

**MERLE DAUBIGNE**

**ON**

**PUSEYISM**

BX  
5055  
.M474  
1843

170-7

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Princeton, N. J.

BX 5055 .M474 1843  
Merle d'Aubignae, J. H. 179  
-1872.

Puseyism examined

The Society  
No. 334.

PUSEYISM EXAMINED.

# PUSEYISM EXAMINED.

BY

✓  
J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D. D.,

AUTHOR OF THE "HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN THE SIXTEENTH  
CENTURY."

WITH AN

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE OF THE AUTHOR.

BY ROBERT BAIRD.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN S. TAYLOR & CO.,

Brick Church Chapel, 145 Nassau Street.

---

1843.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year  
1843, by

**JOHN S. TAYLOR,**

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the South-  
ern District of New-York.

---

**W. S. DORR, Printer,**  
123 Fulton Street, N. Y.

## INTRODUCTION.

IN compliance with the request of many friends, who desire to know something of the family, life, character and literary labors of the Rev. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, author of the celebrated "History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century," I furnish the brief memoir which follows.

*John Henry Merle* (or, as he is called in England and this country, *Merle d'Aubigné*), was born in the city of Geneva, in the year 1794. Consequently he is a little more than forty-eight years of age.

Although a Swiss by birth, Dr. Merle\* is of French origin. His family, like that of many of the inhabitants of Geneva, is descended from Huguenot ancestors, who were compelled to leave their native country, because of their religion, and to take refuge in a city upon which one of their countrymen, *John Calvin*, had been the instrument, under God, of conferring the blessings of the Reformation.

The great-grandfather of the Rev. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné on his paternal side, was *John Lewis Merle*, of Nismes. About the epoch of the Revocation of the

---

\* Dr. Merle received the degree of *Doctor in Divinity* from the College of New Jersey, in the year 1838.

Edict of Nantes (1685), this worthy man, who was a sincere Protestant, fled from his country, and took refuge in Switzerland, in order to enjoy the religious liberty which France, under the rule of Louis XIV., denied him.

His son, Francis Merle, married, in the year 1743, Elizabeth, the Daughter of a Protestant nobleman residing in Geneva, whose name was George d'Aubigné. Agreeably to a usage which exists at Geneva, and, I believe, in many other portions of Switzerland, by which a gentleman adds the name of his wife to his own, in order to distinguish him from other persons of the same name, Mr. Francis Merle appended that of *d'Aubigné* to his own, and was known as *Francis Merle d'Aubigné*. Since his day, the family have retained the name of Merle d'Aubigné. At least this was the case with the son of Francis Merle,—the father of our author,—as well as by our author himself.

*George d'Aubigné*, just mentioned, whose daughter Elizabeth became the wife of Francis Merle, was a descendant of *Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigné*, who left France, in the year 1620, on account of Religious persecution. This Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigné was no common man. The old chroniclers call him *un Calviniste zélé, si oneques il en fut* ; “ a zealous Calvinist, if there ever was one.” He bought the domain of Lods, near Geneva, on which he built the Château of Crest, which still remains. The old Huguenot

warrior handled the pen and the lyre as well as the sword; and his *Tragiques*, a poem full of life and genius, drew a vivid picture of the court of the imbecile Henry III. of France, and his infamous mother, *Catherine de Medici*. His *Histoire Universelle de la fin du 16me Siècle* had the honor of being publicly burnt at Paris, in the year 1620, by order of Louis XIII. He wrote also the *Confession de Saucy*, and several other works. It is related of him, that at the age of eight years, he knew well both the Latin and the Greek languages. At the age of fourteen, he went to Geneva to finish his studies in the "Academy," or University, of that city. Having completed his course in that Institution, he returned to France; whence, as has been stated, he was compelled to fly, in the year 1620. Upon establishing himself at Geneva, he became allied, by marriage, with the families of the Burlamachi and Calandrini, two of the most honorable families in that city, both of Italian origin; for Geneva was a "City of refuge" to persecuted and exiled Protestants of Italy as well as of France.

Francis Merle d'Aubigné had many children, one of whom, *Amié Robert Merle d'Aubigné*, was born in 1755, and was the father of three sons; the oldest and the youngest of whom are respectable merchants in this country—the former in New-York, and the latter in New Orleans—and the second is the Rev. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, the subject of this notice. *Amié Robert Merle d'Aubigné* had a strong desire in

his early years to consecrate his life wholly to the service of his God; and his parents allowed him to pursue the studies requisite for the right discharge of the office of the ministry of the Gospel. But on his father's death, his uncle and guardian, "*par un caprice qui fit le malheur de ma jeunesse,*"\* (as he says in his Memoir, written for his oldest son, William), caused him to give up his studies and embrace other pursuits.

The end of this excellent man was truly tragical and deplorable. In the year 1799 he went on an important commercial mission, to Constantinople and Vienna. On his return from the latter city to Geneva, through Switzerland, in the autumn of that year, he was met on the road, near Zurich, by the savage and infuriated hordes of Russians, who had been recently defeated by the French forces under the command of Massena, and by them was cruelly murdered!

His widow, who is still living in Geneva, in a vigorous old age, devoted all the energies of an active and enlightened mind to the care of her fatherless children; and now daily thanks God for having supplied her with the means of giving them a liberal education.

The preceding paragraphs will suffice to give the reader some knowledge of the ancestors of the subject of this biographical sketch.

---

\* Through a caprice which rendered my youth miserable.

The Rev. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné was educated in the "Academy"—or, as is more commonly called by strangers, the *University*—of his native city. After having completed the course of studies in the Faculties of Letters and Philosophy, he entered that of Theology. I am not certain as to the time when he finished his preparations for the ministry; but believe that it was about the year 1816.

The Theological Faculty in the Academy of Geneva when Dr. Merle d'Aubigné was a student, was wholly Socinian in its character. Whatever were the shades of difference in regard to doctrine, which prevailed among its professors, they all agreed in rejecting the proper divinity of the Saviour and of the Holy Spirit, salvation through the expiatory death and intercession of the former, and regeneration and sanctification by the influences of the latter. With these cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, others which are considered by all Evangelical Christians to be fundamental in the system of their Faith, were also renounced. Alas, the same state of things exists at this day, in the School which Calvin founded, and in which that great man, as well as Beza, Francis Turretin, Pictet, and other renowned men taught the youth, who gathered around them, the glorious doctrines of the Gospel and the Reformation.

It was under such instruction that Dr. Merle pursued his studies for the sacred ministry. But it pleased God to send a faithful servant to Geneva about the

time that he was completing his theological training. This was Mr. Haldane of Edinburgh, a wealthy and zealous Christian, who still protracts a long and useful life, which has been spent in the service of his Master. This excellent man, deploring the errors which prevailed in the theological department of the Academy, endeavored to do what he could, during the sojourn of a winter, to counteract them. For this purpose, he invited a number of the young men to his rooms in the hotel in which he lodged, and there, by means of an interpreter at first, he endeavored to teach them the glorious Gospel. In doing this, he commented on the Epistle to the Romans, at much length. God blessed his efforts to the salvation of some ten or twelve of them.

Seldom has it happened that an equal number of young men have been converted about the same time, and in one place, who have been called to perform so important a part in building up the kingdom of Christ. One of these men was the excellent Felix Neff, of blessed memory. Another was the late Henry Pyt. The greater part of them, however, still live to adorn and bless the Church in France and Switzerland. But none of them have become more celebrated than the subject of this notice.

Not long after his ordination, Dr. Merle set out for Germany, where he spent a number of months, chiefly at Berlin. On his way to that city, he passed through Eisenach, and visited the Castle of Warburg, in the

vicinity, famous for the retreat, if not properly the imprisonment, of Luther. It was whilst gazing at the walls of the room which the great Reformer had occupied, that the thought of writing the "History of the Reformation" entered his mind, never to abandon it till its realization should put the world in possession of the immortal work whose existence may be said to date from that day.

From Berlin, Dr. Merle was called to Hamburg, to preach to an interesting French Protestant Church, which had been planted by pious Huguenots, when compelled to leave France, upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and which has been continued by their descendants. In that city he spent five years, diligently employing his time in amassing information on the great subject upon which he had resolved to write.

From Hamburg he was invited to Brussels, by the late king of Holland, to preach in a chapel which he had erected in that capital, for Protestants who spoke the French language. At that time, and down till 1830, Belgium, (of which Brussels is the capital), was united to Holland, and formed a portion of the Kingdom of Netherlands.

In the year 1830, a Revolution took place in Belgium, occasioned as much by religious as by political causes. The priests, in order to deliver the country from the Protestant influence which a union with Holland diffused in it, joined De Potter and the other

“ patriots” in their revolutionary measures. The enterprize succeeded. The Dutch were driven out. And all who were considered friendly to the king, or intimately connected with him, were in no little danger. Among those who were in this predicament was Dr. Merle. At no small risk of his life, he escaped from Belgium to Holland; where he spent a short time, and thence went to his native city.

