

THE CRITERION:

A MEANS OF DISTINGUISHING

TRUTH FROM ERROR,

IN QUESTIONS OF THE TIMES.

WITH FOUR LETTERS ON THE EIRENICON OF DR. PUSEY.

BY

A. CLEVELAND COXE,  
BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW-YORK.

One basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe; and the other basket had very naughty figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad.—JEREMIAH XXIV. 2.

NEW-YORK:  
H.B. DURAND.  
BUFFALO: MARTIN TAYLOR  
1866.

TO  
THE REV. WM. ADAMS, D.D.  
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AT NASHOTAH  
IN THE DIOCESE OF WISCONSIN,  
I DEDICATE THIS LITTLE BOOK,  
IN TOKEN OF SINCERE RESPECT,  
AS WELL FOR MY FORMER CLASS-MATE IN THE GENERAL  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
AS FOR THE SOUND DIVINE,  
WHO, IN THE GREAT WEST OF AMERICA, IS TEACHING THE  
DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIPTURES, IN THE SPIRIT OF  
THE ANGLICAN REFORMATION,  
AND THEREFORE  
IN THE SPIRIT OF THE GREAT CATHOLIC DOCTORS  
OF THE  
PRIMITIVE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

A.C.C.

## THE CRITERION.

THE times call for great plainness of speech. They are times of confusion and anxiety. On the one hand we have disturbers in the Church, who would remove its very foundations, with Dr. Colenso; on the other, among those who should be “striving together for the faith of the Gospel,” there are great divisions of feeling and of purpose. I am convinced that even among good men there is a want of clear thought upon the great questions of the day, and that mischievous men are more mischievous than they mean to be, because they confound terms, and fail to distinguish between the genuine and the spurious in what claims to be Catholic.

For myself, having been for many years concerned very little in other things, and having found the historical Church of Christ the most interesting of all objects upon earth, even in its dust and ruins, I may truly say that I have thought night and day upon the restoration of its Unity. I am distressed, therefore, by practical mistakes that tend to retard so blessed a result, and thinking that I see clearly where such mistakes begin, I am anxious, if possible, to point it out to others. Having succeeded, especially with young divines, in explaining some matters which have much embarrassed them, I have been slowly led to believe that I may do good, to many others, by stating in simple terms the truth which will enable them to discriminate, in these times, between what is sound and what is spurious, in professed Catholicity.

The Victorian Epoch will be marked in history as that of a great revival and restoration in the Church of England. But, in reformations, generally, there are evils as well as good things; and in this great Revival of Catholicity, it is not surprising that some, having lost their way, have misled others, and made great confusions.

When we speak of Catholicity, let us be understood as using the word in its legitimate sense; as all the world understood it before it became Occidentalized even by Occidentals. It means that Constitution of the Church, and that Profession of Faith, which were recognized, not invented, by the Council of Nicæa, and by the great Councils following; and which were so *recognized*, as from the beginning and as wholly Scriptural.

The use of the word to which, in common with the Easterns, I oppose the usage of all Antiquity, is that which can only be admitted, by conceding that the Latin Churches are the whole of Catholic Christendom, and that the Bishop of Rome is the Centre of Unity. But, this is to concede that there was no Catholic Church, for all the primitive ages; because, in those ages, there was no such idea, and because the Oriental Churches, which never had it, are the oldest, as they were for centuries the foremost, in Christendom, all the Catholic Councils having been Eastern, in place and character, and in no respect Latin, like the pseudo-Council of Trent.

The chief source of the confusions which now exist has been a misunderstanding of this word *Catholic*, and the thing *Catholicity*. The words have been so misused that their abuse is the scandal of literature, and they are still so confounded by popular writers, and also by divines, that even learned men, who may not be blessed with analytical powers equal to their other faculties, often add to the confusion by a correct use of the words in one sentence, and a mistaken application of them in another. At last, a party has become visible in the Church which purposely confounds them: a party generated by the mistakes of some and by the craftiness of others, and which threatens to destroy the peace of the Church, if not to uproot much of the good that has been planted among us, during the past quarter-century. Whatever its origin, it is a very

mischievous party, and, I am sorry to add, a very unscrupulous one. It browbeats and intimidates; it “rages and is confident;” it overthrows old landmarks; it rails at the Episcopate, and exalts nothing but itself and its friends.<sup>1</sup> Sound and sober men are in the immense majority; but just now there seems no one among them to rise up and rebuke the silliest and shallowest faction ever bred in the Church of England. Hence it claims to have everything its own way: it certainly seems to lead the popular mind, among certain classes in the Church. It conciliates the vain and self-sufficient, and leads captive the imaginative. Their triumphing, however, must be short: *prosperitas stultorum perdet illos*; the only fear is that in the indignation they will kindle and the reaction they will stimulate, much that is good will perish with so much evil.

In this country there is a small but busy class of persons, who have opened correspondences with some of their own sort in England, and who have been active in transferring to totally different scenes and circumstances, a plague that is bad enough where it has some historical pretences for its existence. Our Church is a missionary Church, founded among a new people, and has enough to do in teaching them the fundamentals of Apostolic religion, without exciting and shocking the prejudices of millions, by things indifferent in themselves, and alien to their habits and history. The faction that thus disturbs and hinders the work of the Church is small, but, as I have said, it is busy, and it is working a great deal of mischief, far and near. Let us remember the sad experiences of twenty years since: how difficulties arose out of the practical blunders of mere novices, which ended in the degradation of a bishop.

I am sorry to say the evil is getting headway. The faction boasts, I hope not truthfully, of the countenance and patronage of some who have heretofore enjoyed the confidence of their brethren. It has used the press freely, and is scattering the seeds of discord.<sup>2</sup> I am unwilling to see it grow into importance, for want of being met at the beginning with a little resolution, and disagreeable as it is to incur anybody’s ill-will, I feel it to be my duty to resist this party before it gathers support enough to be formidable.

Almost the worst thing that could have been the precursor of a genuine Catholic movement in the Church of England, was such a political blunder as what was called “Catholic Emancipation.” That unjust measure, while it disturbed the foundations of the English throne, and admitted a Trojan horse into Society, led the popular mind to a very false view of Romanism, and identified the word *Catholic* with the cause and with the spirit of the Romish religion. Before this agitation was lulled, the Oxford movement, so called, was inaugurated. I am not too young to have been a deeply interested observer of it, from its beginnings, as I have been, from the most tender age, of all that concerned England and its Church.

Beginning in such confusions, and enlisting from the outset men of widely different antecedents and views, it is not to be wondered at that it has lacked unity and consistency from the first. There was yet lingering a class of old divines who kept up the line of the great Caroline doctors; men like Dr. Routh, who knew what Catholicity means, and who stood just where the sons of the Church of England should always be found. But, there was also a younger class, who began to imagine themselves Catholics on purely reactionary principles, “starting aside like a broken bow,” and disgusted with principles they had formerly professed. Such were the dyspeptics to whom Hurrell Froude became an oracle, and whom he fed with half-truths and other crudities. As time went on, a right and a left began to be visible among the Oxford men and

---

<sup>1</sup> See the *Christian Remembrancer*, London, January and July, 1866.

<sup>2</sup> About two years ago somebody caused Tract No. Ninety to be republished here, at a time when nobody thought about it, and when it was supposed to be dead and buried.

their allies; and yet the movement was kept up, without a general recognition of this distinction, and it was credited alike with the good of the one and the evil of the other, as if it were all one and the same movement. The right wing however was widely different from its counterpart on the left. It was sober, attached to the principles of the Reformation, well-read in the Fathers, deeply conversant with Holy Scripture, and truly Catholic: while the men of the left, though not without brilliancy and cleverness, were superficial, impatient, self-conceited, ignorant of their bearings, reckless in their driftings, and superciliously inconsiderate of wiser and better men. The right wing went to work to restore the Church to herself: the left began, very soon, to attempt its entire transformation. The one class loved the manna of our Prayer-book, and only sought to make others love it: the others craved leeks and onions, and began to praise the flesh-pots of Egypt. The incidental work of the one was a revival of the rubrics and of what may be called the Anglican maxims, while their great work was preaching the Gospel, restoring daily prayers and weekly communions, and everywhere renewing the Church. The whole soul of the other was speedily concentrated in Rome, in the introduction of Latinisms, in candlesticks and chasubles and dalmatics, in flower-pots and thuribles. On went the movement; but the left wing often became confused as well as confounded with the right. Measures and men became inextricably commingled. The left wing helped on some blunder of the right, and the right could not refuse to aid in a good move of the left. At last, owing to some practical mistakes the left began to lead: before long, “servants were on horses and princes walking on the earth.” A miserable apostacy followed and was checked: but, once more, the tail has begun to lead the head, and now the grand movement of the Restoration is threatened with self-defeat. Men have begun to direct it, who will cause it to perish, if they be not speedily checked; and perish it must, if it be left to them, in such an ill-savour as will indefinitely postpone a resurrection.

Now then there must be a drawing of lines, and this dangerous element must be eliminated. We must know, in short, who is who and what is what. The Trentine party is formed; the Catholic school must recognize its own metes and bounds and shut out its enemy. There is this advantage in the crisis to which things have been brought: men and measures have taken shape and are more readily distinguished than heretofore, as what they really are. The popular mind has, heretofore, classed the Bishop of——— and the learned Dr. ——, together, and refused to understand their wide differences: Mr.——— and Archdeacon ——, have been supposed to be of one and the same school, but now everybody may see that they have united in certain measures on different grounds and with a view to directing them to widely different issues. It cannot be so hereafter;

“———sunt certi denique fines,”

and persons must now define their positions, and let all men know where they are and what they are aiming at. The only ones who will object to this are they who claim to be “Catholics,” thereby to get the credit of following Bull and Hammond, while at heart they are Papists, and are following Dr. Manning as fast as they think it safe, or can lead others after them. Now, then, I propose a Criterion, by which to divide between those claiming the name of Catholics, and by which the true men may be easily known from the false. Since these men claim to be “Catholics,” as we do, let us first erect a standard of genuine Catholicity, such as nobody can deny would have been acknowledged as such by Bishop Bull, or by Archbishop Laud. Here are its notes, or characteristics, according to a natural classification of things and ideas:

I.

1. Œcumenical.
2. Primitive.
3. Vincentian.
4. Episcopal.
5. Liturgical.
6. Anglican.
7. Nicene.

But nobody can look at this table, without seeing that a whole hemisphere of things and thoughts, on which a *soi-disant* Catholic party most insists, has no part nor lot in such Catholicity. Their aims, their practices, their whole system, are quite another thing. Let us see how we can define it by seven notes, as we have the other. Here it is then, like Jeremiah's basket of naughty figs:

II.

1. Occidental.
2. Mediaeval.
3. Isidorian.
4. Papal.
5. Ritualistic.
6. Gallican.
7. Trentine.

Now, let them be honest, and say whether this table does not fairly represent the hemisphere in which they move, and are trying to move others. For example, what a great pother they have made, for twenty years, about the Council of Trent, and the harmonizing of our Articles with its articles. Then, how largely they have drawn their inspiration from Galilean sources; from breviaries and what not; until, lately, a learned doctor went over to France to arrange for a *Concordat* with the Pope. Their Ritualistic movement, wholly modelled upon the Romish ceremonies, is quite prominent; and their great tenderness about "the See of St. Peter," is hardly less so. Their Isidorian specialty is less visible to the naked eye; but, certain it is that they are never tired of appealing to maxims and customs, as "Catholic," which have no other origin than that of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, or forged decrees of the early bishops of Rome, in which the Papal imposture is founded. Their Medievalisms will not be denied; and their Occidental habits of thought are sufficiently established if my other notes of the party are justified by the facts to which I have referred. So that we have a party, f or at least a set of men, engaged in this Victorian Restoration, who are clearly for restoring the Church to anything but the Catholicity of Laud,<sup>3</sup> and Bull and Hammond. Surely, nobody can accuse these worthies of any sympathy with the ideas of Table No. II., unless the very simple Liturgical tastes and principles of Laud be confounded, as were his Patristic maxims by the Puritans, with the Popery against which he fought all his life long, and till he was regarded, at Rome, as the worst enemy

---

<sup>3</sup> I shall frequently refer to Laud, as one often represented as on the extreme verge of our Church, in his leanings to Rome, but who is almost a Puritan in the eyes of our now Romanizers.

the Pope had in England.<sup>4</sup>

Here, then, we have found our Criterion. Table No. I is the touchstone by which we discover the whole counter-system of Table No. II.; and now let us set them one over against the other, that we may see how antagonistic they are and ever must be.

A

I.	II.
1. Catholic.	1. Occidental.
2. Primitive.	2. Mediaeval.
3. Vincentian.	3. Isidorian.
4. Episcopal.	4. Papal.
5. Liturgical.	5. Ritualistic,
6. Anglican.	6. Gallican.
7. Nicene.	7. Trentine.

Ω

Now let us look at the two tables, and observe that the line A Ω represents a gulf deep as that of Hades, between two sets of men, measures, sympathies and practical principles. You cannot read one of our old divines, Cosin, Bramhall, Taylor, Pearson, or the like, besides those already mentioned, without seeing that they are absolutely represented by Table No. I. But take up one of the newspapers, magazines, or books of the class I have spoken of as now attempting to control the Church of England, and you will see as clearly that they entirely answer to the characteristics of the opposite table. The line once drawn there is no longer any difficulty in distinguishing men and measures, if the terms be understood: and nobody can be on both sides of the line, except those peculiar people who believe equally in the Copernican and the Ptolemaic systems of Astronomy.

Here, however, it may be well to explain terms even for some who “ought to be teachers.”

I. *a. Œcumenical* ideas are those which include impartially the Greek and the Latin Churches, and the Faith as professed by both, before the schism.

*b. Occidental* ideas are those which practically ignore the Catholicity of the Orientals, and which tacitly allow the claims of the Latins to be the essential part of Catholic Christendom.

2. *a. Primitive* ideas are those derived from Holy Scripture and ancient authors.

*b. Mediæval* ideas are those which are taken from Western writers, since the establishment of the Papacy.

3. *a. Vincentian* principles are those of the Primitive Church, as recorded by the great Vincent of Lerins, and which allow nothing to be Catholic that is novel, though all the world should adopt it, but define that as Catholic which was universally accepted

---

<sup>4</sup> Evelyn’s Diary and Letters, ii. 265.

from the beginning, though only a single Church should be faithful to it.

*b. Isidorian* maxims are those of the false Decretals, forged under the name of Isidore of Seville, and imposed on Western Christendom by Nicolas I., making communion with the See of Rome the test of Catholicity, and authorizing any novelty accredited by the Pope.

4. *a. Episcopal* principles are simply those of Scripture and of the Cyprianic age, that the Unity of the Church hinges on the solidarity of the Episcopate.

*b. Papal* principles are those which make the Papacy a divine Institution and the base and centre of Unity to all Christians.

5. *a. Liturgical* ideas are those which seek to bring out the beauty and majesty of our Common Prayer, and other Services, in all their rubrical and Scriptural fulness, so as to edify and instruct, as well as to animate the worshipper.

*b. Ritualistic* ideas are those which aim at pageantry and ceremony, with an effort to introduce Romish rites and illegal, discarded observances, into our worship, and to reduce the reading of the Prayers and Lessons as nearly as possible to an unintelligible performance.

6. *a. Anglican* ideas are those which have been known as such for three hundred years, and which are familiar in the sermons and teachings of all our great divines.

*b. Gallican* ideas are those imported from the French moderate Papists; and which, in the Exposition of Bossuet, for example, approximate to reformed principles, yet admit all that was absolutely exacted by the Papacy, before the late Dogma.

7. *a. Nicene* principles are those recognized by the Council of Nice and the other General Councils; as in the Nicene Creed, and in the Canonical regulation of the patriarchates.

*b. Trentine* principles are those set up by the Western Council of Trent, only 300 years since, in defiance of the Nicene Canons, and anathematizing all Christians who fail to accept its decrees.

The Criterion which I have thus presented admits of no evasion. Every one who comprehends the terms may see their application to his own sympathies, and to the measures and the men of the times. Does he bring everything to the rule of Œcumenical Councils and the undivided Church, or does he attach importance and weight to a purely Occidental Theology, and to the assumptions of the Latin Councils to legislate for Christendom? Does he bring everything to the test of "Holy Scripture and ancient authors," or does he admit Mediaeval glosses and scholastic subtleties, unknown to the Primitive age? Is he honestly devoted to the Vincentian tests of Catholicity, so that he feels and adopts the principle that the true Catholics may become a minority in Christendom; or does he attach great importance to numerical<sup>5</sup> Catholicity, if not actually accepting the pseudo-Isidorian principle that he is the Catholic who obeys the Pope? Does he believe, with Cyprian, that the Episcopate is the divinely appointed hinge of the

---

<sup>5</sup> The *numerical* consequence of Rome is perpetually dwelt upon. It is a principle which, would have rejected Elijah and also Athanasius; it would at one time have made Arianism Catholic. But see Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitory*, iii. 4.

Church's Unity, or does he sink the Episcopate to a mere function of the Papacy, accepting the Papal Supremacy itself, "with a *Concordat*?" Are his Liturgical tastes regulated by Holy Scripture and the Primitive worship, and anchored in the Book of Common Prayer, so that he merely aims to bring out its richness and completeness, and to make it beautiful only by its own Laws and analogies, to the edification of the people; or does he, in his heart, desire chiefly a splendid ceremony, and, as near as possible, an imitation of the pompous Romish Ritual?<sup>6</sup> Does he make the blessed Eucharist a reasonable service; a commemoration of our Paschal Lamb, in the solemn and edifying use of the words of our reformed office, so that all hearts may follow the solemnity, and be warmed and filled by its Scriptural richness and Liturgic decency and order: or does he make it a mere Rite, closely resembling the Latin Mass, gorgeous in its ceremonial, but almost inaudible and unintelligible in its words?<sup>7</sup> Is he an Anglican with Bishop Bull, or a Gallican with Bossuet, bringing himself to the test of their celebrated correspondence? Does he cultivate, in himself and others, the veritable Nicene spirit; the spirit of undivided Christendom, enthroning the Gospels in the midst of the Councils, and doing all things according to that Law; or does he perpetually recur to Trent, as if that were a Law to Christendom, and as if we were profoundly concerned to accommodate ourselves to its decrees? And there is another question I will ask, of very great practical importance: in respect of the great want of a renewed order of women, separated to good works, does he wish to see the primitive and Scriptural *deaconess* restored to her place and function in the Church; or does he aim to revive those nunneries and monastic institutions which even the Gallicans<sup>8</sup> are exposing for their hypocrisy and cruelty, and which Italy<sup>9</sup> has just swept away with the besom of destruction, after the largest experience of their pernicious influences? Such questions as these must now be asked in all faithfulness, and answered without evasion. Here, if not in England, there should be no room for misunderstanding on these points, when any person is thought of for responsible positions, or when any plans are proposed for institutions of benevolence, and the like. No young man should be ordained a deacon; no deacon should be promoted to the priesthood; above all, no priest should be preferred to the Episcopate, in the present crisis, until his fidelity to the Church is proved, by some such examination, or by inquiries of similar import. Surely such is the spirit of our Canons and of the Ordinal.

The appearance of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, followed by a republication of *No. Ninety*, has made this crisis, or at least brought it clearly into view.<sup>10</sup> Apart from the thoroughly Trentine character of the *Eirenicon*, its alarming feature is its confessed "audacity" in reviving the principle of subscription set forth by Dr. Newman, in *No.*

---

<sup>6</sup> One of the Ritualistic papers (*English Church Times*, August 11) contains a very offensive Ode on "the Assumption of our Lady," with many passages which are almost impious. It ends with these lines:

"And when to Jesus ye bow the knee,  
Cry *Ave Maria, ora pro me.*"

I regret to add that similar things are said and sung in some Churches in England.

<sup>7</sup> See Hirscher's comments on the ceremonial of the Mass, in "Sympathies of the Continent," how he groans over the pomps which destroy the spirit of the Holy Communion.

<sup>8</sup> See *Le Maudit* and *Le Religieuse*.

<sup>9</sup> I am no blind admirer of Italian legislation, in this matter: but, such legislation would never have been thought of among hereditary Papists, had not the abuses been intolerable.

<sup>10</sup> "The significance of the republication of Tract 90 is scarcely to be overrated."—C. Remembrancer, July, 1866, p. 176.

*Ninety*, and renewing the claim of the Romanizers to be ordained, on such a scheme of evasion and equivocation.<sup>11</sup>

As an American bishop I have taken my stand, and am resolved to carry out our Canons and the requisitions of the Ordinal, not only in their letter, but in their spirit. I have given notice that I shall reject any Trentine applicant for Orders; and that any one proposing to me to make his affirmations on the scheme of *No. Ninety*, shall be rejected not so much for unsound doctrine, as for *immorality*. I call it immorality for any one to seek Holy Orders on such false pretences. It is also sacrilege, in view of the vows made to the Holy Ghost, and sealed by the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. On this point I care not who differs with me: I am strong in my appeal to the conscience of mankind, against any one who holds the doctrines of Trent and yet seeks a cure of souls in our Church.<sup>12</sup> I do not think the case will arise in Western New York; but, when it does, I shall most assuredly reject the applicant, and notify his rector that I have so done on the ground of his scandalous immorality in seeking Holy Orders on the false pretence of having neither “written, taught, nor *held* anything contrary to the doctrine” of our Church.<sup>13</sup> There my duty will end. But should the rector who gave him his testimonials in good faith, and the vestry who united in the same, find themselves justly scandalized, and the flock grieved and injured by such duplicity, and should the rector proceed to suspend the offender, accordingly, under the Canon,<sup>14</sup> for his “wickedness,” I should sustain him canonically, and thank him personally for his fidelity to Christ and his Church. Such discipline is needed. I have known a little parish almost broken up by such conduct on the part of a young man; and well may the people tremble if they cannot be protected against teachers who would thus “creep and intrude, and climb into the fold.” The hungry sheep must look up in vain to such pastors; and worse, perhaps,

“Rot inwardly and foul contagion spread.”

