

CHAPTER X.

THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT.

THE Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom—*Sermons and Essays on Reunion*—Denunciation of Protestantism—Reasonable letter in the *Union Review*—The A. P. U. C. denounced by the Inquisition—Degrading Reply of 198 Church of England Dignitaries and Clergy—Archbishop Manning's opinion of the Romeward Movement—The Society of the Holy Cross Petition for Reunion with Rome—Signed by 1212 clergymen—The English Church Union—Its work for Union with Rome—Approves Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*—Pusey writes that there is nothing in the Pope's "Supremacy" in itself to which he would object—The Catholic Union for Prayer—A Colonial Priest on Reunion with Rome—The "levelling up" process—The real Objects of the English Church Union—The *Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*—Lord Halifax wants Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament—E. C. U. members find fault with the Book of Common Prayer—E. C. U. Petitions the Lambeth Conference for Reunion—Reunion asked for under "The Bishop of Old Rome"—Lord Halifax prefers Leo XIII. to the Privy Council—Dean Hook in favour of the Privy Council—Mr. Maclonochie's Evidence before the Ecclesiastical Courts' Commission—Asserts there has been no "Ecclesiastical Court" since the Reformation—A Ritualistic Curate supplies the "Kernel" to Roman Ritual—He preaches the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary—Lord Halifax and "Explanations" of the Pope's Infallibility—The *Homilies* on the Church of Rome—Rome has already reaped a harvest from Ritualistic labours—Secession as well as Union a Scriptural duty—Objections to Reunion with Rome.

THE time at length arrived when it was thought desirable by those who longed for the Corporate Reunion of the Church of England with the Eastern Church and the Church of Rome, to band themselves into societies to promote the object they had at heart. Some of these societies made the Reunion question a part only of their programme; but from the commencement of its existence the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom laboured for this one object alone. This

Association was founded at a private meeting held in the parish of St. Clement Danes, Strand, London, on September 8th, 1857, on the motion of a Roman Catholic layman, seconded by a Church of England clergyman, and supported by members of the Greek Church. At that meeting thirty-four persons joined the infant Association.¹ In a statement issued by one of its chief officers (the Rev. F. G. Lee) in 1864, it was mentioned that in that year it had grown into a membership of 7099, of whom "nearly a thousand" were Roman Catholics, and about three hundred were "members of the Eastern Church." Mr. Lee also affirmed that, "The Association has been approved in the highest ecclesiastical quarters, both amongst Latins, Anglicans, and Greeks. The Holy Father gave his blessing to the scheme when first started, and repeated that blessing with a direct and kindly commendation to one of the English secretaries, who was more recently granted the honour of a special interview."² In an appendix to the volume of sermons from which I have just quoted, and which was "Printed for certain members of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom," an official prospectus of the Association is printed, in which it is mentioned that "*the names of members will be kept strictly private.*"³ On the occasion of its seventh anniversary Masses were said for the success of its work not merely by ordinary clergymen, but even by Archbishops, Bishops, and Monks, and these were offered in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Austria, Prussia, Denmark, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Malta, North America, South America, and South Africa.⁴

The Association still exists, and at the present time numbers upwards of ten thousand members, but from its birth until now it has never, so far as I can ascertain,

¹ *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*, Vol. I., pp. x., xi.

² *Ibid.*, p. xii.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 329

⁴ *The Church and the World*, Vol. I., p. 201.

printed a list of its members, not even for its own private use, so afraid are they lest their names should be found out. In the prospectus just referred to there is printed a short list of Diocesan Secretaries, and of persons to whom applications for information could be made, but as to the rank and file of the Association nobody knows who they are, excepting the head officials. In January, 1863, the *Union Review* was founded by members of the Association, and was subsequently conducted by them, though the Association as such was not held responsible for its contents. But inasmuch as it expressed the views held by those who guided the Association, it may not be considered as inappropriate if I give here a few extracts from it, which show its thoroughly Romanizing character.

"It is a shocking scandal that one of the Homilies of the Established Church should even contain *heretical* reasoning against the belief in a state of connection [*Sic.* Probably *correction* is meant] hereafter, and the benefit of prayers for the departed."⁵

"The English Church is in a state of penance; her daily Sacrifice taken away, and the perpetual Presence on her Altars withdrawn, except in a few favoured places where both have lately been restored."⁶

"The hair shirt, and the spiked cross or belt, sacrificing bodily ease altogether, with the sharper but less wearing means by which the various Acts of the Passion may be followed and sympathized with step by step, are all *valuable* in their several degrees, but require adaptation to particular cases."⁷

"We venture to say, heresy has been practically triumphant for three hundred years together, through the Prayer Book."⁸

"We will not tamely accept the illogical and incomplete system which the Reformers have left us in the Prayer Book as it is."⁹

Perhaps the most remarkable document ever printed in the *Union Review* was a lengthy letter written by a member of the Association to a Roman Catholic priest in Germany. The thoroughly Jesuitical and traitorous character of the Ritualistic Movement is therein very candidly revealed by

⁵ *Union Review*, Vol. III., p. 147.

Ibid., p. 395.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 397, *note*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 621.

Ibid., p. 626.

one of its warmest friends. He announced that for the previous twenty-five years—*i.e.*, from 1842—the leaders of the party had been preaching “the Catholic faith,” and that their doctrines had “*secretly* yet surely been working, like the leaven,” during that period.¹⁰ From this noteworthy letter I give the subjoined additional extracts:—

“Our belief is that the Church of which we are members is Catholic in her Faith, and Catholic in her usages, and that *Protestantism in any shape and form has no legal place within her.*”¹¹

“Day and night—in the Church, and in the closets—there ascend in England from thousands of mourning hearts, smitten with a sense of their bereavement, the fervent expressions of an intense longing of a burning desire for the restoration to our unhappy country of this most glorious privilege of Visible Unity [with the Church of Rome]. *Here you have the real heart and soul of the present Movement; this is the centre from which its pulsations vibrate, and from which its life blood flows.*”¹²

“At the outset of this Union Movement our eyes turned Eastward, rather than rest on the spot on which now they so love to dwell. For now, at last, is God mercifully removing the scales from our eyes. Every year we begin to understand you [the Church of Rome] better, and, therefore, to love you more.”¹³

“Here, in a sense of the danger of the common foe, and of the identity of that Faith which is to overcome him, we hope to find one strong force of attraction to draw not only the Protestant to us, but both together to you [Rome]. But when? ah! when? The time cannot be so very far off. The strides which have been made during the last ten years are enormous; and, as I say, we are all, however opposed, moving on together.”¹⁴

“I hope I have now said enough to justify any convictions that there is no reason for discouragement, on either of these two heads, but that it is reasonable to hope that at the end of this third period, say twenty years hence, Catholicism will have so leavened our Church, that she herself in her corporal capacity, and not a mere small section of her, like ourselves, will be able to come to you [the Church of Rome] and say:—‘Let the hands which political force, not spiritual choice, have parted these three hundred years, be once more joined. *We are one with you in Faith, and we have a common foe to fight.*”

¹⁰ *Union Review*, Vol. V., p. 379.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 380.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 398.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 400.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 408.

There may be a few divergencies of practice on our side. *We seek to make no terms*; we come only in the spirit of love and of humility; but at the same time we feel sure that the Chief Shepherd of the Flock of Christ [the Pope] will deal tenderly with us, and place no yoke upon us which we are not able to bear." ¹⁶

"With such hopes, then, and with such a position, it is surely, I say, much better for us to remain working where we are, for what would become of England, if we were to leave her Church? She would be simply lost to Catholicism, and won to Rationalism. . . . *Depend upon it, it is only through the English Church itself that England can be Catholicised.*" ¹⁶

"The work now going on in England is an earnest and carefully organized attempt, on the part of a rapidly increasing body of priests and laymen, to bring our Church and country up to the full standard of Catholic Faith and practice, and eventually to plead for her union with you [the Church of Rome]." ¹⁷

The object of the Oxford Movement is very truthfully revealed in the last of these extracts from the *Union Review*. Corporate Reunion with the Church of Rome has ever been the great aim of the wire-pullers of the Oxford Movement. This necessarily involves the death of the Reformation Movement of the sixteenth century, at least within the Church of England, and implies that the Reformation was a sin, if not a crime. Here and there some uninfluential Ritualist is now heard to declare that he wants nothing of the kind, but it is well to remember, when we hear such statements, that the movements of an army are not guided by the views of the rank and file, but by the wills of the commanding officers. The language of this article in the *Union Review* is clearly that of a traitor, who remains within the camp of the Church of England for the sole purpose of doing his best to deprive her of her independence and liberty, and hand her over to the tyranny of her greatest enemy. And the strange thing is that this writer's traitorous article was never repudiated by the leaders of the Ritualistic party. There is reason to believe that it only

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 408, 409.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 412.

too accurately represented their views of the situation. Before parting with the *Union Review* I may be permitted to give two more quotations from subsequent volumes:—

“We have grown wiser than some of our forefathers; on questions of doctrine, of ritual, and of religious practice, such for instance as the Confessional, *we are separated but a hair's breadth from Rome*; we no longer consider ourselves involved in the guilt and peril of idolatry, if, when we are abroad, we frequent the service of the Mass; we prefer Notre Dame to the Little Bethels of French Protestantism, *and claim affinity with Rome* or the Orientals rather than with Luther or Calvin.”¹⁸

“By way of suggesting something practical ourselves, we will in this paper recommend, as a first and *essential* preliminary towards the Reunion of Christendom, the total abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles.”¹⁹

The members of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom were very zealous in furthering the work they had on hand. The papers of the Association were translated into several Continental languages, and the members, while travelling abroad, scattered these papers broadcast throughout Europe. In England its work was brought before the public chiefly in connection with special services in churches, on which occasions the Ritual adopted was of the most advanced type. The cause of the Association was also advocated through the press by means of letters in Ritualistic and other newspapers, warmly advocating Reunion with Rome and the East. Nor was their zeal confined to the periodical press. Two volumes of *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom* were issued by the members, several of them from the pens of Roman Catholic and Greek clergymen. These were followed, in 1867, by a remarkable volume of *Essays on the Reunion of Christendom*, which, at the time of its publication, attracted a great deal of public attention. The Association, as such, disclaimed any official responsibility for the opinions expressed either in the *Essays* or in the *Sermons*, each member of the

¹⁸ *Union Review*, Volume for 1869, p. 373. ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Volume for 1870, p. 289.

Association who contributed to the volumes being held responsible only for his own utterances. Probably the *Essays* would not have been so widely read were it not that the "Introductory Essay" was written by the Rev. Dr. Pusey, who, as my readers are already aware, had for many years been labouring zealously to promote Corporate Reunion with Rome, and had written two or three volumes on the subject. In his "Introductory Essay" Dr. Pusey wrote:—

"The idea itself, that the Council of Trent might be legitimately explained, so that it could be received by Anglo-Catholics, and that our Articles contain nothing which is, in its grammatical sense, adverse to the Council of Trent, remains untouched and unrepudiated. And this is the intellectual basis of a future union, when God shall have disposed men's hearts on both sides to look the difficulties in the face, and the presence of the common foe, unbelief, shall have driven them together."²⁰

There are other articles in this collection of *Essays on Reunion* which call for attention here. The writers are more outspoken than Dr. Pusey, on some points, though on all important matters they seem to agree. Canon Humble, a member of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who wrote on "The Exigency of Truth," evidently believed in the doctrine of "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge," for, in a spirit which I must term Jesuitical, he declared that—

"There are many who are quite willing to admit the Primacy, or even more, of the Bishop of Rome, who do not therefore see that they are in anywise bound to proclaim their belief to all the world by immediately joining the Roman Communion."²¹

"Had men listened to the voice of God, in place of giving reins to their violent tempers, we can scarcely doubt that Rome would have become a Monarchy by assent of the whole Church."²²

"The Primacy of Rome was given to her, certainly not by the Church, but by the great Head Himself. . . . Rome was allowed to have the first place under the Patriarchal system, but she had that which no General Council could either give or take away. She was

²⁰ *Essays on Reunion*, p. xxviii.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 26.

constituted to be the strength and support of all other Churches—the centre round which all others should gather.”²³

The marvel is how a man who could write like this did not consistently act upon his principles, and go over to Rome at once. Only on principles which are commonly termed Jesuitical could he remain as a Minister of a Church which refuses to acknowledge either the Primacy or Supremacy of the Pope. What he terms “the Exigency of Truth” alone compelled him to remain where he was, with a view to Corporate Reunion with Rome. The Rev. George Nugee, then Vicar of Wymering, wrote, in these *Essays on Reunion*, an article on “A Conference of Theologians,” in which he, as a clergyman of the Church of England, affirmed that “the Supremacy need not be an abiding hindrance to Reunion.”²⁴ If this be so, it follows that the Protestant Reformation was nothing less than a grave error, and the sooner it is undone the better. Loyal Churchmen, however, are of a different opinion. They believe that the Reformation was one of the greatest blessings God has given to England, and that it would be a sin and a disgrace to undo its glorious work. Papal Supremacy, in any shape or form, is an insuperable barrier to Reunion with Rome. There is nothing good to be obtained by it; but it is certain that we should obtain much that is evil, and lose our civil and religious liberties. The Protestantism of England is also, on the other hand, as long as it remains, an insuperable barrier to the Reunion schemes of these Romanizers. They realize this fact to the full, and consequently they do everything in their power to give Protestantism a bad name, as a preliminary to its final removal. This was very candidly admitted by the Rev. W. Percival Ward, Rector of Compton Valence, in his paper on “The Difficulties of Reunion,” which I have already quoted (see p. 261), but which will bear repetition here:—

²³ *Essays on Reunion*, pp. 27, 28.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 83

"The first great hindrance," he wrote, "that is before us arises from the *Protestantism of England*. Till this is removed, the Reunion of our Church, as the Church of England, with either the Greek, or Latin Churches, is *absolutely hopeless*."²⁵

Here we find a strong reason for maintaining, and even increasing, the Protestantism of the Established Church. So long as it exists Reunion with Rome is "hopeless." It is Protestantism which, by God's help, has been the cause of England's prosperity, and of that of all other Protestant countries. While Roman Catholic countries, which acknowledge Papal Supremacy, are everywhere going down in the scale of nations, Protestant countries are everywhere growing in prosperity, and extending their borders on every hand. The Protestant nations are at the head of the world, in everything which make nations truly great and glorious. We have therefore no reason to be ashamed of the word Protestantism, though we have just cause for being ashamed of the men in the Church of England who are trying to destroy that religion which gives them their daily bread. The man who bites the hand which feeds him is justly held in contempt.