The return of Dr. Merle to Geneva was most opportune. The friends of the Truth had been steadily increasing in number, since the year 1816, and had begun to think seriously of founding an orthodox School of Theology, in order that pious Swiss and French youth, who were looking to the ministry of the Gospel, should no longer be forced to pursue their studies under the Unitarian doctors of the Academy. The arrival of Dr. Merle decided them for immediate action. The next year, (1831) the Geneva Evangelical Society was formed, one of whose objects was to found the long desired Seminary. In this movement Dr. Merle took a prominent part, and was placed at the head of the new School of Theology. His intimate friend, the excellent Mr. Gaussen, so favorably known in this country for his *Theopneustia*, and in Switzerland for many other writings, took an equal part in this important enterprize, and was chosen Professor of Theology. Mr. Gaussen is one of those in Geneva who have had to endure much of the “shame of the cross,” and he has endured it well. For the noble

stand which he had taken in behalf of the Truth, he was, by the government, turned out of the Church of which he was for years a pastor. A man of fortune, as well as of rich gifts and attainments, he has devoted himself, without a salary, to the infant Institution which he and Dr. Merle, sustained by some distinguished laymen,—among whom I may mention Col. Tronchin, Ch. Gautier, and M. Boissier,—have been the instruments, under God, of founding and of raising up to its present respectable standing. Commencing with some three or four young men, it has steadily increased, till it has now forty students, including both the preparatory and the theological departments.

This Seminary has enjoyed the talents of other valuable and distinguished men. For several years, M. Galland was a professor in it. The late, and still much lamented Steiger, the pupil and friend of Tholuck, was a professor in it during some years. And, at present, it enjoys the services of Messrs. Pilet and La Harpe, who are worthy colleagues of Merle d'Aubigné and Gaussen.

The publications of Dr. Merle have been numerous. I will give the titles of the most important of them.

1. *Le Christianisme porté aux Nations.*

Christianity carried to the Nations—a Missionary Sermon.

2. *Célébration de la Cène.*

A Discourse on the Lord's Supper.

3. *Confession du nom de Christ.*

On the Duty of confessing Christ before the World.

4. *Culte Domestique.*

On Family Worship.

5. *Discours sur l'Etude.*

Discourse on Study.

6. *Eglise appelée à confesser.*

The Church called to maintain the Truth.

7. *Enfans de Dieu.*

The Children of God.

8. *Etudes Chrétiennes.*

Christian Studies.

9. *Foi et Science.*

Faith and Science.

10. *Miracles, ou deux Erreurs.*

Miracles, or two Errors.

11. *Voix de l'Eglise.*

Voice of the Church.

12. *Voix des Anciens.*

Voice of the Ancients.

13. *Liberté des Cultes.*

On Religious Liberty.

Most of these publications are pamphlets of from twenty pages up to sixty or eighty. The last named is a volume of some 200 pages, and was called forth by the state of things in Geneva last year, and is alluded to in the Discourse which follows, where the author speaks of his having played the part of Cassandra, in what he had said respecting the recent Revolution in his native Canton.

But Dr. Merle's great undertaking is his *History of the Reformation in the XVIth Century*. The first volume of this admirable work appeared in 1836.

Two others have, at intervals followed. The author is now engaged on the fourth, in which he is well advanced. It treats of the Reformation in Great Britain, and is expected with very different feelings, by different religious parties in England. Nor is its appearance anxiously looked for by people in England only.

It is not probable that the fourth volume will appear in French before the end of this present year, if even so soon. The fifth and sixth volumes—for it is Dr. Merle's intention to make six volumes instead of four, if God grant him life and health—will not be published for some years. It is no easy task to write a history of the Reformation upon the plan which Dr. Merle pursues,—that of making authentic documents speak for themselves.

It is not my intention to write a *critique* on Dr. Merle's work. It needs it not. The world has learned and acknowledged its surprising merits. It may almost be said that the History of the Reformation was never written until his matchless talent, for judiciously selecting and skillfully arranging facts, and graphically presenting them to the reader's mind, was brought to the subject. With the art of a conjurer, if I may so speak, he causes scene after scene to pass before us, on which the *dramatis personæ* are

brought forward with almost the vividness of the objects which are presented to the bodily eye. For the first time, vast numbers of readers will learn the true characters of Luther, and Melancthon, and Calvin, and the other Reformers. And for the first time, the Reformation, with all the various and boundless benefits which it has conferred upon the world, is beginning to be, in some measure, comprehended by mankind.

Three translations of the three volumes of this great work which have appeared have been published in Great Britian—those of Messrs. Walther, Kelly, and Scott—of which the first and the last are better than the second. Mr. Kelly's, however, has had a wider circulation in Great Britian than either of the others, because of the low price at which it has been published. Mr. Scott's translation is the latest of all, and is not only extremely faithful but is also accompanied with valuable notes. It is published by the Messrs. Blackie, at Glasgow, in twenty-two numbers, each for a shilling, and every second one is adorned with an admirable portrait of one of the principal personages who figured in the Reformation—Luther, Melancthon, Tetzal, Leo X., Calvin, the Elector of Saxony, etc. This edition would be called by the French an *affaire de luxe*; but no one who could afford to pay for it would regret the difference of the price.

It may be insignificant to remark—but it will an-

swer some inquiries which have been addressed to me—that Dr. Merle d'Aubigné is a large fine looking man, of most agreeable manners; and *personally*, as well as mentally considered, he would be pronounced by every one, to be altogether worthy to speak of Martin Luther, John Knox, and the other giants of the Reformation. Nevertheless, I am pained to say it: his health does not correspond with the robustness of his frame, nor the vigor of his appearance. He suffers much at times from complaints of the chest. I am sure, that in making this statement, I shall secure the prayers of many a reader, that his valuable life may be spared many years to bless the Church and the world.

In relation to the Discourse which follows, I have to say, that it was prepared and delivered mainly at the earnest request of a number of English Gentlemen who were at Geneva the last summer and autumn. The reader will perceive in it the same philosophical division and arrangement, the same concentration of thought, the same unsyllogistic, but yet clear and convincing mode of argumentation, and the same playful wit, which are found in the *History of the Reformation in the XVIth Century*. His propositions often contain his syllogisms; and his simple statements of the results to which the doctrines of those whom he opposes would lead, form the best refutation of the errors which they hold.

The translation has been made with care, and is as

close as clearness will permit. Some slight French idioms have been allowed to remain, where the meaning is not doubtful, because they tend to break up monotony of conception, if I may be suffered so to speak. The extracts given from the Oxford and other writers, named in this address, may be found to differ in words and arrangement, from the language used by their authors, for in some few cases it was not possible to give the original, because it was not at hand. But though there is a double translation, yet the sense is doubtless well preserved. And this is all that is very important. It was not convenient, nor, indeed, in all cases possible, to hunt up in the original sources, all the extracts which Dr. Merle has given.

R. B.

NEW-YORK, Jan., 1843,

# PUSEYISM EXAMINED.

---

## GENEVA AND OXFORD.

"Two systems of doctrine are now, and probably for the last time, in conflict—the Catholic and Genevan."

*Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

GENTLEMEN :

I am in the practice, at the opening of the course of lectures in our School, to call your attention to some subject peculiarly appropriate to the wants and the circumstances of the times. Several such subjects now present themselves to our consideration.

And first of all, there is one which is appropriate to every year and to every day, it is that which concerns the very nature of this School. It has none of those temporal sources of prosperity, of endowment, and of power, which nourish other institutions; it can exist only as a plant of God; it can be nothing excepting just as the Spirit of God—like the sap—diffuses itself, without cessation, through the principal branches, and through even the least of its twigs; adorning the whole tree with leaves, with flowers, and with fruits. Gentlemen, Professors and Students, we are those twigs and branches. Oh! that we may not be barren and withered branches!

There is another subject which begins greatly to occupy the most distinguished minds; it is the question whether the Church ought to depend upon the civil government, or ought to have a government of its own, having no dependence, in the last resort, but upon Christ and his Word. Without entering here into this important subject, I would indicate two opposite movements, which are at this moment simultaneously taking place under our eyes in the world; the one in theory, the other in practice. On the one hand, an admirable work, the production of one of the

most profound thinkers of our age, Mr. Vinet,(1) leads some reflecting minds to acknowledge the independence of the Church; and, on the other, many people are uniting themselves with new zeal around the institutions of the government; so that there are all around us convictions and movements which seem to carry away the people of our day by contrary currents. It is thus that a student of Geneva has just written to us, that the refusal to grant to him the exemption from military duty which the law stipulates in favor of students in Theology, will oblige him to quit our school. We will always respect authority, but we cannot refrain from remarking that if, as all parties maintain, there has been a radical revolution in Geneva this year, that revolution has not, assuredly, tended to establish among us that equality and that religious liberty, without which all other liberty is but a useless and dangerous plaything. However, it is in France above all that this movement is taking place. A French student writes to us, with regrets which have touched us, that he has united himself again to the Established Church. When young men, after having pursued in our Preparatory School those first studies which present so many difficulties, desire to secure to themselves, by certain measures, a future more easy; or even to abandon our Institution for the purpose of placing themselves in one sustained by government, from which Unitarian and Rationalist doctrines have been banished, we shall be happy to think that we have been able to prepare them in part, with the aid of God our Saviour, for the work of the ministry, and we shall follow them in their career with the same affection, and we hope, with the same prayers. But we ourselves, Gentlemen, will make no advances to the political governments; we believe that our sole resource is with the Government from above, and knowing the faithfulness of Christ towards those who seek only His glory, assured that there is a place for whomsoever He calls to preach His Gospel, we will ask of Him the confidence that we, teachers and pupils, ought to have in His love, and to make us all continue to walk *by faith* and not by sight.

---

(1) Essai sur la Manifestation des Convictions Religieuses—Paris, 1842.

