

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1841.

No. III.

J. A. Packard

- ART. I.—1. *Report of the Committee on Arts and Sciences and Schools, of the Board of Assistants of the City Government of New York, on the subject of appropriating a portion of the School Money to Religious Societies, for the support of Schools. April 27, 1840.*
2. *The important and interesting debate on the claim of the Catholics to a portion of the Common School Fund, with the arguments of Counsel before the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York. Oct. 29 and 30, 1840.*
3. *Report of the Special Committee, to whom was referred the petition of the Catholics relative to the distribution of the School Fund, together with the remonstrances against the same. January 11, 1841.*
4. *The Question—Will the Christian Religion be recognised as the basis of the system of public instruction in Massachusetts? discussed in four letters to Rev. Dr. Humphrey, President of Amherst College.*

WE know not that any subject appropriate to our pages involves more of the essentials of religion and liberty than the true relative position of Christianity in a scheme of national education. This relation has been set forth in various and opposing forms, some of which seem to us as opposite

ken, they do not hear. It seems a hopeless attempt to bring the facts to their knowledge. It is a matter too deep, and too wide, too great for their comprehension. After all, perhaps, no obstacle to the required reform is more in the way than the spirit of faction, because there is none which more absorbs and destroys every feeling of humanity, and every sentiment of virtue. Every consideration but success sinks into insignificance before it; the warfare of party is so close, so incessant and so vigilant, that it leaves no time nor talent for any other conquest, nor can it yield a jot of its advantages for any benefit to those who have no power.

How far any of these particulars may excuse the parties affected *in foro conscientiarum*, or in the light of divine truth, it is not our province to decide. We much fear that however strong some of them may appear in human eyes, the time is coming, when they will be found of no avail. Even, humanly speaking, it appears impossible that men by any scheme of society, or any plan of association, can evade responsibility for a great wrong, for which, if committed individually, they would be held guilty. Surely those who have all the power, and make laws to suit themselves, cannot arrogate much merit for obeying their own behests, nor claim, on that account, exemption at that tribunal before which human laws will be as strictly judged as human actions.

By *Prof. J. Addison Alexander*
with *Dr. Hodge*

- ART. V.—1. *A Brief Examination of the Proofs, by which the Rev. Mr. Boardman attempts to sustain his charge that "a large and learned body of the clergy of the church (of England) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery; with a word or two as to his attempt, without proof, to cast the suspicion of Popery on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: By the Right Rev. George W. Doane, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of New Jersey. Burlington, 1841.*
2. *A farther Postscript to Bishop Doane's Brief Examination of Rev. Mr. Boardman's Proofs: Touching Bishop Kenrick's Letter on Christian Union, pp. 230.*

COLERIDGE tells us of a man who never spoke of himself without taking off his hat. This, though very absurd, is

nevertheless amusing. Such a man could never be the object of any unkind feeling. So far from quarrelling with the subject of a hallucination so agreeable, the gravest looker on may indulge his curiosity in watching the illusions which appear so grand to him who suffers them, and so grotesque to all the world besides. It is a curious fact that the more conceited a man is, beyond a certain point, the more endurable he is to others. A little vanity provokes you; a little more incenses you; a good deal more amazes you; but after that, every addition is positively agreeable. This is the secret of the charm which the writings of Dr. Samuel H. Cox have for the generality of readers. And to this source we are constrained to ascribe the pleasure with which we have read Bishop Doane's pamphlets. We are glad for the author's sake that we have read them. They have really corrected some unfavourable prepossessions which we had against him. In addition to believing what must needs be true, according to the canon of Vincentius Lerinensis—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—that the worthy Bishop was not a little vain, we had received a vague impression that he was not particularly good natured, and at the same time not entirely sincere in his pretensions. It seemed to us incredible, that a man in this country and in the nineteenth century, and especially a man of Dr. Doane's previous history and training, could really believe that even a mitre could confer all the dignity with which he claimed to be invested. Of these uncharitable misgivings we now heartily repent. We no longer doubt his honesty in laying claim to any thing. He is certainly sincere in every syllable he writes to glorify himself. We acquit him also of ill-nature and malignity. We fully believe him when he says that for Mr. Boardman he entertains "no feeling that is not altogether kind."* We believe that he might say the same of nearly all the world. His pages overflow with that complacency towards others which arises from absolute complacency in self. It is impossible to read him and be angry with him. Neither critical bitterness nor Presbyterian sourness has enabled us to withstand his irresistible *bonhomie*. He is so happy in the worship of himself, and so benevolently anxious to make others happy in the same way, that, although we are not prepared to join in the idolatry, we cannot help catching the infection of good humour, and sympa-