Some affect to be surprised at my position, because in England it has not been so done. It is time they should be so surprised. For want of such dealing with Mr. Newman’s disciples, at the outset, owing to the bonds of the State-laws, a large body of youthful ecclesiastics made a mockery of their orders, and passed over to Rome fresh from the hands of their bishops, to the great scandal of the flock of Christ. Others, like poor Mr. Sibthorp, have gone to and fro, between England and Rome, like a shuttlecock, duplicating Orders, but resuming and renouncing the Anglican ministry, at will, no man forbidding. And so it has come to this, that men actually claim a right to be ordained on

---

<sup>11</sup> “Let us be honest and admit that \* \* \* we have not a leg to stand upon as regards what is known of the opinions of those who first drew up the Articles, or those who first imposed them upon the clergy. We do not want the support of either Edward’s or Elizabeth’s divines. *We boldly assert that a sense of the Articles which they would have repudiated as ridiculous, is regarded in fact, as tenable by everybody, and will, we believe, soon be the recognized exposition of the Church.*”—C. Remembrancer, July, 1866, p. 178.

<sup>12</sup> “After all the explanations given, and yet to be given, of the Catholic (Romish) mode of signing the Articles, it will still remain true that to most minds the interpretations of No. 90 will seem evasions rather than explanations.”—C. Remembrancer, July, 1866, p. 178.

<sup>13</sup> Title I., Can. v., Sec. iv.

<sup>14</sup> Title II., Can. xii., Sec. ii.

the plan of Dr. Newman,<sup>15</sup> himself an apostate and a gainsayer, and with his own presumptuous reservation in their mouths—"I will not hold office in a Church which will not allow *my* sense of the articles," that is to say, a Romish sense. If such things are to be allowed in our Church, all confidence in the Episcopate will be forfeited, and justly so. The people look to their bishops for protection against such intruders, and they have a right to expect it. I know not what my venerated fathers and brethren in the Episcopate may think of the *Eirenicon*; but I venture to say there is not one of them that would ordain a man, openly avowing that his subscription is made on the scheme of Dr. Newman's *No. Ninety*,<sup>16</sup> which the *Eirenicon* adopts and more than endorses.

For my plain words I make no apology; the adverse faction is not only downright, but arrogant and abusive.<sup>17</sup> It insults the whole Episcopate, but offers to make a great man of any bishop who will patronize the Trentine party. It commends Dr. Pusey's "audacity," in making "proposals for union with Rome;"<sup>18</sup> and to make his own audacity complete, the reviewer affirms, unblushingly, that *No. Ninety* is the first successful attempt to harmonize the Articles and the Prayer-book. Here are the astounding words of one of the leading periodicals of England:

"That interpretation (of the Articles by *Tract Ninety*) for the most part may be—we fully believe ourselves that it is—in *diametrical opposition* to what Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer meant. But it cannot be dislodged; and having made good its ground, it will make progress; and no considerable amount of teaching can go on at our Theological Colleges without its being seen and admitted that *there is no other method of reconciling the Prayer-book and the Articles than that advocated in the celebrated publication of Dr. Newman.*"<sup>19</sup>

It follows that, for three centuries, our great bishops and divines have occupied an untenable position, and have vainly tried to reconcile their consciences with their subscription to Articles which were repugnant to the Prayer-book. They were the triflers with God and man: the author of *No. Ninety* is the first to solve their problem; and the Gamaliel for whom our Andrewes, and Pearson, and Wilson have waited, is the pervert Dr. Newman.

He who will not "hear the Church" is made to us, by our great High-Priest, himself, "as a heathen man and a publican." He who accepts duplicate Orders is guilty of sacrilege. He who separates himself from the lawful authorities of a lawful Church is condemned by Inspiration, as "sensual, having not the spirit." He who is a "truce-breaker," and resists an Apostolic ministry, on its own Canonical ground, setting up antagonistic claims, and "leading captive silly women" and others, is classed with Jannes and Jambres, by one apostle, and with Korah by another. Yet one who occupies just such a position, if the Anglican Church is a true Church, is the acknowledged oracle of the new party, and his plan of interpreting the Articles is claimed as the proper one to be adopted in our Theological Schools, and by our bishops in conferring Holy Orders. Such are the counsels given to the Church, by a periodical of the first class, and which

---

<sup>15</sup> "Beyond all question the securing a status for the *Eirenicon* has *à fortiori* secured the like standing ground for the interpretation of *Tract 90*."—C. Remembrancer, July, 1866, p. 176.

<sup>16</sup> "It may be long before the Thirty-nine Articles are abolished; but the interpretation of them in *Tract Ninety* is, perhaps, nearly equivalent to their abolition."—C. Remembrancer, July, 1866, p. 175.

<sup>17</sup> See *Christian Remembrancer* for July, 1866.

<sup>18</sup> *Christian Remembrancer*, January and July, 1866.

<sup>19</sup> *Ch. Remembrancer*, July, 1866, p. 176.

triumphs in its unrebuked effrontery.

All the names which Churchmen have been wont to venerate and to identify with the Church's cause, are habitually vilified, by the party, or consigned to contempt with "faint praise." The martyrs of the Reformation, to whom the whole English-speaking world owes more than to any who have lived after them, amid the blessings purchased by their blood, even these venerated fathers are never mentioned without a sneer. It has come to this, that even the malicious policy of the Romanists, in making the martyrs' cause identical with that of Henry VIII. and his rapacious courtiers,<sup>20</sup> is adopted by the party, in terms that strongly attest their hatred, not only of the Reformers, but of the Reformation, and of all those great divines who have fortified it by their massive learning; who, for three hundred years have never been wanting in England, and who have never failed to command the reverence and admiration of Christendom.

Now the growth and progress of this party have been chiefly owing to the confusion of men's minds, hereto-fore, as to their true character. Dr. Newman's Tract claimed to be a defence of the Articles against a charge of inconsistency with *Catholic* doctrine. Hundreds, in view of the position he then occupied, believed that he meant by this term what the Reformers did, when they imposed the Articles and commanded the Clergy to interpret them by the Catholic Fathers. The ambiguities of the writer puzzled even Mr. Palmer, of Worcester,<sup>21</sup> who says, in his "Narrative," "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 *Ninety* had a tendency of that kind." We now know by the *Apologia* that the author designed that it should work Rome-ward, though his theory was to delay individuals and work the whole Church over.<sup>22</sup> "I desired," he says, "a union with Rome under conditions, Church with Church"—the precise position of Dr. Pusey in his scheme of a Concordat. Was it duplicity, then, or was it ignorance that led the author of No. Ninety to his sad misuse of terms? He now pleads ignorance of the notorious usages of the Communion which he has joined,<sup>23</sup> and we may charitably trust it was ignorance, then; but at any rate he was a blind guide and all who have followed him have fallen into the ditch. In those days we I had no idea that any sane man could become a Papist. In 1836, Mr. Le-Bas,<sup>24</sup> comparing the nineteenth century with the seventeenth, said: "*In these times* a reconciliation between the Romish and the Reformed Communions would be thought scarcely less chimerical than a coalition between the religion of the Cross and that of the Crescent." Hence some good men were reluctant to credit their own eyes, and they believed, as did Mr. Palmer, against all appearances, that at the worst, the Tract was simply an injudicious and perilous attempt to keep Romanizers from leaving us. I am persuaded that Archbishop Wake's widely different correspondence with the Sorbonne, in 1717,<sup>25</sup> greatly encouraged those who took a too favorable view of *No. Ninety* on its first appearance. They persuaded themselves that the author meant what Wake meant. Personal partiality

---

<sup>20</sup> Against which Latimer so faithfully bore his testimony, as is justly instanced by Southey in his *Life of Wesley*. Vol. I., Notes.

<sup>21</sup> *Narrative*, New York Ed., 1843, p. 73.

<sup>22</sup> *Apol.*, p. 188.

<sup>23</sup> See his Letter to Dr. Pusey. London, 1866.

<sup>24</sup> *Life of Laud*, p. 372.

<sup>25</sup> See Maclaine's *Mosheim*, vol. vi. p. 61.

might be excused for taking this view of the work; but the author's speedy apostasy should have opened their eyes. His work on "Development," and his late *Apologia*, prove, in fact, that whether he was a self-deceiver, or a deceiver outright, his Tract was the offspring of an essentially Romanized state of mind. He had made Rome a foregone conclusion: whatever was true, or primitive, or Catholic, was Romish in his morbid imagination. Hence if an Anglican divine claimed to understand the Articles by the *Catholic* Councils, he jumped to the conclusion that whether they meant it so or not, they favoured his own interpretation by the *Trent* Council. Such is the ground of his impudent assertion<sup>26</sup> that Hooker, Taylor and Bull, even in their arguments against Rome direct men's sympathies *toward* Rome. Who ever found it out but he, with his strange faculty of turning food into poison?

Happily, the instinctive consent of English minds, in condemnation of the Tract, was so general, that the writer soon threw off the mask, and abandoned a Church which he could not deceive. In his *Apologia*, we have the whole history of his shameless attempt, and of the chagrin occasioned by his defeat. The virtuous indignation of the vast majority of the Church was overwhelming.<sup>27</sup> "If there ever was a case," he says, "in which an individual teacher has been put aside and virtually put away by a community, mine is one." All honour to old English honesty and common sense for so sound a verdict! God forbid it should ever be reversed, till the prodigal "comes to himself."

But *No. Ninety* is indeed a very curious production. It is a tissue of cruel hints and cunning reservations, like Iago's in the play. Sometimes it seems to me as if its author were attempting a grave joke, like Whately in his "Historic Doubts." Again, it reminds me of Swift's "Humble Attempt to prove the Antiquity of the English Language." Then, again, I recognize the veritable Peter, emerging from "the Tale of a Tub," to give us a new Exposition of the Will. Just reflect upon it; an attempt to reconcile our Article on the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, not only with the Decrees of Trent, in general, but over and above with the sweeping requirements of the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth. Here is the language of the latter:

"All and singular the things which were defined in the Sacrosanct Council of Trent concerning Original Sin and concerning Justification, I embrace and receive \* \* \* and all other things delivered, defined and declared (*by said Council*.) I do, without wavering, receive and profess. \* \* \* This is the true Catholic Faith, without which no one can be saved."

And here is the language of the Sixth Article:

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Now he that can reconcile these two articles has a faculty somewhat resembling the digestive powers of an ostrich. It used to be thought absurd in the Presbyterians to enforce their Westminster Confession, with all its subtleties, as conditions of communion; but a creed which embraces, all and singular, the chaos of scholasticism contained in the Trent decrees, and all its minute prescriptions on indifferent subjects, open questions, at worst, for fourteen centuries, and which commands these to be received on pain of damnation; such a Creed, it seems, is quite consistent with our Sixth

---

<sup>26</sup> *Apologia*, p. 176.

<sup>27</sup> *Apologia*, p. 250.

Article, nay with the whole Thirty-Nine; and *No. Ninety* is to be made, hereafter, our Standard Exposition.<sup>28</sup> And Dr. Pusey would have us believe that this is “the *Catholic* interpretation” which our old doctors contended for. Has he never read Hammond’s opinion of Trent?<sup>29</sup> Has he never read Bishop Cosin’s “History of Popish Transubstantiation,” and what he says of the unhappy Pope, who made it *de fide* by means among the most impious of an awfully sinful life?<sup>30</sup> Has he never read the same great bishop’s “History of the Canon?” Of course he has, and it is plain he does not agree with these authors: but, how then he can pretend that Dr. Newman’s book, or his own, has any agreement with such authorities is the puzzle of all sober men. One word of Hammond’s upsets the whole theory of *No. Ninety* and of the *Eirenicon* also; that in which he speaks thus of miscalled Councils:<sup>31</sup>

“Having given the Romanist this account, I shall not add what hath been so fully done by others, the many *eminent nullities* of some of them, especially of *that of Trent*, which is *most magisterially imposed on us*.”

Yet Tract Ninety, which was another magisterial attempt to impose these “nullities,” insinuates that it sustains the cause of Bull and Andrewes and Hooker. Dr. Newman’s own “Apology” proves that he knew better. He confesses in 1845, writing as an open Papist,<sup>32</sup> as follows:

“I have felt, all along, that Bishop Bull’s theology was the only theology on which the English Church could stand I have felt that opposition to the Church of Rome was *part* of that theology; and that he who could not protest against the Church of Rome was *no true divine in the English Church*. I have never said, nor attempted to say, that any one in office, in the English Church, whether bishop or incumbent, could be otherwise than in hostility to the Church of Rome.”

Now this is honest, and it is all the defence I ask for my own position; but it is almost the only thing in Dr. Newman’s writings which his Anglican admirers overlook; and it is certainly unfortunate that he failed to make this clear in *No. Ninety* and his other writings of that period.

It seems to me that the rise of this Trentine Party must be dated from the favourable and exculpatory view which his friend Dr. Pusey was pleased to take of Dr. Newman’s apostacy. So long ago as 1851, this fatal error was justly noted by an able writer, in an American periodical.<sup>33</sup> He justly remarked that “neither the Letters of Dr. Pusey, on the occasion, nor the *Lyra Innocentium*, which feebly sounded from the hands of Mr. Keble, betokened any cordial conviction of guilt in such a transition. The chief claim of the English Church seemed to be that they were born in her; that she was still their mother, a poetic preference which went as far as this—

No voice from heaven hath clearly said  
Let us depart—then fear to roam.”

---

<sup>28</sup> See the Christian Remembrancer, before quoted.

<sup>29</sup> Minor Works, p. 370, and elsewhere.

<sup>30</sup> See Cosin’s Works, vol. iv. p. 222.

<sup>31</sup> Hammond, Parænesis, p. 369.

<sup>32</sup> Apol. p. 195.

<sup>33</sup> Ch. Review, vol. iv. p. 42.

That was the critical moment, when an honest repudiation of Dr. Newman's conduct and example would have saved England the shame that has followed from its Mannings and its Papal aggressions, and would have built up a most healthful Nicene School of Catholic laymen and divines, to reconcile Dissent, and to render such a history as that of Dr. Colenso impossible. But Dr. Pusey chose to make light of his friend's apostasy, his rebaptization, his duplicate orders, and his railing accusations against the Church he had betrayed. Such language as Dr. Pusey then used had a paralyzing effect on consciences: young men began to think it no serious matter to overleap the chasm between the Primitive Church of England and the Trentine Confederacy of Rome; and by a known law<sup>34</sup> of familiarity with things unlawful, the moral perceptions of multitudes became so obtuse, that what disgusted everybody in 1840, is claimed, in 1866, with unabashed effrontery, as the normal interpretation of the Articles, and that which must soon be accepted by our Theological Colleges. One thing however is gained: many of those who were deceived in past days are no longer capable of being imposed upon in these. And whereas some excused No. Ninety, then, because they were over-persuaded that it meant Catholicity, those who uphold it now, do so generally with no concealment that they know it to be Romanism.

Does Dr. Pusey know it to be such? I have too much respect for his piety to accuse him of a position so inconsistent with his character. As that "good man" St. Barnabas was "carried away with the dissimulation" of the Judaizers, so have I felt that the good Canon of Christ Church has been seduced, by his friendship for Dr. Newman, into a delusive enthusiasm that destroys the balance of his mind. But, his admirers are less tender of his reputation. They assure us his eyes are open, and yet they decide that he maintains the same doctrine with the most rabid of those who adopted No. Ninety only as an excuse for their apostasy. Of this class, one of the worst was Mr. Ward. Dr. Pusey himself enters a protest against being classed with so disreputable a writer,<sup>35</sup> whose argument for *No. Ninety* he characterizes as an "extreme Roman" one. But the admiring reviewer of Dr. Pusey does not admit any considerable difference between the two, in point of fact. He thus states the position of each:<sup>36</sup>

1. "What Mr. Ward meant was that *he was willing to adopt the decrees of Trent*:"

2. What Dr. Pusey means is that *he has no objection to them either*, because both the Council of Trent and the Thirty-Nine Articles are not really, but only seem to be at issue."

So then there is no difference at all in their positions, practically, Dr. Pusey's warmest friends being the judges. If Mr. Ward's is an "extreme Roman sense" so is Dr. Pusey's: and the only *extreme* feature of Mr. Ward is his "impertinently obnoxious" way of putting the case. So says the reviewer, who is as well-qualified a judge of that way, as I have ever known among decent literary men.

Mr. Keble's position has been a peculiar one: as Dean Milman said, "there is something about him unlike any other man." I had resolved not to admit his beloved name in this discussion, and if I do so, it is only because others have made it necessary. Nobody has ever heard me speak of him, except in terms of admiration and respect. His

---

<sup>34</sup> Barrow, Sermon xlvi. 4.

<sup>35</sup> Eirenicon, p. 38.

<sup>36</sup> Christian Remembrancer, January, 1866, p. 179.

gentle, loving spirit has ever risen before me as something nearer to St. John's than anything I have ever met with in life. Still, St. John himself was "a son of thunder," and I must own I have often wished that a little of the Boanerges had been visible in that lovely character. I have never permitted the fascination of his character to control those convictions of truth which I have gained from minds superior even to his, and from their clear expositions of the old Fathers and of the Holy Scriptures. I think Jeremy Taylor, though he too had faults, a better guide than Keble, as he was certainly a superior genius: and where the latter has diverged from the old paths under the powerful influence of his partiality for his friends, I have preferred not to follow him. I have ever regretted that unfortunate stanza in the "Christian Year," in which he urges us to "speak gently" of Rome's apostacy—although he calls it justly her *fall*. Still, it was a poetic sentiment and not bad in itself, had it not been so liable to abuse. And how sadly it has been abused for now these twenty years and more! Since those days of the "British Critic" which appalled us, with good reason, what a mawkish tenderness there has been toward everything Romish. What a departure from the spirit of our old divines, and from the vigorous language of that honest hostility to Rome, which Dr. Newman recognizes in Bishop Bull, and which he owns to be the necessary quality of every true-hearted minister of the Anglican Church. Of course we are hostile to a system so contrary to Truth, and evidence, and history and moral *purity* and Catholicity: and Holy Scripture commands us to deal not gently with inveterate error, and with words that eat like a canker. No admirer of the great Anglican divines need be ashamed to speak out on the subject of Romanism. My plain words are not meant to be gentle, but theirs are the trumpets of Sinai followed by the thunderbolts of the Apocalypse. And then this "speaking gently" must all be on one side. The Trentine party did not speak gently of the venerable Jewel, nor have they even scrupled to abuse the Reformers, and all who follow their steadfastness. Such a violent and vulgarly abusive press as has been characteristic of the faction ever since the "British Critic" fell into their hands, has been rarely tolerated among English Christians. Dr. Newman himself has used language the most discreditable and that continually; language which is said to have made Mr. Keble writhe with pain and in his gentle way break forth in expressions of astonishment.<sup>37</sup> Yet he is the man for whom the faction reserves its honied words, while speaking in terms of anything but gentleness of the whole Bench of Bishops; of a prelacy which includes the hoary-headed Exeter, the brilliant Oxford, and one of the most worthy of all the English primates. For Dr. Newman the enthusiastic reviewer has nothing but superlatives of praise. "Absolute fascination," "exquisite delicacy and refinement," "tact and clearness of perception"—these are the qualities ascribed to one who for a score of years has filled his mouth with gall and bitterness whenever he has spoken of the womb that bore him, and whose flagrant ill-temper placed him, on a memorable occasion, in the clutches of the Law, and forced him to hear a homily from Mr. Justice Coleridge.<sup>38</sup> Those words must not be forgotten at this crisis. If anybody blames me for plain words let him be reminded with what a character I am dealing and on what grounds. The Judge said:

"There is an extreme improbability in the story which you put forward, taken as a whole. One can hardly bring one's self to believe that a man not merely so wicked, and for so many years—but, according to your statement so notoriously wicked—should have been, as it appears unquestionably that he was,

---

<sup>37</sup> So says a late Correspondent of the *Guardian*.

<sup>38</sup> "Achilli vs. Newman" and "The Queen vs. Newman," 1852.

caressed, honoured, trusted—trusted with the most delicate and unfit employments in the Roman Catholic Church, until, it appears, he lapsed from the faith of that Church. \* \* \* I do confess that when, long ago now, my attention was first drawn to the pages which are before me, I read them *with infinite shame and disgust*. It appeared to me, I must say, as a mere matter of taste, that you had totally departed from the usual style of your productions. \* \* \* Master as you are in the art of writing, that you should have expressed yourself, in this way, lays you open, at least, to the imputation of great recklessness. It is sad to see that speaking of the Reformed Church, you should commence with a sentence such as this. \* \* \* Surely that was not language in which you should have spoken of a Church of which you had been so long a member. And the whole course of the pages which lie before me is conceived in the same way, partly in what may be called *ferocious merriment*, partly in triumph, partly in exultation over the unhappy man whose foul offences you were producing before your hearers. Surely, if you had felt yourself called upon to act as the judge and as the executioner of a man so foul and wretched \* \* \* you should have approached that task with feelings of sorrow and sadness, and should have executed it with tenderness and with consideration. Judges do not pass sentence on the foulest criminal without some emotion, sometimes difficult to control, \* \* \* but you have repeated these expressions as if it was matter of exultation and merriment, and as it seems to me, *with an utter recklessness* as to the great importance and the serious character of the charges you made. \* \* \* I hope that even in this crowded court there is not a single individual that looks with triumph upon the spectacle before him. \* \* \* Firmly attached as I am, and I believe ever shall be, to the Church of England, in which I have lived and in which I hope to die, yet there is nothing in my Mind on seeing you now before me but the deepest regret. I can hardly expect that you will take in good part many of the observations I have felt it my duty to make. Suffer me, however, to say one or two words more. The great controversy between the Churches will go on, we know not, through God's pleasure, how long. Whether, henceforward, you will take any part in it, it will be for you to determine; but, I think the pages before me should give you this warning, upon calm Consideration, that if you again engage in this controversy, you should engage in it neither personally nor bitterly. The best road to unity is by an increase of holiness of life. If you, for the future, sustain, as you may think you are bound to do, by your publications, the Church of Rome, I entreat you to do it in a spirit of charity and humility.<sup>39</sup>

It is to be regretted that Mr. Coleridge's entreaties have not been regarded. Dr. Newman has, since then, gone on with his experiment, "how much the Church of England will bear." True, the Church of England gave him no such plea for his grosser rhetoric, as was furnished by the career of one of his co-religionists, (whose crimes were shewn, in Court, to have been no scandals in the estimate of Rome, till he abjured her dogmas), but, apart from that, I hesitate not to say that every fault charged on Dr. Newman, by Mr. Coleridge, from the Bench, has been, as before, so ever since, perseveringly kept up by that unhappy offender in his railings against the Church.