The circumstances even of the Church in our country might also occupy our attention. Alas! we have played this year the part of Cassandra. In vain have we presented, as well as we could, the correct principles of Ecclesiastical Government; in vain, in particular, have we shown that the elders of the Church ought to be chosen by the people of the parishes assembled in their places of worship, with their pastors, after having invoked the name of God, and not by municipal councils, over which magistrates preside; our words for a moment heard, have in the end been in vain. We have seen among us, a very strange spectacle; we have seen ecclesiastics, men in other respects truly enlightened, and possessing undoubted talent, appear to fear their parishes, and employ their powerful influence to cause the rulers of the Church to be elected, not by the Church, but by the magistrates charged to watch over the maintenance of the roads and public edifices. And now that this election has been made, what do people say! surprising thing! Exclamations of astonishment and grief are heard, that the political bodies to which some have wished at all price to entrust the ecclesiastical elections, have made those elections political; the fall of the Church is predicted, men are now occupied with those who *are destined infallibly to share the spoils*,<sup>(2)</sup> and nothing can equal the zeal which has been employed to obtain this change, unless it be the grief which has been manifested when, as we predicted, its inevitable results have been discovered. Behold, Gentlemen, whither ignorance of the first principles of ecclesiastical government, on the part of those who administer the Church, whatever may be, in other respects, their illumination, their morality, their patriotism, inevitably conducts.

If we look beyond this School, beyond this city, into the religious world in general, there are, Gentlemen, other subjects which present themselves. It is thus that we see pious men, seduced, without doubt, by many truths mixed up with strange errors, receive a system come from a city in England,<sup>(1)</sup> according to which there is no more Church,

---

(1) See the Courier of Geneva of the 24th Sept., 1842.

(2) Plymouth. (Dr. Merle here refers to those who are called "Plymouth Brethren.")

although Jesus has promised (Matth. xvi.) that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and that there ought to be no more pastors and teachers, although revelation declares to us that Christ himself has established "pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," (Ephes. iv. 11, 12.)

But, Gentlemen, there is another error; it is that which is found at the other extremity of the theological line, that I intend now to indicate to you. In the bosom of a University in England, that of Oxford, has grown up an ecclesiastical system which interests and justly grieves all Christendom. It is now some time since some laymen, whom I love and respect, came to me to ask me to write against that dangerous error. I answered that I had neither the time, nor the capacity, nor the documents necessary for the task. But if I am incapable of composing a dissertation, I can at least show in few words how I regard it. It is with me even a duty, since respectable Christians ask it of me; and it is that which has determined me to choose this subject for the present occasion.

---

Let us comprehend well, Gentlemen, the position which Evangelical Christian Theology occupies.

At the epoch of the Reformation, if I may so speak, three distinct eras had occurred in the history of the Church.

1. That of Evangelical Christianity, which, having its focus in the times of the Apostles, extended its rays throughout the first and second centuries of the Church.

2. That of Ecclesiastical Catholicism, which, commencing its existence in the third century, reigned till the seventh.

3. That of the Papacy, which reigned from the seventh to the fifteenth century.

Such were the three grand eras in the then past history of the Church; let us see what characterized each one of them.

In the first period, the supreme authority was attributed to the revealed Word of God.

In the second, it was, according to some, ascribed to the Church as represented by its bishops.

In the third, to the Pope.

We acknowledge cheerfully that the second of these systems is much superior to the third; but it is inferior to the first!

In fact, in the first of these systems it is GOD who rules.

In the second, it is MAN.

In the third, it is, to speak after the Apostle, "THAT WORKING OF SATAN, with all power, and signs and lying wonders," (2 Thess. ii. 9.)

The Reformation, in abandoning the Papacy, might have returned to the second of these systems, that is, to Ecclesiastical Catholicism; or to the first, that is, to Evangelical Christianity.

In returning to the second, it would have made half the way. Ecclesiastical Catholicism is, in effect, a middle system—a *via media*, as one of the Oxford Doctors has termed it, in a sermon which he has just published. On the one hand, it approaches much to Papacy, for it contains, in the germ, all the principles which are there found. On the other, however, it diverges from it, for it rejects the Papacy itself.

The Reformation was not a system of pretended *juste milieu*. It went the whole way; and rebounding with that force which God gives, it fell, as at one single leap, into the Evangelical Christianity of the Apostles.

But there is now, Gentlemen, a numerous and powerful party in England, supported even by some Bishops, (whose Charges have filled us with astonishment and grief), which would, according to its adversaries, quit the ground of Evangelical Christianity to plant itself upon that of Ecclesiastical Catholicism, with a marked tendency towards the Papacy; or which, according to what it pretends, would faithfully maintain itself on that hierarchical and semi-Romish ground, which is, according to it, the *true, native and legitimate* foundation of the Church of England. It is this movement which is, from the name of one of its principal chiefs, called *Puseyism*.

"The task of the true children of the Catholic Church," says the *British Critic*, (one of the Journals which are the organs of the Oxford party,) "is to unprotestantize the Church." "It is necessary," says one of these doctors,(1)

---

(1) Mr. Palmer.

“to reject entirely and to anathematize the principle of Protestantism, as being that of a heresy, with all its forms, its sects and its denominations.” “It is necessary,” says another in his posthumous writings,(1) “to hate more and more the Reformation and the Reformers.”

In separating the Church from the Reformation, this party pretends to wish not to bring back the Papacy, but to retain the church in the *juste milieu* of Ecclesiastical Catholicism. However, the fact is not to be disguised, that if it were forced to choose between what it considers two evils, it would greatly prefer Rome to the Reformation.

Men highly respectable for their knowledge, their talents, and their moral character, are found among these theologians. And, let us acknowledge it, the fundamental want which seems to have decided this movement is a legitimate one.

There has been felt in England, in the midst of all the waves which now heave and agitate the Church, a want of *antiquity*; and men have sought a rock, firm and immovable, on which to plant their footsteps.

This want is founded in human nature; it is also justified by the social and religious state of the present time. I myself thirst for antiquity.

But the doctors of Oxford, do they satisfy, for themselves and others, these wants of the age?

I am convinced of the contrary. What a juvenile antiquity is that before which these eminent men prostrate themselves! It is the young and inexperienced Christianity of the first ages which they call ancient; it is to the child that they ascribe the authority of the old man. If it be a question respecting the antiquity of humanity, certainly we are more ancient than the Fathers, for we are 15 or 18 centuries older than they; it is we who have the light of experience and the maturity of gray hairs.

But no; it is not respecting such an antiquity that there can be any question in divine things. The only antiquity to which we hold is that of the “Ancient of days,” (Dan. vii. 13,) “of Him who before the mountains were brought forth, or ever He had formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting is God.” It is “He who is our refuge from age to age,” (Ps. xc. 1, 2.) The truly an-

---

(1) Mr. Froude.

cient document to which we appeal is that "Word which is settled forever in Heaven." (Ps. cxix. 89,) and "which shall stand forever," (Isaiah, xl. 8.) Behold, Gentlemen, *our antiquity.*

Alas, that which most afflicts us in the learned doctors of Oxford, is that whilst the people who surround them hunger and thirst after antiquity, they themselves instead of leading them to the ancient testimony of the "Ancient of days," only conduct them to puerile novelties. What novelties in reality, and what faded novelties!—that *purgatory*, those *human pardons*, those *images*, those *relics*, that *invocation of the saints* which these doctors would restore to the Church (1). What immense and monstrous innovation that Rome to which they would have us return!

Who are the innovators, I demand? those who say as we do, with the eternal Word: "God hath begotten us of His own will, with the word of truth," (Jas. i. 18,) or those who say as do the "Tracts for the Times:" "Rome is our mother, it is by her that we have been born to Christ." Those who say as we do, with the eternal Word: "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God," (Heb. iii. 12;) or those who say, as do these doctors: "In losing visible union with the Church of Rome, we have lost great privileges,"(2) certainly the doctors of Oxford are the innovators.

The partizans of Rome, that grand innovation in Christendom, do not here deceive themselves; they hail in these new doctors advocates of Romish novelties. The famous Romish Doctor Wiseman writes to Lord Shrewsbury:

We can count certainly on a prompt, zealous, and able co-operation to bring the Church of England to obedience to the See of Rome. When I read in their chronological order the writings of the theologians of Oxford, I see in the clearest manner these doctors approximating from day to day our holy Church, both as to doctrine and good-will. Our Saints, our Popes, become more and more dear to them; our rites, our ceremonies, and even the fes-

(1) Tracts for The Times, No. 90, Art. 6.

(2) British Critic

tivals of our saints, and our days of fasting, are precious in their eyes, more precious, alas, than in the eyes of many of our own people."

And the doctors of Oxford, notwithstanding their protestations, do they not concur in this view of the matter, when they say: "the tendency to Romanism is at bottom only a fruit of the profound desire which the Church, greatly moved, experiences to become again that which the Saviour left her,—One." (1)

Such, Gentlemen, is the movement which is taking place in that Church of England, which so many pious men, so many Christian works, have rendered illustrious. Dr. Pusey has had reason to say in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury: "upon the issue of the present struggle depend the destinies of our Church." And it is worth while for us to pause here a few moments to examine what party we ought to prefer, as members of the ancient Church of the continent, and what we have to do in this grave and solemn crisis.

Gentlemen, we ought to profess frankly that we will have neither the *Papacy*, nor the *via media* of Ecclesiastical Catholicism, but remain firm upon the foundation of Evangelical Christianity. In what consists this Christianity when it is opposed to the two other systems which we reject?

There are in it things essential and things unessential; it is of that only which forms its essence; of that which is its principle, that I would here speak.

There are three principles which form its essence; the first is that which we may call its *formal* principle, because it is the means by which this system is formed or constituted; the second is that which may be called the *material* principle, because it is the very doctrine which constitutes this religious system; the third, I call the *personal* or *moral* principle, because it concerns the application of Christianity to the soul of each individual.