* Brief Examination, p. 154.

thizing in the delight with which our author talks and writes about himself. Nor is this sympathetic feeling counteracted by the smarting of those deep cuts which he deals out right and left upon "Puritans," "Genevans" and "other denominations," who have assailed and almost made a martyr of him with their "cant and Calvinism," their "savage howl" and "sanctimonious whine." They are hard blows certainly. Still we forget the pain in admiration of the man, who seems to say in every look and action,

Populus me sibilat at mihi plaudo.

Even insolence, in the present case, loses all its virulence in its absurdity. The examiner sets out with a typographical sneer at his antagonist as "Pastor" of a "Presbyterian church," and as having put forth a pamphlet "purporting to be correspondence[?] between the Right Rev. Bishop Doane, &c." The same use is made of the interrogation mark on a subsequent page. Of this courageous innuendo the interpretation which will strike every reader as the true one, is, that it was intended to check the undue familiarity with which Mr. Boardman had ventured to "come between the wind and his nobility." Such an intimation, considered as coming from an Episcopal Bishop to a Presbyterian Pastor, would be very feeble and very much out of taste. But in the present case, coming from Dr. Doane to Mr. Boardman, considering their relative standing as Christian gentlemen, it is simply ridiculous; and is merely another evidence of the hallucination with regard to himself, under which our author habitually labours. Not long since there was a valet of Lord Somebody figuring at Saratoga in his master's clothes, and we can easily imagine the air with which he would have met the presumptuous advance of a "Mr." Clay or a "Mr." Webster.

Of all the illusions under which Bishop Doane labours, we are not sure whether the most remarkable is not the paradoxical belief that he is a fine writer. So he is, in the same sense in which some men are fine gentlemen without being gentlemen at all. But that our author can be reckoned a good writer, even in America, with all our zeal in his behalf we cannot venture to affirm. If there is one improvement more conspicuous than any other, in the taste and practice of contemporary writers, especially in England, it is the exchange of pompous rhythm and pedantic phraseology, for homely plainness and pure native idiom. That this exchange is per-

fectly compatible with elegance and beauty of the highest kind, has been proved by the example of some noted English writers, and by none more clearly than by several of the Oxford Theologians. To our taste Newman, as a writer, stands pre-eminent, as being more musical and elegant than Pusey, and at the same time less mawkish and more masculine than Keble. But in all three, and especially in Newman, what attracts us is the restoration of the old English freedom as to the length of sentences, and variety of structure, but without those harsh inversions, and those sesquipedalian vocables, by which many of the best early writers are disfigured. In a word, the grand improvement is the happy combination of a free and flowing with a chaste and simple style; whereas of old, the flowing writer was almost in every case an incorrect one, and the simple writer was an awkward and constrained one. Now if we were required to select a kind of writing just as far removed as possible from that which we have been describing as the style of the best modern English writers, we should certainly select that of the "Bishop of New Jersey." It is not the want of talent which makes him thus to differ, not even of that peculiar talent which enables men to shine in composition. It is the want of proper culture, and, as a cause or an effect of this, the want of taste. His parts may be those of a Bishop; but his taste is the taste of a Sophomore. It does indeed appear wonderful how any man of his years and opportunities can be a passionate admirer and assiduous imitator of the best English writers and yet so unlike them; how he can even read them and be turgid, pompous and bombastical himself. That he is perfectly unconscious of his failure in attempting to adopt the Oxford style, is clear from the frequency with which he brings the two styles into mortifying juxtaposition. We would gladly quote if we had room for it a striking instance of this indiscreet arrangement, which the reader may find on pages 160, 161 of the Brief Examination, where in the very middle of a fustian paragraph the author suddenly exclaims, "I quote the burning words of Mr. Newman," and then gives an extract so unlike himself that it was perfectly superfluous to tell us he was quoting somebody. He calls them "burning words," and so they may be in the sense which he intended, but to us they seemed like fresh air and cold water on escaping from the hot blast of a smithy, or like the singing of birds compared with the ringing anvil or the puffing bellows. The contrast in the case referred