Be patient we must; but it is certainly beyond all reasonable expectation that we should be content to see such a man made our model of "delicacy and refinement," as well as the great expounder of our Articles. And as for "speaking gently" of Rome, however amiable was the sentiment, in the poetry of the *Christian Year*, when it first appeared, in a generation by-gone, I cannot think it has led to any good results, especially in the case of the author of *No. Ninety*. Mr. Coleridge added:

"The sentence of the Court is that you do pay to her Majesty a fine of £100, and that you be imprisoned with the first class of misdemeanants, in the Queen's prison, until the fine be paid."

Now, it gives me pain to bring up this matter; but Dr. Newman's admirers make it necessary that his incorrigible habit should be reproved. When I read his "Lectures on Certain Difficulties" which he impertinently ascribed to Anglicans,<sup>40</sup> said—"here is language so gross, as well as unjust, that its precise equivalent, levelled at the Romish

---

<sup>39</sup> Reported in the *Guardian*.

<sup>40</sup> Published in 1850.

Church, in England by a fanatic of Exeter Hall, would hardly be relished even there.”

Such elaborate caricature of things the most sacred; such minute and persistent outrage to the most religious feelings of an Anglican; such bitter innuendo and such insulting sympathy have seldom, elsewhere, been connected with a style so scholarly, with such an assumption of innocence and even of patience and sanctity. To think how vulnerable is his own system, had any one the conscience to repay him in his own way! There was a Nemesis, therefore, in what he heard as a culprit at the bar, and the Trentine faction must thank themselves for my recall of Mr. Justice Coleridge, to shew just what sort of a person it is that they would have enthroned in our “Theological Colleges.” For one, I cannot think well of discarding Hooker and Bull, in favour of a selection from “the first class of misdemeanants,” in the Registry of Queen’s Bench.

To return to Mr. Keble’s position, it is my conviction that, like Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, he gave his friend’s Tract, by a too partial construction, the credit of meaning Catholicity and not Romanism. I could express my own views of the Articles, in general terms, precisely as he does; only, I cannot read No. Ninety with his tender eyes. But, the one grand distinction of Mr. Keble, in all this sad history, has been his undoubted love of the Church of England.<sup>41</sup> To his dying day he deeply felt the violence of Dr. Newman, and spoke sharply of perverts from the Church’s fold. I quote as follows:<sup>42</sup>

“It was on the afternoon of Sunday the 19th of June, 1864, I found him seated on the lawn absorbed in the Appendix (of Dr. Newman’s *Apologia*), which had just reached him. \* \* \* never saw him so moved before, or after. He seemed almost stupified by the blow, which was as unexpected, as he felt it to be severe. I remember, full well, his exclamations of disappointment and sorrow; much as though his dear and trusted friend had spoken slightly of his mother. After sitting for a long time silent and abstracted, at table, he said, when we were alone, ‘You see I can’t get over it, at all.’ When walking together in the park, he would say, ‘I can’t think how he could say *that*.’ And again, ‘What could make him so disdainful,’ and such like.”

In 1851, referring to the Roman Church,<sup>43</sup> he says, “Which now, alas I seems more than ever determined to deal with us as *a scornful and unsparing enemy*,” and these are strong words from him.

The interpretation of the Articles on which I insist, then, is simply that natural, grammatical and historical one which the Reformers themselves authorized. Whatever private and personal views they had, I agree, is of little moment; we must look to their Synodical decisions, and find in them the *expositio contemporanea et fortissima*. Now, they gave us their Expository decree, in what Cosin<sup>44</sup> calls their “Golden Rule,” and published it with the Articles, in 1571. It reads as follows:

“Let nothing ever be taught as to be religiously held and believed, save only what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what, from that very doctrine, has been gathered by the Fathers and ancient bishops.”

No words could be more fatal than these to any such interpretation as Mr. Newman contends for. Volume on volume of our old doctors may be cited which prove that the Trentine decrees are both a crime and a blunder; and if that were not enough, we

---

<sup>41</sup> He was a member of the Anglo-Continental Society, from 1855 to his death.

<sup>42</sup> Correspondent of the *Guardian*, April 18, 1866,

<sup>43</sup> Pastoral Letter.

<sup>44</sup> History of the Canon, p. 236.

could prove it even out of the better class of Gallicans, from the admissions of Bossuet, Fleury, Launoy and Du Pin. The Fathers and ancient bishops knew nothing of such a creed, and Dr. Newman's doctrine of "Development" virtually admits the fact. Yet, the whole artifice of *No. Ninety is the groundless assumption that Romanism is Primitive and Catholic*, and that, therefore, anybody may claim the above "Golden Rule" in defence of his right to subscribe our articles in his own private view of what is "Catholic," that is in a *Romish* sense.

Abuse has had its effect in leading us to undervalue the old Marian martyrs, and one is thought less of for quoting them. God forbid I should the less love and venerate those worthies: may my soul be with them in the last Day! They are commonly thought to be less Catholic than the Caroline divines, and so they were. But why? Not because they were disciples of Calvin, but because, like Calvin, they had been bred in no better school than that of Romish Scholasticism. Hence it was that at first, like Calvin, they knew not that the Episcopate was of divine institution; hence they only learned slowly and painfully that bishops are of an order superior to that of presbyters; and hence they could not immediately free themselves from ideas which became Calvinism at Geneva, but which tormented the Gallican Church for a generation after it had lost its hold in England, and which still survive as Jansenism. Yet it is just for what Rome had taught them that they are despised by the writer of Tract No. Ninety, and by the shallow party he has created. I will not omit, then, a quotation from Cranmer, which has always endeared him to me, in spite of his infirmities, and which has in it more of the spirit of Catholicity than is to be found in anything Dr. Newman ever wrote. It is in his "Appeal to a General Council,"—as follows:

"I protest that it was never in my mind to write, speak or understand anything contrary to the most Holy Word of God, or else against the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I have learned of the Sacred Scripture and of the Catholic Church of Christ *from the beginning*, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned Fathers and martyrs of the Church. And if anything, peradventure, hath chanced otherwise than I thought—*I may err*, but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as I am ready, in all things to follow the judgment of the most Sacred Word of God, and of the Holy Catholic Church."<sup>45</sup>

Now the Catholic interpretation of the Articles as understood, by Bull and Hammond, was just this, and no words could be more exclusive than these of the Trentine novelties which all our great divines have pronounced contrary to the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops. Cosin, who was all his life at war with the Puritans, and whose Catholic character will not be gainsayed, uses language about the Council of Trent much stronger than mine, and says in his last will:

"I do profess with holy asseveration and from my very heart, that I am now, and have ever been, from my youth, altogether free and averse from the corruptions and impertinent new-fangled or papistical (so commonly called) superstitious and doctrines, and new super-additions to the ancient and primitive religion and Faith of the most commended, so orthodox, and Catholic Church, long since introduced, contrary to the Holy Scripture and the rules and customs of the ancient Fathers."

This is my position; and everybody who is acquainted with the Anglican doctors, knows that such is the current, nay, the *torrent* of their testimony.

I know very well that seeming concessions can be culled here and there from their

---

<sup>45</sup> Cranmer's Remains, Cambridge, p. 227.

writings, as from Archbishop Wake's Letters,—but, in this latter instance, all was based on the *proviso* that the Gallicans were to assert their "Liberties" and abjure the Papacy; and some such *proviso* is always expressed or understood in other cases. For my part, should the Gallicans abjure the Pope, and hold to Bossuet's Exposition, not as Articles of Faith, nor as terms of Communion, but as we hold our Articles, then I say, myself, that our Faith being the same Catholic Creeds we could not be justified in refusing Communion with them; nay, it would be our duty, in order to lead them to a sounder practical Theology, to accept their advances to us. We could still speak the truth in love. But, all this is very different from going over to them and the Pope, and accepting the Trent decrees as our rule of Faith.

The late Dr. Wiseman threw out a bait which Dr. Pusey seems to have caught, when he said that "such an interpretation may be given of the Thirty-nine Articles as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine Synod." Dr. Newman's Tract shews how such an interpretation may be manufactured, no doubt; but let no man say that it is the Catholic interpretation, or that it can in any way, be harmonized with the views of our great Catholic divines. On the contrary, who does not see that the very effort to harmonize them with the Trentine decrees, erects those decrees into a standard, and admits the authority of a Council which they abhorred?

Besides, allowing the possibility of so harmonizing the Articles and making them all one with the decrees of Trent, nothing is gained in the way of Unity with Rome till those decrees are received as *de fide* and that operation would erect our Articles, as harmonized, into Articles of Faith also. Why not propose to abolish them at once, to submit to Rome outright, and swallow all the decrees of Trent as they are? It would be much more sensible to propose this; and it would be less tedious, and would involve much less of the morals of that remarkable saint, Liguori.

And, then, observe the *Occidentalism* of the project. Is Rome the whole Church? When we go back to her are we any nearer to Catholic Unity? Every one of those Trent decrees is a schism in itself, reduplicating the sin of Nicolas I., who interpolated the Nicene Creed, and erecting new barriers against Communion with the East. The Greeks ignorantly object to our Articles as they are, overlooking the facts that we make them no Creed, and that they are merely our Provincial Theology; but, to Tridentinize them is to make them part and parcel of our Faith, and so to put adamantine walls between ourselves and the Orientals. Does any one imagine that the Easterns will ever accept the Creed of Pius IV.? Why does Dr. Pusey ask us then to make concessions to the Latins, which will justly offend the Greeks? And why are the Trent anathemas forever in the head and heart of the new party, rather than the mild demands of the Orientals? Are the Romanists the rather to be propitiated because they enforce every jot and tittle of their decrees on pain of eternal damnation? Is there anything in the conduct and character of Dr. Manning to lead us to draw near to him, rather than to the venerable Philaret of Russia? The *Eirenicon* only aggravates the dilemma of Christendom; and never, more than since reading it, have I admired the grand Vincentian position of the Anglican Church, which offers alike to Greeks and Latins to meet them on the old basis of the Nicene Constitutions, putting all things back where they were before the divisions.

On this principle our position towards the Latin Churches becomes very clear. The mere statement of the principle dissolves the figment of a "Roman Catholic Church."

No such Church is known to Ecclesiastical History, before the division; it is a fiction of the Papacy and only of yesterday, at that. We can know only our sister Churches of the West, each for itself, and the Bishops of Rome only as such, with his limited patriarchal jurisdiction as defined by the Council of Nice. The Italians, in large numbers, are already awake to this Canonical view of their Church, and the Galileans have been on the verge of it, over and over again, since 1682.<sup>46</sup> Now, with each of these Churches, we are already in organic Unity, whether they recognize it or not; our Unity is in the Common Episcopate and the Common Faith; but with their Provincial corruptions we hold no communion, nor do we ask them to adopt our Provincial Articles. Local and Provincial matters, be they good or bad, have nothing to do with organic Unity. Philadelphia was in Unity with Sardis, in spite of her corruptions, through the common organization signified by the seven Stars and the seven Candlesticks, and through the common Faith in Christ, signified by His Presence amid the Candlesticks and his hand upholding the Stars. Thus the Church's Unity is only in the Truth: all that is common to the whole Church is Truth; and it is the intimation of Christ himself, in the Vision of the Seven Churches, that Smyrna and Philadelphia are to maintain Unity with the corrupt Churches, but not *in their corruptions*; so that the corrupt Churches by recurring to first works and first love, that is to *primitive* purity, may not be cut off, but "rather, be healed," through the example of sister Churches, less defiled.

We know the Latin Churches, then, as we know the Oriental Church, and not otherwise, only in their primitive organizations, and in the common Faith. And, as we occupy this ground we are the most Catholic Church in the world, since even the Greeks demand that we should give up some of our freedom in Christ, for the privilege of visible communion with them; while we propose nothing but, as of old, the Common Creed and the Common Episcopate.<sup>47</sup> Occupying this ground and maintaining it in love and consistency, we may yet be made the instruments of restoring all things. The plan of the *Eirenicon* is to surrender our Catholic mountain, and to propose a union of forces in that Tridentine bog—"where armies whole have sunk."

In short, its narrow and fatuous scheme may be summed up in a word: It proposes Unity at the cost of Truth, and only Occidental Unity at that, instead of Œcumenical Unity—the Unity of the Nicene Creed.

The Council of Trent, therefore, we can recognize only as what Bishop Bull called it, "a mere convention." It must pass away like an abortion, as another Rimini; its decrees must be nullified like the Sirmian Confession signed by Liberius. The Bishop of Rome, who has already ceased to be a temporal prince, in reality if not in name, must now become a Catholic, as no Bishop of Home has been, since the schism of Nicolas I. This the Neapolitans have already demanded,<sup>48</sup> and God forbid that Anglicans should cease to insist upon it. It will not be the first time that Bishops of Rome have been obliged to obey the Catholic Church, and to abjure their heresies and schisms:<sup>49</sup> and this

---

<sup>46</sup> See de Maistre on the Assembly of 1682, *de l'Eglise Gallicane*, ii. 5. Also Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* iii. 35.

<sup>47</sup> Hammond, of Schism, p. 283.

<sup>48</sup> L'Emancipatore Cattolico, *passim*.

<sup>49</sup> Bossuet, Defens. Declarat. Cleri Gallicani, cap. xxxii. *et seq.*

wonderful year<sup>50</sup> has already made greater changes in the position of the See of Rome than have ever been known since the times of Charlemagne. This even Papists recognize: the Monde has lately uttered words more pregnant than it comprehends, as follows:<sup>51</sup>

“If Austria succumbs there will be no State depending upon the Vicar of Jesus Christ—*All will have abjured the official character of the Catholic faith*. There will be numerically Catholic peoples; the Protestants will dare to call themselves a Protestant nation. England and Prussia will make a show of their pretended orthodoxy, and the mass of the Catholics in France, Spain, and Germany will let fall the throne of Pius IX.—that visible sign of the Catholicity of the nations. Remaining faithful to that grand cause, Austria testifies to it by her defeats. If she is irremediably vanquished she will have all the honour of the combat. *She will close the Catholic cycle of modern peoples*. The Church and the world will enter upon new struggles, the struggles full of obscurity, the conditions of which it is impossible to determine.”

This is more true than the writer intends it to be. The age of the Papacy is past, and a better era begins. What Charlemagne bestowed is taken away: what Nicolas usurped must soon follow:

“—————nec Babylonios  
Tentaris numeros.”

Surely Gregory the last Patriarch of Rome spoke by the Spirit of prophecy when he made his successor Boniface,<sup>52</sup> not Antichrist, but “the forerunner of Anti-Christ.” With him came the penumbral darkness, but the Anti-Christian eclipse was reserved for the man of the Decretals, for Nicolas, truly “a Man of Sin.” How marked is that Pontificate by everything that could justify the thought that in him one beholds the awful figure that affrighted Daniel; the dreadful apparition, by the mere foreshadowing of which St. John was startled in Patmos. “Since the days of Gregory I. to our time,” says a writer<sup>53</sup> of his own century, “sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign.” But we now know how to complete his portrait, the portrait of the first Pope. So long as the Roman patriarch even claimed a canonical position, and pretended to be the *Executive* of the Synodical Canons, his exaggerated pretensions were not formally schismatical; he still sat as a patriarch of the Church, though he had set up claims which the Church ignored. But, Nicolas made the breach. He it was, who, at one blow severed Western Christendom not only from the East, but from its Canonical Unity with the great Councils, and with Antiquity. He placed all the Churches of the West under the autocracy of the Roman See: he practically annihilated the “ancient usages,” the sanctity of which was affirmed at Nicæa; he impiously interpolated the Great Symbol itself and involved the whole line of his successors in the most gigantic fraud of history, and in all the woes and horrors it has brought upon Christendom.<sup>54</sup> He was the great destroyer of the Unity of

---

<sup>50</sup> The “Forerunner of Antichrist” became such A.D. 606, when Boniface was made “Universal bishop,” by the usurper Phocas. This year completes the prophetic cycle of 1260 years. See Daniel vii. 25. Rev. xiii. 5.

<sup>51</sup> For *Catholic* read *Romish*, throughout this quotation.

<sup>52</sup> This whole subject is summed up in a masterly manner, by the Abbé Guettée. See his *Papauté Schismatique*, of which there is now an English Translation, published by Carleton, New York.

<sup>53</sup> Rhegino, abbot of Prum. See Gieseler, ii. 70.

<sup>54</sup> “The long and large prevalence of such corruptions has been *obtained by force*.”—Bishop Butler, Sermon v., p. 222.

the Church of Christ: and if he was not the Lawless One,<sup>55</sup> he certainly was his next of kin.<sup>56</sup>

It is not to Luther that we owe the first return of daylight. He kindled a conflagration, but the first restoration of the Sunshine, after the eclipse, appears in England, where the slow and orderly progress of reformation gave tokens of a more than human hand, as it were, of the Faithful Witness in heaven. There, and alas! there only, the Nicene Constitutions re-appeared, and in some good degree there the Church revealed herself again, “as at the first and her counsellors as at the beginning.” What a glorious work! When the Roman pontiffs had become the scourge of Europe, and afterward its scorn; when Council after Council had tried, and ignominiously failed to reform the Western Church, “in its members and in *its head*,” when blood had been shed like water by Inquisitors and princes, under Papal instigation; when all things in the Church were venal, and when Huss and Savonarola had borne their testimony at the stake, apparently in vain; when good men cried despairingly to Christ, and dared to fancy Him once more “asleep on a pillow;” when they saw the men that claimed to be His Vicars, and to have all power upon earth to forgive sins, the scandals of the world for avarice and lust and cruelty; when a Borgia was succeeded by a Rovera, and Julius by Leo X.; and when the very madness of men that essayed a rash reformation on the Continent was pardonable in comparison with every characteristic of those against whom they struggled; then—what a work it was which God caused to be wrought in England, by his servants Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley.<sup>57</sup> Granted they were but men, of like passions with us, yet in such times, and by the Spirit working in them, what a work they did for the Church, and for mankind. On the Continent the reforming doctors pulled down great wrongs, but in England, the primate and the bishops, working patiently and by Catholic rule, restored the Primitive Constitution of the Church. When I reflect on the Anglican Reformation; when I worship in the glorious Liturgy they rescued from an unknown tongue, and cleansed from innumerable defilements; when I compare our reformed Church with Holy Scripture and the purest ages of Antiquity, I am amazed at these results; I wonder that amid the passions and the conflicts of such an age, such a miracle should have been wrought by the hands of men. Then, when I see these benefactors of the world attesting in the flames their holy Mission, and bequeathing their work to England, sealed and hallowed with their blood, I seem to dream when I think of an age like this, that has bred a puny race of men to mock their memory and to go on servile knees to those who slew them, begging to receive back again the yoke of bondage and of corruption.<sup>58</sup> Thank God, three hundred

---

<sup>55</sup> II. Thess. ii. 8.

<sup>56</sup> On the whole subject of the Romish imposture, Antichrist, Babylon and the like, I own myself greatly enlightened and in a measure satisfied by the “Lectures on the Apocalypse” of Canon Wordsworth.

<sup>57</sup> Their greatness grows upon us when we contrast their work with the feebleness of Bossuet and of the French reformatory attempt of 1682, which ended in establishing the *Regale* on the Anglican base (see de Maistre, *l’Eglise Gallicane*, ii. 2.) with no compensating advantages to the Church. “Le Roi,” says Fleury, “avait plus de droit que l’évêque et autant que le Pape.”

<sup>58</sup> The lengths to which the Trentine party have gone in England would hardly be credited. A layman who is far from disapproving of moderate ritual thus complains of what he has seen and heard, in a letter which was lately read in Convocation: “Why, also, do these clergy presume to come into the Church, and even up to the altar, and join in the service or preach a sermon, with their heads covered—wearing a Romish cap or hat called a ‘biretta’? If a layman were to come into the church wearing a similar hat, he would be required to take it off, and properly. But why do these clergy do what in others they would call an act of irreverence, except it be to imitate foreign and Romish peculiarities, and to outrage our sense of decency? Again, why

years of civil and religious freedom have spread the reformed Church of England all over the world, and the martyrs to whom we owe it have children in all lands to speak with their enemies in the gate. Here in America, at least, we know how to value our dear Mother, and all the blessings of the Christian Covenant which we receive through her. We have only to look at the Southern portion of this Continent, to Mexico and South America, to feel what we owe to the reformers. Away with slate-and-pencil reckonings of merits that are grudgingly conceded to her; we see in her the splendours of a Primitive Catholicity such as are no where else to be found. Is it a little thing that she gives to all her children the Word of God, the words which are Spirit and which are Life? Is it a small thing that we have unmutilated Sacraments, and the Creeds unmixed with blasphemous decrees and dogmas? Have we not reason to rejoice in the chaste marriage of the Clergy, according to the Scriptures, and in the sanctity of the Christian Family, unviolated by a compulsory Confessional and by inquisitorial casuistry alike indecent and profane? Do we owe little to those who have made the ideas of home, wife and mother, superlatively beautiful in the English heart? Do we owe them nothing for the incomparable English of the Prayer-book, for the general structure of the Liturgy, for the wonderful majesty and yet primitive simplicity of the Ordinal? Is it a meagre note of Catholicity, that, in the Anglican Church, Paradise is restored to the Faithful, and "Purgatory" annihilated, and that in our sorrows we are not only permitted to hear but to feel the words, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord"?