Another of the articles in the *Essays on Reunion*, which was written anonymously, very candidly, and in the most brazen-faced fashion, unblushingly boasted that the Ritualists were doing the work of the Church of Rome within the Church of England. Any honest man of business would say that if they were doing Rome's work they ought to receive Rome's pay, and not that of the Church of England. But it is to be feared that large numbers of Ritualists possess what the Apostle terms a "conscience seared with a hot iron" (1 Tim. iv. 2)—hardened, and past feeling. What I have just said may, at first sight, seem to some of my readers, almost incredible, and therefore I give below the actual words of this Ritualistic writer—

"The marvel is, that Roman Catholics whatever their views may

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

be, do not see the wisdom of aiding us to the utmost. Admitting that we are but a lay body with no pretensions to the name of a Church, we yet, in our belief (however mistaken) that we are one, are doing for England that which they cannot do. We are teaching men to believe that God is to be worshipped under the form of Bread, and they are learning the lesson from us which they have refused to learn from the Roman teachers, who have been among us for the last three hundred years. We are teaching men to endure willingly the pain of Confession, which is an intense trial to the reserved Anglo-Saxon nature, and to believe that a man's 'I absolve thee' is the voice of God. How many English Protestants have Roman priests brought to Confession, compared with the Anglican clergy? Could they have overcome the English dislike to 'mummery' as we are overcoming it? **ON ANY HYPOTHESIS, WE ARE DOING THEIR WORK."**²⁶

These traitors within the camp knew very well that the Church of Rome would not care to have the Church of England even as a present, unless she had first of all repented of her Protestantism, and adopted Romish doctrines and practices. Consequently their great efforts, for the time being, centred round the "Catholicising" work described in the above statement.

"Let us be assured," wrote the Rev. T. W. Mossman, Rector of West Torrington, "that the Roman and Greek Churches cannot, if they would, hold out the right hand of fellowship to us, *so long as we are uncatholic in our practice*. . . . We see then most clearly, as the conclusion of the whole matter, that by adopting and promoting really Catholic Ritual observances, we are, as far as in us lies, promoting in the most effectual way possible the accomplishment of Visible Unity and intercommunion amongst all parts of the Church; and that by neglecting or opposing Catholic Ritual we are doing our best, or our worst, to hinder the glorious consummation of the visible, corporate Reunion of the whole Christian family."²⁷

For several years after the formation of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, Roman Catholics were permitted to join it. As we have already seen, large numbers of them became members, and Masses for its object were offered in several Romish countries.

²⁶ *Essays on Reunion*, p. 180.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 288, 289.

But in April, 1864, the Roman Catholic Bishops in England seem to have become alarmed as to possible dangers to their people, through being joined together with non-Romanists in religious work. They, accordingly, addressed a letter to the Inquisition on the subject, asking for an authoritative decision on the question. On September 16th, 1864, the Inquisition sent its official reply, signed by Cardinal Patrizi, to the Bishops, condemning the A. P. U. C., and ordering all Roman Catholics to withdraw from it. From this document I give the subjoined extracts:—

“It has been notified to the Apostolic See that some Catholics and even ecclesiastics, have given their names to a Society established in London in the year 1857, ‘for promoting’ (as it is called) ‘the Unity of Christendom’; and that several articles have been published in the public papers signed with the names of Catholics, in approval of this Society, or supposed to have been written by ecclesiastics in its favour. Now, the real character and aim of the Society are plain, not only from the articles in the Journal called the *Union Review*, but from the very prospectus in which persons are invited to join it, and are enrolled as members. Organized and conducted by Protestants,²⁸ it has resulted from a view, put forth by it in express terms, that the three Christian Communions, the Roman Catholic, the schismatic Greek, and the Anglican, though separated and divided one from another, have yet an equal claim to the title of Catholic. Hence its doors are open to all men whencesoever—Catholics, schismatic Greeks, or Anglicans—but so that none shall moot the question of the several points of doctrine in which they differ, and each may follow undisturbed the opinions of his own religious profession. . . .

“The Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office, to whose scrutiny the matter has been referred as usual, has judged, after mature consideration, that the faithful should be warned with all care against being led by heretics to join with them and with schismatics in entering this Association. The most Eminent Fathers the Cardinals, placed with myself over the Sacred Inquisition, entertain, indeed, no doubt that the Bishops of those parts address themselves already with diligence, according to the charity and learning which distinguish

²⁸ Roman Catholic controversialists persist in calling Ritualists “Protestants,” though they repudiate the name. I need hardly add that no true Protestant would ever join a Society to pray for Reunion with Rome.

them, to point out the evils which that Association diffuses, and to repel the dangers it is bringing on. Yet they would seem wanting to their office, did they not, in a matter of such moment, further enkindle the said Bishops' pastoral zeal; this novelty being all the more perilous as it bears a semblance of religion, and of being much concerned for the unity of the Christian society.

"The principle on which it rests is one that overthrows the Divine constitution of the Church. For it is pervaded by the idea that the true Church of Jesus Christ consists partly of the Roman Church spread abroad and propagated throughout the world, partly of the Photian schism and the Anglican heresy, as having equally with the Roman Church, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism. . . . The Catholic Church offers prayers to Almighty God, and urges the faithful in Christ to pray, that all who have left the Holy Roman Church, out of which is no salvation, may abjure their errors and be brought to the true faith, and the peace of that Church, nay, that all men may, by God's merciful aid, attain to a knowledge of the truth. But that the faithful in Christ, and that ecclesiastics, should pray for Christian unity under the direction of heretics, and, worse still, according to an intention stained and infected by heresy in a high degree, can no way be tolerated. . . .

"Hence, no proof is needed that Catholics who join this Society are giving both to Catholics and non-Catholics an occasion of spiritual ruin: more especially, because the Society, by holding out a vain expectation of those three communions, each in its integrity, and keeping each to its own persuasion, coalescing in one, lead the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith, and, by the Journals it publishes, endeavours to prevent it.

"The most anxious care, then, is to be exercised, that no Catholics may be deluded, either by appearance of piety or by unsound opinions, to join or in any way favour the Society in question, or any similar one; that they may not be carried away by a delusive yearning for such new-fangled Christian unity, into a fall from that perfect unity which by a wonderful gift of Divine Grace stands on the firm foundation of Peter.

"C. CARD. PATRIZI."

"ROME, this 16th day of September, 1864."²⁹

The issuing of this document was, indeed, a terrible blow to the promoters of the A. P. U. C. It not merely proclaimed

²⁹ I quote from the official Roman Catholic translation, in *Synodi Dioeceseo Suthwarcensis, Londini, 1868*, pp. 186-190.

war against the Association, but treated it with unmitigated contempt. Its members are termed "heretics"; and the Association is declared to be engaged in the task of "diffusing evils," and producing "dangers" in the Church. Its chief "principle" is even said to "overthrow the Divine constitution of the Church"; and its "intention" is declared to be "stained and infected with heresy in a high degree." But some of the Ritualists seem to take a special delight in humbly kissing the Papal toe which has just kicked them. No fewer than 198 clergymen of the Church of England, members of the A. P. U. C., answered the document issued by the Inquisition of cruel and evil memory, with an address of contemptible humiliation and explanation. The one thing they seemed to dread was to offend the Pope. Not a thought of the effect of their traitorous conduct on the Protestants of England ever seems to have entered their heads. They put their names to their address, but, no doubt, with the knowledge that none of the public would ever know who they were. The secret has been kept ever since. What a storm of indignation would have swept over them, had their identity been known at the time to the people amongst whom they ministered! It will be observed that some of them held high office in the Church of England, describing themselves as "Deans" and "Canons." Their address to what they termed "the *Sacred Office*" of the Inquisition is not generally known, and therefore I print it in full:—

"To the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Father in Christ and Lord C. Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Sacred Office.

"We, the undersigned Deans, Canons, Parish Priests, and other Priests of the Anglo-Catholic Church, earnestly desiring the visible reunion, according to the will of our Lord, of the several parts of the Christian family, have read with great regret your Eminence's letter 'to all the English Bishops.'

"In that letter, our Society, instituted to promote the Reunion of all Christendom, is charged with affirming in its prospectus that 'the

three Communions, the Roman Catholic, the Eastern, and the Anglican, have an equal claim to call themselves Catholic.'

"On that question our prospectus gave no opinion whatever. What we said, treated of the question of *fact*, not of *right*. We merely affirmed that the Anglican Church claimed the name of Catholic; as is abundantly plain to all, both from the Liturgy and the Articles of Religion.

"Moreover, as to the intention of our Society, that letter asserts our especial aim to be, 'that the three Communions named, each in its integrity and each maintaining still its own opinions, may coalesce into one.'

"Far from us and from our Society be such an aim as this; from which must be anticipated, not ecclesiastical unity, but merely a discord of brethren in personal conflict under one roof. What we beseech Almighty God to grant, and desire with all our hearts, is simply that œcumenical intercommunion which existed before the separation of East and West, founded and consolidated on the profession of one and the same Catholic faith.

"Moreover, the Society aforesaid should all the less excite your jealousy that it abstains from action, and simply prays, in the words of Christ our Lord, 'May there be one Fold and one Shepherd.' This alone finds place in our hearts' desire, and this is the principle and the yearning we express to your Eminence with the utmost earnestness, with sincere heart and voice unfeigned.

"As to the Journal entitled the *Union Review*, the connection between it and the Society is purely accidental, and we are, therefore, in no way pledged to its *dicta*. In that little work, various writers put forth indeed their own opinions, but only to the further elucidation of the truth of the Catholic faith by developing them. That such a mode of contributing papers should not be in use in Rome, where the controversies of the day are seldom under discussion, is hardly to be wondered at; but in England, where almost every question becomes public property, none results in successful conviction without free discussion.

"To hasten this event, we have now laboured during many years. We have effected improvements beyond what could be hoped for, where the faith of the flock, or Divine worship, or clerical discipline, may have been imperfect; and, not to be forgetful of others, WE HAVE CULTIVATED A FEELING OF GOODWILL TOWARDS THE VENERABLE CHURCH OF ROME, that has for a long time caused some to mistrust us.

"We humbly profess ourselves your Eminence's servants, devoted to Catholic unity."³⁰

On this document, and the reply given to it by the Inquisition, Cardinal Manning addressed a pastoral letter to the clergy, entitled the *Reunion of Christendom*. In this document, while firmly upholding the decision of the Inquisition forbidding Roman Catholics to join the A. P. U. C., Dr. Manning showed how much he rejoiced in his heart at the work of that Society. Of the address to the Inquisition, by 198 Church of England clergymen, he wrote:—

"We do not regard this as a merely intellectual or natural event. We gladly recognize in it an influence and an impulse of supernatural grace. It is a wonderful reaction from the days within living memory when fidelity to the Church of England was measured by repulsion from the Church of Rome. It is as wonderful an evidence of the flow in the stream which has carried the minds of men onwards for these thirty years nearer and nearer to the frontiers of the Catholic faith. It is a movement against the wind and tide of English tradition and of English prejudice; a supernatural movement like the attraction which drew those who were once farthest from the Kingdom of Heaven to the side of our Lord. A change has visibly passed over England. Thirty years ago its attitude towards the Catholic Church was either intense hostility or stagnant ignorance. It is not so now."³¹

At this period Dr. Manning seems to have devoted a great deal of his attention to the Romeward Movement in the Church of England. He thankfully acknowledged the services rendered by the Ritualists to the Church of Rome, and simply laughed to scorn their boast that they kept their followers from joining the Church of Rome by giving to them Popery within the Church of England, in order that it might be unnecessary for them to go to Rome for it. In the course of his inaugural address to the Roman Catholic Academia, in 1866, Archbishop Manning entered at considerable length

³⁰ Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. II., pp. 279, 280.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

into the effects of Ritualism on the prosperity of the Church of Rome in England. He said:—

“In the last thirty years there has sprung up in the Anglican Establishment an extensive rejection of Protestantism, and a sincere desire and claim to be Catholic. Ever since the Reformation, indeed, the writers of the Anglican Church have claimed to be Catholic; but none that I know disclaimed to be Protestant. They assumed that a Protestant Christian was *ipso facto* a primitive Catholic. Not so now. Protestantism is recognized as a thing intrinsically untenable and irreconcilable with the Catholic faith. The school of which I speak claim to be Catholic because they reject Protestantism with all its heterodoxies. In this school are to be found many Catholic doctrines, not exactly or fully expressed or believed—for such are not to be found either full or exact outside of the Catholic Church—but more or less near to truth. For instance, the Church of England forbids the use of the term Transubstantiation, by declaring the doctrine to be an error. The doctrine of the Real Presence, less Transubstantiation, is like the doctrine of one God in three Persons, less the doctrine of the Trinity. Not only is the term rejected, but the conception is correspondingly inaccurate. This runs through all the Catholic doctrines which are professed out of the unity of the Church, and apart from the traditions of its sacred terminology. It is under this limitation that I go on to say that at this time the doctrine of the Sacraments, their nature, number, and grace; the intercession and invocation of saints, the power of the priesthood in sacrifice and absolution, the excellence and obligations of the religious life, are all held and taught by clergymen of the Church of England. Add to this, the practice of Confession, and of works of temporal and spiritual mercy in form and by rule borrowed from the Catholic Church, are all to be found among those who are still within the Anglican communion. I must also add the latest and strangest phenomenon of this movement, the adoption of an elaborate ritual with its vestments borrowed from the Catholic Church.

