

### III

#### Party-Spirit— Tendency to Romanism.

What has been stated will suffice to show, that dissent in some particulars from the Tracts, and from Froude's views, were combined with personal regard, and with a due sense of the services which had been rendered to the cause of Church principles. I have already disclaimed all intention of entering on the discussion of particular differences; but there are some subjects of a general nature, and so important, that I am impelled to invite the friends of Church principles to a serious examination of them. The subjects to which I allude are, the existence of party-spirit amongst some of the adherents of Church principles, and the tendency to Romanism which has recently been developed.

I would then address myself most respectfully to that large and important portion of the Church, which is, in various degrees, favourable to the principles advocated by the *Tracts for the Times*. If warm personal affection and esteem for the principal authors of those Tracts, cemented by the most sacred associations, and never in thought, or word, or deed, diminished; if community of suffering beneath undeserved imputations; if anxiety for the welfare of the Church; if a life devoted, to the utmost extent of limited powers and attainments, to the inculcation of sound and Catholic principles; if some experience, as one who at the very beginning took part in that movement which has exercised so deep an influence; if these constitute any claim on attention, I trust, in humility, that I may be heard.

The eminent men themselves, who have taken so conspicuous a part in the movement connected with the Tracts, are far too humble and too wise, to conceive themselves exempt from the possibility of having made *some mistakes* in matters of opinion and judgment. No men can be more remote from a spirit of dogmatism, or from the wish that their private opinions or statements should become the standard of belief. The very liberty which was claimed for individual developments in the

composition of the Tracts, the total absence of any system of revision, are sufficient to prove that the Tracts were merely designed to advocate the truth, without making any sort of pretence to infallibility. Their authors have often, and most sincerely, disclaimed all wish to form a party in the Church; their object was simply to draw attention to *neglected* truths—to appeal to the Church itself as their standard; to be of no other party.

But notwithstanding this, it is not any longer possible to conceal from ourselves the growth of *something like party* amongst some of their friends and admirers. It cannot excite any surprise that such rare endowments, such varied abilities, such noble designs, such abnegation of self, should exercise profound influence on those who came within their immediate sphere. We accordingly witnessed the growth of a feeling, which its objects would have been the first to deprecate had they been fully conscious of it—a feeling of implicit submission—of uninquiring obedience. We even saw every little peculiarity of speech, or gait, or manner, sedulously copied; certain *names* even were heard with awe. Such things, however trivial or amusing in themselves, are, when regarded as indications of the spirit working within, worthy of deep attention. We beheld every peculiarity and novelty of doctrine, everything that was startling and perplexing to sober-minded men, instantly caught up, disseminated, erected into an article of *Catholic* faith, by young and ardent spirits. Each novelty of this kind became for the moment a sort of *Articulus stasis cadentis Ecclesiae*.<sup>1</sup> We could not but see in this, the growth of an influence most dangerous to the Church, a disposition to create human leaders, to follow them with indiscriminating and headlong fervour, even to urge them onward continually to bolder and stronger proceedings.

In speaking thus, it is not of course meant that the spirit of party which has been alluded to is generally, or even extensively, prevalent amongst those who are favourable to the great principles of the Tracts. Nothing could be more unfounded or more unjust than any such imputation. But, needless as it may be to caution the leading friends of Church principles, as they are exhibited in the Tracts, against a spirit from which they are very far removed, I yet cannot but endeavour to draw their attention to the fact, that there is danger of party-spirit amongst some few of the younger adherents of their cause; that there is too implicit an adoption of the views of individuals; too little tolerance for different opinions; too little respect for constituted authorities, when they are supposed to be, or are, unfavourable to particular tenets.

It is against party,—against the spirit of party, with all its evil consequences,—that I would most earnestly, and with great humility, warn and entreat all who adhere to Church principles—to Catholic antiquity. They are *especially* called on to be on their guard against this extreme devotion to the opinions—this zealous vindication of the practices of particular men. The temptation is, I admit, very strong, to draw

more closely around those whom persecution in every varied form has been assailing; whose pure-minded and self-denying exertions for the public good have been thus rewarded. But, deep as is this trial to all generous minds, I would entreat them to remember, that the cause of God is yet more sacred than that of men; that it is unlawful to array ourselves under any banner, or unite ourselves in any combination, but that of Jesus Christ, and of His Church. It is a sense of the evils resulting from extreme devotion to certain leaders, the danger of taking human guidance instead of Divine, the divisions thence arising, the opposition aroused and returned with daily increasing irritation, the risk which we run of sacrificing the interests of *truth* itself amidst the unreasoning outcry of popular prejudice, the consequent tendency of things to a state *far more precarious and difficult for Churchmen*,—it is the sight of these present and impending evils, which induces me to stretch forth my hands in earnest supplication to my friends, and to all adherents of Catholic principles; and to entreat them to discourage, to the utmost of their power, party associations and party feeling.

I speak not of the *name* but of the *reality* of party. The apprehension of being *stigmatized* by party *names* for adherence to unpopular principles, should not deter us from following the path of duty; but we are bound by the most solemn obligations to God and His Church, not to permit party-spirit *really to influence* our minds, our language, or our conduct; not to range ourselves under leaders, or to say, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; not to receive implicitly their tenets, or to regard those of different tenets as necessarily wrong or uncatholic, or to withdraw from association and friendship with them, or to limit our association only to those who adopt the fullest extent of the doctrine taught by those whom we especially admire; not to think that piety and goodness are restricted to one set of men in the Church; not to attempt to *FORCE* our opinions and practices on the public, in spite of its evident reluctance and opposition; not to permit ourselves a tone of irony, or bitterness, or censure, unmingled with charity towards opponents; not to class them together under party names, and thus *assist* in forming amongst *them* the spirit and combinations of party; not to permit ourselves to *feel* unkindness, or irritation, against them, however great may be the amount of ignorance, of prejudice, of manifold infirmities and faults, which we have to encounter. There *was* a time, not long past, when the advocates of Church principles did, universally, exemplify this conduct; when firm and calm in the consciousness of right intention, they listened with charity to the clamour of their opponents. Intemperance, and intolerance, party-feeling, the spirit of sectarianism, appeared not at all amongst them; at least on the surface of things. But the [former] spirit of Newman, Pusey, and Keble has not been transmitted to all their friends. By the examples of those eminent and holy men

(if no higher motive will avail), I would beseech their disciples to use more gentleness, to cultivate a greater spirit of charity, patience, forbearance, tolerance.

I must now approach, with the deepest concern, a branch of this subject, which nothing but a sense of duty could induce me to allude to—the tendency, if not to Romanism itself, yet to the greatest possible approximation towards its views and practices. If the authors of the earlier Tracts—if all advocates of Church principles—if I myself have earnestly desired [though with little hope of accomplishment] that the time might come, when the divisions which have for so many ages existed in Christendom, might, through Divine mercy, be removed, and the universal Church from east to west might rejoice in the restoration of its ancient harmony and union—if we endeavoured to remove from amongst ourselves, all scandals, ignorances, narrow-mindedness, which might interpose an obstacle to so grand and glorious a consummation—if we laboured for the restoration of primitive and Catholic principles; for the revival of discipline so grievously collapsed; for the decency and majesty of public worship; in the hope that all other Churches might behold our wish for unity, and might, in like manner, remove from themselves all things calculated to offend—if we admitted that the Church of Christ was not limited merely to our own communion, but even that those of Rome and Greece, notwithstanding the prevalence of errors and corruptions amongst them, were still to be accounted as branches of Christianity;—if these were our designs, our motives, our admissions, I think I can answer for all advocates of Church principles, that it was never their design to compromise one particle of religious truth; to diminish in any degree the attachment of our people to the National Church; to sacrifice any of its rights, liberties, or laws; to give countenance to superstitious or idolatrous practices; or to subvert the principles of the English Reformation.

The charge of Romanizing tendencies, to which so many advocates of Church principles have been subjected, notwithstanding their exertions in the field of controversy against Rome, did not excite surprise or uneasiness amongst them, because they were well aware that the imputation of Popery is the standing argument of those who have no other mode of resisting the truth. They knew that the Puritans and the Independents imputed Popery to the Church of England herself; that episcopacy is denounced as Popish by the Presbyterians; the doctrine of the Trinity by Socinians; the retention of Creeds and Articles by Latitudinarians; the Sacraments by Quakers; the union of Church and State by Dissenters. Satisfied of the truth of their own principles, and of the power of those principles in sustaining controversy with Romanism, they heard, without the least uneasiness, the outcry of 'Popery' with which they were assailed by Dissenters; by those whose sympathies were with Dissent; and by all the avowed and open enemies of the Church and of the Constitution. They felt daily more satisfied of the strength of their position, when Dissenters, Presbyterians, Romanists, Infidels, and Radicals united in assailing them.

That any tendency to Romanism should ever exist amongst *themselves*; that Church principles should ever become the path to superstition and idolatry; that they or their disciples should ever become alienated from the English Church, never entered their imaginations as possible. When their opponents charged them with such tendencies, the charge was always steadily denied. They availed themselves of every opportunity to clear themselves from the imputation of Popery. They even contended against the errors of Romanism. They had no intention to assist in the propagation of those errors.