The famous challenge of Bishop Jewel has never yet been answered, by an apologist of Rome, and it never can be. But, let it be added that the Church of England has saved us from that Trent Council which is a schism and a heresy, and which brought massacres and dragonnades on France, and the Inquisition upon Spain, and thick darkness upon Italy;<sup>59</sup> she alone in Western Europe has proved a true keeper of Holy Writ, rejecting the apocrypha and the awful decree that substitutes the vulgate for the words of the Holy Ghost; she has revived, in Western Europe, the Apostolic Episcopate; she has re-asserted the truth which Trent, in the interest of the popes, has taught nations to deny, that the bishop is of an order superior to the presbyter, and that his consecration is not a mere anointing, but an Ordination; she has given back to Confirmation the apostolic Laying-on-of-hands; she has revived the grand Vincentian Canon of Truth, and the Cyprianic maxims of Unity; she alone, in Christendom, pleads for Unity like the woman before Solomon, *asking nothing for herself*;<sup>60</sup> and out of her has gone forth the life-giving movement for restored Unity, which is now shaking the dry-bones all over the world.

---

do some of these clergy put forth such a book as *The little Prayer-book*, a thorough imitation of a Romish model, and similar books of devotion? and why do many endeavour to spread such publications, in which is a direct prayer to one's guardian angel, as direct and full as might be to the Almighty? By means of these publications, Roman, not Catholic, doctrine is taught: private confession to a priest, called 'the Sacrament of Penance,' is represented as necessary and obligatory on all in the English Church, and Romish directions for the practice of confession are given. The extent to which Romish, not Catholic, teaching is going on under the auspices of persons of the extreme party, in Churches where 'a full and gorgeous ritual' is carried out, is, *I think, little known or realized by our bishops* and by members of Convocation. There is good reason to believe that the ultimate aim and object of this party is nothing less than to make the doctrine, practice, and worship of the Anglican Church as nearly as possible identical with the Roman."

<sup>59</sup> "The value of our own Church ought to be very much heightened, in our esteem, by considering what it is a security from. I mean the great corruption of Christianity, Popery."—Bishop Butler, Sermon v., p. 222.

<sup>60</sup> That is—on a simple Nicene base, with no demand for the reception of her Provincial Articles.

Is this the time, then, for the reactionary dreams and vapours of *No. Ninety*, and for Dr. Pusey's *Concordat* with the Pope? When Italy abjures the Papacy, are we to accept it? When Montalembert warns us that Rome's "evil communications will corrupt our good manners," are we to seek the embrace of Pius the Ninth and Liguori? When the whole Trentine fabric breaks down with the weight of the abominations it has piled upon the Latin Churches, is England to adopt it, as proposed by Dr. Pusey? I cannot say that none of our old divines ever dreamed of such a thing, for now I remember that the holy and sainted George Herbert has imagined it, in lines which I trust are not prophetic.<sup>61</sup>

"When Seine shall swallow Tiber, and the Thames  
By *letting in them both*, pollutes her streams,  
When Italy of us shall have her will,  
And all her calendar of sins fulfil,  
Then shall religion to America flee."

What could he have foreseen? It is true that the Thames has been running very foul of late, and it is true that London Bridge spans no flood more polluted than has been poured in upon England by the Papal aggressions, followed up by the schism of Dr. Manning, and by the impiety and profaneness of his heretical writings. But it is to be hoped that Italy is not any further to "have her will" or way in England. The (Gallican) Seine is very visible in the *Eirenicon*, and the (Ultramontane) Tiber in Dr. Manning's response to it; but will England "let in both"? Is there no Bishop Bull to turn back the tide? The danger is very urgent, if even half be true that is stoutly asserted by the *Remembrancer*<sup>62</sup> in these words:

"The point upon which we now insist is, that *what was condemned in every quarter of the land* in 1841, is held by public opinion to be entirely tenable in 1865, and is, in fact, held *by nearly all* the learned laity and clergy of the Church of England."

Is this possible? Is Dr. Newman the Rabbi of such men, and are *No. Ninety* and the *Eirenicon* to furnish us with a Talmud? A "Babylonian Talmud" verily!<sup>63</sup>

"Now Seine is swallowing Tiber; if the Thames  
By letting in them both pollute her streams,  
Or if the seers shall connive or wink,  
Beware the thunderbolt—*Migremus hinc*.  
Oh, let me die and not survive to see  
Before my death religion's obsequy."

So one of Herbert's admirers responded to his own vaticinations<sup>64</sup> in 1670. May I not venture to ask of the venerable prelates of England whether this is the time for "seers to see not," and for "prophets to prophesy not." It is not pretended that they approve of

---

<sup>61</sup> Herbert's Poems. Pickering, p. 211.

<sup>62</sup> January, 1866, p. 179.

<sup>63</sup> See Prideaux. Connections, Ann. 446.

<sup>64</sup> Commendatory verses, p. xvii.

No. Ninety and its dark shadow, the *Eirenicon*;<sup>65</sup> but, the faction promises itself that they will “connive or wink,” through mere unwillingness to encounter impudence and browbeating. “The Church of England,” say they,<sup>66</sup> with a glance at the bishops, “must have gained a considerable amount of courage, if it will now *run the risk of offending the influential party of which Dr. Pusey is now the principal representative.*” Surely, this is mere impertinent bravado. If not, and if this faction is to go on, unchecked—

“Then shall religion to America flee.”

At least the poet consoles us with this hope. But, God forbid that we should have our “times of Gospel” at the expense of our most dear and tenderly beloved Mother Church. It is true that, in America, we cannot do otherwise than maintain the time-honoured position of the reformed Church of England. If our English brethren can afford to compromise it, we cannot. Here, we are surrounded by a boundless Sectarianism, on which we act powerfully, only in proportion as we hold our ground and uphold a Primitive and Scriptural Catholicity. We are striving, moreover, against an invasion of Romish hordes, who grasp political power, and lay their hands, without scruple, and by every means, not only on the money of their own people, but on the public purse. If the scheme of the *Eirenicon* be a good one, we have no excuse for our existence. We must succumb, and be swallowed up, without a Concordat, by Tridentinism in its meanest shape; for such it is as exhibited in this country, where gross impudence and mendacity, with a faculty for political intrigue, are considered prime qualifications for its Episcopate, and where the bloody Bedini, known in Italy as “the butcher of Bologna” was lately imported to renovate its Succession, and to supplant the decent Gallicanism of Dr. Carrol, by a rabid Celtic Ultramontanism. If, then, the English bishops can suffer their just authority to be overborne and insulted by a *bureau* of the *Remembrancer* like the *bureau* of the *Univers* in Paris,<sup>67</sup> and, if while it is usurping power they can assure themselves that their “strength is to sit still,” I acknowledge their superior wisdom and am glad they are so strong. But, here, in America, we cannot afford to imitate them. In our comparatively feeble church such a *bureaucracy* would be fatal to the claims of an Episcopate, which is closely watched and compared with the primitive Episcopacy. Besides, we are a missionary Church, and our trumpet must give no uncertain sound. Nicene or Trentine? That’s the question, now, and if our Church hesitates, for a moment, we are lost; and with its ruin expires all hope for the speedy evangelizing and Catholicizing of this immense population. Our position and principles are the subject of constant interest and inquiry: small as we are, we are set upon a hill; as yet, we have been true to the doctrines we have received from our Mother Church; we have asserted and maintained the principles of a Primitive Catholicity, since the days of Seabury; we are irresistible in this position; we stand in the old paths, and we know how to bring the wanderers into the fold, by so doing; but, I repeat it, such counsels as those of *No. Ninety* and the *Eirenicon* would destroy us. Even to entertain them, would compromise our

---

<sup>65</sup> Their presumed disapproval is the subject of a most insulting passage in the Rem. for July, 1866, p. 165.

<sup>66</sup> C. Remembrancer, Jan., 1866, p. 179.

<sup>67</sup> For a picture of this *bureau* and its effects, see that remarkable work *La Religieuse* by the Abbé \* \* \*. As early as 1853, we find in a Gallican brochure, these prophetic words: “Les journalistes de l’*Univers* prétendent marcher seuls, et sans les évêques, et contre les évêques même, et imprimer enfin à l’Eglise de France, et par la à la nation tout entière, le mouvement et la direction. *Lettres Cardinales*, etc. Paris 1853.

steadfastness. We should cease to command respect; we should soon cease to exist, if the adoption of such a policy were within the horizon of things possible.

But, since the crisis has been created, I do not think we need be sorry that it is so. In this country it will only deepen our roots,-and strengthen our hold, in the Primitive Nicene Catholicity. In England, I cannot conceive of any other than a good result, in the Providence of God, for hers is a sober and a sensible as well as a conscientious people. They will not forsake their old doctors for such a guide as the author of *No. Ninety*, at the demand of such writers as the reviewer in the *Remembrancer*; but, I think I can see how it will work. The discussion tends to de-insulate and to Catholicize, by demonstrating the absurdity of the scheme to Latinize, and by opening to view the duties we owe to the East, with which we have never quarrelled, and with which our long non-intercourse is wholly due to our Babylonish captivity under the popes. At this juncture, a Pan-Anglican Synod is once more spoken of and desired. If it may be brought about, it is most important to convoke it soon. If such a Synod might be held in the Spirit of old Nicæa, the Gospels enthroned within it as the voice of the Holy Ghost, the venerable Episcopate sitting as one body in Christ, *omni plebe adstante*, who shall limit its blessed results? Thenceforth, an Englishman, like an intelligent Russian, would clearly understand his Catholic position. There would be no more misunderstanding of the term; no more confounding of Catholicity with the anile imposture of the Decretals; the voice of the Great Head of the Church would be heard again, as in Patmos, and his form be seen amid the golden candlesticks, as the only centre of Unity. The old Churches of the East might be saluted and thanked for their maintenance, through a thousand years of Western degeneracy, of the Creed and the Constitutions of the Catholic Councils. The *Filioque* might be discarded from the Creed, to signify our acknowledgment of its improper insertion there, while retained in the Litany in entire accordance with what the East has allowed. Measures might be taken to renovate Missions; to wake up the Scandinavians, and restore the Germans. The Cyprianic age might be renewed; and by the blessing of God on the revival of a spirit of Unity, the Faith might once more “have free course and be glorified,” as in the days of old, as in the former days. So be it, gracious Lord. *Exsurgat Deus, et dissipentur inimici!*

If I am myself devoted to ideas like these, I am sure right reason does not discourage them, and I am persuaded, that, the signs of the times are favourable, and that the Holy Spirit seems to be moving over the nations. And even if such aspirations are not soon to be fully realized, yet he is the true Catholic who keeps them in view, and prays for a better age, in which the Church shall renew her youth, according to the promises of God in Holy Scripture. Meantime, in this great Republic, the Church of the Apostles and of the Reformers, is planted and firmly rooted, and it is sweet to live and labour for her extension among the swarming millions of our population. Though not insensible to her defects, her children behold in her such a chaste and matronly beauty that it is impossible to love her by halves. She is beautiful, exceedingly, as the spouse of Christ should be; and I long to see all my countrymen sharing the blessings she imparts to individual souls, to households, to Society. If I fail to do what I would, in this respect, still I shall enjoy a sweet contentment in the good-will she inspires toward my fellow-men, and in trying to realize in my own soul the spiritual life which she bestows and developes. Dear Church! What would life be worth without her consolations; with what sorrow should I look upon my children, if, in a world so evil, her blessed communion were not their inheritance, and

the sure source to them, if they will be faithful, of pleasures no riches can impart. How truly she represents to them their Saviour, her heavenly Lord: what an evidence she is that His promises and His own institutions cannot fail. The Church of our English forefathers is the source from whence all that is precious in my country is directly or indirectly derived, though, like light and air, it is enjoyed with little reflection upon its nature and origin. Now, I ask, is she less than all this to Englishmen; to the land which she has made so great and so much envied by all the world? Why then does Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon* award her such parsimonious praise? His own book furnishes frightful evidence that her sister churches are defiled like Sardis and like Laodicea; in comparison she is an Ephesus if not a Smyrna. He himself is shocked at their awful Mariolatry; he exposes their slavery to the imposture of the Decretals, but he forgets that he owes it to the Reformers that he himself is not as they are. Where is his tribute of gratitude to God, for what he owes to them? I am ashamed of such a case as he makes out for our Church; he who dwells in Oxford, and eats the finest of her wheat. We love her better in America. There are thousands here who while they only gather up the crumbs, feel the blessedness of being her children, and would rather die than speak of her as do many in England. Year by year, we derive from her Communion the blessings that sweeten our existence, and which we honestly believe to be the richest God ever bestowed on man. And shall we hear her undervalued, even by her sons, without a remonstrance? Nay, we rise up and call her blessed. I count it my dearest privilege to be her child and servant: and that this privilege is my personal inheritance from one of her faithful missionaries, by whom our Church was founded, is a claim to it which I value as my choicest birthright. God knows I love her as, in Christ, my chiefest joy, and when I forget her, "may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth." I am sure that in defending her against whatever adversary, I am obeying that precept of Inspiration, that "We ought to contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints."

## ADVERTISEMENT.

Anxious to do my duty in guarding young students of divinity against the Trentine movement, I addressed a letter of caution to a Candidate for Holy Orders, last Spring, which, after a little delay, I enlarged and published in the local religious newspaper of this diocese. Facts came to my knowledge, soon after this, which led me to write another letter; and this was followed, at intervals, by others.

These letters have been written, as it were, on wheels, while toiling through my diocese, and in republishing them I have had little time to improve them. I have allowed some expressions to remain which I should have preferred to soften, had they not been so grossly misrepresented that to let them stand is the best refutation I can make of the sense which has been put upon them, by violent inferences, and by unwarranted applications, of general statements, to persons of whom I have never spoken save with respect.

To my young brethren, for whom I first wrote, on this subject, let me commend the careful reading of three important works:

1. The treatise of Dr. Hammond<sup>68</sup>—“Of Schism, a defence of the Church of England against the objections of the Romanists.”
2. “A Discourse of Heresy” by the same divine, inserted in his “Parænesis.”
3. The Abbé Guettée’s work on “The Papacy,” in which he proves its imposture and schism, and which he proposes to follow by a work on its heretical character.

From the writings of the learned and holy Hammond, the student will get a clear idea of what the doctrines of our Church are, as expounded by a genuine Anglican doctor; and I am quite willing to leave to his common sense the question whether, or not, those doctrines are faithfully represented in my exposure of *No. Ninety*. It must be remembered that, confessedly, the *Eirenicon* and *No. Ninety* are one in principle, and must stand or fall together.

---

<sup>68</sup> Hammond’s “Minor Works,” one volume, Oxford, 1849.

I.  
LETTER TO A CANDIDATE FOR ORDERS.

MY DEAR YOUNG FRIEND:

You are quite pardonable for asking my opinion respecting any important matter touching the doctrine of which, if the Lord will, you are soon to be a teacher. You are quite right in thinking that Dr. Pusey's opinions, as respects the Thirty-Nine Articles, are "novelties," in the ordinary sense of the word. I will add that they are novelties which do not concern us, and which the Church of England is quite competent to dispose of without our aid.

Still, as a Student of Divinity, you ought to know how to account for the phenomena of the times, and how to answer gainsayers. You shall have such aid as I can give you in so doing.

Dr. Pusey, as you have heard, is a pious and a learned man, but he has fallen into a dangerous error, and one that ought, very much, to impair confidence in his judgment, and, indeed, in his *theoretical* morality. You will be at loss, perhaps, to reconcile this statement with his reputation; but through life you will encounter difficulties of the kind, shewing that man "in his best estate is altogether vanity."

When I object to his *theoretical* morality, I refer to the tendency of his principles to weaken the moral faculties of those who act upon them. Thus, Dr. Paley was a very good man, I suppose, but his moral philosophy is generally admitted to contain the seeds of much practical evil.

If you have never given much attention to Bacon's *Confutation of Idols*, let me ask you now to study the Fifth Book of his *Advancement of Learning*, on this point, and what he says elsewhere on the same subject.

"A man," he says, "always believes more readily that which he prefers—in short, his feelings imbue and corrupt his understanding in innumerable and sometimes imperceptible ways." Thus, for example, our country abounds in clever and pious men, of divers sectarian persuasions, who are learned and candid too; yet they resist the plainest and most reasonable truths as proposed by the Church, because of their habits of mind. They know as well as we do certain facts of history; but it is their habit to regard nothing as important which is not delivered in Holy Scripture with an explicit "Thus saith the Lord." It makes nothing to them, that they have actually accepted all the Books of Scripture itself, at least those of the New Testament, without such an oracle; they live altogether in the confusion of ideas resulting from such preconceptions and habits of mind.

When we can trace any gross mistake or error in a good man to his "idols of the den," we must be charitable in judging him, but we need not be very tender in exposing his fault.

Now, Dr. Pusey labours under the same "idols of the den" with his old *confrère* Dr. Newman. In the *Apologia* of the latter, it is everywhere apparent that it is his

inveterate habit to confound the schismatical Papacy with the old legitimate patriarchate of Rome, which has ceased to exist. He also forgets that the Greeks are the historical Catholics. He knows that there are Oriental Catholics; he knows very well that the ancient councils recognized no Papacy, when they composed the Nicene Creed. But what of all that, when he forgets it habitually, and thinks and theorizes in his den?

The vulgar use, or abuse, of the word *Catholic* which Dr. Newman craftily adopted and which is still kept up by those of his school, is the source of much of Dr. Pusey's confusion. I beseech you, make it a principle, never to use this word except in its legitimate sense, as in the Creeds. So used, it is of itself a Protest against the Papacy, which has no place in any Creed except that of Trent. Dr. Pusey labours under the delusion that the Pope is somebody, if not all that he esteems himself, and that the Council of Trent was a real Synod of the Church. But, from nothing nothing comes. If there was no Pope when the Nicene Creed was set forth, there can be no such thing now, that is to say, no such power in the Church, legitimately, or according to the Catholic Constitution. To a true Catholic, therefore, the Papacy is simply an imposture, and the Council of Trent a mere Convention of nobodies. Neither the Pope, nor his Jesuits who did everything at Trent, had the slightest authority to legislate for the Christian Church. To call such a Church, then, as the Pope presides over, "The Catholic Church" is absurd. The continued use of the word "Catholic," in a sense unknown to the Creeds, is a scandal in literature, and in a theologian it is consummate ignorance, or unpardonable slovenliness. In society, it is a duty we owe to ourselves, never to hear the word misused, without a considerate remonstrance.

To speak more precisely of Dr. Pusey, he seems to be out of place in the Church of England; he is a Gallican on the wrong side of the Channel. But, what might be a noble position in a French divine, struggling toward the truth, is a miserable one for an Anglican, groping back into night.

His unfortunate book the *Eirenicon* is a mere reproduction of the work of Dr. Newman, Tract *No. Ninety*; a Tract which shocked the moral sense of England when it appeared, and which was so universally condemned, that its author apostatized to Rome, as the consequence. The *Eirenicon* is not an Ultramontane book; it is distinctly Romish, but it takes the Gallican position, admitting all that has been thought essential for Union with Rome, but very forcibly protesting against the more monstrous and recent dogmas of the Papacy.

It betrays and surrenders the grand old position which our great divines have held for three centuries, and to which we owe our deliverance from the awful blasphemies which he himself exposes, and shews to be embraced in Romish Doctrine and practice.

It practically ignores the fact that our Thirty-Nine Articles are not made terms of Communion, while the Thirteen Articles of Modern Romanism are imposed as a creed under the most fearful anathemas.

Instead of shewing that we can have no dealings with Rome until she abolishes such a Creed, and returns to the Catholic Faith, pure and simple, it proposes a compromise on the basis of a harmony between our Articles and the Creed of Pius IV.

The absurdity of such a position is clear from the fact that the poor Gallicans have

tried to maintain it, in Communion with the Pope, for two centuries; and have lived all the time on the very verge of the Papal anathema, and absolutely “under the ban.” The doctor thinks an *authoritative* approval of his diluted Romanism would settle the difficulty. Has he forgotten that Popes cannot be bound with green withes? What are oaths and concordats to the potentate that has already *authorized* the Morals of Alphonsus de’ Liguori? Did not Innocent XI. pretend to confirm Bossuet’s *Exposition*; and has not the whole power of the Papacy, ever since, been employed to uproot and to destroy it? Poor Bossuet! He is abhorred at Rome almost as much as Luther. How simple, then, in Doctor Pusey to propose a concordat based on his own *Exposition*. Alas! while Italy advances toward us, Dr. Pusey would lead us back to the embrace of the despotism which thousands of the Italians *religiously*, and as Catholics, discard. The Doctor has misrepresented the movement of those faithful witnesses in Italy, who are calling their countrymen up to the Holy Scriptures and the Nicene Church, while he would drag us down to the Pope and the Trent Council.

I form my opinion of the *Eirenicon*, not only from the book itself, but from those letters of the Doctor’s which I have seen, and from the laudatory reviewal of it which appears in the *Remembrancer*.<sup>69</sup> The book contains much that is good. It exposes the New Dogma, just as any Gallican might, and probably would if he had a chance. But whatever the merits of the performance, these are but baits to a very deadly hook. The fawning reviewer admits that his friend, Doctor Pusey, has merely reproduced, on a broader scale, the principles of Tract No. Ninety. He says it in plain words; and he seems to rejoice in a delusive idea, that the moral sense of English Churchmen is so debauched as to accept in 1866 what they rejected with scorn and contempt five-and-twenty years ago. He imagines, in other words, that England is prepared to accept the morals of Liguori and the Jesuits.

