





**PRESENTED TO ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY
BY REV. T. CALLAGHAN**

Jeffrey Elias
Lambford
1847.

$n/2$

283
W/219

5



THE IDEAL

OF A

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

CONSIDERED

IN COMPARISON WITH EXISTING PRACTICE,

CONTAINING

A DEFENCE OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IN

THE BRITISH CRITIC

IN REPLY TO REMARKS ON THEM IN

MR. PALMER'S 'NARRATIVE.'

By THE REV. W. G. WARD, M.A.

FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Second Edition.

PRESENTED TO ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

BY REV. T. CALLAGHAN



LONDON:

JAMES TOOVEY, 192, PICCADILLY.

M.DCCC.XLIV.

LONDON :
Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY, WILSON, and FLEY,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

TO
ALL MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

WHO HAVE

HER WELFARE DEEPLY AT HEART

These Pages,

WHICH HAVE BEEN PROMPTED BY

AN EARNEST DESIRE TO BEAR PART, IF IT MIGHT BE ALLOWED,

IN THE GREAT WORK

OF RESTORING UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND ACTION WITHIN HER PALE,

ARE

RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY

INSCRIBED.



PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

IN the Preface to the First Edition of the following work, I apologised for the irregularity of its structure, and the admixture of temporary and accidental matter with the general statement of principles. These defects I had hoped to remedy, as far as my ability extends, in a second edition. In particular, I had hoped to omit all allusion to Mr. Palmer and the British Critic (as belonging to an ephemeral controversy, the interest of which had passed away); to extend the eighth chapter into a more substantive form; and, above all, to enlarge the last chapter to at least double its present size, in order that the statement might be more clear and intelligible of principles, which appear to me of all the most important, in the present circumstances, not of our own Church only, but of 'the Holy Church throughout all the world.'

These intentions, however, I have been compelled for the present to abandon; because the recent proceedings at Oxford necessitate the immediate appearance

of a Second Edition, and also make it desirable that the said Second Edition should be, as nearly as possible, a fac-simile of the first. No alteration whatever, then, has been made, except the correction of typographical errors.

Of course no apology is intended for the substance of the work, as distinct from its form. As to the sentiments contained in the propositions which have been officially called into question, I have only to say that my conviction of their truth, for a long time past, has grown deeper and more undoubting; that they were expressed with the most perfect deliberation; and that with the same deliberation they are here distinctly re-asserted.

Balliol College, Oxford,
Dec. 10, 1844.

P R E F A C E.

THE following work has grown under my hands into dimensions which I had been very far from expecting. When I spoke at the outset of 'trespassing at greater length than I could wish on the public attention,' an unusually long pamphlet was the utmost which I anticipated as likely to follow. The result of this mode of composition has necessarily been, to introduce an admixture of temporary and accidental matter with the general statement of principles; an admixture, which in many respects may increase the reader's difficulty in following the course of the argument. On the other hand, without the justification which arises from having been made the subject of severe censure, I could not have brought myself to so bold a step, as publishing opinions which, however deeply and fixedly entertained, in many respects differ from those more generally held in our Church. This reason has made me feel it quite necessary to my own comfort, that I should retain the allusions to Mr. Palmer's 'Narrative;' whatever the incidental inconveniences which may be so entailed on me.

To speak of more important matters than the form of the work. The one object which has been nearest

my heart throughout, has been the attempting to lay down a sufficient basis, on which all who profess what are called 'high-church' sentiments, might be able to cooperate, without compromise on any side: and I hope that the second chapter, the fifth chapter as far as p. 260, the sixth and the seventh chapters, may on the whole meet with their concurrence. The principles, which I have laboured there to establish, are such as these:—that careful and individual moral discipline is the only possible basis, on which Christian faith and practice can be reared—that our Church at present performs the duty with deplorable inadequacy, or rather makes no attempt to perform it;—that, in consequence, our standard of holiness, and also our average of Christian attainment, are miserably low; and our belief even in such a truth as our Blessed Lord's Divinity, very far less firmly rooted than we are apt to think—that to remedy these defects is an object of so much magnitude, as to offer the fullest scope for all our energies—that to act heartily and unsuspectingly on our points of agreement, is the sure mode of arriving at agreement on matters which are now points of difference.

At the same time, for various reasons (some of which are expressed in the work) I have felt it a positive duty in no way to conceal my own deeply and deliberately entertained opinions, on the ultimate result which will ensue from all wisely-directed endeavours to reform and purify our Church. But so far from having felt it a duty to give *reasons* why I so think (though it cannot but happen that some of my reasons will incidently appear), the very object, to which I desire humbly to

invite the concurrence of 'high-churchmen,' is, that we should not trouble our minds with the ultimate result; but perform our immediate duties, under the full conviction that, in proportion as we do so, the ultimate result must be such as God in His Wisdom desires.

