

WHY RITUALISTS DO NOT BECOME  
ROMAN CATHOLICS.



" Haud facile emergunt, quorum virtutibus obstat  
Res angusta domi, sed Romæ durior illis  
Conatus."

JUVENALIS, *Sat.* iii. 164.

"They scarcely rise, whose merit lies by hardship pressed at home,  
But sorer far their troubles are, who try their luck in Rome."

# WHY RITUALISTS DO NOT BECOME ROMAN CATHOLICS

*A REPLY TO THE ABBÉ MARTIN*

BY RICHARD FREDERICK LITTLEDALE

LL.D., D.C.L.

*(Reprinted, with additions and corrections, from the "Contemporary Review")*

SECOND EDITION.—THIRD THOUSAND



STRAHAN AND COMPANY LIMITED

34 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON



SPEC  
CAPAM

## WHY RITUALISTS DO NOT BECOME ROMAN CATHOLICS.

---

THE Church of England, like the English Constitution, and not a few other national products, is of such a complex nature, and so perplexing as a problem even to Englishmen who have not given special attention to its history and peculiarities, that it is not wonderful to find almost total misconception, where there is not mere blank ignorance, prevalent concerning it amongst foreigners in general, but little aided in their search after information by the commoner sort of Anglican chapels and chaplains on the Continent. When, therefore, a foreign ecclesiastic is found like the Abbé Martin, who has not contented himself with accepting without inquiry the popular caricatures of the Anglican system, but has evidently given much time and pains to study the question at first hand and independently, his views and criticisms are entitled to a degree of attention and respect which cannot be often accorded to the stereotyped objections of the ordinary French or Italian controversialist. And the query he has put in the *Contemporary Review* for August 1878 is undoubtedly entitled to a reply, which I will now attempt to give.

I may be pardoned for remarking at the outset that to myself and others who tried to read between the lines of a former communication by the Abbé Martin to another Review\* in the previous February on a cognate subject, it appeared that he was in truth uttering a veiled censure on

\* *The Nineteenth Century.*



the policy and language of the Ultramontane faction now dominant in the Church of France. And it is just possible, it seems to me now, that his meaning was sufficiently obvious to those in authority to draw forth a hint of the expediency of purging himself from the suspicion of too much liberality and toleration, viewed as disaffection, by means of a polemical diversion against the Church of England, which we have just seen made in no incapable fashion.

For it must not be forgotten that the Abbé Martin's paper, albeit nominally dealing with Ritualists alone, is really a quasi-retractation of that earlier essay, shaped into a clever indictment against the English Church in general, as undeserving the attachment and allegiance of its members, and as being in truth so manifest a failure, if not imposture, that no men so far versed in theology and in ecclesiastical history as the Ritualist leaders are, can possibly put any faith in its claims, or resist in their hearts the overwhelming evidence in favour of the Church of Rome, so that they must in consequence be held back by motives more or less ignoble from acknowledging and following out their inner convictions. This assumption underlies the whole article, and no courteousness of mere phrase avails to cloak its real character, on which some further light is thrown by a series of Lectures on Ritualism, but lately published by the Rev. Fr. Gallwey, S.J., to which I shall have occasion to advert slightly hereafter.

I must begin by traversing the position taken up by the Abbé Martin in his introductory remarks, wherein, after sketching graphically enough the unrestful, inquiring, anarchic temper of the present day, and the rival action of the two great religious currents of thought, he assumes that when the goal of Rome—Catholicism, as he names it—has been attained, the problem of the age has been solved in one direction at least, and truth with rest acquired by those

who have so ended their wanderings. I wish to point out that he arrives at this demonstration by leaving all Roman Catholic countries and populations out of account, and confining himself to those communities which are outside the pale of the Latin obedience. Doubtless it is true enough that the massive conservatism of the Roman Church exercises a powerful attraction on those who are weary and bewildered with the conflicts of opinion, theistic and atheistic, in Protestantism, and who are ready to turn to the Vatican as the one haven where the strife of tongues is hushed in submission to a voice which asserts its own infallibility. But what of the religious and mental condition of the once docile children of the Latin Church? What of France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Italy, even Belgium itself? Suppose some particular region were extolled by physicians as a health-resort of exceptional virtues, and the many cures effected by even a brief sojourn there were trumpeted everywhere; what would be the effect on public opinion of a discovery that the indigenous population was stunted, unhealthy, and constantly thinned by emigration in search of health, and by the very diseases for which their home was alleged as a specific? Clearly, the value of Roman Catholicism as a remedy for the spiritual ailments of our time must be tested, not by the mere handful of proselytes who declare themselves to have found their cure there, and who, as often as not, really mean no more than that they have given up thinking about the problems which once occupied their attention, and are content to sit in the dark without any longer calling for candles, but by the power it exercises in checking the generation of doubt amongst its own children. And the broad fact is that the Latin area of absolute infidelity and of revolt from the Roman aspect of Christianity contains at least twice as large a number of millions as is to be found ranked under the banners of Pro-



testant scepticism. Not to go further than France itself, it is speaking within bounds to say that the Abbé will find three disbelievers in Christianity amongst his own fellow-countrymen for every one he could discover in England. And this not because of any such confusing rivalry of sects as may be pleaded amongst us, seeing that Roman Catholics in France are more than 98 per cent. of the population, and that the tiny Protestant minority was diminished further between the census periods of 1866 and 1872; while the Italian ratio is 99 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent., Spain has about one Protestant in every three hundred of the population, and Portugal one in every eight thousand. There is consequently no such simple issue existing as he alleges, for the alienation from Christianity is most intense in those countries where the Roman Church has exercised undisputed monopoly ever since the dawn of the Reformation; and it is therefore wholly misleading to assure us that if we desire to escape the advance of Rationalism, there is a safe refuge to be found in the Roman obedience; and to represent the widespread apathy and indifference to theological speculation which characterizes the vast majority of the Roman Catholic clergy, and practically the whole body of the laity, as identical with the attainment of religious certitude on all debateable questions. I am not, even in thought, charging the Abbé with designed misrepresentation, but I believe him to labour under that very disadvantage of traditional and prejudiced education which he assigns as the main cause of Ritualist impenitence, and that to a far greater degree than those whom he criticizes.

For, while he is quite right in alleging that a violent and mainly unreasoning prejudice against Roman Catholicism, which Dr. Newman has termed the "Great Protestant Tradition," has long existed amongst Englishmen, chiefly of the less cultured classes, he appears not to have observed,

first, that this tradition is bifurcated, and consists far more largely in glorifying the characters and defending the acts of the chief promoters of the Reformation under the Tudors than in directly censuring or vilifying Roman Catholicism ; and next, that there is a positive historical basis for much of the distrust and disapproval which takes the latter form ; and notably in respect of those Seminary priests who were executed under Elizabeth for high treason, and for plotting the Queen's murder.\* The Abbé groups together as amongst the stock themes of Protestant reproach, and apparently as equally unjustifiable for use in argument, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Inquisition, the Dragonnades, and the False Decretals. He tells us that "the Catholic Church is not responsible for the faults committed by her children ; that she has disavowed all the crimes committed in her name ; that she has denounced every abuse of things sacred," etc. I accept his own repudiation, but does he seriously mean to tell us that he can appeal to any genuine, authoritative, and efficacious repudiation of all those things by the rulers of the Roman Church ? I have at this moment before me, as I write, an exact copy in silver, made by the facsimilist employed at the British Museum, of the medal struck at Rome in honour of the St. Bartholomew. It bears on the obverse the bust of the then reigning Pope, with the inscription "GREGORIVS XIII. PONT. MAX. AN. I. ;" on the reverse, three dead bodies lying amidst scattered weapons on the ground, one armed soldier with broken sword just falling, two figures taking to flight, and, most conspicuous of all, a winged and aureoled angel, with a cross in the left hand and a drawn sword in the right, advancing swiftly to stab one of the fugitives in the back, the legend being "VGNOTTORVM STRAGES, 1572." I remember that one of the

\* See the letter of Lord Acton (a Roman Catholic peer) in the *Times*, Nov. 24, 1874.



last important public acts of Pius IX. was to canonize Peter d'Arbues, a man of whose personal character for holiness absolutely nothing is known, and whose one claim to notice is that he was slain by the friends of some victims to his ruthlessness as an inquisitor ; and I have never yet found any formal disclaimer or censure of the Holy Office for its acts in Spain. As to the Dragonnades, it is true that Innocent XI. expressed no approval of them, but neither did he censure them, and St. Simon, whom I have just consulted, declares that he was on far too bad terms with Louis XIV., by reason of the dispute as to the *regale* and the four Gallican Articles of 1682, to be inclined to bless what he regarded as a mere political measure to suppress a civil difficulty. But when the *last* of the Dragonnades began, at the date of the Cevenol revolt of 1703, not only did the French bishops preach a crusade against the heretics, but Clement XI. granted a plenary indulgence to all Catholics who should take up arms for that purpose, and the barbarous atrocities committed by those volunteers, who styled themselves *Enfants de la Croix*, were something startling even in that intolerant era.\* As to the False Decretals, the Abbé Martin is so far right that their factitious character is now admitted in all companies where it would be useless to maintain the contrary thesis ; but I have before me the Ultramontane "Dictionnaire des Sciences Ecclésiastiques," by the Abbé J. B. Glaire (Paris, 1868), in which I find gravely laid down that

"It is quite wrongly that many historians, theologians, and canonists have asserted that they [the False Decretals] had overthrown all the ancient discipline of the Church. The thoughts, the principles, the rules, the teachings, and the counsels they contain are excellent ; they are a tissue of passages borrowed from Scripture, from the Fathers of the Church, from

---

\* Lavallée, "Histoire des Français," liv. III., sec. ii., chap. v., § xi.

Councils, from ecclesiastical writers, from the legislation of the Emperors, in sum, from special and competent authorities, from the Council of Elvira, held in 305, to the Council of Paris in the year 829."

But there is a much graver fact yet to be adduced than this attempted rehabilitation, which is, that though a large portion of the Roman Canon Law and of the Papal claims has absolutely no other basis whatever than these False Decretals, nothing has been given up or even modified since or because of the exposure of the forgery—which must have been known from the very first at Rome, as these Decretals were never in the archives there. I apprehend that if the Abbé Martin knew some landed proprietor who was in possession of an estate unjustly obtained by his grandfather by forging a will to the exclusion of the lawful heirs, he would not rate the grandson's honesty very high if he were to say, "Oh yes, I know my grandfather did forge the will, and got the estate that way; and it is very candid and noble of me to say so. But it happened seventy years ago, and the property has been in our family ever since, while the other people are either dead or not stirring in the matter, so I shall hold on still."\*

No doubt, it would be a very partial and misleading view to take of the Roman Church that these and like matters

\* The Abbé Martin has replied that the Pope was misled by false information as to the character of the St. Bartholomew, and ordered the rejoicings in mistake; but afterwards disapproved of it. This the Abbé alleges on the authority of "historians." What historians, and where, and what proofs do they offer equivalent to my proof from the medal? Did Gregory XIII. *disapprove* as clearly and publicly as he *approved*? And where does this plea in his defence leave Infallibility, for this matter is within the sphere of morals? As to the Abbé's reply on the Decretals, it is made possible only by his omission of the words above ["a large portion of the Roman Canon Law and of"], which seriously qualify the sentence, easily controvertible in their absence.



constitute the whole of her system and actual working ; but so long as repudiation of them is left to private unofficial persons, while authority is at best silent, and more often approving, the Abbé Martin is not quite logical in requiring that our acknowledgment of the personal virtues of individual Roman Catholics, and our admission of them to equality in civil rights by the repeal of all disabling penal laws, shall be taken to involve confession that we were entirely in the wrong in our judgment as to the working of the Roman Church when it can have its own way.