The *formal* principle of Christianity is expressed in few words:

THE WORD OF GOD, ONLY.

That is to say, the Christian receives the knowledge of

---

(1) Letter of Dr. Pusey to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

the truth only by the Word of God, and admits of no other source of religious knowledge.

The *material* principle of Christianity is expressed with equal brevity :

#### THE GRACE OF CHRIST, ONLY.

That is to say, the Christian receives salvation only by the grace of Christ, and recognises no other meritorious cause of eternal life.

The *personal* principle of Christianity may be expressed in the most simple terms :

#### THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT, ONLY.

That is to say, there must be in each soul that is saved a moral and individual work of regeneration, wrought by the Spirit of God, and not by the simple concurrence of the Church,\* and the magic influence of certain ceremonies.

Gentlemen, recall constantly to your minds these three simple truths :

*The Word of God, ONLY ;*

*The Grace of Christ, ONLY ;*

*The Work of the Spirit, ONLY ;*

and they will truly be "a lamp to your feet and a light to your paths."

These are the three great beacons which the Holy Spirit has erected in the Church. Their effulgence should spread from one end of the world to the other. So long as they shine, the Church walks in the light ; as soon as they shall become extinct or even obscured, darkness like that of Egypt will settle upon Christendom.

But, Gentlemen, it is precisely these three fundamental principles of Evangelical Christianity which are attacked and overthrown by the new system of Ecclesiastical Catholicism. It is not to some minor point, to some doctrine of secondary importance that they direct their attention

---

\* The words which are used in the French are *adjonction de l'Eglise*, and are employed to express that additional or concurrent influence which the Church is believed, by the Puseyites, to exert in regeneration by her ministrations.—*Note by the Tr.*

at Oxford; it is to that which constitutes the essence even of Christianity and of the Reformation, to those truths so important that, as Luther said, "with them the Church stands, and without them the Church falls." Let us consider them.

## I.

The *formal* principle of Evangelical Christianity is this :

## THE WORD OF GOD, ONLY.

He who would know and possess the Truth, in order to be saved, ought to address himself to that revelation of God which is contained in the Sacred Scriptures, and to reject everything which is human addition, everything which, like the work of man, is justly suspected of being stamped with the impress of a deplorable mixture of error. There is one sole source at which the Christian quenches his thirst; it is that stream, clear, limpid, perfectly pure, which flows from the throne of God. He turns his lips away from every other fountain which flows parallel with it, or which would pretend to mix itself with it; for he knows that because of the source whence these streams issue, they all contain troubled, unwholesome, perhaps deadly waters.

The sole, ancient, eternal stream, is God; the new, ephemeral, failing stream, is MAN; and we will quench our thirst but in God alone. God is for us, so full of a sovereign majesty, that we would regard as an outrage, and even as impiety, the attempt to put anything by the side of His Word.

But this is what the authors of the novelties of Oxford are doing. "The Scriptures," say they, in the *Tracts for the Times*, "it is evident are not, according to the principles of the Church of England, the Rule of Faith. The doctrine or message of the Gospel, is but indirectly presented in the Scriptures, and in an obscure and concealed manner."<sup>(1)</sup> "Catholic tradition," says one of the two principal chiefs of this school,<sup>(2)</sup> "is a divine informer

---

(1) Tract 85.

(2) Newman, *Lecture on Romanism*.

in religious things; it is the unwritten word. These two things, (the Bible and the Catholic traditions,) form together a united rule of Faith. Catholic tradition is a divine source of knowledge in all things relating to Faith. The Scriptures are only the document of ultimate appeal; Catholic tradition is the authoritative teacher."

"Tradition is infallible," says another doctor;(1) "the unwritten word of God, of necessity, demands of us the same respect which his written word does, and precisely for the same reason,—because it is His word." "We demand that the whole of the Catholic traditions should be taught," says a third.(2)

Behold, Gentlemen, one of the most pestiferous errors which can be disseminated in the Church.

Whence has Rome and Oxford derived it? Certainly the respect which we entertain for the incontestable science of these doctors shall not prevent us from saying it: This error can come from no other source than the natural aversion of the heart of fallen man for everything that the Scriptures teach. It can be nothing else than a depraved will which leads man to put the Sacred Scriptures aside. Men first abandon the fountain of living waters, and then hew for themselves, here and there, cisterns which will hold no water. Here is a truth which the history of every Church teaches in its successive falls and errors, as well as that of every soul in particular. The theologians of Oxford only follow in the way of all flesh.

Behold, then, Gentlemen, two established authorities by the side of each other: The Bible and Tradition. We do not hesitate as to what we have to do:

TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY! We cry with the prophet: "If they speak not according to His word, it is because there is no light in them: and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish; and they shall be driven to darkness." (Isa. viii. 20, 22.)

We reject this Tradition as being a species of Rationalism which introduces, for a rule in Christian doctrine, not the human reason of the present time, but the human reason of the times past. We declare, with the Churches of

(1) Keeble's Sermons.

(2) Palmer's Aids to Reflection.

the Reformation in their symbolical writings, (Confessions of Faith,) that "the Sacred Scriptures are the only judge, the only rule of Faith;" that it is to them, as to a touchstone, that all dogmas ought to be brought; that it is by them that the question should be decided, whether they are pious or impious, true or false? (1)

Without doubt there was originally an oral tradition which was pure; it was the instructions given by the Apostles themselves, before the sacred writings of the New Testament existed. However, even then, the apostle and the evangelist, Peter and Barnabas, (Gal. ii. 13.) could not walk uprightly, and consequently stumbled in their words. The divinely inspired Scriptures alone are infallible: the word of the Lord endureth forever.

But, however pure was oral instruction from the time that the apostles quitted the earth, that tradition was necessarily exposed in this world of sin, to be little by little defaced, polluted, corrupted. It is for this cause that the Evangelical Church honours and adores, with gratitude and humility, that gracious good pleasure of the Saviour, in virtue of which that pure, primitive type, that first, Apostolic tradition, in all its purity, has been rendered permanent, by being written, by the Spirit of God himself, in our sacred books, for all coming time. And now she finds in those writings, as we have just heard, the divine touchstone, which she employs for the purpose of trying all the traditions of men.

Nor does she establish concurrently, as do the doctors of Oxford and the Council of Trent, the tradition which is *written* and the tradition which is *oral*; but she decidedly renders the latter subordinate to the former, because one cannot be sure that this oral tradition is only and truly Apostolical tradition, such as it was in its primitive purity.

The knowledge of true Christianity, says the Protestant Church, flows only from one source, namely, from the Holy Scriptures, or, if you will, from the *Apostolic tradition*, such as we find it contained in the writings of the New Testament.

The Apostles of Jesus Christ,—Peter, Paul, John, Matthew, James,—perform their functions in the Church to—

---

(1) Formula of Agreement.

day ; no one has need, no one has the power to take their place. They perform their functions at Jerusalem, at Geneva, at Corinth, at Berlin, at Paris ; they bear testimony in Oxford and in Rome itself. They preach, even to the ends of the world, the remission of sins and conversion of the soul in the name of the Saviour ; they announce the resurrection of the Crucified to every creature ; they loose and they retain sins ; they lay the foundation of the house of God and they build it ; they teach the missionaries and the ministers of the Gospel ; they regulate the order of the Church, and preside in Synods which would be Christian. They do all this by the *written Word* which they have left us. Or rather, Christ, Christ himself, does it by that Word, since it is the Word of Christ, rather than the word of Paul, of Peter, or of James. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations ; lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." (Matth. xxviii. 19, 20.)

Without doubt, as to the number of their words, the Apostles spoke more than they wrote ; hut as to the substance, they said nothing more than what they have left us in their divine books. And if they had taught by the mouth, as to the substance, differently or more explicitly than they did by their writings, no one could at this day be in a state to report to us, with assurance, even one syllable of these instructions. If God did not wish to preserve them in His Bible, no one can come to His aid, and do what God Himself has not wished to do, and what He has not done. If, in the writings more or less doubtful, of the companions of the Apostles, or of those Fathers who are called Apostolical, one should find any doctrine of the Apostles, it would be necessary, first of all, to put it to the trial, in comparing it with the certain instructions of the Apostles, that is with the Canon of the Scriptures.

So much for the tradition of the Apostles. Let us pass from the times when they lived to those which succeeded. Let us come to the tradition of the doctors of the first centuries. That tradition is, without doubt, of great value to us ; but by the very fact of its being presbyterian, episcopal, or synodical, it is no more Apostolical. And let us suppose, (what is not true,) that it does not contradict itself ; and let us suppose, that one Father does not overthrow what another Father has established, (as is often

the case, and Abelard has proved it in his famous work entitled the *Sic et Non*, whose recent publication we owe to the care of a French philosopher (1);—let us suppose for a moment, that one might reduce this tradition of the Fathers of the Church to a harmony similar to that which the Apostolical tradition presents, the canon which might be obtained thus could in no manner be placed on an equality with the canon of the Apostles. (2)

Without doubt,—and we acknowledge it,—the declarations of Christian doctors merit our attention, if it is the Holy Spirit which speaks in them, that Spirit ever living and ever acting in the Church. But we will not, we absolutely will not allow ourselves to be bound by that which, in this tradition and in these doctors, is only the work of man. And how shall we distinguish that which is of God from that which is of men, but by the Holy Scriptures? “It remains,” says St. Augustine, “that I judge myself according to this only Master, from whose judgment I desire not to escape.” (3) The declarations of the doctors in the Church are only the testimonies of the faith which these eminent men had in the doctrines of the Scriptures. They show how these doctors received these doctrines; they may, without doubt, be instructive and edifying for us; but there is no authority in them which hinds us. All the doctors, Greek, Latin, French, Swiss, German, English, American, placed in the presence of the Word of God, are, altogether, only disciples who are receiving instruction. Men of the first times, men of the last, we are all alike upon the benches of that divine School; and in the chair of instruction, around which we are humbly assembled. nothing appears, nothing elevates itself, but the infallible Word of God. I perceive, in that vast auditory, Calvin, Luther, Cranmer, Augustine, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Cyprian, by the side of our contemporaries. We are not “disciples of Cyprian and Ignatius,” as the doctors of Oxford (4) call themselves; but of Jesus Christ. “We do

---

(1) *Ouvrages inédites d'Abelard*, published by Mr. Victor Cousin. Paris, 1836. The Introduction to this work, upon the history of Scholastic Philosophy in France, is a *chef-d'œuvre*.