The discussion of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification became necessary, not only from the accidental circumstance, that I had used such strong language on the subject in the *British Critic*; but much more, because that doctrine formally denies the truth, which seems to me the key to all moral and religious knowledge, and which accordingly I lately mentioned as the leading idea of the present work; the truth, namely, that careful moral discipline is the necessary foundation, whereon alone Christian faith can be reared.

I am well aware that there are several passages in the following pages, which admit of being extracted and circulated with great promise of success: but I would beg to urge on the attention of those who might be inclined to such a course, that all who circulate extracts from a work, incur the responsibility of implying, that such extracts give a *fair and just idea* of its general contents. I here then enter my protest, that no series of extracts will, in my opinion, convey this fair and just idea, if they do not include such passages as that in p. 81, beginning, 'And I will say plainly,'—in p. 23, beginning, 'to all these I would add,' in p. 459, beginning, 'Such religious practices.' Those who may read the work, will see that these are no

more than samples of similar expressions in every part of it.

A friend who has seen the sheets thinks that there may be a misapprehension of my meaning in p. 288-9. I have more fully expressed what I there intended, in p. 576—582.

In conclusion I most earnestly desire the reader to believe and remember, that the feeling expressed at the outset, (p. 5—8.) was present to my mind in every sentence that I have written from first to last.

Balliol College, Oxford,
June 6, 1844.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

p. 1—8.

CHAPTER II.

OF WHAT KIND WILL BE THE IDEAL OF A CHURCH IN CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE OURS?

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Sect. 1. Ideal of a Christian Church | 9 |
| Sect. 2. Ideal of a Christian Church in imparting Moral Discipline | 11 |
| Sect. 3. Ideal of a Christian Church in imparting Orthodox Doctrine | 18 |
| Sect. 4. Ideal of a Christian Church in gratifying our aspirations and affections | 24 |
| Sect. 5. Ideal of a Christian Church in her relations to the poor | 26 |
| Sect. 6. Ideal of a Christian Church in her relations to the rich | 33 |
| Sect. 7. Ideal of a Christian Church as educator of the higher classes | 34 |
| Sect. 8. Ideal of a Christian Church in her intellectual duties | 35 |
| Sect. 9. Ideal of a Christian Church in her political duties . | 45 |
| Sect. 10. Inference from this review | 50 |

CHAPTER III.

IS IT UNDUTIFUL TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH TO AIM AT SUCH AN IDEAL?

| | |
|--|----|
| Sect. 1. Has the tone of the British Critic latterly been dis- loyal to our Church? | 53 |
| Sect. 2. Has it tended to perplex the humble? | 57 |
| Sect. 3. Has it tended to encourage the undutiful? | 67 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Sect. 4. Consideration of the dilemma proposed by Mr. Palmer | 70 |
| Sect. 5. Has the tone of the British Critic shewn absence of humility? | 74 |
| Sect. 6. On what account is the Church of Rome to be considered our fitting model? | 47 |
| Sect. 7. In what manner may loyalty to our Church be displayed by those who deplore its corruptions? | 93 |
| Sect. 8. On what ground can attachment to our Church be really felt by such persons? | 102 |

CHAPTER IV.

DOES OUR EXISTING SYSTEM RESEMBLE THAT OF THE EARLY CENTURIES?

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sect. 1. What is meant by 'the early centuries?' | 104 |
| Sect. 2. Does our existing system resemble theirs in Church government? | 105 |
| Sect. 3. Does our existing system resemble theirs in our formularies? | 111 |
| Sect. 4. Does our existing system resemble theirs in formal discipline? | 114 |
| Sect. 5. Does our existing system resemble theirs in recognised ecclesiastical principles? | 117 |
| Sect. 6. Does our existing system resemble theirs in our tone and temper of mind? | 133 |
| Sect. 7. Augury as to future course of the controversy | 165 |

CHAPTER V.

ON THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sect. 1. Bishop O'Brien's views on the matter stated and considered | 168 |
| Sect. 2. Statement of the two questions which it is necessary to bring to issue, and of the Lutheran answer to one of them | 185 |
| Sect. 3. Answer to objections that may be raised against <i>being</i> the allegation that this <i>is</i> necessarily the Lutheran answer | 191 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Sect. 4. Hypothetical effect of the Lutheran principle, if it were possible to act on it consistently | 194 |
| Sect. 5. Practical effect of the Lutheran principle as actually witnessed | 205 |
| Sect. 6. Statement of the vitally fundamental truth which Lutheranism denies, and defence of it against a popular objection | 247 |
| Sect. 7. The extremely important and practical results which flow from this fundamental truth | 260 |
| Sect. 8. The sacredness of hereditary religion | 279 |
| Sect. 9. Application of the principles just established to our present circumstances | 290 |
| Sect. 10. Answer to the second of the two questions raised in Sect. 2 | 293 |
| Sect. 11. Proofs of the real nature of Catholic doctrine on 'self-righteousness' | 296 |
| Sect. 12. Enumeration of some among the principles of natural religion, which Lutheranism denies | 299 |

CHAPTER VI.