Once more, the Abbé deceives himself as to the scope, intentions, and desires of the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom. In his eyes it denotes loss of sympathy with the English Church, and ardent desire for fellowship and absorption in Rome. But just as he uses the phrase "Catholicism" as interchangeable and identical with Romanism (and most curiously alleges that Ritualists object to call themselves Catholics), so he here instinctively narrows the range of Christendom in the same manner. The aim of the A. P. U. C. is to bring about the reunion of *all* now divided Christians, beginning first with the four old historical Churches, Greek, Armenian, Latin, and English, but going on to include all Protestant bodies which still hold by the Creeds. And the proof that the idea of the Association is not what the Abbé supposes is to be found in the fact that a Papal Rescript, promulgated by Cardinal Patrizi in 1864, at the instance of a leading convert, directed all Roman Catholics to abandon its membership as altogether infected with heresy, and necessarily leading to latitudinarian indifference in religion. The continued existence of the A. P. U. C. in the face of such a rebuff as this proves that the Ritualists are no more inclined to accept the Roman programme of reunion than Rome was to allow that of the Association.

The truth is that the Abbé Martin, with all his painstaking diligence, is thirty years in the rear of English Church history. According to his view, sheer ignorance is the main deterrent of wholesale conversion, and as this ignorance disappears gradually before the light of inquiry, and the Roman Church becomes daily better known, the prospects of the Holy See will brighten in England. Now, what he augurs for the future really belongs to the domain of the past—I will add, of the unreturnable. In the first revulsion of the discovery how unlike the real Church of Rome is to the traditional Protestant bugbear, what treasures are enshrined in her liturgical books, her hymnody, her devotional treatises, with the revived taste for mediæval art and literature, the power of appreciating the saints she has reared and the missions she has established, everything belonging to her seemed enveloped in a golden cloud of glory; and entranced devotees, in most cases repelled by the scandals and abuses of the Church of England, which they were close enough to see accurately, and driven further still by the bitter hostility of their ecclesiastical superiors, flocked eagerly into that which seemed to them a very Land of Promise. Men famous for learning, for ability, for zeal, for piety, abandoned the Church of England in crowds, and two great epochs of secession, in 1844 and 1851, seemed to foreshadow the drain of all the true vitality to be found amongst us into an alien stream.\* These men threw themselves into their

\* An indiscreet list of "Rome's Recruits"—rightly so termed, for very few ever became veteran soldiers, and most never got out of the goose-step—lately published, calls for serious modification of this sentence. The total number of lay converts of both sexes (almost equally divided) from the educated classes of the whole United Kingdom, reckoning in Dissenters, between 1826 and 1878 inclusive, was about 1860, and of clergy 342. Only ten per cent. of the clergy and two per cent. of the laity were persons of any intellectual mark.



new system with fervid enthusiasm, and have themselves or by their pupils been for thirty years busied in controverting publicly and privately that Protestant tradition of which the Abbé Martin complains, and have at any rate succeeded in making the Anglo-Roman community a much more prominent, noticeable, and influential member of the English body politic than it had been since the accession of Elizabeth. But how has that operated in the interests of proselytism? Thus, that since the year 1857 scarcely one clergyman of intellectual distinction or personal influence sufficient to produce so much as a passing ripple on the surface of Church life by his secession, has quitted the communion of England for that of Rome. It is not merely that the seceders have been numerically much fewer than in the earlier period, but that they have been personally and collectively insignificant and unregretted. Clearly, there is a flaw in the Abbé's reasoning here, and it is, to say the least, more than likely that the greatly increased knowledge now possessed by English Churchmen of the real character of practical Romanism helps to deter them from seceding, because they know that the difficulties and abuses they must encounter in their new communion are certainly as great as those they are familiar with at home, and probably greater; with this additional consideration, to which no light weight attaches, that they see the visible progress of wholesome reform in the Church of England, the steady abatement of nuisances, extinction of abuses, establishment of new or revival of disused agencies for good; while they perceive that in the Roman Church, contrariwise, the man who chafes against scandals may not even hope to see them removed, but must choose sullen and dumb acquiescence, or else the title of "bad Catholic," as his reward for remonstrance.

I come now to consider the three reasons which the Abbé Martin has assigned as mainly deterring Ritualists from

entering the Roman Church. And first he places interested motives. Now as to this, the reply seems to me very conclusive. The Church of England may be compared to a great scalene triangle, bounded on its longest side by the other ancient historical Churches of Christendom, with which its polity and doctrine have the largest amount of common matter; on the second side by so-called Orthodox Protestantism; and on the shortest side by Rationalism. Necessarily, those who occupy the actual frontier line in any of these three directions are under the temptation to cross into the adjoining territory, and so to transgress their own assigned limits. As a fact, the thing does happen, and has happened, now and for three centuries past. Some leakage in each direction is to be looked for, so long as human nature continues what it is. But although there have been, at the lowest computation, proportionably as many Evangelical clergymen in our time whose sympathies were entirely with Dissent, and Broad Churchmen who preferred Unitarianism and Deism, as High Churchmen who leant towards Rome, it is only the last-named who have had to any practical extent the courage of their opinions, and readiness to make great sacrifices in order to follow their consciences. I am unable, speaking under correction, to name ten men in either of the two former schools who have abandoned their clerical position under circumstances involving them in poverty, but those of the third section who went out to begin life over again with no settled prospects can be counted by the hundred. And as to be a pronounced Ritualist now is to voluntarily abandon all hopes of professional advancement; to be pelted with defamatory epithets by Bishops, newspapers, and parliamentary orators; to be at the mercy of any three "lewd fellows of the baser sort" whom a wealthy and unscrupulous faction may hire as spies, informers, and prosecutors; to be



the sport of biassed tribunals which (as the Lord Chief Justice has explained) do not care to observe even the forms of law, not to say the spirit of equity, when dealing with him ; to give his days and nights for many years together to unremitting and unrewarded toil, and in a great proportion of instances to derive either nothing at all or the barest pittance from his calling,—I see no reason for believing that the spirit of self-sacrifice is less awake and vigorous now than it was in 1851, or that the call of conscience, were it in the direction of Rome, would be less courageously obeyed. It would be difficult indeed to find at this moment ten Ritualists of mark who gain anything by their connexion with the Established Church, while nothing would be easier than to count many who not only derive nought from ecclesiastical funds, but freely pour their own private resources into the treasury of the Church. As to the married clergy, it is a notable proof of the strength of habitual prejudice that the Abbé Martin does not see how his reference to this subject causes a really sound and tenable argument against the Roman Church to present itself. According to his view, a married English clergyman who begins to doubt the validity of his position is gravely in error if he allow his family ties to affect his decision at all.

He quite fails to take account of this aspect of the question: that a married clergyman becoming a Roman Catholic can never hope to be employed in ecclesiastical work again. He may be, as one whom I knew well was, an unusually profound and brilliant preacher ; he may be a wise and skilful director of consciences ; he may be an indefatigable visitor of the sick and aged ; he may be heart and soul, in every fibre of his body, in every cell of his brain, an ecclesiastic, a minister of God, and yearning to spend and be spent in His service. But Rome can and

will give him nothing to do (though she has acknowledged the permissibility of a married clergy in the Uniat Churches); she condemns him perforce to lay communion; to the continuous breach of pledges made solemnly to God, and not to this or that particular human society; to be a house-decorator, as in one instance known to me; a low-comedy reciter and author, as in another; a mere loafer about billiard-rooms and the like, as a third I could name, and so forth. Is not a broad fact in the direction of deterioration like this, so abject a failure in utilizing material far superior to the average hedge-priest, and lifted morally much above the celibate clergy of Spanish and Portuguese America, not to probe sores nearer home, entirely against the Abbé Martin's reasoning? What is the special attraction in being told, "Because you have entered into a state of life which the Church accounts as holy, and done so by means of a Christian sacrament, you shall not be permitted to serve God any longer, but must be expelled from His ministry (though the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter himself, was chosen to his office as a married man), while persons who are more than suspected of immorality, but who have not formed any hallowed domestic ties, may be found by scores and hundreds amongst our clergy?" No doubt it looks very specious to urge secession upon married clergymen on the plea that the very completeness of the sacrifice it involves points it out as the higher way, and therefore to be followed; but I have much reason to believe that in not a few instances the motive which has prompted the secession of such men has been the wish to be permanently free from the moral and religious checks of the clerical profession, and to be at liberty to adopt uncensured the habits of a fast layman; while as regards the destruction of worldly prospects, considered as a test of sincerity and as a proof of being in the right way, the Abbé must see that a Roman



Catholic clergyman who should think it right to get married, as a forcible protest against the unhealthy working of the law of celibacy, would ruin himself just as effectually, and, by parity of reasoning, would be bound in conscience to do so. It is a mere matter of detail to add that the induction as to the Eves who hold back our ecclesiastical Adams from the right path is imperfect, for several Ritualist leaders are unmarried men ; others have private incomes, and spend far more on the Church than they have ever received from its funds ; and in some instances Eve has plucked the forbidden fruit alone, and has gone over to the Roman Church, leaving Adam behind unseduced, but with the difficulties of his position indefinitely aggravated.

Let us come now to the motives of sentiment or feeling, next alleged as deterrents. These are, the Abbé tells us, vanity, self-love, affection. Vanity prevents a man from resigning a leading position, and forfeiting the regard of a large congregation which he has drawn together ; self-love represents as a disgrace the painful avowal of having been in error for " thirty, forty, fifty years," and of having helped to mislead others during that time, while to follow conscience and reason rather than passion and interest, through pain and humiliation, to the great and noble goal of conversion, is a difficult thing, though an evidence of uprightness and force of character ; and lastly, the close ties of personal friendship, nowhere so strong as in England, and regard for a Church which " represents all that is beautiful, noble, grand, which has produced so many great writers, has formed so many noble characters, is so blended with the whole national life of the people, that it has become, as it were, the living embodiment of every high and holy thought, memory, purpose, life," prevent a man from abandoning that which has " blessed his cradle, moulded his young life, appealed in after-years to his generosity and to his heart, to

aid in ameliorating and reforming society, which is, in short, his mother and bosom friend." All this tempts them, we are told, to deceive themselves, to resist conscience, to avoid sacrifices, and to endeavour to think it their duty to stay where they are, continuing to reform a communion on which, in these latter days, Providence has seemed to pour down blessings. Accordingly, they invent theories of the "primitive and undivided Church," of "branches of the Church," of the origin of Christianity, and of the character of the Reformation in England, and so forth, spending time, money, effort, learning, in propping up systems which have no foundation in fact, and are perpetually contradicted by history.

Well, as regards the two former reasons here assigned, the same reply is obvious as that made to the earlier count of the indictment, as to interested motives. Men did go out thirty years ago under just the circumstances detailed, did forsake important spheres of labour and attached congregations, did confess themselves to have been blind leaders of the blind, did pass through the disgrace and humiliation of conversion. What has there been in the thirty years since to make the position of advanced High Churchmen in the clerical ranks personally easier than it was then, so as to lull them into the morbid repose of a drugged conscience? Has the offence of the cross ceased for them? does their religion walk now in silver slippers, and no longer barefoot along a flinty road? The answer is plain, that they are still the one school which is yet reviled and baited on all sides, and not less now, after its loyalty and its wisdom have been proved by forty years of brilliant and unexampled Church revival, due absolutely and indivisibly to its unaided toil, than when it first broke the slumbers of an episcopate reared in Hanoverian traditions, and desiring nothing less than to be forced to confront new problems, and essay paths untried for ten generations.