“On all these things I trust a blessing may descend. I see in them many things: First, they are a testimony in favour of the Catholic Church, which has always unchangeably taught and practised these things; secondly, a testimony against the Anglican Reformation, which has always rejected and cast them out.”²³

“Every parish priest happily knows how empty and foolish is the

²³ *Essays on Religion and Literature*, pp. 12, 13. Second series.

boast they [Ritualists] make of keeping souls from conversion [to the Church of Rome]. The public facts of every day refute it. They may keep back the handful who surround them, and hide the truth from their own hearts, but the steady current of return to the Catholic and Roman Church throughout the whole of England is no more to be affected by them than the rising of the tide by the palms of their hands. Against their will, certainly, and perhaps without their knowledge, they are sending on numberless souls into the truth which they probably will never enter. But the number of those [Ritualists] whose good faith is doubtful is not great. The multitude of those who are drawn by a simple and natural reverence to clothe what they sincerely believe with a becoming ritual, and who worship piously and humbly in Churches which might almost be mistaken for ours . . . is very great, and is perhaps continually increasing. They are coming up to the very threshold of the Church. They have learned to look upon it as the centre of Christendom, from which they sprang, and upon which their own Church is supposed to rest. They use our devotions, our books, our pictures of piety; they are taught to believe the whole Catholic doctrine, and to receive the whole Council of Trent, not indeed in its own true meaning, but in a meaning invented by their teachers. This cannot last long. Such teachers are, as Fuller quaintly and truly says, like unskilful horsemen. They so open gates as to shut themselves out, but let others through." ³³

Since the year 1867 the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom has not come very prominently before the public. But it has worked in private ever since, in ways with which the outer world is not generally acquainted. It is advertised in several of the Ritualistic annuals, and twice a year "Celebrations" for the "intention" of the Society are offered in English, Scottish, and Colonial Churches. The Church of Rome no longer gives the Association any help; she only reaps the fruit of its labours.

Amongst the Ritualistic societies which, as a portion only of their operations, advocate and labour for the Corporate Reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome, is the secret Society of the Holy Cross. In the year 1867, at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, this Society

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

issued an *Address to Catholics*, in which its deep, heartfelt longings for Reunion with Rome found expression.

"It may well be," says this *Address*, "nay, it is, a *very grievous drawback* to the Church of England that she is not now in visible communion with the Western Patriarchate."³⁴

By the "Western Patriarchate" is, of course, meant that of the Church of Rome. I venture to assert that the majority of loyal Churchmen are quite certain that the absence, during the past three centuries, of "visible communion" with Rome, instead of being "a very grievous drawback to the Church of England," is, in reality, a great blessing for which England cannot be too thankful to Almighty God. It is no "drawback" to either individuals, nations, or Churches, to be spiritually free from Papal bondage. Should the S. S. C. gain its objects, then farewell for ever to our religious liberty!

During the few months immediately preceding the Wolverhampton Church Congress, of 1867, the authorities of the Society of the Holy Cross were busily engaged in securing signatures, from both clergy and laity, to an *Address to the Bishops* assembled that year, at the first Lambeth Conference. The Romeward leanings of the Society, which was described at that time, by a Ritualistic newspaper, as "a shy and retiring organization,"³⁵ are still more clearly seen in this *Address*, which was publicly advertised at the time as emanating from the S. S. C. The following extract from this document will be read with disapprobation by all who love the freedom of the Church of England, and believe that it would be a sin to join the Roman communion, whether individually or corporately:—

"We are mindful of efforts made in former time by English and foreign Bishops and theologians *to effect*, by mutual explanations on either side, a *reconciliation between the Roman and Anglican Communions*. And, considering the intimate and visible union which existed between

³⁴ S. S. C. *Address to Catholics*, p. 13.

³⁵ *Church News*, August 21, 1867, p. 372.

the Church of England and the rest of Western Christendom, we earnestly entreat your lordships seriously to consider the best means of renewing like endeavours; and to adopt such measures as may, under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, be effectual in REMOVING THE BARRIERS which now divide the Western Branch of the Catholic Church."³⁶

I do not know any expression which more clearly and accurately describes the work of the Ritualists than that of "removing the barriers" between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Those "barriers" were set up by our Reformers, nearly 350 years ago, and for good and sufficient reasons. They are as much needed now as ever, for Rome has not improved, but has rather grown worse, since the Reformation. It is, therefore, the bounden duty of all who love the Reformation, whatever may be their ecclesiastical or social position, however exalted, or however humble, to resist all attempts at removing them, whether those attempts are made by the secret Society of the Holy Cross, or by any other Ritualistic society or individual. This S. S. C. Address to the Lambeth Conference was signed by no fewer than 1212 clergymen in the Church of England, and by 4453 of the laity, of whom 1995 were women.³⁷ It will no doubt surprise many of my readers to learn that so far back as the year 1867 such a large number of clergymen were found anxious for "a reconciliation between the Roman and Anglican Communions." If so many could be found then, is there not good reason for fearing that the number has multiplied since, and that the dangers to our Church from this Romeward Movement have multiplied also? A few names only of those who signed this Address were published in the papers—the great majority of them are unknown until this day. Amongst others, it was signed by the Rev. Dr. Pusey; the late Canon H. P. Liddon; Canon T. T. Carter, of Clewer; the Rev. W. Butler, late Dean of Lincoln; the Rev. F. H. Murray, then and now Rector of

³⁶ *Ibid.*, September 11th, 1867, p. 426. ³⁷ *Ibid.*, September 25th, 1867, p. 455.

Chislehurst; the Rev. R. M. Benson, then head of the Cowley Fathers; the Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas, now Vicar of St. Paul's, Worcester; the Rev. A. Wagner, Vicar of St. Paul's, Brighton; Rev. P. G. Medd, now Rector of North Cerney, Cirencester; the Rev. G. R. Prynne, Vicar of St. Peter's, Plymouth; the Hon. Colin Lindsay, then President of the English Church Union, and subsequently a seceder to Rome; and the Hon. C. L. Wood, now Lord Halifax, and the present President of the English Church Union.

The secrecy which surrounds the work of the Society of the Holy Cross has prevented me from learning much as to its operations in furtherance of Reunion with Rome since 1867, but I have heard nothing which would lead me to suppose that it has withdrawn from the position which it then adopted. There can be no doubt that during that period it has laboured zealously in Romanizing the services of the Church of England, and it even went so far as to make the adoption of "Roman Ritual" the rule for the Brethren to follow. And it has certainly laboured hard ever since 1867 in teaching Romish doctrine. The Master of the Society, in his Address to the September, 1876, Synod, went so far as to declare that "no Brother [of the S. S. C.] should be considered disloyal to the Society who agrees in opinion with the rest of Western Christendom, except in one article, or its immediate consequences, which denies that the Brother himself is a Catholic."³⁸ The "one article" here referred to, there can be no question, was that of Papal Infallibility. A man can therefore agree with every other doctrine of "the rest of Western Christendom," that is, with the Church of Rome, without being in any way "disloyal" to the Society of the Holy Cross. That, no doubt, is the case; but here the important question comes in, Is not such a man "disloyal" to the Church of England? At the September, 1878, Synod of the S. S. C. the following resolution proposed

³⁸ The *Master's Address*. Festival of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, 1876, p. 5.

by Brother Lowder, and seconded by Brother Goldie, was carried *nem. con.*:—"That this Synod regards with much interest the attempts to revive the life and action of the A. P. U. C. [Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom], and holds that the time is now come for its adopting some more practical measures for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom, and in particular that the S. S. C. would desire to co-operate with the A. P. U. C. in obtaining the sanction of the Catholic Patriarchs of Western and Eastern Christendom for freedom to English Catholics to communicate at Catholic altars in foreign countries."³⁹ In the course of the discussion which took place on this resolution, Brother Mossman informed the Brethren that the Order of Corporate Reunion "had arisen out of the yearning of many hearts for visible unity and communion with the See of Peter. He gave an account of an interview he had had with Cardinal Manning, to whom he had mentioned four points which, he believed, would be urged by the Catholic party in any negotiations with the Holy See. (1) The recognition of Anglican Orders; (2) the marriage of priests; (3) the giving of the chalice to the laity; (4) the Liturgy in the vernacular. The answers of his Eminence had been satisfactory, though he would not commit himself to speak authoritatively on the matter."⁴⁰ At this same Synod the Society of the Holy Cross considered its attitude towards the Order of Corporate Reunion, and a Committee was appointed to consider the subject. Subsequently the Society adopted and published the Report of this Committee. It was decidedly against the O. C. R. The conclusion arrived at is contained in the following paragraph:—"We therefore hold that the assumed jurisdiction of the Order of Corporate Reunion is without any lawful foundation, that its claims cannot be substantiated, and that Catholics should therefore be warned against joining the Association, as involving

³⁹ *S. S. C. Analysis of Proceedings*, September Synod, 1878, pp 9-11.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

themselves thereby in the guilt of schism, and probably of sacrilege." ⁴¹

One of the members of the Society of the Holy Cross, the Rev. N. Y. Birkmyre, Vicar of St. Simon's, Bristol, gave expression, in 1888, to his wishes for Reunion in a very candid manner indeed. He was preaching for the Church of England Working Men's Society on that occasion, and, speaking for himself and the Society, he declared:—

"We must never be content to settle down till the Church of England can say boldly, not by the mouth of two or three individuals, but by the mouths of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church, to the Sister Churches:—'See, here we have cast out from ourselves Protestantism, we now every one of us believe and use the Sacraments, and now we say, receive us again into inter-communion, let us all be one again.' . . . And the second great danger is the idea of building up a modified, but still practically a National religion. People say that the Church of Greece and the Church of Rome teach one thing, and the Church of England something else, but if the Church of England teaches anything about the Blessed Sacrament different from the others she teaches a lie. No, we must understand that the teaching is one." ⁴²

Another Ritualistic Society, which has made Corporate Reunion with Rome one of the planks in its platform, is the English Church Union. In its earlier years this subject was kept somewhat in the background, and when mentioned in public was generally referred to as "the Corporate Reunion of Christendom," a convenient expression which may mean more or less according to the intention of the person who uses it. The attitude of the Union was to a large extent that which it adopted, in its earlier years towards Ritual. Its rules did not fully reveal their plans to the public. One of the most prominent members of the Union, the Rev. T. W. Perry, at an ordinary meeting of that Society on February 16th, 1869, very candidly explained

⁴¹ *Statement of the Society of the Holy Cross Concerning the Order of Corporate Reunion*, p. 10. Revised edition.

⁴² *Church Times*, August 14th, 1885, p. 623.

the tactics of the Union in the following terms:—"It is quite clear," he said, "it would never do for the President and Council, any more than it would do for a general and his officers, to explain all their tactics. They must be as candid as they can, but they must observe such reticence as is necessary."⁴³ The English Church Union had been many years in existence before it became officially pledged to Corporate Reunion with Rome. Previous to that period its work consisted largely in educating its followers as to the alleged duty and necessity of such a union. The subject was frequently discussed at meetings of its branches throughout the country, and these branches occasionally passed resolutions on the question, which, while they were not binding on the Central Council, yet served to show the direction in which the tide was flowing Romeward. To sooth the minds of the more timid of their followers the Unionists were heard, from time to time, talking against some of the practical abuses of the Church of Rome, and finding fault with a few of the doctrines taught in Continental books of devotion. What Bishop Robert Abbot said of Laud and his followers, might with equal justice be said of those wily Ritualists who, while denouncing Rome, are labouring zealously for Reunion with her.

"If they do at any time," said Dr. Abbot, "speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it; they speak nothing but that wherein one Papist will speak against another, as against equivocation, and the Pope's temporal authority, and the like; and perhaps some of their blasphemous speeches. But in the points of Free Will, Justification, Concupiscence being a sin after Baptism, Inherent Righteousness, and certainty of Salvation; the Papists beyond the seas can say they are wholly theirs; and the Recusants [Romanists] at home make their brags of them. And in all things they keep themselves so near the brink, that upon any occasion they may step over to them."⁴⁴

⁴³ *English Church Union Monthly Circular*, Volume for 1869, p. 99.

⁴⁴ *Heylin's Life of Laud*, p. 42. Dublin, 1719.

At the Annual Meeting of the English Church Union, June 12th, 1861, the President of the Union, the Hon. Colin Lindsay (who subsequently seceded to Rome) congratulated the members that on that morning they had offered up to the Throne of Heaven their "united prayers for the Reunion of Christendom." Though he does not appear to have mentioned it by name, there can be no doubt that he included Reunion with Rome in that expression.

In 1865 Dr. Pusey startled the ecclesiastical world by the publication of the first volume of his *Eirenicon*, the object of which, as the title-page states, was to prove that the Church of England, as "a portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church," might become "a means of restoring visible unity" to the whole of the Church throughout the world. A more detailed, and also an accurate summary of its object was that given by the *Union Review*, which remarked that:—"The object of the book is to prove that in all essentials for Unity, the Churches of England and Rome are one, and that, as a Catholic interpretation can most readily and truly be given both to the Decrees of Trent and the Thirty-nine Articles, nothing need hinder their mutual acceptance. He holds it to be a mistake to suppose that any of the Articles were levelled against the doctrines of the Roman Communion as set forth by the Council of Trent, or that the Decrees of Trent were levelled against anything upheld by the English Church, or that they really maintain anything which the English Church has condemned."⁴⁵ Dr. Pusey considers that those parts of the Roman system which are popularly spoken of as Romanism are but excrescences like the many heresies among ourselves."⁴⁶ In other words, his attitude towards Rome was very much like that of Laud and his followers, as

⁴⁵ Those who wish to read an able and conclusive refutation of the position adopted by Dr. Pusey, should read Dean Goode's *Tract XC. Historically Refuted*. Second edition, 1866. London: Hatchards.

⁴⁶ *Union Review*, Volume for 1866, p. 2.

described by Bishop Robert Abbot, in the sermon quoted above. The only differences between the two are that Dr. Pusey went much further in a Romeward direction than Laud ever dreamt of, and that he wrote far more gently of Papal error than Laud would ever have sanctioned. The Roman Catholic newspaper, the *Weekly Register*, reviewed the *Eirenicon* at considerable length, and this drew from Dr. Pusey himself a letter, dated November 22nd, 1865, addressed to the Editor of that paper, in the course of which he made the following remarkable statements:—

“ I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained *authoritatively, i.e.,* by the Roman Church itself, not by individual theologians only. This involves the conviction on my side, that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly, as not contradicting anything held to be *de fide* in the Roman Church. . . . As it is of moment, that I should not be misunderstood by my own people, let me add, that I have not intended to express any opinion about a visible head of the Church. *We readily recognize the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that Primacy upon other local Churches, we believe to be matter of ecclesiastical, not of Divine law; but neither is there anything in the Supremacy in itself to which we should object.*”

No doubt Dr. Pusey would wish the “Supremacy” of the Pope to be exercised over the Church of England—in case of Reunion—in the gentlest possible manner, but to be willing to accept it in any shape or form, with the lessons of the past for our guidance, is an act which must be abhorred by every liberty loving Englishman. This country knows, from bitter experience, what Papal supremacy means. The lessons of the Martyr fires lit in Mary’s reign are not yet forgotten in England.