to, is the more remarkable because the extract from Newman approaches unusually near to the tone of declamation, and was therefore more susceptible of combination with the stuff that goes before it, but the two refuse to coalesce, and the quotation stands out in as strong relief from the preceding context as an antique column from the rubbish which at once disfigures and preserves it.

We ask attention also to the style of the following extract. "The rabid rage with which this paper (*Catholic Herald*) has assailed the present writer, finds no fit resemblance short of a mad dog. The smoke of Smithfield may be smelled in every line. But it is all well. One cannot greatly be in wrong when so between the fires of errors that profess to be antagonist." p. 16, note.

On the rhetoric of this passage we make no remark, but we feel constrained to correct an error into which our author seems to have fallen. We have occasionally seen the animadversions of the *Herald* here complained of, and so far as those examples go, the opposition savoured less of "rabid rage" than of cool contempt. It is natural that any man, and especially a vain one, should choose to be vilified rather than laughed at, and should see mad dog and smell Smithfield, where his neighbours can see nothing but smiles at his expense, and smell nothing but squibs set off for his annoyance.

The wittiest passage in the "Brief Examination" is to be found on p. 155. "Who has not heard—and that by those with whom Mr. Boardman closely sympathises—the sweeping charge of Popery brought not only against the church of which Hooker was a Presbyter, and its American sister, but against all and singular their doctrines, rules and usages. Did they believe and teach the doctrine of the Apostolic succession? It was rank Popery. Popery was thus a matter of history. Did they maintain baptismal regeneration? Still it was Popery. Then Popery was a doctrine. Did they administer confirmation? All Popery! Then Popery became a rite. Do they use a liturgy? Popery! Popery is a form of prayer. Do they make the sign of the cross in baptism? Popery! Popery is a gesture. Do they kneel in the communion? Popery! Popery is a posture. Do they wear a surplice? Popery Popery is a garment. Do they erect a cross upon a church, or a private dwelling? Sheer Popery! A bit of wood is Popery!"

Without in the least detracting from the force or dignity

of this passage it might be carried a little further. Does he write fustian? Popery! Popery is nonsense and bombast. Does he publish a series of pamphlets just as he sets sail for England? Popery! Popery is a sea voyage. Does he bring back a shovel hat and wear it in America? Popery! Popery is an old fashioned beaver. We submit whether the merit of our continuation be not quite equal to the original.

It seems obvious that Bishop Doane got up this controversy with Mr. Boardman simply to serve a purpose. The remark incidentally made by that gentleman respecting the Oxford Tracts had been made a thousand and one times, by Protestants and Catholics, by bishops, priests and deacons, by Episcopalians and Presbyterians, yet our author remained silent. The moment however it dropped from Mr. Boardman, he comes out with a demand at once pompous and pragmatistical, and which he says, was meant to be "most peremptory" for proof of a charge which was in every body's mouth. He says that he was moved to this extraordinary proceeding by "no chivalry of companionship;" that "the honest hope was entertained, that ground which is untenable, would candidly be yielded to the just convictions of a new investigation. It is not so." p. 7. No, and it was not so. No such anticipations of a change of sentiment on such a subject were felt in any quarter. The only "honest hope" entertained about the matter, was the "honest hope" of figuring on both sides of the Atlantic as the advocate of Oxford. The "chivalry of companionship," whatever else may be asserted of phrase, is perfectly descriptive of the spirit, taste, and motive of this "Brief Examination."