I would appeal to the great body of the clergy and laity who have maintained Church principles, whether their honest and sincere *intention* has not ever been to maintain the truth, as much against Romish corruption on the one hand, as against Rationalizing infidelity on the other. They *know* that it has been their earnest endeavour to guard against, not merely the *imputation* of Romanism, but Romanism itself. Individuals, indeed, may have made concessions now and then, which have been laid hold of as indications of a tendency towards Romanism, and which they probably would not have made had they been conscious of the interpretation which would be placed on them. Perhaps almost every one who has written or spoken on these subjects, may have had something to lament in his own expressions. But, however such indiscretions may have been exaggerated, and to whatever surmises they may have given rise, the advocates of Church principles *themselves* know their real integrity of attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England, and their firm determination to resist the errors and corruptions of Romanism. It is this knowledge, this humble confidence in their own principle, which has, perhaps, in some instances led them to a degree of candour and liberality in the avowal of their sentiments, which has been misunderstood.

I might appeal, in proof of the sincerity of our opposition to Romanism, and of our attachment to the principles of the English Reformation, to the writings of the great body of our ablest and most popular writers. I might refer to the works of such men as Hook, Perceval, Gresley, Paget, Churton, Manning [then opposed to Rome], Sewell, Gladstone, and very many others. But I would appeal more especially to those writings which have been more than others exposed to the imputation of Romanizing tendencies, and I have no hesitation in saying, that a candid examination of the greater part of the *Tracts for the Times*, and of the writings of their authors [as cited by Dr. Pusey in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford in 1839], will sufficiently prove that (whatever may be thought of their individual opinions on particular points) there is throughout a continual avowal of *opposition to Rome in general*, a strong sense of its corruptions and errors, an earnest wish to resist those errors. Such would seem to be the principle and the feeling, on the whole,<sup>2</sup> to which the Tracts and their writers have given expression, and in which the great body of those who are friendly to them have concurred.

Let me be permitted to bring before the reader some proofs of what has been now said, selected chiefly from the Appendix to Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "On the *tendency to Romanism imputed* to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church." This appendix is entitled "Extracts from the *Tracts for the Times*, the *Lyra Apostolica*, and other publications; showing that to oppose ultra-Protestantism *is not to favour Popery*."

I first turn to the *Tracts for the Times*.

The Tracts maintain, that at the Reformation we were "*delivered from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation*," and from the "*superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages*";<sup>3</sup> that "there is not a word in Scripture about our duty *to obey the Pope*";<sup>4</sup> that "*Luther and others of the foreign Reformers, who did act without the authority of their bishops*," were justified in so doing;<sup>5</sup> that one object of the Tracts was to "*repress that extension of Popery*" for which religious divisions are making way.<sup>6</sup> They profess "*enmity against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel*";<sup>7</sup> a persuasion that the Romish "*Communion is infected with heterodoxy; that we are bound to flee it as a pestilence; that they have established a lie in the place of God's truth*."<sup>8</sup> It is admitted that "our Church is a true branch of the Church Universal"; that "*it is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical*."<sup>9</sup> Transubstantiation is represented as "a manner of presence *newly invented by Romanists*."<sup>10</sup> It is declared, that the Romish doctrine of Justification is "*unscriptural*"; that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is "*profane and impious*"; that the denial of the cup to the laity; the sacrifice of masses as it has been practised in the Roman Church; the honour paid to images; indulgences; the received doctrine of Purgatory; the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue; forced confession; direct invocation of Saints; seven Sacraments; the Romish doctrine of Tradition; the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop; and other points, are respectively blasphemous, dangerous, full of peril, gross inventions, at variance with Scripture, corruptions, contrary to Scripture and antiquity.<sup>11</sup> We are told to "apply Vencentius's test—antiquity; and *the Church of Rome is convicted of unsoundness*."<sup>12</sup> Amongst the "practical grievances" in the Roman communion are, "the denial of the cup to the laity; the necessity of the priest's intention; the necessity of confession; purgatory; invocation of saints; images."<sup>13</sup> It is held, that "*the twelfth century*" was a time "*fertile in false steps in religion*";<sup>14</sup> and that "*the addresses to the blessed Mary in the Breviary carry with them their own condemnation in the judgment of an English Christian*"; that these usages "do but sanction and encourage that *direct worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints*, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church."<sup>15</sup>

I next turn to the writings of Dr. Pusey, in which we find the same sort of disapprobation of Romanism.

We read there, that “the Romanist, *by the sacrament of Penance*,” would forestall the sentence of his Judge.<sup>16</sup> The “*corrupt Church of Rome*” is spoken of.<sup>17</sup> The Reformers who suffered under Mary are entitled “*Martyrs*.” Rome is described as “*a seat of Antichrist*.”<sup>18</sup> “The error of Transubstantiation” is said to have “*cast into the shade the one oblation once offered on the cross*.”<sup>19</sup> Rome is admitted to have forsaken “the principles of the Church Catholic”; and to have “stained herself with the blood of saints.”<sup>20</sup> Our Church, “alone of all the reformed Churches, was purified in the fire and *purged by the blood of martyrs*, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child.”<sup>21</sup> The idolatries committed in the worship of saints in the Church of Rome (without any protest or objection from her authorities) are amply exhibited in the postscript to Dr. Pusey’s Letter on the Articles treated of in Tract 90; and the conclusion of the whole is that “*while these things are so, although we did not separate from Rome, yet, since God has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, we see not how the Anglican Church could reunite with her, without betraying the trust which she owes to her children*.”<sup>22</sup>

Few writers have expressed their sentiments more decidedly on this subject than Mr. Newman. A sort of retraction of some strong expressions has, indeed, lately appeared, which is supposed to have proceeded from this eminent writer; but we have no right to infer that such retraction (though it may, perhaps, with some reason have added to the apprehensions which had been previously excited in the minds of Churchmen) was intended to apply to the *general view* which had been taken of the Romish system: it seems only to relate to particular modes of expression. I shall therefore, without hesitation, refer to the following passages as confirmatory of the views developed in the Tracts, and in Dr. Pusey’s writings.

“We agree with the Romanists,” he says, “in appealing to *antiquity* as our great teacher, but *we deny that his doctrines are to be found in antiquity*.”<sup>23</sup> We are thus cautioned against making advances to Rome: “If we are induced to believe in the professions of Rome, and *make advances towards her*, as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation.”<sup>24</sup> With reference to the doctrine of Purgatory it is said, “it may be shown that its existence is owing to a like indulgence of *human reason*, and of private judgment upon Scripture, *in default of Catholic tradition*.”<sup>25</sup> “There have been ages of the world in which men have thought too much of *Angels*, and paid them excessive honour; honoured them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty God. This is the sin of a *dark age*.”<sup>26</sup> “We believe” that Popery is “*a perversion or corruption of the truth*.”<sup>27</sup> “We are restrained by many reasons from such invocations [of Saints]. . . . First, because the practice was not *primitive* . . . ; next, because we are told to pray to God only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then become idolatrous.”<sup>28</sup> “The present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public,

goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the blessed Trinity, it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the blessed Virgin and the Saints.”<sup>29</sup>

In fine, Mr. Keble has spoken of the “*exorbitant claims of Rome*”—its “undue claims, and *pernicious errors*”<sup>30</sup>—its “image worship and *similar corruptions* by authority.”<sup>31</sup> He remarks that “the reverence of the Latin Church for tradition” has been unscrupulously applied “to opinions and practices of a date comparatively recent”—that “had this rule (the exclusion of *novelty*) been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from *Transubstantiation* on the one hand, as from the denial of Christ’s real presence on the other.”<sup>32</sup>

There cannot then, I think, be any doubt in fair and reasonable minds, that the Tracts and their principal writers were opposed to the Romish system *on the whole*; and that they concurred in this with *Protestants*, and with the *Reformers* themselves. It is true, indeed, that individual writers may have made unwarrantable concessions to Romanism on *particular points*; and it is also true, that writers may not be willing to justify every particular expression which they may have employed against Romanism; that they may even have withdrawn language which seems to them to have been unnecessarily strong, offensive, &c.; but, after all, the general principle and spirit of the passages to which I have referred (and which might easily be multiplied) was *opposed to Rome and its corruptions*, and *favourable to the Reformation*.

The repeated and explicit avowals on these points; the anxiety which was evinced to disclaim the imputation of Romanizing tendencies, obtained for the Tracts and their authors the support or the toleration of a great and influential portion of the Church, which would otherwise have been withdrawn. We endured much of what we could not approve—exaggerated views of the independence of the Church; undue severity to the Reformers; too much praise of Romish offices; a depreciating tone in regard to our own; not to speak of views on “Sin after baptism,” the “doctrine of Reserve,”<sup>33</sup> and other points which were more than questionable: but we were satisfied that the imputation of Romanism was *really* unjust and unfounded; and therefore we could not assume any hostile position. Nor does it seem that any circumstance has yet occurred which should oblige Churchmen to alter their opinion of the general views and the intentions of the authors of the Tracts.