Dr. Pusey’s book speedily attracted the attention of the English Church Union. At its next annual meeting a resolution was unanimously carried, expressing the rejoicing of the Union at its publication, together with an earnest hope for the Reunion of Christendom. The resolution was

proposed by the Rev. W. Gresley, Vice-President of the Union, in the following terms:—

“That this Union rejoices in the publication of Dr. Pusey’s letter (the *Eirenicon*) to the author of the *Christian Year*, and earnestly hopes and prays that God, in His own time and in His own way, will so dispose the hearts and minds of His people, that the sad divisions which now rend the seamless robe of Christ may be healed; and that the whole of Christendom may be re-united into one holy communion and fellowship, to the glory of our Lord God, and the salvation of the human race.”⁴⁷

Mr. Gresley, in moving this resolution, informed the members of the Union that he had brought the subject forward at the request of the Council. He said that their scheme for Reunion included not only the Roman and Greek Churches, but the Dissenters also. “It would not,” he declared, “be a truly Christian scheme which did not embrace them also”; but he did not stop to explain that the only condition on which Dissenters will ever be admitted into the Church of England—by Ritualists—is that of absolute surrender, and that is a condition which they can never be expected to accept. So that Reunion with Dissenters, on Ritualistic principles, is quite “out of the range of practical politics.” Individual Dissenters may come over to the Church of England on this condition, but to expect that any Nonconformist Church will do so, as a body, is simply the dream of sacerdotal fanatics. The discussion on Mr. Gresley’s resolution was enlivened by the appearance of the Rev. Archer Gurney—a member of the Union—who stood up to propose an amendment. His remarks were received, however, with hisses and uproar, and constant interruption, and he could only find three persons to vote for him. Yet he told the Union some plain and wholesome truths, which it would have done well to lay to heart. He declared that there were members of the Union (though, as it turned out, there were only three in the meeting) “who are

⁴⁷ *English Church Union Monthly Circular*, Volume for 1866. p. 191.

not prepared to assent to Reunion with Rome on any basis whatsoever, constituted as Rome now is, and maintaining the claims she now maintains." While Mr. Gurney was speaking Dr. Pusey was present at the meeting, which had just elected him a Vice-President of the English Church Union. When, therefore, Mr. Gurney attacked him by name, he at once roused the anger of the Romanizers. Yet, nothing daunted, Mr. Gurney went on with his indictment. "I am," he continued, "heartily persuaded that the *Eirenicon*—recognizing, as I do, the purity of motive of the writer—is, nevertheless, most dangerous in its effects, and, in addition, calculated to deprive us of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. . . . These are the principles which I come before you to uphold this day—the independence of the Catholic Episcopate of any Pope, of any single Bishop claiming to exercise Universal Primacy and Supremacy. And he [Dr. Pusey] whom you so much delight to honour has expressed his conviction that there is nothing objectionable in such a Supremacy. I hold his own words in my hand, and he has distinctly said, not only that 'we readily recognize the supremacy⁴⁶ of the Bishop of Rome,' but that 'there is nothing in that Supremacy in itself to which we should object.' I say, as a Catholic, he is not Catholic who uses such language as this; . . . and mark this, one of the chief Bishops of the American Church has told us, that the man whom you delight to honour is a Gallican on the wrong side of the water." At this point there was great confusion in the meeting, and angry shouts from the Romanizers were heard all over the room. When Mr. Gurney sat down, Dr. Pusey rose to reply to him, and was received with long-continued cheering. As to the question of Papal Supremacy, he said that he did "not know where it is defined in what Supremacy consists." "It matters not," he continued, "under whom

* The word actually used by Dr. Pusey was "Primacy" not "Supremacy."

we live,⁴⁹ so that by living under that authority it does not touch our conscience."

At the next annual meeting of the English Church Union, June 19th, 1867, the President announced the formation of a new Society ("The Catholic Union for Prayer") which had been promoted by the Union, for the purpose of praying for the whole Church, and more especially for the restoration of its unity.

"There is," said the President, "one powerful weapon we can all use; that is, Prayer. The Council, feeling this so strongly, have promoted the establishment of a new Union, called the 'Catholic Union for Prayer.' The object of this Union is to combine all who love God and His Church in an Holy Confraternity to pray for the Holy Catholic Church, and for our portion of it in particular. If we all unite in saying the Lord's Prayer once every day for this great object, we may, relying upon the Divine promise to grant all petitions offered in Christ's name, look forward with confidence to the speedy deliverance of the Church of England, and her Reunion with East and West. Let us labour hard for this glorious end."⁵⁰

A prospectus of this "Catholic Union for Prayer," which I possess, states that its Warden was Dr. Pusey, the Hon. Colin Lindsay its secretary, and that fourteen well-known members of the Ritualistic party—seven clerical and seven lay—constituted its Council. "All Churchmen," it states, "being communicants of the Catholic Church, are earnestly invited to join this bond of prayer, *this Holy Confederation, for the Reunion of Christendom*"; and, no doubt with a view to promote secrecy, it is added that "the names of the Associates shall not be published." The "Catholic Union for Prayer" is mentioned in every volume of the monthly magazine of the English Church Union for several years after its formation, after which I can find no record of its

* Most Churchmen believe that it *does* matter very much "under whom they live"; but it is evident that with Dr. Pusey to live under Papal Supremacy, "would *not* touch our [*his*?] conscience." With loyal Churchmen it would be otherwise.

⁵⁰ The *Liberties of the Church*, an Address by the Hon. Colin Lindsay, p. 22, English Church Union Office.

existence. Probably we shall know more about it when the last volume of the *Life of Dr. Pusey* is published.

The subject of the Reunion of Christendom was kept prominently before the public by the English Church Union, after the publication of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*. It was discussed at the meetings of many of its branches, and occasionally resolutions on the subject were passed. When the Lambeth Conference met, in 1878, at the annual meeting of the Union that year, a resolution was carried unanimously, affirming that the Union viewed the Conference with the deepest interest, "in the hope that their united counsels may tend to the peace and well-being of the Church, the reunion of those separated from her fold at home, and the restoration of visible communion between the various Apostolic Churches of Eastern and Western Christendom."⁵¹ In the annual report of the President and Council adopted at the same meeting, a paragraph appeared which was almost word for word the same as the resolution I have just quoted.⁵²

No one can doubt, who has studied the operations of the English Church Union, that the prime mover in all its Corporate Reunion work has been its President, Lord Halifax. He was elected to that office, April 21st, 1868, on the resignation of the first President, the Hon. Colin Lindsay. That gentleman, in his letter of resignation, assigned reasons for ceasing to be President which were only ostensible. He pleaded his state of health.⁵³ No doubt he was in ill-health at the time, but that which brought on the crisis was his determination to secede to the Church of Rome, an event which took place not long after his resignation. At that time the new President had not been called to the House of Lords, and was known as the Hon. Charles L. Wood. Since he became President of the English Church Union his whole heart and soul have been thrown into the work of healing the breach that took place between

⁵¹ *Church Union Gazette*, Volume for 1878, p. 179.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 154.

⁵³ *History of the English Church Union*, p. 99.

England and Rome in the sixteenth century, and he has done all that in him lay to assist that "levelling up" process within the Church of England which seems to have been thought necessary, as a preparation for the expected reconciliation. It seems to have been generally accepted as a principle by the advanced section of the Ritualists that the Church of England is not in a sufficiently Catholic condition—at least in practice—to make her respectable enough to keep company with the truly holy and Catholic Church of Rome! Hence the necessity for "levelling up." This idea of the relative position and purity of the Churches of England and Rome found expression in a letter written by "a Colonial Priest," which appeared in the *Church Review* of September 21st, 1888. A brief extract from this letter I have already given, but it may be well to give its statements at greater length.

"It seems to me," wrote this Ritualistic priest, "utterly premature to consider Reunion, especially with the great Patriarchal See of the West [*i.e.*, with Rome], as within even distant probability, until the Anglican Communion, as a whole, is Catholicised. *There lies our work*; for every priest and every faithful lay person to live, each in his or her little sphere, the Catholic life. When as yet the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is offered daily in only two hundred churches; while the Holy Sacrament of Unction is ignored by every member (so far as I know: I shall be delighted to find that I am wrong) of the Anglican Episcopate; while multitudes of laity never dream of purging their souls of deadly sin by Sacramental Confession, and multitudes of priests never teach them that such is their bounden duty; while fasting reception of the Body and Blood of our Lord is still the exception; while almost every kind of heresy can be taught unchecked from our pulpits; while Bishops can still deny the very existence of sacrifice or priesthood in the Christian Church; while it is still possible for a Bishop to be threatened with legal penalties for celebrating the Divine Mysteries with bare decency, and for the head of the Anglican Communion, the successor of St. Augustine and St. Thomas of Canterbury, to decline taking proceedings on merely legal grounds; *while these scandals, and a thousand like them, still daily take place, is it not premature to think of asking the Apostolic See [Rome] to reconsider its position towards us, for which it has had only too much justification? And yet English Catholics, knowing the fearful*

corruption yet disgracing the English Church,⁵⁴ can find it in their hearts to accuse the Latin communion of Mariolatry, and such like. We, to accuse Continental Catholics of excess of devotion to blessed Mary, when with us the most holy Mother of God has, at the best, but a mere grudging honour paid to her, as if every offering of love at the feet of Mary could be anything but a most real worship of her Incarnate Son! *Let us cleanse our own house of heresy.* Let us get rid of that Pharisaic self-righteousness which imagines all perfection to be contained within the four corners of the Prayer Book, and despises everything 'un-English.'

"Before any communication with either East or West can be even thought of, the following reforms [?] must be accomplished:—

"1. A daily celebration of Mass by every priest to become the rule, according to the long-standing Western custom.

"2. The restoration to our Altars generally of the sweet perpetual presence of Jesu in the most Holy Sacrament.

"3. The full recognition and use of Extreme Unction.

"4. Sacramental Confession of mortal sins to be recognized as the Church's rule.

"5. Restoration to our formularies of definite and distinct Prayers for the Faithful Departed, and of Invocations of our Lady and the Saints.

"6. Universal belief throughout our communion in (a) the Real and Substantial Presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, in the Sacrament of the Altar; (b) that in the Mass a true, real, and propitiatory Sacrifice, as well for the living as the departed, is offered to God the Father, even the Immaculate Lamb; (c) that there are seven Sacraments of the New Law, though the two 'Sacraments of the Gospel' are of pre-eminent dignity and necessity. . . .

"I firmly believe that the day will come when such a *Reformation* [?] will have penetrated throughout the length and breadth of the English Communion, from the Primate of All England to the peasant at the plough. God has wrought such great things for us during the last fifty years, that it would be faithless to doubt that, in His own time, *every vestige of Protestant heresy will be purged out from us.* But the time is not yet. Therefore let everyone, while praying daily for Reunion, remember that *the surest way to accomplish it is by working towards the PURIFICATION of our own branch of the Catholic Church.*"

I do not in any way hold the English Church Union

⁵⁴ Not a word does this Ritualistic writer say about the "fearful corruption" which actually *does* exist in the Roman Communion.

responsible for this letter of "A Colonial Priest"; but I do assert that the *principles* which he lays down are those which have guided the Union. I am not aware that it has, like this correspondent of the *Church Review*, advocated the Invocation of Saints, but it has certainly, by means of the literature on sale at its central office, advocated the Mass for the living and the dead. It now holds a "Requiem Service" for its deceased members every year. It has, as we have seen, advocated the Confessional, and many of its branches even defended the Society of the Holy Cross, when attacked for its indecent confessional book, the *Priest in Absolution*. This policy of "levelling up," which has made the English Church Union such a thoroughly "Preparatory School for Rome," was boldly advocated by the Rev. V. S. S. Coles, now the head of the Pusey House, Oxford, in a sermon which he preached on "The Place of E. C. U. Objects in a Churchman's Life." The sermon was printed *verbatim* in the *Church Union Gazette*, for September, 1891.

"We must," said Mr. Coles, speaking for himself and his brethren of the E. C. U., "pray that we may all recognize the true unity of the great portions of the Church, Roman, Greek, Anglican, now, through our sins and those of our fathers, outwardly divided, and that these outward divisions may pass away in a day of blessed Reunion. *Meanwhile*, that the . . . unspeakable mystery of the Altar may be recognized as a Divine Communion, a true Sacrifice, a Real Presence demanding a special adoration; that Holy Communion may be rightly prepared for, and to this end that there may be wider opportunities, and more frequent use of *Private Confession*; that the ancient Catholic rule of *Fasting Communion* may be better observed; . . . that the *Anointing of the Sick* may be rightly and dutifully restored; that all *rites and ceremonies* which witness to our union with the rest of the Catholic Church, and to the doctrines which we hold in common, may be protected and restored. . . *These are the objects with which our Society is chiefly concerned.*"

It must be admitted that this is going a long way towards carrying out the Plan of Campaign laid down by "A Colonial Priest" three years before, while it is entirely

founded on the principles which guided his very discreditable letter. The English Church Union is clearly responsible for what Mr. Coles said, since they published his sermon, without finding any fault with it, in their official organ. And what made Mr. Coles' statement of E. C. U. policy so gravely important was, that it represented the policy of a Society which at that time numbered nearly four thousand clergymen, and twenty-four bishops, in its ranks.