Now, on this point, my dear young friend, I must speak with solemnity. As yet you have a good conscience and are shocked by what you have seen in print. Keep that pure conscience, my dear brother, and let no man deceive you. In a short time you will be called on, in circumstances the most awful, to affirm before me, your Bishop, your sincere acceptance of the doctrines summed up in the Thirty-Nine Articles. Such is the nature of the promise of Conformity which you will be called to subscribe, and of the answers exacted by the Ordinal, in harmony with the Canonical requirements of the Church. As a Christian gentleman, I am sure you will make your affirmation in none other than the grammatical and historical sense of your words; but I think it well, before any scandal arises, to let my rule of action be known. Should any one ever offer himself to me for Holy Orders, on the principle of subscription set forth in the Tract aforesaid, I should not only reject him as a candidate, but I should sustain his pastor in suspending him from the Holy Communion. We have not yet come to that pass, that premeditated perjury is less than scandalous evil-living; or that a man should be tolerated as a communicant who is prepared to lie to the Holy Ghost.

In the Church of England discipline is so hampered by the power of the State, that many scandals go unpunished there, which, in this country, can be suppressed summarily. Now, I suppose it to be self-evident that if a clergyman, or candidate for Orders in our

---

<sup>69</sup> Christian Remembrancer, January 1866.

Church, professes to hold any distinctly Romish doctrine, and at the same time to accept the Thirty-Nine Articles, he is an immoral man. The thief and the counterfeiter are not so bad as he in the sight of God. With such a hypocrite I will deal as a Bishop should; I will use the degree of forbearance which the Holy Scriptures and the Church enjoin, and then proceed to make an example of him.

In the ancient days, St. Hilary could say to a heretical Bishop of Rome, "I call thee anathema, thou prevaricator, Liberius." Let me urge you to study the sound old Anglican Divines of the Seventeenth century, and you will then see, clearly, how to bear yourself toward Papists. You will see that instead of meeting them at Trent,<sup>70</sup> on any pretence whatever, it is our duty to summon them up to Nicæa, and to the Apostolic College.<sup>71</sup> You will see that we cannot recognize any "Roman Catholic Church," so called; we can only deal with the Latin Churches, separately, as such; and with us, the Pope is the Bishop of Rome, and nothing more, but heretical at that. You will see also that the Trentine Missions, in America, and elsewhere, lack the organization of Churches, and have only the feeblest pretensions to be recognized at all, as in any sense Catholic Churches.<sup>72</sup> Let me commend to you the learned work of a true Catholic, *The Papacy Schismatical* by the Abbé Guettée, a man of remarkable history as well as genius, who, though bred a Gallican, has long ago seen further and more clearly than Dr. Pusey does, or ever did, in this matter.<sup>73</sup> I will also beg you to read that noble letter of the grand old Bishop Bull to Bossuet, in which he introduces the "Eagle of Meaux" to the sunlight of Catholic truth, and teaches him what a Catholic is and must be. Brave old champion of God's truth! Not all the flatteries of Bossuet and the Sorbonne could seduce him from the downright honesty and manliness which belong to the character of every true son of the Church of England. Be sure, my dear friend, that what Bull has written is as durable as Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* will prove to be ephemeral. I believe the Doctor to be a morbidly conscientious divine, but too little sensitive in behalf of truth through his desire for unity. I am truly sensible of his great claims to our respect as a scholar, but when he reproduces and tries to make current the principles of Tract *No. Ninety*, I make no apology for treating his proposals with the disgust which I believe they must suggest to every unsophisticated mind.

SEE-HOUSE, BUFFALO, Lent, 1866.

---

<sup>70</sup> Read Bishop Jewel's Letter to Signer Scipio, a Venetian gentleman. Works p. 1095.

<sup>71</sup> Read Archbishop Laud against Fisher the Jesuit, which settles the question.

<sup>72</sup> I refer you to the Ecclesiography published in successive numbers of the Churchman's Calendar, New York.

<sup>73</sup> This work will soon be published, by Carleton, New York. No student, no divine, should fail to read it.

## II. LETTER TO A PRESBYTER.

Your desire that I should explain more fully the objections I have made to Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* shall be gratified. I comply with your request cordially as a matter of duty, but not cheerfully, for my soul abbot's controversy. You find much in the *Eirenicon* that strengthens your own aversion to Rome: hence, you are unable to feel that it may be dangerous to others, especially to the young. But the same flower from which the bee sucks honey may yield venom to the creature that is not furnished with the bee's faculties and organs. What may be even useful to a clergyman of mature age and settled convictions, may be quite the reverse to a less experienced mind, and especially to a mere Candidate for Orders, yet in the state of pupilage.

I have already allowed that there is much in the book that is excellent; the learning and industry of which it is the fruit are conspicuous, and require no comment.

I am pleased with much that the Author says about the Essential Unity of the Church; with his large extracts from Fleury; and with his reprint of the damaging responses of Romish bishops, to Pius IX. on the subject of his impious Dogma. But, I am not pleased with the fact that he fails to draw the only practical inference from his own argument; the common-sense inference that Rome must come back to Catholicity, before we can have any commerce with her, save only that of trying to open her blinded eyes.<sup>74</sup>

True, then, the book is, in some respects, not only learned but instructive. So much the worse if its good be, as I affirm that it is, mixed up with faults that are deadly. A learned book infected with a false morality and an equally false conception of the matter it attempts to treat is dangerous to both the head and the heart of the incautious reader. I propose to shew that such a book is the *Eirenicon*.

That it contains a false morality is the graver charge, and it shall be demonstrated. In making such a charge I should not dare to trust to my own impressions wholly: I find it sustained by the confessions of its admirers.

You are not too young to remember Tract No. Ninety. If you agree with me that it was an immoral work, justly condemned by the entire Episcopate of the Church of England, and as such repelled with disgust by the moral sense of the Church generally, it will not be difficult for me to establish the rest of my charge. If, as I trust is not the case, you are yourself a convert to the principles of that Tract, it is vain for us to confer together. Its author soon found his only Ark in the Communion that has authorized and canonized the Morals of Alphonsus de' Liguori: and you must forgive me for saying that anybody who admires Tract No. Ninety is only fit to keep him company.

Now my practical point in the *Letter to a Candidate for Holy Orders* was simply this: I warned him, at the earliest moment, that I would never ordain any man professing such principles of subscription. My chief objection to the *Eirenicon* was that it is merely Tract No. Ninety in a fuller and much more dangerous form.

I thought every man could see this at a glance, or as one discovers that a fine looking joint is not food, by the bad flavour of the first mouthful tasted. It seems such is

---

<sup>74</sup> Nor am I pleased with the very favourable views of the actual state of things in Romanism which he more than suggests, and which are quite the reverse of fact. See (p. 30) concerning Extreme Unction and (p. 33) concerning the purchase of Masses.

not the case: many who have never admired *No. Ninety* are loud in their praises of the *Eirenicon*. Let us then consult Dr. Pusey himself. He says:<sup>75</sup>

“Our dear friend’s tract has done good and lasting service, by breaking off a mass of unauthorized traditional glosses, which had encrusted over the Thirty-Nine Articles.”

He adds, in a note, “*I vindicated it* in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, as *the natural, grammatical interpretation of the Articles*.” He deprecates Mr. Ward’s *extreme* vindication of the same Tract; but his “dear friend,” Mr. Newman’s own vindication of it was certainly the logical one, and that was an immediate emigration to the Communion of St. Alphonsus de’Liguori.

I might quote more, to the like purpose, from the *Eirenicon*, but it shall suffice to take Dr. Pusey’s own admissions in his Letter to a Romish periodical, the *Weekly Register*. He says:

“There is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly, as not contradicting anything held to be *bona-fide* in the Roman Church.”

I suppose nobody who remembers *No. Ninety* has any doubt that this is the essential principle of that Tract; and stated in equivalent terms it amounts to this, that there is nothing in our Articles which conflicts with Romanism, if we accept as Romanism the *minimum* of what Rome tolerates. To this statement I shall have occasion to recur; happily, if may be easily disproved, if it be not a proposition too monstrous for serious confutation. My present business is to shew that it is the principle of the *Eirenicon*, as it is that of the Tract aforesaid.<sup>76</sup>

I shall not refer to the expressed opinions of one whom I profoundly respect, the learned and laborious Canon Wordsworth, but, rather, I will take the opinion of an enthusiastic admirer of the *Eirenicon* and its author, the writer of a reviewal in the *Christian Remembrancer*. If Dr. Pusey’s own admissions be not enough, we may accept the statements of his friends in his behalf: they are not so much confessions, as proud boastings. He writes as follows:<sup>77</sup>

“It is, in fact, the traditional interpretation of the Articles from the Bishop of Salisbury, of 1689, to the Bishop of Ely of 1865, inclusive, *which has to be upset*. Dr. Pusey is not the first divine who has done this. For, in point of fact, as far as this part of his work is concerned, *it is neither more nor less* than an endorsement of the celebrated Tract which brought the *Tracts for the Times* to an untimely close. In the elaborate analysis of the Articles which are supposed to be specially anti-Roman, Dr. Pusey has been anticipated by Mr. Newman.”

After giving five pages of the *Remembrancer* to a comparison between the points made by *No. Ninety* and those of the *Eirenicon*, the Reviewer says:<sup>78</sup>

“Surely, again, here, if there is any difference between Dr. Newman’s Tract and Dr. Pusey’s *Eirenicon*, *the latter has gone beyond the former*.”

He is surprised that so few remonstrate:<sup>79</sup>

“One might almost have thought that the Protestant part of the community had been paralyzed *at the astounding audacity of its author in so uncompromisingly vindicating the position occupied by his friend, Mr. Newman*, in the publication of *No. Ninety*.”

Again.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> *Eirenicon*, p. 37, New York Edition.

<sup>76</sup> This was almost lost labour, as it is no longer concealed that the *Eirenicon* is only *No. Ninety* in triple brass. See *Christian Remembrancer*, July 1866.

<sup>77</sup> See *Christian Remembrancer*, January 1866, p. 160.

<sup>78</sup> C.R. p. 167.

<sup>79</sup> C.R. p. 175.

<sup>80</sup> C.R. p. 175.

“We should have expected the Protestant feeling of the country to be lashed into absolute fury, that the condemnation of the author and his book would have been loudly called for, on *the ground of his sacrifice of those very doctrines for which our Protestant forefathers were brought to the stake.*”

And all this is from an admirer of the book, and from so servile a devotee of the author that he says:<sup>81</sup>

“To avow any serious difference of opinion [with him] would partake of the nature of impertinence.”

Finally, this garrulous Reviewer gives us his estimate of the effects of the *Eirenicon* as follows:<sup>82</sup>

“In the times that are coming over the Church of England the question will arise—What service have the Articles of the Church of England ever done, and of what use are they at the present day? The latter question must be answered very fully and satisfactorily, if the answer is to be any makeweight against *the condemnation of them, virtually pronounced by the Eirenicon.* But we venture to go a step beyond any suggestion contained in this volume, and boldly proclaim our opinion that, *before union with Rome* can be effected, the Thirty-Nine Articles must be wholly withdrawn.”

If, then, it be a settled thing that the *Eirenicon* and Tract *No. Ninety* are what King James would have called only different “toots on the same horn,” it may help us to a just view of the *Eirenicon* to examine the precise state of mind which *No. Ninety* represented. Happily, its author supplies us with abundant testimony in his *Apologia*.

In that melancholy account of his mental processes which the erratic but brilliant genius of its author has furnished, he thus speaks of his Tract and its real spirit:<sup>83</sup>

“Though my Tract was an experiment, it was, as I said at the time, *no feeler*. The event shewed it; for, when my principle was not granted, I did not draw back, but *gave up*. I would not hold office in a Church which would not allow *my sense* of the Articles.”

That Mr. Newman’s sense was one which despised history, and the venerable authority of the Reformers, he does not conceal. He had got so far as to call Rome “the Catholic Church,” even then, and he said:<sup>84</sup>

“It is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit; *we have no duties toward their framers.*”

He otherwise expressed the same idea, in a letter to Dr. Jelf, thus:

“The Articles are received not in the sense of their framers, but (as far as the wording will admit, or any ambiguity requires it,) in the one Catholic sense.”<sup>85</sup>

Mr. Newman was then living too near his old training in the Catechism not to feel qualms of conscience about the morality of his position, and so he tells us he wrote a letter in October, 1840, “*to the friend whom it was most natural for him to consult* on such a point.” In that letter he explains the state of mind in which a man who subscribes on the principles of *No. Ninety* remains, even for a time, in the Church of England. He says:<sup>86</sup>

“I cannot disguise from myself that my preaching is not calculated to defend that system of religion which has been received for three hundred years in this place.”

He adds:<sup>87</sup>

“They understand that my sermons are calculated to *undermine* things established. I cannot disguise from myself that they are. \* \* \* I am leading my hearers to the Primitive Church, if you will, but *not to the Church of England.* \* \* \* I fear I must allow that whether I will, or no, *I am disposing them*

---

<sup>81</sup> C.R. p. 156.

<sup>82</sup> C. R., p. 188.

<sup>83</sup> Apol., p. 171, New York.

<sup>84</sup> Apol., p. 172.

<sup>85</sup> Apol., p. 172.

<sup>86</sup> Apol., p. 174.

<sup>87</sup> Apol., p. 175.

toward Rome.”

As he had already reached that mental stage of his disease in which he could imagine Rome more “Primitive” than our own Communion, it is not difficult to account for a moral sense which was rapidly conforming itself thereto. Still he had qualms: some sense, at least, of the fitness of things; and he goes on to tell his friend what follows:<sup>88</sup>

“People tell me that I am exerting at St. Mary’s a beneficial influence on our prospective clergy; but what if I take to myself the credit of *seeing further than they*, and of having, in the course of the last year, discovered *that what they approve so much is very likely to end in Romanism.*”

He goes on to say that he had unbosomed himself to “A. B., than whom I know no one of a more fine and *accurate conscience*, and it was his *spontaneous idea* that I should give up St. Mary’s, if my feelings continued.” Of course, any man of “accurate conscience” could say nothing else; what then must he thought of the conscience of that other friend, whose “judgment was in favour of my retaining my living, at least for the present?”

In accepting this friend’s advice, Mr. Newman deliberately avowed among his constraining considerations, and that friend seems to have accepted, the following portentous words:<sup>89</sup>

“*I do not think we have yet made fair trial how much the English Church will bear.* \* \* \* As to the result, viz: whether this process will not approximate the whole English Church as a body to Rome, that is nothing to us.”

Afterward he says, with respect to these, among other views:

“Such was about my state of mind on the publication of Tract *Ninety*, in February, 1841.”

Surely that friend not of “accurate conscience,” was *particeps criminis*. Mr. Newman had a clearer head and a less enviable heart; he soon began to talk in the shameless way he has since adopted, as a habit, and he says, writing to a friend, of the Heads of Houses:

“They have said that my interpretation of the Articles is an *evasion*. Do not think this will pain me. You see no *doctrine* is censured and my shoulders shall manage to bear the charge. If you knew all, or were here, you would see that I have asserted a great principle, and I *ought* to suffer for it: that the Articles are to be interpreted, *not according to the meaning of the writers*, but (as far as the wording will admit) according to the sense of the Catholic Church.”<sup>90</sup>

What he already had begun to call “The Catholic Church,” we have seen. Trent and Liguori and the Glories of Mary were his Catholicity, and as for the faithful old Confessors who, under God, delivered the English race from the moral and civil condition of Spain and Italy and South America, his scornful sentiment is—“we have no duties toward them.”

Such being the theology and the morality of Tract *No. Ninety*, and those of the *Eirenicon* being, as I have shewn, identical with it, I will offer no apology for being prompt, before any scandal had arisen, in directing the minds of those whom I expect to ordain to its pernicious character. But, I will subjoin a word or two, if you will forgive it, touching the experiences of my own mind, because, I confess, they inspired me with a quick and tender sympathy for those who now stand just where I did, in 1841, when Tract No. Ninety appeared.

I was then in the Seminary at Chelsea, in New York, and drawing near to the time of my examination for the Diaconate. Little did John Henry Newman know or care for

---

<sup>88</sup> Apol., p. 175.

<sup>89</sup> Apolo., p. 176.

<sup>90</sup> Apol., p. 178.

the friends he had in a little band of earnest youth, who loved him, in far-off America, and who, in the generous confidence of their first manhood, admired him as a “guide, philosopher and friend.” We considered him a true man: a friend of Keble’s; a true successor of such men as Hugh James Rose; an ornament and a defence of our Apostolic Church in the pulpit of St. Mary’s. On me the spell of his genius was powerful: his sermons did me good and warmed me to new views of duty. For myself, under the guidance of Hooker and Pearson and Bull, as I imagined him to be, I ever supplied from these great masters what he seemed to lack; and no suspicion clouded my spirit that he also was not leading me into green pastures and beside still waters, in the footsteps of the flock, and following the Good Shepherd. When *No. Ninety* appeared I was shocked—and I was *delivered*. Thank God! I had lived with a good conscience, and its report was “accurate.” This author, said I, is the man whom even a pagan would have “hated, as the gates of Hades.”<sup>91</sup> I denounced it among my fellow-students, as many of them will remember, and began to look with distrust on everything from the writer whose name had been chief in the movement. I imagined *No. Ninety* was his work. Of Newman, whom I loved with an affection like that of a personal friend, for whom I prayed, and for whom I gave thanks to God, I had no suspicion. When some one assured me that he had written *No. Ninety* I resented it; I referred to the strong things he had said against Rome, and I felt sure that he knew better where his foot stood right, and how to praise God in the congregations. Some time afterward, when I was already at work, in my priesthood, and when I was forced to admit what had become notorious, I remember how my heart within me became like a stone, and, how, even at the Altar, amid the solemnities of the Eucharist, my soul yearned over him, and how I seemed to hear Christ Himself bemoaning—“Is he a pleasant child! How can I give him up.”

That he has been “given up” for some mysterious purpose to a system of lies and delusions, with which, even now, he cannot wholly bring his English heart to sympathize, is painfully manifest. He adores *Duessa*, he despises *Una*.<sup>92</sup>

The author of the *Eirenicon*, makes an awful admission as to his own state of mind, which nevertheless does much to explain how it is that a pervert to Romanism becomes so soon transformed into the spectacle which Dr. Manning now exhibits:

“For myself, *I have always felt* that had (which God of His mercy avert hereafter, also) the English Church, by accepting heresy, *driven me out of it*, I could have gone in no other way than that of *closing my eyes and accepting whatever was put before me*.”<sup>93</sup>

Here are two important notes of the state of mind in which the *Eirenicon* is written. First, its author would strain out a gnat, in the Anglican chalice, and then blindly swallow the whole cup of Rome’s fornications. Second, if not the Church of England, *the only alternative* with him is Rome, and blind submission to Liguori and Pio Nono! Why so? Is it not evident that such a writer has no sense of the primary claims of the East, which preserves the Catholic Creed intact, and the authority of Holy Scripture, and which demands no such blind and brutal degradation? This then is to be taken merely as a sign of his mental condition: what must be the *moral condition*<sup>94</sup> of a guide and leader in

---

<sup>91</sup> *Iliad*, ix. 308.

<sup>92</sup> Spenser in his *Faery Queene* gives the contrast between Rome and England not too rhetorically, under these names.

<sup>93</sup> *Eirenicon*, p. 98.

<sup>94</sup> The Moral Theology of Alphonsus de’Liguori might seem to account for Dr. Pusey’s position as here professed. See Liguori, *Theologia Moralit*, Tom. ii. De juramento, Dub. iv.

Israel, who is so sensitive as to a *possible* heresy in the Church to which he owes everything under God, that he deliberately proposes, as the remedy, habitually kept before him, a blind acceptance of the Romish system, with its unspeakable heresies, its awful idolatry of a fabulous woman, its imposture of the Decretals, and the Morals of Alphonsus de'Liguori?

As a contrast with this miserable avowal, I have directed the attention of the Candidate for Orders to that true Catholic, the great Bishop Bull. Hear him: it stirs my soul like a trumpet, after the poor vagaries we have been reviewing:<sup>95</sup>

“The Church, of England will be found the best and purest Church, at this day, in the Christian world. Upon which account, I bless God, that I was born, baptized and bred up in her Communion; wherein I firmly resolve, by His grace, to persist, *usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum!*”

It is very painful for me to write as I have been forced to do about Dr. Pusey. As a Hebrew Scholar we all admire and revere him, and really, at this moment, when we all are weeping together, over the grave of Keble, it seems harsh to reproach him. But, the Church is dearer to me than any man, and he little knows how deep a wound he has given her, for I am sure he means well. The greatest clerks, truly, are not always wise men: and the Doctor's admiration of Newman has led him too near the bog, over which the genius of his friend so long hovered and into which he plunged, headlong, drawing so many after him. Lest this mischief should go further among us, I must make such a resistance as I can; and since I have begun, I shall have more to say in another Letter.

SEE-HOUSE, BUFFALO, April 27, 1866.

---

<sup>95</sup> Bull's Works, Vol. ii. p. 239, Oxford.

### III. LETTER TO A DEACON.

It is pleasant to observe the close family relationship of Englishmen to one another. Nurtured as they are together, in great schools and universities, and interknit by sweet communities of thought and feeling, it is impossible that a learned and amiable man like Dr. Pusey should not command a degree of respect, by force of personal character, far beyond that to which his polemical writings, in themselves, entitle him. Under the *prestige* of his name, and of the names with which his own has been so long associated, he is listened to, and deferred to, as a Master in Israel. It is a social necessity in England; and it ought to be so. But it is a law which has its dangers. No man examines the sayings of such a Rabbi with strict reference to truth only. None like to be known as his antagonists, and so he is allowed his way, and his admirers claim a victory, when there has been no contest. But surely sober reflection must set bounds to this enthusiasm. When his admirers exult in the impunity of what even they pronounce his “astounding audacity;” when they themselves are amazed at the extraordinary position which he assumes, and yet pronounce it impertinence to “avow any serious difference” with him; surely we, at least, in the American Church, may be pardoned for questioning his infallibility, and for venturing to prefer the old paths, and to cling to the old landmarks which our fathers have set.

