, that he may be a Jew or a Christian in covenant with God, who has neither been circumcised nor baptized outwardly, if his "heart" has been "circumcised to love God," or he has received the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" inwardly; while, on the other hand, he is neither a Jew nor a Christian, in the true sense, whose heart has not been circumcised to love God, or who has not been baptized with the Holy Spirit, although he has been circumcised or baptized outwardly. Abraham was justified and possessed the circumcision of the heart, before he was circumcised in the flesh. For forty years the ordinance of circumcision was discontinued in the wilderness. Many of Abraham's descendants died before the eighth day. The thief upon the cross was probably never baptized, or never received the Lord's Supper. Thousands of children have died in the Lord, who never received christian baptism: so,

of adults, who yet, having received the baptism of the Spirit, and the blessing of the new covenant, were received up into glory. On the other hand, many to whom both the sacraments have been ministered, have been destitute of saving grace, and of the hope of the gospel. Witness Simon Magus, Judas, hypocrites, and such, at last, as, notwithstanding sacraments and church-membership too, will be found "reprobates." To all which we may add, that we know the character of God too well, to suppose that he would cut off infants and others from the blessings of grace, because they were not baptized, it being no fault of their own. What! shall the fate of children be dependent upon the convenience or wills of nurses and parents? Alas, for the haste with which some infants are baptized! Alas, for the distress that some ignorant parents feel, because it so happened that their children were not baptized! Alas, for the hurry with which the Lord's Supper is administered to dying persons, to persons never designed to participate in it, to persons that do not understand its meaning, or fall in with its design! But why all this? It has been impressed upon their minds, that the sacraments are necessary to salvation! What mean, what unscriptural thoughts must such persons possess of that God "with whom we have to do," who "is a Spirit," and "looketh at the heart!"¹

¹ Let the reader not fail to read the remarks on Forms and Ceremonies, at the conclusion.

SECTION ON TENET X.

On Baptismal Regeneration.

“In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the GOSPEL.”
1 Cor. iv. 15.

We have been wont to consider the baptism of water as an “outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace,” the thing *signified*; but the Oxford doctrine teaches us that in the ordinance itself is conveyed the inward and spiritual grace. We have supposed, also, that if the twenty-seventh Article of the church of England speaks of saving benefits being “signed and sealed,” yet that the framers meant only, as indeed they express it, to such as “receive baptism rightly;” that is, to adults who receive it with “repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;” and if, again, they say in the Catechism, that it is “a means whereby we receive the same,” that they meant that it is to such adults as rightly receive it, and not that it actually confers the benefits on infants baptized. And when in the same answer it is added, “and a pledge to assure us thereof,” that it was intended conditionally, that is, upon such baptized persons afterwards believing and seeking. At least we are willing to put this favourable construction upon the meaning of our pious reformers. And we will take occasion also to remark, by the way, that such has been our hope with reference to the answer in the Catechism, where the child is instructed to say, that, in baptism he “was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of

heaven," that is, visibly and outwardly : and to *enjoy* the privileges that belong to such, conditionally, on believing and receiving the grace.

But Puseyism teaches that the Spirit is given in baptism with the water, and makes no distinction between baptism with water and baptism with the Spirit, at least viewing them as inseparable. Whether it be so or not, however, let the reader judge, after maturely considering the following discourse upon the subject.

In treating on a topic of this kind, we conceive that it will be most satisfactory to state the Scripture doctrine of baptism; and afterwards to form our judgment of the "baptismal regeneration" in question.

Baptism is two-fold. There is the baptism of water, which we consider as a means of grace, introducing us into the visible kingdom of Christ; and the baptism of the Spirit, which introduces into the invisible and spiritual kingdom of Christ. "I baptize you with water," says John, "but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" manifestly making a twofold distinction. Probably the Saviour had both these ideas in view when he said, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" intending by the former the being "born of water," to signify the entrance into the kingdom visibly, or entering the visible kingdom; and by the latter, the being "born of the Spirit," to signify the entrance into the kingdom invisibly or spiritually, or entering the invisible or spiritual kingdom.

But we shall begin with the baptism of the Spirit; or the entrance into the spiritual kingdom of Christ and of God, for a reason which will afterwards appear.

I. What, then, is the *baptism of the Spirit*, or the baptism that *saves*?

Since our Saviour says, "That which is born of the Spirit is *spirit*," we conclude that he intends to convey the idea, that the Spirit begets a *new nature* in the soul, by which Christ saves his people from their sins; and, in consequence of which, they "wash the *heart* from wickedness," so that no longer will they suffer "vain thoughts to lodge within them;" by which they wash their *hands* from "the evil of their doings," and by which they wash their *feet*, and so "cleanse their way." So that it is the same as the apostle intends by the "washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which God sheds on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour," and by which he "saves" us. Now, revert to this latter passage. The apostle had been speaking of the former state of the persons intended, as "foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another." Well, and what then? Why, God of his mercy had "saved them"—from what? from this "foolish, disobedient, deceived," &c. state. But how? By this "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," by which they both "hated evil, and ceased to do evil," and loved good, and "learned to do well." And this, we conceive, is the baptism that the apostle Peter intended, when he said, "Baptism doth also now save us." And, being thus "saved from their sins," and "renewed in the spirit of their mind," they become fit subjects for "the kingdom of God;" that kingdom which is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

And HOW is this baptism of the Holy Spirit effected? Other Scriptures, explanatory of our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus, will show us; for this doctrine of the new birth is mentioned in many places, and indeed was no *new* doctrine, as our Lord's reply to Nicodemus intimates. It was expressed in Old Testament Scripture by "circumcision of the heart to love God," by "giving a heart to know the Lord," by a "new heart and a new spirit," and still more to the purpose, by being "born." Thus, speaking of Zion, says the Psalmist, "This man was born there. And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her." "The Lord shall count when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there." And what birth could this be, a birth in Zion, in the house of God, but the spiritual birth? And how this spiritual birth? By the word of God preached there, whereby the Spirit of God discovers to the man the filthiness of sin, his own filthiness of heart, of hands, and of life; and disposes him to "wash his heart from wickedness," to "wash his hands" of all his filthy doings, and to "cleans[e] his way." Hence, both the apostles James and Peter give us to understand that the new birth is by the word. Says James, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth:" and Peter speaks of believers as being "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." And Paul also, speaking of himself as the instrument of the conversion of the Corinthians, says, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Why? Because by him they had believed that gospel, which is the "power of God unto salvation to every one that

believeth." And the "words" of Christ, applied by the Spirit to the soul, became "spirit" and "life." Thus a new living nature is produced which our Lord calls "spirit," and the man thus born, "walks in newness of life." O blessed, "holy baptism" this! "As many of you," says Paul, "as are baptized into Christ are baptized unto his death," even to "die unto sin and to live unto righteousness."—"As many of you as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—"By one Spirit are we all," whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, "baptized into one body." This is the true spiritual baptism, the "baptism that doth also now save us," and that causeth to return "the answer of a good conscience toward God," and the "confession that is unto salvation." And the man that has the faith that purifieth the heart, when bid to "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord," will, in connexion with his outward baptism of water, "wash away his sins" of heart, of hands, and of feet, "calling upon the name of the Lord," to enable him to do so. This is "holy baptism" indeed!

II. *The Baptismal Ordinance.*

We are now prepared to speak of the baptism of *water*, or of the baptismal *ordinance*. To distinguish this from the baptism of the Spirit, the apostle Peter had no sooner spoken of "baptism," as "now saving us," than he adds, as if he would caution us against relying on the mere sacrament, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." Why distinguish thus, if he did not really put a difference between the ordinance and the thing signified by the ordinance, even that baptism of the Spirit, which, as he afterwards intimates, disposes to

return "the answer of a good conscience towards God?"

The baptismal *ordinance* by water is a SIGN of the baptismal regeneration by the Spirit; and a fit sign it is, as the remarks already made must have shown. And it appears to be in strict analogy with the "doctrine of baptisms," and the "diverse" (*διαφοροι*) "baptisms" (*βαπτισμοι*) belonging to the Levitical law. As by water poured out from the brazen laver upon the body of the priest, he was washed, and washed himself, to enter upon the service of God in the tabernacle; so it is by the "washing of regeneration," and by our "cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit," that we are fit, as Christians, to serve God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. As the priests were first washed by Moses in their consecration, so are the people of God, who are to be to him "priests," washed with "the washing of regeneration;" and as these priests for their daily service themselves washed their hands and their feet, so do God's spiritual priests cleanse themselves from all filthiness in their works and walk. Thus, as is the christian baptism, so were the Jewish baptisms *fit* signs of the true spiritual baptism, inasmuch as they both signify the necessity of our being sanctified by purifying for the service of and communion with God. And, viewed thus, it becomes an instructive lesson to all who are baptized, or who are connected with the ordinance, for teaching our filthiness and God's purity; and likewise the necessity of "the washing of regeneration, of the Holy Spirit" to be "shed" upon us, or of the "baptism that saves us," in order to such service and communion.

But, did Moses, who prescribed the Jewish baptisms, or taught the "doctrine of baptisms"—did the priests who observed them—did John in his baptism, or the disciples of Christ in their baptisms,—or, more directly, did our Lord in his institution of the Christian baptism, once think that the ordinance and the baptism of the Spirit were inseparably united? that the thing signified was necessarily communicated with the sign? that in receiving the baptism—which was "the putting away the filth of the flesh,"—the baptized received the *baptism that saves*? No such thing. Certainly John did not, for he carefully distinguished between his baptism "with water," and his Master's baptism "with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Nor did our Lord himself; for, says he, "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." And how did Peter, his apostle, understand it, after Simon Magus had been baptized? So far from concluding that the baptismal grace had been communicated to him in the ordinance—so far from supposing that the baptism of water had been the baptism of the Spirit that saves, Peter, addressing him, says, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God;"—adding, "I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." And the same Peter, as has been before observed, cautions against resting in the baptism that "puts away the filth of the flesh, as distinguished from that which saves." No, as it was with circumcision, the originally-instituted ordinance of dedication to God, there is observed in Scripture an essential distinction between the outward ordinance and the

inward grace, so is it in baptism, the Christian institute. That outward ordinance was, it seems, a sign of the necessity of the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," and of the "circumcision of the heart to love God;" and this, of the "putting away the filth of the flesh," and the "renewing" of the soul by the shedding abroad of the love of God in it: but it is remarkable, that as Paul, in speaking of the former, distinguishes between it and the "circumcision of Christ," so Peter, in speaking of the latter, distinguishes between it and "baptism that saves." Yes, the great apostle of the Gentiles knew, that the ordinance of circumcision only made a "Jew outwardly," while it was "the circumcision of the heart by the Spirit" that made a "Jew inwardly;" and so, doubtless, he knew, as did his brother Peter, that the ordinance of baptism only makes a Christian outwardly, while it is the baptism of the Holy Spirit that makes the Christian inwardly.

The two-fold baptism being thus scripturally understood, how *erroneous*, and, as we shall hereafter see, how *dangerous*, it is to confound the saving baptism with the baptismal ordinance, and to connect with the latter all those spiritual blessings which belong only to the former! See Tenet XIII.

To draw to a conclusion. Besides the obvious distinction which the Scripture makes between the sign and the thing signified, it must appear to common sense and reason that, since the spiritual birth is a birth of the *mind and heart*, a change of views and disposition, a "new heart and a new spirit," this cannot be effected by a mere sacrament. Knowledge must be communicated, the understanding must be enlightened,

a new taste must be given: and, in the very nature of things, how can these things be imparted by a mere ordinance,—an outward ordinance, applied to the body? No! we are therefore taught, that the new birth is in Zion; that it is by “the word of truth,” and that people are “begotten” by “the gospel.” We might as well represent religion as created in us by a mere spell or charm!

From the whole we learn, in opposition to the Oxford School,—

1. That we are to distinguish between the baptism of water—the sign—and the baptism of the Spirit—the thing signified; and that the former may be administered and yet not the latter bestowed, while the latter may be bestowed where the former is not administered: and that, therefore, the virtue which the Puseyites ascribe to the sacraments is altogether unscriptural as well as the sentiment injurious.

