

doctrine in our church's communion, so only he hold no preferment or ecclesiastical station.

"The utter futility, however, of this reply will be made obvious, by reciting the grounds on which it appeared to me so important that the holding of Roman doctrine should be permitted in our church; and that my grounds were such as I shall proceed to mention will be very evident on a perusal of my work.

"It appeared to me, on the one hand, that all the arguments which, so far as I know, were adduced in disproof of Roman doctrine, proceeded on an assumption which, if valid at all, is equally valid in disproof of Theism itself. (See, e. g. p. p. 482—508.) On the other hand, I had been placed by God in our own communion, and in that communion had received instruction in great Christian principles; as, first of all through the agency of Dr. Arnold, so afterwards in a very far greater degree, and with a very far less admixture of error on the one side and perplexity on the other, from Mr. Newman. I knew nowhere of the recognition of a higher idea of Christian sanctity than I found recognised in our own church; and all those whom I so deeply revered, so far as I then knew, found, as I just now observed, our ordinances the more trustworthy in proportion as they led a stricter life. On such grounds as these, to remain in our communion seemed the plain, unmistakeable dictate of modesty and sobriety; while, on the other hand, I should have been so absolutely puzzled at being called upon to view the Roman church as authoritatively teaching error, that had I obliged myself to do so, it would have been necessary by main force to divert my mind from speculating on theological subjects at all.

"In such circumstances it was natural, or rather inevitable, to fall back on the sort of theory contained in my work. I was led, I say, naturally to such considerations as the following:—'The progress from error to truth cannot be made in one leap; persons cannot, on the mere word of an external authority, embrace at once a whole class of new doctrines, foreign, and at first even repugnant to their moral nature.' The doctrines, again, to which I allude are but accessories to the central verities of the Gospel—not those verities themselves; and will follow in due time, in proportion as those verities are rightly believed, heartily embraced, and fed on by prayer and contemplation. The English church, then, at present,\* witnessing as it does, those truths in its formularies, but silent, to say the least, on these accessories, does seem a providential ordinance, adapted to prepare minds by degrees for the doctrine and communion of Rome." Almost every page of my work, I might say, will show that this is the view I there advocated.

"That such a course of conduct, if avowed, was a course consistent with perfect honesty and integrity, cannot, I conceive, be questioned. As to subscription to the articles, I have no wish to enter again into a worn-out controversy; but I believe as firmly as ever that no consistent person, of whatever opinions, can subscribe all our formularies without offering the greatest violence to the natural meaning of language; and considering that the existing church, in some shape or other, is necessarily the *'imponens,'* however grievous a burden such formularies must be to any community, I do not think any one need scruple in offering that violence, whether with the view of reconciling the articles to Roman, or the Prayer-book to Lutheran opinions, so long as he says plainly, in the face of day, what sense he does attach to the words, and remains without interference from constituted authorities. But in my case my opinions were now only avowed, they were most conspicuously (many say even an ostentatious parade) put forward. I called on 'high Churchmen' of various grades to combine in the object of impressing more deeply on the minds of our people the great truths to which I just alluded, and which they all profess; and willingly staked the truth of my own further opinions upon the result. I was and am most undoubtedly confident that nothing more is necessary to dispose people fully for the reception of all Roman doctrine, when brought before them, than a hearty, unuspicious, and laborious appropriation of that portion of truth\* plainly witnessed by our church. I might here, then, allude to the additional reason for giving up the hopes I entertained when I wrote my work, which arises from the undeniable fact that 'Anti-Roman high Churchmen' have shown no sort of willingness (quite the reverse) to unite with what are called 'extreme' persons on any such terms. But my present purpose is merely to point out how completely the decision of the ecclesiastical courts has destroyed whatever there might otherwise have been of plausibility in the theory I maintained as to the office of our church.

"I say, then, that however plausible such a theory might have appeared, so long as the holding of all Roman doctrine was allowed to be an open question among our clergy, not a word more need be said to prove how utterly extravagant it became, from the moment that all the instructors of our people were bound to renounce some part of that doctrine. It requires, certainly, a very enthusiastic hope to imagine that our church could really be made extensively available for the object supposed, when every one who entered on the ministry, or received a degree at either university, was called upon to renounce that object, as inconsistent with the claims of religious truth.