All through this modern agitation for Corporate Reunion there has but little been said against the corruptions of the Church of Rome. Some of the practical abuses found in her fold have been censured, but it has been in the gentlest possible manner, and with many apologies to Rome for taking such a liberty; and it has been carefully explained that fault has not been found so much with the *authorized* religion of Rome, as with that "*unauthorized*" teaching given by some of her children, especially on such a subject as the extravagant devotion to the Virgin Mary. To quote again the words of Bishop Abbot, "If they do at any time speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disturbing the birds that are in it." The "levelling up" process, the work of preparing the way for Reunion with Rome has not yet, in the estimation of Lord Halifax, and some of his brethren on the Council of the English Church Union, been fully accomplished, even in the most advanced of Ritualistic Churches. The Ritualistic party no longer declare that they are satisfied with the Book of Common Prayer. They wish to add largely to it from Roman sources. For many years they resisted Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, on *Protestant* lines: now, influential members of the party are now advocating it on Romanizing lines. A remarkable volume of Essays was published in 1892, entitled the *Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*. Of the eight gentlemen who contributed to it, seven were

members of the English Church Union, and of these four were members of its Council, including Lord Halifax, President of the Union. I look upon this volume as, *indirectly*, a manifesto of the English Church Union, or at least as an indicator of what its policy is likely to be, though officially the Union has not given it its approval. But we can best judge of what the future policy of a Society will be by ascertaining the views of those who rule it. The first essay in this volume was from the pen of Lord Halifax himself. His lordship affirms that some of the "changes in the Liturgy" made by the Reformers in the sixteenth century were "mistaken," and that we should not decline to do our "very best to get them remedied."⁶⁵ In other words, we should pull down a part of the work of the Reformation. He goes on to affirm that there are "shortcomings" in the English Church; and that the "arrangements of our present Liturgy, with the dislocation of the Canon which those arrangements involve, is *a most serious blot* on the Eucharistic Service of the English Church," which "urgently calls for reform."⁶⁶ In other words, Lord Halifax is thoroughly dissatisfied with the Prayer Book, and is determined to go in for its Revision, but, to save appearances, he will not use that word, but expresses what he wants by the term "reform." The result of seeing services conducted on strictly Church of England lines, even under High Church auspices, seems to fill him with disgust. He sighs for what he has seen on the Continent.

"In this connection," writes the President of the English Church Union, p. 38, "let me say it, though I say it with shame, that of all the sad and discouraging sights which it is possible to see, none appears to me so sad and so discouraging as the sight of an English Cathedral, even the best, after being any time on the Continent. Contrast Westminster Abbey with the Cathedral at Cologne, or any French Cathedral, and you will almost wish never to enter it again till a radical change has been effected in all its arrangements."

Lord Halifax evidently wishes English Cathedrals to be

⁶⁵ *The Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*, p. 27.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

modelled after the Roman Catholic Cathedrals of the Continent. There are, it is well known, several English Cathedrals where the services are conducted on High Church lines, but even of these, Lord Halifax is ashamed: the sight of them makes his heart sad, and discourages the Romanizing hopes that fill his breast. We may well ask, had the Reformers of the sixteenth century been men of the views of Lord Halifax, would England ever have escaped from the degrading slavery and cruel intolerance of Papal bondage? We cannot doubt that if those who guide the policy of the English Church Union could have their own way, the iron heel of the Papacy would once more crush the independence and liberty of the Reformed Church of England. In his essay Lord Halifax asks, "Why should not the recitation of the Commandments be omitted at the choral celebration of Holy Communion on Sundays, just as is now often done at early celebrations of Holy Communion"?⁴⁷ We may well answer this question by asking him another—What do you want them left out for? Are the Commandments of God "grievous" (1 John v. 3) unto you? Or is the reason of your wish to omit them to be found in the manifest fact that the Second of them forbids the use of pictures and images in Divine worship? It is, no doubt, most inconvenient for a Ritualistic priest to read aloud that Second Commandment before the congregation, when they can see the skirts of his dress touching one of the forbidden things? Every lover of the Word of God will—Lord Halifax notwithstanding—plead that the Commandments of God may remain, whatever else it may be necessary to remove from the Communion Service.

The fact that the President of the English Church Union pleads so earnestly for additions to the Communion Service is a clear proof that he, and his followers, are longing for many things which the Church of England, in her wisdom, has thought it best not to provide for her children. He

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

wants additional Gospels, Epistles, and Collects to be provided for the Black Letter Days, and for "Services for the Dead."⁶⁸ He also "pleads" for the "restoration where it is possible of the practice of Reserving the Blessed Sacrament in our Churches."⁶⁹ The ostensible reason for restoring the Reserved Sacrament is that it is then always ready to be given to the sick in cases of emergency; but the real reason is for purposes of adoration. The Ritualists do not plead for the Reservation of the wine; but only for *half* a Sacrament—the consecrated wafer. Why not both? Loyal Churchmen are aware that there is no provision in the Book of Common Prayer for giving the sick the Communion in one kind, according to the modern Roman Catholic fashion, first made obligatory in the fifteenth century. The English Communion for the Sick requires the clergyman to consecrate both wine and bread in the sick room. Suppose, then, the Church were to give permission to Reserve the *bread*, how much time would the Minister gain by such a permission, were he still to be required to consecrate the wine in the sick room? None whatever. The real reason then why the Reserved Sacrament is so earnestly longed for is adoration, and this is shown in Lord Halifax's essay, in which he makes it plain that he is most anxious for the restoration of the service known as the "Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament," which cannot be performed unless a Reserved wafer is kept until evening for this service.

"It will be said," writes Lord Halifax, "by some that it [the Reserved Sacrament] will be a step to *Benediction* and other practices which are of comparatively modern origin; by others, that in the imperfectly instructed condition of our people it might lead to irreverence. Now, in regard to *both* these objections may not this be asked—and it is a remark which, I think, applies to many other matters of a not dissimilar nature—why should we object to certain practices which have grown up round the Blessed Sacrament, and *which experience has proved to be useful for encouraging the devotion of the Faithful?*"⁷⁰

⁶⁸ *The Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*, p. 29. ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 35. ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

The answer to all this is that the service of the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and the Reservation of the Sacrament, would both certainly lead to that which the Black Rubric terms "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

Another contributor to this volume of essays, who is also a member of the English Church Union, the Rev. E. W. Sergeant, seems anxious for the *entire* omission of the Ten Commandments from the Communion Service. "It is," he writes, "no part of the priest's office in the ritual of the Eucharist, like another Moses from Mount Sinai, to convey God's laws to the people."⁶¹ Another supposed defect in the Book of Common Prayer, which is nothing less than gall and wormwood to the whole Romanizing party, is termed by Mr. Sergeant "one of the most mischievous innovations in our Eucharistic Office." It is that, "whereas in the rubrics alone of the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass in the Sarum Missal the word altar occurs *thirty* times, *it does not occur once in any part of our Prayer Book.*"⁶² This gentleman is also sorely grieved because "such marked prominence" is given in the Prayer Book to the title, "The Lord's Supper"; and he asks with burning indignation, "Why change the title? Why reject the old and certainly inoffensive term 'the Mass'?"⁶³

It is, therefore, quite clear that these gentlemen are not satisfied with the Prayer Book *as it is*. They are not content, however, with introducing all these Romanizing novelties on their own responsibility, and without any sanction from the law. What they now want is that they shall be incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer, and thus made part and parcel of the law of the Reformed Church of England. If it is asked, why do Prayer Book Churchmen object to these changes and additions, the answer is that the result of adopting them would be a gigantic schism in the Church of England. The Church

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 124.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

which for nearly four centuries, excepting during the brief interval of the Commonwealth, has stood firmly against all the storms and oppositions through which it has passed, would at once fall to the ground, rent asunder by traitors within her fold. Can statesmen view such a possibility with pleasure? A Prayer Book Romanized on the lines of the English Church Union could not be accepted by any honest Protestant Churchman, and the whole Protestant power of Protestant England would be behind those who would then once more fight again, for dear life, the battle of the Reformation. Yet nothing less than this will satisfy the wire-pullers of the Ritualistic party. It is useless to talk of a possible compromise between the Lord's supper and the Sacrifice of the Mass. They are as opposed to each other as light and darkness, as the Word of God and the corrupt Traditions of men. This preparatory work for Corporate Reunion with Rome must be resisted by all in whose hearts the memory of the Protestant Martyrs is not dead; by all who love civil freedom and religious liberty.

As time went on the English Church Union became more and more energetic in labouring for Reunion. As I have said, the volume of essays on *The Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*, which appeared in 1892, was not issued by the Union, though it certainly does clearly indicate what its policy is. Going back four years from that date, we find the Council of the E. C. U. bringing the Reunion Question once more before the Lambeth Conference, which again met in that year. At the annual meeting of the Union, June 14th, 1888, an Address to the Conference was unanimously adopted, which concluded with the following paragraph:—

“We would conclude with our most earnest prayers that the counsels of this great gathering of the Episcopate round the chair of St. Augustine may be so guided and inspired by God the Holy Ghost, as to quicken the life of the Church of England throughout all its branches, to win back those who have separated themselves from its fold, and, *above all*, to prepare the way for *the restoration of visible unity between the Anglican Communion and the rest of the Western*

Church, and the Reunion of East and West, and to hasten the dawn of that blessed day of restored peace and goodwill among all Christian people, when there shall be One Flock and One Shepherd.”⁶⁴

In moving the adoption of this Address, Lord Halifax said that Corporate Reunion was “that hope which is nearest and dearest” to the hearts of the members of the Union, and that they longed for the time “when the schisms and divisions which divide the West shall have been healed, when East and West shall be again one, and all shall be again united in the bonds of a visible unity as in the days of old.” The views of the Council of the E. C. U. were echoed by its branches. At a meeting of the Cheltenham Branch, December 17th, 1889, the Chairman, the Rev. G. Bayfield Roberts, who was subsequently selected to write the official *History of the English Church Union*, said that—

“Unhappily, as a Protestant, Canon Bell looked to Reunion with Dissenters, and to an utter and irremediable breach with the Churches of the East and West. They, as Catholics, looked to Reunion with those Churches of the East and West which, in their fine ancient Patriarchates, possessed the historical Episcopate, *to Reunion under the Primacy of him to whom the Fathers gave the Primacy . . . the Bishop of ‘old Rome.’* Was this a rash statement? At any rate, it was historically true, and was substantially the same as that to which *Lord Halifax* gave utterance at the Annual Meeting [of the E. C. U.] in London, in 1885:—‘Peace among yourselves, peace with our separated brethren at home, the restoration of visible unity with the members of the Church abroad, East and West alike, *but, above all, with the great Apostolic See of the West*, which has done so much to guard *the true faith* in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and the reality of His life-giving Sacraments. These things surely should be our object—the object nearest our hearts.’”⁶⁵

Lord Halifax’s speech, in 1885, in favour of Reunion with Rome, quoted by Mr. Roberts, led to a correspondence between his lordship and Canon Hole, now Dean of Rochester, in which the President of the English Church Union declared that although he did “most earnestly desire

⁶⁴ *Church Union Gazette*, Volume for 1888, pp. 168, 216-220.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, Volume for 1890, p. 45.

the restoration of visible communion between ourselves and the members of the Roman Church," yet he did not wish for such a union "by a sacrifice of the truth, but through the truth."⁶⁶ But here of course comes in the question, What is "the truth" which his lordship is unable to sacrifice? I have no doubt that he would be willing to "sacrifice" a great deal of that which Protestant Churchmen consider as Scriptural truth. The really practical question is, how much of that which the Pope considers as the "truth" would Lord Halifax require him to surrender as the price of Reunion? Would he require him to give up either his Primacy or Supremacy, or any one of the doctrines of the Council of Trent? I very much doubt it. Lord Halifax would be very glad to "sacrifice" Protestantism, but there is very little, if anything at all, in the official doctrines of Rome which he would wish a re-united Church to lose. The speech which Mr. Roberts quoted was referred to by Lord Halifax himself the year after it was delivered. At the annual meeting of the E. C. U. in 1886, Lord Halifax said:—

"I ventured to say something on this subject at our last annual meeting, and though fault has been found in some quarters with what I then said, I have nothing to retract. On the contrary, I desire to emphasize what I said last year. The crown and completion of the Catholic Revival which has transformed the Church of England within the last fifty years is the Reunion of Christendom. We desire union with those from whom we are separate, not by a sacrifice of truth, but through the truth, and among our brethren with whom we long to be at one, *none come before those who are in communion with the Roman See*. . . Our own instincts—nay our own experience as Anglicans—point out *the practical need of a central authority*. What has been the history of the South African Church? Has it not been on one side a willingness to recognize in the Archbishop of Canterbury the authority of an Anglican Patriarch; on the other an attempt to claim the fulness of Papal authority for the Privy Council? After all, if a central authority is good for the Anglican Communion, *a central authority must be good for the Church at large*. . . . Certainly those who are willing to recognize an appeal from the Archbishop of

⁶⁶ *Church Union Gazette*, Volume for 1890, p. 50.

Canterbury to the Judicial Committee need not scruple to an *appeal to a Christian Bishop*. IS THERE A SINGLE INSTRUCTED CHRISTIAN WHO WOULD NOT PREFER LEO XIII. TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL ?"⁶⁷

The answer to Lord Halifax's question is that there is a very large number of very well "instructed Christians" who would prefer the Privy Council to the Pope. There is a great deal of misconception as to what the functions of the Judicial Committee really are. I suppose that most High Churchmen will admit that the late High Church and learned Dean Hook was an "instructed Christian." Yet this is what he wrote on the subject :—

"I see no objection to the Committee of Privy Council being our Final Court of Appeal: they do not form a Synod, and here is the mistake so often made. In an ancient Synod the members were legislators as well as judges. If they decided that such or such a thing was contrary to law, they might say, 'The law is a bad one, therefore we will make a new law.' The Committee of Privy Council does nothing of the kind. I wish to obey the law. You say that the law says one thing, I say it means another—and who shall decide? It is a question, not of opinion, but of fact; and who can deal with such a subject so well as lawyers? *Who could be worse judges than ecclesiastics*, who would endeavour to bend the law to their opinions?

"The old High Churchman was wont to say, 'I will do what the Church orders me to do.' 'I like,' he might say, 'lights upon the altar; but if *you* dislike it, let us ask what the law says. To ascertain that fact I go, not to parsons but to lawyers, who are not to make the law, but to discuss what it was made by ecclesiastics.'"⁶⁸

It is here most important to point out that Lord Halifax and the English Church Union are manifestly bent on pulling down the authority of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee of Privy Council, for the sole purpose of setting up that of the Pope of Rome in its room. "Who would not," asks Lord Halifax, "prefer Leo XIII. to the Privy Council"? There is, he says, "a practical need for a central authority"; and such an authority would, he thinks,

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, Volume for 1886, p. 242.