What infatuation has come over those who can think, with any complacency, of surrendering the grand and impregnable position of the Anglican Church? Who is Dr. Pusey, that he should make us forget the position that such giants as Bishop Butler, and all our great doctors since the immortal Hooker, have made as glorious as it is sound?

The Abbé Guettée, a disinterested observer, thus speaks of Dr. Pusey’s position:

*“If his theological science equals his knowledge of the Hebrew and his sincerity, we doubt not he will soon find a way which will conduct him to Catholic Truth. But, unfortunately, Dr. Pusey has sacrificed theology to his favourite studies: so he hesitates. \* \* \* How to remedy the defects of the Anglican Church, he appears to us, not clearly to see. We imagine, he would prefer the Roman Church to the Eastern. Wherefore? We cannot comprehend it. \* \* \* What have been the fruits of the tendency to Romish Unity which he has impressed on his school? Rome has gathered his disciples, with rejoicing. \* \* \* Union with her cannot be accomplished save by the absolute destruction of Anglicanism. \* \* \* He knows the Church of Rome but poorly, if he deludes himself with other ideas.”*

I have endeavoured to shew that there is a false morality in the scheme of the *Eirenicon*; and I have a few words more to say on that point. It was objected to the great Archbishop Laud—for truly great he was, with all his faults—that he had “a damnable plot to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome.” His answer is worthy of being remembered.<sup>96</sup>

“If to reconcile them, with the maintenance of idolatry, it were a damnable plot indeed. But if Christian truth and peace might meet and unite together, all Christendom over; were that a sin too? Were I able to plot and effect such a reconciliation, I would think myself most happy, whatever I suffered for it.”

---

<sup>96</sup> Troubles and Trial, p. 320.

Here is a spirit quite as warm for Unity as Dr. Pusey's, but much more concerned for Truth: so that he does not scruple to tax Rome with idolatry, as he does elsewhere, at large, quoting Cassander,<sup>97</sup> himself a Romanist, though a reforming one, who confesses that, in the matter of adoration of images, they "come full home to the superstition of the heathen." But the point is, that he uses such strong language about just such a reconciling as the *Eirenicon* proposes; for Dr. Pusey does not demand a reformation in this respect among Papists. Even their adoration of the Virgin, he gives up to them, only stipulating that we should not be obliged to hold their "pious opinions" ourselves.<sup>98</sup> And what Laud would have said of *No. Ninety* and of the *Eirenicon*, may well be gathered from what he says of a book by one Walter Brown, who wrote to prove that "a man might be a Roman Catholic and yet go to Church and conform in England." He calls the argument "foul and dangerous," and adds: "the opinion is *very base and unworthy*, and was first broached by the Jesuit Azorius."<sup>99</sup> I am at loss to see any essential difference in principle between this argument and that of *No. Ninety*, which the *Eirenicon* adopts and defends.

But the *Eirenicon*, in its whole conception of the question between us and Rome, as also of the requisites for Unity, is feeble and puerile in the extreme. This was my second point; and I prove it first by the author's friend, the reviewer.<sup>100</sup> For this admirer of the *Eirenicon*, in effect, pronounces the very idea of the book a failure, and he gives a most damaging sentence against it, in the following words:

"We venture to go a step beyond any suggestion contained in this volume, and boldly proclaim our opinion that (1) *before union with Rome* can be effected, (2) the Thirty-Nine Articles must be wholly withdrawn."

The reviewer clearly understands (1) the scheme, or project, of the book to be "Union with Rome;" and (2) the idea of bringing this about by "smoothing down" the Articles, he pronounces a failure. It is of no use, in other words. All this is a waste of labour. To accomplish what he desires, Dr. Pusey must give up rasp and file; the Trent Articles must stand, in all their grossness, and with all their anathemas; and the English Articles must flee before them—"must be wholly withdrawn."

The same writer has the effrontery to ask—"What service have the Articles of the Church of England ever done, or of what use are they at the present day?" This question he himself answers, when he confesses that there can be no union with Rome while they are in the way. And if a further answer is needed, we may add, that seeing neither *No. Ninety* nor the *Eirenicon* have been successful in dissolving them, it is evident that they are a grand defence of our Catholicity against the heresy and schism of Trent: they are a barrier against the Decretalism which Fleury has so fully shewn to be the corner-stone of the Trent Creed, and of Modern Rome itself: they also stand between us and the Worship of Mary; between us and the late Encyclical; between us and the morals of Liguori; between us and the Anti-Christ who has fabricated a new Revelation, or Protevangel; who denies to his own followers the right of thought on any subject which he presumes to decide for them, and who has just uttered one of the boldest blasphemies that ever fell

---

<sup>97</sup> Controversy with Fisher, p. 310.

<sup>98</sup> See Letter to *Weekly Register*.

<sup>99</sup> Troubles and Trial, p. 319.

<sup>100</sup> Christian Remembrancer.

from mortal lips—saying, “I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.”<sup>101</sup>

To this *reductio ad absurdum*, God has permitted the Trent Creed to run, in the present Pontificate; and yet, just at this time, when Italy shakes herself from the dust of a thousand years, and demands with ten thousand voices a Catholic reformation, annulling Decretalism, and abolishing the Trent Council and all its decrees, as an imposture, we have an Anglican divine, whose scheme of Unity is based on the idea that the Trent Articles must be permitted to stand, and that all things must be conformed, as well as they may, to that standard of doctrine.

As if the Council of Trent were not to be judged by Catholic Law, and as if, so judged, it could stand a moment! The Trent Council is a nullity: “a mere convention,” says Bishop Bull;<sup>102</sup> “an assembly to be called anything rather than a General Council.” It is not a Provincial Council, for that it did not pretend to be: much less is it a General Council, which it had the audacity to call itself: it is, therefore, a mere abortion; another Sirmium, anathematizing another Athanasius, and like Sirmium, none the less heretical because subscribed and proclaimed orthodox by a Bishop of Rome.

On this point, let the *Eirenicon* be answered by Laud; for the *Eirenicon*, except in one case fatal to the rest, presupposes the validity and irreversibility of that Anti-Catholic Conspiracy. In the first place, Laud denies that it has any authority whatever from the *Written Word*, “as all Councils must have that will not err;” and then he says:<sup>103</sup>

“Secondly, is that Council legal where the Pope, the chief person to be reformed, shall sit president in it, and be chief judge in his own cause, against all law divine, natural, and human? \* \* \* I think the decrees of such a one are *omni jure nulla*, and carry their nullity with them through all law.”

To this, Laud adds a question, which is all important to a just estimate of the *Eirenicon*:

“Is that Council general that hath none of the Eastern Churches’ consent, nor presence there? Are all the Greeks so become *non ecclesia*, no church, that they have no interest in General Councils?”

To this inquiry the *Eirenicon* would seem an affirmative; for if we must square our Articles by Trent, so must the Greeks their Catechism. There is one hint, indeed, that this ulterior question arose in the author’s mind. He says, but with a reference to the ill-starred “Council of Florence,” which had better have been left out, that “a plan which should embrace the Greek Church also, would facilitate \* \* \* authoritative explanations.” He adds—“The Thirty-Nine Articles and *the Council of Trent* might pass away and be

---

<sup>101</sup> A correspondent of the *Union*, published in Paris, writing from Rome, gives the following account of Pio Nono’s reply to the address presented to him:—“You have probably heard speak of the Address presented to the Sovereign Pontiff last Saturday by a large number of visitors. The reply of the Pope was most remarkable, and vividly impressed the numerous bystanders. They were above all struck with the passage of the discourse, when the Holy Father, rising up against those Catholics, Lay or Ecclesiastic, who arrogate the right to give counsels to the Papacy, and have the presumption to trace for it the road to follow, said, raising his voice with an admirable majesty, ‘Alone, in spite of my unworthiness, *I am the Successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Jesus Christ; alone I have the Mission to conduct and to direct the bark of Peter; I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.* Those who are with me are with the Church, those who are not with me are out of the Church, *they are out of the Way, the Truth, and the Life.* Men must be made to know this, that they may not be deceived and led astray by the words of people who call themselves Catholics, but who will and teach otherwise than the Head of the Church wills and teaches.’”

<sup>102</sup> Letter to Bossuet.

<sup>103</sup> Against Fisher, p. 237.

merged in the Eighth General Council of the once more united Christendom.” Now, this is to the point. Do away with Trent, and the Articles will have fulfilled their purpose. This is holding to the Anglican position; this proposes Unity on the only possible base. The puerility of the *Eirenicon* betrays itself in nothing so thoroughly as in this, that, a grand and feasible scheme, which would be accepted by the Greeks and by thousands of the Latins now panting for reform—such a scheme is but an *obiter dictum*; while the whole power of the work is directed to the impossible plan of making a harmony between irreconcilable standards—which, even if they could be reconciled, would necessarily pass away together, before there could possibly be a “re-united Christendom.”

How strange that one who could imagine a better way, even while exposing the world of practical abuses which are upheld as by an Atlas, by the Creed of Pius the Fourth, should yet write a book to persuade England, like the strong ass of Issachar, to “bow her shoulders to bear, and to become a servant to tribute!” Its practical futility has been illustrated by the two hundred who went to Cardinal Patrizi for “authoritative explanations.” Truly, as in an ancient example of harlotry, “they went unto *the Pope* with ointments, and did increase their perfumes.” “They were wearied in the greatness of their way.” The answer they got was another parallel: “Bow down that we may go over:” and alas! that there should be sons of English mothers, who are ready for the rest of it—“to lay their body as the ground, and as the street to them that go over,” and to “debase themselves unto Hell.”

And now about those “hard blows” which the author gives to practical Romanism, and which have made enough dust to blind so many eyes. His heaviest blow is what he quotes from Fleury, and from the Romish opponents of the New Dogma; and the use he makes of his quotations simply amounts to self-stultifying. For what is the use of exposing Rome’s rottenness so long as, after all, he urges us to marry her, and asserts a distinction between Rome theoretical and Rome practical? This is mere Gallicanism; and many a Gallican has given Rome much more sturdy blows than these. The old Anglican position is the only one justified by common-sense: it refuses to distinguish between the Trent Creed and the fabric which it sustains, and which it was meant to sustain. Dr. Pusey deserts this position, and tells us what a nice little harmless thing this cornerstone is, in itself. Or, to change the figure, the English divines have always regarded the Trentine system as a whole, a massive wedge, which, if once introduced into a Church, must destroy its Catholicity, and rend its own rightful and canonical walls to shivers. Now, Dr. Pusey has found out that the blade end of this wedge is not the butt end. His plan is, admitting and demonstrating the awful nature of the butt end, to persuade us only just to admit the fine end, and then trust to “a concordat” with the Pope and the Jesuits, who will agree not to drive it any further! Could anything be more imbecile than such an *Eirenicon*? But then there are to be “authoritative explanations.” Was it ever heard of that Infallibility should be forced to explain? That he who can bind and loose *ad libitum* should bind himself? That any arrangement could be made through which the Pope could not drive his state-coach, while the nature of oaths and promises is to be interpreted according to Alphonsus de’Liguori?

But the folly of this scheme is the more manifest, because it has been tried for two centuries. The poor Gallican Church is just what the Anglican Church would be without the Articles. The work of DeMaistre, from which Dr. Pusey quotes a paragraph in praise

of the Church of England, and which inspires the warmest tribute he can spare to his own Mother Church—that work demonstrates that the Gallican Church, in 1682, took a position, with respect to the Papacy, *identical with the Anglican position, under the Eighth Henry*. By a blunder of Infallibility, as he demonstrates, England was driven further, but the Pope was wise enough to temporize with the Gallicans. He submitted to the assertion of “The Gallican liberties”—that is of Anglicanism minus the Articles: to just such Anglicanism as Dr. Pusey approves; and he went so far as to accept Bossuet’s *Exposition*, giving thus the very “authoritative” base which the Doctor desiderates. The author of the *Eirenicon* is in favour of the same experiment, in England: he is for calling in the rider, and submitting to bit and bridle, with a *concordat* against being driven too far. So the horse hunted the stag, but he found himself in the man’s stable, at night; and France has been in the Pope’s harness and under his whip, ever since she tried the folly of asserting “Gallican Liberties,” with the Man of the Decretals on her back.

To what does it all amount? This protesting against Ultramontanism, and subscribing the Creed of Pius the Fourth? Read the history of Port Royal; ask the poor Jansenists; listen to the dying words of, those late Confessors, Prompsault and Demoulin and Laborde. The Abbé Guettée has been the first Gallican who has discovered the only logical sequel to Fleury’s exposure of the Decretals. He has become a Catholic; he finds his home in the Oriental Communion, and has demolished Gallicanism, and the *Eirenicon* too, in his noble work *La Papauté Schismatique*.

Would the *Eirenicon*, however, leave us in as good a case as that of the Gallicans? Its weakness is further demonstrable by the example of the Jansenists. The Church of Holland is the best refutation of the *Eirenicon*. The Articles, in spite of *No. Ninety*, would remain our *Augustinus*; and humble ourselves as we might, we should only find ourselves spurned and spit upon by the same “authority” which, for two centuries, has rewarded the patience and piety of Utrecht and Deventer, with renewed anathemas and excommunications.

Dr. Pusey does not altogether come up to the Gallican standard, however. Bossuet hits Rome much harder blows than he, as I have said. For Bossuet maintains the old Canons and will not hear of any Supremacy but that of a Catholic Council. Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, says: “There is not any Supremacy, in itself, to which we should object.” Surely, this is about as “much as the English Church will bear.” The experiment is tried at last: “the force of *weakness* can no further go.” Who may be included in the Doctor’s “We,” it would be hard to say: happily it never included the old doctors of the Church. The Articles were their work, and in the opinion of many, they have done us some service, in forcing those who say such things to go with Dr. Newman. “Of what use are the Articles?” Ask the last three centuries of England as compared with France. If a very probable story be true,<sup>104</sup> the Trent Creed-maker himself proposed to Queen Elizabeth to allow the English Prayer-Book if only she would admit his Supremacy. Had the Queen and the Bishops of her day been of the same mind with Dr. Pusey, it would have been an accomplished fact; and then let us see how it might have been with us. We should, perhaps, have escaped that paternal Inquisition which drew Spain so close to the Papal throne; we are too far off to have basked in the sunlight of Central Infallibility, as it

---

<sup>104</sup> See Harington’s Letters in *Notes and Queries*, Vol. xi. 510, et seq.

irradiates Italy and blesses the Romagna: we could hardly have become as Mexico, or been made like unto Brazil; but it is not to be doubted that England would have been capable of nearly as much of the Trentine blessings, as fell to the lot of the sister kingdom with her “Gallican Liberties.” If not a St. Bartholomew’s day—yet at least we should have been worthy of the *dragonnades*. Instead of a Laud and a Sancroft we might have had a Richelieu and a Mazarin; and instead of Puritans rioting in Westminster Abbey, we might have seen a harlot adored on its altar. Christmas might not have been abolished, but only the Lord’s Day and God Himself. Instead of an Addison and a Johnson, we should have had a Voltaire and a Rousseau; and instead of a Shakspeare and a Milton, we might have had no poetry at all. What South America is, North America would have been also, under English and French colonization; we should have had no Methodists, but only Jesuits and Liguorians. But for those Articles, we too might, at this moment, be worshippers of the great goddess *Immacolata*, and contributors of Peter’s-pence to the Sovereign of the Papal States, the author of a New Dogma and of an Encyclical against the enlightenment of the age and the progress of Science.

In short, then, let the *Eirenicon* be accepted by the Church of England, and she will gain all that she has thus lost: and for a recompense, she will cease to be Catholic, and become as all those Churches are which by accepting the Creed of Trent have brought themselves under the anathema of Ephesus. Dr. Newman has had the hardihood to assert that he never felt the Fathers to be his own, till he submitted to that usurpation which once anathematized Athanasius, and in excommunication from which both Cyprian and Augustine, like us Anglicans, were content to die. But, certain it is that instead of allying himself with the Fathers, he has not only cut himself adrift from them, but also broken loose from the orthodoxy even of the best of the Schoolmen. He took two oaths which contradict one another, when he promised, in the same breath, “to embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Council of Trent,” and at the same time never to take or interpret the Scriptures otherwise than “according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.” He knows that St. Bernard testifies that “the unanimous consent of the Fathers” is against the New Dogma; and yet, the New Dogma he is obliged to embrace, or to be excommunicated. And this is the dilemma into which the *Eirenicon* proposes to bring the Church of England itself. And so would that dear Church, not only forfeit her Catholicity, but her identity: for although she was once under the Pope, she was never under the Trent Council, nor did she ever accept the Creed of Pius the Fourth, or any other Creed except that of the Nicene Council, and those others which simply expound it. And as a reward for all this, England shall have a Senate, and Universities, and firesides, as well as altars, put under a new *régime* according to the aforesaid Encyclical.

But no! Dr. Pusey is alarmed at the thought of being blest too much: he feels the infelicity of being outside the Pope’s little circle of unity, but he shrinks from getting too far within. What an impeachment of the paternal character of the Papacy; what a reflection on all his arguments for “Union with Rome” lurks in the reservations of this consoling announcement.<sup>105</sup>

“I have been informed by those who were competent to speak, that there would be no difficulty in a *concordat*, which should save the liberties of the English Church, or the prerogatives which belong to the

---

<sup>105</sup> Letter to the Rev. Archer Gurney.

Sovereign.”

This surely ought to be considered reasonable. Make the wolf shepherd, with a concordat against his dining on mutton. It is the old parliamentary story over again: “I hear a lion in the lobby roar,” etc. We are to admit the enemy of our Liberties, and then try to drive him out. “A *concordat*”—forsooth! England to become a party to such a transaction as that between Pius the Seventh and the First Consul! A *concordat*—putting Eton and Harrow under the Jesuits, and the *congé d’elire* under the hand of Antonelli—but “saving the liberties of the English Church, and the prerogatives of the Sovereign.” Whose liberties were ever saved by the Pope? And this for the land of Ridley and Hooker and Taylor and Pearson and Bull and Thorndike and Wilson and Routh! This for the land of Bacon and Boyle and Newton and Johnson and Burke and Wilberforce and Gladstone! Surely the experiment is fairly tried—“how much the English Church will bear.”

A *concordat*! oh where is old John of Gaunt to ring changes on that word, and to hold up to just indignation the school of divinity that began with No. Ninety, and which culminates in this proposal:

“That England that was wont to conquer others,  
Should make this shameful conquest of itself.”

But, then, says the Reviewer—“Before union with Rome can be effected, the Thirty-Nine Articles must be wholly withdrawn.” In this I am happy to coincide with him, entirely. In other words, the Articles are destined long to outlast the *Eirenicon*.

The fundamental error of the *Eirenicon*, I repeat it, is this: it concedes, at the outset, the Catholicity of the Trentine Communion, and the necessity, in all attempts at unity, of making everything else square with the position Rome has presumptuously assumed.

The Anglican position is wholly antagonistic to all this. I would direct attention once more to the words of Bishop Bull. He calls the Council of Trent a mere assembly or convention—by “any other name rather than that of a grand council.” And as to the Church of Rome he adds, “*If she may be allowed still to remain a part or member of the Catholic Church—which hath been questioned by some learned men, upon grounds and reasons not very easy to be answered—yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her primitive purity.*” And this was no mere platitude about her degeneracy: he was not talking of Encyclicals and ritual Mariolatrics, but of the Faith itself. He defines his objections in a manner to which Dr. Pusey’s *Eirenicon* presents a lamentable contrast. He says:

“The Church of Rome hath changed the primitive canon or rule of Faith, by adding new articles to it, as necessary to be believed, in order to salvation. Look to the Confession of Faith according to the Council of Trent; \* \* \* Alas! these super-added articles of the Trent Creed are so far from being certain truths, that they are, *most of them*, manifest untruths; yea, gross and dangerous errors.”

The great Bishop of St. David’s then puts himself to “the pains of examining some of them;” and while Dr. Pusey’s examination ends in discovering that nearly all of them are quite consistent with our articles—we find Bishop Bull concluding with the expression of his wonder how so learned a man as Bossuet could, with a quiet conscience, remain in a Church that held so corrupt a confession. In the point of the

Eucharist, he says—"If the blessed Apostles were alive and present at the celebration of the Mass in the Roman Church, they would be amazed and wonder what the meaning of it was: sure I am they would never own it to be that same ordinance which they left to the Churches." Now, all this was said to Bossuet, whose *Exposition* supplies the very *minimum* which Dr. Pusey desiderates. It is evident that if we agree with Bull, the great Defender of the Nicene Faith, we must be content to see no great merit in the "smoothing down" of Dr. Pusey. We place ourselves on the Nicene Constitutions, and say, "let the ancient usages" prevail; on the Nicene Creed and say—No other confession but that of the whole Church. On this ground we stand with Bishop Bull, and we pronounce the Trent Council a mere "Convention," its Creed a nullity, its anathemas a schism. We do not give up the glorious idea of a restored Intercommunion; we shew the only way in which it can be obtained. Let Trent follow Rimini, and let Pius the Fourth go to his own place with Honorius. Away with Decretalism, and all that rests upon it. Let the Western Churches stand as free as they did of old: let the Bishop of Rome confine himself to his Diocese and to the Suburbicarian patriarchate. Let a true Council be called, and let the Archbishop of Canterbury attend in his place. If his Catholicity is disputed, let him recite the Creed without the *Filioque*. If the Thirty-Nine Articles be objected to, let him ask "when did we ever make them terms of Communion?" Then will it be seen that just so soon as the Latins are willing to return to Catholicity, there we stand already; there we are ready to receive them. May the Great Head of the Church hasten it in His time.

SEE-HOUSE, BUFFALO, May 10, 1866.

#### IV. LETTER TO A LAYMAN.

The holy Bishop Ken, in his last will and testament, said these memorable words: “As for my religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolical Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I die in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovation, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross.” This is the Catholicity of an Anglican Christian.