Within the last two or three years, however, a new School has made its appearance. The Church has unhappily had reason to feel the existence of a spirit of dissatisfaction with her principles, of enmity to her Reformers, of recklessness for her interests. We have seen in the same quarter a spirit of—almost *servility* and *adulation* to Rome, an enthusiastic and exaggerated praise of its merits, an appeal to all deep feelings and sympathies in its favour, a tendency to look to Rome as the model and the standard of all that is beautiful and correct in art, all that is sublime in

poetry, all that is elevated in devotion. So far has this system of adulation proceeded, that translations from Romish rituals, and “Devotions,” have been published, in which the very form of printing, and every other external peculiarity, have evinced an earnest desire for uniformity with Rome. Romish catechisms have been introduced, and formed the models for similar compositions. In conversation remarks have been sometimes heard, indicating a disposition to acknowledge the supremacy of the See of Rome, to give way to *all its claims* however extreme, to represent it as the conservative principle of religion and society in various ages; and in the same spirit, those who are in any way opposed to the highest pitch of Roman usurpations are sometimes looked on as little better than heretics. The Gallican and the Greek Churches are considered unsound in their opposition to the claims of Rome. The latter is held to be separated from *Catholic* unity.<sup>34</sup> The “See of St. Peter” is described as the centre of that unity; while our state of separation from it is regarded, not merely as an evil, but a sin—a cause of deep humiliation, *a judgment for our sins!* The blame of separation, of *schism*, is openly and unscrupulously laid on the English Church! Her reformers are denounced in the most vehement terms. Every unjust insinuation, every hostile construction of their conduct is indulged in; no allowance is made for their difficulties, no attempt is made to estimate the amount of errors which they had to oppose. Displeasure is felt and expressed in any attempts are made to expose the errors, corruptions, and idolatries, approved in the Roman communion. Invocation of saints is sanctioned in some quarters; purgatory is by no means unacceptable in others; images and crucifixes are purchased, and employed to aid in private devotion; celibacy of the clergy—auricular confession, are acknowledge to be obligatory. Besides this, intimacies are formed with Romanists, and visits are paid to Romish monasteries, colleges, and houses of worship. Romish controversialists are applauded and complimented; their works are eagerly purchased and studied; and contrasts are drawn between them and the defenders of the truth, to the disadvantage of the latter. The theory of development advocated in the writings of De Maistre and Möhler (Roman Catholic controversialists), according to which the *latest* form of Christianity is the most perfect, and the superstitions of the sixteenth or eighteenth century are preferable to the purity of the early ages, is openly sanctioned, advocated, avowed.<sup>35</sup> In fine, *menaces* are held out to the Church, that if the spirit which is thus evinced is not encouraged, if the Church of England is not “unprotestantized,” if the Reformation is not forsaken and condemned, it may become the duty of those who are already doubtful in their allegiance to the Anglo-Catholic communion, to declare themselves openly on the side of its enemies. I have no disposition to exaggerate the facts of the case; all who have had occasion to observe the progress of events will acknowledge the truth of what has been said. I would only add, that I hope and believe that the spirit which has been described is only to be found amongst a *very small section* of those who are

popularly connected with the advocates of Church principles. I believe it is no secret, that the authors of the Tracts (several of them at least), however they may think themselves obliged to tolerate such excesses, are embarrassed by them, and deplore their occurrence. I believe that the great body of their immediate friends concur in this feeling; and, most assuredly, the advocates of Church principles in general most strongly disapprove of the spirit which has now been described, and of the existence of which I am about to furnish detailed proofs.

I will not say that the writers of the Tracts have not been, in any degree, instrumental in drawing forth this spirit; I will not inquire how far it is traceable to the publication of Froude's *Remains*, and to the defence of his views contained in the Preface to the second series of the *Remains*: nor will I examine how far it may be a reaction against ultra-Protestantism: it is unnecessary now to enter on this painful and complicated question, on which different opinions may be entertained. One thing, at least, is most perfectly certain: it never was the *intention* of the advocates of Church principles to promote Romanism: they have always been persuaded that their principles do not, by any fair and legitimate reasoning, lead to that system, to which they have ever been conscientiously and firmly opposed; and I am persuaded that they will feel it a duty to offer to the Church every possible pledge of their attachment to her doctrines; that if their names have been employed to sanction any system which generates a spirit of dissatisfaction with the English Church, and tends to the revival of Romish errors and superstitions, they will adopt such measures as may be sufficient to mark their disapprobation of such a system, and their sense of its inconsistency with the principles which they maintain.

Before I proceed further in this painful task, let me, at once, disclaim any unfriendly feeling in regard to those whose opinions will come under consideration. However great and grievous may be our differences; however strong may be the feelings of sorrow, and even indignation, with which the friends of Church principles contemplate the aberrations of some brethren; yet I do most firmly and humbly trust, that those feelings are, and will be in no degree mingled with hostility to those brethren—that “our heart's desire” and our prayer will be for their spiritual and eternal welfare, and for the removal of those shadows, which have (we trust only for a time) fallen on their path. We will not forsake the hope, that if the indiscretions of youthful and ardent minds; if inability to cope with controversial difficulties; if a too great readiness to receive without examination any theory which may be plausibly advanced; if too great confidence in intellectual power, and in theological attainment, have in fact led to doubts and difficulties; to the unsettlement of principles; to language and conduct which has deeply shocked every sober-minded and orthodox believer; the time may not be far distant, when such evils may be buried in oblivion; and the objects of our present grief and apprehension may have retrieved that good opinion, which has unhappily been, to a certain extent, lost.

The proofs of the tendency to Romanism which I am about to produce, will be chiefly taken from the *British Critic*; but let me not be misunderstood as involving in such a charge, *all the writers* who have contributed to that periodical<sup>36</sup>. Many articles have appeared, which are perhaps *wholly* unexceptionable. Many others are only slightly tinged with objectionable principles. Even in the most Romanizing parts, there is frequently much which we cannot wholly disapprove. Still, there is a decided leaning *on the whole* to Romanism, and there is nothing *in opposition* to this tendency. Even the best articles present no *antidote* to the errors which are to be found elsewhere. They do not sufficiently restore the balance. They contain no refutation of Romish errors; no vindication of the opposite truths; no attempt to revive affection to the Church of England; or to defend her principles or her position. All is unhappily consistent *in fact*, and tends to one system only; though *positive evil* is not found in all the articles. Indeed the excellence of many of them, only renders the danger greater.

I am well aware that I may be exposed to the charge of unfairness in quoting isolated passages. Undoubtedly it is difficult to avoid occasional injustice in such cases; but we are absolutely without any other alternative, unless we were prepared to occupy a space altogether beyond reasonable bounds. I can only say, that I feel very confident, that no substantial injustice will be found in the following delineation.

With a view to obviate any mistakes or misconstructions, I would also premise, that the intention in adducing the following quotations, is only to exhibit *the general character and tendencies of the system*; and that no opinion is meant to be expressed, as to the extent or nature of the error or impropriety which exists in *each particular quotation*. It is unnecessary, and would require too much space, to enter on such a discussion. We need only establish the general character of the system.

I. The advocates of such a system cannot impute to us any want of *forbearance*: we have often privately protested against the principles developed in the *British Critic*; and yet the writers in that periodical have deliberately continued in their course, under the full and avowed consciousness that it is displeasing to the firmest friends of Church principles; and that it may be injurious to the Church of England. Thus, in the article of Bishop Jewell, in which the question “whether or not the English Reformers be trustworthy witnesses to *Catholic doctrine*” is determined in the *negative*, we find the following passage in reference to this question:—

If it be urged, on the other hand, that the very agitation of such a question is inexpedient, as tending to unsettle men’s minds, and to furnish matter of triumph to our opponents, we can only reply, “*Fiat justitia,*” &c. Or if, again, that the mere disposition to agitate it, can hardly be displayed, *without the risk of pain*ing, if

*not alienating, some of those whom one least wishes to hurt, and could little afford to lose, then we must close with the lesser of two evils, great as even that lesser is.*<sup>37</sup>

In a later number of the same periodical we find the following passage, which distinctly proves, that neither the advise of friends, nor the interests of the English Church, can restrain certain writers from pursuing their course:—

It is sometimes urged, and in quarters justly claiming our deep honour and respect, that those who feel the real unity in essentials existing among “high churchmen” in England, *do ill in troubling such unity by making various statements about other Churches which cannot but give offence.* But we answer, that it is not only among English “high churchmen,” but foreign Catholics also, that we recognize such essential unity. And on what single principle of Scripture or tradition can the position be maintained, to meet the objectors on their own ground, that the *unity of a national Church is the legitimate object of ultimate endeavour?* Both Scripture and antiquity are clamorous and earnest indeed in favour of unity of *the Church; but is the English Establishment the Church?* . . . If there *is* to be an armistice, let it be *on both sides*: if various highly-respected persons will agree never to *censure Rome*, it is plain they they will at least be doing their part in removing one reason which exists *for pointed and prominent descants in her praise.*<sup>38</sup>

Thus, then, our remonstrances are disregarded: the interests of the Church of England are avowedly set aside: it cannot, therefore, be any matter of surprise, if the friends of that Church, if the advocates of her principles, feel themselves obliged to disclaim any alliance, as to views and opinions, with those who have themselves proclaimed their alienation.