ON OUR EXISTING PRACTICAL CORRUPTIONS.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sect. 1. Probability of corruptions | 306 |
| Sect. 2. Absence of all system of moral discipline for the poor | 306 |
| Sect. 3. Absence of all system of moral discipline for the rich | 334 |
| Sect. 4. Our Church's total neglect of her duties as guardian of, and witness to, morality | 386 |
| Sect. 5. Our Church's total neglect of her duties as witness and teacher of orthodoxy | 389 |
| Sect. 6. Powerlessness of our Church to perform the other duties, especially in protecting and helping her poor, while these are neglected | 409 |
| Sect. 7. Rationalism prevalent in our Church | 422 |

CHAPTER VII,

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS IN THE WAY OF REMEDY.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Sect. 1. Preliminary observations | 430 |
|---|-----|

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Sect. 2. Remedies in the power of those who have spiritual care of the poor | 438 |
| Sect. 3. Remedies in the power of those who have spiritual care of the rich | 446 |
| Sect. 4. Benefits that may be conferred on our Church by all humble and orthodox Christians | 460 |
| Sect. 5. Benefits that may be conferred on our Church by those whose life is chiefly speculative | 460 |
| Sect. 6. The absence of any present external model to guide our Church in the performance of her 'intellectual' and 'political' duties | 470 |
| Sect. 7. The ultimate result if our Church were to perform her present duties | 472 |

CHAPTER VIII.

A FEW WORDS ON OUR AUTHORITATIVE FORMULARIES.
474—481.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUPREMACY OF CONSCIENCE IN THE PURSUIT OF
MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sect. 1. The principle of free enquiry stated | 482 |
| Sect. 2. The principle of free enquiry considered with the view of refuting it | 487 |
| Sect. 3. The principle of faith stated and illustrated | 508 |
| Sect. 4. Enumeration of certain canons which follow from this principle | 516 |
| Sect. 5. Application of these canons to the enforcement of the reverence due to Scripture | 533 |
| Sect. 6. Application of these canons to the vindication of the course adopted by the Church towards her members ; and of her development of Christian doctrine | 545 |
| Sect. 7. Application of these canons to the vindication of the course adopted by the Church in gaining converts | 558 |
| Sect. 8. Application of these canons to the vindication of our position in the English Church | 562 |
| Sect. 9. Conclusion of the work | 587 |

THE IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

MR. PALMER'S pamphlet has, as might have been expected, been so widely circulated, and read with so much interest, that some notice of it, on the part of those against whom it is principally directed, seems almost imperatively called for. Who these are, Mr. Palmer makes no secret. 'It is the design,' he says in his preface, at the very outset, 'of the following pages to clear those who uphold Church principles from the imputation of approving certain recent tendencies to Romanism;' 'to draw a line of demarcation between our principles and those of the British Critic.' (p. v.) The periodical in question he considers to have been marked of late by an 'impetuosity and recklessness,' 'better fitted to revolutionize than to reform.' (p. ix.) The feelings with which 'the friends of Church principles contemplate' such 'aberrations,' are those of 'sorrow, and even indignation;' although, as the author 'most firmly and humbly trusts,' 'in no degree mingled with hostility to those brethren.' (p. 46.) The most favourable interpretation which can be given to 'language and conduct which has deeply shocked every sober-minded and orthodox believer,' is the attributing it to 'the indiscretions of youthful and ardent minds; inability to cope with controversial difficulties; a too great readiness to receive without examination any thing which may be plausibly advanced; too great confidence in intellectual powers and theological attainments.' (pp. 46, 7.) But it admits, in the author's opinion, of a very different construction, which 'appearances

seem to justify,' but of which he 'cannot bring himself to entertain the notion;' a construction which would imply, on the part of the writers whom he censures, 'revolting iniquity,' 'disgraceful and detestable treachery and hypocrisy.' (p. 68.)