(2) Nitzsch, *Protestantische Thesen*.

(3) *Retract.* in Prol.

(4) Newman on Romanism.

not despise the writings of the Fathers," we say with Calvin, "but in making use of them we remember always that "all things are ours" (1 Cor. iii. 22); that they ought to serve, not govern us; and that "we, we are Christ's" (1 Cor. iii. 23), whom in all things, and without exception, it behoves us to obey."(1)

This the doctors of the first centuries are themselves the first to say. They claim for themselves no authority, and only wish that the Word which has taught them may teach us also. "Now that I am old," says Augustine, in his *Retractions*, "I do not expect not to stumble in word, or to be perfect in word; how much less when, being young, I commenced writing?"(2) "Beware," says he again, "of subjecting yourselves to my writings, as if they were Canonical Scriptures."(3) "Do not esteem as Canonical Scriptures the works of Catholic and justly honored men," says he elsewhere. "It is allowed us, without impeaching that honor which is due to them, to reject those things in their writings, should we find such in them, which are contrary to the Truth. I am, in regard to the writings of others, what I would have others be in regard to mine."(4) "All that has been said since the times of the Apostles ought to be retrenched," says Jerome, "and have no authority. However holy, however learned, a man may be, who comes after the Apostles, let him have no authority."(5)

"Neither Antiquity nor Custom," says the Confession of the Reformed Church of France, "ought to be arrayed in opposition to the Holy Scriptures; on the contrary, all things ought to be examined, regulated and reformed according to them."

And the Confession of the English Church even says the doctors of Oxford to the contrary notwithstanding: "The Holy Scriptures contain all that is necessary to salvation, so that all that is not found in them, all that cannot be proved by them, cannot be required of any one as an article of faith or as necessary to salvation."

(1) Calv. Inst. Relig. Christ.

(2) *Retractions*.

(3) In *Prolog. de Trinitate*.

(4) *Ad Fortunatianum*.

(5) In *Psalm. lxxxvi*.

Thus the Evangelical doctors of our times give the hand to the Reformers, the Reformers to the Fathers, the Fathers to the Apostles; and thus forming, as it were, a chain of gold, the whole Church of all ages and of all people, shouts forth as with one voice to the *God of Truth*, that hymn of one of our greatest poets:(1)

Parle seul à mon cœur, et qu'aucune prudence,  
 Qu'aucun autre Docteur ne m'explique tes lois;  
 Que toute créature en ta sainte présence,  
 S'impose le silence,  
 Et laisse agir ta voix!(2)

What then is Tradition? It is the testimony of History.

There is a historical testimony for the facts of Christian history, as well as for those of any other history. We admit that testimony; only we would discuss it, and examine it, as we would all other testimony. The heresy of Rome and of Oxford,—and it is that which distinguishes them from us,—consists in the fact that they attribute infallibility to this testimony as to Scripture itself.

Although we receive the testimony of History in that which is true, as, for example, in that which relates to the collection of the writings of the Apostles; it by no means results from this that we should receive this testimony in that which is false, as, for instance, in the adoration of Mary, or the celibacy of the priests.

The Bible is the Faith, holy, authoritative, and truly ancient, of the child of God; human Tradition springs from the love of novelties, and is the Faith of ignorance, of superstition, and of a credulous puerility.

How deplorable but instructive, to see doctors of a Church called to the glorious liberty of the children of God, and which reposes only on God and his Word, place themselves under the bondage of human ordinances! And how loudly does that example cry to us: "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. v. 1.)

(1) Corneille.

(2) Speak Thou alone to my heart, and let no other Wisdom, no other Doctor explain to me Thy laws; let every creature be silent in Thy holy presence, and let Thy voice speak!

All those errors which we are combatting come from truths which have not been rightly understood. We also believe in the attributes of the Church of which they speak so much; but we believe in them according to the meaning which God attaches to it, and our opponents believe in them according to that which men attach to it.

Yes, there is *one holy* Catholic Church, but it is, as the Apostle says, "The general assembly and Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven," (Heb. xii. 23). *Unity* as well as *holiness* appertains to the invisible Church. It behooves us, without doubt, to pray that the visible Church should advance daily in the possession of these heavenly attributes; but neither rigorous unity nor universal holiness, is a perfection essential to its existence, or a *sine quâ non*. To say that the visible Church must absolutely be composed of saints only, is the error of the Donatists and fanatics of all ages. So also, to say that the visible Church must of necessity be externally one, is the corresponding error of Rome, of Oxford, and of formalists of all times. Let us guard against preferring the exterior hierarchy, which consists in certain human forms, to that interior hierarchy which is the kingdom of God itself. Let us not permit that the form, which passes away, should determine the essence of the Church; but let us, on the contrary, make the essence of the Church, to wit, the Christian life—which emanates from the Word and Spirit of God,—change and renew the form. *The form has killed the substance*,—here is the whole history of the Papacy and of false Catholicism. *The substance vivifies the form*,—here is the whole history of Evangelical Christianity, and of the true Catholic Church of Jesus Christ.

Yes, I admit it—the Church is the judge of controversies—*judex controversiarum*. But what is the Church? It is not the Clergy, it is not the Councils, still less is it the Pope. It is the Christian people, it is the faithful. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," (1 Thess. v. 21), is said to the children of God, and not to some assembly, or to a certain bishop; and it is they who are constituted, on the part of God, *judges of controversies*. If animals have the instinct which leads them not to eat that which is injurious to them, we cannot do less than

allow to the Christian this instinct, or rather, this intelligence, which emanates from the virtue of the Holy Spirit. Every Christian, (the Word declares it), is called upon to reject "every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," (1 John, iv. 1—5) And this is what is essentially meant, when it is said that the Church is the *judge of controversies!*

Yes, I believe and confess it,—there is an authority in the Church, and without authority the Church cannot stand. But where is it to be found? Is it with him, whoever he may be, that has the external consecration, whether he possess or not theological gifts, whether he has received or not grace and justification? Rome herself does not yet pretend that orders save and sanctify. Must then the children of God go, in many cases, to ask a decision in things relating to faith, of the children of this world? What! a bishop, from the moment he is seated in his chair, although he may be perhaps destitute of science, destitute of the Spirit of God, and although he may perhaps have the world and hell in his heart, as had Borgia and so many other bishops, shall he have authority in the assembly of the saints, and do his lips possess always the wisdom and the truth necessary for the Church?... No, Gentlemen, the idea of a knowledge of God, true, but at the same time destitute of holiness, is a gross supernaturalism. "Sanctify them through the Truth" says Jesus, (John, xvii. 17.) There is an authority in the Church, but that authority is wholly in the Word of God. It is not a man, not a minister, not a bishop, descended from Gregory, from Chrysostom, from Augustine, or from Irenaeus, who has authority over the soul. It is not with a power so contemptible as that which comes from those men, that we, the ministers of God, go forth into the world. It is elsewhere than in that episcopal succession, that we seek that which gives authority to our ministry, and validity to our sacraments.

Rejecting these deplorable innovations, we appeal from them to the ancient, sovereign and divine authority of the Word of the Lord. The question which we ask of him who would inform himself concerning eternal things is that which we receive from Jesus himself: "What is written in the Law, and how readest thou?" (Luke x.

26.) That which we say to rebellious spirits is what Abraham said from heaven to the rich man: "You have Moses and the prophets, hear them." (Luke xvi. 29.)

That which we ask of all, is to imitate the Bereans who "searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so." (Acts xvii. 11.)

"We ought to obey God rather than men," even the most excellent of men. (Acts v. 29.)

Behold, the true authority, the true hierarchy, the true polity. The churches which men make possess human authority—this is natural. But the Church of God possesses the authority of God, and she will not receive it from others.

## II.

Such is the *formal* principle of Christianity; let us come now to its *material* principle, that is to say, to that which is the body, the substance even, of religion. We have announced it in these terms:

### THE GRACE OF CHRIST, ONLY.

"Ye are saved by grace, through faith," says the Scripture, "and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8.)

Evangelical Christianity not only seeks for complete salvation in Christ, but seeks it *in Christ only*, thus excluding, as a cause of salvation, all works of his own, all merit, all co-operation of man or of the Church. There is nothing, absolutely nothing upon which we can build the hope of our salvation, but the *free and unmerited grace of God*, which is given to us *in Christ*, and communicated *by faith*.

Now, this second great foundation of Evangelical Christianity is equally overthrown by the modern Ecclesiastical Catholicism.

The famous Tract, No. 90, which I hold in my hand at this moment, seeks to explain in a papistical sense the Confession of Faith of the Church of England.