II. It is now admitted on all hands, that there is a tendency to Romanism in some quarters. The author of Tract 90 stated, that his object was to keep certain persons from “*straggling in the direction of Rome*”:<sup>39</sup> Dr. Pusey has written at some length on the “*acknowledged tendency* of certain individuals in our Church to Romanism.”<sup>40</sup> Difficult as it has been for Churchmen to realize to themselves the strange and almost incomprehensible fact, that any who had ever professed Church principles should have a tendency to Romanism, they have been gradually and reluctantly compelled to admit the lamentable truth. Actual secessions from the Church, few indeed, but yet sufficiently alarming; a change of tone in private society;

and above all, the doctrine continually and systematically advanced in the *British Critic*, can leave no further doubt of the existence of the evil. That evil has been distinctly perceived for more than two years by some friends of Church principles, who have been withheld from taking any decided and open step in opposition, by apprehension lest such a proceeding might have the effect of precipitating events which they would deeply deplore. It seems, however, that there is *more danger* in continuing silent, when we perceive the increasing dissemination of most erroneous and decidedly Romanizing views, under the assumed name of Church principles, and when the advocates of those principles are universally *identified* with doctrines and practices which they most strongly disapprove.

The *British Critic* has for two years been under the influence of those who are *uncertain in their allegiance to the Church of England*,<sup>41</sup> and who cannot be considered as friendly to her. Of this assertion it is but too easy to bring abundant proof. I shall select a few passages from the successive numbers of this periodical.

In the Article on Bishop Jewell, the Reformation is described as “a *desperate* remedy,” nay, almost “a *fearful judgment*.”<sup>42</sup> Bishop Jewell, who is represented “as a *very unexceptionable specimen* of an English Reformer,”<sup>43</sup> is condemned as a heretic.<sup>44</sup> We are openly advised to “withdraw our confidence” from the English Reformers.<sup>45</sup>

“To call the earlier Reformers *martyrs* is [we are told] to beg the question, which of course Protestants do not consider a question; but which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can for a moment think of conceding to them, viz., whether that for which these persons suffered was ‘*the truth*.’”<sup>46</sup> “Were the Church of England to be considered as in any degree pledged to the private opinions or individual acts of her *so-called Reformers* . . . one does not see how in that case persons who feel with Mr. Froude’s Editors . . . *could consistently remain of a communion so fettered*. Mr. Froude’s Editors have thrown out a rope which, *whether trustworthy or not*, is at all events *the only conceivable means of escape for persons in a very embarrassing position*; and for this act of kindness they deserve our thanks, *however we may pause*, as is very natural, and even prudent, before availing ourselves of the proffered aid. The *question* then is this; viz. How persons cordially believing that the *Protestant* tone of thought and doctrine is essentially *Antichristian* . . . *can consistently adhere to a communion* which has been made such as it is, in contradistinction from other portions of the Catholic Church, chiefly through the instrumentality of persons *disavowing the*

*judgment of Rome*, not merely in this or that particular, but in its general view of Christian truth.”<sup>47</sup>

The solution of this difficulty proposed is the view lately advanced by a “Party which may be considered as represented in the Preface to the Second Part of Mr. Froude’s *Remains*,” that the doctrines of the English Reformers may be separated from those of our formularies.<sup>48</sup> It seems that this solution does not afford satisfaction: “One advantage, amongst others, of such a view *if it will but hold*,” &c. So that, in fine, the reader is left *in doubt* whether there is any sort of justification for his remaining in the communion of the English Church! The party which thus avows the uncertainty of its allegiance to our communion, announces, at the same time, what is to be the mode of its operations as long as that communion is not renounced.

It ought not to be for nothing; no, nor for anything short of some vital truth . . . that persons of name and influence should venture upon the part of “ecclesiastical agitators” . . . . An object thus momentous we believe to be the *unprotestantizing* (to use an offensive but forcible word) of the National Church. . . . It is absolutely necessary towards the consistency of the system which certain parties are labouring to restore, *that truths should be clearly stated which as yet have been but intimated, and others developed which are now but in germ. And as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principle, if any such there be, of the English Reformation.*<sup>49</sup>

This open avowal of a determination to agitate with a view to alter the character of the Church of England, and to recede from the principles of the Reformation, proves the existence of designs to which every Churchman is bound to offer his strenuous opposition. But I proceed to further proofs of dissatisfaction with the Church.

In a subsequent number of the same periodical we have the following expressions introduced by a quotation from the Romish controversialist Möhler, comprising the doctrine of development.

This state of things [the development of doctrine in the Catholic Church united in communion] has come to an end. The Church has broken off visible united and divided against herself; *no one branch* [not even the English Church!] *retains the faithful image of primitive doctrine* . . . . That no branch has yet *forfeited*

the power of communicating the gifts of grace, this we humbly *trust*; but . . . in vain will the humble and teachable disciple look at this moment in the ENGLISH CHURCH for one uniform pervading spirit which may guide him in his religious course. . . . To refer inquirers to *primitive tradition*, essential though it be, is far from being all that is wanted.<sup>50</sup>

In this distress, the English Church being pronounced inadequate to satisfy our wants, our only recourse, it seems must be, “to make ourselves *in heart* a Catholic Church, to cling *anxiously* to the marks of the Holy Ghost *wherever* we can find them.”<sup>51</sup> We are reminded, that the especial note which would attach certain minds, “the image of a true Christian Church living in that apostolic awe and strictness which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of Christ, *is the very one which is now most signally wanting*”<sup>52</sup> amongst us.

The cause of the Church is, without scruple, sacrificed, whenever certain theories seem to require it. Thus we have in one place a series of arguments to prove that *Scripture in its more obvious meaning is favourable to the objections of Dissenters and other Protestants* against rites and ceremonies and the ecclesiastical system in general; the object being to show, that the private and unbiased interpretation of the Bible is dangerous and mischievous.<sup>53</sup> I cannot but think that sufficient arguments may be adduced against the abuses of private judgment, without *pleading the cause of Dissenters*.<sup>54</sup>

On a subsequent occasion, the Church of England is charged with

A “*sort of Antinomianism*,” i.e. an establishment or creed, the means of grace *necessary* to salvation, and some formularies for the most important occasions, *without* a system of religious customs and practices, and acts of faith, sufficiently numerous, distinct, and specific, *to satisfy the wants and engage the attention of the Christian soul*.<sup>55</sup>

We are informed, that

The *last remnants of the ancient Catholic system*, with all its native good as well as its engrafted evil, had been withdrawn [in the English Church], and . . . *the glorious privilege of teaching and training the elect to Christian perfection was taken away from the Church*.<sup>56</sup>

It seems difficult, if this be the case, to suppose that the English forms any part of the Christian Church.

The question of actual separation from our communion and adhesion to that of Rome, would seem to be as yet *undecided*: an opinion is very guardedly expressed, that *at present* such steps are not to be taken by *individuals*. The Romanists, it is said,

Seem almost to rejoice more over the accessions to their number, caused by mere argument, or mere imagination, *than over all the indications, now so general, of reviving earnestness, which* (we are arguing with them all along *on their own principles*) *would seem to promise, in due time, a far more plentiful, and incomparably more valuable reinforcement. . . .* The very proximity of doctrine between the English and Roman Churches . . . must the more make it *a matter for grave and mature deliberation, before a decisive step is taken*. We repeat, we are speaking *ad homines*; our own opinion, as we have before expressed, is, that *individuals* would, *at present*, act (*in the abstract*) quite unwarrantably in leaving us for Rome.<sup>57</sup>

III. Let us contrast with this systematic disparagement of the Church of England, these avowed difficulties in continuing communion with her, the equally systematic and unscrupulous approbation and adoption of Romish doctrines and practices; their identification with *Catholicism*, the terms in which the See of Rome is mentioned, the disposition to make common cause with it, even against the more moderate of its own adherents.

We talk of the blessings of “emancipation from the Papal yoke,” and use other phrases of a like *bold and undutiful tenour* . . .<sup>58</sup> We trust, of course, that active and visible union with *the See of Rome* is not of the essence of the Church; at the same time we are deeply conscious that in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a great privilege.<sup>59</sup>

*The lights of the Church* in the middle age, *Hildebrand, Becket, Innocent* . . .<sup>60</sup> [these being the chief supporters of exaggerated views of the Papal authority].

The monastic system, and the superior sanctity of the Roman Church, are advocated in the following terms:—

Is it visionary to expect, that he who leads the life *most nearly of all earthly things resembling the divine* [i.e. the monastic life] shall have truer sympathy with, and so fuller understanding of *words that are divine?* [i.e. Christian doctrine] . . . Let it be observed whether those who are so loud in their protests on the *uselessness* of a life of seclusion, believe in *any true sense the efficacy of intercessory prayer*. . . . Is it the active *Protestant* or the contemplative *Catholic* who has sent forth *the sisters of Charity and Mercy, the devoted priest, the zealous missionary?* Let not the question then be ruled on the *Protestant* side, till something be done to make both reasoning and fact *less exclusively on the Catholic*<sup>61</sup> [the latter being evidently the *Roman Catholic*].