⁶⁸ *Life and Letters of Dean Hook*, p. 588. Sixth edition.

“be good for the Church at large”—the authority, of course, being that of the Pope. It may be well to remind my readers that the Reformers of the sixteenth century were of a different opinion. It was their glory and their boast that they cut themselves off from all communication with such a “central authority” as the Pope, and inserted in the *Reformed Prayer Book* the petition:—“From the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord, deliver us.” The fact is that there is no *existing* authority within the Church of England to which the Ritualists will give their full obedience, when its decisions come into conflict with what they, in their superior wisdom, assert to be the law of the Church. Reasonable men would say that it is better to have some authority within the Church of England, however imperfect it may or may not be, than to have no binding authority at all. It is better to have unsatisfactory Ecclesiastical Courts than to have no Ecclesiastical Courts at all. It is better to have the Privy Council as the Final Court of Appeal than to have no Court of Appeal at all. One result of the labours of the English Church Union is the spread of Anarchy in the Church. That well-known Ritualist, the late Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, Vicar of St. Alban’s, Holborn, who was for many years supported by the English Church Union—of which he was a leading member—in his rebellion against the decisions of the Courts of Law, gave evidence, on March 2nd, 1882, before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts. From the official Report of that Commission I take the following extracts of Mr. Mackonochie’s evidence bearing on the subject before us:—

“6089. Then is there no Ecclesiastical Court?—Not as far as I can see.

“6090. So that every man can do what is right in his own eyes?—That is not our fault.

“6091. Of course not. That is the state of things?—Yes.

“6092. Has there never been an Ecclesiastical Court?—*Not since the Reformation.*”

" 6171. Then why do you think that the Bishops have no authority now?—Because they have got bound up in the State Courts."

" 6178. But does it not strike you that that is *fatal to the idea of any society existing*, that he must judge entirely for himself?—Yes; then I cannot help it."

Anarchy and lawlessness in the Church, a state of things in which every clergyman does that which is right in his own eyes, and in which he will submit to no authority which opposes his own opinions, is certainly one calculated to create alarm. I do not assert that it exists amongst the whole of the clergy of the Church of England. Far from it. We may be thankful that there are yet thousands of clergymen who love law and order; but, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that the lawless spirit is very widespread indeed amongst the Romanizing clergy. Nor should it be forgotten that the spirit of lawlessness and anarchy is a contagious disease. It will not stop within the Church. The people of England will argue that what is good for the clergy is good also for them. If the Ministers of the Gospel will not obey the laws of the Church, why should they obey the laws of the State? This is an aspect of the Ritualistic question which is deserving of the serious attention of statesmen. But the unfortunate thing is that those in authority in the State, in only too many instances, smile upon rebellion, give the rebels words of encouragement, and present them to many of the high places in the Church which are in their patronage, while those who show respect to law and order are frequently frowned upon, and left out in the cold. The time has come when the people of England should, through Parliament, bring both the Government for the time being—both Conservative and Liberal Governments are equally guilty—to account. No law-breaker should ever receive promotion at the hands of the Crown through its accredited advisers.

I might easily multiply quotations from the utterances of members of the English Church Union advocating Corporate Reunion with the Church of Rome, but I should only

wear my readers by doing so. As illustrating the kind of Romish teaching frequently given to the branches of the Union, I may, however, be permitted to add here the following extract from a speech delivered at the annual meeting of the Devon Branch, on July 30th, 1889. On that occasion the Rev. Ernest Square, then Vicar of St. Mary Steps, Exeter, but now Rector of Wheatacre, Suffolk, said :—

“ He did not know where they were to go for their Ritual if it was not to the Church of Rome, which seemed to be the living Church, and in whose Ritual he could see nothing harmful. She was the greatest Church in Christendom—there could be no doubt about it—and he did not think they could go to a better pattern than the Church of Rome for their Ritual. She had kept up her Ritual, which the Church of England had not done, through all the ages. We had been most slovenly, and with us it had been a kind of domestic Ritual, no more than they would have in their own homes or at their own tables—and not so good. The Church of Rome had always kept her own Ritual, and, therefore, he did not see why the English Church should not go to her for help in this matter.”⁶⁹

The adoption of the full Roman Ritual has now become very common in Ritualistic churches; but some of the party go even further than Mr. Square, for they teach all the *doctrines* of Rome which the Ritual is intended to symbolize. Three years before Mr. Square's Exeter speech, the Rev. William Stathers, Curate of St. Matthias', Earl's Court, and now Curate of St. Benet and All Saints', Kentish Town, was dismissed from his curacy by his Vicar, on the charge of Romanizing. The charge seemed an extraordinary one, coming from a Vicar who himself adopted, in the services of his Church, the full Ritual of the Church of Rome. In self-defence Mr. Stathers, who was then, and still is, a member of the English Church Union, published a *Letter of Explanation* to the members of the congregation, in the form of a pamphlet of sixteen pages. He pleaded that while Mr. Luke, his Vicar, had given his congregation the *shell*, he (Mr. Stathers) had given them the *kernel*, and he evidently

• *Western Times*, July 31st, 1889.

thought the kernel a much better thing than the shell. The shell was Roman *Ritual*; the kernel was Roman *doctrine*.

"The teaching," wrote Mr. Stathers, "which I have regularly given from the pulpit of S. Matthias's is in perfect harmony with the Ritual of that Church. There are only three kinds of Ritual possible in our churches:—The Ritual of self-pleasing, invented out of the Incumbent's own head; the old English Ritual, very elaborate and now lost, but which some are fruitlessly trying to bring back; and the *Modern Roman*, very simple, regulated by the Sacred Congregation of Rites at Rome, and possessing present authority. It is the latter Ritual, I am happy to say, which is followed at S. Matthias's, and I am bound to say that while the accuracy of it would be a lesson to many Roman congregations, they could never hope to approach its dignity. To many it will not seem surprising that finding St. Matthias's possessed of a particular kind of shell, I did my best to provide the corresponding kernel, or that finding myself face to face with a skeleton, I did my best to clothe it with flesh and make it instinct with life.

"Some persons may perhaps be of opinion that in *preaching the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady* I have gone beyond Tridentine limits, and have thus far been inconsistent. I have never, however, insisted on the doctrine as of necessity for faith, but have simply given the reasons for it, and have left objectors free to hold the Immaculate Birth instead. Moreover, the doctrine, though outside the Tridentine definitions, can hardly be said to be outside Prayer Book limits."⁷⁰

I am not aware that Mr. Stathers has ever publicly repudiated his teaching, as expressed in this pamphlet, though he still holds a curacy in the same Diocese of London. In his *Protest* he further informed his readers that—

"Mr. Luke having desired to be informed more precisely as to the exact meaning which I attached to the phrase 'general teaching Tridentine' [contained in Mr. Stathers' advertisement for a curacy in the *Church Times*],⁷¹ I explained to him at a private interview, and, if

⁷⁰ *A Protest and Explanation*, by the Rev. William Stathers, p. 12.

⁷¹ Mr. Stathers' advertisement, which he truly described as "most unmistakable," was as follows:—"Town Curacy or Sole Charge (in the South) desired at once, by a priest of considerable experience; 35, musical, unmarried, fond of children. Extempore and written sermons. Ritual (not necessarily advanced) on Roman lines preferred. General teaching Tridentine.—W. S., 85, Marton Road, Middlesbro."—*Church Times*, December 21st, 1883, p. 959.

I remember rightly, by letter, that I meant the general teaching of the Western Church, the most satisfactory summary of which teaching, and at the same time an authoritative summary, *is to be found in the Catechism of the Council of Trent*, points having reference to the Papal Supremacy being excluded by the necessity of the case." (73)

I must now hasten on to the time when, on February 14th, 1895, Lord Halifax delivered at Bristol his now notorious speech on Reunion with Rome. It was, I may here remark, delivered at a meeting of the Bristol branch of the E. C. U., and was subsequently printed and circulated by the Council, thus giving to it an official sanction and approval. It was a very long speech, and its delivery created a great deal of excitement and controversy in Church of England circles. Its influence went further and extended to Rome, where the Pope himself greatly rejoiced at the welcome news which it contained. In this speech the President of the E. C. U. went further towards Rome than ever he went before. Even some of his own friends were surprised, though they did not repudiate his utterances. His lordship laid down what he considered as reasonable conditions on which Reunion between England and Rome could take place; but it was noticed that he did not require the Church of Rome to give up any one of her peculiar doctrines, not even the doctrine of the Pope's personal Infallibility, as taught by the Vatican Council of 1870! As to the latter truly monstrous doctrine all that he seemed to require, to enable English Churchmen to accept it, was that it should be sugar-coated to suit the English palate!

"Even in regard to the Vatican Council," said Lord Halifax, "it appears not impossible that mistakes and exaggerations as to its scope and consequences may have been made, and that as time goes on *explanations will emerge* which may make the difficulties [ought he not to have said falsehoods?] it seems to involve less than they have sometimes appeared? . . . If by Papal Infallibility it is only meant that the Pope is Infallible when acting as the Head of the whole Church, and expressing the mind of the Church, and after taking all the

⁷³ *A Protest and Explanation*, p. 3.

legitimate and usual means for ascertaining that mind, in determining which the authority and witness of the Bishops, as representing their respective Churches, must be paramount, and then only in regard to the substance of the deposit handed down from Christ and His Apostles, *it would seem that the difficulty of a possible agreement is not so insuperable* as it has been sometimes represented. Certainly, it is not such as to preclude all endeavours to find possible terms of peace on other matters. In any case, till it is proved to the contrary, let us nourish the hope that such explanations are possible."⁷³

But here it may well be asked, would not the acceptance of the Pope's Infallibility, in any shape or form, or with any "explanation," be in a reality a "sacrifice of the truth"? How could a Union based on such a falsehood be a Union "through the truth"? "Do not let us be afraid," said Lord Halifax, in his Bristol speech, "to speak plainly of the possibility, of the desirability of a union with Rome. Let us say boldly *we desire peace with Rome with all our hearts.*"⁷⁴ Language like this is very different from that of the old-fashioned High Churchman, the Rev. John Moultrie, of Rugby:—

"Your Pope may be a learned priest, and a prince of high degree,
But God and Jesus Christ are more Infallible than he;
And I in God, through Jesus Christ, rest all my faith and hope,
And indeed I cannot part with these for Prelate or for Pope.
I still must keep my simple creed, and tread the path I've trod
By the help of my Redeemer—by the guidance of my God."⁷⁵

"No peace, but deadly warfare still, between those twain must be,
While the one would bind both heart and mind, and the other
set them free;
No peace for Rome and England, but a stern, relentless strife;
Till Light shall vanquish Darkness, Death be swallowed up of
Life."⁷⁶

If there is one man of the sixteenth century who, more than any other, is honoured by Protestants all over the

⁷³ *Reunion of Christendom*. Speech by Lord Halifax, p. 24. (English Church Union Office.)

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁷⁵ Moultrie's *Altars, Hearths, and Graves*, p. 79. Edition, 1854.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

world, it is Martin Luther. But he was God's instrument for freeing the nations from Papal bondage, and for this amongst other reasons, he is hated and reviled by modern Ritualists, who are not worthy to unloose his shoe strings. In his Bristol speech Lord Halifax went out of his way to insult his honoured memory by declaring that although he began his career as "a harmless and necessary Reformer," he eventually became "a needless and noxious rebel."⁷⁷ Luther certainly was, very much to his credit be it recorded, a "rebel" against the usurped Supremacy of the Pope; but in the opinion of the majority of the ablest men who have lived since his times, his rebellion was a very necessary one, and by no means "needless." It was the only way in which the world could get rid of an intolerable spiritual slavery. Luther's rebellion against the Pope was obedience to Almighty God, and therefore it makes us justly indignant to find such a brave and holy deed stigmatized as a "noxious" crime. It will, I trust, never come to pass that the children of this great "rebel" against tyranny and corruption will come to terms of peace with that system against which he waged an unrelenting warfare, not even at the invitation of Lord Halifax. "Who," asked his lordship, "can endure the sense of being separated from those [Roman Catholics] with whom in all essentials of belief and sentiment we are one?"⁷⁸ The answer to such a question is that there is no need whatever for the Ritualists to "endure" such a melancholy state of things for even one day longer. Why need they be "separated" any more? The Papal door is wide open to receive them, and the sooner they go over the better it will be for the Reformed Church of England. When traitors are discovered within the citadel zealously pleading with its rulers to surrender to an enemy whose yoke is too heavy to bear, the best thing to do is to turn them out of the citadel at

⁷⁷ *Reunion of Christendom*. Speech by Lord Halifax, p. 8.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

once, if they refuse to go voluntarily. There is no safety for the citadel while traitors are within its walls. It cannot, I think, be seriously pleaded that there are any doctrines officially taught by the Church of Rome to which gentlemen of Lord Halifax's stamp can have any conscientious objections. "We are convinced," he says, "on the one hand that there is nothing whatever in the authoritative documents of the English Church which, apart from the traditional glosses of a practical Protestantism, contains anything essentially irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome."⁷⁹ Certainly, the majority of loyal Churchmen think otherwise. They still retain the opinion that the Thirty-nine Articles contain a great deal which is "irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome," and that is also the opinion of Roman Catholic divines who may be allowed to know what the real doctrines of their Church are much better than any member of the English Church Union. One of the "documents of the English Church" is the Book of Homilies. Every clergyman of the Church of England has solemnly subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles. Every curate must subscribe them, and every new incumbent of a living is bound to read them through to his new congregation. In one of those Articles—the 35th—it is declared that the Homilies "contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, *and necessary for these times,*" that is, for this year of our Lord, 1897. We know very well that the clergy are not bound to accept every historical statement in the Homilies, but they are bound to the "doctrine" taught in them. I would therefore ask Lord Halifax whether *he* can reconcile the following extract from the "document" known as the *Homily of the Peril of Idolatry, Part Third*, "with the doctrines of the Church of Rome"? The language is somewhat rough, but, as it is "appointed to be read *in Churches,*" there can be nothing wrong in reading it in *this book* of mine.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

“Which the idolatrous Church [of Rome] understandeth well enough. For she being indeed not only an harlot (as the Scripture calleth her), but also a foul, filthy, old withered harlot (for she is indeed of ancient years) and understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsomeness which of herself she hath, doth (after the custom of such harlots) paint herself, and deck and tire herself with gold, pearl, stone, and all kind of precious jewels,⁸⁰ that she, shining with the outward beauty and glory of them, may please the foolish phantasy of fond lovers, and so entice them to spiritual fornication with her; who, if they saw her (I will not say naked) but in simple apparel, would abhor her, as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen: according as appeareth by the description of the garnishing of the great strumpet of all strumpets, ‘the mother of whoredom,’ set forth by St. John in his Revelation.”