2. That the baptism which is saving, is by the word of God, understood, believed, and received, and not by the application of *water*; such understanding, believing, and receiving the word, producing that change of heart and life which is signified by the new birth, and by which we become fitted to become the subjects of God’s “kingdom” of “righteousness, and peace, and joy.”

3. That, while their doctrine is contradicted by fact, ours is in accordance with fact.

SECTION ON TENET XI.

On Baptismal Justification.

“ All that believe are justified.”—Acts xiii. 39.

In endeavouring to refute this tenet, we will first show what Justification is, and then we shall see whether it is properly connected with Baptism.

What is *Justification of Life*?

It is nothing less or more than this: God, the great King, Lawgiver, and Judge, pronouncing the man *righteous*, and accordingly adjudging him to life, the promised reward of righteousness. Than which can there be anything more desirable?

Now, that man cannot be thus pronounced righteous for his *own* righteousness, is manifest, inasmuch as it is declared by an infallible writer, “ There is none righteous, no, not one:” that is, There is none that is perfectly conformable to law, as to its prohibitions and requirements, as to its spirit as well as its letter: no, not one. A man must, therefore, be accounted so in another way, if he be really declared so. With reference to that way the Scripture teaches us, that it is the way in which mankind became sinners. And this is thus expressed: “ So, then ”—I render the words precisely as they are in the Greek—“ as by one offence judgment came unto ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) all men unto condemnation, so by one righteous sentence ($\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$) judgment came unto ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) all men unto justification of life.” From whence it appears manifest, that the righteous-

ness or justificatory sentence (*δικαιωμα*) pronounced upon the "last Adam," or "the second man," is the ground of our "justification of life," as the "offence" of the first Adam was the ground of our condemnation of death. Such is the *legal* ground—such is the *judicial* ground of man's justification of life, now that he is fallen; and if he "receive the abounding of grace and the gift of righteousness" he shall, *in fact*, "reign in life through Jesus Christ our Lord;" so that as "sin hath reigned in (*εν*) the death," so also was it designed that "grace might reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." This, then, is our position, our legal position, as fallen creatures in Adam. It is not by virtue of *personal* righteousness, but it is by virtue of relationship to Christ as "the *second man*" and the "last Adam," that we are justified. And so it has been with man ever since the fall, as connected with "the promise of life in Christ Jesus." And very well is this expressed by Clement, one of the earliest writers, in his epistle to the Corinthians: "We are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have done in the holiness of our hearts; but by that faith by which God has justified those also who were from the beginning; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." By that "faith," I should suppose, he means faith in Christ, in his redemption and righteousness.

Thus, then, it is, "As by one offence judgment came unto all men unto condemnation, *so*, also, by one righteousness, judgment comes unto all men unto justification of life. For, as by the disobedience of

one many were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of one *shall* many be constituted righteous." The former verse speaks of the *judicial* award, and the latter of the *actual fact*, such "many" having "received the abounding grace, and the gift of righteousness."

But, as before observed, it is by virtue of relationship to Christ, "the *second* man," that we have this "justification of life," as it was by virtue of relationship to Adam, "the first man," we fell into condemnation of death, its opposite—by being "*in* Christ," that second man, as we were *in* Adam, the first man; there being a divinely-constituted oneness in the former case, as there was in the latter; so that the justificatory sentence (*δικαιωμα*) passed upon Christ, the Head, when he was "justified by the Spirit" at his resurrection, becomes available to all that are "*in* him," as his body. Hence, not only the expression of being "justified in the name of the Lord Jesus" "by his blood," &c. but of being justified as "*in*" him, and of there being "no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Well might the apostle Paul so intensely desire to be "found in him!"

But how comes to pass this union and connexion? It is by that *faith* which "receives the abounding grace and the gift of righteousness." Yes, when a sinner, "believing with the heart" the word of God as to his "condemnation," believes with the heart also the testimony of God concerning his abounding grace and righteousness, and so receives them, he shall "reign in life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus is he justified, and as justified, is adjudged to life, the reward

of righteousness. Hence it is called "Justification of life."

Justification of LIFE! What is this "life"? It is the believer's *well-being*, as to his whole constituted nature, "spirit, soul, and body," under the favour and blessing of God. O glorious state! May all my readers be possessed of it, and enjoy it, friend or foe! Yes, and it is life *everlasting*, too. Upon such as possess it, God, in whose favour is life, "commands the blessing, even life for evermore." To carry out this design, or in execution of this judicial sentence to "life," the last Adam, "*in*" whom he is, having been "made a quickening spirit," actually does give life to the spirit and soul by his "words," which are "spirit and life" now; and at the resurrection morn, by the same Spirit, he will give life to the body also. Thus, by Christ's righteousness, the believer has not only justification, but "justification of life." Now, the Spirit of God imparts "the life of God" to the soul, and hereafter will he impart life to the mortal body. And what is the result of this "justification of life" here? Why, the "spirit" becoming "life," and "the life of God" being within him, the man becomes "dead to sin and alive unto God," living no longer to the will of man, but to the will of God; and so may be said to "walk in newness of life," until his soul is taken to live with God in heaven, waiting for the completion of the "adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body," at the resurrection. O, glorious justification, to be followed by such a life, and a life, too, permanent as eternity!

Justification being thus scripturally explained, it will not be difficult to detect the error of Puseyism, in main-

taining, that it is simultaneous with, and conferred in baptism, instead of being connected, in adults at least, only with believing. Conferred in baptism! Not justification of life surely. Appeal to *fact*. Take a whole town for example. Nearly all of them have been baptized with water: where is the manifestation of the "life of God" in the soul, by their "walking in newness of life," as all the justified do? On the contrary, are not the greater part of them "alienated from the life of God?" How can we conclude that they *are* justified, as Dr. Pusey maintains, because they have received the baptismal rite?

How can it be proved that justification is connected with baptism, and flows from it? In no one scripture out of the great number that speak of justification is it so connected. No, it is uniformly connected with *faith*. See particularly Paul's epistle to the Romans, and also that to the Galatians, where the subject is also particularly treated. Take a passage or two. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith." "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith." "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Indeed that whole fourth chapter is to the same purpose; and then, in the beginning of the next, as an inference from the whole argument, the apostle says, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." And when, lower down, he is contrasting the two Adams, after showing that whereas sin and death came by the first, and that righteousness and life came by the last, he connects justification with "receiving the abounding grace

and the gift of righteousness." See, also, the tenth chapter. In the third of the Galatians, and in the third of the Philippians, it is all clearly the same. And, taking our opponents upon their own ground, resting, as they do, so much upon antiquity, we may refer them to the very earliest of these ancient writers, Clement, who, in his epistle to the Corinthians, as before quoted (p. 125), speaks decidedly in our favour.

SECTION ON TENET XII.

On Baptismal Sanctification.

"Sanctified by faith that is in me."—Acts xxvi. 18.

To refute this error we shall take the same method as before; for the correct statement of truth is oftentimes the best refutation of error.

What, then, is *Sanctification*?

Sanctification is God's setting apart a person for himself by the blood of his Son, and the work of his Spirit, whereby, removing his guilt and defilement, he prepares him to glorify and enjoy him. Let us see how far this definition is scriptural.

It is God's setting apart an individual for himself. Setting apart for God is the radical meaning throughout Scripture, both as applied to persons and things. So the priests and Levites of Israel were separated from the rest of the people, and set apart for God; and so the vessels of the tabernacle. And so are God's people, his spiritual Israel, now "sanctified by God the Father."

It is to be set apart by the application of the *blood* of Christ, for the removal of their *guilt*. Thus, of old, were persons and things set apart by the sprinkling of blood, or of the water of purification, which, being made of the ashes of a *red* heifer, predicated the same thing. Israel was so set apart in covenant with God. "Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people." When, too, the Levites were set apart, water of purifying was sprinkled upon them. In both these cases it was to sanctify. So, as to the Christian sanctification, Christ is said to "sanctify the people with his own blood."

It is by the work of the *Spirit*, removing their *pollution*. Thus, under the Old Testament, as to the flesh, washings for cleansing were common, in order to sanctification. Moses washed Aaron and his sons with water at their consecration. The priests washed themselves before they accomplished the service of God. And so now, God's people are not only "sanctified by God the Father," and "sanctified by Christ's own blood," but they undergo "the sanctification of the Spirit" by "the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," in order that they may be set apart for God. Nor is this all; there is, besides, a continuous work of the Spirit of God upon the church of Christ, which is called "the washing of water by the word," that Christ "might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

And here an important question arises as bearing fully upon this controversy. *How* does the Holy Spirit

effect this great purpose? We answer, It is *by the word*. It is by the word received in faith that he purifies the heart, that they “wash their heart from wickedness,” not allowing “vain thoughts to lodge within them;” that they “wash their hands” from evil deeds; and that they wash their feet, or “cleanse their way.” “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth,” says Christ, in his intercessory prayer for his people. And so the apostle Paul gives us to understand in the passage of Scripture above cited. “Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.” And affliction is another mean by which the process of sanctification is carried on, for God chastens his children to make them “partakers of his holiness.”

Thus, then, it is that God’s people are sanctified, and so sanctified as at length to be presented to her royal bridegroom at the last day. O glorious destination of the church and people of God! glorious sanctification as in connexion with justification!

Now what says Dr. Pusey concerning this sanctification? He maintains that the “sanctification of the Church” is conveyed by baptism, and that “baptism is essential to sanctification.” Well, so it is, if we take baptism for the inward baptism of the Holy Spirit; but we must deny that the outward baptism is so; we mean, that which Peter calls “the putting away the filth of the flesh.” No! frequently is that done when there is no “sanctification of the Spirit” unto salvation; where there is no purifying of the heart, no washing of the heart from wickedness, no washing of the hands from evil deeds, no cleansing of the way.

Appeal to fact as well as to Scripture. But, after what has been said on regeneration before, we assuredly need say no more on the necessity of distinguishing between the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace.

Nor can we at all agree with Dr. Pusey that the sanctification is by the word of consecration, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." We cannot, for a moment, suppose, as he does, that Paul meant such a thing, when he said that Christ would, speaking of the Church, "sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water *by the word.*" No. We believe that he meant the same thing as his Lord had done, when, in his intercessory prayer, he prayed that his Father would "sanctify through his truth;" adding, "thy word is truth." And, is it not fact that Christ's church is thus sanctified by the word? We appeal to christian experience. But, this sacrament of baptism, according to Dr. Pusey, is to do everything for us, it seems; but this brings us to another tenet. Before we conclude, however, we may repeat the remark, that, however he may imagine that he has antiquity on his side, we conceive that he mistakes the meaning of the ancient Fathers, and that they intend the baptism which the apostle intends, the baptism into Christ by the Spirit, and not the mere baptismal ordinance; or if they do intend the baptismal ordinance, they intend adult proselytes, supposing that when they received the ordinance, they did it with that faith in and by which we are sanctified by the Spirit.

SECTION ON TENET XIII.

All spiritual blessings conferred in Baptism.

“To the faithful in Christ Jesus—who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings.”—Eph. i. 1—3.