Were all this changed, were its unparalleled services to the Church of England (which, to use the phrase of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, it has made "interesting") frankly recognized, and were simple toleration granted to its members, not to say gratitude, rewards, dignities, showered upon them, it would be plausible, even if it were unjust, to suggest that vanity and self-interest keep them where they are. But denounced by one of their ecclesiastical rulers as "conspirators," by another as guilty of "*anomia*," by a third as "traitors," who are to be "squeezed out,"—the accusers in all three cases being men who have, to say the least, not been zealous champions of the English Church, whether doctrine, discipline, or morals, be taken into account;—pointedly excluded from even the minor distinctions and prizes of the Church, and harassed by incessant worrying, from the petty baiting of ill-conditioned parishioners to the unconstitutional and lawless ukases of the revived Star Chamber, their lines have not fallen in such pleasant places as to tempt them to remain where they are for any cause save that of duty. They have practically far more to bear than their predecessors who seceded in despair of reform in 1844 and 1851; and I submit that the Abbé Martin is not justified by facts in assuming that their consciences are duller and their self-sacrifice less than was the case with members of the same school thirty years ago.

There is, besides, another rejoinder which rebuts the argument. By speaking of men who have been in the advanced High Church ranks for "thirty, forty, fifty years," the Abbé has barred himself from considering the case of the younger members of the Ritualist school, those who have been born into a comparatively late stage of the movement, and know nothing personally of its earlier struggles, vicissitudes, and conquests. He is dealing with men of fifty, sixty, and seventy years of age. Now, the simple fact

is that while men of the "mere Anglican" type have, in a great multitude of cases, remained all these several terms of years exactly at their starting-point of 1828, 1838, 1848, and have never progressed an inch, even in power of comprehending the religious changes of the times; contrariwise, every Ritualist clergyman over fifty years of age—I might almost say every one over forty—has had to confess himself to have been in error, to acknowledge that he has begun only at a comparatively late period to realize the logical necessities of his doctrinal position, to apologize to his people and to the Church at large for having been so long halting between two opinions, and to expose himself to ridicule, misrepresentation, and positive suffering in defence of these his finally matured convictions. And I may cite, in illustration, names made familiar by recent events—Mr. Bennett, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Pelham Dale, Mr. Ben Oliel, and last, but very far from least, Archdeacon Denison, whose "Notes of My Life" I recommend to the Abbé Martin's attentive perusal.

I do not propose to traverse the main outlines of the third clause in this count of the Abbé's indictment, that which deals with the clinging affection felt by Englishmen for their national Church. But I would ask him, if it be really an institution such as he has described it in the paragraphs I have honestly summarized without inserting a syllable of my own, does it not look very much as if God Almighty were in the plot against the Roman mission in England? Is there any other religious communion in the world, outside the Latin pale, to which the Abbé Martin thinks such language of unwilling eulogy fairly applicable, any other so startlingly like a real Church as to deceive the very elect? Nay, could he truly say so much for the Latin Church itself at this moment in Portugal, in Austria, in Bavaria, in Mexico, in Brazil? Surely, on his own showing, even if the



Ritualists be in error when yielding to the glamour of such an unique society, their mistake is a noble and pardonable one, and not justly to be qualified with the injurious motives he has ascribed to them. Those of us who have least sympathy with the Lacedæmonian policy can yet admire that old saying of the Laconian mother to her son going to battle, *Σπάρταν ἔλαχες, ταύταν κόσμει.\**

It is true that in his very next paragraphs the Abbé Martin assails the Church of England forcibly, and holds the reverse of the medal up to public view. He complains, as indeed Fr. Gallwey does also, of Ritualism as a more "subtle and dangerous" form of the Anglican tradition (by which I understand him to mean that it is a more effectual barrier against secession, which is perfectly true in fact), and speaks of the seductiveness of its picture of the Church as originally a federation of patriarchates, and of Catholicity as the basis of all true doctrine; but, he asks, what are these save specious and delusive semblances and mirages, which, when closely examined, prove contrary to the Gospel, and to the practice of primitive ages, and even to reason and good sense? And then, in a sentence I do not pretend to understand, he adds, this theory "has produced the Eastern Churches, almost all of them dead or dying for the last many centuries; it has produced the Church of England, which is to-day that which it has been often described in language not more severe than just, as 'a monstrous anomaly,' a 'monstrous failure,' a 'stupendous self-contradiction,' a 'practical failure,' a 'scene of utter disorder,' etc."

I would fain say a few words on this paragraph, before I proceed to cite the yet more trenchant phrases in which the indictment shifts from the Ritualists to the Church of England as a whole. As regards the theory that the Christian Church was organized at an early time in the form of a

\* "Sparta is thy lot, adorn her."

federation of patriarchates, I fail to see how it can be contrary to the Gospel, for the obvious reason that all four Gospels end their narrative at a date anterior to the formal organization of the Christian Church, as something apart from and independent of Judaism, while even the Acts and Epistles scarcely carry us down to the first beginnings of a diocesan episcopate, discoverable in the Pastoral Epistles. But the Abbé Martin knows as well as I do that the idea he dismisses so airily was not merely present to the minds of those eminent divines of early Christendom who defined the Creed and shaped the polity of the Church, but that it is actually embodied with singular precision of statement in the sixth Canon of the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa; the second and third Canons of the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople; implicitly, though not verbally, in the eighth Canon of the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus; and in the twenty-eighth Canon of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon; those four chief synods of ancient Christendom of which St. Gregory the Great, in language now and for many centuries embodied in the Roman Canon Law, says: "As the four books of the Holy Gospel, so I acknowledge that I receive and venerate the Four Councils: to wit, the Nicene, . . . the Constantinopolitan, . . . further, the first of Ephesus, . . . and also Chalcedon. . . . I embrace them with entire devotion, I maintain them with the fullest approval, because upon these, as on a squared stone, the building of the Holy Faith arises, and in them consists the rule for each man's life and conduct" (Lib. I. Regest. Epist. xxiv. cited in Corpus Juris Canonici, Decret. I. xv. 2). And each Pope at his coronation is obliged to swear that he will keep the teaching of these four Councils, "*usque ad unum apicem immutilata servari*"\* (Decret. I. xvi. 8). Thus we have the reiterated and *unanimous consent* and tradition

\* "To be kept intact, even to a single tittle."



of the whole Catholic Church against the Papal monarchy of to-day. As to Catholicity of doctrine, rather than submission to the Roman Pontiff, being the basis of Christian solidarity in the Church, I now adduce another authority, by which the Abbé Martin is equally bound. The Fathers of the Council of Trent, in their Decree on the Symbol of Faith, enacted in the third session, February 4th, 1546, speak thus: "Wherefore it [the Council] has decided to have set forth, in the very same words as those wherein it is read in all churches, the Symbol of Faith which the Holy Roman Church uses, as that *first principle* wherein all who profess the Christian faith necessarily agree, *and the firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*, which is—not St. Peter as the Rock, and the Pope as his heir, but—of this sort: 'I believe in one God the Father Almighty,' etc.,"—the Nicene Creed being quoted in full.

What he means by the Anglican theory (which to his mind must imply a post-Reformation date) having *produced* the Eastern Churches, which are older than Rome itself, I confess I do not understand. Perhaps what he does mean is, that if these Churches, which in early Christian days were far more populous, important, and full of intellectual life, than the depopulated provinces which then composed the small Roman patriarchate, had submitted to the Roman claims, yielded up their primeval independence, and recognized the Pope, not the Creed, as the centre and bond of Christian union, the course of history would have been signally altered, and Islam would not have displaced Christianity in so many Oriental regions. If this be what the Abbé intends, I have only to say that it belongs to the sphere of unsupported conjecture, and not to that of ascertained fact, capable of serving as material for solid argument.

His charge against the English Church collectively, is that it works badly, and never so badly as when it puts forth a

little fresh life and vigour ; that the bishops for three hundred years past have never proved equal to their duty, notably just now, and for the last fifty years—a proposition I, for one, do not dream of disputing ; that there has never been quietness, peace, and order in the Church of England save when tied hand and foot by the civil power, and when the Sovereign has gagged bishops and Convocation, and brought about thereby an interval of order and peace, which is also that of nothingness ; that every attempt to infuse new life has produced schisms and convulsions which have nearly destroyed the Church ; that even now Ritualism, and Ritualism alone, is compromising the very existence of the Establishment ; while the universal condemnation of the efforts of Ritualists in the direction of Catholicism, despite the acknowledged zeal, self-denial, and devotedness which mark them, show that they are working against the very principles of Anglicanism itself.

I must be permitted to offer my compliments to the Abbé for the skill and adroitness with which these cuts and thrusts are made. It is a real intellectual pleasure to contrast his delicate rapier-play with the clumsy bludgeon-flourishing of Mr. Edward Jenkins, for example. But he is wasting his science of fence by assailing the wrong persons. To show the purely insular Churchman, the mere Anglican, that there are grave faults, startling anomalies, and notorious abuses of theory and practice in a communion which he has taught himself to regard as an improved edition of Apostolic Christianity, is effective enough ; but the whole *raison d'être* of the Ritualist movement—taking it in the widest sense as denoting the energizing vanguard of the entire Catholic Revival in each stage of its forty years' onward progress—is the reform of abuses and the development of efficiency in the Church of England. I doubt if the Abbé Martin can tell us anything in this direction which Ritualists do not know already ; but if he can unearth any scandal, or disclose



any weak point which has escaped their detection, I can assure him that they will thank him for his help, and simply remark, "Here is another piece of work cut out for us."

Before touching on the Abbé's broader charges against Anglicanism, it is desirable to correct two errors of fact into which he has pardonably fallen. In the first place, it is not only incorrect to say that Ritualism is the single cause of the present peril of the Establishment, but it is not even indirectly one of the causes. The Abbé is so far right in making the statement that it has been made before, and that very loudly, by two classes of persons. In the first place, the extreme Puritan school has incessantly repeated it to the Bishops, whom it believes to be collectively much more concerned for the Establishment than for the Church, in order that they may be induced to employ severer measures of repression against the Ritualists, in the hope of thereby maintaining their own civil privileges; and in the next place, the Bishops have in many instances repeated it in their turn, with the hope of inducing the moderate High Church school, which is conservative above all things, to join them in the raid upon Ritualists, regarded as the bringers-in of revolutionary change. But if he will look into the facts for himself, he will notice that the agitation for Disestablishment is due to causes which are operating in every country where there is an Established Church; that the main influence at work here and now is Nonconformist hostility to the very notion of any State Church, quickened by the sense of social inferiority which Dissenters feel and resent very keenly; that the particular shape the agitation is taking at present has nothing whatever to do with Ritualism, but is a struggle of Nonconformists for superior burial rights over the clergy in the churchyards of the Establishment—superior, not merely equal, in these salient respects: free choice of the bodies to be interred, free choice of the