These are very serious charges; and, as being one of those against whom they are brought, I am quite confident that the love of justice, so characteristic of Englishmen, will insure for me a patient hearing, if in the attempt to meet them I should find it necessary to trespass at greater length than I could wish on the public attention. And if it be asked why I come forward on the occasion, not having been Editor of the *British Critic*, nor in any way responsible for its general tone, the reply is easy; viz. that if we except the article on Bp. Jewel, the writer of which has already published a formal defence and explanation of its language, a greater number of the other passages, selected by Mr. Palmer for reprobation, were written by myself, than by all the other contributors put together. At the same time, of course, I am only professing to defend those articles for which I am myself responsible; and my doing so will be no impediment in the way of any other writer in the *British Critic*, who may wish to do the same in his own behalf. Nor, much less, is it at all necessary to allude to any other of the various matters which Mr. Palmer's pamphlet embraces. Whether or no 'some of the principles advocated in the *British Critic* are displeasing to the authors of the *Tracts*,' (p. vi.) is a matter on which *they* should speak, not the contributors to that Review, nor yet Mr. Palmer himself. Whether or no any principles 'adopted by the' same periodical, be 'wholly subversive of' doctrines 'inculcated in the *Tracts*,' (p. 45, note,) is a question which I cannot be called on to discuss, for I never either wrote in the *Tracts*, or professed to follow their teaching in every particular. And so much of my own writing has been in various other quarters the subject of very pointed and severe censure, that I shall have quite enough to do in defending myself. At the same time, I am particularly glad of the opportunity to come forward and take on myself the full responsibility which is justly mine;

as far as I may be involved in Mr. Palmer's allusion, (p. 83,) I can assure him that I have no wish whatever to avail myself of the shelter of the anonymous, or shrink from avowing what I have not shrunk from publishing.^a

The articles which I have contributed to the British Critic are those on 'Arnold's Sermons,' (October, 1841,) 'Whately's Essays,' (April, 1842,) 'Heurtley's four Sermons,' (April, 1842,) 'Goode's Divine Rule,' (July, 1842,) 'St. Athanasius,' (October, 1842,) 'Church Authority,' (Jan. 1843,) 'The Synagogue and the Church,' (July, 1843,) and 'Mill's Logic' (October, 1843). On looking them over with a view to the present object, I find nothing in them of a doctrinal nature which I can retract, except part of the second note in p. 52, of No. lxiii., in which I think I have overstated the weight due to internal evidence on the canonicity of Scripture; and except also that I could not, as at present minded, use the expressions at the bottom of p. 333, and also of p. 355, in No. lx.; neither of which passages, as far as my knowledge extends, has been made matter of comment.^b

^a "As a general rule it may be said, that no man writing upon controverted questions without the constant sense of responsibility which publicity entails, will write with the same degree of caution, the same degree of considerate forethought, the same degree of tenderness for the weak, and of wise and comprehensive charity, to which he would attain if he had that aid. An increased severity of judgment, a higher strain of invective, a more copious use of rhetorical colouring, a more artful and constant recourse to dialectic subtleties, a greater recklessness of consequences, and a blunted instinct for pure truth, commonly distinguish anonymous authorship upon matters deeply moving the nature of man. The anonymous writer conducts a process, that ought to be judicial, in the dark; in the dark he condemns, he lashes, and he stabs; unseen himself, he sees, and he acts without the salutary check which the consciousness of being seen imposes."—Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review for October, 1843, p. 596. These most forcibly and justly expressed dangers have been, in my own case, considerably counteracted by that necessity of avoiding individual peculiarities of opinion, which results from writing in a Review. Certainly I am bound to state, that I can find no instances in which I have overstated my own convictions; but a considerable number in which I have much understated them.

^b Since writing the above, I observe that Mr. Palmer (p. 51) *has* expressed a criticism on the former of these passages. That particular opinion however there implied, to which he objects, is one which I do *not* retract.

In defending these articles, I conceive that I have mainly to prove two points. First, that the various expressions and sentences quoted by Mr. Palmer and others, which seem to have shocked and startled so many excellent men, were not put forth wantonly and without careful deliberation; but were no more (often less) than the adequate exponents of my own deep, intimate, deliberate, and habitual conviction. Secondly, that they are not inconsistent with a genuine 'allegiance' and attachment 'to the Church of England,' (see Palmer, p. 50,) in the truest sense of the words. I cannot profess that I am surprised, or have any right whatever to complain, if my own articles in general have given a very different impression. This may have arisen in part from the circumstance, that (in consequence of having ordinarily treated on subjects put before me by others, and of having been also precluded from the distinct expression of any sentiment which might directly clash with those advocated by other contributors), I have never hitherto had the opportunity of putting forth a connected and methodical view, on the present condition and prospects of our Church. I cannot but hope that many statements, when viewed in their proper place and connection with reference to such a view, may appear, even to those wholly unprepared to receive them, as not destitute of reason and probability; which yet might of themselves, without such explanation, most naturally convey the impression of being wild, violent, and eccentric; of being introduced in a spirit of wantonness, and maintained in a spirit of exaggeration. Such then is the task to which I must necessarily apply myself: to draw out such a theory on our present circumstances, as may give a natural, unexaggerated meaning to the sentiments of which complaint has been made, and shew their consistency with a hearty loyalty to our own Church. For such a theory, although it most certainly was implied in the various articles I have written, still, I most readily acknowledge, could not have been deduced from them without a far closer attention than I had any right to expect; even if it should have occurred to readers (which is not very likely) to distinguish

the contributions of one writer from those of another. Nor, of course, can I be accused of egotism, if from time to time I quote, either in the text or notes, such parts of what I have written in the *British Critic* as bear some relation to what I may be at the time saying; for it is the very object of my publication to exhibit such relation.