For the church to which Bishop Doane belongs, and for the office which he bears we have the highest respect—for himself we are sorry we cannot say so much. The man, who can deal damnation with a smile, and claim for himself the awful power to communicate the Holy Ghost as he would descant upon the polish of his boots, cannot expect to be respected. And when, in the spirit of frivolity, he comes before the public with his fearful claims of spiritual power, he must expect to be frankly told how they are regarded. We yield to no set of men in our respect for such prelates as White, Moore, Meade and M'Ilvaine; and we yield to none in our contempt for prelatical coxcombry.

Having thus freely expressed our opinion of Bishop Doane's pamphlet, we shall dismiss the subject:

Nonsense or sense I'll bear in any shape,
In gown, in lawn, in ermine or in crape,

but from the duty of answering nonsense, we hold ourselves and all other men, excused.

The question respecting the Popish tendency of the Oxford Tracts, if parties are agreed as to the meaning of terms, does not admit of discussion; without such agreement, discussion must be endless and useless. The three characteristic forms which Christian doctrine has assumed, may be called the evangelical, the rationalistic, and the sacramental. The first, as we believe was taught by Christ and his apostles, and has always had its confessors in the church. It was the system of the Reformers, and is embodied in the Thirty-Nine Articles, in the Augsburg Confession, in the symbols of the French, Swiss, Dutch and Scotch churches. It is therefore the Protestant, in opposition to the Romish system. The second had its representative, first, in Pelagius; at the time of the Reformation, in Socinus; and since that period, in multitudes of all communions. Its great characteristic, is the striving to remove from the gospel all that is supernatural and mysterious, and to bring down its doctrines to the standard of common sense, and to accommodate them to the taste of the un-renewed heart.

The sacramental, or church system, supposes that the sacraments (and not preaching) are the great means of salvation. To the question, How religion, or the grace of God is to be obtained and preserved? it answers, Receive the sacraments; they are the channels through which the merits of Christ and the Holy Spirit are communicated. In baptism plenary pardon and spiritual renovation are conveyed to the soul. Baptized persons, therefore, are not to be addressed as though they were to be converted. The spiritual life begun in baptism is maintained by the real body and blood of Christ received in the Lord's supper. These ordinances to be effectual must be administered by duly authorized men, who have "the awful power to make the body and blood of Christ." To possess this power, they must receive appointment to office, and the communication of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of a Bishop's hands. Bishops have the power to communicate the Holy Spirit in confirmation and ordination. The church, in its officers, is the representative and vicar of Christ, and hence has power to forgive sins, to renew the heart, and to give the Spirit. It is the storehouse of Christ's merits; it is the channel through which, by means of the sacraments those merits are conveyed to his people. Religion is therefore something com-

municated *ab extra*, by the hands of men. To be in communion with these men, is consequently essential to salvation; to be a member of the church whose treasures they dispense, is to be a member of Christ; to be excluded from its pale, is to be beyond the covenant of mercy.

This system developed itself very early in the church. It reached its full maturity in Romanism. It has existed in various forms. It has been combined with mysticism, and been the religion of devotees; it has maintained itself as a mere system of forms, and been the religion of bandits. It accommodates itself to all classes of men, to the worldly and wicked, to the devout and the fanatical. It is a great temple, which offers an asylum not only to the penitent and believing, but to fugitives from justice.

That this sacramental system is inculcated in the Oxford Tracts, we presume no one will venture to deny. While their authors maintain that it is the true Anglican system, they admit that it is not that of the English Reformers. Though the denunciations of the Reformation, which were contained in Froude's *Remains*, published under their auspices, had given great offence, yet when they came to publish the continuation of that work, they openly vindicated his language. They distinctly maintained that the system of the Reformers and that of the church in the fourth century were not only different, but opposite, so that we are forced to reject the one, if we choose the other.