We have already quoted passages from Dr. Pusey, in our first chapter, sufficiently indicative of this sentiment; but it may be useful to add, notwithstanding, one other passage. Treating of a portion of Scripture in Col. ii., says the doctor, “Does he (the apostle) depreciate their baptismal privileges? or, because they were tempted to lean on circumcision, does he disparage outward ordinances? or dread that the exaltation of the ordinance should lead to a depreciation of Christ? Rather, he shows them how everything which they sought or could need, was comprised, and had already been bestowed upon them in their Saviour’s gift, in his ordinance: that this ordinance was no mere significant rite, but contained within itself the stripping off of the body of sin, death, resurrection, new life, forgiveness, annulment of the hand-writing against us, despoiling of the strong one, triumph over the powers of darkness. We also have been thus circumcised, have been buried, raised, quickened, pardoned, filled with Christ; all this God has done for us, and are we not to prize it? not to thank God for it, ’stablished in the faith which we have been taught, and abounding therein with thanksgiving? and are we, for fear men should *rest* in outward privileges, to make the Lord’s sacra-

ment a mere outward gift, deny his bounty, and empty his fulness? or rather ought we not, with the apostle, to tell men of the greatness of what they have received?"¹

From this passage and those quoted in the first chapter of this work we see that in baptism, according to Dr. Pusey, are all things necessary to salvation and life, all spiritual blessings conferred; and he impugns the idea of baptism being considered only as an ordinance, and maintains that it contains within itself all that we can need or desire. But, alas! for the consequences of not distinguishing between the ordinance of baptism, which is but the sign, and the baptism itself of the Spirit, which is the thing signified! True it is, that "*as many* of us," baptized professors, "as are baptized unto Christ Jesus," by this latter baptism "are baptized unto his death," and life, and all the blessings of that life; true it is, that *as many* as are by one Spirit "baptized into one body," are one with Christ, and of the mystical body of which he is the head, and so have fellowship with him; true it is, that "*as many as* have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ;" true it is, that *believers* are buried with him in baptism; and true it is, that "baptism also now saves us:" but the apostles, Paul and Peter, both, in these passages, intend the *spiritual* baptism of "the washing of regeneration," &c. and *not* "the putting away of the filth of the flesh" by the outward ordinance. In the first of them, Paul says, "As many of us;" why this limited expression if he meant the outward water baptism? for they *all* had been thus baptized. In the second, he expressly mentions the Spirit as the efficient in baptism. In the third,

¹ Pusey's Holy Baptism, pp. 127, 128.

he uses the limited expression again, as when writing to the Romans. In the fourth, he speaks of them as having been circumcised "in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ," which elsewhere he says was "by the Spirit;" and therefore, as analogous to it, considers them as "baptized with Christ;" and in the fifth and last place, Peter, in so many words, declares that it was *not* the "putting away of the filth of the flesh" that he intended; and, of course, by the "baptism that saves us," mentioned just before, he must intend the spiritual baptism, — that which causes to return "the answer of a good conscience towards God."

The subject thus understood, how erroneous must be this sentiment — that the ordinance itself comprises within itself all those saving operations and spiritual blessings of which Dr. Pusey so much speaks! And, when we consider that he recommends us to "*tell* men of the greatness of what they have received" in this ordinance, how awful the consequences! But of this in another chapter.

And here, in conclusion, we must remark, that, while Dr. Pusey bolsters himself up in this sentiment by the ancient Fathers, or, as he would say, of the ancient apostolic church, we are of opinion that, in many of his quotations, they themselves had a reference to that same spiritual baptism to which the apostles had reference, and of which we have been speaking: and if, in others of his quotations, the intention of the writer accords with Puseyism, we have only to regret that so many of the Christian church, both in ancient and modern times, should, after the example of the Jewish

church, fall into such injurious and dangerous error. The good Lord opens men's eyes to see it!

SECTION ON TENET XIV.

On the Lord's Supper as imparting life to the soul.

“ This cup is the new covenant by my blood ; [so the Greek ;] this do ye [my disciples]. ” — 1 Cor. xi. 25.,

Still thinking that the true way to dispel darkness is to introduce light, we will, as before, endeavour to introduce the light of Scripture upon the subject of the Lord's Supper itself.

What is the nature and design of the *Lord's supper*, according to Scripture?

The Lord's supper is a gracious ordinance of the new covenant, that God has made to and with the spiritual Israel ; wherein, by breaking of bread and pouring out wine, are signified the broken body and shed blood of Christ ; and it is designed to show forth and to keep in memory that death by which such covenant was dedicated, and the mutual communion of those who receive it, in its benefits.

This definition we will explain in its several parts, and thus show that it is the true Scripture doctrine.

1. We will begin with the *covenant*, of which it is an ordinance. This covenant was promised by Jeremiah, and is cited and applied in the epistle to the Hebrews thus : “ Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel

and the house of Judah : not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt ; because they continued not in my covenant and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord ; I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts ; and and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord ; for all shall know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Glorious covenant ! This covenant is said to be "cut" by Jeremiah, and by Paul to be "perfected ;" the latter expression explaining the former. Jeremiah's expression shows, that it was not only a "covenant by sacrifice," but alludes to the manner in which, from the time of Abraham, at least, it had been customary to make covenants. This was, by cutting asunder into two parts the sacrificial victim, and placing them in juxtaposition, in order that the parties covenanting, might signify their adherence by passing between the parts. And Paul expresses the thing as actually and perfectly done by Christ the victim being virtually, though not literally, "cut asunder" in his vicarious sufferings.

Now that the Lord's supper is an *ordinance* of this covenant, appears from the words of the institution in all the four places where such institution is mentioned, "This is my blood of the New Testament," or covenant,

for the word is rendered "covenant" more frequently than "testament." As if our Lord had said, "This wine which I now hand to you is the sign of the blood by which the new covenant is about to be 'dedicated,'" alluding to the dedication of the covenant at Sinai, which, as the apostle says, "was not dedicated without blood;" or, it is as if he had said, as Paul does after, "This is the blood of the everlasting covenant." Precious must be that covenant which was dedicated by blood, and such blood!

2. We pass now to consider the *Covenantees*. These are "the house of Israel and the house of Judah." Not "Israel after the flesh," but the Israel and Judah that are born supernaturally, "after the Spirit." These include, in the first place, those whom the apostle calls the Israel who are of Israel naturally: that is, such as are the true Israel, *but of* the "Israel after the flesh;" and then, since "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek," but "all are one in Christ Jesus," also, all those of the Gentiles who are born of the Spirit: for, all are of the same body, and partakers of God's "promise in Christ Jesus by the gospel." Such, then, as are born of the Spirit, whether Jew or Gentile, are "the house of Israel and the house of Judah," spiritually considered, and as such are the covenantees. These alone are in covenant with God as to this new covenant, and these alone are the persons who are to partake of the Lord's supper, its appropriate ordinance.—We now notice,

3dly. The *sign* for showing forth the death of Christ.

This is the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine, showing us that Christ's body was broken

at the crucifixion, for “all his bones were out of joint;” and that his blood, his life, was poured out at the same time. And in this way his death is showed forth, and it must be so until his second coming.

4thly. The *Commemoration* of that death by which the covenant was dedicated.

“Do this,” said Christ, “in remembrance of me.” Do it in remembrance of my dying love in thus interposing on your behalf, so that my Father, having, through my blood-shedding, become “merciful to your unrighteousness, &c.” might enter into a new covenant with you, putting his laws into your mind and writing them in your hearts, and so, while he becomes to you a God, you might become to him a willing and obedient people. Such is my design in dying, and do you observe this ordinance in grateful remembrance of it. And—

5thly. Another design of the ordinance was to signify the *communion* which believers, or those born of the Spirit, the covenantees, have, in the benefits of this death. “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” Yes, thus meeting together, as at a table—for it is called the “Lord’s table”—the people of God signify their mutual interest in the death of Christ and in its benefits, and, particularly, in the benefits of the covenant. One thing more remains to be considered in the definition proposed, and that is—

6thly. That it is a *gracious* ordinance, inasmuch as by all the true “Israel of God” partaking of it worthily, it is found, under the blessing of Christ, a soul-nourish-

ing ordinance. It helps to increase their faith, to enliven their hope, to inflame their love, and the latter to Christ, to God, and to one another. Nor is it calculated to promote their faith and hope and love only, but their humility, reminding them of their sin as the cause of Christ's death. Now all these things tend to nourish the piety of the soul, and, therefore, we may call it a soul-nourishing ordinance, and, consequently, a gracious one, instituted by our Lord, out of his grace or kindness to his church. Such is the *Scripture* doctrine of the Lord's supper.

Now, upon a review of the above, as to the nature and design of the Lord's supper—its being an ordinance appended to the new covenant—its being intended for those “born of the Spirit”—its being an appropriate sign—its being a commemoration—its being a communion—and, finally, its being graciously designed to nourish the life of the believer—we may see the fallacy of the Puseyite and High-church notions concerning it. They seem to overlook the peculiar nature of the covenant to which the ordinance belongs—to mistake with reference to the “peculiar people” who are to receive it—to consider it as actually conveying the thing signified rather than as a sign, and greatly to overlook it as a commemoration and a communion. But that which we shall particularly notice is, that they consider the ordinance as the instrument of conveying inward life. It will, indeed, under the blessing of God, *nourish* life, where that life is already received, but it does not impart life to such as do not receive it in faith, nor was ever designed to do so. Nor is there any passage of Scripture upon which such sentiment can be founded, that we are aware

of, but one, and the meaning of that appears to be egregiously, as well as most injuriously, mistaken. It is that in the sixth chapter of John, where our Lord, after discoursing of himself as the bread of life, speaks of his flesh and blood as meat and drink; and, says he, "except ye eat of my flesh and drink of my blood ye have no life in you"—which words they apply to the sacrament of the Supper, and infer that life is given by the participation of it. But we do not believe that it relates to the Lord's supper at all. The assertion was made a considerable time before the Lord's supper was instituted, and, from the connexion, it is evidently designed to be taken spiritually and figuratively, as if our Lord had said, "I am about to give my flesh for the life of the world," and to shed my blood for the remission of sins, and for the confirmation of the new covenant; therefore, except ye believe, and receive this doctrine of my coming in the flesh and shedding my blood for such purposes, ye have no life in you, no spiritual life." Such must be his meaning. It is true, the words eating and drinking are used, but to those who are acquainted with the phraseology of Scripture, that will present no difficulty, inasmuch as they know that such terms indicate no more than the "receiving the truth in love," and digesting it as food by meditation. Thus Job "esteemed the words of God's mouth more than his necessary food;" thus Jeremiah "found God's words, and did eat them:" and which sense is confirmed by our Lord himself, who, afterwards, says, "The flesh profiteth nothing: the *words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Away, then, with that delusive and dangerous sentiment, that these words relate to the

taking of the sacrament, and that thereby men are saved, and have "life." Besides, where is the evidence of this life, of this "life of God" in the soul of numbers who have taken the sacrament? Do they appear to have that knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ, which is "eternal life," or that "love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit," which becomes an active principle there, stirring up to live to the will and the glory of God? When persons *have* this life, as the result of this knowledge, then the participation of the ordinance may be, and is, a means of nourishing this life, but nowhere is such participation said to communicate it.

And to none but such as profess to "join themselves to the Lord in this perpetual covenant," ought it to be administered. Search through the Acts of the Apostles as well as the Epistles, and where will you find a place which intimates its ministration to others? We shall, therefore, take the liberty to draw the following inferences:—

1st. That persons who have no desire for the grace of the covenant, or to perform the obligations of the covenant, of which we are reminded in the ordinance—who do not, in fact, wish to "join themselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant," have *nothing to do* with the ordinance. They do not, as the Scripture expresses it, "take hold of God's covenant," or wish to "join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants"—they do not even wish that God should "put his laws into their minds, or write them in their hearts," or to be brought to "know the Lord," as this covenant promises

and provides ; and how, then, can they be considered as covenantees, and, of course, worthy partakers of its appropriate ordinance? Alas, for those who either take or wish to take the Lord's supper, while they neither have the grace of the covenant, nor wish to have it! Alas, for those who either take or wish to take the sacrament while they neither do fulfil, nor wish to fulfil, its engagements!

2nd. We see the impropriety, and indeed danger, of *urging* upon persons, whether in health or at death, to receive the sacrament, so called, or even of *administering* it to them, while they give no evidence that they are heartily willing to take hold of this covenant, or to "subscribe with their hand to the Lord," and to "sur-name themselves by the name of Israel." Who would not dread thus to delude souls, and by thus causing them to rest secure in a false hope, prevent their seeking after a *good* hope? And, if this reasoning be sound, what shall we say of the custom of administering the sacrament to condemned persons, and to the dying? In most cases, do such persons wish to enter into covenant with God, according to its true tenor? Do they wish to have God's laws put into their minds and written in their hearts, in order that they may be his willing and obedient people? Nothing of the kind, it is to be feared, is thought of by the clergyman or the unhappy culprit! The latter wishes to escape the punishment of sin, not its power; to enjoy happiness in heaven, not its holiness: and the former to compose a disturbed mind, and to do what he considers his duty: but, alas! both are in dangerous error.