person to officiate, free choice of the service to be used, whereas the Church is tied down strictly by law in all three—with avowed intention to claim similarly superior rights in the churches, declared to be national property, when the churchyards have been conquered; and, finally, that the three branches of the Anglican communion in which disestablishment has already been effected, Ireland, Canada, and the West Indies, are all markedly non-ritualistic, while all things point to the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland as the next subject for operation. Doubtless it is true enough that a small section of the Ritualists has been so aggrieved by the recent lawless encroachments of the civil power on the spiritual domain, that it is now lending its aid to the forces at work to separate Church and State, but it has come up as a late ally. In the next place, the Abbé, when alleging that Ritualists are working against Anglicanism itself, and cannot justify their position, does but echo, as he truly says, a whole chorus of English objectors, from the Bishops downwards, who assert the very same thing; and it is not surprising that he should use such a weapon when put into his hand. I might traverse the statement generally by simply replying that the cardinal principle of Anglicanism, as laid down in formulary after formulary, in Prayer Book, Articles, Canons, Acts of Parliament, and so forth, whether sincerely or not, is appeal to the early Church of the first five centuries as the standard of doctrine and practice, and that Ritualists are trying to make this appeal a fact and not a theory. But I will take up broader ground, and put the matter to a practical issue. The Abbé will admit, as a logician, that enfeeblement or failure must be the unvarying result of any course of action which conflicts with the requirements and nature of the body acted on. Let an agriculturist use a dry and thirsty soil for crops which need abundant moisture, such as rice;



let him feed his graminivorous animals on meat ; let him sow his corn when the ground is bound hard as iron with keen frost, and what will come of it? Now Ritualism, in that extended sense of which I have previously spoken, has been at work for more than forty years in the Church of England, and has grown from very small beginnings to be the most active and energizing of its factors. If it have been an alien and hostile element, the results of its introduction must needs be marked enfeeblement and decay of the whole body it has affected. But the precise contrary is the most patent of facts. It is not Ritualists alone who say so, but their most embittered and persistent enemies and detractors. In the opening sentences of the joint Allocution against the Ritualists put forth by all the English archbishops and bishops, save those of Durham and Sarum, on March 1st, 1875, they say: "We acknowledge, humbly and thankfully, the mercies vouchsafed by Almighty God to the Church of England. By His blessing on the labours of the clergy and laity, our Church has of late been enabled in a marvellous manner to promote His glory and to advance His kingdom, both at home and abroad. If we judge by external signs,—the churches built, restored, and endowed *during the last forty years*; the new parishes formed in that time, especially in our great towns and cities; the vast sums of money voluntarily contributed for the promotion of religious education; the extension of the Church in the colonies and in foreign countries, including the foundation of more than fifty new sees; the great increase in the number of persons of all classes who by prayers and labour assist in the work of converting souls to Christ,—all bear witness to the zeal and earnestness of the clergy and laity of the English Church." And then, *more suo*, they turn round in the very next paragraph to revile and blacken the only people who have brought this state of

things about. Next, there has been a representative gathering of the Low Church clergy held yearly for the last half-century, and known as the Islington Conference. In several recent meetings of that assembly, one or other of the speakers has adverted to the marvellous change for the better which has come over the whole Church of England as a corporate institution, and has incidentally brought in the date of the revival as about *forty years* in operation. Now, the only new factor which was introduced at that period was the Oxford movement of 1833, which has been influencing the country ever since. The Broad Church school had its innings from the death of Queen Anne till the French Revolution, and as nearly as possible killed the Church of England in its religious aspect, besides making it a very sink of jobs and abuses. The Evangelical school, taking its rise after Wesley and Whitefield had made its work easy, did a great deal for the revival of personal religion, yet not only essayed no corporate reforms whatever within the Church, but actually created modern Dissent, which it fostered, till, from one-seventh at most of the population, as it was at the close of the last century, it is now about three-eighths, and the most powerful rival and thwarter of the Church. And the large central mass then, as now, and as always, was mainly inert, and quite incapable of originating movement. Therefore it follows that the present conspicuous revival is due exclusively to the forlorn hope of the High Church school; and the inference from this fact must be drawn in one of two ways. Either Ritualism is the only true and genuine Anglicanism, under which alone the Church of England can really thrive and prosper; or it is so much better, tested by its results, than Anglicanism, that it ought, on the mere ground of practical expediency, to be substituted for it. The Ritualists themselves take the former view, and the objection to the latter is that already stated, that an



element out of harmony with the body into which it is introduced cannot tend to the strength or healthy development of that body.

Now to return to the Abbé's charges against the Church of England generally, as a monstrous anomaly and failure, which never knows order and quiet save in drowsy trance, which buys life at the price of schism and disorder. I would ask the reader, in the first place, to compare this language with that which I have cited above, as to the fascination exerted by the English Church upon its sincere adherents, and to see how far the two are capable of being reconciled when placed side by side. Nobody cared about the Church of England, save as a source of income, when it was in Broad Church hands a hundred years ago; few people cared about it in the earlier part of this century, and Cobbett's "Legacy to Parsons" will help to tell why; but the attractiveness about it now is that it *does* work, and that with marked vigour, under exceptional disabilities imposed from without; while its anomalies, like those of the English Constitution itself, are due to an intricate series of counter-checks, preventing more evil and friction than they cause, but which are, I well know, peculiarly unintelligible and exasperating to the French mind, which attaches far more value to symmetry of construction than to efficiency of working, just as in French literature finish of style is set incomparably above intrinsic weight of matter. But I desire to point out that the circumstance to which the Abbé draws particular attention as the one fatal blot peculiar to the Church of England, that it never is quiet and orderly without being half-dead, and that whenever it is alive and vigorous, it is also full of strife and disturbance, holds good of the Church Universal all through ecclesiastical history, from the earliest times down to our own day. The three great eras of Church life and of theological literature—the

fourth, the period which bridges the twelfth and thirteenth, and the sixteenth centuries—are all times of conflict. The golden age of the later French Church was when Louis XIV., aided by Bossuet and De Marca, was struggling to wrest the *regale* from the Pope, was dealing with bishoprics and the like in a far more high-handed fashion than Queen Elizabeth ever ventured to do, and when the Jansenist controversy was occupying all the keenest intellects in his kingdom; while the first half of the third century, the tenth, and the eighteenth, the three chief eras of ecclesiastical peace, are the least active and honourable in the annals of Christendom. The Abbé has come upon a general law, and has thought to restrict its incidence to one solitary example.

Next in order of the charge comes the statement of the intellectual reasons which the Abbé regards as deterrents. He is far less clear and precise on this head than on the two former, and the sum of what he has got to say is that Ritualists do not look at [Roman] Catholicism as a whole, so as to get a full view of its harmonious unity and other transcendent merits, but take it piecemeal, and so do not see the true connexion of its parts; that they do not read history with the predetermination to disbelieve everything alleged against Rome, to make the fullest allowances for incontestable objections, as due to individual faults, not to corporate blameworthiness—that is, that they wrongly fail to do in the case of Rome what he forbids them to do in the case of England,—and to acknowledge as the inevitable conclusion that not only does the Roman Church work well, but that it is the only communion which does work well.

To my apprehension, this passage, which I have abridged, but not consciously coloured, is not in the least a statement of the intellectual reasons which impede secession; it is a complaint that Ritualists do not enter on the inquiry by



“sacrificing their intellect,” and begging the question they are supposed to be proving; it is, in short, an averment that they have no business to have any intellectual reasons at all against conversion. I should be glad to have the process of survey which the Abbé suggests somewhat more clearly indicated, as also the observatory from which the bird’s-eye view he recommends can be obtained, for I cannot discover the least clue to either in his remarks. As to the main issue raised here, I will touch on it by-and-by.

He does, however, adduce in a subsequent division of his argument a real intellectual difficulty, which he has classified separately, under the head of moral and disciplinary questions: namely, the Roman doctrine of Authority. And here, while putting his finger with prompt accuracy on the weakest point of Anglicanism, its laxity of discipline, he is yet conscious that he, as a Frenchman, in magnifying authority as the root-principle of all religion, views the matter from a standpoint widely different from that of Englishmen, accustomed to constitutional liberty, a plant which has never thriven in France, and of which France has never even had a near view, save under the huckstèring, priggish, and Philistine rule of Louis Philippe. The truth is, not only that every Frenchman regards government as an end and good in itself, and the citizen first and chiefly as a governable entity; but that modern Roman theology, forsaking even mediæval teaching, has come round to the Lutheran heresy of the total and unmixed depravity of human nature, and goes on the principle that the smallest relaxation of restraint on the intellect straightway brings in unbelief, and the slightest liberty of the will means vice; so that the only way to keep the Church and Society from chaos and dissolution is to tie every one up tight, except a very few rulers and a few more spies, and to let both rulers and spies feel that they are watched and punishable in their turn. What this

comes to in Roman Catholic school discipline the Hon. and Rev. William Petre has been telling the English public lately; what it comes to in the ecclesiastical and political spheres I will cite from the pregnant words of Pomponio Leto, which are believed to convey the sentiments of the late Cardinal Nobili-Vitelleschi, since an Italian prelate cannot be charged with viewing the question through the spectacles of an impenitent English Liberal like myself.

Pomponio Leto, asking why it is that Catholic societies exclusively in modern times are agitated by the spirit of violent, brutal, and envious revolution, from which Germany, England, Switzerland, and America are free, declares that the only possible answer is the exaggeration of the principle of Authority, forcibly inculcated by the Latin Church ever since the Reformation, and still more since the French Revolution.

“This thirst for authority, called forth in the first instance by the insubordination of the age, and kept up with the view of maintaining order and unity in the Church, too often results in destroying the first and impairing the second. . . . Moreover, the excessive use of authority in relation to the masses has the result of weakening and sometimes of suppressing the working of individual consciences, by absorbing their sense of personal responsibility in the sole conscience of Church authority, and so the perception of good and evil ceases to be personal and spontaneous. . . . It often happens that the Catholic, unless gifted with unusual superiority of mind, *has no knowledge of good and evil* other than that which he derives from the external authority, which in many cases is represented by any chance individual. . . . The consequence of such an excessive submission to authority is that the human conscience, being often ill-guided, is likely to go astray; at any rate, having never learnt to judge for itself, it loses the capacity for so doing, grows gradually weaker, and at last becomes impotent. . . . The recoil from such a despotism in the present day frequently throws the pupils of the Jesuits into revolutionary excesses.



. . . Hence arise the subtleties, the mental compromises, and the disingenuousness, too frequently met with amongst our people. . . . All countries governed by the Ultra-Catholic *régime* are without any appreciation of the real nature of authority, which is alternately adored with servility and subjected to outrage.”\*

The Abbé complains because English journals still quote the words of Cardinal De Bonnechose in the Senate, though uttered more than a dozen years ago, “My clergy is a regiment; when I say, March, it marches.” Surely, the point is not how long ago they were uttered, but their truth; whether they did not compress into epigram the whole policy of the French episcopate, and whether that policy has not remained unaltered since, to the serious injury of the French Church. And in a clever but thoroughly unsubstantial defence of that Church as it now is, he has made certain statements which I am going to dispute. He says first, that if the Church were left free by the State to act, the ecclesiastical despotism now existing would be relaxed, and the old provisions of the Canon Law touching collation to benefices and the irremovability of the clergy would be restored. I reply (1) that the existing state of affairs is due to the plot of Pius VII. with Napoleon I. against the liberties of the Gallican Church, and therefore has the highest possible Roman Catholic sanction; (2) that the same policy is being carried out more and more in the Anglo-Roman body, where the State does not meddle at all; (3) that the Bishops in Belgium habitually extort bonds of resignation from the beneficed clergy; † (4) that the Vatican decrees, by annulling episcopal independence, and giving the Pope

\* Otto Mesi a Roma : Febbrajo.

† The Abbé Martin says that if this be true at all of Belgium, it is only an isolated fact, and not the usual practice. He offers no disproof, and I therefore simply record his protest.

direct and immediate jurisdiction in every diocese, have extended the very same principle much more widely, and in a higher sphere, so that it is now an integral part of the whole Roman system.