The following extract from one of the organs of the Tract party, contains almost all the points mentioned in the above account of their system. "The essence of the doctrine of the one only Catholic and apostolic church," it is said "lies in this—that it is the representative of our absent Lord, or a something divinely interposed between the soul and God, or a visible body with invisible privileges. All its subordinate characteristics flow from this description. Does it impose a creed, or impose rites and ceremonies, or change ordinances, or remit and retain sins, or rebuke or punish, or accept offerings, or send out ministers, or invest its ministers with authority, or accept of reverence or devotion in their persons—all this is because it is Christ's visible presence. It stands for Christ, can it convey the power of the Spirit? does grace attend its acts? can it touch or bathe, or seal, or lay on hands? can it use material things for spiritual purposes? are its temples holy? all this comes of its being, so far, what Christ was on earth. Is it a ruler, prophet, priest,

intercessor, teacher? It has titles such as these, in its measure, as being the representative and instrument of him that is unseen. Does it claim a palace and a throne, an altar and a doctor's chair, the gold, frankincense, and myrrh of the rich and wise, an universal empire and a never-ending cession? all this is so, because it is what Christ is. All the offices, names, honours, powers which it claims, depend upon the simple question, Has Christ, or has he not, left a representative behind him? Now if he has, all is easy and intelligible; this is what Churchmen maintain; they welcome the news; and they recognise in the church's acts, but the fulfilment of the high trust committed to her." *British Critic*, No. 66, p. 451.

All is "indeed easy and intelligible," if the bishops are the church, and if the church "is what Christ is." Then indeed may she remit sin, confer the Holy Spirit, give grace, claim devotion in the person of her ministers, assert her right to a throne and altar, to the gold and frankincense of the rich, to an universal empire and never ending succession. Beyond this, when or how has the Romish Church ever advanced a claim? How indeed is it possible to claim more than to be what Christ is, to be his visible presence, upon earth?

It would seem that these writers are disposed to put to shame all who pretend to distinguish between them and the Romanists. Speaking in the same number of the *Critic* respecting the church of Rome, they say, "All the great and broad principles on which she may be considered Babylon, may be retorted upon us. Does the essence of Antichrist lie in interposing media between the soul and God? We interpose baptism. In imposing a creed? We have articles for the clergy, and creeds for all men. In paying reverence to things of time and place? We honour the consecrated elements, take off our hats in churches, and observe days and seasons. In forms and ceremonies? We have a service book. In ministers of religion? We have bishops, priests and deacons. In claiming an imperium in imperio? Such was the convocation; such are elective chapters. In a high state of prelacy? Our bishops have palaces and sit among princes. In supporting religion by temporal sanctions? We are established. In the mixture of good and bad? We are national. In the discipline of the body? We fast. England does not differ from Rome in principles; but in questions of fact, of degree, of practice; and whereas

Antichrist differs from Christ, as darkness from light, if one of the two churches is Antichrist, the other must be also." p. 429. The same authority insists upon it, that the titles, Antichrist, Babylon, Mother of harlots, Beast, which are so liberally applied by the authorized standards of the Church of England to the Church of Rome, "are as much a note of her being Christ's church as her real inward sanctity is. Rome must not monopolize these titles; Rome has them not alone; we share them with Rome; it is our privilege to share them; Anglo-Catholics inherit them from the Roman family, from their common Lord and Saviour. Rome must not appropriate them. The early church had them. We take it as a clear mark that we are the church, and Rome the church, and both the same the church, because in these titles we are joint heirs of the Church of St. Cornelius and St. Augustine. Heretics have generally taken high ground, considered themselves saints, called the church by foul and frightful names; it is their very wont to speak, not against the Son of Man, for he is away, but against those who represent him during his absence." p. 418.

This language is sufficiently intelligible, however unbecoming it may be in the mouth of men whose own standards most expressly apply these terms of condemnation to the Church of Rome. It is the world they say who apply such titles to the church; it is heretics that give these foul and frightful names to the representative of the absent Saviour. Then surely the Church of England is heretical, or these men are apostates from her faith and testimony.

It is not Rome however in her purest and best days, but Rome when most deeply sunk in superstition and corruption, that is the object of the admiration of these theologians. "People," they say, "really use this term the Dark Ages, as if to excuse their ignorance of the most interesting, the most soul-stirring, the most enthusiastic, and perhaps the most truly religious eras the world has seen." p. 483.

These writers, therefore, distinctly assert that they do not differ in "principles" from the Church of Rome, and Tract number ninety was prepared and published, to show that the thirty-nine articles do not condemn those principles; and consequently that those who agreed with the Papists may with a good conscience remain members of the Church of England. The articles declare that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not

to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary for salvation." This plainly asserts that the Scriptures are the rule of faith, but Mr. Newman, in this Tract, endeavours to prove, that "In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, is *not*, on Anglican principles the rule of faith."