3rd. From the above Scripture doctrine of the Lord's supper, it appears, that the ordinance is a *social* ordinance, and, therefore, for true Christians assembled together in society. It is called a "supper:" the believers at Corinth are supposed to gather together into one place to partake of this supper, and to tarry for one another. It is likewise called a "communion," which implies fellowship as at one table. Indeed, it is called "the table of the Lord." It must, then, be intended as a social ordinance. And where, in any one case, do we read of it as administered or received, individually, in Scripture? Nowhere. Whence then such a use of it? Alas, that any should expect to settle their accounts with God in this way, on a dying bed! How many thousands are lulled to sleep by it!

Finally, what shall we say to it? That an ordinance which requires understanding, faith, hope, love, and fixed choice, should be administered without respect to these, and yet be represented as *giving life!* giving, as though it acted as a charm or spell! Is this honourable to a God of infinite wisdom, dealing with intellectual and reasonable creatures? But the Tractarians or Puseyites impugn the doctrine that "God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies—that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations;" and maintain that "the Church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen:" and, upon this ground, seem to allow of administering the Lord's supper to infants, and to the dying and insensible, at least, if the latter have been "consistently pious and believing in their past lives."

“What!” says D’Aubigné, reflecting on this subject, “an unreasoning infant, which knows no speech—a sick man, whom the approach of death has bereft of intelligence and consciousness, will receive grace by the mere external application of the sacraments,—the will, the affections, need not be touched to effect sanctification! What a debasement of man, and of the religion of Jesus! Is there any great difference between such rites and the mummeries or charms of the corrupt Hindus, or the rude Africans!”¹

SECTION ON TENET XV.

Justification and Sanctification confounded.

“Justified by Christ.”—Gal. ii. 17.

“Through sanctification of the Spirit.”—2 Thess. ii. 13.

The Puseyites consider justification as including inherent righteousness, as well as imputed righteousness, and indeed seem to refer it rather to the former than the latter.

As this error consists in the confounding things that differ, we conclude that it will be most satisfactory, in the first place, to state our views of the difference between justification and sanctification, and then to draw the obvious inferences.

Justification is an act of God *towards* us, sanctification is the work of God *in* us.—Justification is through the *Son*, sanctification is by the Spirit. Justification is a matter of *law*, sanctification is a matter of *fact*; the former is a thing “*de jure*,” the latter a thing

¹ D’Aubigné’s Geneva and Oxford, p. 20.

“de facto.”—Justification is a *judicial verdict* in court, sanctification is an *actual work* in and upon the subject of such verdict.—Justification is *imputing* righteousness, sanctification is *making* righteous.—Justification is the *awarding* the “blessing of life for evermore” to the man as declared righteous, sanctification is the *putting in possession* of the blessing.—We are justified by the *blood*, we are sanctified by the *water*.—Justification frees from the *charge* of the law, sanctification fits for performing the *duties* of the law.—Justification brings us into *favour* with God, sanctification restores us to the *image* of God. Finally, justification, as a judicial sentence, is passed *at once* on believing, sanctification is a *continuous* work on the person thus believing.

Upon a review of this statement, can there be a doubt that the Oxford school confounds the two doctrines? Nay, that it even turns justification into sanctification, when it says, “It is to be held as the work of the Spirit, not of Christ”—when it says, “Justification is the indwelling in us of God the Father, and of the incarnate Word by the Holy Spirit?” But is this the scriptural view of it? Let the reader attentively examine the Epistle to the Romans, particularly from the twentieth verse of the third chapter to the end of the fifth chapter; and, in doing so, let him keep constantly in mind that the apostle has reference throughout to law and justice, and to the state of a sinner as before the great King, Lawgiver, and Judge of man; and then he will see that justification has relation to judicial verdict, and not to sanctifying agency, to the “imputing righteousness without works,” and that to the “ungodly;” not to the making the ungodly righteous. That subject comes afterwards in the sixth and seventh

and eighth chapters, as the result of being "baptized into Christ," by what is called elsewhere the "washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," concerning which we have said so much under the Section on "Baptismal Regeneration." For further satisfaction that the view of the subject above given is scriptural, we may refer the reader to the Section on "Baptismal Justification."

We must conclude, then, that we are justified before God, not by an *imperfect* righteousness, such as inherent righteousness is ever in the best, but on account of a perfect righteousness, such as is that of the last Adam; and that the instrument of it is *faith*, and faith alone; and yet such a faith as is connected with and causes the sanctification of the Spirit, inasmuch as it "works by love," and "purifies the heart." Assuredly, the righteousness of the last Adam, which is said to be to "justification of life," neither included, or need to include, any righteousness in us; and if the righteousness of God revealed, is ($\epsilon\kappa$) out "of faith," and ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) "to" or unto "faith," we must conclude that justification is BY FAITH.

SECTION ON TENET XVI.

On the presence of Christ' body and blood at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"This is my body," 1 Cor. xi. 24, compared with "That rock was Christ," 1 Cor. x. 4.

Why such a mystical meaning put upon our Lord's expressions, "This is my body"—"this is my blood?"

What difficulty is there in supposing that he meant, This *signifies* my body—this signifies my blood? But “to the law and to the testimony” again. “What saith the Scripture?” We must look to its phraseology in other similar cases to ascertain its meaning in this.

In the case of the *Passover*,¹ which the Lord’s Supper was to succeed. With this ordinance, and with the Scripture phraseology concerning it, our Lord’s disciples, to whom the words were addressed, were well acquainted. Speaking of the paschal lamb, Moses says, “It *is* the Lord’s passover.” Did he mean that it was the passover itself? No—he meant that it was the *sign* of the Lord’s passover; and doubtless the children of Israel at first, and in their succeeding generations, understood it so. And why should we understand Christ otherwise, when he says, taking the bread, “This *is* my body,” or taking the wine, “This *is* my blood?”

But we will adduce another case perhaps plainer still. The apostle Paul, alluding to the rock smitten in the wilderness, and applying it to Christ, says, “That rock *was* Christ.” He did not think it necessary to say, That rock *signified* Christ, because he concluded that all would so understand him. And so assuredly we ourselves do. What difficulty then, we ask again, is there in supposing that Christ, in the matter in question, meant, “This *signifies* my body”—“this *signifies* my blood?” And if so, why seek for another, for a mystical signification? Understood as the protestants understand it, it answers all the purposes which our Lord intended, affectingly to show forth and to remind of his broken body and his shed blood.

¹ That is, of the Lord having *passed over* the dwellings of the Jews.

But it seems, according to Puseyism, that, in the Lord's Supper, after consecration of the elements, although the bread and wine are not changed into Christ's body and blood, yet Christ is spiritually present in them, as though they were turned into Spirit, and that to act upon us and influence us. But what warrant is there in Scripture for such a doctrine as this? Christ is indeed present with his people receiving the elements in faith and love, but not in the elements themselves; nor is he present at all at the administration, however consecrated, and by whomsoever consecrated, unless the communicants are true believers in him, and communicate in faith; for there is not a word in Scripture from whence we may gather that the bread and its eating, or the wine and its drinking, are anything more than *signs*; or that such bread and wine is anything more than natural bread and wine. Far from us, then, be such superstitious notions of the spirituality of the bread and wine, or of the efficacy of them. Just so far as we look through the signs to the things signified, and make a believing scriptural application of them to our case, so far are they effectual and no further—to suppose more, is to encourage superstition and to promote delusion. And, really, it reminds us of the folly of heathen idolaters, who, while they would not consider the stone for worship to be as a god, until consecrated or dedicated, yet, after such consecration or dedication, would consider it as such, thinking that the spirit of the god it represented was in it or about it!

SECTION ON TENET XVII.

The sacrifice of the Mass allowable, if only as commemorative.

“By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”—Heb. x. 14.

Upon this it is not necessary to dwell, after what has been said in some foregoing Sections. Suffice it to say, it cannot be granted, because—

1. No such offering is enjoined in Scripture: on the contrary, the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, teaches us that the offering of Christ was for “once,” and that “by one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.” Nor is any sign or ordinance enjoined in connexion with such offering besides that of the Lord’s Supper.

2. It calls off the attention, especially of the vulgar and uninformed, from the true sacrifice to such supposed sign of it, causing men to trust in the priest’s or representative sacrifice, rather than in Christ’s true original sacrifice. Moreover, it has given great occasion to the indulgence of the love of filthy lucre in the priesthood, as well as to idolatrous worship and numberless superstitions and impostures. For these reasons, and because we are not to receive “the doctrines and commandments of men,” we reject the tenet, and shall say with Dr. Watts,

“The death of Christ shall still remain
Sufficient and alone.”

SECTION ON TENET XVIII.

Purgatory of some kind may be admitted, though not the Romish.

“ Was buried ; and in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments.”—Luke xvi. 22, 23.

“ Willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord.”—2 Cor. v. 8.

Having discarded tradition, we, of course, pay little regard to what Tract 90 is pleased to call a “ primitive doctrine,” concerning a certain purgatory, as we have noticed in the first chapter. Its author calls it primitive, but it would not be primitive doctrine to talk of “ Sainte Mary,” for “ S^{te}. Mary ” was not so honoured in the primitive or first ages. However, there is no evidence in Scripture, of which we are aware, of such doctrine : on the contrary, the rich man is represented as being in hell, immediately upon his death, and the pious Lazarus as equally soon in Abraham’s bosom. Paul believed that he should be “ present with the Lord,” when “ absent from the body ;” and therefore “ desired to depart and be with Christ ” as “ far better ” than being here. Nor have we any reason to suppose his case to be peculiar. Moreover, antiquity, primitive antiquity, to which the Puseyites so often appeal, is in our favour.

SECTION ON TENET XIX.

On veneration for Relics and Images.

“ He brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made :
for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense
to it : and he called it Nehushtan.”—2 Kings xviii. 4.

In the minds of the common people, veneration will soon progress to adoration, as was the case with reference to the adoration of stocks and stones: for the Phœnician worship of stones originated in veneration for the stone pillar which Jacob set up at Bethel as a consecrated place of worship for himself and his household after his return from Padan-aram. Having been the place of worship, and on account of God's appearance to Jacob there, becoming a sacred place, the people of the country held the stone or stones of Bethel in veneration; and this, in process of time, grew up to adoration. So was it also with the Israelites in regard to the brazen serpent in the wilderness. It became, at length, an object of worship. And have we not seen such results in the Roman Catholic history?

SECTION ON TENET XX.

*Allowable to invoke Saints, not as giving, but as
interceding.*

“ For there is one mediator between God and men.”
1 Tim. ii. 5.

What does calling upon a saint merely to intercede, suppose? A belief that such saint knows, and hears,

and sympathises, and cares for, and may be trusted in, to interest himself in our case. But who told us that they are thus capable? Where is it to be found in Scripture? What says the church by Isaiah? "Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel knoweth us not." Moreover, it is God's prerogative, and his alone, to "hear prayer"—his prerogative, and his alone, to "look from heaven, to behold all the sons of men," and to "know the thoughts that come into the mind;" and shall we ascribe these things to a creature? Would it not be blasphemy, a "provoking the Lord to jealousy," who has said, "I will not give my glory to another?"

It is also dishonouring Christ our Intercessor, as though his love, his sympathy, his care, his intercession, were not sufficient. And, finally, when once you begin to invoke saints, you know not where it will stop. Hence the thousands of demi-gods among the heathen; hence the multitude of saints amongst the Roman Catholics. "Every artificer and profession hath his special saint, as a peculiar god. As, for example, scholars have St. Nicholas and St. Gregory; painters, St. Luke: neither lack soldiers their Mars, nor lovers their Venus amongst Christians. All diseases have their special saints, as gods, the curers of them the falling evil, St. Cornelio; the tooth-ache, St. Apollin, &c. Neither do beasts nor cattle lack their gods with us; for St. Loy is the horse-leech and St. Anthony the swineherd."¹

¹ Homily on Peril of Idolatry, p. 188.

SECTION ON TENET XXI.

On attention to Forms and Ceremonies.

“ Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”—2 Tim. iii. 5.