When he urges that the unpopularity of the Church in France, as contrasted with the popularity of the Church in England, is due to the firmer attitude of the former in never paltering with the right, or sacrificing its independence, I simply ask him if he remember—he cannot forget—how and why it was that the French clergy, when Louis Napoleon was making his way to imperial power through treason and massacre, and when their decision might have turned the wavering scale, blessed the Man of December, and won for themselves the undying hatred of his victims and their friends? Was it not a bargain as to the occupation of Rome, entered into with certain bishops, who then put the screw on their subordinates? And it is still believed that the disastrous war of 1870 was prompted by clerical intrigue far more than by dynastic motives; so that the clergy are even now much more unpopular than the Empire.

And as to the peasant level of the French clergy, and the excuse that the absence of gentlemen from their body is merely in consequence of the similar disappearance of gentlemen from democratized civil society, I really must say that the Abbé is playing with us, and relying on our unfamiliarity with the France of to-day. It was a remark of a duke elected as a deputy to the Assembly not long ago that he never met so many brother-dukes in his life as he did amongst his colleagues; and whatever may be the effect of the abolition of privileges, and of the rise of a shoddy aristocracy, with sham names and forged titles, now swarming in every department of France, nevertheless the fact is that the *noblesse* are still a very powerful factor, numerically and influentially, in French rural society, and not without their



weight in all save the Radical manufacturing centres. There are sixty thousand (?) French priests out of a total of a hundred and fifty thousand ecclesiastics; and on any reasonable estimate of the proportion of gentlefolks in the nation, there ought to be at least three or four thousand priests drawn from the higher social grades. As a fact, it would be difficult to find ten, outside the Jesuit body. Nay, the Abbé Bougaud's statistics now tell us that so far from the nobility alone being absent from the French clerical ranks, there is scarcely a fraction of the priesthood drawn from the middle class, whether professional or commercial, and that even the supply of peasants has fallen off to such an extent that every diocese in France save Paris is undermanned; that three thousand benefices are vacant and cannot be filled, and that three thousand parishes besides have neither priests nor church. It is to be observed that the case is not in the least that the gradual democratization of French society, as the Abbé puts it, preventing hereditary wealth, pulls down great families, but that their now poor scions may still be found amongst the clergy. It is that *none but peasants*, whose forefathers have been peasants before them, and some of the very lowest of the trading class, can be had at all; none even from the lower middle class. And as to the poverty of the clergy causing this, what that proves is that the laity of one of the richest countries in the world do not love their clergy enough to supplement, with voluntary offerings, the meagre stipends of the State.\* Two more remarks may fitly end this negative portion of my reply: first, that I must offer the correction that English Ritualists are not so enamoured of the practical working of Infallibility in the Roman Church as to desire its intro-

\* The average income of the Free Kirk minister in poor Scotland, raised entirely by voluntary offerings, is at least eight times that of the average *curé* in wealthy France.

duction here, any more than English Liberals covet the institutions of Spanish-American republics in exchange for their own monarchical form of government; and next, that the Abbé has laid undue stress on the circumstance that Dr. Pusey has translated and adapted a work on confession by Mgr. Gaume. The truth is that Ritualists, in considering how they may best strengthen and adorn the Church of England, act in the spirit of the old Peruvians, who held that gold, wherever or with whomsoever found, belonged to the Sun-God and the Inca. The modern Ritualist is entirely free from the strait-laced prejudices of his Anglican brother, and is perfectly ready to take a hint or adopt a useful addition from any quarter whatsoever, and does not care a straw whether a Roman cardinal or a Baptist minister be its original parent; whether it be a Jesuit invention, like the Ignatian retreat, or a Nonconformist one, like the mothers' meeting; no more thinking himself bound to copy everything where he has found something, than his countrymen feel any obligation to import Chinese manners into England along with their tea.

It will not be inexpedient, for the sake of narrowing the issue, to preface the positive division of this reply by stating what the reasons are why some few Ritualists, clerical and lay, do become Roman Catholics, before explaining the reasons why the main body do not. I have had unusual facilities for coming to distinct conclusions on this subject, having had much conversation with persons who have afterwards seceded, besides having read most of the manifestoes which the seceders have in a great number of cases published, either as their own justification, or in the hope that the arguments which prevailed with themselves may equally influence others. And first, I always find that the waverer who is *sure* to go to Rome is he, and especially she, who knows almost nothing of the Church of England, and absolutely



nothing of the Church of Rome ; while I have never yet, in the whole course of my experience, known one person who has been brought over to the Church of Rome as the result of such a dispassionate, historical, and theological course of study of its claims and system as the Abbé Martin recommends to the Ritualists. I am not asserting the thing to be impossible in itself. That would be begging the whole question at issue. I am merely stating the fact for what it is worth, and do not forget that Cardinal Manning, who is probably more familiar than any man living with the art of proselytism, has denounced the "appeal to history" in questions of religion as "heresy and treason"—a tolerably sufficient proof as to the sort of evidence he thinks discoverable by that process. And by "history" here is meant *Church* history, Church documents, liturgies, creeds, canons, and the like. It is not an appeal to something *external*, against the Church, but an appeal to the *Church herself*, as to whether she really does teach what is tendered now as her true doctrine. So, when we find that the Church of past days condemned some Popes as heretics, and deposed others as heretics and traitors,\* and that this action was acquiesced in as right and valid, the Church herself tells us that Papal Infallibility is a modern fraud, and not her doctrine. We are submitting to the whole Catholic Church in recognizing these facts, just as we are submitting to General Councils in rejecting Cardinal Manning's Nestorian heresy on the cultus of the Sacred Heart—a devotion, by-the-by, borrowed by Fr. la Condamine from the Independent preacher, Thomas Goodwin, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell !

I should classify nearly all the converts with whom I have had any acquaintance under three heads: (1) those who have seceded from causes of temperament ; (2) those who

\* *E.g.*, John XII., Benedict IX., Gregory VI., Gregory XII., and John XXIII.

have done so from sentimental motives ; and (3) those who have gone on what I may call practical grounds.

By the first class I mean persons like the late F. W. Faber, to whom, from their natural disposition, the Roman system is powerfully attractive; who make no pretence at all of inquiry into its merits, but accept it eagerly because they like it ; just as they might like oysters or pastry, without caring to know anything about the nutritive value of those articles of food. So, too, there are minds whose bias is just in the opposite direction, which are innately Evangelical or Rationalist in tone, and are never easy till they find their congenial atmosphere, in which alone they can breathe with comfort to themselves. But there is no evidential value in cases of this sort, and they form but a small percentage of the whole.

I may illustrate the next class by a story I once found in some Roman Catholic book of religious anecdotes, whose name I have forgotten. A married pair—they were French Protestants—were driving in an open carriage through a street where the gentleman had some business to transact. He pulled up at the door he wanted, which happened to be just opposite a beautiful old Gothic church, and entered the house, leaving his wife behind in the carriage for about twenty minutes. When he returned, she said to him, " My dear, I am a Catholic, and desire to be received into the One Church. I have been looking across at that lovely building there, and am convinced that the religion which its builders professed must be the true one, and far superior to that of the people who built our Protestant temple." And accordingly she was received within a few days, followed, if my memory be not at fault, by her husband, overpowered by the cogency of the lady's argument. It is something that the building did not happen to be the cathedral of Cordova, or the Jumna Musjid of Delhi, for



then the pair might have turned Mohammedans.\* There is so much which is august and stately, so much which is graceful and picturesque, so much which is profound and mysterious, so much which is heroic and romantic, in the history and aspect of the Church of Rome, that minds which have more imagination than judgment, more emotion than logic, are apt to be carried away by the sheer impulse of admiration, and to believe on trust that what held good of the twelfth century, for instance, is equally discoverable now; that the exceptional splendours which have arrested their attention are mere average specimens of pervading glory. I can do no better here than quote the words of one who in his degree did as much as any one to foster this mode of thought, the late Augustus Welby Pugin, written long after he became a Roman Catholic:—

“All anterior to the Reformation is regarded and described as a sort of Utopia—pleasant meadows, happy peasants, merry England—according to Cobbett; bread cheap and beef for nothing, all holy monks, all holy priests—holy everybody. Such charity, and such hospitality, and such unity, when every man was a Catholic. I once believed in Utopia myself, but when tested by stern facts and history, it all melts away like a dream.”†

The sentimental attraction takes, however, a comparative form more frequently than a positive one; by which I mean that persons who are keenly alive to certain obvious faults in the Church of England, often weak just where Rome is strong, are indisposed either to make the best of these defects, or to labour personally for their correction, but

\* A learned correspondent has pointed out the original of this story to me in St. Simon's "Memoirs" (1704), as referring to M. and Mme. Chardon, and there the process of conversion is much slower. But I have given the incident just as I found it, edited anew for the edification of the faithful.

† Pugin's "Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy," 1850.

secede for the sake of finding the contradictory of that which has displeased them, and that without inquiring whether it is really to be had where they seek it, or whether there may not be counterbalancing disadvantages of which they are unaware. The commonest of all these motives is the notion carefully inculcated by Roman controversialists, and accepted without examination by the mass of ordinary people, that there is absolute harmony and unity of doctrinal teaching within the Roman pale, as contrasted with the strife and conflict of opinions in the Church of England. Theologians who have tested the matter know better, of course, but they are always a slender minority; and are heard with surprise when they state, from accurate knowledge, that there is great variety, and even conflict, of teaching in the Roman Church, on grace and free-will, on purgatory, on indulgences, on the Holy Eucharist,\* and even on Papal Infallibility itself, which was to have settled everything. There are probably as many Calvinists (for instance) among Roman Catholics now as in all the rest of Christendom put together. Or secession may be due to weariness at being worried, and scolded, and hustled, and rabbled, whether as cleric or laic, for divergence from the standards of popular English irreligion; but this is akin to a boy's enlisting as a soldier when made uncomfortable at home. Chief of all the sentimental reasons, however, is disgust at the almost unbroken and unvaried misconduct of the collective English Bishops—too like that of the courtier prelates during the Arian struggle of the fourth century—their lack of moral courage, their servility to the civil power, nay, to mere popular opinion, however crude, ignorant, and even openly irreligious; and, above

\* *E.g.*, the Roman Church teaches a "supra-local" Presence in the Eucharist (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xiii. cap. 1). Fr. Gallwey, in "An Hour before my Crucifix," teaches a local one, "imprisoned in the Sacred Host."



all, their uniform failure to regard themselves and to act as the natural heads, and therefore as the natural leaders, champions, and protectors, of the clerical body, as the Judges do for the Bar, and the Horse Guards does for the army. For, whereas they have been given temporal rank and wealth expressly and only that they may be independent, and may confront the rich and noble of secular society on equal terms, in defence of the Church and the clergy; in practice they treat these privileges as retainers on behalf of the laity, in return for which they are to act as spies and whippers-in over the clergy: to dragoon them into submission whenever, and on whatever ground, any of the laity choose to disapprove of their conduct.