And the same defence, which I am putting forward for using expressions liable to misconstruction, I am very desirous also to urge for the apparent immodesty of addressing the public at all, on subjects of such overwhelming magnitude and importance. I have been drawn, as it were, into the position which makes it necessary, without my knowledge and against my will. To undertake a review on such works as 'Whately's Essays,' or 'Goode's Divine Rule,' or even on writings so superior to them, as Dr. Arnold's or Mr. Heurtley's Sermons, will not, I would fain hope, be generally considered an act of unwarrantable presumption. But it so happened, that I found myself unable to comment as I wished on what appeared to me defects in those works, and to draw out consistently the antagonist truth, without implying a general view of things, differing in many particulars from that with which I ordinarily met among 'high churchmen.' This led to misconception; and this again to the necessity of explanation: and thus I find myself involved in an undertaking, from which two years back I should have recoiled in alarm. One disclaimer especially I am still most anxious to make explicitly; a disclaimer which, in more than one article, I have expressed as clearly as the anonymous permitted, and which I wished the readers of the *British Critic* to understand by the following passage in my last article: a passage which, without this clue, might seem unnecessarily introduced, or even unmeaning.

"A person who shall have no more power than would be given him by such occasional periods of moral action" (I had just spoken of acting *for a single day*, with a reasonable constancy, in disregard of other inclinations and with a single eye to duty) "in understanding and sympathising with moral goodness, and who should be very far from having attained that '*patient continuance* in well-

doing' which is absolutely required for salvation; so only he have mastered this great principle, that holy and self-denying men are the real fountains from which moral truth flows to the world, and so only he have access to the company of such men; such a person, if endued with great powers of observation and analysis, may define and adjust moral truth, trace it to its ultimate laws, and compare it in its different aspects, with a depth and precision beyond the reach of very many *who are incomparably his superiors in all that is strictly valuable.*"^c

And in an earlier article I introduced a similar disclaimer, which I shall also beg leave to quote.

"In very many cases absolute and great defects of character, and in a vast number circumstances utterly independent of the degree of their moral advancement, will be the natural occasions of bringing home to men's consciousness this sense (whether warranted or not) of their Church's deficiency. . . . A few instances may serve partially to illustrate this. In some men, according to the old division, the irascible, in others the concupiscible, part of their nature predominates. Set before men of the former class a high aim and a stern rule, they lack little else; they devote themselves with a deep and self-forgetting earnestness, to their task, and press sturdily and resolutely onward. The latter class is far more liable to be assailed by temptation, drawn back by sloth, cowed by want of sympathy, repelled by the appearance of opposition, allured by those outward objects which tend in an opposite direction. No one can call men of this character more exalted and virtuous than of the former; rather the reverse: yet it is these, and not the others, who will especially desiderate such a protection against self, as would be provided by the habit of regular and periodical confession to a priest, or occasional retirements from the world, with an appointed round of prayer and meditation; it is these again, and not the others, who will be so sensible of a deficiency, should it exist, in that varied and majestic ceremonial, which the Church in her deep wisdom has devised, that she may encounter and overcome the world with the world's own weapons, and draw her children only the more closely to their and her Lord, by those addresses to the eye and ear which are felt to be so ravishing and

^c 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 409.

transporting. And this, be it observed, will be still more felt, in proportion as habits of past sin have made the road to virtue more rugged and thorny; have increased the power of temptation, and lessened the habit of resistance. Would not any system be considered most maimed and imperfect, which, succeeding to the very utmost in all else, should fail in its addresses to the returning penitent? yet by the very hypothesis, none would be conscious of its defects, save him who should have deeply sinned. Another, it is matter of neither praise nor blame, may have a more quick and penetrating intellect than ordinary; to him, confusion and inaccuracy of expression, inconsistency of parts, and the like, would be far more readily perceptible, and far more a cause of stumbling, than to those destitute of this qualification. A third has studied history; and though studying it with a predisposition in favour of the existing system, still has experienced in the circumstances attending its establishment a cause of distrust, which otherwise he would not have experienced; or else has found the aspect of those earlier ages, to which he has been referred, to be widely different from his anticipations. Another has travelled abroad; and though he went there with a strong prejudice against other Churches, as was probably his duty, still he can no longer possibly give credence to those tales of exclusive purity at home and corruption abroad, which he has hitherto rightly taken on trust. Another again has been thrown by circumstances into positions, where his right course of action was very difficult of discovery; he has learned by experience the little sympathy felt at home for distresses of conscience, and the inestimable value of foreign works on casuistry. Another is gifted with an especial and yearning eagerness for sympathy; this is not surely the highest character; yet in consequence of it, he has within himself the most certain and sad evidence, how unfounded are the dreams, suggesting that real unity exists among the several members of his own Church, which delight the repose of many of her children. One and all of these persons may, if the reader will, be ever so widely mistaken, but at least, in lamenting the condition of the English Church, they do any thing rather than lay claim to an especial and peculiar sanctity.”^d