The following note is appended:—

It is far from our wish to *disparage* the efforts of Protestant missionaries, many of whom deserve our deep reverence and gratitude; still let the long quotation made by Mr. Oakeley from the *Eclectic Review* (the organ of a class of dissenters), in the Preface to his *Whitehall Sermons*, be well considered. . . . We are free to confess, that for zeal, and entire devotedness to their object, we know of few missionaries that surpass, or *indeed at all equal*, those of the Romish Church.<sup>62</sup>

Amongst other evidences of a “holy life” which are held up to our admiration, in the case of La Mère Angélique, are, “prayer before the Sacrament, as soon as the perpetual adoration [of the Eucharist] was instituted at Port-Royal”;<sup>63</sup> the use of “shirts of hemp, in which the splinters of the stalks were left”; the harbouring of vermin; the use of “disgusting” food.<sup>64</sup> It is held questionable, whether some saints have not been “even marked externally by the semblance of *the five adorable wounds*.”<sup>65</sup> We are left in doubt, whether the healing of a young lady by *a thorn*, “said to have been one of those that pierced our Saviour,” was miraculous or not. It is argued, however, that one would naturally look for such miraculous events in *monasteries*, “where persons take the kingdom of heaven by violence, *and begin on earth the life of angels*, ‘neither marrying nor giving in marriage.’”<sup>66</sup>

Such passages as the following speak for themselves:—

The idea that to a Christian believing all the astounding mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the incarnation

the further belief in the real presence, *even to the extent of the Tridentine definition*, is a serious additional tax on his credulity, is not tenable for one moment.<sup>67</sup>

The Pope is spoken of as “*the Primate of Christendom*,”<sup>68</sup> as “that pontiff, whom, *to say the least*, all antiquity, with one voice pronounced the first bishop in Christendom.”<sup>69</sup> We are reminded of the “*surprising number of texts to which Bellarmine appeals*” in favour of *Purgatory*.<sup>70</sup> In allusion to pilgrimages, and the anniversary “*on a firm belief, that devotions paid in particular places had a special efficacy about them*,” we have this remark:—

So natural is this feeling that it is really wonderful how it has been possible so thoroughly to root it out of the English mind. Cruel and hard-hearted indeed were those who made *the baneful attempt*, and have gained *such a mournful victory*. . . . *Processions and pilgrimages are useful*, [&c.]. . . . It is a mere fact . . . that the peasant does find consolation in praying at places hallowed by the devotions of former generations. Let them at least enjoy the delusion, say benevolent persons; *the prayers of the saint* may have no power to save her child, but still the mother may as well fancy that they have, . . . [&c.].<sup>71</sup>

With reference to the Papacy we have the following:—

“[The Pope is] *the earthly representative of her* [the Church’s] Divine Head. . . .”<sup>72</sup>

“The Holy See [is] *the proper medium of communion with the Catholic Church*. . . .”

“*The Church* suffered also in the person of *its head*, Pius VI. . . .”

“Many persons about [Napoleon] are known to have urged him to set up a Gallican Church without communion with the rest of Christendom. With that strange instinct, however, which extraordinary men possess, he rejected the idea; he would have his Church *Catholic* . . . and the notion of *a Catholic Church out of communion with Rome* does not seem to have struck him. . . . *From Rome alone* could the despot obtain possession of *the heavenly powers* of which he wished to make use. . . .”<sup>73</sup>

It is intimated that the *Papal excommunication* of Napoleon was amongst the principal causes of his ruin:—

This little act of the Pope is almost imperceptible; but who knows *what unseen powers* fought with England against him whom *the Church had condemned?*<sup>74</sup>

It is contended, that our *Reformation* was in spirit *Calvinistic*; that a *noble* episcopate reclaimed us from Calvinism; and that this episcopate was *inclined to a union with Rome*.<sup>75</sup> Whatever may be the foundation for such a statement, I cannot but think, that the object for which it is advanced, namely, the justification of an attempt to alter the doctrine of the English Church, and to assimilate it to Romanism, renders it most highly reprehensible.

Romanism is thus identified with Catholicism:—

The exemption by special gift from venial sin is believed by *most Catholics* to be a privilege appertaining to the Blessed Virgin. . . . We must *abandon* either this pious belief, *and the religious devotion to the Theotokos*<sup>76</sup> *connected with it*, or the heresy advocated by Dr. Whately.<sup>77</sup>

[We are informed that Rome is] she to whom we should *naturally turn*, our *Mother in the Faith* . . . [and reminded of] that feeling of regard and affection (*we should rather say deep gratitude and veneration*) which is her due.<sup>78</sup>

I must abstain from multiplying proofs of a tendency, which is but too evident.<sup>79</sup>

There are, however, some important principles of the writers in question, to which attention must be drawn.

IV. The principles to which I allude are of the most wide and comprehensive character, and tend to the restoration of Romanism in its fullest extent, and the total subversion of the Reformation.

1. The doctrine of *development* (derived from the writings of De Maistre and Möhler, in which it is employed for the defence of Romanism) has been received without hesitation, and is now both privately and publicly advocated. Romish controversialists have, within the last few years, devised this mode of evading the objection which is founded on *the silence of primitive tradition*, in regard to the papal supremacy, the worship of Saints and Angels, and other Romish doctrines and practices; or on *its actual opposition* to Rome in such points. For a long time Romanists evaded this difficulty, by alleging the existence of *unwritten tradition in the living Church*, as a sufficient proof of the apostolic origin of the points in

question. The uncertainty of such tradition being sufficiently apparent, they next resorted to the principle of *Reserve*, or the *Disciplina Arcani*, which accounted for the silence and apparent opposition of antiquity, by pretending that the Fathers systematically *abstained* from the mention of certain doctrines and practices, either through reverence, or from the fear of misapprehension. The weakness of this system having been demonstrated, the modern defenders of Romanism have adopted a new theory, which is essentially opposed to those of their predecessors. They have adopted the bold expedient of *avowing* that their doctrines receive but little aid from the testimony of primitive antiquity—that in fact, the each Church was perhaps *unacquainted* with those doctrines, since it is the nature of Christianity *to develop itself gradually* in the course of ages, and under change of circumstances; so that Christianity in the *middle ages*, was more perfectly developed than in the primitive times: it was the expansion of a system which existed at first, merely *in germ*; and probably, on the same principle, the *existing system* of the Roman Catholic Church may be still more perfect than that of the middle ages, and be itself less perfect than that which is to be hereafter.

Undoubtedly there is much in this theory which is pleasing to the imagination. The notion that Religion—that Divine truth, is capable of continual progress; that we may look for developments corresponding to the advance of art and science, and analogous to the processes of change which we see operating in the natural world around us, has very great temptations to the human mind. That it has, we need no further proof than the fact that this theory is upheld by Socinians and other Rationalists; the principal difference between their system and that of the philosophical Romanists above alluded to, being, that the latter attribute to the Church that office of development which the former assign to the reason of individuals. This is not the only affinity between the systems: it is the well-known tendency of Rationalism to disregard the sentiments of former ages; to esteem itself superior in knowledge to the primitive Church. Now the doctrine of development has the same tendencies; it leads to the conclusion, that the religion of the present day is more perfect than that of the early Church: it teaches us so far *to set aside the testimony of Catholic antiquity*, on pretence, that religion was then but imperfectly understood.

But on what ground is this theory maintained? It would seem to be a *merely philosophical theory* (it was devised by Kant), based on analogies in nature, which have no necessary connexion with Revelation.<sup>80</sup> Scripture does not announce any gradual development of Christian truth: it speaks of “the faith *once* delivered to the Saints”; of delivering “the *whole counsel* of God”; it supposes throughout that “all truth” was made known to the Apostles, and by them to the Church. The principle of the Church has always been, *to hand down and bear witness to the Catholic verities which she received from the Apostles*, and not to argue, to develop, to

invent. Her decisions are but the expressions of the belief which she has always entertained. Such, at least, is the *principle* which she has always avowed; and which has hitherto been asserted by Romanists themselves. On *novelties*—on doctrines or practices, either unsupported by the evidence of Scripture and Antiquity, or inconsistent with them, the Church has always looked with jealousy and suspicion. It would seem that those who uphold the theory of development, are rather inconsistent in regarding *Mediæval Christianity* as the model of perfection, whereas, according to their principle, the system of the Roman Church *at the present day* ought to be implicitly adopted.

That *Theology* is capable of development in a certain sense; that Reason under the guidance of Faith, may do much to systematize, harmonize, illustrate; and that lawful and edifying practices may be introduced by the Church in different ages, is quite certain.