I am simply putting down here complaints which have been made to myself, and which have usually been directed far more against Bishops who lay claim to High Churchmanship than against open and professed Evangelicals who know no better. The charge is not, so far as I have ever heard it made, that the Bishops do not encourage and lead the Catholic Revival, instead of always acting as drags upon its wheels; much less that they, like the Crown, will not promote Ritualists (since these regard themselves as the constitutional Opposition, not yet entitled to the good things of the Ministry); but that they never come forward to correct any popular misapprehension, to allay any wild panic, of which the clergy are the objects, but themselves swell the chorus of vituperation at the top of their voices, lest they should incur any share of the passing unpopularity. This was notably the case when the Public Worship Regulation Act was being debated, and also quite lately when the storm was raging about the "Priest in Absolution." Not one Bishop had the boldness to say plainly that the Church of England teaches auricular confession in its Prayer-Book, and that clergymen who were simply carrying out its direc-

tions, are more honest, loyal, and consistent, than those who not merely neglected but reviled the practice, and ought accordingly to be let alone. What is perhaps worse in this connexion was that the specific charge made at the time was that certain Ritualistic clergymen had wantonly put a book, declared to be obscene, into public circulation, the actual fact being that they had bought up the book with the express purpose of *withdrawing* it from circulation, and that so effectually, that the copy which Lord Redesdale produced as his brief in the House of Lords had, as Mr. Collette, the well-known Evangelical solicitor and controversialist, has incautiously told us, to be—— well, informally conveyed, by the person to whom its publicity is due. The story has been denied since, but it came from a friendly pen, and has every mark of probability about it. Now, not only did no Bishop attempt to rebut the false accusation, but several of them repeated it, although a fully authenticated statement of the facts was in the hands of each of them. And lastly in this category, the complaint is often heard that Ritualism, which is at the worst a devout and earnest movement, erring if you please, but ardently Christian and missionary, is the *only* kind of clerical action with which a Bishop will interfere penally. Open deprecation of Christianity itself in the pulpit, personal immorality of life, daring nonconformity in public worship, gross neglect of pastoral duties, illegally exacted fees for gratuitous offices, deliberate sordidness and irreverence in the ministration of sacraments ; all these I have myself known to have been laid before bishop after bishop, with no result whatever save a snubbing to the complainant, while the slightest hint of Ritualism was sure to meet with immediate attention and expression of readiness to suppress and punish it if possible. That sort of thing sends men over to Rome.

It may seem somewhat curious if I put, as I now do, doubts as to the validity of Anglican Orders, as to the



canonical jurisdiction of the English Episcopate, and, above all, as to the fatal character of the interference of the State, whether in Parliament or in the Law Courts, in the spiritual domain, under the head of sentimental reasons for secession, as they certainly have caused many to secede. But I do so because my experience is that they are almost never the original moving causes, but are simply caught up subsequently, in nineteen cases out of twenty, as a justification for seceding, by those who have first been carried away by their emotions, and then try to persuade themselves and others that they have been actuated by reason and study alone, an assumption disproved by ten minutes' conversation with any one versed in the subjects named, and by the fact that the seceders never so much as inquire whether things are any better in these respects in the Roman Church, but take on trust there what they demand to have proved here by tests which are asked for in no other case. For instance, people have come to me much upset by having been told by Mgr. Capel and others that the Ordinal used for the consecration of Bishops in England between 1552 and 1662 is an invalid form, *because* it does not specify the episcopal office at the actual time of laying on of hands (as the present one does); so that the necessary intention was absent, and no more than *confirmation* need be implied. They were NOT told that in an earlier place the intention of the rite is declared to be to do to the bishop elect whatever Christ did in commissioning the Twelve Apostles, and the Apostles in turn when sending out SS. Paul and Barnabas; and still less, that the very omission complained of *is in the existing Roman Pontifical itself*, whose form is "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," and no more; nay, that in the Roman ordination of priests the Bishop *is forbidden to say anything* when laying on hands, though the essence of the ordination (Conc. iv. Carth. can. 3) consists therein.\*

\* This fact refutes another cavil sometimes brought against the English

Last come the practical reasons. These rank under three clearly marked heads. First is the wish to be free from clerical obligations, and to enjoy the unrestraint of laymanship. This, though not covering a very large number of cases, does unquestionably account for an appreciable fraction. Next,—and this chiefly affects lay folk,—residence in some part of the country not yet covered by the rising waters of the Catholic Revival, or where neglect, sordidness, or a narrow and illiterate Puritanism, are still dominant. It has often happened that persons who have found religious privileges, which ought to be accessible to every member of the Church, denied even to their earnest

Ordinal. It is said that, even if we have Bishops, we have no priests, because the essence of the priestly office is to offer sacrifice, whereas no express reference to this is found in the English Ordinal; while the Roman, and most others, have a clause conferring this power. But, if a priest “must of necessity have somewhat to offer,” then the authority to do this must needs be included in the commission, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God” (as the Anglican form runs), because that which confers the fulness of any office confers all authority comprised under that office. And, as a Roman priest is actually ordained without any words at all, he must obtain the power of sacrificing long before any mention of it occurs in the Roman Ordinal,—for this obvious reason, that if he be not a priest from the moment the Bishop’s hands have been laid on him, he is a mere layman or deacon still when the commission to sacrifice is given him later on in the rite, and so is not capable of receiving it, and does not in fact receive it; because the modern (thirteenth century) ceremony with which it is bestowed is no part of the ordination proper, but a mere late ornamental accretion thereon. And further, if it be necessary to specify the details of every grade when conferring it, then the Roman Church has no Bishops, for the powers of confirming and ordaining, distinctive of the episcopal order, are not bestowed by name in its Ordinal for the consecration of Bishops, but are merely incidentally touched on and grouped with the power of baptizing, open to all laymen, of offering, common to all priests, and expounding, permitted to all preachers, as things which a Bishop *ought* to do.



entreaty, who have been shocked and revolted by wanton irreverence and profanity in word and act by some clergyman, nearly certain to be condoned by his Bishop if invoked; or equally alienated by the timorous refusal of an incumbent to do what he knows and confesses to be his duty, lest he should compromise himself; have cut the knot by secession, even though involving themselves in the difficulty of having to make long journeys, at infrequent intervals, to obtain their new ministrations. And finally in this category come what are in my experience the immense majority of cases, namely, those who, from motives of sheer mental laziness and sloth, and of unwillingness to face the spiritual problems of the day for themselves, go out of a communion which bids them "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good,"—just as the Founder and first Apostles of Christianity appealed to the *reason* of their hearers, and to proofs which they offered them, not to their own *authority*, as the ground for accepting the Gospel\*—into one whose easier counsel is to use their intellect only so long and so far as it may lead them into the haven of Rome, and thenceforward to abandon all the trouble and sin of thinking, which will be much better done for them by the Church, acting through the agency of a qualified director. I am bold to say that this is, beyond all others, the chief motive and incentive to secession so far as I have ever been able to examine and test the matter. What its moral value is, I leave my readers to decide.

I now come to offer my own account, by no means minutely exhaustive, of Ritualistic stubbornness and tenacity in continuing within a Church whose rulers either actively persecute or passively disapprove men of that school, in which they receive hard blows and scanty or no pay, where every man's tongue and hand are against them.

\* S. Luke xxiv. 27; S. John ii. 11, iii. 2, v. 36, x. 25; Acts vi. 8—10, viii. 35, xvii. 2, 11; I Peter iii. 15.

1. The first and most obvious consideration is that Ritualists find themselves by no act or choice of their own, but by the circumstances of their birth, education, and surroundings, members of the Church of England—a Church, by-the-by, which always lay outside the limits of the original Roman Patriarchate, never authoritatively nor canonically extended,\* and which at no time, *pace* the Abbé Martin, accepted the “laws” of the Roman Catholic Church, if by that term the Roman Canon Law be intended—and that the *presumption* so far is that it is God’s will that they should stay where He has placed them. Of course this argument can be met by the objection that the same holds good of the most degraded paganries in the world, and that, on this showing, men ought to remain Thugs or cannibals. But the conditions of change are very unlike in the several cases. Roman Catholicism, take it at its best, is only a variety, and not a very remote variety, of the same creed and polity already held by English Churchmen, and is not at all so plainly and obviously a step upward and for the better as any form of Christianity is when compared with savage cults. It is a question of degree, not of kind. If it can prove its claims, well and good; but the contention of the ordinary Roman controversialist is that the presumption must be always held to be in favour of Rome, and the burden of proof lie with those who dispute her title, not with those who press it. This, however, is the reverse of the process in all other cases of claim by outsiders, and it is not the duty of English Churchmen, any more than it is of Italian or Spanish Churchmen, to take for granted that their position is untenable, and to help in proving it such. As well call on the owner of an old entailed estate to give up possession to

\* Nay, barred from such extension by Canon VIII. of the General Council of Ephesus.



any claimant who may allege a flaw in the title-deeds, without clearly establishing his own superior right.

2. Next comes the fact acknowledged by several candid Roman Catholics, by Welby Pugin, by Dr. Newman, and by the Abbé Martin himself in that former paper of his on Ritualism, that the Church of England, whatever its defects may be, is *the* great "breakwater" against the progress of infidelity in this country, and is thus discharging an important national work more successfully by far, be it said with submission, than the Latin Church is doing in France, Spain, and Italy. There is no proof, to say the least, that a transfer of allegiance, by removing a number of stones, would strengthen this breakwater, or help to erect another as serviceable. For no fact is better established than the scantiness, poverty, and ineffectiveness of Roman Catholic apologetic literature or efforts against Rationalism and infidelity. If the Abbé Martin cite Dr. Pusey's version of Mgr. Gaume's manual on confession, as showing how England is forced to borrow from Rome, I would refer him in turn to the "Démonstrations Evangéliques" of the Abbé Migne, where he will find the Anglican names of Locke, Burnet, Leslie, Clarke, Stanhope, Tillotson, Warburton, Bentley, Lyttelton, Butler, Porteus, Milner, Paley, and Buckland, to cite no more, in the list of authors included, and remind him further that at the epoch of the great Deistical assault on Christianity in the last century, it was England, not Rome, which routed the assailants, who learnt their lessons from the Roman-sprung Socinians and the Jesuit-taught Descartes; while if there be any eminent and successful Roman apologists for Christianity against the newer forms of unbelief living now, I am not fortunate enough to be acquainted with their names, save the possible exceptions of Hettinger and Reusch.

3. There is, so far as I can see, no evidence that the

Roman Church in her own lands is doing what I may call aggressive missionary work at all so vigorously or successfully as the Church of England. I do not forget that in France the evil wrought by the disastrous interlude of Atheism under the first Republic has never yet been wholly undone; but no such plea can be entered in palliation of the Church's failure in the two great southern peninsulas; and the Abbé's plea, that the revived Paganism of the Renaissance is to blame, even if we accept it for Italy,—where, however, the living presence of the Pope ought to have been more than a counterbalance—will not account for Spain and Portugal. The educated classes are in open revolt everywhere; the boasted hold on the lower classes, as Fenianism in Ireland, and Garibaldism in Naples and Sicily have demonstrated, is precarious in the extreme. Even here in England, despite of proselytism, aided by Irish and Continental immigration, the Roman Church, as the marriage returns prove, does not hold its own, and cannot maintain its natural ratio of increase (4·50 per cent.) compared with the total population,\* lavish though it be in establishing clerical plant. Still less is it effective as a missionary agency amongst those unattached waifs and strays who profess no creed, nor does it practically influence the Dissenting bodies, and, indeed, its Welsh mission is a complete and abject failure. On the other hand, I myself ministered for years to a congregation of which the majority had been Methodists, Baptists, and Independents, and I

\* The ratio of Roman Catholic marriages to the total number was 2·65 per cent. in 1848. Then came the great wave of Irish immigration, which sent the rate up to 4·26 in 1851. The No-Popery agitation of that year showed its result in 1853 by a rate of 5·09. Under Ritualism, it dwindled in 1874 to 4·00 per cent., and the Public Worship Act has raised it again to 4·26, the proportion of 1851; 4·50 would be its natural ratio now.



know of several others similar in various towns. It is not a very unreasonable deduction from these premises that the Roman Church, from whatever cause, cannot do the work in England that Ritualists can and do.

