

sacramental doctrine laid down in the original volume on the Incarnation. The Archdeacon's opinions on the Lord's supper have occasioned much excitement and agitation in the Church of England. It is supposed that he has advocated the two Romish doctrines, Transubstantiation and the Mass,—that is an actual transmutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, so that the elements, after consecration, are no longer bread and wine; and a real sacrifice for sin—not a memorial of it—and a true propitiation for human guilt. At all events, Roman Catholic periodicals have accepted this treatise as an exposition of the views of their church on this subject. The *Dublin Review*, for April, 1854, says of it: "We cannot but rejoice to find Mr. Wilberforce establishing the whole system of Catholic doctrine, with respect to the Holy Eucharist, as at present received by the church in connection with the see of Rome. With one or two exceptions, it is the ancient Catholic doctrine of the church, set forth once more in almost the very terms of the Tridentine definition." It was supposed that proceedings would be instituted against him for publishing doctrines opposed to the symbolic books of his church; and many were looking forward with much interest to a second discussion, which might possibly prove, still more than the Gorham case, how much the Reformed Church of England stood in need of a second Reformation. But the archdeacon has put an end to this dispute by resigning his preferments. The Archbishop of York accepted the resignation very readily, and no doubt he was thankful that the controversy could be so easily settled, which, had it been entered upon, would have shook the walls of the ancient Establishment. The reason assigned by the archdeacon for his resignation was the Queen's supremacy in spiritual matters; and the grounds of his objection to the royal supremacy "in all spiritual things or causes" will shortly be given to the public. It is probable enough that this is but the beginning of the end, and that he will soon follow his brother to the Romish church. He ought to have been there long ago.

We have not yet done with the Wilberforces. There is a fourth son, Samuel, who is at present Bishop of Oxford. Possessed of fine talents, excellent powers of oratory, and of a most fascinating manner, he exercises a large influence over the young men of Oxford. But his career has not been one of unsullied honour. His fellow-students called him Slippery Sam, and it would seem as if his future conduct has rather strengthened than weakened the impression, which was formed of him in his early years. Talent without principle, decorated with a great affectation of spiritualism, appears to be his characteristic. He has never yet convinced the world that he is a thoroughly honest man, one who can be depended upon when the hour of danger comes. Well, the bishop has got into an unpleasant controversy with the Rev. Mr. Brock, of Bishop's Waltham, regarding his brother the archdeacon. Mr. Brock writes the bishop to this effect:—"I have been told that you have expressed it as your opinion, that the views which have been propounded by Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his book entitled 'The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' are the only views which can save the Church of England from the dangers which beset her at the present crisis." The bishop answers in the negative. He never said so. He adds, however, "that he agrees with the work in question in so far as it maintains, enforces, and illustrates that view of the reality of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which Richard Hooker mentions in the fifth book of 'Ecclesiastical Polity' as the doctrine of Holy Scripture and our Reformed Church," and then, under the mask of great piety, he accuses Mr. Brock of uncharitableness, of bringing railing accusations, of using inflamed and exaggerated language, etc. Mr. Brock, however, is a man of too much vigour to be so easily put down. He answers him, keeps him close to the point at issue, and meets his personal accusations by referring to some of the crooked policy of the pious and tearful bishop himself, with regard to Bishops Hampden and Gobat. We do not enter upon the lengthened correspondence. One thing is certain, that the bishop appears here in his true character, shuffling and slippery, that he has come off only second best in the battle, and that he himself is quite conscious of the unpleasant fact. It would not grieve us much, should the Bishop of Oxford become a Papist. He would do infinitely less damage to the interests of Protestantism were he an avowed Jesuit, than he does in his present position. There is no fear of Popery in this country, except that Popery which exists in the Episcopalian Churches of England and Scotland. It is the traitor within the walls, not the enemy without, that occasions any apprehension. And not the least dangerous of those traitors, in our opinion, is Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford.—*Scottish U. P. Magazine*.

[We see it reported that Robert Wilberforce has actually joined the Papists; and being a widower it is thought not improbable he may take orders in the church of Rome.]