In a word, the charge of intellectual presumption to any extent, (though I trust that it is not deserved,) will give

^d ‘On Church Authority,’ pp. 225, 6.

me very little pain or uneasiness : but should it be imagined that the free strictures and confident opinions, in which I may indulge, imply any arrogation to myself of moral superiority over those whom I criticise ; should it be imagined that, when I acknowledge the English system to be in many particulars uncongenial with my own feelings, I allude to the impediments by which it thwarts the aspirations of a holy mind after saintliness, rather than the absence of such helps as may support an erring and sinful mind in the most ordinary path of salvation ; should this be imagined, I should be almost overpowered with shame and confusion.

CHAPTER II.

OF WHAT KIND WILL BE THE IDEAL OF A CHURCH IN CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE OURS ?

1. A VERY convenient introduction to the matter in hand will be found in an extract from the British Critic of several years since, on Mr. Palmer's treatise, in which indeed the writer professes to draw out not his own view, merely, of the Church's office, but Mr. Palmer's also :—

“Men find themselves in this world with many spiritual wants, with a consciousness that they need a revelation, and a desire to receive it. For a long while Providence left them in this unsatisfactory state, with no certain communications from Him; nay, to this day, such is the state of the greater part of the world. But He has blessed us with a message from Him, the Gospel, to teach us how to please Him and attain to Heaven. He has given us directions what to do. . . . And now comes the question, where those directions are, and what? . . . The Church is, in matter of fact, our great divinely appointed guide unto saving truth, under Divine grace. . . . The Church is practically ‘the pillar and ground of the truth,’ an informant given to all people, high and low, that they might not have to wander up and down and grope in darkness, as they do in a state of nature. Then comes the question at once, *where* is the Church? what are the criteria by which she is discriminated and known to be God's appointed messenger or prophet? And here, at very first sight, it is plain that, if the Church is to be an available guide to poor as well as rich, unlearned as well as learned, its notes and tokens must be very simple, obvious, and intelligible. *They must not depend on education, or be brought out by abstruse reasoning;* but must at once affect the imagination and interest the feelings. They must bear with them a sort of internal evidence, which super-

sedes further discussion, and makes their truths self-evident. . . Such evidences we are bound to find of the Church's divinity ; not such as cannot possibly be explained away or put out of sight, but which if allowed room to shew themselves, will persuade the many that she is what she professes to be, God's ordained teacher in the way to heaven." ^a

In this passage of course is involved the further principle, that those who have yielded their assent to the evidence thus characterized, shall find that very thing to be true on trial, which they had received on faith ; that 'high and low, rich and poor, one with another,' shall have the great principle daily and hourly impressed on their minds by the Church, of their soul's salvation being the one thing needful ; and shall be guided, encouraged, cheered, helped, and protected in the way of that salvation. Such is the form with which we should expect and desire to see the Church invested, if she is to perform those very functions for which she was given : a form which may proclaim to the world that treasure of grace which she is really privileged to dispense ; by which, as on the one hand she may bear with her plain marks of her divine commission, sufficient to accredit her at once to all serious and humble persons as God's appointed representative ; and may also offer its fitting place in His service to every faculty of every mind, moral or intellectual ; so, on the other hand, (without which indeed the former cannot exist,) she may be so consistent, plain, deep, and sound in the teaching which she dispenses, that she may unite to herself more and more firmly the hearts of all, in proportion as they have earnestly and confidingly submitted themselves to her guidance, by the 'threefold cord which cannot be broken,' of conscience, Scripture, sanctity : i.e. [1.] by their perceiving with daily increasing certainty how exquisitely her system corresponds and answers externally to the internal voice of *conscience* ; [2.] how deep and entire the harmony of her doctrines with *Scripture* ; [3.] how high and

^a British Critic for October, pp. 354, 5.

unapproachable by other systems the *sanctity* which is her witnessed result. “*Now* we believe not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.”^b

Let us carry with us then this simple and obvious ideal of the Church’s office, (which, of course, like other ideals, is nowhere realized in perfection, but towards which indefinite progress may be made,) that her one only object shall be to save the souls of those committed to her charge; and that the very proof which she offers to her children of her divine authority, shall be the sense entertained by them of the spiritual benefits she imparts; that her voice shall be as the Voice of God heard amidst the din of this restless and sinful world, guiding us in perplexities, soothing us in distresses, strengthening us in temptations, alarming the careless and worldly, cheering the contrite and humble of heart. And let us apply this ideal in detail to the principal circumstances of our age and country.