I am not prepared to say, that *inferences* may not be legitimately deduced from Scripture, and that such inferences or “developments” can never be matters of faith.<sup>81</sup> Nor, of course, would it be possible to maintain that inferences may not have been *gradually* made in the course of ages; but there is certainly danger in theorizing on this important subject without sufficient care and discrimination. There is the more necessity for caution, because it would seem that various doctrines and theories are, at present, comprehended under the common term of “Development.” The term is variously employed in the sense of “practical application”; “inference”; “expansion”; “detailed statement”; and of course such various uses of the term naturally lead to confusion. If I may be permitted to express a doubt on the subject, I would say, with deference to better judgments, that it is questionable whether an eminent writer has sufficiently distinguished between different theories and notions in his recent view of the doctrine.<sup>82</sup> In advocating in general the propriety of making developments or dogmatic inferences and statements under the Gospel, it seems that attention is not sufficiently drawn to the different senses in which the right of development is contended for, and to the great practical distinctions which exist between developments in those different senses. That there is such a difference is indeed evident. “Ideas and their developments,” it is said, “are not *identical*, the development being but the carrying out of the idea into its *consequences*. Thus the doctrine of Penance may be called a development of the doctrine of Baptism, yet still it is a *distinct doctrine*; whereas the developments in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation are *mere portions of the original impression, and modes of representing it, &c.*”<sup>83</sup> Thus, then, there are “developments” which are mere *expressions* of Revelation. There is a wide and essential difference between these things. The former need not be, properly speaking, articles of Revelation or Faith: they may be theological truths: they may not have been deduced in the primitive ages; they need not be articles of Catholic Faith. The latter have been at all times held

substantially by the Church; they are comprised in Scripture, if not literally, yet in its spirit and meaning; they are mere *expressions of quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus creditum est*;<sup>84</sup> they can only be novel in form; they are in spirit and life identical with “the Faith once delivered to the Saints.” The “numerical Unity of the Divine Nature,” or the doctrine of “the Double Procession,” may not have been defined by any *Council* till the thirteenth century,<sup>85</sup> but certainly those doctrines are really, in their orthodox sense, comprised in the true meaning of Holy Scripture; and the testimony of Christian antiquity is sufficient to prove that the Church was never ignorant of them. These Catholic doctrines, and others included in the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, should not be confounded with mere theological dogmas deduced from the truths of Revelation by the action of reason; lest in advocating both on the same principles and in the same mode, the Faith should be in danger of being mingled with the doctrines of men.<sup>86</sup>

The doctrine of the Discourse alluded to, would appear simply to maintain the *possibility* of developments, in the sense of “clearer statements,” and “inferences,” being made in the course of ages. But there is *another doctrine* afloat on the subject; and it were to have been wished that the eminent writer above mentioned had taken some notice of a view, which is undoubtedly prevalent in some quarters. It is, in short, maintained [by Newman ultimately] that the Christian Revelation may be compared to a plant which only gradually attains its perfection; and further, it is conceived, that, in point of fact, all the additions and innovations in doctrine and practice made during the middle ages, *were not corruptions, but developments*—that *e.g.* the Papal power; Transubstantiation; Purgatory; Indulgences; the worship of Images, the Virgin, and the Saints, &c., are certainly or (at least) not improbably, *developments* of Christianity. If you urge the *silence* of Scripture, or of the Fathers and Councils; or their apparent *inconsistency* with Romish doctrines or practices, the reply is at hand:—“The doctrines or practices in question were not *developed* during those ages.” Thus it is continually *assumed* that Romanism is the development of Christianity; and this assumption apparently rests on the further assumption, that whatever is extensively prevalent in the Church—whatever is allowed or tolerated by her authorities, *cannot be a corruption*.<sup>87</sup>

I cannot now discuss this very extensive subject. It will have been sufficient to have directed attention to the dangerous theories which are afloat. It is not easy to see what may be the termination of such theories. Romanism may not be the only eventual gainer from that theory of Christianity, which supposes it to have existed originally *in germ* only. There is a subtle Rationalism in such a notion; nay, something still worse, if possible. If the Gospel is to be developed by reason; if its lineaments are to be filled up by the human mind; if it was originally *imperfect*; is there not some danger of supposing that, after all, it is only a philosophy of science, a creation of the intellect? And again, if its processes are analogous to those which

we see in nature, may not the inference be drawn that, like them, it has its period of decay as well as perfection; of extinction as well as of germination? A germ infers growth, indeed, and change, but it also infers *corruption and death*. On this principle, may not the corruption of religion be considered a law of Divine Providence? so that those who regard the Reformation as an *evil*, may be, after all, only opposing such a law; and, in fine, may not Revelation itself be supposed to have concluded its course—to have lost its vitality? I see not how, when men once begin to theorize on the development of the Christian religion, they are to prevent such speculations, or to answer them. They may discover, too late, that a philosophy which has commenced its speculations in the service of Romanism, may have found its legitimate conclusion in Rationalism, or in St. Simonianism. [Philosophy, in fact, recognizes a *negative* development which gets rid of the Christian faith by degrees.]

I have been lately informed, that the philosophy of development is taking new and ominous forms in Germany. An eminent philosopher has applied it to the doctrine of the Trinity; Duality being supposed to be the development of Unity, and Trinity that of Duality; and really one does not see what is to prevent speculative men from conceiving that Polytheism may be only the development of Monotheism. In point of fact, doctrines more or less nearly allied to this, are to be found in the theological and philosophical systems of Brahmanism and other oriental systems of idolatry. Nor is there apparently any stronger presumption that the corruptions of Romanism are developments of primitive Christianity, than that the systems of ancient and modern Paganism are developments of the primitive religion of the world. I cannot therefore but feel and express the deepest uneasiness at the introduction of theories which may lead to incalculable evils.

The theory of development has been repeatedly put forth in the *British Critic* within the last two years, though not to its full extent. The works of Möhler indeed and De Maistre, in which it is employed in defence of Romanism, are favourite authorities with this periodical. The following passage from the former writer is quoted immediately after the announcement, that the “French translation . . . *has just come to hand*:”<sup>88</sup>—

The identity of the Church’s knowledge at different epochs of its existence, in no way requires a mechanical and stationary uniformity. . . . This knowledge develops itself, this life extends more and more widely, becomes more and more precise, clearer; the Church attains the age of manhood. . . . Tradition then contains within itself the successive *developments* of the principal germs of life. . . . This development . . . arrives at maturity at the period of the great Councils of the Church.<sup>89</sup>

This theory is adopted, and referred to again and again.<sup>90</sup> But whatever may be the real views of some of the writers in that periodical, we do not find them *directly maintaining* that Romanism *actually is* the development of Christianity. They are contented to hint that such *may be the case*. It is *only* suggested that the whole *Mediæval system, the Papal power in its full extent, the worship of Saints and of the Virgin, the doctrine of Purgatory, &c.*, are *developments* of primitive Christianity, and have the same claims on our “unqualified sympathy.”

How painful a reflection to any one, who has imbibed so much of the Catholic spirit, as to burn for union with all those who so much as bear the name of Christ . . . that all this agreement [in great matters] is felt as yet to give no sufficient scope for genuine, hearty, unsuspecting sympathy, from the vivid perception we have of mutual differences, on points which, if less fundamental, are unhappily felt as even more obtrusive and (in a sense) practical! . . . These differences . . . are doctrinally perhaps reducible to this question; viz. *how far does the Mediæval Church demand our unqualified sympathy?* How far may it be considered as the very same in its claims upon us with the earlier Church, as being the external exhibition of the very same spirit, changed only in that it is in a further state of growth, and that the external circumstances with which it has to cope are so widely different? And in speaking of the Mediæval Church’s exhibition, we are far of course from continuing our view to the mere formal statements of doctrine made at that period; we extend it to *the whole system*, which virtually received the Church’s sanction: though on the other hand we may equally claim to consider that system apart from incidental, local, temporary, or popular corruptions. . . .

It may be, that while our mind is fixed on high doctrines and primitive faith, and occupied with nothing less than our present divisions—it may be that God will reveal even this unto us; that *many questions connected with later ages*, may present themselves in new, and (as we shall then understand) far clearer colours. How far the special prerogatives, attached from the very first to the *Roman See*, would prepare us for the circumstance as healthy, and natural, and designed by God’s Providence, that when the Church’s dependence on the civil power, which succeeded to its state of depression and mutual isolation should in its turn give way to the period of its independent action, that at such time, St. Peter’s chair *should obtain an unprecedented and*

*peculiar authority*: or how far the honour (to modern notions most superstitious and extravagant) paid in early time to martyrs, marks the existence of a principle, which, when the special ages of martyrdom have passed, would display itself in honour of a different kind . . . *to Saints generally and to the Mother of God*: or how far the idea, universally prevalent in the early Church, on some unknown suffering to be undergone between death and final bliss, would have its legitimate issued in the doctrine . . . at the time of the Council of Florence [*Purgatory*]; or what light the primitive view of *celibacy* would throw on later periods: or what light is thrown on the general question of doctrinal *development* . . . these are questions which [depend on knowledge of Church history].<sup>91</sup>

In private society, however, the doctrine of development is more openly advocated, and carried out to its results. There are individuals who on this principle look on the Papal supremacy, the invocation of Saints, &c., as divinely instituted.

2. In perfect harmony with this theory, is the unwillingness to permit any censure or disapprobation of “Romish corruptions,” or to allow their existence.<sup>92</sup> The religion of the middle ages is represented as being in essential respects superior to our own.<sup>93</sup> With reference to the worship of saints and angels, it is said:

Till we not only come to believe, but in some measure to *realize* these solemn truths [the belief in guardian-angels, &c.], and make them part of our *habitual thoughts, of our whole spiritual nature*, we are no fair judges of their corruptions as existing in other churches. We have no wish to apologize for superstition or idolatry; but if we having only so recently recovered . . . these truths, go out of our way unnecessarily to pass judgment on their *practical action, &c.* . . . will not Matt. vii. 5 [“Thou hypocrite!” &c.] rise up against us in judgment at the last day.<sup>94</sup>

In another place those who profess “high church” principles are requested to abstain from severe condemnation of the mediæval system, on the following view:

That many doctrines and practices were then sanctioned, *very alien to the system in which he [a Churchman] was trained, and far from congenial to his own mind*, of this such a person may be well aware; and as this is quite sufficient to guide his own

practice, so surely it is all which *charity* can altogether justify him in maintaining.<sup>95</sup>

We are, then, to content ourselves with abstaining from what we think superstitious or idolatrous, and to permit others without warning to embrace such practices. This seems a new view of Christian charity!