The 11th Article of this Confession says: "That we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine."

Behold the commentary of the new School of Oxford: "In adhering to the doctrine that faith alone justifies, we do not at all exclude the doctrine that works also justify. If it were said that works justify in the same sense in which it is said that faith alone justifies, there would be a contradiction in terms. But faith alone in one sense justifies us, and in another, good works justify us: this is all that is here maintained!.... Christ alone, in one sense justifies, faith also justifies in its proper sense; and so works, whether moral or ceremonial may justify us in their respective sense."

"There are," says the *British Critic*, "some Catholic truths which are imprinted on the surface of the Scripture rather than enveloped in its profound meaning; such is the doctrine of justification by works." "The preaching of Justification by Faith," says another doctor of this School, "ought to be addressed to Pagans by the *propagators* of Christian knowledge; its *promoters* ought to preach to baptized persons justification by works."—Works, yes: but justification by them, never!

Justification is not, according to these doctors, that judicial act by which God, for the sake of the expiatory death of Christ, declares that He treats us as righteous; it is confounded by them, as well as by Rome, with the work of the Holy Spirit.

"Justification," says again the chief of these doctors, "is a progressive work; it must be the work of the Holy Spirit and not of Christ. The distinction between deliverance from the guilt of sin and deliverance from sin itself, is not scriptural."(1) The *British Critic* calls the system of Justification by grace through faith "radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical and anti-Christian." "The custom which has prevailed," say again these doctors, "of advancing, on all occasions, the doctrine of Justification explicitly and mainly, is evidently and entirely opposed to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures."(2) And they condemn those who make "Justification to con-

(1) Newman, on Justification.

(2) Tract 80.

sist in the act by which the soul rests upon the merits of Christ only.”(1)

I know that the doctors of Oxford pretend to have found here a middle term between the Evangelical doctrine and the Romish doctrine. “It is not,” say they, “Sanctification which justifies us, but the presence of God in us, from which this Sanctification flows. Our Justification is the possession of this presence.” But the doctrine of Oxford is at bottom the same with that of Rome. The Bible speaks to us of two great works of Christ: CHRIST FOR US, AND CHRIST IN US. Which of these two works is that which justifies us? The Church of Christ answers: The first. Rome and Oxford answer: The second. When this is said, all is said.

And these doctors do not conceal it. They inform us that it is the system against which they stand up. They declare to us that it is against the idea, that, when the sinner “has by faith laid hold of the saving merits of Christ, his sins are blotted out, covered, and cannot re-appear; his guilt has been abolished, so that he has only to render thanks to Christ, who has delivered him from his transgressions.”—“My Lord,” says Dr. Pusey to the Bishop of Oxford, “it is against this system that I have spoken”—Stop! Do not tear to pieces this Good News, which alone has been, and will be in all ages, the consolation of the sinner!

Gentlemen, if the first principle of this new School had for effect to deprive the Church of all light, this second principle would have for its end to deprive her of all salvation. “If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain. O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth: received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith!” (Gal. ii. 21, iii. 2, 3.)

Men the most eminent for piety, have felt that it is the source even of the Christian life, the foundation of the Church, which is here attacked: “There is reason,” says the excellent Bishop of Winchester, who, as well as several other Bishops, and particularly those of Chester and Cal-

---

(1) Newman, on Justification.

cutta, has denounced these errors, in a Charge addressed to his clergy, "there is reason to fear that the distinctive principles of our Church would be endangered, if men should envelop in a cloud the great doctrine which sets forth the way in which we are accounted righteous before God; if men doubt that the Protestant doctrine of Justification by faith is fundamental; if, instead of the sacrifice of Christ, the pure and only cause for which we are graciously received, men establish a certain inherent disposition of sanctification, and thus confound the work of the Spirit within with the work of Christ without."

The School of Oxford pretends, with Rome and the Council of Trent, "that justification is the indwelling in us, of God the Father and of the incarnate Word, by the Holy Spirit, and that the two acts distinguished from each other by the Bible and our theologians form only one."(1)—What then?

God 1. remits to the sinner the penalty of sin; he absolves him; he pardons him; 2. he delivers him from sin itself; he renews him; he sanctifies him.

Are there not here two things?

The pardon of sin on the part of God, would it not be just nothing at all? Would it not be simply but an image of sanctification? Or should one say that the pardon which is granted to faith, and which produces in the heart the sentiment of reconciliation, of adoption, and of peace, is something too external to be taken into the account?

"The Lutheran system," says the *British Critic*, "is immoral, because it distinguishes these two works." Without doubt, it does distinguish them, but it does not separate them. "See wherefore we are justified," says Melancthon, in the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg; "it is in order that being righteous we should do good, and begin to obey the law of God; see, here why it is that we are regenerated and receive the Holy Spirit; it is that the new life may have new works, and new dispositions." How many times has not the Reformation declared that justifying faith is not an historical, dead, vain knowledge, but a living action, a willing and a receiv-

---

(1) Letter of Dr. Pusey to the Bishop of Oxford.

ing, a work of the Holy Spirit, the true worship of God, obedience towards God in the most important of all moments. Yes, it is a living, efficacious faith which justifies; and these words, *efficacious faith*—which are found in all our Confessions of Faith—are there for the purpose of declaring that faith *alone*, without doubt, serves as a cause in the work of justification, that *alone*, without doubt, it justifies, but that precisely because of this it does not rest *alone*, that is to say, without its appropriate operations and its fruits.

Behold, the grand difference between us and the Oxford School. We believe in sanctification through justification, and the Oxford School believes in justification through sanctification. With us, justification is the cause and sanctification is the effect. With these doctors, on the contrary, sanctification is the cause, and justification the effect. And here are not things indifferent, and vain distinctions; it is the *sic* and the *non*, the yes and the no. Whilst our creed establishes in all their rights these two works, the creed of Oxford compromises and annihilates both. Justification exists no more, if it depend on man's sanctification, and not on the grace of God; for "the heavens," says the Scripture, "are not clean in his sight," (Job xv. 15), "and his eyes are too pure to behold iniquity," (Hab. i. 13); but on the other hand sanctification itself cannot be accomplished; for how could you expect the effect to be produced when you begin by taking away the cause? "Herein is love," says St. John, "not that we loved God, but that He loved us; we love Him because he first loved us." (1 John, iv. 10, 19.) If I might use a vulgar expression, I should say that Oxford *puts the cart before the horse*, in placing sanctification before justification. In this way neither the cart nor the horse will advance. In order that the work should go on, it is necessary that that which draws should be placed before that which is drawn. There is not a system more contrary to true sanctification than that; and, to employ the language of the *British Critic*, there is not, consequently, a system more monstrous and immoral. What! your justification, shall it not depend upon the work which Christ accomplished on the cross, but upon that which is accomplished in your hearts! It is not to Christ, to his grace,

that you ought to look in order to be justified, but to yourselves, to the righteousness which is in you, to your spiritual gifts !....

From this result two great evils.

Either you will deceive yourselves, in believing that there is a work in you sufficiently good to justify you before God ; and then you will be inflated with pride, that pride which the Scriptures say, "goeth before a fall." Or you will not deceive yourselves, you will see, as the Saviour says, that you are poor, and wretched, and blind and naked ; and then you will fall into despair. The heights of pride and the depths of despair, these are the alternatives which the doctrine of Oxford and of Rome bequeathes us.

The Christian doctrine, on the contrary, places man in perfect humility, for it is Another who justifies him ; and yet it gives him abundant peace, for his justification,—a fruit of the "righteousness of God," (2 Cor. v. 21)—is complete, assured, eternal.

### III.

Finally, we indicate the *personal* or *moral* principle of Christianity. We have announced it in these words:—

#### THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT ONLY.

Christianity is an individual work ; the grace of God converts soul after soul. Each soul is a world, in which a creation peculiar to itself must be accomplished. The Church is but the assemblage of all the souls in whom this work is wrought, and who are now united because they have but "one Spirit, one Lord, one Father."

And what is the nature of this work ? It is essentially moral. Christianity operates upon the will of man and changes it. Conversion comes from the action of the Spirit of God, and not from the magic action of certain ceremonies, which, rendering faith on the part of man vain and useless, would regenerate him by their own inherent virtue. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but [to be] a new crea-

ture;" (Gal. vi. 15.) "If through the Spirit ye do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live;" (Rom. viii. 13.)

Now the doctors of Oxford, although there is a great difference among them on this point, as well as on some others,—some going by no means as far as others,—put immense obstacles in the way of this individual regeneration.

Nothing inspires them with greater repugnance than Christian individualism. They proceed by synthesis, not by analysis. They do not set out with the principle laid down by the Saviour: "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" but they set out with this opposite principle: "all those who have participated in the ordinances of the Church are born again." And whilst the Saviour in all his discourses excites the efforts of each individual, saying: "Seek, ask, knock, strive to enter in at the strait gate; it is only the violent who take it by force;" the Oxford doctors say, on the contrary: "The idea of obtaining religious truth ourselves, and by our private inquiry, whether by reading, or by thinking, or by studying the Scriptures or other books, . . . is nowhere commanded in the Scriptures. The great question which ought to be placed before every mind is this: "What voice should be heard like that of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church?" (1.)

And this individual regeneration by the Holy Spirit, how shall it be accomplished, since the first task of Puseyism is to say to all, that it is already accomplished; that all who have been baptised have thereby been rendered partakers of the divine nature; and that to preach conversion again to them is contrary to the truth? "It is baptism and not faith," says one of these doctors, "that is the primary instrument of justification;" (2) and we know that with them justification and conversion are one and the same work. To prevent the wretched from escaping from the miserable state in which they are, would not the best means be to persuade a poor man that he possesses a large fortune, or an ignorant man that he has great science, or a

(1) British Critic.