Forms and ceremonies, such as are of divine appointment, are doubtless of use, and of great use, in religion; and it is a divine rule, that “all things should be done decently and in order:” but the danger is, lest the handmaid should usurp the place of the mistress; and for this plain reason, that mankind are generally averse from heart-work in religion; and that attention to the “form of godliness” being much more congenial to our senses than is attention to the “power” of it, men, if they possibly can quiet their consciences thereby, will do so. Survey the history of the church of Israel, and indeed of the christian church, and you will find that such has been the case in all ages. How zealous were the Jews about ceremonies, about their temple services, their sacrifices, their baptismal purifications, their meats and their drinks, their feasts and their fasts, while, at the same time, their “heart was far from” God. So was it before the first destruction of their city and temple, and so was it before their second destruction: and so has it been in the christian church from early times down to the reformation. And the protestant church is not cured of this folly to the present day; nay, of late, in the Oxford school they seem to be returning to it with renewed zeal. Hence that

increased attention to forms and ceremonies noticed in our first chapter; and well if, in the midst of all this zeal about the form of godliness, the power be not denied—if, in so great attention to signs, the things signified be not disregarded—if, in the use of the means of grace, the grace of the means be not, in a great degree at least, left out of the question.

It was on account of this disposition in the ancient Jewish church that the Lord exhorted the people to “break up the fallow ground, and sow not among thorns; to circumcise themselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of their heart.” The Searcher of hearts knew that, while their *heart* was like “fallow ground,” producing nothing but the thorns of wickedness, vain were all their religious observances; nay, that even the rain of his word would answer no valuable purpose; and therefore he exhorts them to think of and to concern themselves about the state of their hearts: he knew that while their *hearts* were “uncircumcised,” vain was the “circumcision of their flesh,” much as they trusted in it, and therefore he exhorts them to concern themselves about “the circumcision of the heart.” So, by Ezekiel, after having exhorted these Jewish people to “turn from their wickedness and live,” he closes by saying, “Make you a new heart and a new spirit, for, why will ye die, O house of Israel?” Nor was the design otherwise, when he promises to *give* to the remnant of Judah “a new heart and a new spirit.” He knew very well, that, until there was a work upon the *heart*, until he had given them “a new heart and a new spirit,” a “heart to perceive,” a “heart to know the Lord,” had “circum-

cised their heart to love God," they would never be sound converts, they would never have the *power* of godliness.

And what shall we learn from all this? That it is a dangerous thing to lay so much stress upon the forms and rituals of religion, lest the power of it be overlooked; lest men should lull their consciences to sleep in it, and they themselves sleep the sleep of eternal death. Nor, supposing the *power* of godliness be not disregarded by either priest or people, yet still there is danger of a preponderating regard to the form.

To all this we might add, that man is a creature of sense, and that a religion of sense will *captivate* him rather than a religion of faith; and that, therefore, form, ceremony, variety, pomp, and pageantry, while it may greatly increase the votaries of religion, may yet leave the heart unrenewed and ungodly; and the more a "child of the devil" and a "child of hell."

It may, indeed, be said of ritual observances, that they awake and keep awake attention; and that they inspire with awe for the solemnities of religion. True, they may, when *proper* to the holy religion of the Bible, when such as are prescribed there, when decency and order require them, when not in excess; but if they are jejune and trifling, if they are not understood, or are ill understood, if they call off the heart from communion with God, and have no tendency to produce or maintain "the life of God" in the soul, they are injurious. If they awake attention for the present, of what use is this attention, if the impression be transient, and the mind uninformed, and the heart and life unimproved? If they inspire with awe, we are to distin-

guish between a superstitious awe, that gendereth to bondage, and that reverence and godly fear which lies at the foundation of all religion. Moreover, however men of enlarged minds may rise superior to such attractions of sense, yet it is otherwise with the mass of mankind, who scarce look beneath the surface of things, and are carried away with exhibitions that excite their senses and their passions. Never should it be forgotten that religion is a religion of the heart and life; that as "God is a Spirit," so he seeks such to worship and serve him, as would worship and serve him "in spirit and in truth;" and that, therefore, if we pray, it must be "with the understanding;" if we sing, it must be "with the understanding;" and that all Christians should, "in understanding be men." And, finally, that it has so its seat in the understanding as to make willing to "deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." This is religion—this is the religion, without which all the forms and ceremonies in the world, and all the sacraments, however and by whomsoever, administered, will be of no avail.

SECTION ON TENET XXII.

On mystical and allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

“ I speak forth the words of truth and soberness.”

Acts xxvi. 25.

The great apostle of the Gentiles, speaking of himself and of his fellow-labourers in the gospel, says, “ We are not as many who corrupt the word of God, but as of sincerity, but as of God, speak we in Christ ;” and further on in the same epistle, discoursing of the manner in which they discharged the ministry they had received, declares that they had renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth to every man’s conscience.” Herein are they patterns for every one who ministers in holy things, either from the pulpit or the press. And not only should we, therefore, most carefully shun perversions of Scripture, but likewise a fanciful, allegorical interpretation of it, where the Holy Spirit intended no allegory ; for we acknowledge that some parts are allegorical. In the first chapter of this work, under Tenet XXII., it will be seen how Dr. Pusey allegorizes ; but the reader can form no adequate conception to what extent he is disposed to do so, unless he reads the latter part of his work on “ Holy Baptism.” We do not mean to say that the Doctor designedly “ corrupts” the word of God, or “ handles it deceitfully.” No ; we know that many good men, with the

best intentions, have gone into this method of interpretation ; and in Dr. Pusey it appears to originate in his fond attachment to the writings of the fathers, so called ; but we must enter our protest against it. There are so many temptations to such a mode of treating Scripture, however, that we had need be on our guard. It gratifies the curiosity of the listening multitude ; it may minister to the vain-glory of the preacher, inasmuch as the hearers look up to him as a man singularly endowed with understanding ; it is likewise an easy way of preaching ; and, in fact, of propagating error ; for any heretic may, in this way, cause the Scripture, apparently, to favour his doctrine. If, then, we would follow the apostle Paul in his sincerity and fidelity, let no temptation induce us to speak what the Holy Spirit did not intend to speak ; but let us diligently and prayerfully endeavour to ascertain what is his mind in the passage, and, as such, to deliver it to our hearers or readers. If we do not, we are in danger of making the word the sneer of infidels ; we shall lead into error, we shall vitiate the taste of our hearers, instead of causing them to become “in understanding to be men ;” we shall but minister to their humours and passions, and, at best, make them like the stony ground hearers, who, though they “immediately received the word with joy,” yet, it not having root in their understanding, in time of temptation fell away. Nor let it be forgotten, that “the wood, and the hay, and the stubble,” will not abide the fire in that day when “the fire will try every man’s work of what sort it is ;” and that “if any man corrupt ($\phi\theta\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\iota$) the temple of God, him will God corrupt ($\phi\theta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota$).” A solemn warning this against corrupt-

ing the word of God, inasmuch as by such means the temple of God is corrupted!

Yet, as before hinted, we do not mean to say that some parts of Scripture are not allegorical, and therefore to be treated allegorically; but in this the Scripture and sound judgment will be our guide, especially if we are ever careful, with Paul, when before Agrippa, to "speak forth the words of truth and soberness."

CHAPTER IV.

AN EXPOSURE OF THE TENDENCY OF THESE TENETS.

“For ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face.”—2 Cor. xi. 20.

“To utter error against the Lord, to make empty the soul of the hungry, and he will cause the drink of the thirsty to fail.”—Isa. xxxii. 6.

“Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life: therefore ye shall see no more vanity, nor divine divinations: for I will deliver my people out of your hand: and ye shall know that I am the Lord.”—Ezek. xiii. 22, 23.

“But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”—Gal. i. 8, 9.

SECTION I.

To exalt the power of the Clergy.

SEE the Puseyite clergyman of a parish. He assumes to himself the direction, the sole direction of his parishioners in their eternal concerns. He alone has a right to make them “members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven” by the sacrament of baptism, which, as administered by him of

the apostolical succession, not only regenerates them, but justifies, and sanctifies, and confers upon them all spiritual blessings. No one but himself has authority to instruct them in the way of salvation, or to direct them in the way to heaven. At length, they draw near to their final account, when it becomes all-important that they have "administered to them," as it is termed, "the consolations of religion." He reads the prayers and service appointed, administers to them the sacrament, which, in his hands, communicates "life" to the soul, and having pronounced the absolution of their sin as professing to be penitent and believing, he dismisses them for heaven. Now, what is the obvious tendency of such power as this upon the mind? Feeling that their everlasting interests are in so great a degree in his hands, they must, of course, look up to him with a sort of awe, bordering upon dread; nor will they dare to displease him. Nothing remains for them but an implicit obedience to his injunctions, and the reception of his sayings as unerring truth. And still more will this be the case, if he can persuade the congregation of his hearers that he is a "successor of the apostles," that there is an efficacy in the sacraments as administered by him; and that, by his consecration of the elements, he can bring down the presence of Christ in the bread and wine! How sacred must be the person of such a man! Can any one doubt then that these tenets exalt the power of the clergy? That they minister to the pride and ambition of the human heart?

And here we cannot refrain from inserting some remarks of the good Bishop Burnet, in what may be called his dying advice to the clergy. "Learn to view

popery in a true light, as a conspiracy to exalt the power of the clergy, even by subjecting the most sacred truths of religion to contrivances for raising their authority, and by offering to the world another method of being saved besides that prescribed in the gospel—I see a spirit rising among us, too like that of the church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond their due authority to an unjust pitch; this rather heightens jealousies and prejudices against us than advances our real authority; and it will fortify the designs of profane infidels, who desire nothing more than to see the public ministry of the Church first disgraced and then abolished—Therefore, let the clergy live and labour well, and they will feel that as much authority will follow that, as they will know how to manage well. And to speak plainly, Dodwell's extravagant notions, which have been too much drunk in by the clergy in my time, have weakened the power of the Church, and soured men's minds more against it than all the books wrote or attempts made against it could ever have done; and indeed, the secret poison of those principles has given too many of the clergy a bias towards popery, with an aversion to the Reformation, which has brought them under much contempt.”¹ Thus far Burnet as to his own times, and could anything have been more appropriate as to the times in which we live?

Whether our Puseyite clergy cherish their tenets with such views and feelings—for we will not judge them as doing so—yet, such exaltation must be seen to be the natural result; and it cannot be denied that the temptation is great to avail themselves of it. It

¹ Burnet's History of his own Times, vol. ii. pp. 639, 640.

may not be amiss, however, to remark, that it was not on such grounds as the above, did Paul require that the Christians at Thessalonica should “esteem highly in love” those that were “over them in the Lord;” not on such grounds did he himself claim the regard of those to whom he wrote. He could appeal to the Ephesian bishops (επισκοπους) that, when amongst them, he had been “serving the Lord with all humility of mind;” and to the church over whom they had been made bishops, in writing to them, he calls himself “less than the least of all saints.” And, when writing to the Corinthian church, it will be seen that he possesses the same spirit. Hence he uses such expressions as these—“I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God, that giveth the increase.” Again, “Not I, but the grace of God that was with me.” “By the grace of God I am what I am.”

SECTION II.

To enslave the minds of the People.

The doctrines of grace, such as free forgiveness in the name of Christ, justification freely by grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, salvation by grace through faith, and eternal life as the gift of God, when rightly understood and believed by a convinced sinner, will burst the bonds of sin, and break the yoke of Satan; and by causing the Holy Spirit to take possession

of the soul, will introduce it into a state of sacred freedom; and the soul will delightfully say in consequence, "O Lord, truly I am thy servant, I am thy servant—thou hast loosed my bonds." But what else will produce such freedom? Not assuredly the sacraments—the belonging to the so-called apostolical Church—or a rigid adherence to rites and ceremonies, &c. without the mind being informed, or an intelligent faith produced. These sacraments, these adherences, in themselves have no adaptation for the purpose. They communicate no knowledge, they give no understanding, they impart no true faith, they bring no promises to the mind, that is, well-applied promises, to fill it with joy and peace in believing, nor can, in such cases, "the joy of the Lord be our strength." Should the conscience of a man be awakened, what must he do? "Do!" says a Puseyite, "he must repent and believe, it is true; but by all means he must comfort himself with his baptism, with his relation to the true Church, and he must take the Lord's supper, and pray, and do as well as he can." But what adaptation is there in all this to ease his conscience, and set his mind at liberty? If he were led to the cross of Christ, and shown that therein God's holiness was cleared, his justice satisfied, his law established, so that with infinite "wisdom and prudence," God can "glorify his mercy" in pardoning and saving the chief of sinners, there would indeed be something to relieve him: but not so, in the way above specified. And then, what adaptation is there in adverting to sacraments, to church relation, to the power of the ministry to induce him to renounce his former servitude of sin, and to live as "the Lord's freeman?" Ah, an apostle would teach us

that it is the blood of Christ believed in, that, while it “purges the conscience from dead works,” disposes “to serve the living God.” This sacramental religion, this trusting to the Church and its ministry, therefore, not only keeps the sinner in his state of slavery, but stands in the way of his being brought out into the “liberty” of “the Spirit of God.”