But the words in which the author of the *Eirenicon* defends his Mother Church are, to me, almost “as distasteful as any part of his book. They are not such words as must have proceeded from one inspired by the spirit of Bishop Ken; they are not the filial words of Bishop Bull; they are not the words of one truly grateful to God for having cast his lot in the most primitive and the most Catholic Church on earth. They are rather the measured expression of a close calculation, a case made out. The writer is just able to satisfy himself, conclusively, but not heartily, that the Church of England is a true Church; that he cannot conscientiously leave it; that the crisis is not reached when he must follow his friend Newman, straining out a gnat of Erastianism to swallow the Ultramontane camel. Where in all his enumeration of favourable symptoms is there anything that approaches to the gush and feeling of the profession, “I will die in the Communion of the Church of England as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovation?”

This feeble, compromising spirit he has impressed on his admirers. Instead of maintaining our high Catholic position, and calling the Greeks and Latins to meet us on the Nicene ground, he sends them, hat in hand, to Rome, with a proposal to meet them on the Trentine basis; to reduce our Articles of Religion to the terms of that bastard Creed of Pius the Fourth, which is actually of later origin than our Articles: and to accept the Roman Supremacy itself with the humiliating gratuity of a *concordat*. This, as I have shewn, is the scheme of the *Eirenicon*: but, not content with sending his followers on this errand, he goes himself. Such is the astounding “audacity” of his self-constituted diplomacy, and he returns to boast that he has succeeded in arranging all preliminaries: he has even settled the matter as it concerns the rights of his Sovereign. She is to be indulged with the nomination of English Bishops, “though she is a Protestant.”

Here is his own story:<sup>106</sup>

“I went abroad in order to ascertain whether what I hoped for was a dream or whether it was reality. Of course I cannot repeat anything which I am unable to speak (?). I saw various Bishops, and *some that the papers did not know that I saw*. (A laugh.) I saw also theologians whom the papers happily know nothing about; *and I went with them through all the details of our case*. I stated what our difficulties were—how we believed that they could be explained and how we believed that they could be met. I assure you that people in England *will be extremely astonished* if I am able to shew (as I hope soon to do) how much that is popularly supposed to be *de fide* with Roman Catholics is not *de fide* with them. (Cheers.) I will only give one instance. I saw a theologian, and one of the most eminent. We talked *for two hours about the Council of Trent*, and about our belief as it is expressed by those whom, we considered to be the most

---

<sup>106</sup> Reported, and afterward corrected, in the *Guardian*.

genuine sons of the Church of England. The result was that *point after point he was satisfied*; and the interview ended in his saying, 'I shall salute you as a true brother.' (Loud cheers.) As to supremacy, I said, 'I do not know where it is to be found stated in what the supremacy consists.' (Cheers.) It has been said that I have lived so much among old hooks that I do not know that the modern practice is very different from what I had gathered from those old books. As regards appeals to Rome, which formed so large a portion of the quarrel at the Reformation, this theologian told me that *there is now scarcely such a thing known as an appeal*. (Cheers.) He stated that those things which the Church of England disclaimed were no essential parts of the supremacy; and I may add that a very eminent French theologian said to me, 'If other matters are settled, *the supremacy will make no difficulty*.' I had spoken to him just the same words as have been quoted, only the emphasis was not laid on the words 'in itself—that is 'the consequences which it involves.' He left me saying, 'If other matters were settled, the question of the supremacy could be easily arranged by a *concordat*.' As to our Bishops, he said they might be named in any mode which had ever been known to the Church—they might be named even by Queen Victoria, *though she was a Protestant*. And the person who said this was an authority of no common weight." (Loud cheers.)

The Abbe Guettée's view of the Doctor's projected Union may satisfy some as to its probable working. He says:

"What surprises us is that Dr. Pusey could, for a single instant, conceive the idea that it was possible for Anglicans even to enter into negotiations with Rome; that he did not understand that the sole basis of union between Anglicanism and Popery must always be the *annihilation of the former* and the absolute submission of Englishmen to the Pope. Rome does not recognize the Anglican Church, as a Church. She regards (i.e. pretends to regard) its Bishops and Priests as simple laymen, who make themselves ridiculous by assuming designations to which they have no title. She regards Anglicans simply as Protestants; and, as preliminary to all idea of union, would insist upon the reordination of Bishops and Priests, and the re-baptizing of laymen; for the existing ordinations are null in her eyes, and the baptisms are in most cases (though the Roman Church accepts the baptism of midwives and nurses) *doubtful*. After these preliminaries, Bishops, Priests, and Faithful must make profession of obedience to the Pope. The Pope would then grant some small concessions of mere details, just to save appearances. Even these would gradually be withdrawn again, little by little, as obedience became firmly established, and then the Anglican Church would remain purely and simply Ultramontane."

The parentheses are my own, but may direct your attention to the thorough hypocrisy of Romanism in all its dealings with the Church which for three centuries has been the chief object of her fear and hate.

But, to return to Dr. Pusey's account of himself, such is the last phase of his development, as appears by the report of the "English Church Union," in its late noisy assembly. It need not frighten any one to find such a meeting adopting the *Eirenicon* as its fetish. The meeting was not composed of those who lead the sentiment of England: not a single Bishop was present; few names of note are observed among those of the attendants: and Dr. Pusey himself reminded them that "very few of them" knew anything of three-and-thirty years since.<sup>107</sup> Such was the assembly that rejected a proposed amendment which was designed to guard against a complete surrender of Anglican principles: and which, before it separated, took all the steps necessary to the formation of a visible Trentine party in the Church of England, with the author of the *Eirenicon* as its leader.

I do not wonder that superficial readers of that work were unable to credit my remarks as to the structure of its argument. It is true that a great part of it is *a conclusive*

---

<sup>107</sup> My own recollections of the accession of William IV. and of the expected effects of the Reform bill on the Church are vivid. A very deep impression was made on my boyish mind by the remarkable speech of the King to the Bishops, in May, 1834. I never could understand how the Sailor-King could have risen to a tone so well worthy of a Charles I.

*argument against Popery*: how then could the rest of it be designed as a compromise with Rome? Does a man take pains to prove that a house is a pest-house, when he wishes us to walk in? Well might one be puzzled with such a *non-sequitur*; yet it is not more strange than true that such is the scheme of a book in which the piety and truth of its author work in one direction, and his theories of unity in another. Utterly illogical as it is, we have the facts before us, and after his utterances at the meeting aforesaid, there is no longer any possibility of denying that he proposes a reunion of the English Church with the Roman, by a surrender of the Thirty-Nine Articles, in their spirit and intent, and by the acceptance of the Papal Supremacy, with a *concordat*.

Such are the ultimate consequences of the morality of *No. Ninety*, and it is well for us that we can no longer be blinded as to the fact. I have spoken in strong terms of its duplicity: but, though friendship has beguiled Dr. Pusey into accepting it, it must always be remembered that the author of it is Dr. Newman, who carried it out, to its consequences, long ago. It is impossible that anybody should *practically* adopt it, and remain true to the Anglican Church.

A few words may here be said of the great Oxford movement, which, like Methodism, has passed into the life of the Church, in one form, and is going out of it in another. There can be no doubt that if such a man as Hugh James Rose had lived, and had held its helm, it would have taken the form of a grand revival of such Catholicity as that of Bishop Ken, and would have been wholly primitive and Nicene. But the movement unhappily fell under the engineering of John Henry Newman, a man, in many respects, inferior to his co-workers, but full of that *audacity* which was not natural to them, and of that nervous genius which utters oracles and creates a following. By his own confession, Mr. Newman was never a genuine Catholic, never a sound Anglican. From a feeble Evangelicalism he flew to an opposite extreme, and very soon his ruling idea became a dislike of the Reformation, which he identified with his former Calvinism. This antipathy suggested a mere reactionary movement, and his mind took its Romeward turn. He conceived *No. Ninety*, and he soon followed his own jack o' lantern into the mire.

Happily, the great movement communicated to the Church at large was Catholic; but, as it was left in the hands of Dr. Pusey, it was doomed, like Wesley's, to develop a counter-spirit. He had, himself, begun his ministry in the Evangelical School, or in something like it. He never felt himself firm on the grand old Anglican Rock where the foot of Ken was planted. His practical horizon was bounded by the Reformation-epoch, and he confounded Catholicity with Western Christianity. To get back again to union with the Western Churches became his ruling thought. To do so, by first calling on these Churches to revert to Catholic Antiquity, never entered his mind. We must take them as they are, Trent-Creed and Papacy included, and we must make our Articles square with these as we may. His friendship for Dr. Newman had fixed his thoughts on *No. Ninety* as the grand Catholicon; and this idea having produced the *Eirenicon*, is now about to culminate, as he promises, in a work designed to "astonish" Englishmen, with his discoveries in France, as to what is really *de fide* among the Romanists. As if any Englishman, who has any information on such subjects, could possibly be ignorant of Gallicanism, and of Port-Royal-ism. As if everybody did not know that all that is *nominally* conceded, is practically exacted, in the one simple fact that you must accept every decree of the Pope or be excommunicated. If Dr. Pusey would really "astonish" us,

let him shew that there is any freedom of thought or opinion left in the Communion to which Pius the Ninth gives absolute law and prescribes new dogmas; and to which he claims to be “the Way and the Truth and the Life.”

Such is the movement which is now passing out of the Church, like the serpent out of the chalice of St. John, in the form of a small but mischievous Trentine party. In its last efforts to identify itself with genuine Catholicity, it invokes the saintly name of Keble, and pretends to claim its patronage. If it could be shewn that his strong affection for his friends had blinded his pure eyes to the real nature of their theories, what would be gained? Keble was but human, and had some infirmities like other men, I dare say. His career has been widely different in many respects from that of his old companions; his genuine love for the Church of England has been the real drag upon their Homeward tendencies: and if he loved them too well to see all their mistakes and faults, there is evidence that he regarded Newman’s course with strong aversion, and was deeply pained by his bitter and remorseless writings against the Church of England. What that holy man finally thought on many subjects connected with the movement, would be an interesting question, were it not an impertinent one. I revere his memory too much to drag it into controversy. I leave to their own sober reflections those who are seeking to narrow its influence by identifying it with a party, those who use it to embitter controversy, and those who wound the most sacred feelings of their brethren whose love of his name and character has never led them to surrender their right of thinking for themselves.

So now we have this whole movement defined, in a party which is “going out from us, because they are not of us.” In that clamorous meeting of the “Church Union,” one voice was raised in behalf of those sound old principles of Bishop Ken, and of the Reformation; but it was drowned in contemptuous outcries, and hooted as well as voted down. Before this was done, however, one memorable warning was uttered against the morality of *No. Ninety* and the *Eirenicon*. It was the voice of a Romish layman who has tasted all the sweets of *concordats* and *de fide*, and whose *suspiria de profundis* might well have suggested wisdom even to an assembly which would have tasked the Town Clerk of Ephesus to keep it in order.

“As a Roman Catholic,” said the Count Montalembert, as quoted by Mr. Gurney, “I wish what I believe to be the truth to triumph; but when I consider the *moral bearings of the question*, the high tone of moral integrity that is preserved by the Church of England and the English people, I must confess I fear the consequences of *reunion with us as we are* would be to draw you down to our level instead of raising us up to yours.”

In spite of this warning, the assembly went on to confirm the principle of Tract *No. Ninety*, by which an English Churchman may subscribe the Thirty-Nine Articles in a sense consistent with all Roman Doctrine.

Alas! ever since the appearance of that baleful tract, the process pointed out by the Count Montalembert has been going on in the Church of England among all who have accepted it. We see the results in this Trentine party, and its unblushing “audacity.” Had the English Bishops who denounced it five-and-twenty years ago been unshackled by State interference, they would, have refused to ordain the triflers with God and man who subscribed the Articles on such principles, and so it would have been nipped in the bud. But they were not able to do this, and now there is a set of men in the Church who claim, as an established right, this liberty to equivocate and swear falsely. I saw the fatal

mistake from the outset, and I deplored it. Now, when I am in a responsible position myself, I find an effort made to transplant this noisome pestilence and to naturalize it in our Church; I have resisted it, and have taken occasion before the evil gets head, to let the youth committed to my care understand how I intend to deal with it, should it ever be heard of in this Diocese. I am not responsible for other parts of the flock of Christ; but I know what I have undertaken to do for the fold over which the Master has set me as Chief Shepherd. Let all who may be concerned understand that I have said nothing which I am afraid to make good.

I acknowledge the pain and grief it gives me to oppose the sayings and doings of such a man as Dr. Pusey; if his were a less eminent and respectable name, however, there would be no need of opposition. Such a delusive and impracticable scheme as his has no other vitality than that which his *prestige* imparts to it. But who can forget the sacred interests which his dream endangers, simply because it is a prophet that prefers his dreams to God's Word? Who can read his own account of his doings in France, without blushing for him as well as for the spectacle to which he has reduced our Church by his unauthorized diplomacy? He comes home like one "caught with chaff;" he reports his sayings and doings among Romish theologians, and hints that he has been dealing with very high authorities: he tells how he consulted about the Council of Trent for two whole hours: he is in raptures over his discovery that this and that are not *de fide*; that the Supremacy is actually undefined; that even Romish kings have too much sense to permit appeals to the Pope, and that, all else being smoothed down by his exposition of the Articles, the Queen of England will actually be permitted to nominate English Bishops, by a *concordat*, "though she is a Protestant." Is it really necessary to shew that all this is the talk of a "prophet that hath a dream?" Why, the Latin divines themselves fought for seventeen years in the Council of Trent against the innovations which he accepted in "two hours." As for the "Supremacy," was he really ignorant of what he parades as a discovery; or does he need to be informed that although the Gallicans have nominally abjured it for two centuries, it is nevertheless practically forced upon them every time a bull comes from Rome, and every day when they recite the Roman breviary? Is it any honour to the Court of Rome that even Popish princes cannot trust it with appeals? And as to the proposed *concordat*, by which Queen Victoria is to retain her rights "though she is a Protestant," let him expound its value by the vacant Sees of Italy, and illustrate its advantages by the Pope's dealings with Victor Emanuel—though *he* is a Papist. Does the author of the *Eirenicon* really imagine that Pius the Ninth would confirm the Queen's nominees if, instead of appointing such men as Dr. Manning, she should name a worthy successor of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley?

Alas! If the unity of the *Eirenicon* be a good thing, these holy martyrs went to the stake for a bad cause, and we have lived for three hundred years in unjustifiable schism. It is not I who have rebuked Dr. Pusey, albeit as a Christian Bishop I have a right and a duty to censure any doctor as soon as his teachings endanger my own Diocese, or the Church which has set me in authority. I have only compared his doctrine with that of the great divines with whom he challenges a contest. He is rebuked by the holy testimony of those who suffered at Oxford and at Smithfield; he is condemned by Laud, by Andrewes and by Hooker.

Does any one imagine that the judicious Hooker would have agreed with those

Romish theologians after two hours' talk about the Council of Trent? Dr. Pusey tells us they "saluted him as a brother," and "were satisfied." I have no doubt of it: and that is the reason why I forewarned my candidates for Holy Orders that nothing of the same kind will satisfy me. I do not intend to appoint such "theologians" as Canonical examiners in this Diocese.

But, in conclusion, let us look at the scheme of the *Eirenicon*, supposing it practically adopted, as Dr. Pusey proposes. The Church of England accepts the "Supremacy," which it never did before the Reformation, and agrees to the Trent Creed, which was not in existence in those days. Look at the result. It becomes, thereby, a part of the Roman Obedience; it is estranged from Antiquity; it is involved in the schism with the Greeks. It loses, forever, its grand Nicene position, its oneness with the Catholic Church, "before the division between East and West:" and the restoration of Catholic unity will be further off than ever before. Now, we are in a grand position to act as Mediators: now, we have a glorious part to perform, if we are true to ourselves, on Nicene principles. Let us once adopt the Trentine Scheme of Unity, and we cease to be Catholics; we become a mere appendage of the Popish Usurpation.

Let those (few as yet in number, and of little influence) who would introduce this Trentine movement among us, in America, reflect on the consequences to our Church, of any such step on the part of the Church of England. Ridiculous as it is, let us imagine Dr. Pusey's scheme carried out, and the Anglican Church swallowed up by the Romish Communion. Where are we? What is to become of us? Clearly, we should no longer be in Communion with the Church of England. That would then be justly claimed by the Irish Papists among us: by the Church of the late Dr. Hughes and of the Nuncio Bedini. Our glory would have departed, and we should be left alone in Christendom, unless we should resolve on a grand *felo-de-se*, and merge ourselves in the foul elements of American Romanism. A savoury fate, indeed, for the Church of Seabury and Bishop White.

If others are willing to commit themselves to such results, they cannot be better pleased with their position than I am with mine. I feel, indeed, the gross misrepresentation to which I have been subjected, but I pray God to give its authors a clearer perception of truth. It has pleased God to place me, though all unworthy, in the seat of an Apostle; and I know well that it is alike my duty to "rebuke with all authority," and, if need be, to "suffer reproach" in defending the Catholic Faith, and in protecting that portion of the flock of Christ which He has committed to my trust.

SEE-HOUSE, BUFFALO, July 27, 1866.

V.  
LETTER TO A GALLICAN LAYMAN.<sup>108</sup>

As to Mr. Newman's treatise on *Development*, it is full of the ingenuity and interest with which that eccentric individual has imbued all his writings, but is a very inferior work in all respects, but especially in candour and fairness, to the writings which he produced, before his lapse, and upon the other side of the question.

The Holy Scriptures are so clear in commanding us to keep the faith as a trust, and to refuse all novelties, that I think the bare knowledge of the New Testament quite sufficient to sustain any unprejudiced mind, against the sophistries of the work.

But, when I see such a scholar as Mr. Newman, bending every fibre of his mental frame to the task of destroying the rule of Vincent of Lerins, and confessing that its application is fatal to Romanism, I find myself greatly strengthened in my own principles as a Christian of the primitive Confession, and as an antagonist of the Creed of Trent, and the morals of the Vatican.

The theory on which Mr. Newman has submitted his whole soul to the Tridentine system, is one which naturally carries him to extremes, at the present time. But as he is a theoretical convert merely, and as such a mere experimenter, at best, in his practical devotion to his principles, it remains to be seen where he will stop. He must go all lengths, of course, as do all theorists, and so the very boldness of the experiment may shipwreck his theory, and emancipate him at the last. Wait for the result. He now "deifies" the Virgin and carries his enthusiasm for his new cause to an excessive and hazardous extent, yourselves being judges. He may yet find that he has mistaken *decay* for development, and that it is a fatal blunder to regard St. Paul as a lisping babe in theology, and Alphonsus Liguori as the perfect man in JESUS CHRIST.

As to the work of the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, on the Royal Supremacy, its sting is in its title-page only: for, while I must own, in all frankness, that there are grounds for a determined resistance of the Royal aggressions in England, at this time, I cannot but feel that the book of Mr. Wilberforce is neither just in its definition of the grievance, nor wise in the prescription of the remedy. It appears to me more like the vindictive blow of irritated self-love, than the calm complaint of a suffering witness for the testimony of JESUS.

The "Royal Supremacy," however grievous, as degraded to the purposes of Statecraft, and ministerial policy, is, as a matter of law, a very different thing. It is, in its true character, as defined by law, a *purely temporal* supremacy, having no authority in things spiritual, except as the executive of what may be done by Convocation; and whatever it may have done beyond this is mere meddling, and arbitrary usurpation, not long to be endured. Nor does such an abuse of the Royal authority, in any way, commit the Church of England to anything which her own act, in Convocation, does not recognize and

---

<sup>108</sup> My respect for the judgment of a friend induces me to republish this letter, written more than ten years ago, and printed with my Translation of the Abbé Laborde's Essay on the Immaculate Conception.

decree. Besides, the Anglican communion is not English only; it exists in Scotland and in America, and in both of these countries it exists in entire freedom from any *supremacy* whatever, save only that of Christ. The “Royal Supremacy,” therefore, is a local and accidental thing; not a matter of faith, but a mere compact with the State; and, as you know very well, in France, *is precisely analagous to the relations which the French crown has always sustained to the Gallican Church, in spite of its subjection to the Pope.* But the little finger of Louis XIV., to say nothing of Napoleon, was stouter than the loins of any British Sovereign, as a “bishop *ab extra*” (évêque du dehors,) since the days of Henry VIII. The late Archdeacon, if he now calls himself a member of the French Roman Catholic Church, in which he made his submission, has really “strained at a gnat, to swallow a camel.” You know very well what the Ultramontanists think of your Gallican *Regale*. I beg you to consider what it was in the hands of Napoleon I., and what it may be, at any time, in the hands of Napoleon III. Did the papacy prove any effectual restraint upon the *Regale*, when Pius VII. sacrificed the canonical bishops of France to imperial policy, in 1801? It seems to me a very cool thing, with so fresh an example of the practical workings of popery before our eyes, to commend us to the Papal Supremacy as a cure for the ills of an abusive *Regale*.

I knew the late Archdeacon, and have had conversations with him, at his own instance, on these very points, in which he seemed to seek the views of an American presbyter, who is no more concerned to defend the English *Regale*, than an Italian is to sustain your Pragmatic Sanction. I delight to bear witness to the piety and amiable attractiveness of the man, as an Anglican ecclesiastic, and an English gentleman; but I must say, he was so morbidly sensitive on this subject, that it seemed to *fret* him (as we express it), at all times, and to rob him of the calm possession of his faculties. He often seemed to admit the force of arguments, which he could neither answer nor yet accept as satisfactory, so sadly had he accustomed himself to a form of thought, or rather of theory, which had vitiated his mental appetite, and of which he could not be deprived, without longing for his stimulant.