4. Not only does the missionary Roman Church in Great Britain fail, except so far as it poaches on Anglican preserves, but its value as a *moral* educator is open to grave question. Those who are familiar with its system are aware that the amount of direct control and influence exercised by its clergy over those who in any practical way admit their claims is very much greater than that which Anglican or Protestant ministers commonly enjoy. But in England the number of Roman Catholics convicted of criminal offences is enormously out of proportion to their ratio of the population, and very far exceeds that of the Church of England, though the latter is held accountable for every one who does not definitely avow himself as a member of another communion.\* And in Ireland no reasonable doubt exists that if the Roman clergy chose to deal as promptly and forcibly with agrarian murders (exclusively a Roman Catholic crime) as they do with mixed marriages, or with voting for the wrong candidates at elections, they could destroy that combination of

\* There are about 1,000,000 Roman Catholics in England and Wales, out of 24,000,000 = 4.50 per cent (Mr. Ravenstein, in his *Denominational Statistics*, says that they were 982,000 in 1866). But the criminal Protestant children, boys and girls, detained in English reformatories on Dec. 31st, 1877, were 4,289, and the Roman Catholic ones 1,346, or more than 24 per cent. of the whole number, *i.e.*, nearly *six times* their proper ratio. The adult Roman Catholics in three metropolitan prisons, whose returns I have seen, vary from 16 to 22½ per cent. of the whole number. Yet, while there is but one Anglican clergyman (23,000) for every 1,044 of the whole population for which the Established Church is responsible, there is a Roman Catholic priest (1903) for every 525 of his co-religionists in England and Wales, without counting members of active religious orders of both sexes, who have greatly increased of late years, and share the work.

the peasantry to shelter assassins which makes their capture and conviction well-nigh impossible. Orangemen are bad enough, Heaven knows, but at least they do not shoot their opponents from behind a hedge. The deduction from these facts is that the Roman clergy either cannot or will not press the *moral* law adequately on their flocks. Why should a Ritualist, who does press it, sit down humbly at the feet of such teachers to learn their method?

5. Next, it is to be remembered that the Emancipation Act, which helped to draw the English Roman Catholics out of their long retirement, very shortly preceded the Oxford movement; and since that time, notably since the impetus given them by the convert element, they have been familiar figures in general society. We know all about them now, they are no longer shrouded in mystery; and the impression they create, on the whole (I have no wish to word it offensively), although the Roman Church shows at its very best in England, where it is forced to be cautious and moderate, is not that of superiority to English Church people. They were asleep and inactive till the converts, won by no zeal, energy, or devotion of theirs, woke them up; their whole active element even now is chiefly convert. They are distinctly more narrow, apathetic, and negative, more incapable of interest in higher thought, even on religious topics, less earnest and willing—apart from those who devote themselves directly to clerical or conventual life—to work in and for their Church. Indeed, the complaint I hear from Roman Catholics is, “We can get money enough for almost any scheme we start, but they drop through one after another, because we cannot get the men.” My own belief is that the fault of this, too, lies with the Latin clergy, in their craving to officialize everything, and to keep the reins of power in their own hands, reducing the laity to mere passivity. Ritualists, whose strength lies in a



attached and co-operating laity, do not see how they would gain by the wholesale clericalization which would follow on submission to Rome.

6. I come now to a sorer place, but I am bound to probe it. Our general experience, and (as I am assured by competent information) that of the Roman Catholic clergy themselves, is that conversion to Rome involves, in a large majority of instances, sudden, serious, and permanent intellectual and moral deterioration, especially as to the quality of truthfulness. I allow the exceptions to the full. I count not a few converts amongst my own personal friends; there is one convert at least, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, who enjoys, in his long enforced retreat at Edgbaston, a far higher degree of love and reverence amongst us Anglicans than he receives from his present co-religionists. And I grant that where Roman Catholicism is the first form of belief to make a serious impression on a previously careless person, there is improvement; only, this is equally true of Plymouth Brethrenism. But the broad fact is as I say, and the most conspicuous example of all is the best proof of it. I had the moral beauty of conversion brought home to me not very long ago by learning that an educated professional man of my acquaintance, within forty-eight hours after he was received, with all a neophyte's tender graces still freshly clinging round him, was locked up for getting drunk and assaulting the police; a thing which had never happened in his Anglican days. I will cite another instance, which I regard as graver, because deliberate, and adopted under very high Roman authority and counsel indeed. A Sisterhood with which I had some relations of occasional service was got at and tampered with, so that about two-thirds of the whole body seceded in mass to the Roman Church. Of course, as usual in such communities, the property, whether realty or personalty, belonged to all the members

jointly. Each had a common right and interest in it, and most of it had been given to the Sisters on the faith of being an Anglican body. But the seceders took everything, the whole of the furniture, bedding, linen, plate, glass, books, etc., except a few English Bibles and some personal articles which could be directly identified, and summarily turned the non-seceders out of the house, to shift for themselves as best they might. This was not all. The bills for the past quarter came in soon after, for the meat, bread, groceries, and the like, which the whole community had been consuming. The seceders refused to pay any part whatever of the debts, though they had consumed the far larger share of the goods, alleging that they, as Catholics, were not bound to pay the debts of Protestants. It was not long after the Saurin v. Starr trial that all this happened, and the Superior of the steadfast minority consulted the Superior-general of her society, asking her what she should do. "Your claim," was the noble Christian reply, "would stand good at once in law, but it is better that you should put up with the loss than give the world the sorry sight of Sisters quarrelling with one another about money." Which does the Abbé Martin prefer of these two lines of conduct, of which the former, I must repeat, was not spontaneous like the latter, but advised by very highly-placed Roman ecclesiastics indeed? I could add many more similar facts, well-nigh as telling, but I have said enough to show that the new convert does not necessarily rise into a higher moral sphere. As for the intellectual question, one fact with which experience makes me familiar, is that the very first thing most new converts do is to sell off all their books,—not merely those Anglican volumes which have perhaps ceased to be useful; but general literature, and even Roman Catholic theology itself.\* This I have noticed scores of times; as also that most

\* A Roman Catholic complained in the *Tablet* of Dec. 28th, 1878,



lay male converts sink into cold religious indifference, scarcely distinguishable from scepticism, to which not a few pass on.

7. Once more, Ritualists fail to see that fellowship in the Roman Church has proved any warrant or safeguard against doctrinal or moral error in the past. The English Church has, at the worst, originated but two sects,\* Quakers and Methodists: of whom the former have won an honourable name for unbroken peacefulness and unremitting charity; while the latter have diverged less from Catholic standards of doctrine than almost any other large Protestant body. But Rome not only has caused the separation of the East, and the revolt of all Northern Europe, but is the parent or grandparent of every other Western sect, from Socinians to Mormons inclusive, save the secret remnant of the Albigensian Gnostics, and even they were largely recruited from the Franciscans of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is all very well to quote: "They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us" (1 St. John ii. 19, Douai version); but an infallible society which cannot prevent formidable schisms and heresies from growing in its own bosom, and issuing thence to spread themselves outside, does not seem to possess any clear advantage over a fallible one, which has never given rise to one-fiftieth of the mischief, even if charged with that wrought here in England by ex-Roman bishops and priests, under pretext of reformation, in Tudor days.

that the reading Roman Catholic public in London, as estimated by a leading Roman Catholic publisher, consists of no more than six hundred persons. This must mean, not only that most original Roman Catholics have not hitherto been readers, but that most converts give up reading.

\* Plymouth Brethrenism arose in Ireland, and its original parent, the learned John Walker, became a Presbyterian before he founded the sect whence Mr. Darby borrowed his chief ideas.

8. An issue which is broader and more visible than any yet discussed is the wonderful revival of the Church of England itself under Ritualist influence, to which the Abbé Martin has borne generous testimony in that other paper of his, wherein he observes quite truly that the most striking peculiarity about it is that, unlike all merely sectional movements, this one has been and is powerful not only within its own immediate area, nay, its own communion, but is telling strongly on the separatist bodies themselves. His words are :—

“The rising tide is not limited to the members of the Anglican Church ; it has even extended to the Dissenting communities, and to the Wesleyans in particular, . . . . . and it is not one of the least curious and least consoling symptoms, that we find the most implacable enemies of Ritualism carried away by the movement which they wish to oppose. Progress is made in everything : in doctrine, in worship, in charitable works and institutions, and in religious practices ; all have been drawn into the Anglo-Catholic current.”

Now, a Christian can explain an unparalleled and varied movement like this only on the hypothesis of Divine grace. That grace, as theologians agree, may be ordinary or extraordinary in its channels and manifestations. If it be ordinary here in England, then it must prove that the Church of England is a true Catholic body, drawing grace from valid Orders and sacraments, to abandon which would be schism. If it be extraordinary, then God is dealing with us by miracle, and under a special dispensation, as when He sent Elijah and Elisha to minister in the northern kingdom of Israel, with no hint in their teaching that its citizens were bound to go south and be reconciled to the High Priest in Jerusalem ; and it is our duty to wait God's pleasure so long as He is plainly working amongst us, nay, with us as His



instruments; and not to go elsewhere, with, to say the least, small prospect of finding the like tokens of spiritual revival; and none at all of being allowed to undertake like reforms of evils, which is the special work God has given us to do.

9. On this follows a consideration which is perhaps even weightier. While the English Church has during forty years been drawing ever closer to ancient standards of belief and practice—very much as still needs to be done—the Church of Rome has, contrariwise, not only made a brand-new creed with—to cite Bishop Maret (*Du Concile General*, ii., 375)—only one article, “I believe in the Pope” (whereas Ritualists prefer a religion more than eight years old), besides upsetting the moral law by making Liguori a Doctor of the Church, and his “probabilism” her accredited doctrine,\* but has been deteriorating into gross and puerile superstition (Montalembert called it “idolatry”) of the most mechanical type during the same period. The popular cults which, eagerly pushed on by authority, have well-nigh supplanted the religion of the Missal and Breviary, are as thoroughly Pagan in spirit as the revived culture-worship which is the last gospel of Materialism. I tabulated some results of inquiries I made on this head in a paper on

\* By “probabilism” is meant the doctrine that it is permissible in morals to follow a *less* probable opinion which makes *against* the strict observance of the law, rather than a *more* probable opinion which makes *for* that observance. For example, a man of superior rank makes a promise of marriage to a woman of lower station, and confirms it with an oath. He seduces her, and then retracts his promise. The casuists are divided as to the lawfulness of such retraction, but in general allow it. Liguori, summing up the arguments on both sides, lays down that the man is not in the least bound to marry the seduced woman in case his family should think the match disgraceful, for that makes his oath *ipso facto* null, as being about an unlawful thing.—*Theol. Moral.* 4. v. 644. Similarly, Liguori sanctions a witness on oath in a trial denying that the defendant committed the act charged, if in

Ultramontane Popular Literature in the *Contemporary Review* for January 1876, and those who would like a convenient manual of the subject may be referred to "L'Arsenal de la Dévotion, Notes pour servir à l'Histoire des Superstitions," par Paul Parfait (Paris, Georges Decaux). Old-fashioned English Roman Catholics were much exercised in their minds thirty years ago by the new-fangled Italian devotions and cults thrust upon them, some of which Dr. Newman has described as "like a bad dream," but even such a dream is a Paradisiac vision compared with the ghastly nightmares I refer to. And they are not merely tolerated, as erroneous opinions and practices in the Church of England may be, but directly encouraged and forced on by authority, which could at once suppress them if it chose, by reason of its coercive discipline, so that the Roman Church is guilty of heresy, where the English is guilty, at worst, of negligence. Now, I do not profess to say what is the duty of a born

the witness's opinion the act is not itself wrong (*e.g.* agrarian murder in Ireland), unless the proof be so strong already as to make the judge's questions concerning it "legitimate."—*Ib.* 4. ii. 154; 5. iii. 268—270. So, too, a man may lawfully bribe a judge, if he think he will get his own just rights thereby; and the laws against such bribery are to be interpreted as directed only against attempts to secure an unjust sentence.—*Ib.* 5. iii. 212. Theft is dealt with in much the same fashion; as for instance, it is the current "probable" opinion that it is venial to steal small sums from very rich men who do not miss them.—Scavini, *Theol. Mor.*, VII., ii. 4; Liguori, *Opus Moral.*, iii. 519—527. The Congregation of Rites decreed in 1803 that "in all the writings of Alfonso de' Liguori there was not a word that could be justly found fault with." By his elevation to the rank of Doctor of the Church still more is implied,—namely, that it is not lawful to contradict his teaching in any particular, because he did not merely teach *in* the Church, but taught the Church itself.—Benedict XIV., *De Canonizatione*, iv. 2; xi. 11. It is clear that there is thus no fixed moral law now recognized in the Roman Church, for every layman may follow the laxest counsel of any director, and every director may follow the laxest opinion of any casuist.