But there is a direct *mental* bondage produced by this Puseyism or High-churchism. What is its language? “To the episcopal clergy, and to them alone, belong the ministry of the word and sacraments; and your salvation is in great danger, to say the least, if you attend to other ministrations.” Suppose, then, that a man lives in a parish wherein such a clergyman resides. As his parishioner, he must then receive him as his sole spiritual guide. The man, of course, if he is convinced of sin, will desire “a servant of the most high God,” who can and will “show him the way of salvation;” but, alas! it so happens, that his “authorized” guide does not know the way himself. Again; the parishioner may be already in the way, and wishes to be furthered in it—the same difficulty occurs. The clergyman neither is in it, or knows it, and of course is utterly unfit to guide or lead others. And yet he must attend his parish church, and sit under his ministry! Is not this bondage? Does not such Puseyism and High-churchism tend to enslave the mind? But what makes it more grievous—in the same parish there is a ministry where I may not only learn the way of salvation, but may be furthered in it; and under which I may be quickened, comforted, and established; but the minister is an “unauthorized teacher”—“it is dangerous to hear

him"—if he hears him, he not only endangers his salvation, but the clergyman, the esquire, the churchwardens—all become his enemy; and whatever charities may exist in the parish he shall not partake of them. Is not all this calculated to bring his mind into a state of slavery—yes, of complete slavery? Nor is this all: the unhappy man has a feeling for his neighbours who are in the same wretched situation! The good Lord, in his mercy, interpose to deliver our fellow-creatures and fellow-countrymen from such thralldom!

The tenet concerning the necessity, or, at least, the general necessity of the sacraments, urged as they are as necessary to salvation, induces mental slavery. A child is born to a parishioner—it is unexpectedly seized with convulsions—it is on the point of death—that it may be saved, it must be baptized; but lo, the minister who alone can administer the ordinance effectually is not at hand! The father, the mother, the nurse, are all of them concerned for the future welfare of the child—but what can they do? They wait, and wait, and wait in vain; and the child has expired without the saving rite! Is not an exposure to such a state of mind, a bondage? Yes; even though the parents may hope that the will will be taken for the deed. The same may be said in the case of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as to its administration to the dying. Both the dying man himself and his attendant friends may suffer greatly in their minds, having been taught by their minister to lay such stress upon the sacraments.

Moreover, I must surrender, it seems, my private judgment to the judgment of the Church and to my minister, and believe as they believe. This doctrine

may very well accord with the feelings of the slothful, who will not take the trouble to think for themselves; but to one who knows how to value his intelligent and voluntary nature, and who deems himself responsible for the use of his intellects and will, it must necessarily be repulsive; and perpetually to have enforced upon his belief what he deems absurd and unscriptural can be considered as nothing less than a state of bondage. Yes, God has made me a free agent; my body may be imprisoned, my mouth may be gagged, but my mind must think; and if I am not allowed to think freely, I am in bondage; and this bondage becomes more intolerable, when I consider that the God who made me, and gave me my thinking powers, requires me to search the Scriptures for myself, to see whether the things I am told are so or not—requires me to “prove all things and to hold fast to that which is good,” and not to “believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they are of God.” If, then, I find myself forbidden by man to think and judge, while I am required to do both by my Maker, am I not held in mental bondage? But, “whether it be right to hearken unto man rather than unto God,” let the reader judge.

In fine, to the clergyman himself I am in fetters; for, since my spiritual welfare and comfort depend so much upon his ministrations, it is my interest to please him, and, upon any terms, to keep in with him; and I cannot, in many respects, do as I would, for fear of the contrary. And still more is it so, if he can persuade me that there is any sort of purgatory after death over which his prayers or absolutions may have any influence. In short, this Puseyism, when

thoroughly instilled into the minds of the parish, puts the people into the hands of the clergy to do with them almost as they please. So was it in the days of popery; for so great was the ascendancy that the clergy gained over the minds of the people, that property was left to the Church to an immense amount, and it became requisite for the civil government to interpose by the statute of mortmain.

Finally, we may remark, that the attempt to make the Church *one*—of one form and order, one external hierarchy—is another way of enslaving the people. Pleasing idea, truly, such a uniformity! pleasing reality, perhaps, in heaven! but on earth it is not to be expected. The different constitution of the human mind, diversity of education, situation in society, and the unequal distribution of the means of information, forbid such a uniformity. We cannot think, and yet think alike; and if, therefore, government requires us to act as though we did, it must necessarily put a force upon our feelings, and we must, therefore, be in a state of mental bondage. But is not this the tendency of Puseyism, and High-churchism, which demands that all should submit to what it calls the Catholic Church?

SECTION III.

It propagates a spurious Religion.

However upright may be the *intentions* of our opponents—for, doubtless, many of them are sincere, and think that they are right,—yet the *tendency* of their doctrines is to substitute a counterfeit religion for the real

religion, and to propagate such spurious religion. It will cause persons to rest in the outward baptism of the body, as making them Christians, irrespective of that inward baptism of the soul and indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which alone can make them so; for has not Christ declared that we must be “born of the Spirit;” and has not the apostle Paul asserted, that “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his?” The eating bread and drinking wine, though but bodily actions, will pass for the participation of Christ’s spirit of life to the soul through believing. It will cause union to the visible church by baptism—pass for union to Christ and to his invisible church by a living faith. Ordination to the ministry of religion, by the laying on of the hands of man, will pass for ordination, or the sanctification of a person to the work by the grace and gifts of the Holy Spirit. The doctrines and commandments of men will be substituted for the doctrines and commandments of God; and the form of godliness for the power of godliness. And thus an outward religion will be rested on, while the heart will remain unchanged, and even “alienated from the life of God;” for, if the people are taught to consider the sacraments as more effectual than the word, and that indeed such sacraments are effectual without the word, they will, of course, place reliance on the former, and neglect the latter. And what must be the obvious consequence of this? They will not be solicitous about being “*begotten*” by the word of truth,” or even understanding what the new inward birth is; and those inward operations of the mind and soul which constitute the essence of true religion will be disregarded: nor, supposing

them Christians, would they care about being “*sanctified* by the word of truth.” Content with their baptism, their confirmation, their relation to the Church, attendance at and zeal for it — especially if their lives be moral—they will consider themselves as truly Christians, and as heirs of heaven; while, alas! not being born of the Spirit, and not having the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them, they have no claim to the name of the former; and, not having the “first-fruits,” or “earnest of the Spirit,” they have no fitness for the latter.

But a religion that thus disparages the word of God, not only how injurious, but how contrary to the Scripture! There, we are told, that “The law of God is perfect, *converting* the soul”—there we learn, that the Scriptures “make wise to salvation”—there, that the “engrafted word” is “able to save the soul.” Nor only that they “convert,” that they “make wise to salvation,” and that they are “able to save the soul;” but our Lord himself, in his intercessory prayer, teaches us that it is by the word of truth that persons already converted are *sanctified*—“Sanctify them through thy truth,” says he; “thy word is truth.” What! and is all this to be attributed to sacraments; baptism for the one, and the Lord’s Supper for the other! Is this the religion of the Bible? Is it not, in fact, a spurious religion?

It is true, indeed, that they do speak of grace, and of the grace of the Holy Spirit, as given in ordination, in baptism, in confirmation, and in the eucharist; yet this grace, instead of being the result of the operation of an intellectual spirit upon another intellectual spirit, appears, after all, to be nothing more than a sort of

mystical spell or charm, as has already been proved under a former Section. It is neither light in the mind, nor love in the soul, nor likeness to God in the character; nor is it to be seen in the "sober, righteous, and godly life."

Nor is this all. We have reason to fear that there will be such interpretations of Scripture, both from the pulpit and from the press, as will eat up the vitals of religion. Take a specimen from Dr. Hook, as brought forward with approbation, in a review of one of his sermons in the Gentleman's Magazine.¹ The passage commented upon is one where we should expect spiritual religion more than from many others. It is that concerning predestination, calling, justification, and glorification, in the eighth chapter of the Romans. "And now," says Dr. Hook, "comes the question, *who* are those predestinated to the glories of the new heaven, the new earth, the new Jerusalem, which is to come down from above? Let St. Paul give the answer. 'Whom he did predestinate, them he also called.' Called by the circumstances under which he providentially placed them, either by the appearance in the past ages of an apostle or evangelist, or, as is the case with us, by the fact of being born in a christian land: and 'whom he called, them he also justified;' receiving them, for Christ's sake, as his own children in holy baptism; he justified us for the same Saviour's sake, counted us holy then, who as yet were not actually so: and those 'whom he justified, them he also glorified:' he glorified them by regenerating them, and making them temples of the Holy Spirit, than which what greater glory can

¹ See Gentleman's Magazine for February, 1843, p. 55.

pertain to the sons of men?' The foregoing passage furnishes us with a description of Christians, of baptized persons, and, consequently, to Christians those other passages which relate to God's predestination. Them God hath predestinated; and, as such, as God's elect people, predestinated not merely to means of grace,—for this was clearly inadequate,—but to glory in the kingdom of glory." Now, observe, with regard to this comment; here is, first, the "*predestination*;" Paul says, it was to be "conformed to the image of God's Son," but not so the Doctor; and whatever might be his own wish with regard to such an end, we fear it would not be so of many of his baptized hearers, who would lay the flattering unction to their souls, concluding that they were "predestinated" to "the kingdom of glory," as the Doctor speaks. Then there is the *calling*. Would those who composed the Article of the church of England "on predestination," have given such a low external sense to the "calling" there mentioned? No; "they through *faith* obey the call," says the Article. Would the Westminster Assembly of Divines? No! far, very far from it. "Effectual calling," say they, "is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, and enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel." How different! and, of course, how different their sense of the *justification* that is said to follow! And where, in the Articles of the church of England, are we taught that justification is the being "received, for Christ's sake, as God's own children in holy baptism," and "counting

us holy" then? Is this the religion that the apostles would have taught? a religion that makes individual readers, makes a whole congregation of hearers imagine that, because they were "born in a christian land," because they had partaken of "holy baptism," that therefore they were the predestinated, justified, and glorified people of God? What will be the result of such views as these if spread over the land? It is true this is but a quotation from one person, and therefore we would take care how we judge a whole class from it; but yet it is from a leading person of that class; and it is brought forward in a periodical review, of no inferior note, as a comment which has their approbation.

Thus do the Puseyite or High-church doctrines cause counterfeit coin to pass for genuine. But—solemn thought!—"Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is."

SECTION IV.

It deludes and destroys souls.

Our Lord says, that "if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Both, observe; not only he who leads, but the individual *led*. How important, then, to "take heed what we hear!" And how serious the results of Puseyism and High-churchism, if its tenets are so erroneous as has been represented! But let us inquire.