(2) Newman, on Justification.

sick man that he is in perfect health? The Evil One could not invent a stratagem more fit to prevent conversion, than this idea that all men who have been baptised by water are regenerated.

Still more, these doctors extend to the Holy Supper this same magic virtue. "It is now almost universally believed," say they, in speaking of their Church, "that God communicates grace only through faith, prayer, spiritual contemplation, communion with God; whilst it is the Church and her sacraments which are *the* ordained, direct, visible means for conveying to the soul that which is invisible and supernatural. It is said, for example, that to administer the Supper to infants, to dying persons apparently deprived of their senses, however pious they may have been, is a superstition; and yet these practices are sanctioned by antiquity. The essence of the sectarian doctrine is to consider *faith*, and not the *sacraments*, as the means of justification and other evangelical gifts." (1)

What then, a child which does not possess reason and which does not know even how to speak, a sick man whom the approach of death has deprived of perception and intelligence, shall they receive grace purely by the external application of the sacraments? The will, the affections of the heart, have they no need to be touched in order that man may be sanctified? What a degradation of man and of the religion of Jesus Christ! Is there a great difference between such ceremonies and the mummeries and charms of the debased Hindoos or of the African savages!

If the first error of Oxford deprives the Church of light, if the second deprives her of salvation, the third deprives her of all real sanctification. Without doubt, we believe the sacraments are means of grace; but they are only so when faith accompanies their use. To put faith and the sacraments in opposition, as the Oxford doctors do, is to annihilate the efficacy of the sacraments themselves.

The Church will rise up against such fatal errors. There is a work of renovation which must be wrought in man, a personal or individual work; and it is God who per-

---

(1) Tracts for the Times. Advertisement in Vol II.

forms it. "A new heart," saith the Lord, "will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." (Ez. xxxvi. 26.)

By what right would they thus put the Church in the place of God, and establish her clergy as the dispensers of divine life?

Then it would be of little consequence that a man had led a dissipated life, and that the heart remains attached to sin and the world; would not a participation in the sacraments of religion suffice to put him in possession of grace? We are assured that already sad consequences are manifested in the life of many of the adherents of Oxford.

The system of Puseyism tends to lull the conscience to sleep, by the participation of external rites: the Evangelical system tends to awaken it without cessation. The work of the Spirit, which is one of the grand principles of Evangelical Christianity, does not consist only in regeneration; it consists also in a sanctification, fundamental and universal. If, instead of permitting ourselves to be enfeebled by trusting to human ordinances, we have truly the *Spirit of Christ* within us, we shall not suffer the least contradiction to exist between the divine law on the one hand, and our dispositions and actions on the other. We shall not content ourselves with abstaining from the grosser manifestations of sin, but we shall desire that the very germ of evil be eradicated from our hearts. We shall love the Truth, and we shall reject with horror that sad hypocrisy which sometimes defiles the sanctuary. We shall not have in the communication of our religious convictions that reserve which Puseyism prescribes: "that which shall have been told to us in the ear, we shall proclaim on the housetops." (Matth. x. 27.) We shall not remain in a Church whose most sacred truths we trample under our feet, eating the bread which she gives us and lifting up the arm to strike her. From the moment that we shall have discovered, that a doctrine is opposed to the word of God, neither dangers nor sacrifices shall prevent us from casting it far from us. The work of the Spirit will carry light into the most secret recesses of our hearts. "The King's daughter is all glorious within." (Ps. xlv. 13.) The King whom we follow has said to us: "I am the light of the

world : he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." (John, viii. 12.)

---

I repeat again in closing, Gentlemen, the three great principles of Christianity are these :

*The Word of God, ONLY.*

*The Grace of God, ONLY.*

*The Work of the Spirit, ONLY.*

I come now to ask you to apply to yourselves henceforth more and more these principles, and let them reign supremely over your hearts and lives.

And why, Gentlemen? Because everything that places our souls in immediate communication with God is salutary; and everything that interposes between God and our souls is injurious and ruinous. If a thick cloud should pass between you and the sun you would no longer feel its genial warmth, and might perhaps be seized with a chill. So if you place between yourselves and the Word of God the tradition and authority of the Church, you will no longer have to do with the Word of God; that is to say, with a divine, and consequently a powerful and perfect instrument; but with the word of man; that is to say, with a human, and consequently a weak and defective instrument, it will have lost that power which translates from darkness into light.

Or, if you place between the grace of God and yourselves the ordinances of the Church, the episcopal priesthood, the dispositions of the heart, works, *grace will then be no more grace*, as St. Paul says. The instrument of God will have been broken, and we shall no longer be able to say, that "charity proceeds from faith unfeigned," (1 Tim. i.); that "faith worketh by love," (Gal. v.); "that our souls are purified in obeying the truth," (1 Cor. i.); "that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith," (Eph. iii.)

Man always seeks to return, in some way, to a human salvation; this is the source of the innovations of Rome and of Oxford. The substitution of the Church for Jesua

Christ is that which essentially characterizes these opinions. It is no longer Christ who enlightens, Christ who saves, Christ who forgives, Christ who commands, Christ who judges; it is the Church, and always the Church, that is to say, an assembly of sinful men, as weak and prone to err as ourselves. "They have taken away the Lord, and we know not where they have laid him." (John, xx. 2.)

The errors which we have indicated are, therefore, practical errors, destructive of true piety in the soul, a deprivation of God's influence, and an exaltation of the flesh, although in a form, that "has the show of wisdom in will-worship and humility." (Col. ii. 23.) If they should ever obtain the ascendancy in the Church, Christianity would cease to be a new, a holy, a spiritual, a heavenly life. It would become an external affair of ordinances, rites and ceremonies. This has been clearly seen by the servant of God, whom we have already quoted: "Finally," says Sumner, Bishop of Winchester, "I cannot but fear the consequences that a system of teaching, which confines itself to the external and ritual parts of divine worship, while it loses sight of their internal signification and the spiritual life, may have upon the character, the efficacy and the truth of our Church; a system, which robs the Church of its brightest glory, and, forgetting the continual presence of the Lord, seems to depose Him from His just pre-eminence; a system, which tends to put the observance of days, months, times and seasons, in the place of a true and spiritual worship; which substitutes a spirit of hesitation, fear and doubt, for the cordial obedience of filial love; a slavish spirit for the liberty of the Gospel; and which, indeed, calls upon us to work out our sanctification with fear and trembling; but without any foretaste of the rest that remaineth for the people of God, without giving us joy in believing."(1)

The universal Church of Christ rejoices to hear such words. She beholds, with gratitude towards her divine Head, the firmness, with which some bishops, ministers,

---

(1) Charge delivered by Ch. R. Sumner, D. D., Lord Bishop of Winchester, 1841.

and laymen of England meet this growing evil. But is this enough? Is it enough to retain, on the edge of a precipice, a Church and a people, hitherto so dear to the friends of the Gospel?

Oxford conducts to Rome; Mr. Sibthorp and others have proved it. The march of Puseyism regularly inclining, from Tract to Tract, towards the pure system of the Papacy, demonstrates clearly enough the end to which it tends. And even if it should not effect a total conversion to Popery—what signifies it, since it is nothing else than the Popish system, (in its essential features,) transferred to England? It is not necessary that the Thames should go to Rome to bear the tribute of its waters: the Tiber flows in Oxford.

England owes everything to the Reformation. What was she before the renovation of the Church? Blindly submissive to the Tudors, her forms of government, both political and ecclesiastical, were superannuated, without life and spirit; so that in England, as in almost all Europe, we might say, with a Christian statesman, that "despotism seemed the only preservative against dissolution."<sup>(1)</sup> The Reformation developed, in an admirable manner, that Christian spirit, that love of liberty, that fear of God, that loyal affection for the sovereign, that patriotism, those generous sacrifices, that genius, that strength, that activity, which constitute the prosperity and glory of England. In the age of the Reformation, Catholic Spain, gorged with the blood of the children of God, fell, overthrown by the Almighty Arm, and reformed England ascended, in her stead, the throne of the seas, which has been justly termed the throne of the world. The winds which engulfed the *ARMADA* called up this new power from the depths.

The country of Philip II., wounded to the heart because she had attacked the people of God, dropped from her hand the sceptre of the ocean; and the country of Elizabeth, fortified by the Word of God, found it floating on the seas, seized it, and wielded it to bring into subjection to the King of Heaven the nations of the earth. It is the Gospel

---

(1) Archives of the House of Orange-Nassau, published at the Hague, by Mr. Groen Van Prinsterer, Counsellor of State.

that has given to England our antipodes.(2) It is the God of the Gospel who has bestowed upon her all that she possesses. If in those distinguished islands the Gospel were to fall under the united attacks of Popery and Puseyism, we might write upon their hitherto triumphant banner: "Исчавод, the glory of the Lord is departed."

God has given the dominion of the seas to nations who bear, every where, with them the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But if, instead of the Good News of Salvation, England carries to the heathen a mere human and priestly religion, God will deprive her of her power. The evil is already great. In India the Puseyite missionaries are satisfied with teaching the natives rites and ceremonies, without troubling themselves about the conversion of the heart; thus treading closely in the steps of the Roman Catholic Church. They endeavor to counteract the efforts of evangelical missionaries, and disturb the weak minds of the natives, by telling them that all those who have not received Episcopal ordination are not ministers.