Soon after his Bristol speech, Lord Halifax went to Rome, where he had several interviews with the Pope, with a view to the success of his Reunion schemes. A *verbatim* report of his interviews would be interesting reading. In his speech at Bristol he had not, as I have said, asked Rome to give up one of her doctrines as a condition of her Reunion with England, not even the Papal Infallibility. But he did insist on the Pope’s recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders. There went to Rome, a few months after Lord Halifax, two members of the English Church Union, whose travelling expenses were paid for by the Union. One of the party, the Rev. T. A. Lacey, a member of its Council, and also a member of the secret Society of the Holy Cross, wrote a document for the private use of the Roman Cardinals, to whom the question of the validity of Anglican Orders had been remitted for consideration. Probably Mr. Lacey never dreamt that such a document would ever see the light of day in England; but, somehow or other, the *Tablet* got hold of a copy, and published it in full—translated from the original Latin—in its issue for November 7th, 1896. In this document Mr. Lacey made some very candid admissions, and some inaccurate assertions, such as the following:—

⁸⁰ Just like our modern Ritualistic priests, who “deck and tire” themselves and their Churches in a similar fashion.

"The Reformation," wrote Mr. Lacey, "begun under Henry VIII., effected nothing contrary to Catholic faith. There took place, I admit, certain things which were *criminal*, and certain things which are still to be *deplored*; *the withdrawal from the Communion of the Roman Church*, the extirpation of the Religious Life."

"The English Church, delivered from so many dangers, *has differed in nothing* from the other national Churches included in the Catholic unity, save that she has lacked communion *in Sacris* with the Holy See."

"Many have turned their eyes with great desire to the Holy Roman Church as to the Mother from whom the light of the Gospel was first shed upon us."

"In the year 1865, he [Dr. Pusey] published his *Eirenicon*, in which he dealt with the question of visible unity to be brought about by means of the Anglican Church. He added much concerning the differences of worship and doctrine; *that such things did not relate to faith*; the discord between the Anglican and Roman formularies to be more apparent than real; *the power of the Roman Pontiff to be a not insuperable obstacle*; and the like. This letter of so celebrated a man created incredible enthusiasm."

The hopes of Lord Halifax and his followers were doomed to disappointment. Instead of recognizing the validity of Anglican Orders the Pope issued his now famous Bull declaring them to be, in his estimation, invalid. This Bull came as an unexpected thunderstorm in the Ritualistic camp. The Romanizers had flattered, cringed to, and prostrated themselves before the Church of Rome in a state of abject humiliation, in the hope that the Pope would do them the honour of recognizing them as real sacrificing priests. Instead, however, of being honoured by him, they were treated with the most unmitigated and well-deserved contempt. Instead of receiving a Papal blessing, they were spurned from the throne of the Vatican with a Papal kick. For a time, in bitter rage and dissatisfaction, the Ritualists turned their faces towards the Eastern Church, and declared that they would go in for Union with that corrupt communion, and leave Rome to her fate. A few Churchmen were deceived by these professions, and declared that the English

Church Union would now cease to labour for Reunion with Rome. But they little realized the depths of spiritual degradation of which the Ritualists are capable. The tide has already turned, and once more we see the Ritualists crawling along to kiss the Papal toe that kicked them only the other day. In his speech at the annual meeting of the English Church Union, June 1st, 1897, Lord Halifax bitterly complained that the present dominant authority in the Church of Rome in England threw "every obstacle in the way of any step that may be taken towards bringing about a better understanding, and the eventual Corporate Reunion of the Anglican Communion with the Roman Church." "We have indeed," said his lordship, "honestly desired—we desire still—to see the relations which existed between St. Cyprian and the Church of Carthage on the one side, and St. Stephen and the Roman Church on the other, as insisted on in the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, restored between Canterbury and Rome."⁸¹

It is a noteworthy fact that while the leaders of the Ritualistic party have advocated Corporate Reunion with Rome, and have opposed individual secession, yet the overwhelming majority of individual perversions to Rome in this country have been from the ranks of the Tractarians, Puseyites, and Ritualists. The Tractarians prepared the ground, the Puseyites planted, the Ritualists watered, and the Pope has reaped the harvest. As far back as 1850 Bishop Samuel Wilberforce wrote to Dr. Pusey:—"I firmly believe that the influence of your personal ministry does more than the labours of an open enemy to wean from the pure faith and simple Ritual of our Church the affections of many of those amongst her children."⁸² To the Rev. C. Marriott, the Bishop wrote, November 23rd, 1850:—"He (Dr. Pusey) tries to retain these souls to the Church of England, but in vain. He has given the impetus, and he cannot stop

⁸¹ *Church Times*, June 4th, 1897, p. 668.

⁸² *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, Vol. II., p. 80.

them. He has no deep horror of the Popish system; none has been infused into the early beginnings of their awakened spiritual consciousness; *they have practically been set by him on a Romish course.*"⁸³ Even Dr. Pusey's Father Confessor, the Rev. J. Keble, acknowledged that "a larger number, possibly, has seceded to Rome from under his (Dr. Pusey's) special teaching than from that of any other individual now among us."⁸⁴ It has been more or less the same with all the Ritualistic teachers. A correspondent of the Roman Catholic paper called the *Ransomer*, who was in an excellent position for obtaining accurate information on the subject, wrote as follows:—

"But has this development of Ritualism in the Establishment satisfied souls, won the working classes, or last, but not least, *stayed the stream of secessions to Rome? Not one whit.* I have never met a high Anglican who was contented with the condition of his Church. The vast multitudes of the poor, and the labouring men and women are more conspicuous than ever by their absence from the functions of Ritualism. *As to conversions [to Rome] it is well known that nine out of every dozen are the direct result of Ritualistic training.*"⁸⁵

In the year after this testimony was written, the Rev. Mr. Whelan, a Roman Catholic priest, preaching at St. Wilfrid's, York, said:—

"I am bold enough to say here that *Ritualism is one of our consolations*, for I think it to be the *Preparatory School* for the training of English Catholics. By Ritualism our great dogmas are taught to thousands who would not listen to us. In Ritualism we have a powerful solvent for melting the frost-bound traditions of three centuries. Many, perhaps, may be hindered from finding the real home of truth, but a *larger number* are helped by this approximation in externals, and become obedient children of the faith."⁸⁶

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, the official organ of the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland, in its issue for July, 1891, published a remarkable article on "The Conversion of

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁸⁴ *Ransomer*, July 22nd, 1893.

⁸⁵ *Catholic Standard*, June 23rd, 1894.

England," written by a priest residing in Manchester. It says:—

"There are two forces at work regarding the Catholicism of the country. . . One is inside the Church, and the other outside it; one Catholic, the other Protestant, though Catholicising. *The Ritualists, and the Ritualists alone, are doing all that is being done among Protestants.* How many parsons from Newman to Rivington have been converted by priests? True, all have been *received* by priests. But how many have confessed their obligations to our sermons or our writings that we Catholic priests were in any degree answerable for their conversion? The Catholicising movement in the Establishment has not been the result of the missionary activity of the Catholic Church in England. It is true to say that convert priests receive more converts than others, but that is mainly on account of personal influence in certain non-Catholic quarters where we have no access, as well as having a keener grasp of difficulties which we never feel. Men who pass through the fire themselves are good guides. This external movement is of vast importance. At this hour *five thousand Church of England clergymen are preaching from as many Protestant pulpits the Catholic faith* (not, indeed, as faith) to Catholicising congregations, much more effectively, *with less suspicion and more acceptance than we can ever hope to do.* Protestant sisterhoods are doing, we feel sure, the best they can under the circumstances to familiarize the Philistine with Nuns—and that is much. Protestant societies, like St. Margaret's, Westminster, furnish poor country missions (there *are* poor country Protestant missions, and city ones too) with Black Vestments for Requiems on All Souls'. This is, indeed, a matter for devout thankfulness. *We could desire no better preparation for joining the Catholic Church than the Ritualists' Preparatory School; and the fact that from them we have secured the majority of our converts, strengthens us in our view of it.*"⁸⁷

The *Month*, the organ of the English Jesuits, in its issue for November, 1890, published an article on "The Newest Fashions in Ritualism," in which it declared that—

"At any rate the Ritualists are doing a good work, which in the present state of the country, Catholics cannot do in the same proportion; they are preparing the soil and sowing the seed for a rich harvest, *which the Catholic Church will reap sooner or later.*"⁸⁸

⁸⁷ *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, July, 1891, p. 644.

⁸⁸ *The Month*, November, 1890, p. 333.

There remains one great question to be considered. Many will ask, Why should there not be a movement for the Corporate Reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome? What harm can it do? Is not Christian unity a Christian duty? To this I answer, that Protestants, in objecting to Reunion with Rome, do not forget that Christian unity is a Christian duty, but it is to be feared that modern Ritualists do forget that *separation* is just as much a Christian duty as unity. It was by God's command that, in Old Testament times, the Jews were separated from the Gentile nations. This separation was considered by Moses as a special result of God's favour, when he addressed the Lord in these words:—"For wherein shall it be known here that I and Thy people have found grace in Thy sight? Is it not in that Thou goest with us? so shall we be *separated*, I and Thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth" (Exodus xxxiii. 16). It would have been a grievous offence against Almighty God, had the Israelites sought unity with the Gentiles, though it was always open to the latter to seek unity with the former. And in the Christian Church this duty of separation is clearly set forth in the New Testament. How else are we to explain such texts as "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye *separate*, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2 Cor. vi. 17); and, "I heard another voice from heaven saying, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Rev. xviii. 4)? It is wisdom for Churches, as well as individuals to keep out of bad company. We must be united only with that which is good, and separate from all that is evil. The written Word of God, and the traditions of man can never unite together. Protestantism and Popery must evermore remain separated.

There are many other grave and weighty reasons against Reunion with Rome, but it would require a volume to exhaust the subject. I may, however, point out, that from a merely

worldly point of view there are strong and sufficient reasons for trying to defeat the schemes of the English Church Union and kindred societies. *Popery is an enemy to National Prosperity.* Looking abroad throughout the whole world, we find that Popery degrades the nations, instead of raising them to a higher level. The Ritualists cannot point to a single Roman Catholic country which is even on a level with, much less superior to, Protestant countries. On the contrary, Popery has dragged down Spain from her proud eminence, to be the most degraded and poverty-stricken nation in Europe, excepting Turkey. It has kept the South American republics and nations in a state of degradation, immorality, and ignorance deplorable to behold. Would any Englishman wish this Protestant country to become what the Papal States were under the temporal rule of Pope Pius IX.? Would English working men wish to exchange wages with their brethren in any Roman Catholic country in the world? Every part of Ireland is under the same government. Why, then, is it that the Roman Catholic portions of that unhappy land are those in which more poverty, dirt, disloyalty, and ignorance are to be found, than in the Protestant portions? The answer to this question must be that the religion of Popery is at the bottom of this marked difference. Before we listen with pleasure to the Reunion with Rome plans of the Ritualists, let us calmly consider the facts, not only of history, but of the everyday life around us. When we contrast Popish countries with Protestant lands, can we doubt any longer which religion most promotes *National Prosperity*? Is there any valid reason for supposing that England will become more prosperous if she forsakes her civil and religious liberties, and goes back to Papal bondage, at the request of Lord Halifax and the English Church Union? Common sense can answer these questions in only one way. Protestantism and *National Prosperity* go together, like Siamese twins. They cannot be separated. And let it not be said that this is an argument which

Christians should ignore, for has not the Word of God taught us that true "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Timothy iv. 8) ?

We also object to Reunion with Rome *because we have nothing good to gain by it.* As Protestants we already possess the *whole* of the Christian religion, in that we possess the Bible. What more do we need? Ours is the religion of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John, St. Peter, St. Paul, and the Blessed Virgin Mary. They taught nothing but Protestantism, and never taught even one of the peculiar doctrines of Rome. Open the New Testament, and if you consult either the Authorized Version or the Roman Catholic version in English, the result will be the same. You will not discover one word in either version about the Supremacy of the Pope, or of Papal Infallibility, of Purgatory, Auricular Confession, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, Prayers for the Dead, Indulgences, Holy Water, Holy Scapulars, Holy Wells, Holy Breads, Holy Beads, or any one of the false doctrines and superstitions of Romanism, which have now become dear to the hearts of our modern Romanisers. What will England gain if she takes all these things back again? She will gain what we should gain were we to throw away the good gold sovereigns supplied to us from Her Majesty's Mint, and instead apply to the makers of bad money for a supply of sovereigns, made from a slight quantity of real gold, and a large quantity of base metal. To act like this in worldly matters would be accounted folly; but is it not even greater folly to act so in spiritual things? Yet this is what the Ritualists are anxious for us to do. And our answer to their solicitations must be a stern resolve to allow of *no adulteration* of the Christian religion which, thank God, we possess. Popery is the great adulterator of the Christian religion. She has *nothing* to give us that is good for the souls of men. What she is anxious to do in Protestant England is well described

in the Bible as "making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition" (Mark vii. 13); and "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. xv. 9). The question before us is, Shall Protestant England submit to be fed with the chaff which comes from the Pope's table, when she is already fed with the good grain of the Gospel, as contained in the Bible? Our answer is, that, by God's grace, this thing shall never be. Shame, double shame, on the Ritualistic traitors who are trying to bring us back to Papal bondage!