We would ask, then, if the doctrine of "apostolical

succession" be admitted, are not the souls of whole parishes, in certain cases, in danger? Here is a clergyman, who entered college not from a desire to save souls, but from a desire to procure for himself a respectable living; after having passed through the requisite trials, he is inducted into a living, and has the oversight of a parish as a "successor of the apostles;" and he gives his people to understand that the charge of their souls is committed to him, and to him solely; but, alas! though professedly a "servant of the most high God, to show unto men the way of salvation," yet he is incapable of doing so, not himself knowing the way. And what follows? The people are not led at all; or they are blindly led. The "gospel," which is "the power of God unto salvation," they hear not, and therefore they are not saved; or else, being led wrong, they stumble and "fall into the ditch"—fall into hell! And who, or what is to help it? He is their authorized teacher—he passes as a "successor of the apostles;" and though there should be another teacher in the same parish, who does know the way of salvation, and who does preach the gospel, and who is the instrument of saving many a soul, yet no matter; he has no authority, and therefore they are forbidden to go and hear him! Does not this "apostolic succession," this exclusive succession, tend, in such cases, to ruin souls? or, which is the same thing, leave them to perish? They are not "saved from their sins;" they do not "overcome the world;" they are left a prey to their lusts and passions; they do not "deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly;" some disgrace themselves by drunkenness, others by fornica-

tion, and others by swearing and sabbath-drinking, and at length die in their sins; whereas, had they attended upon a gospel ministry, and a faithful minister of Jesus Christ, though "unauthorized" by a diocesan bishop, they might have been saved.

The *efficacy* of the sacraments is another doctrine that proves delusive and destructive. By the sacraments, Dr. Pusey teaches that we are united to Christ, chosen, justified, sanctified, adopted, and become heirs of heaven. Persuaded of this, will their hearers "search the Scriptures daily," as the noble Bereans did, so as to believe and be saved? Will they earnestly and perseveringly pray that the Lord would open their understandings, that they may understand them? will they "labour for the meat that endureth to everlasting life?" will they "strive to enter in at the strait gate?" No such thing; "They are safe in Christ already, and it will be all well at last." Who sees not the end of this delusion? Whereas, had they considered the sacraments only as signs and sealed blessings *conditionally*, they would have been concerned to acquire that understanding and faith by which they might have possessed and enjoyed the things signified. Alas! under such teaching, people may hope for heaven when they have never been "wrought" for it; may expect the inheritance, when they have never received its "earnest;" and though going up to heaven's gates with a "Lord, Lord, open unto us!" may be spurned from the Saviour's presence with a "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity!"

A word or two more concerning the blessings they say are conferred in the sacraments, in baptism particu-

larly. Perhaps there is no tenet of Puseyism more delusive and dangerous than that which holds that *all spiritual blessings* are connected with this "holy baptism." According to Dr. Pusey, we have the forgiveness of sins, justification, sanctification, adoption, heirship of the heavenly inheritance, and indeed all the privileges conferred upon true believers. Now, in Scripture, we learn that these are uniformly connected with repentance and faith: nor are any encouraged to expect them but in such connexion. How *delusive* must it then be to connect them with mere baptism, in the absence of such qualities! Nor can it be much less *dangerous*; for such persons, concluding that they are safe and blessed through baptism, will not concern themselves about such repentance and faith, nor will seek after them. Certain profligate and abandoned sinners may indeed need them, but not they; and, although such blessings professed and enjoyed, do, in Scripture, suppose that the happy subjects of them are the "baptized by one Spirit into Christ," and not such as are merely baptized with water, no matter, for Puseyism teaches them, that they were baptized both with water and the Spirit when they were thus outwardly baptized; and that, therefore, all is settled and well.

Nor is this all. The preachers themselves will confirm the delusion. For as they cannot say, "I have begotten you through the gospel," so neither can they seek to "beget them with the word of truth," or to awaken their hearers to the necessity of such regeneration. And why? They are regenerated already in baptism. And then, being made Christians thereby, and viewing their congregations as congregations of

Christians, they address them as such, exhorting and comforting them accordingly. And what is the result of this? A carnal, fatal security!

Indeed, this reliance upon sacraments seems to set aside the exhortations of Scripture to seek, ask, knock, strive, labour; for baptism has made us Christians, and the Lord's Supper will finish us as Christians; at least, the people will be in danger of so inferring. Nor, if the writer in the *British Critic* speak the mind of his brethren, will the priests peradventure care much about it; "for," says he, "the notion of getting religious truth ourselves, and by our private inquiry, whether by reading, or meditation, or the study of the Scriptures, or any other book . . . is contained in none of the precepts of Scripture. The grand question which ought to be put before our private judgment is this, What is to be considered as the voice of the holy catholic apostolic Church?" If, then, we are not to care about "getting religious truth ourselves," but to satisfy ourselves with the voice of the Church; and, at the same time, as Dr. Pusey says, "the Church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul" the "supernatural and unseen" grace, it is too apparent that the soul will settle on its lees, and let the Church and her sacraments suffice for its salvation, without much asking, or seeking, or knocking, or striving, in order that we might believe and be saved, or that we might continue in the faith. Well has D'Aubigné said, "The tendency of Puseyism is to set asleep the conscience by the observance of external rites; the tendency of the gospel system is to awaken it incessantly."

We add another consideration. The great stress that is laid upon *forms and ceremonies* is also dangerous. Who, that is at all acquainted with human nature, knows not, that it is far more likely to be attracted by form and ceremony, by pomp and parade, than by things which tend to inform the understanding and renew the heart; and that mankind are more easily induced to attend to things outward than to those which have their place in the mind and heart? And who knows not, also, that, to have the mind so disproportionately and inordinately directed towards the forms and ceremonies of religion, divides and weakens its energies? Let the history of the church of Israel, as well as that of the Roman Catholic church, sound an alarm on this head. Let the Pharisees, with their long robes and broad phylacteries, and fondness for pomp and show, in connexion with our Saviour's representation of it, prove a warning! If the *form* of godliness be substituted for its *power*, the soul is in danger; and the stress which Puseyism lays upon form, particularly with weak and ignorant minds, tends to such a result. The form, as the handmaid to the power, is a blessing; but when it becomes the mistress, it is a curse. And in concluding this subject, we are quite sure that we but breathe the spirit of the religion which comes from that "GOD" who is a "SPIRIT," when we remind our readers, both with reference to these forms and ceremonies, and to the sacraments before mentioned—not indeed in the exact words of the apostle, but in the spirit of them—forms, and ceremonies, and sacraments, do "not avail anything, but *faith which worketh by love*;"—forms, and ceremonies, and sacraments, "avail

nothing, but a *new creature* ;”—forms, and ceremonies, and sacraments, are “nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God.”¹ Our great care should be to possess a living “*faith*,” even a faith which, producing “love,” will set us upon “the work and labour of love;” a faith which will produce a “*new creature*” as to the understanding of the “spirit,” and the disposition and affections of the “soul,” and instrumentality of the “body;”² a faith which, thus “working by love,” and producing a “new creature,” will cause to “keep the commandments of God.” And then shall we possess a religion wrought in us by the Spirit of God, and a religion which “God,” who “is a Spirit,” will recognise as the true religion; and without which all the forms and ceremonies, all the sacraments, all the fastings, and all the services of religion, will be to HIM as “nothing.”

Absolution shall bring up the rear. How far Puseyism will extend this ceremony we are not prepared to say; but we cannot conclude this Section without warning the priest against having recourse to it, and the individual against relying upon it. Why use it at all? If the dying person has truly repented and believed, is it not enough that God has declared in his word that he is forgiven? And if he has not—and how frequently are we mistaken upon this point!—why pronounce a sentence upon earth that is not pronounced in heaven? Is it not deceiving to the individual? Is it not calculated to mislead the bystanders? Does it

¹ Gal. v. 6; vi. 15.

² See these three constituent parts of man in 1 Thess. v. 23.

not tend to promote carnal security and presumption in the living, who will imagine that the prayers and absolutions of the priest, especially as accompanied with the sacrament, will relieve them of the burden of their sins? For, alas! however our reformers, or the composers of the Liturgy might understand the absolution as conditional, yet it is to be feared that the dying person, and the survivors, will not do so. How striking is that case mentioned by Dr. Calamy, in his "Life and Times," concerning a lady of pleasure, who had been mistress to King Charles the Second, but, on her death-bed, was haunted with the recollection of her crimes! We will state it in the words of Dr. Calamy himself. Having mentioned the introduction of the Rev. Mr. Sylvester, the friend of the great Richard Baxter, he says that he "distinctly opened to her the terms of salvation, as they are laid down in the gospel. She declared, that nothing of that nature afforded her any comfort, she having oft returned back to the same abominable acts of wickedness, after very strong convictions, and most solemn vows, purposes, and resolutions of amendment. In the midst of this discourse there comes in a dignified clergyman of the church of England, sent for by some present. Upon his appearance, one in the company cried out, 'Madam, here comes your guardian angel, pray listen to him.' The curtains at the bed's foot were presently thrown open, and the clergyman, without any discourse foregoing, lifts up his hands, and in a solemn manner utters these words: 'In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I absolve thee from all thy sins!'" Such is the statement of Dr. Calamy of this absolution; but what was the result upon the lady he does not say,

only that Mr. Sylvester, perfectly astonished, left the room.

Now, if *such* power of absolution as this be assumed by the "priest," and the dying individual admit it, it is easy to see what must be the consequence upon survivors. But who gave them this authority? To the apostles our Lord said, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained:" but not to them. Are they apostles? are they inspired men, who can pronounce by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit?¹ But, in this case, evidence was not even sought of "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" without which inspiration itself would not pronounce absolution. Oh! let those who take upon them the charge of souls, of immortal souls, of souls that surpass in value a whole world; let men, to whose hands God entrusts his honour, take care how they delude and destroy the former; let them take care how they pollute the latter!

Another reason may be assigned for our position, that Puseyism is destructive to souls; and that is, because it is *destructive to morals*.

"Depart from me, all ye that work iniquity," will be the awful declaration of the Judge to the immoral at the judgment-day: of course, everything that becomes the *occasion* of such iniquity must therefore be pronounced destructive. And we maintain, that to call off the attention from heart renewal to outward ordinances and ceremonies, from the substance of religion to its

¹ It may be questioned whether our Lord intended that even they should do so, otherwise than by their writings—their *inspired* writings:

show or shadow, has this tendency; especially when men are induced to place a reliance upon the latter; because, in such case, the gospel ceases to be the power of God unto salvation. Look at Italy, look at Rome, when at the height of their glory, as to the forms and ceremonies of religion. When was there greater attention paid to the use of the sacraments, to rituals? and when were the ministers of religion clothed with more outward dignity and glory, than at the close of the fifteenth century? Moreover, where should we expect more of the power of religion than where its great, its popes, its cardinals, and its most renowned priests resided? But what were the facts of the case? Nowhere was there less religion—nowhere were the morals more corrupt! Oh how affecting are the accounts which that eminent Florentine, or Italian reformer, Girolamo Savonarola, gives of the state of things at that time! The reader will allow of a few extracts from his “Life and Times,” lately published. That there was no want of a *show* of religion, appears from his account of the solemn festival held in honour of St. George, the patron of the city of Ferrara:—“On such illustrious occasions,” says he, “there are gorgeous processions of priests and singers, canons and musicians, and masked men and women, and boys with censers of incense, dignitaries and ennobled persons attendant upon crosses and statues of saint and confessor, and images of angel and archangel, of virgin and child, with the bishop majestically bearing the consecrated host—a visible god, for the worship of a superstitious and idolatrous populace. Nor are mere worldly amusements wanting; the splendours of the opera, the

passions and humours of the theatre, the drolleries of punchinello, the vulgar pleasures of houses of gross entertainment, with licence and misrule abroad in the public streets, or more retired revelling concealed in the haunts of dissipation—all designed to make the holy profane enough for the crowd, whose appetites are their only deities. This ended, the gorged and flown multitude hasten from their various sports to the church, where they confess all the sins they have committed during the festive period just closed.”¹ And, apologizing to his father for his choice of a monastic life, he says, “The reason which induces me to become a monk is this; in the first place, the great wickedness of the world, the iniquity of men, the violence, the adultery, the theft, the pride, the idolatry, the hateful blasphemy into which this age has fallen, so that one can no longer find a righteous man. For this, many times a day, with tears, I chanted this verse:—

‘Heu, fuge crudelas terras, fuge litus avarum!’²

And this because I could not endure the great distemper of some of the people in Italy; the more also, seeing virtue extinct, ruined, and vice triumphant; this was the greatest suffering I could have in this world: therefore daily I entreated of my Lord Jesus Christ, that he would rescue me from this defilement.”³ And again he says, “He who looks considerately, must confess that Italy is the acme of wickedness. But when the measure is full, the sword must clear away all that is

¹ Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, p. 42.