If England prove unfaithful to the Gospel, God will humble her in those powerful islands where she has established her throne, and in those distant countries subjected to her sway. Do we not already hear a faint rumor, which justifies these gloomy presentiments? The mother country sees her difficulties increase; unheard of disasters have spread fear and terror on the banks of the Indus. From the chariot of this people is heard a crackling noise, because impious hands have changed the pole-bolt. Should England forsake the faith of the Bible, the crown would fall from her head. Ah! We also, Christians of the continent and of the world, would mourn over her fall! We love her for Christ's sake; for His sake we pray for her. But if the apostacy, now begun, should be accomplished, we shall have nothing left for her but cries, groans and tears.

What are the Bishops doing? What is the Church doing? This is the general question.

If the Church of England were well administered, she would only admit to her pulpits teachers who submit to

(2) New Zealand.

the Word of God, agreeably to the Thirty-nine Articles, and banish from them all those who violate her laws, and poison the minds of the youth, trouble souls, and seek to overthrow the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

A few Episcopal mandates will not accomplish this. We undoubtedly believe that no power can take from the Christian the right to "examine the Scriptures, and to try the spirits whether they are of God." But we do not believe in the supreme power of the Clergy: We do not believe that the servants of a church may announce to it doctrines which tend to overthrow it. Did it not please the Apostles, the elders, and the whole church to impose silence upon those at Antioch, who wished to substitute, as they do now at Oxford, human ordinances for the grace of Christ? (Acts xv. 22). Since when, does a well constituted Church speak only through isolated voices? Shall the Annual Convocations of the Church of England remain always a vain ceremony and an empty form? If their nature cannot be changed, shall not powerful remedies be applied to counteract great evils? Will not the Church be moved in England, as formerly at Jerusalem! Shall not the "elders and the whole Church" (Acts xv. 22) form a Council which shall, as tradition tells us they did at Nice, place the Word of God upon an elevated throne, in token of its supreme authority, and, condemning and cutting off all dangerous errors, render to Jesus Christ and his Word that sovereign authority, which usurping hands are on the point of wresting from Him?

But if the Church still holds her peace, if she allows her sacred foundations to be sapped in her Universities, then (we say it with profound grief) a voice like that of the prophet will be heard exclaiming: Woe to the Church! woe to the people! woe to England!

Gentlemen, there are two ways of destroying Christianity; one is to deny it, the other to displace it. To put the Church above Christianity, the hierarchy above the Word of God; to ask a man, not whether he has received the Holy Ghost, but, whether he has received baptism from the hands of those who are termed successors of the Apostles, and their delegates,—all this may doubtless flatter the pride of the natural man, but is fundamentally opposed to the Bible, and aims a fatal blow at the religion of

Jesus Christ. If God had intended that Christianity should, like the Mosaic system, be chiefly an ecclesiastical, sacerdotal and hierarchical system, he would have ordered and established it in the New Testament, as he did in the Old. But there is nothing like this in the New Testament. All the declarations of our Lord and of his Apostles tend to prove, that the new religion given to the world is "life and Spirit" and not a new system of priesthood and ordinances. "The kingdom of God" saith Jesus, "cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you," (Luke xvii. 20—21.) "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," (Rom. xiv. 17.)

Let us then attribute a divine institution and a divine authority to the essence of the church; but by no means to its *form*. God has, undoubtedly established the ministry of the word and sacraments, that is to say, general forms, which are adapted to the universal church; but it is a narrow and dangerous bigotry, which would attribute more importance to the particular forms of each sect, than to the spirit of Christianity. This evil has long prevailed in the Eastern Church, [Greek,] and has rendered it barren. It is the essence of the Church of Rome, and it is destroying it. It is endeavouring to insinuate itself into every Church; it appears in England in the Established Church; in Germany in the Lutheran, and even in the Reformed and Presbyterian Church. It is that mystery of iniquity, which already began to work in the time of the Apostles. (2 Thess. ii. 7.) Let us reject and oppose this deadly principle wherever it is found. We are men before we are Swiss, French, English, or German; let us also remember, that we are Christians before we are Episcopalians, Lutherans, Reformed, or Dissenters. These different forms of the Church are like the different costumes, different features, and different characters of nations; that which constitutes the man is not found in these accessories. We must seek for it in the heart which beats under this exterior, in the conscience which is seated there, in the intelligence which there shines, in the will which there acts. If we assign more importance to the Church than to Christianity, to the form than to the life,

we shall infallibly reap that which we have sown; we shall soon have a Church composed of skeletons, clothed, it may be, in brilliant garments, and ranged, I admit, in a most imposing order to the eye; but as cold, stiff, and immoveable as a pale legion of the dead. If Puseyism, (and, unfortunately, some of the doctrines which it promulgates are not, in England, confined to that school,) if Puseyism should make progress in the Established Church, it will, in a few years, dry up all its springs of life. The feverish excitement which disease at first produces, will soon give place to languor, the blood will be congealed, the muscles stiffened, and that Church will be only a dead body, around which the eagles will gather together.

All forms whether papal, patriarchal, episcopal, consistorial, or presbyterian, possess only a human value and authority. Let us not esteem the bark above the sap, the body above the soul, the form above the life, the visible Church above the invisible, the priest above the Holy Spirit. Let us hate all sectarian, ecclesiastical, national or dissenting spirit; but let us love Jesus Christ in all sects, whether ecclesiastical, national or dissenting. The true catholicity which we have lost, and which we must seek to recover, is that of "holding the Truth, in love." A renovation of the Church is necessary; I know it, I feel it, I pray for it from the bottom of my soul. Only let us seek for it in the right way. Forms, ecclesiastical constitutions, the organization of Churches, are important,—very important. "But let us seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be added unto us." (Matth. vi. 33.)

Let us then, Gentlemen, be firm and decided in the Truth; and while we love the erring, let us boldly attack the error. Let us stand upon the rock of ages,—the Word of God; and let the vain opinions, and stale innovations, which are constantly springing up and dying in the world, break powerless at our feet. "Two systems of doctrine," says Dr. Pusey, "have now, and, probably, for the last time, met in conflict; the system of Geneva and the Catholic system." We accept this definition. One of the men who have most powerfully resisted these errors, the Rev. W. Goode, seems to think that by the Ge-

nevan system, Dr. Pusey intends to designate the Unitarian, Pelagian, latitudinarian system, which has laid waste the Church, not only in Geneva, but throughout Christendom. "According to Romish tactics," says Mr. Goode, "the adversaries of the Oxford School are classed together under the name that will render them most odious; they belong, it is said, to the *Genevan School*. (1)

Certainly, Gentlemen, if the Unitarian School of England and Geneva were called upon to struggle with the semi-Papal School of Oxford, we should much fear the issue. But these divines will meet with other opponents in England, Scotland, Ireland, on the continent, and if need be, even in our little and humble Geneva.

Yes, we agree to it; it is the system of Geneva, which is now struggling with the Catholic system; but it is the system of the ancient Geneva; it is the system of Calvin and Beza, the system of the Gospel and the Reformation. The opprobrium they would cast upon us we receive as an honor; three centuries ago Geneva rose against Rome; let Geneva now rise against Oxford.

"I should like," says one of the Oxford doctors, (2) "to see the Patriarch of Constantinople and our Archbishop of Canterbury go barefoot to Rome, throw their arms round the Pope, kiss him, and not let him go, till they had persuaded him to be more reasonable;" that is to say, doubtless, until he had extended his hand to them, and ceased to proclaim them heretics and schismatics.

(1) *The Case as It Is*

(2) W. Palmer's *Aids to Reflection*, 1841. This work contains some curious and, without doubt, authentic conversations, which Mr. Palmer had at Geneva, in 1836, with different pastors and professors of the Academy and the Company. "July, 26. The public professor of Dogmatic Theology told me, when I asked him what was the precise doctrine of the Company of Pastors at that time, on the subject of the Trinity, 'Perhaps no two had exactly the same shade of opinion, that the great majority would deny the doctrine in the scholastic sense.'—August 4. A pastor of the Company told me, 'that of thirty-four members, he thinks there are only four who would admit the doctrine of the Trinity.'" The author was almost as much dissatisfied with the Evangelical as with the Unitarian ministers. He relates that one of the former said to him, on the 12th of August; "You are lost in the study of outward forms, mere worldly vanities: *You are a baby, a mere baby*, he said in English."

Evangelical Christians of Geneva, England, and all other countries! It is not to Rome that you must drag yourselves, "to those seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations" (Rev. xvii.); the pilgrimage that you must make is to that excellent and perfect tabernacle, "not made with hands" (Heb. ix.); that "throne of grace, where we find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. iv.)

It is not upon the neck of the "Man of Sin," that you must cast yourselves, covering him with your kisses and your tears; but upon the neck of Him with whom "Jacob wrestled, until the breaking of the day" (Gen. xxxii.); of him, "who is seated at the right hand of God in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and every name that is named, not only in this world; but also in that which is to come." (Eph. v.)

Yes, let the children of God in the East and in the West arise, let them, understanding the signs of the times, and, seeing that the destinies of the Church depend upon the issue of the present conflicts, conflicts so numerous, so different, and so powerful, form a sacred brotherhood, and, with one heart and one soul, exclaim, as Moses did when the ark set forward, "Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate Thee flee before Thee." (Num. x. 35.)

NOTE.—This address was delivered before the Professors and Students of the New Theological Seminary, at Geneva, at the opening of the present session, on the fourth of October last.

T H E E N D .



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01013 6507