2. The great truth, which a Church following such a model, and established in the midst of a fallen world, will ever have to proclaim in the loudest and most articulate voice, will be the intrinsic hatefulness and peril of sin. Before this gigantic and paramount evil, all others shrink into infinite insignificance. In educating the young, whatever else might or might not be taught, this at least will be impressed on their minds in every variety of shape; on their conscience, on their imagination, on their reason. They will learn to connect indissolubly their idea of beauty with holiness, deformity with vice. What these duties are in their respective circumstances, which they cannot omit without the temporary loss of God’s grace, or at least imminent peril of such loss, no pains and trouble will be considered excessive, in order that they may adequately know; what those temptations are to which throughout the day they will probably be exposed, to what evil tempers and dispositions they are most liable, by what rules and pious practices they may best overcome such

^b ‘On Goode’s Divine Rule,’ p. 82.

temptations, and be faithful to the grace which God so bountifully gives them ; instruction in all this will be fully recognised as so absolutely the principal object in education, that whatever of mental cultivation must needs be sacrificed in order to its adequate reception, without thought or deliberation *will* be sacrificed. To implant principles, and inculcate habits of daily observance, which may be the Christian's safeguard against temptations from within or from without, which may be God's instruments in preserving him unharmed and unsullied in an evil world, and in enabling him to persevere even to the end, this will be not professed only but fully realized, as the one principal purpose towards which every branch of education shall converge ; differences of opinion may exist on matters of detail and application, but this great *principle* will be assumed, not in word only but in habitual act, as an axiom.

And the same principle will be extended to more general ministrations. To arouse the confessedly irreligious and profane from their fatal lethargy, and sound the trumpet of Christ's judgment, as if by anticipation, in their ears ; this is a very necessary part of the Church's duty, and will by no means be neglected. Still it will not occupy her chief attention ; for it seems absolutely impossible that persons who never come to Church nor profess to pray, should deceive themselves into the notion that they are safe from God's vengeance. Much greater care will be employed with those who do come to Church lest they be betrayed into the delusion, that a regular attendance at Christian ordinances can compensate for open and deliberate habits of sin. Such an idea, at all events as regards certain sins, is very widely prevalent in England, as all experienced clergymen combine in assuring us ; but it will fill with dismay the watchful and anxious priest. He will be ' instant in season and out of season ' in warning them of their fearful peril ; and would rather even die a death of torment, than so far encourage them in their miserable infatuation, as to admit them to the Lord's table, or recognise them as in any full sense Christian brethren.

Even this, however, is comparatively a very easy task. To impress on the mind of the offenders, at every possible occasion, the general principle of which they appear ignorant, is all that is required: the individual application, in the case of wilful and open sin, will be readily made by each one for himself. Far more subtle and specious is the snare of Satan, in cases where deadly sin exists, unknown, nay, unsuspected by the sinner himself; where wealth is idolatrously prized or pursued; or love of power or of ease wholly banish from the soul any real love of God; or men admit maxims and practices in their daily calling, indefensible on grounds of morality; or allow themselves in resentment or absence of forgiveness to some one, at least, of their fellow men; or pursue some habitual course of action which they are afraid steadily to look in the face, lest they be compelled to acknowledge it wrong; or where thoughts of pride and self-complacency, or of envy and malice, or of another and more dangerous kind, are permitted in a degree which constitutes a deadly sin; or the like.

Nor indeed are the triumphs of Satan confined to cases of deadly sin. How often do habits such as I have described, though they fall short of this extreme character, and do not actually obstruct the avenues of grace, still more or less, as it were, choke them up; so that no principle of growth displays itself; so that the spiritual stature remains dwarfish, disproportioned, and unshapely; and even though they continue in a sense to enjoy the means of grace here, the final salvation of the offenders is placed in the most imminent jeopardy.^c Such perils as these will at all

^c Spiritual writers lay great stress on the arduous contest which we shall all have to wage against Satan, at the moment of death; and say that he will put forth his utmost strength, at the moment when the prey is on the point of escaping his snares. Our Prayer-book in like manner says, "O God most mighty, O Holy and Merciful Saviour, Thou most worthy Judge Eternal, suffer us not, at our last hour, for *any pains of death* to fall from Thee." This is one great reason why a prayer for final perseverance should form part of the daily devotions even of the most advanced Christians. The thought altogether is very awful and sobering to all of us; but for those who content themselves with languid and remiss efforts after self-mastery and growth in grace, it is a ground for the most lively alarm.