We object further, to the Reunion schemes of the Ritualists because they are *opposed to our National Independence, and to our civil and religious liberties*. Should the Ritualists succeed, we should have again a Roman Catholic King of England, and the unhappy days of James II. would be repeated. By means of his spiritual weapons, the Pope of Rome, through the Confessors of the King and his Statesmen, would rule the British Empire in temporals as well as spirituals. Rome has, during the past half century, put forth her claims to temporal power with a haughtiness which was never exceeded by a Hildebrand or an Innocent III. The throne itself would be at the mercy of the Pope. I know some of my readers will smile at this, as the utterance of a visionary and an alarmist. Yet, for all this, Mr. Gladstone's statement is literally true:—"Rome has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused."⁸⁹ The late Rev. Thomas Francis Knox, of the Brompton Oratory, tells us, in a book published as recently as 1882, and compiled at the request of Cardinal Manning, that the following decree, passed at the Fourth Council of Lateran, is still a "part of the ordinary statute law of the Church":—

"If a temporal lord, after having been required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to cleanse his land from heretical

⁸⁹ *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, p. xxvii.

defilement, let him be excommunicated by the metropolitan and the other Bishops of the province. And if he shall through contempt fail to give satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the *Sovereign Pontiff*, that he may thereupon declare his vassals absolved from allegiance to him, and offer his land for seizure by Catholics that they may, after expelling the heretics, possess it by an incontestable title and keep it in the purity of the faith."⁹⁰

Is it wise to bring about a state of things in which this law may stand a chance of being enforced? Is a system which still retains such a law to be trusted by liberty-loving Englishmen? In a volume of essays, edited by Cardinal Manning, a similar claim is put forward, in which we read that—

“To depose Kings and Emperors is as much a right as to excommunicate individuals and to lay Kingdoms under an interdict. These are no derived or delegated rights; but are of the essence of that Royal authority of Christ with which His Vicegerents on earth are vested.”⁹¹

How can National Independence exist when such a law as this is enforced? The real ruler would be, not the nominal sovereign, but a foreign potentate called the Pope. Mr. Gladstone's assertion on this point, supported as it was by abundant proofs, should not be forgotten. “No one,” he wrote, “can now become her [Rome's] convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another,”⁹² that is, the Pope. Mr. Gladstone made this statement in 1874, and has never withdrawn it. But has Rome improved since Mr. Gladstone wrote? On the contrary, these disloyal utterances have been re-asserted again and again by her theologians. In the fourth edition of the *Catholic Dictionary*, published in 1893, with the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal Vaughan, we are told what is the opinion on the subject of the Deposing Power now held by Roman theologians. It is stated that this power is at present fallen “into abeyance.” But that

⁹⁰ *Records of English Catholics*, by Thomas Francis Knox, D.D. Vol. II., p. xxvii.

⁹¹ *Essays on Religion and Literature*, edited by Archbishop Manning, p. 417. Second series.

⁹² *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*, p. xxiv.

is not the fault of the Pope and his party. It is the result of the strong arm of Protestantism. Anyhow the statement of the *Catholic Dictionary* affords a strong confirmation of Mr. Gladstone's assertion that "Rome has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused."

"The ordinary opinion of Roman theologians may be seen stated in full in the pages of Ferraris. 'The common opinion teaches that the Pope holds the power of both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, which jurisdiction Christ Himself committed to Peter and his successors. . . . The contrary opinion is held to savour of the heretical belief condemned by Boniface VIII. in the Constitution *Unam Sanctam*.' 'Accordingly, unbelieving kings and princes can be deprived by the sentence of the Pope, in certain cases, of the dominion which they have over believers; for instance, if they have forcibly seized upon Christian countries, or are endeavouring to turn their believing subjects from the faith, and the like.' Barbosa and other Canonists hold that 'a King who has become a heretic can be removed from his Kingdom by the Pope, to whom the right of electing a successor passes, if his sons and kindred are also heretics.' 'There is nothing strange in attributing to the Roman Pontiff, as the Vicar of Him Whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, the world and all that dwell therein, the fullest authority and power to lay bare, a just cause moving him, not only the spiritual but also the material sword, and so to transfer sovereignties, break sceptres, and remove crowns.' The Canonists produce numerous instances where this has been actually done, as when Gregory II. deposed the Byzantine Emperor Leo III.; Gregory VII. deposed the Emperor Henry IV.; Innocent IV., in the Council of Lyons, deposed the Emperor Frederick II., &c.

"The celebrated Constitution *Unam Sanctam* (1303) teaches that 'both swords, the spiritual and the material, are in the power of the Church, but the latter is to be wielded for the Church, the former by the Church; one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hand of Kings and magistrates, but at the pleasure and sufferance of the priest. One sword must be under the other, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power.'" 93

The *political* aspect of the question of Corporate Reunion, set before us in the above extracts, is one which seems to be

⁹³ *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 280. Fourth edition.

almost entirely ignored ; yet it is one which every patriotic Englishman would do well to consider. The Church of Rome is not only a religious body, she is also a political power as well ; and, therefore, her twofold character must be taken into view. A proposal, which should involve the bestowal on the Emperor of Russia of the right to depose our Queen from her throne, would at once be reprobated by all loyal Englishmen. Why should a proposal, such as that of the Ritualists, which involves the right of the Pope to depose the Queen, be thought of more highly ? All true friends of our *National Independence* will, therefore, oppose the Ritualistic plans for Corporate Reunion with Rome.

We are also opposed to Corporate Reunion with Rome because it would certainly lead to the *death of our Religious Liberty*. The "woman drunken with the blood of the saints" (Rev. xvii. 6) has not lost her cruel nature. She has slain the saints of God with the sword and fire, and has never repented of her crimes and wickedness. Has she ever expressed sorrow for burning to death our Protestant Martyrs ? The history of many centuries is red with the blood she has shed. Is there no feeling of shame left in those Ritualists who plead for Corporate Reunion with *her* ? If Rome had ceased to be what she once was, we would not bring her past crimes and murders to her remembrance. But in this point, alas ! more than in any other, she is indeed *semper eadem*. Her persecuting laws are still the same as when in the Dark Ages her infernal Inquisition performed, unhindered, its bloodthirsty work. The modern authorities of the Church of Rome still glory in the intolerant work of their Church in those days. The leading quarterly journal of that Communion in this country, as recently as 1877, said :—

"It would have been a kind of ingratitude and treachery to Jesus Christ Himself—we may almost say it would have exhibited the implicit spirit of apostasy—had the hideousness of sectarianism been permitted [in the Dark Ages] to sully the fair form of Catholic unity,

had heresy been permitted to poison the pure air of Catholic truth. . . . *So far is any apology from being needed for the then existent intolerance of heretics that, on the contrary, an apology would be now needed for the Mediæval Church—and would indeed not very easily be forthcoming—had she tolerated the neglect of such intolerance. . . .* And we need hardly add—though we will not dwell on this—that *the same principle, which applied to Mediæval Europe, applies in its measure to any contemporary country, such as Spain, in which Catholicity has still entire possession of the national mind.*"⁹⁴

This is a fair warning, which might well set Ritualistic Reunionists thinking. It is confirmed by the testimony of a modern Jesuit Professor, whom Cardinal Newman termed "a great authority" and "one of the first theologians of the day," the late Rev. Edmund J. O'Reilly, s.J., who had been a Professor at Maynooth College, and at St. Bruno's College, North Wales. Professor O'Reilly declared that—

"The principle [of "liberty of conscience"] is one which is not, and never has been, and never will be, approved by the Church of Christ."⁹⁵

Another late Professor of Maynooth College, the Rev. T. Gilmartin, is equally strong in his denunciations of liberty of conscience.

"The State," he writes, "can punish heresy as an evil in itself and as an offence against the Church, and the Church can require the assistance of the State in suppressing heresy, if its interference be deemed necessary for the good of society."⁹⁶

Another contemporary priest, who has been made a Monsignor by the present Pope (Leo XIII.), argues strongly against allowing "political Liberty of Conscience" in Roman Catholic countries. "How," he asks, "could the Catholic State allow this so-called Liberty of Conscience? As well might you ask a person to allow poison to be introduced in

⁹⁴ *Dublin Review*, January, 1877, p. 39.

⁹⁵ *The Relations of the Church to Society*, by Edmund J. Reilly, s.J., pp. iii., 273. London, 1892.

⁹⁶ *Manual of Church History*, by the Rev. T. Gilmartin. Vol. II., p. 228. Dublin, 1892.

his body. Do you say, what a cruel and bigoted thing for the Catholic Church and State to put down heresy? We only ask you to allow the Catholic State the right no man will deny himself or his neighbour, to reject poison from his system."⁹⁷ I need hardly add here that the *State* can only "put down heresy" by physical force. Again, this Mon-signor remarks: "If to-morrow the Spanish Government, *as advised by the Catholic Church*, were to see that a greater evil would ensue from *granting* religious liberty than from *refusing* it, then it would have a perfect right to refuse it. Of course the Protestant Press would teem with charges of intolerance; and we should reply: TOLERATION TO PROTESTANTS IS INTOLERANCE TO CATHOLICS."⁹⁸

Now, the Ritualists know all this very well, just as much as you or I do; yet, strange to relate, their dearest ambition is to place English Churchmen under the rule of this cruel and intolerant Church. Are they not, in this, real foes of our religious liberties? The faithful and eloquent warning of the late Canon Melville may well be quoted here:—

"Make peace, if you will, with Popery; receive it into your Senate; shrine it in your churches; plant it in your hearts. But be ye certain, as certain as that there is a heaven above you, and a God over you, that the Popery thus honoured and embraced is the very Popery that was loathed and degraded by the holiest of your fathers: the same in haughtiness, the same in intolerance, which lorded it over Kings, assumed the prerogative of Deity, crushed human liberty, and slew the Saints of God."

And now, in bringing this volume to a close, I would name one last and crowning reason against adopting the Reunion Plan of Campaign of the Ritualists. They wish our Church and nation to be joined once more, in a Corporate capacity, with the Church of Rome. They do

⁹⁷ *Liberty of Conscience*, by the Rev. Walter Croke Robinson, p. 22. London: The Catholic Truth Society.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

not, as a preliminary condition, require the Church of Rome to purge herself of a single one of her false doctrines. They do not seek—though that would be a vain task—to raise her to the higher level of the Reformed Church of England; but they seek to drag down the Church of England to the level of the Church of Rome. It is an unholy task which they have undertaken, on which the smile and blessing of Almighty God cannot be expected to rest. In common with most of the learned Divines of the Church of England since the Reformation and—as we have seen—in accordance with the teaching of her Homilies, we object to Reunion with the Papacy because *the Church of Rome is the Babylon of the Revelation*. This has been most clearly and conclusively proved in that brief, able, unanswered, and unanswerable treatise of the late Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, of Lincoln, entitled:—*Union with Rome: Is not the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse?*” I cannot too urgently press upon my readers the great advantage of reading this shilling book. It was not written by an Evangelical Churchman, but by one of the old-fashioned High Church School, one whose great learning is acknowledged by all scholars. He proves that to expect the Reformation of the Church of Rome is to go contrary to the spirit of the Revelation. Her hopeless doom is to be “burnt with fire.” She will be Babylon even unto the end.

“Nearly eighteen centuries,” writes Bishop Wordsworth, “have passed away since the Holy Spirit prophesied, by the mouth of St. John, that this Mystery would be revealed in that city which was then the Queen of the Earth, the City on Seven Hills—the *City of Rome*.”

“The Mystery was then dark, dark as midnight. Man’s eye could not pierce the gloom. The fulfilment of the prophecy seemed improbable—almost impossible. Age after age rolled away. By degrees the mists which hung over it became less thick. The clouds began to break. Some features of the dark Mystery began to appear, dimly at first, then more clearly, like Mountains at daybreak. Then the form of the Mystery became more and more distinct. The Seven Hills, and the Woman sitting upon them, become more and more

visible. Her voice was heard. Strange sounds of blasphemy were muttered by her. Then they became louder and louder. And 'the golden chalice in her hand, her scarlet attire, her pearls and jewels were seen glittering in the sun. Kings and Nations were displayed prostrate at her feet, and drinking her cup. Saints were slain by her sword, and she exulted over them. And now the prophecy became clear, clear as noon-day; and we tremble at the sight, while we read the inscription, emblazoned in large letters, 'MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT,' written by the hand of St. John, guided by the Holy Spirit of God, on the forehead of the CHURCH OF ROME." 99

And now we know, in a nutshell, what the Ritualistic Conspiracy really means. What the future may bring forth God only knows. But what the duty of all loyal Churchmen is, is clear and evident. We must raise once more the good old war cry, "NO PEACE WITH ROME." While Lord Halifax and his followers would lead us astray from the good old ways of our forefathers, into open rebellion against the revealed will of God, let us hearken to God rather than to man. And His cry to one and all is not to join the Church of Rome, but to separate ourselves as far as possible from her. The command of God the Holy Ghost is, "COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE, THAT YE BE NOT PARTAKERS OF HER SINS, AND THAT YE RECEIVE NOT OF HER PLAGUES. FOR HER SINS HAVE REACHED UNTO HEAVEN, AND GOD HATH REMEMBERED HER INIQUITIES" (Rev. xviii. 4, 5).

For the Church of England let our prayer be:—

"God send her swift deliverance from the plagues which vex her now,
God heal the discord in her heart, and chase the trouble from her
brow!

And when her penal hour hath past, and purged her from her sin,
Restore her prosperous state without, and her peace and joy within.

* Wordsworth's *Union with Rome*, p. 62. Eleventh edition. London: Longmans, 1893.

- “ God give her wavering clergy back that honest heart and true,
Which once was theirs, ere Popish fraud its spells around them
threw ;
Nor let them barter wife and child, bright hearth and happy home,
For the drunken bliss of the strumpet kiss of the Jezebel of Rome.
- “ And God console all holy hearts, now yearning for the day,
When this black cloud shall pass at length from England’s skies
away !
God help us all to struggle still, with patience and with might,
Against darkness, lies, and bondage, for Freedom, Truth, and
Light !
- “ And God forgive the fallen ones—by their own weak hearts
betrayed,
And convert the misbeliever, and reclaim the renegade
And God unite the good and true, the faithful and the wise,
Till the Dayspring come on the night of Rome, and the Sun of
Truth arise ” !¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ Moultrie's *Altars, Hearths, and Graves*, p. 65. Edition, 1854.