Roman Catholic, who finds these things in his Church under high sanction, and who knows that he is expected to be at least silent concerning them, if he cannot openly yield them his assent. But there is no question at all that an English clergyman voluntarily taking office in a Church which permits such usages and tenets to be recommended to the faithful, becomes as guilty and responsible as if he had invented them every one himself. And I, for one, have no mind for such accountability.

10. Thus, not only has the Church of Rome lost all security for *faith*, by putting doctrinal truth at the mercy of the caprice of one man, who may be, as predecessors of his have been, insane, wicked, or heretical, yet can now, even when not speaking *ex cathedrâ* (and therefore not infallibly, even on Ultramontane principles) practically force any error into a hundred thousand pulpits during his whole pontificate, if not longer; and lost all security for *morals*, by the acceptance of Probabilism; but owing to the doctrine of Intention (*Conc. Trid.* sess. vii. can. 11), no Roman Catholic can entertain more than a bare hope that any valid *Sacrament* is ever administered in his Church. He cannot be sure of the Orders of the Bishop who confirms, or of the Priest who confesses, him, of the genuineness of any Mass, Absolution, Baptism, or other rite performed by the clergy. Nor is this a mere Anglican cavil; it is openly confessed by Perrone (*De Sacramentis*, iii. 129), who, after saying that in consequence of the doctrine of Intention "disquiet must necessarily arise in the mind as to whether one has been baptized, or has had any other sacrament validly conferred," goes on to allege that in these cases "moral certainty must suffice;" that is, as consultation of Bellarmine's exactly similar teaching shows us,\* the absence of any sure

\* Bellarmine says: "Nor can any one be certain, with the certitude of faith, that he receives a true Sacrament, because a Sacrament cannot

warrant at all, and having to make up one's mind to do without it. So, then, one great dissuasive from joining the Church of Rome is that it now offers much *less* certainty of any kind to its adherents than any other old historical Christian Church.

11. Further, no one can be reconciled to the Roman Church without (a) submitting to one thing which involves express disobedience to a Divine command, the refusal of the Eucharistic chalice to the laity,—an innovation dating only from June 15, 1415—so that the lay convert cuts himself off for life from whatever special grace or benefit is derivable thence, and the convert who takes Orders binds himself to mutilate the administration of the Sacrament; (b) accepting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which, however innocent it might be as a mere speculative opinion, explicitly contradicts the well-nigh unanimous teaching of ancient Christendom,\* and (c) the tenet of Papal Infallibility, which all who have even cursorily examined the evidence know to be a shameless and indefensible figment, repudiated till the other day by many of the greatest Roman Catholic divines, and whose recent promulgation cost the Roman Church many of her most distinguished

be validated without the intention of the minister, and no man can see another's intention."—DISPUT. CONTROV. *De Justif.* III. viii. 5.

\* The Abbé Martin denies this statement. I formally reaffirm it, from personal study of the question, pursued in the course of writing commentaries on Holy Scripture. The strongest passage I have found in its favour is that where St. Augustine says that he had rather not enter on the question (*De Nat. et Grat.* 36), thereby implying that if he did enter on it he would be forced to decide it negatively, as in fact he does elsewhere (*Enarr. in Ps.* xxxiv. 3). And to those who cannot examine the matter for themselves, it suffices to say that up to 1854 the great Dominican Order, the special champion of orthodoxy, always opposed the dogma, while its chief defenders were found in that fruitful nest of wild heresy, the Franciscan Order.



and faithful sons. Some ten years back, a fervent Catholic was arguing with a Protestant on the claims of the Roman Church as evidenced by the great men she continues to produce and attach, and he cited as palmary instances three living names, the first that of a theologian of rare learning, acumen, orthodoxy, and lofty personal character; the second that of a famous lawyer and canonist; the third that of a brilliantly eloquent preacher. They were Döllinger, Schulte, and Hyacinthe. We are bound to keep the faith once delivered to the saints, and these unhappy accretions under the late disastrous Pontificate are no part of that faith, while its last achievement makes the permanence of any ancient dogma whatever in the Roman Church altogether precarious for the future.

12. Next in order comes that very principle, the lack of which is constantly urged against the Ritualists by all their opponents, and notably by the Abbé Martin himself and Father Gallwey, namely, respect for constitutional authority. In the Roman Church this is gone, deliberately abolished by the suicidal act of the bishops at the Vatican Council, which did away with the rights of the whole over a mere part, and substituted a sheer human despotism, held in check, no doubt, but not by recognized and lawful means, for a Divine order. In the English Church authority is dormant and in abeyance, partly from civil encroachments, partly from episcopal unfaithfulness, but it is being struggled for and will be won back, and then put on a firm constitutional basis. The Ritualist view is that old Aristotelian one (Pol. iii. 12), that the whole Church binds the local Church, that the law is above the executive, that autocracy and personal caprice have no place in a true Christian polity. And the first step towards recovery now being made is the re-establishment of diocesan synods, the most ancient tribunals known to the Church Catholic, which, I need

hardly remind the Abbé Martin, have been systematically neglected by the Latin episcopate, despite the injunctions of many Councils, for the last seven centuries, and have now been made practically superfluous by the decrees of 1870. Constitutional order, hateful alike to despots and to mobs, such is the authority we recognize and will obey; but it is in England, not in Rome, far less in an outlying dependency and mere colony of Rome in England, that we must seek it.\*

13. Once more, if the Roman Church be indeed so far superior to the English, its distinctive merits ought at once to shine more clearly in, and be more powerfully influential over, its clerical members. I will ask the Abbé Martin to tell us whether he sincerely thinks the moral standard of the Latin clergy to be as high as that of the English. It is true that there is too much domesticity and too little missionary zeal in the average Anglican parsonage. But what of the relative numbers of black sheep? My own inquiries, made in no unfriendly spirit, have received very gloomy replies indeed from earnest Roman Catholics. And it is matter of notoriety that the prelates of the Roman Curia, who drink daily at the very fountain-head of Ultramontane inspiration, are about as unspiritual a body of men as can be found anywhere. Of what highly-placed Anglican dignitary is it possible to say truly what every one said uncontradicted of two men who lately held the second post in Latin Christendom, as ministers of the Priest-King of a professedly

\* The Abbé Martin defends "the infallible and divine authority of the Church to teach" as "the basis of the Catholic system." So do we. But what say the Vatican decrees? That in faith and morals "the definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irrefragable of themselves, and *not from the consent of the Church.*" Pope Honorius I. gave such a definition once, and the Sixth General Council consequently decreed "Anathema to Honorius the heretic, Pope of Old Rome."



spiritual realm, Cardinals Antonelli and Franchi, to cite no others? And, to touch on another side of the same topic, I learn that, without counting ecclesiastics degraded or interdicted as a punishment for misconduct, at least one hundred French priests, and a still larger number of Italian ones, abandon their clerical life yearly, and retire into a lay position. This, even allowing for the far smaller numbers of the Anglican clergy, is about ten or twelve times the ratio of such secessions here, albeit encouraged by law since 1870, and argues, I apprehend, either loss of faith, despair of reform, or at the very least, thorough disenchantment with the Latin Church when seen too close. Ritualists think that the communion which holds the affection and loyalty of its own officers more surely is likely to be the healthier of the two.

14. There is, besides, the constantly recurring proof of bad faith in nearly all Roman controversy. My own experience of it is large, and I am continually met, not merely by marks of disingenuous artifice in proselytism, nor yet by biassed premises and illogical conclusions, which may be set down to unintentional error, but by unquestionably misleading statements as to matters of historical fact, garbled quotations, incorrect renderings, unverifiable references, and the like, proceeding from persons whom I believe to be quite well aware of the real truth.\* I have no reason to

\* Two recent examples will suffice as fair average ones. 1. Cardinal Manning, in his "True History of the Vatican Council," p. 67, alleges that the book called "Janus" appeared in Germany in the year 1868, and first formally announced the "fable" that Papal infallibility was to be defined by acclamation. The date of the preface of the first edition of "Janus" is July 1869. The facts are (a) that this scheme was devised as far back as the canonization of the Japanese martyrs in 1867; (b) that it was suggested again by the French correspondent's letter in the official Papal organ, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, on February 6th, 1869, about five months before "Janus" appeared; (c) that Mgr. Plantier,

suppose the experience of others who take nothing for granted, but insist on testing every statement, to be different from my own. And the natural conclusion is that if the cause could be adequately supported by true evidence, there would be no inducement to manufacture that which is false. Ritualists do not find it necessary to use such weapons in arguing with their proselytes or opponents, and are therefore justified in believing their position to be morally stronger than the Roman one, though far less imposing, just as a mere humble earthwork surpasses in military value a vast and stately mediæval castle, which one modern siege-piece could easily destroy.

15. Last of all, I would end with one word. The Abbé Martin has spoken truly in saying that the lack of enthusiasm and of the heroic and apostolic spirit has been the most crying defect of the Church of England. He has generously said that Ritualists have got just this very apostolic spirit. There is no doubt at this moment that Roman Catholics in England, and especially Roman Catholic clergymen, are much safer from hostility and molestation than the Ritualist ecclesiastic, who is the one exception made to the equal

Bishop of Nîmes, delivered on *March 26th*, 1869, a Charge in which he urged the definition of infallibility by acclamation, the second (Paris) edition of which was most favourably reviewed in the *Civiltà* of *July 17th*, 1869 (VII. vii. 210). 2. Fr. Gallwey, in his fourth "Lecture on Ritualism" (pp. 127, 128), says: "Going backwards century by century, you arrive at length at the memorable day when, standing on the shore of the typical Lake of Galilee, Jesus of Nazareth said to Simon Peter the fisherman, 'Feed My sheep; feed My lambs.' For 'thou art the rock, and on this rock I will build My Church, and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'" This audacious falsification of the Word of God is not due to the Douai version; which runs thus:—"Thou art Peter," etc. So that Fr. Gallwey has deliberately falsified the words of Christ Himself, from which it may be conjectured how he treats other inconvenient documentary evidence.



64 *The Ritualists and Roman Catholicism.*

protection and incidence of the law. For a Ritualist to become a Roman Catholic, is to pass from the van of battle to the rear, to exchange the cross for the olive-branch. On any theory of Christian conflict, of self-sacrifice and devotion, his nobler and truer post is where the blows are falling thickest, for in that part of the battle is the King.