But, how strange it is that one who could be so scandalized by an abused prerogative of his Sovereign, could reconcile himself to the supremacy of the Pope, with its absolute and despotic dominion over *the faith* itself. And that, too, just at the moment of its towering tyranny, as signalized in the late decree, which scandalizes even you. I consider Bossuet himself a sufficient antagonist of the late Archdeacon, and beg to refer you to his works in defence of the “Gallican liberties” against the aggressions of the pontiff, as an effectual reply to all he has advanced. If, however, you read English with sufficient freedom to undertake such a study, I cannot but ask you to examine Barrow’s treatise on the Papal Supremacy, a standard work among us, and one which ought to be translated into all the languages of the Continent, with editorial comments, adapting it to the present time. When you see what safeguards we possess in our standard theology, you will cease to wonder at the comparative powerlessness of the attacks which have been made upon us, by our late seceders.

But there is another reason for this loss of influence. It is one which even the amiable and pious Archdeacon, I grieve to observe, already illustrates.<sup>109</sup> How is it that

---

<sup>109</sup> See *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1855.

men of character and of principle, no sooner go to you, from us, than they seem to lose their former love of truth? Forgive a question which your own view of the Liguorian morality, emboldens me to urge upon your convictions, in all its force. I know the stand which you, and a few others, have taken in reprobation and abhorrence of those pestilent works, to which the Pope and the Roman congregations have affixed the highest sanction of your Church. But alas! how generally it infects your clergy. No sooner do our late beloved friends become the spiritual children of your theologians, than we are horrified to see them breaking out, as with a leprosy, in all the hideous deformity of the morals which used to be regarded as the peculiar stigma of the Jesuits. Thus, the new adherents of Cardinal Wiseman, deal in the wares of imposture and deceit, with the boldness of practised Ultramontanists. Even Mr. Wilberforce quotes authorities which you and all Gallican Romanists consider as spurious, and which your eminent divines have rejected with contempt, or refuted with indignation. Alas, for the cause, in support of which such forgeries were considered requisite; but you must forgive us if we love the more and better, the cause, against which such weapons are still found the only implements of warfare.

And this leads me to say, with reference to the new dogma, which I know you deplore, that this iniquitous mode of sustaining it, is employed to such an extent, as it seems to me must call down upon many of your theologians the execration of the civilized world. The artifices of Monseigneur Parisis, which M. Laborde so cleverly exposes, are the work of innocence itself, as compared with the fraudulent performances of some of our Romish enthusiasts in America. There is no blush to the eifrontery with which they parade their contraband wares, and counterfeit coin, as if they were genuine resources. The very best of their publications is a little work, compounded by Dr. Ullathorne (Irish, I believe), in which he ventures the monstrous assertion that “there is an unbroken chain of fathers for the Immaculate Conception.” Instead of exhibiting such a chain, however, he fills up his pages with a little of everything else, citing, among other authorities, “Mohammed and Martin Luther,” both of whom were far more likely to speak in favour of it than any one of the fathers, I do not doubt. However, as neither Mohammed nor Luther are authorities with Anglicans, it is hardly worth while to inquire what may have been said by either of them. Of course Dr. Ullathorne knew very well that Luther himself *repudiated* in later days, what he had written as a monk,<sup>110</sup> and expunged the very passage in question from the later editions of his works; but true to his Liguorian morality,” the Doctor scruples not to speak of it as “a testimony left on record” by the founder of continental Protestantism.

And now, as to the new dogma, I suspect that you will soon be obliged to confess that it is not only a crime, but something which at Rome is counted “worse than a crime,” a *blunder*. All men who can think, must know that it has committed the Pope and his entire communion to a palpable and monstrous novelty. What then becomes of infallibility? Pius IV. makes you swear to believe the “unanimous testimony of the fathers,” while Pius IX. forces you to do the contrary, in a matter which no one can so

---

<sup>110</sup> I have examined the edition of Walch, A. D. 1742. He marks (vol. xi. p. 2614) the passages quoted by Ullathorne, as expunged in the edition of 1527; while instead of it a short paragraph was inserted, (in which the cowl is only half visible,) to the effect that it is a mere theological opinion, on which Scripture says nothing, and men may think as they please.

disguise, as to make the Fathers agree with it. If the Pope be right what becomes of the Fathers, and if the Fathers be right, what becomes of the Pope?

Besides, what next? The winking picture at Civita Vecchia, and others elsewhere, are now “the foolery of a few simpletons,” in your estimation; but so was the feast of the Conception in St. Bernard’s day, to him. How long will it take to make it an article of the faith, that pictures have winked, and that St. Mary of the winking miracle, as well as St. Mary of the Immaculate Conception, is to be worshipped and glorified?

This, perhaps, is too absurd a suggestion. But how then as to the immovability of the earth? That has had a papal decision in its favour for two hundred years, and is much stronger therefore as a “pious opinion,” than the Immaculate Conception ever was, till the 8th of last December. And then, it has a show of support from Scripture; and many of the Fathers could be brought forward, without mutilation or garbling, to sustain it. Nor need we resort to the scholastic subtleties by which the Fathers are now doctored into orthodoxy; we will not assert a distinction between *active* and *passive* immovability, nor say that the Fathers only believed in the earth’s immovability in “the *passive* sense,” or in some other sense equally profound, not to say ridiculous.

You must allow me to wonder on what your new dogma rests, as its ground of reception, among you. On the Pope’s decision? But do not Bossuet and other eminent men among your divines assert that the Pope is not by any means infallible, but, on the contrary, may be a *heretic*? This has long been asserted in the Gallican Church, and as the Council of Trent did not define the contrary, how are we to be sure of any counter assurance? Not even a Pope has denuded his own infallibility, as a dogma of the faith; so that the new dogma, rests like the Hindoo universe, on the back of an elephant, which stands on a tortoise, which stands on—something which the Brahmins have not yet defined.

You speak of our late losses at Oxford. It is a subject on which we feel a little sore, I own, for among those who have left us, there have been some whose loss is really a loss. But they have lost much more. And when we see the pontiff himself confessing with what agony of heart he beholds the utter overthrow of his power in Spain and Sardinia, and in several South American nations, we cannot, in charity, think of comparing our sufferings with his, or pause to enumerate the many individual instances of virtual, or absolute conversion to Anglican orthodoxy, which more than balance our account with Rome.

And when we reflect on the various causes which have led to the Romanizing movement in England, and on the nature of the step, which the perverts have taken, we are inclined to think it one of those periodical manifestations of a contagious enthusiasm, with which the history of the Church familiarizes the Christian student, on a scale so much larger and more sweeping. Indeed, nothing but its comparative insignificance, leads us to doubt whether it ought not to be ranked with the Puritan contagion in the seventeenth century, and that of the Methodists in the eighteenth century. In France, you are familiar with much more terrible reactions against even Gallican Romanism. The revolt of Newman will never leave that scar in the Anglican Church, which that of Jansen has kept open in yours for two centuries. And what has “the Oratory” done to Romanize England, to be compared with what Port Royal did to destroy Romanism in France?

You entirely overrate the influence of the late secessions: it was not great at first, and is certainly, as we say in English,

“Small by degrees and beautifully less.”

We wish our perverts much joy of their new Creed, and congratulate them on the addition to the articles of their faith, which makes their religion still fresher than their perversion. How comfortable it must be to them, to find themselves in a Church which enjoys an “infallible judge,” once in *six centuries*. We have little doubt that even the Archbishop of Canterbury will be ready to reverse the Gorham case, and to decide in favour of Archdeacon Denison, when it has been discussed five hundred and ninety years longer: and should he then decide against Mr. Gorham, it is evident that Mr. Gorham and St. Bernard will be in similar predicaments; while if he should decide point-blank against all antiquity, Fathers and schoolmen together, he will only show himself very fit to be a Pope, and quite as infallible as Pius IX. himself.

I am sorry, my dear sir, for your “unhappy divisions,” but since you feel so sorry for ours, I must ask you whether you have read the late work of Hirscher, on the actual state of Romanism in Germany, or that of Laborde on the new dogma as regarded by many in your own country? Let me commend them to your particular attention. True they have been put into the Index, along with the works of Copernicus and Galileo: but, still it remains true, that the earth goes round the sun; that the best of the Romanists in Germany are longing for a reformation; and that the Blessed Virgin was not conceived without taint of original sin. If you are not persuaded of the earth’s immovability, I am sure you will find, by examination, that much more can be said in its favour, than can be said, truthfully, for the new dogma, and both are supported by pontifical acts, the former claiming the precedence by two hundred years.

And now, my dear sir, *unity of faith* with the blessed Apostles, is the prime note of a truly Catholic Church. You possess it no longer, if you did until now. You profess to-day, what yesterday, even your own bishops were free to deny, and what has been boldly denied by millions of Christians, in your own communion, ever since it was first broached. Meanwhile you will find, in our communion, the Apostolic faith, perfect and entire; nothing new—nothing that was not professed at the Council of Nice, and the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem. God has preserved to us this note, while from you it is taken away. Three centuries ago we were delivered from the perils which have destroyed your Gallican Catholicity, and now, we are apparently entrusted with the great commission of filling the world with the doctrine of the Apostles, and gathering the nations into their fellowship. The great historical movement of the century, is that which has diffused the Nicene Episcopate throughout the world, in the path of Anglo-Saxon civilization. It is only second to the original publication of the Gospel over the Roman highways, and in the track of Roman conquest. Let me assure you we recognize our call and our mission. Look where we were three centuries ago, in the fires of Smithfield, or two centuries ago, beneath the foot of the Puritan. And now what has not the Lord wrought for us! The “seed is upon many waters.” When I look back upon our old reformers expiring in the flames for the Apostolic faith, and behold the results of their labours as we see them now, in all the world, I am reminded of that sublime passage of an English poet, in which their dying prophecy seems to be embodied, and addressed to the Pope himself:

*The Criterion*, by Arthur Cleveland Coxe (1866)

“Fond, impious man! think'st thou the sanguine cloud  
Raised by thy breath has quenched the orb of day?  
To-morrow he repairs the golden flood,  
And warms the nations with redoubled ray.”

So far as you are of the old religion, I am, my dear sir, your brother in the  
confession of the Catholic and Apostolic faith.

BALTIMORE, 1855.

## VI. LETTER TO A BISHOP.

I agree with you that the matter of "Ritualism" is becoming a serious one for us, as well as for the English. I regarded it as simply absurd, while it was presented in a single instance in New York, where the feebleness and shallowness of a foppish puerility have served the useful purpose of a caricature. But, the appearance of the Bishop of Vermont's little book is a serious thing, as it opens the door for experiments which are not unlikely to be made in respectable Churches, if not in some of the most important seats of the Church's dignity and strength.<sup>111</sup>

Have you seen that elaborate work miscalled the *Directorium Anglicanum*? This shews what is aimed at, and nobody can look at its frontispiece, in which the priest is elevating the chalice, without seeing that the whole movement is connected with false doctrine. In connection with *No. Ninety* such ritualism would soon finish the work of thoroughly Romanizing us. Dr. Pusey's *concordat* might be realized very speedily, should the *Eirenicon* and the *Directorium*<sup>112</sup> gain any considerable hold upon the Church of England.

Had a genuine Liturgical effort been made, like that of Bishop Andrewes, to bring out and illustrate our own system of worship, in its true spirit and character, I should have been far from feeling any objection to it, in England, where the Church's position and appointed work are so different from ours. I have always felt an admiration for the Non-Jurors' Liturgical principles, and a regret that foreign reformers were permitted to meddle with our ritual and to influence us to discard some things which even Lutherans retain. But, the fact cannot be altered, and after three centuries of desuetude, the restoration of discarded ceremony is a very serious experiment. This would be the case even were the spirit of the revival true and loyal to our Doctrinal Articles, and our position in Catholic Christendom. But, when the attempt is made simultaneously, if not in partnership, with a daring effort to Romanize us in dogma, and to subjugate us "with a concordat" to the Papacy, there can be no doubt as to the spirit in which this Ritualistic movement should be met. To give it any quarter is to betray the Church: its extravagance and treachery are enough to make even the most desirable improvements inexpedient. In fact it has the double fault complained of by the Revisers of the Common Prayer-Book, in 1662; its authors, although acting in a contrary direction, imitating the Puritans in "*secretly striking at some established doctrine* of the Church of England," or else proposing things "utterly frivolous and vain." My very love for a pious and pure and primitive Liturgic beauty, inflames me against anything so meretricious; calculated, as it is, to bring disgrace and contempt on a genuine effort to sustain that "decency and order" of public worship for which we have the Apostolic precept and example.

The work of our presiding Bishop deserves to be treated with respect. It is

---

<sup>111</sup> The Bishop of Vermont's little work appeared while the preceding letters were in press.

<sup>112</sup> The *Directorium Anglicanum*, etc. Edited by the Rev. Frederick Geo. Lee, D. C. L. Second Edition. London, 1865.

dispassionate in its argument and contains much that is valuable and interesting as a work of theory and antiquarianism. Nor does it venture to recommend the introduction of “the novelties which disturb our peace.” On the contrary, its venerable author himself doubts their expediency. Far be it from me to write or speak a word against his book, except in a spirit the most respectful and considerate. Yet, in view of the tendencies of its argument, and of the use which will be made of it, I must agree with you, in deploring its appearance, and I shall feel bound to resist any attempt that might possibly be made to give the Bishop’s opinion any practical force of Law in the Church.

Without denying the claim that we inherit something from the spirit, if not from the letter, of English Ecclesiastical Law, I am sure that a whole system of novelties in our public worship is entirely inconsistent with our American position, as defined in the Preface of the Common Prayer-Book, and in the promise of conformity prescribed by Article Seventh of the Constitution. The Thirty-Fourth Article, moreover, as accepted in *this* Church, is a Canon which forbids a violation of our own American Traditions, by any *private* judgment; which certainly makes it presumptuous for any one to introduce rites and ceremonies not even approved of and allowed by the Ordinary. I think, without any new legislation, an American Bishop can enforce an essential uniformity in his own diocese, and can wholly shut out the dangerous fopperies of the school of *No. Ninety*.

With us, it seems to me, the question is a practical one entirely. Admitting all that may be demanded as to the English Law, and the freedom which our own Church allows in things indifferent, who that is of a sober mind will deny that the American Church has a work to do, which would be indefinitely retarded, if not wholly wrecked by ritual excess? A few dreamy enthusiasts, breathing the atmosphere of our great cities, and dividing their time between the opera-house and a fancy chapel, may be amused, for the moment, with a pantomime called worship; but even these will soon discover that for dumb-show and musical trickery, the Romish mummerly is the only thing that can be harmonized with their otherwise artificial existence. As for gaining any hold on the American people, or winning souls to Christ and his Church, by such performances, I am sure that nobody whose judgment is ordinarily sound, can think of such a thing, unless his observation be most limited. I have consulted many devoted missionaries and earnest men, their helpers in the Lord, and I have never yet met one who did not lament the very introduction of this ritual question, as one more likely than anything else to defeat the purposes of their life, and all their pious labours. Millions of souls are to be taught the very alphabet of the Gospel: the popular mind of America is averse even to the sober proprieties of Christian Worship. The simple decencies of our ordinary services are, as experience shews, the best thing to correct the gross ignorance and irreverence of the masses; and yet even these win their way very slowly at the first, and are seldom accepted except on sober second-thought, when wild enthusiasm, or cold impiety, have worn themselves out, and excited disgust. Now, not to waste words on theory, who does not see that, in practice, our work, for at least one generation, and probably for a century, must be to go on in the missionary spirit, leaving things indifferent out of view, and maintaining “the mild majesty and sober pomp” of our services very much, in the average, as they are now understood and received among us. In Cathedrals and great Churches like “Mother Trinity,” we may properly maintain what have always been the Cathedral usages of our reformed Church; at least where the ordinary of the diocese deems it expedient or useful. A modest directory, based on Scripture, Law and usage,

common-sense, good-taste and real devotion, might be of use, no doubt. But as for this “advanced ritual” as they call it, it seems to me, its place is nowhere, and its progress, at this time, would do more, I am persuaded, to gratify our worst enemies and to uproot all that has been gained, than almost anything else of which I can conceive as possible.

Who can believe that we are in earnest about our real work, if we even consent to lose time in such talk about mantua-making? What would be thought of a General, amid the awful scenes of a campaign, who should pause in his career to consult about uniforms, or to order his tailor to make him a new parade suit?

Oh! when I look at the growing prevalence, in this land, of irreligion and unbelief; when I see the thousands of souls who have no helpers, and none to seek after them; when I behold the work that is first to be done, in harmonizing Christians, in bringing back the wanderers, and in restoring the Catholic spirit to believers themselves, I own it does seem to me as mockery of God, when I see Christian ministers, and candidates for Orders, spending their nights and days in studying the mere romance of religion, and in talking and thinking about postures and bows and crossings, and about this colour or that, in the solemn service of Him who seeks before all things purity of heart, and a sound mind, and an enlightened faith? How many of these ritualists are preeminently exemplary in their lives, or “mighty in the Scriptures”? In England, it is admitted that they are busy as bees in many good works, but so are “the Plymouth brethren” and all others who are anxious to draw attention to their oddities and isms, and to bring them in on the tide of their credit for philanthropy and self-denial. This is no argument with anybody who knows the history of the Romish friars, in their divers rival orders.

The Bishop’s Scriptural argument seems to me by no means unworthy of respect, as a plea for the toleration of Judaizing ceremonies, among Orientals and others, whose habits of mind are not unsuited to such things. We have no right to find fault with them merely on ceremonial grounds. Our reformers would never have quarrelled with Rome on such a plea.

It has often occurred to me that the Synagogue worship, in its simplicity, is the rule for parochial services, while the Temple service, which was practically *exceptional* in a Hebrew’s experience, is only a proper argument for Cathedrals, and their higher ritual. But I have always felt the force of St. James’ exposition of the Christian *cultus*, to be an implied admission that the Apostolic rites were very simple, and the object of contempt on the part of the Pharisees. “Pure *Ritualism* and undefiled,” he says,<sup>113</sup> “is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

In short, then, as you inquire my position, with respect to these novelties, I confess it is that suggested by two maxims of inspired Wisdom. (1) “All things are lawful but all things are not expedient,” and (2) “Let all things be done *unto edifying*.” I am very sure these “advanced ritualists” edify nobody but themselves, for they read the Holy Scriptures wretchedly, as if their purpose were the very reverse of Ezra’s and Nehemiah’s, who “gave the sense,”<sup>114</sup> while these folk only give incense.<sup>115</sup> It pains me

---

<sup>113</sup> See original Greek. See also, I. Cor. x. 32, 33.

<sup>114</sup> Nehemiah viii. 8.

at heart to see our glorious Liturgy so caricatured and so degraded; and I am afraid we are in danger of being driven into an opposite extreme, by the excesses of a very small faction among us, who, like Burke's grasshoppers, are so noisy that they fill the whole field with their attempts at music, while the patient oxen that plough and make it fruitful, are not heard at all.

In a poor missionary Church like ours, it must be remembered that a costly ritual would greatly interfere with the progress of the Church; and where this "advanced ritual" is not costly, it is mean and contemptible. Who does not prefer our decent Chancels and Altars to the tawdry finery (paper lace and cotton velvet) of the Romish Churches in this country.

It will be hard to "keep the happy mean between too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting variations;" but I cannot believe that the work of Seabury and White was crowned with such miraculous success, only to be deformed and defeated by the very inconsiderable characters, who, with rare exceptions, are the only practical advocates of these innovations. There is much wisdom and common sense in the Church, and it generally triumphs in our Councils. As to the Episcopal costume, of the unfitness of which to missionary work you justly complain, nobody would object to slight modifications, suggested by climate and evident propriety.<sup>115</sup> In the South its intolerable weight and heat, in summer, must be an affliction; and in winter, I have often desired the warmth of a cloth cope, while ministering in cold Churches, for the cope is the only Ecclesiastical cloak I know of, and the fashion of St. Paul's is probably forgotten, even at Troas. Common-sense, in these matters, as distinguished from clerical foppery, will seldom give offence; and taste might be gratified in a large degree if this baby-house spirit did not render even moderate ornament distasteful. Still, in spite of triflers, "Wisdom will be justified of all her children." I agree with the Bishop of Vermont that our black satin is not a very ornamental habit, but I think it will answer all the purposes for which it was put on my shoulders, and I pray God I may have grace to make it only half so beautiful, *for association*, as my venerated predecessors in the Episcopate have made it in my eyes. Even its sombre hue of "mourning and humiliation" appears to me most befitting our sad times. Who does not bewail the departed glories of the Catholic Church? Who does not perceive that sackcloth and ashes are the proper symbolism for all those who "think upon her stones and grieve to see her in the dust?" "For one, I think it was time to put on the hue of mourning in the Church of England, when four of her Bishops had been burnt at the stake by their fellow-Christians, by their countrymen and former friends; nor do I think it the time to put by our mourning, when those venerable martyrs are so much vilified, and as it were, murdered afresh. The gondoliers of Venice may now restore to their barges their rainbow colours, for their liberties are graciously restored, this year; but, I admire them for that beautiful devotion to the cause of their country, which has so long kept the gondola in black, "Just like a coffin clapt in a canoe;"

---

<sup>115</sup> An English ritualist complains that they give too much of a good thing, and make too much smoke; and a friend, just returned from England complains to me that in a London ritualistic Church, he could not make out what they were reading or saying in any part of the Service. They affect a sort of chaunt even in the Lessons and hum or drone them, instead of imitating the Levites, who "read the hook, in the Law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense and caused them to understand the reading."

<sup>116</sup> The chimere, I believe, is only a cope improperly modified by the excessive lawn-sleeves. If restored to its true form, the sleeves might be fastened to the rochet, and the cope put on, or off, very conveniently.

*The Criterion*, by Arthur Cleveland Coxe (1866)

and, for one, I am disposed to vote, in the House of Bishops, that all questions about “blue and purple and scarlet,” should lie on the table, to be called up only when “the beauty of holiness” shall be more visible among us; only when the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ shall be seen and known and loved in all this land, in her true character, as the Bride of CHRIST, and the only faithful witness and keeper of Holy Writ.

SEE-HOUSE, BUFFALO, October, 1866.