3. One legitimate conclusion of the theory of development appears to be arrived at in the last number of the *British Critic*, from which it would seem that Rome *as she is* should be our actual model in religion. The class of doctrines which are included under the term “sacramental mediation,” are, it seems, recognized only in theory in the Church of England, but—

This whole view, thus distinctly recognized by our Church in theory, thus *wholly abandoned in practice*, has been preserved *abroad in practice*, as well as in theory. We are absolutely driven then, were we ever so averse, *to consider Rome in its degree our model*, for we are met *in limine* by objections derived from the witnessed effect of these doctrines in Roman Catholic countries.<sup>96</sup>

Why such objections oblige us to make Rome our *model* seems difficult to perceive. One would think that sufficient light might be derived from the practice of *antiquity*, and of the Oriental church, without constituting Rome *our model*, as is now done habitually by certain persons.

4. The last principle to which I shall direct attention is, that *Roman Catholics* may subscribe the Articles, provided they do not hold the Pope to be, *de jure*, the primate of Christendom. I do not here adduce Tract 90, because it would seem that the leading object of the writer was to show that *Catholic* doctrines—the doctrines of the Fathers and the Primitive Church, or private opinions not inconsistent with faith, are not condemned in the Articles; and I should conceive that in contending for a “Catholic,” he did not mean to suggest a “*Roman Catholic*” interpretation of the Articles, though certainly some of the expositions in Tract 90 had a tendency of that kind: but other persons seem evidently to have adopted this course. The *British Critic* holds that—

The fact seems highly probable, as a matter of history, that in the construction of the *Articles*, an eye was had to the comprehension of all *Roman Catholics except only those who maintained the Pope to be de jure the Primate of Christendom*.<sup>97</sup>

And accordingly we are informed that—

Mr. —'s "Observations on Tract 90," and "Collection of Testimonies," are a very important step towards settling the question of *Catholic* subscription to the Articles. He proves historically, that the Articles were not designed to exclude *Roman Catholics*, who signed generally, without being taxed with insincerity for so doing,<sup>98</sup> &c.

Those who are thus continually labouring to *write up* the Church of Rome, and to disseminate doubts and objections against the English Church, its Reformation, its doctrines, articles, liturgies, apostolical succession; those who are thus undermining in every way the Church, and preparing the way for secession from its communion—are either in doubt as to the propriety of remaining within its pale, or they are not. If they are not in doubt, they have either made up their minds that it is a matter of duty to remain in the English Church, or else to unite themselves with the Roman Communion: no other alternative can be supposed. Now let us consider how far the line of conduct which has been pursued by the *British Critic*, and by the individuals to whom I allude, can be justified under either of these alternatives.

1. If they are in *doubt* whether they ought to remain in the communion of the English Church or not, then it is inexcusable, nay *sinful*, to promulgate doubts and difficulties, and to assume such a tone in regard to Rome, as has a manifest tendency to unsettle faith in the Church of England, when it is still *uncertain* at least whether she is not a true Church. If it be possible that our duty is due to her, it is surely inconsistent in us to let fall a single expression which may have a tendency in the slightest degree to place a stumbling-block in the way of discharging that duty. I cannot conceive a greater pain than the feeling that we have been instrumental in raising doubts, when doubts ought not to have existed; when our own infirmity of judgment, and our own want of knowledge, were alone to blame. If any man entertain *doubts* in regard to the Church of England, he is bound in conscience to seek silently for the solution of those doubts; to cease from writing or speaking on subjects in which his own opinions are *unsettled*. No one deserves any blame for being in doubt on religious questions, unless, indeed, that doubt has arisen from too great confidence in his own powers, or from some other moral fault; but it is really inexcusable in any man, who is himself involved in the perplexities and dangers of doubts in religion, *to publish those doubts to the world*—to involve others in his own dangers and temptations.

2. If men are satisfied that it is a matter of duty to remain in the English Church, then I say, that it is wholly inconsistent with that duty to excite a spirit of doubt and dissatisfaction in the Church, and to tempt its members, in every possible way, to

secede from its communion. Nothing can be more inconsistent than the practice of disregarding its authorities, encouraging disobedience and disrespect to its prelates, and discontent with the Church itself, as if the great mass of its members were engaged in measures hostile to the true faith. It is sinful even to contemplate the possibility of voluntarily separating from the Church under circumstances of persecution or obloquy. Notions of this kind tend to diminish the horror which every Catholic should feel at the very notion of schism.

3. If there be any who are secretly convinced of the duty of uniting themselves to Rome, and who are waiting the moment to declare themselves, while in the mean time they are labouring to insinuate their own persuasion amongst the duped and blinded members of the English Church—No—I will not believe that such disgraceful and detestable treachery and hypocrisy can exist in any one who has ever partaken of sacramental privileges in the Church of England. However appearances may seem to justify such a belief, I cannot for a moment entertain the notion of such revolting iniquity:—and yet it is impossible to offer any reasonable answer to those who suspect that there are individuals who remain in the Church, only with a view to instil doctrines which would otherwise be without influence—to gather adherents who would otherwise be safe from temptation.

Under no conceivable circumstances, then, can the tone adopted by the *British Critic*, since it passed from the editorship of Mr. Newman in 1841, be excused. I confess my surprise that this periodical has so long been permitted to continue in the same course. I can only say, that I have felt it a painful duty to discontinue subscribing to it; and I sincerely hope that some change may be effected in its management, which may have the effect of relieving anxieties, and of restoring confidence in the principles of a Review, which was formerly a respectable and useful organ of the Church of England, but which can certainly no longer justly claim that character. I deeply regret the necessity which exists for speaking thus strongly and severely. Occasional errors of judgment, such as we saw in the Tracts, may be excusable; but when the mistake is perpetuated; when it is canonized, and propagated, and multiplied from day to day, the evil becomes intolerable, and calls for the public disapprobation of Churchmen. The admission of such articles as that on “Bishop Jewell” into the *British Critic*, the tone and principles of that periodical in general, and the measures of the party which it represents, have compelled me to break silence at length, and to state my dissent from their views; and I am deeply thankful to be enabled to add, that all the advocates of Church principles with whom I have been able to communicate, concur in disclaiming the doctrines of the *British Critic*.

In dissenting from these views and principles, we are only refusing to abandon the position which all sound and consistent Churchmen have hitherto maintained. When we associated ten years since in defence of the Church of England, in

vindication of her orthodox and primitive principles, we had already satisfied ourselves that this Church is justified in holding her course apart from Romish corruptions. We were not about to *settle our opinions* on such points. We were not about to put the Church of England on her trial. We were, and I trust still are, conscientiously and devotedly attached to her communion; and we have always esteemed it our glory that her belief is in accordance with *Scripture*, and with *Catholic and primitive antiquity*. The doctrine and practice of *Rome* are not our model or our standard; and we are resolved, with God's aid, to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and to be in bondage to no man. Such, I am persuaded, are the principles of the body of Churchmen; such seem to me to have been the principles even of the *Tracts for the Times* in general; and those who now admit the Papal supremacy, the worship of saints and angels, purgatory, and certain theories of development, really hold views as inconsistent with those Tracts, as with the sentiments of the great body of Churchmen.

I should not speak thus, had I not ascertained the sentiments of many influential friends of Church principles who have looked with pain and uneasiness on the course of events for the last two or three years. Their opinions ought no longer to be misunderstood. Their cause should no longer be mingled with doctrines and practices alien to it. It rests with them to dispel the illusion.

The *only* difficulty with which those who uphold Church principles have had to contend, is the imputation of a tendency to popery. The continual *assertion* of our opponents of all kinds has been, that Romanism is the legitimate conclusion of our principles. Romanists, Dissenters, Latitudinarians, and many others have reiterated the assertion, till the world is nearly persuaded of its truth. But what can we say—what defence can be made, when it is undeniable that Romanism, *in its very fullest extent*, has advocates amongst ourselves; that they have influence in the *British Critic*; that they are on terms of intimacy and confidence with leading men, that no public protest is entered against their proceedings by the advocates of Church principles? It is a conviction of the necessity of making some attempt, however feeble, to arrest an intolerable evil, which has induced me to publish this narrative of our proceedings, and these records of our principles and views. They are written under the apprehension that the dangers which now threaten us, are not inferior to those which surrounded the Church in 1833; that the tendency to latitudinarianism has been replaced by a different, but not less dangerous tendency; while the spirit of disaffection to the Church has only taken a new form. It seems therefore a plain duty to hold out some warning to those who might be in danger of being deceived.