² “Alas! fly the cruel lands, fly the greedy shores!”

³ Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, p. 43.

wicked. Yes, thy turpitude, Italy, Rome, and Florence! thy godless life, thy unchastity, thy usuriousness, bring ruin!"¹ From the people he proceeds to the priests. "Before all," says he, "the wicked priests and servants of the church are the guilty cause of this corruption, as also of the coming misfortune. Some practise simony; others gambol in the evening; keep concubines in the night, and come with sin in the morning to mass. Others go from riding and hunting to the sacred office. O ye priests and heads of the church of Christ! leave your benefices, of which you cannot be rightly in possession,—leave your wanton pleasures—your clubs—leave your voluptuous and unnaturally obscene life, while it is yet time to repent, and keep your masses with devotion."² Once more: "The scandal begins at Rome, and goes through the whole; they are worse than Turks and Moors. Begin only with Rome, and you will find that they have now all their spiritual benefices by simony. Many seek them for their children and brothers, who enter them with insolence and a thousand sins. Their covetousness is monstrous; they will do anything for money. Their bells sound avarice,—call to nothing else but money and ease. The priests go for money to the choir, the vespers, and their office. They sell the benefices—they sell the sacraments—they traffic with the mass,—in short, everything is done for money. And then they fear excommunication. As soon as evening comes, one goes to gaming, another to concubines. And when they go to a funeral, where

¹ Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, p. 212.

² Ibid. p. 213.

they should pray in stillness for the dead, there are great entertainments, there is rich eating and drinking, and much gossip; and what scandalous vices do they practise! But they go in the day adorned. They wear fine shirts, and are otherwise richly appareled. Some know nothing even of the rules of their order; know not what they are; nay, are altogether ignorant. Confession and care of saints are unknown to them. There is no more belief, no more faith, no love, no virtue. Formerly the saying was, 'If not fair, then fine;' now prudence is not needed, since it has become a shame to live well. Look, if a priest or canon lives well, men will make game of him, and accuse him of hypocrisy. Now the word is no more, my nephew, but my son, my daughter. Harlots go publicly to St. Peter, each priest has his concubine; they practise infamy without concealment. This poison has so accumulated at Rome, that France, Germany, and all the world is infected with it; it has gone so far, that one must warn each other against Rome; and it has become a saying, 'If you will ruin your son, make him a priest!'"¹

Such are the results of the substitution of a religion of form for a religion of power; of a religion of sense for a religion of faith. Say not, such are not, such cannot be the effects of Puseyism. True, not as yet; nor do our Puseyite adherents intend it. But human nature is human nature still; and—begin to neglect the culture of the mind and heart,—substitute the signs for the thing signified,—the sacraments for the word and Spirit

¹ Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola.

of God, and sense for faith; and together with this, surrender your souls and consciences to the guidance of corrupt and misguided men, men seeking only for their own emolument and aggrandizement,¹ there is no security whatever, in the absence of the counteracting power of the gospel, that you fall not again under the dominion of your appetites and passions, and that society will not again become the "cage of unclean birds." Nothing but the pure, unadulterated gospel will save souls! Nothing, perhaps, tends more to their destruction than a gospel that is corrupted and perverted!

We will conclude our remarks on this head by a citation from D'Aubigné's pamphlet, entitled, "Geneva and Oxford," wherein he gives us the Bishop of Winchester's opinion of the injurious effects of the doctrines of Puseyism. "I cannot but fear the consequences for the character, the efficiency, and the very truth of our Church, if a system of teaching should become extensively popular which dwells upon the external and ritual parts of religious service, whilst it loses sight of their inner meaning and spiritual life; which defaces the brightest glory of the Church by forgetting the continual presence of her Lord; seeming, in effect, to depose him from his rightful pre-eminence, . . . which tends to substitute, at least in unholy minds, for the worship in spirit and in truth, the observance of 'days, and months, and times, and years;' for the cheerful obedience of filial love, an aspect of

¹ N.B. It is not intended to convey the idea that the present generation of Puseyite clergymen are thus corrupt; but such may be the case in process of time. What has been, may be again.

hesitation, and trouble, and doubt ; for the freedom of the gospel, a spirit of bondage which works out salvation indeed with fear and trembling, but without any foretaste of the rest that remaineth for the people of God, and without joy in believing.”

THE END.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

IN THE ORDER IN WHICH PUBLISHED.

I.

PARENTS' AND TEACHERS' HELP.

Price 2*d.* Third Edition.

II.

THE SCRIPTURES FULFILLED.

Post 8vo. Price 4*s.*

Treats, principally, of Prophecies, the fulfilment of which may be seen at the present day.

“This is really a judicious exposition of the leading prophecies of Scripture, and is a very suitable work to be put into the hands of young persons.”—*Evangelical Magazine*, Nov. 1830.

“Written in a plain and popular style; the arguments are well arranged and illustrated; and the inferences in favour of the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures, are briefly and forcibly stated.”—*Congregational Magazine*, April, 1830.

“Will greatly assist in the study of fulfilled predictions. The observations relating to the Gypsies are important and judicious.”—*Home Missionary Magazine*, Jan. 1830.

III.

ESSAYS ON EXHORTATIONS TO SINNERS,

PREACHED IN TWO DISCOURSES.

12mo. Price 1*s.*

Published by request.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

IV.

QUESTIONS CALMLY CONSIDERED

CONCERNING

“THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD;”

Her Nature, Connexion with the State, as to Public Instruction and Public Morals, Civil Establishment, and Support by the Voluntary Principle.

8vo. Price 1s. 6d.

“Well adapted to enable pious churchmen to arrive at a clear, unprejudiced view of the subject. It is written in a very mild and conciliatory spirit.”—*Eclectic Review*.

V.

HEAVEN :

A MANUAL FOR THE HEIRS OF HEAVEN.

ALSO,

ON THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS.

12mo. Price 4s.

“The subject itself, and the scriptural manner in which it is treated, are so interesting as to demand our sincere recommendation.”—*Evangelical Magazine*.

“It breathes the spirit of its subject, and delightfully raises us above the toils and sorrows of time.”—*Family Magazine*.

“Affording a rich solace under the pressure of the cares of the world.”—*Christian Lady's Magazine*.

VI.

PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST.

24mo. Price 1s.

“An excellent preservative against the subtle poison of Socinianism.”—*Christian Lady's Magazine*.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

VII.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE
LORD'S-DAY.

8vo. Price 6d.

“ One of the most able pamphlets on this topic we have ever seen.”—
Family Magazine.

VIII.

NATIONAL HAPPINESS ;

OR,

POLITICAL ECONOMY, AS FOUNDED UPON SCRIPTURE, THE ONLY
TRUE BASIS OF A NATION'S SECURITY AND WELFARE.

12mo. Price 1s. 6d.

IX.

TRUTH IN LOVE.

ON SCHISM, APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, APOSTOLICAL BISHOPS,
THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, &c.

12mo. Price 6d.

X.

NATIONAL EDUCATION :

ITS SCRIPTURAL AND SOCIAL IMPORTANCE, WITH SUGGESTIONS
AS TO THE MANNER OF CONDUCTING IT.

8vo. Price 1s.

N.B. Pamphlets VIII. IX. and X. not sent for review.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

XI.

MONUMENTA ANTIQUA ;

OR,

ESSAY ON THE STONE MONUMENTS OF ANTIQUITY ;

Including a Dissertation on Stonehenge, on the Pyramids
of Egypt, and on the Round Towers of Ireland.

Post 8vo. with Plates, 6s.

N.B. This work is designed to trace up their origination to Scripture facts, and to show that there is to be found their true illustration.

“Your book has great merit. . . . I have a high opinion of your book as a digest (and a good one) of antiquities collated with Scripture.”—*The Rev. Edward Duke, F.A.S.*, an eminent antiquarian, residing near Stonehenge ; yet differing as to one or two topics.

“The idea of making the Holy Scriptures the ground-work of antiquarian researches in matters which concern the primitive ages, does credit at once to the author’s christian feeling and good sense. . . . We can safely commend Mr. Weaver’s Essay to the perusal of those who resolve in their minds the origin of these structures and memorials to what no written records of our history distinctly refer.”—*Gentleman’s Magazine, March, 1840.*

“Few can look into the pages of this most entertaining work, without feeling thankful to the author for his laborious investigations.”—*Evangelical Magazine, May, 1840.*

XII.

THE PAGAN ALTAR AND JEHOVAH’S
TEMPLE.

12mo. 6s. With Plates.

An Essay to excite renewed interest in Public Worship, in our common Christianity, in the “Great Salvation,” and in the Missionary Enterprise.

“Conveying a vast amount of curious and valuable information on subjects of the deepest interest to the antiquarian. . . . Its style is so simple and elegant, that young persons may read it with delight, and the well-instructed *literati* will derive advantage from its perusal.”—*Plymouth Times.*

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

"It is well entitled to the careful perusal of intelligent Christians. It is by no means a common-place production, but exhibits marks throughout of extensive reading, and even original thought."—*Evangelical Magazine*, Aug. 1841.

"Calculated to do much service, in an unpretending way, to the cause of real Christianity."—*Gentleman's Magazine*, Oct. 1842.

"It is a book which should be introduced into every parochial library as being especially calculated for perusal among the middle classes."—*Dearden's Miscellany*, April, 1840.

XIII.

THE FRIENDLY CAVEAT

AGAINST CERTAIN WIDELY-SPREAD, BUT DELUSIVE AND DANGEROUS,
ERRORS REGARDING THE AUTHORITY AND CUSTOMS OF
THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED BY LAW.

8vo. Price 6*d*.

XIV.

THE RECONCILER :

An Attempt to exhibit, in a somewhat new light, the Harmony and
Glory of the Divine Government and the Divine Sovereignty.

8vo. Price 10*s*.

N.B. One distinguishing feature of this Work, is, that it shows, the wisdom of God in making provision for all, although he fore-saw its rejection; in that it subserves the important purpose of a WITNESS for God, "whether" men would "hear or forbear." Matt. xxiv. 14.

"Discussed in a manner very comprehensive, and yet precise and full, in a candid spirit, and with the most important bearings on practical piety."—*Dr. J. P. Smith*, in "*Four Discourses*," 2d Edit. p. 322.

"We have sincere pleasure in recommending the volume before us. . . . There is scarcely an obscure sentence in the volume."—*Patriot*, March 18, 1841.

"We have felt much pleasure in the perusal of the work. . . . He has done, perhaps, as much as, in the present state of human knowledge, is to be expected."—*Eclectic Review*, Nov. 1842.

"We think it has been treated by our author with knowledge, research, reasoning, and impartiality."—*Gentleman's Magazine*, Jan. 1843.

"Having carefully perused this volume, we can with pleasure and much confidence, recommend it to all who desire to have clear and consistent

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

views of the deeply important subjects upon which it treats; and we feel persuaded that our younger ministers would be exempted from many painful perplexities, and have increased freedom in their public addresses, by a thoughtful consideration of this excellent work. We sincerely wish the volume a wide circulation, from a conviction that it is adapted for usefulness, and cannot be perused in a right frame of mind without leaving the reader a wiser and a better man."—*Congregational Magazine*, April, 1843.

XV.

AN APPEAL TO THE CHRISTIAN WORLD,
AS TO DISSENTERS' CLAIMS AGAINST THE EXCLUSIVE
PRINCIPLES OF OUR HIGH-CHURCHMEN.

12mo. Price 4*d.* and 6*d.*

N.B. The design of this Work is to show the *absurd* consequences of this High-Churchism.

XVI.

AN ESSAY ON THE CONNEXION OF CHRIS-
TIANITY WITH POLITICS.

ALSO,

ON THE BEARING OF EXTREME DESTITUTION IN THE WORKING
CLASSES ON RELIGION AND MORALS.

8vo. Price 1*s.*

XVII.

TRIPLET HYMN-BOOK;

OR,

HYMNS OF THREE VERSES ONLY;

Which, although it might serve as a Supplement to Dr. Watts, is particularly adapted to Prayer-Meetings and the Closet.

24mo. Price 10*d.* or 8*s.* the dozen.