"General councils," says the twenty-first Article, "may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordered by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." The Tract asserts that there "is a consistency of this article with the belief in the infallibility of Oecumenical councils." It asserts that there is a promise that councils shall not err, where they "are not only gathered together according to the 'commandment and will of princes,' but *in the name of Christ*, according to his promise. The Article merely contemplated the human prince, not the King of Saints."

The thirteenth Article is entitled "Of works before justification," and is of the following import: "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or as the School authors say, deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin." Mr. Newman tries to persuade men that it is consistent with this Article, to believe "that works done with divine aid, and in faith, *before* justification, do dispose men to receive the grace of justification." And that "works before justification, when done by the influence of divine aid, gain grace."

The twenty-second Article says—"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints is a foud thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warrant of scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." This is met by such comments as the following: "Neither is all doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, images, and saints

condemned by the Article, but only ‘the Romish.’” “The Homily then, and therefore the Article, does not speak of the Tridentine purgatory.” “The pardons then spoken of in the Article are large and reckless indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments.” “By invocation here is not meant the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight, because we use the Psalms in our daily service, which are frequent in invocation of angels to praise the Lord. In the *Benedicite* too, ‘we address the spirits and souls of the righteous, and in the *Benedictus*, St. John Baptist.” “Invocations are not censurable, and certainly not ‘fond,’ if we mean nothing by them, addressing them to beings which we know cannot hear, and using them as interjections.”

In the twenty-eighth Article it is said, “Transubstantiation (or change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper, is faith.” On this Mr. Newman says, “We see, then, that by transubstantiation, our Article does not confine itself to any abstract theory, nor aim at any definition of the word substance, nor in rejecting it, rejects a word, nor is denying a *mutatio panis et vini*, a denying every change.” “There is nothing in the explanatory paragraph . . . (viz: The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven not here,) to interfere with the doctrine elsewhere taught in our formularies, of a real super-local presence in the holy sacrament.”

The thirty-first Article declares that “The sacrifice of masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer it for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous follies and dangerous deceits.” This Article Mr. Newman says “Neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sins.”

All the important points of difference between the Church of England and that of Rome are disposed of in the same way. Now we do not hesitate to declare our conviction that no honest man could write or approve of the Tract from which these quotations have been made; Bishop Doane

may call Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and Professor Keble, "the holy three" as long as he pleases, if they sanction, (and Mr. Newman has avowed himself its author) the Jesuitical perversions of that Tract, the Christian public will not and can not believe them to be honest men. A man might as well assert that theft, murder, and adultery are not forbidden in the Decalogue, as that the Thirty-Nine Articles do not condemn the doctrines of Mr. Newman. We are therefore not surprised that the publication of this Tract has shocked the moral sense of the people of England, and led to the interference of the ecclesiastical authorities to stop the publication of the series. To the honor of the University of Oxford its Hebdomadal Board has officially repudiated the Tract in question; which has even excited the scorn of worldly men. Mr. Macaulay, in his place in Parliament, when speaking on the bill for removing the civil disabilities of the Jews, said, "He should be glad if the learned persons who were now engaging so much attention elsewhere could communicate to the Jews some of their ingenuity, and then he had no doubt that the declaration which they now scrupled at, and which now excluded them from participation in civil rights, would be swallowed by them without difficulty. The Jew might then declare that he entertained views favourable to Christian principles with as much sincerity as those persons could subscribe to the Articles who held the faith of Rome with the emoluments of the established church."

It would be idle, after the publication of Mr. Newman's Tract, to discuss the Popish tendency of these Oxford writings. And we much doubt whether even Bishop Doane, had he been aware of its existence, would have ventured to publish his *Brief Examination*. If however he chooses to be more Popish than the Pope, and shall assert that his Holiness, instead of being delighted with the Oxford Tracts, ought to be dreadfully alarmed at them, we shall not object. He and his Holiness may settle the matter as they think best.