## Notes

1. *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*: “literally, *the article of the standing and falling of the church*; i.e., the article of Christian doctrine necessary to the life and perpetuation of the church” (Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985], 46). *Ed.*

2. I would not be understood to deny that passages may be pointed out, in which we do not perceive that *firmness of tone* which ought to have been maintained.

3. No. 15, p. 4.

4. *Ib.* p. 5.

5. *Ib.* p. 11.

6. Vol. i. Advert. p. 5.

7. No. 20, p. 1.

8. *Ib.* p. 3.

9. *Ib.* p. 4.

10. No. 27, p. 2.

11. No. 38, p. 11.

12. Records of the Church, No. 24, p. 3.

13. No. 71, p. 9.

14. No. 75, p. 7.

15. *Ib.* p. 7, 9.

16. Pusey on Baptism, p. xiv.

17. *Ib.* xviii.

18. *Ib.* 201.

19. *Ib.* 2nd ed. p. 6.

20. Sermon on Nov. 5, p. 29.

21. *Ib.* p. 32.

22. Pusey’s Letter on Tract 90, p. 217.

23. Newman on Romanism, p. 47.

24. *Ib.* p. 102.

25. *Ib.* p. 212.

26. Sermons, ii. 400.

27. Advert. to vol. iii.

28. Vol. iv. p. 207.

29. Letter to Jelf.

30. Keble, Sermon on Primitive Tradition, p. 6, 20.

31. *Ib.* p. 40.

32. *Ib.* p. 45, 47.

33. It were to have been wished that the excellent writers alluded to had so expressed themselves at first, as to preclude the necessity for *explanations*, which in such cases often come *too late*. The same remark applies to the anathemas of a respected namesake against "Protestantism" and, in its degree, to Tract 90.

34. I cannot but remark on the improper manner in which this term has been used within the last two or three years. It has become the fashion in some quarters to speak of everything Romish as *Catholic*.

35. I cannot avoid observing, that the principle of *development*, as taught by Möhler, and adopted by the *British Critic*, is wholly subversive of that respect for the authority of primitive tradition and of the early Fathers, which was so much inculcated in the Tracts, and in other writings of their authors. The early Fathers and the primitive Church, according to this theory, represent Christianity only *in germ*, and *undeveloped*; we must look to the *latest form* of Christianity, i.e. to modern Romanism, as the most perfect model!

36. Thomas Mozley, at this time the editor of the *British Critic*, later wrote, "My first troubles were with Oakley and Ward. I will not say that I hesitated much as to the truth of what they wrote, for in that matter I was inclined to go very far, at least in the way of toleration. Yet it appeared to me quite impossible either that any great number of English Churchmen would ever go so far, or that the persons possessing authority in the Church would fail to protest, not to say more. . . . My own feeling about Ward's articles was that they were within comprehension and mastery; and that if I made the required effort I should probably go very far with them, but that I should find myself thereby embarked in an adventure beyond my control; in a word, that the terminus of the articles was outside the Church of England" (*Reminiscences, Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols. [London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1882], 2: 225-26). *Ed.*

37. No. LIX. p. 32.

38. No. LXIV. October, 1842, p. 411.

39. Letter to Dr. Jelf.

40. The Articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered, p. 153-173.

41. [The Editor at that time has recorded his then intention to become a Romanist.]

42. No. LIX. p. 1.

43. *Ib.* p. 4.

44. *Ib.* p. 32, &c.

45. *Ib.* p. 9.

46. *Ib.* p. 14.

47. *Ib.* p. 28.

48. *Ib.* p. 30, 31.

49. *Ib.* p. 45.

50. No. LX. p. 333, 334.

51. *Ib.* p. 334, 335.

52. *Ib.* p. 364.

53. *Ib.* p. 424-427.

54. It is elsewhere contended, that the whole body of ceremonial in the Church is intimately connected with the *Catholic* doctrine of the Mass; and that if, *e.g.* surplices are used, except as connected with that system, they are mere *formalisms*, and burdens on conscience. Thus again Dissent and Puritanism are justified. See No. LIX. p. 24.

55. No. LXI. p. 44.

56. *Ib.* p. 53. The *right* of pointing out defects in the Church of England is contended for, No. LXV. p. 224. We are elsewhere advised to “*claim the right*” of holding that the Reformation introduced *worse corruptions* than it removed. No. LXII. p. 270.

57. No. LXII. p. 294, 295.

58. No. LIX. p. 2.

59. *Ib.* p. 3.

60. *Ib.* p. 15.

61. No. LX. p. 316.

62. *Ib.*

63. *Ib.*, p. 386.

64. *Ib.*, p. 389, 390.

65. *Ib.* p. 401.

66. *Ib.* p. 403.

67. No. LXIII. p. 71.

68. No. LX. p. 431.

69. No. LXII. p. 266.

70. *Ib.* p. 296.

71. No. LXIV. p. 283.

72. *Ib.* p. 289.

73. No. LXIV. p. 290. It is quite curious to observe how, on all occasions, this devotion to the Papal See manifests itself. *The Gallican Church* was unfavourable to the claim of infallibility and absolute power advanced by the popes; Gallicanism is condemned by the *British Critic* (No. LXIV. p. 285); and its opponent, M. De Maistre, receives the most unqualified praise (No. LX. p. 365). *Jansenism* is obnoxious to Rome; its defence is disclaimed by the *British Critic* (*Ibid.*). The Pope condemns certain Roman Catholics at *Gibraltar*, who appeal to the temporal courts against some alterations introduced by a new “Vicar Apostolic”: the *Critic* takes part, of course, with the Pope (No. LX. p. 271). The *Constitutional Church* in

France, and “*la petite église*,” are condemned by the *Critic*: they were both opposed to the Papal authority (No. LXIV. p. 286, 290).

74. No. LXIV. p. 295.

75. *Ib.* p. 385.

76. *Theotokos*: “*bearer of God*; a title given to the Virgin Mary by the Alexandrian and Cappadocian theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries” (Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985], 304). *Ed.*

77. No. LXIV. p. 397.

78. *Ib.* p. 402.

79. From the manner in which the works of Romish theologians, the lives of Romish saints, the decrees of popes, the Council of Trent, &c., are continually quoted in the *British Critic*, without any intimation that they represent a system different from that of the writers, one would really often suppose oneself to be perusing a Roman Catholic publication. The illusion is heightened by the repetition of most *violent* attacks on “Protestantism.” I cannot but remark on the extreme temerity of those who thus indiscriminately and vehemently condemn and assail “Protestantism,” when they ought to be aware that the term, in its ordinary meaning, *i.e.* as implying *opposition to the See of Rome and to Popery*, includes nothing to which any member of the English Church can object. We may not, indeed, think it advisable to designate our Church or our religion by a term which gives them a merely negative or a controversial character: but *in a certain sense, and on proper occasions*, individuals need not hesitate to avow themselves “Protestants”: and certainly recent tendencies have rendered it necessary to maintain the term. On this subject the reader may profitably consult Dr. Hook’s Church Dictionary (article, PROTESTANT).

80. The author has offered some remarks on the theory of development, as advocated by De Maistre and Möhler, in the third edition of the *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 443-445.

81. This question has been considered by the author, in the *Treatise on the Church*. Part III. ch. ii.

82. *Sermons before the University*, by the Rev. J. H. Newman (Serm. XIV). [Newman having not yet seceded, the author speaks of him with great caution here.]

83. *Ibid.* p. 331.

84. *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*: “*which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all*; the so-called canon of Vincent of Lerins (d. ca. 450), which measures universal or catholic orthodoxy” (Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985], 256). *Ed.*

85. Ibid. p. 324.

86. I am not quite prepared to concur in the statement, that 'the controversy between our own Church and the Church of Rome lies, it is presumed, *in the matter of fact*, whether such and such developments are true (e.g. Purgatory a true development of the doctrine of sin after baptism), not in the *principle* of development itself' (Newman, *ubi supra*, p. 321). It seems to me, that it is a question of *principle*, whether developments, in the sense of *inferences made by human reason*, are, or are not always to be considered as articles of Catholic Faith. If the modern theory of development be true, these developments are as Divine, and as much parts of Christianity as the great articles of the Creed. The doctrine of Purgatory, as a *development*, must be as binding as that of the Trinity; the worship of the Virgin, or of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as necessary as the worship of God. Processions, Pilgrimages, Monastic Vows, the perpetual adoration of the Sacrament, Indulgences, &c., must be as sacred and as necessary as the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.

87. That errors, corruptions, and idolatries, may exist extensively in the Universal Church, the writer has endeavoured to prove, in his *Treatise on the Church*, vol. i. pp. 82-94; vol. ii. pp. 101-112. 3rd edition.

88. No. LX. p. 329.

89. Ib. p. 332.

90. Ib. p. 433.

91. No. LXIV. p. 408, 409. See also LXV. p. 111. The works of Aquinas, Bonaventura, and the other schoolmen, on which the Roman theology is based, are assiduously recommended in the successive numbers of this periodical.

92. No. LXV. p. 223, 229.

93. No. LX. p. 303; LXV. art. iv.

94. Ib. p. 306.

95. No. LXIV. p. 410.

96. No. LXVII. p. 6.

97. No. LIX. p. 27.

98. No. LX. p. 507.