times be among the most dangerous pitfalls in the Christian's course ; but in an age of civilization they will assume a shape of hundred-fold importance. At a period of comparative refinement like the present, when ' the regime of public opinion is adverse to at least the indecorous vices ;' when ' breaches of the tenth commandment of the Decalogue will be encouraged in proportion as the open violation of the three preceding is discountenanced by public opinion ;' when from the fact that ' overt acts of passion are restrained' by ten thousand motives wholly independent, or at least short, of the fear and love of God, the temptation to ' wilful, protracted, and therefore ruinous sins of thought' or of secret transgression, will be indefinitely increased ; when the strict claims of duty to God will be continually put in the background, from the very circumstance of the prominence given to a certain half-selfish, half-indolent benevolence towards man ; at such a period, the sins above described will be to an ideal Church objects of the most incessant care and watchfulness. To see persons regular at Church and Sacrament, in whom he has reason to fear the existence of such secret sins, will fill the faithful priest with misgiving and alarm. No sense of any temporal or prudential advantages, derivable from their presence there, will have the faintest effect in deadening his sense of fear for himself ; lest, by encouraging or allowing them in their most perilous self-deceit, he may have to give account for their souls at the Great Day. What he can, he will, do, by the plainest and simplest expositions from the pulpit, of the fearful character of those evil tendencies and dispositions, which he may suspect to exist within them. But he will most sensibly feel the need of some far more penetrating and efficacious weapon, in order to pierce the crust of obdurate self-complacency and self-ignorance, with which he has to deal. To the discovery of some such spiritual weapon, if such be not already possessed, the most gifted spirits within the Church will direct the utmost vigour of their mental resources. It will be felt by all around, that the whole Church is pervaded by no deeper anxiety, no more incessant and corroding care, than the supplying of this de-

iciency: that in no one other point will her eagerness be greater and more sustained, than in carefully examining the records of past and present times, and in zealously following the slightest and most distant ray of light on the subject; in order that from any possible quarter she may discover some means for adequately coping with this subtle snare, which, to her most bitter sorrow, is enmeshing the souls of so many among her dear and beloved children in the faith.

Again, a Church which is ever on the watch to catch souls, will take especial advantage of those moments, when from reverse in worldly business, or sickness, or sorrow, or from some temporary religious impression, an impulse towards good is felt by one who has hitherto led a worldly or an openly immoral life. She will 'fall on the neck,' as it were, of such an one, 'and kiss him;' she will endeavour to place religion before him in a light as attractive as truth will permit; and to make that task as easy and joyous to him as the case allows, which at best must be most wearisome and grievous, of retracing his steps, and disentangling himself, under God's grace, from the miserable thralldom of sinful habits. At the same time, some wisely and religiously constituted system of observance must be always at hand, to fan the embers of piety into a steady glow; to obtain possession of him, as it were, and secure him from the world, before the latter has had time to reassert its dominion; to bring before him religious truths and sanctions, and impress them on his whole nature; to strengthen and protect him in holy seclusion; till he may be able again to go forth into the world, without imminent danger of falling a second time away from the narrow path.

But the father who fell on the younger son's neck and kissed him, said also to the elder, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine." An object then still dearer to her heart even than comforting and retaining the penitent, will be to guide those aright, who have never wholly withdrawn themselves from under her Lord's light yoke; to relieve their perplexities, point out their duties, direct their

obedience, shew them their spiritual dangers, guide their penitential acts, and mould their habits after the Christian model. And all this, without cramping or fettering, while she directs, the free and natural development of their character; or interfering with that endless diversity of opinion, which must ever exist, on the application of true principles in each particular case. This diversity was plainly intended by God, and is an important means whereby He works out His purposes in our regard; nor could the Church more seriously mistake her duty, than by any attempt to substitute, on such matters, arbitrary Ecclesiastical dictation for well-regulated individual responsibility:

A function of the Church, even more important than any that we have yet named, is what may be briefly described as the training up of Saints; the sedulously tending of those who, whether in reward for a consistently holy walk in time past, or by the free workings of God's grace, have aspirations within them which tend to a high and noble strictness of life, and who thirst for a far more entire self-abnegation and devotion to God's will, than that for which the ordinary walks of life afford sufficient scope. To place before Christians such as these the opportunity, of consecrating wholly to heavenly realities those ardent and enthusiastic feelings, which men among us ordinarily squander on earthly and transitory objects, objects which neither are worthy of them, nor can possibly satisfy or repay them; this is an office which an ideal Church will prize and cherish to her heart of hearts, as her noblest and most transporting privilege; she will feel it as the greatest of all the mercies that she has received from God, that she is allowed, in return as it were for His infinite loving-kindness, to offer before Him specimens of the capabilities of our common nature, and visible proofs of the inexhaustible power of His wonder-working grace. But in times like the present, (as indeed at all times more or less,) for the mere purposes of practical efficiency, such institutions will have an absolutely inappreciable value. We are, if I may use a homely expression, at a perfect stand-still for want of saints and saintly men; surrounded and menaced on

all sides by dangers the most imminent ; from which, humanly speaking, we see no means of escape, until it shall please God to raise up for our needs, and to do His work among us, intrepid, self-devoted, ardent, enthusiastic, humble, holy, heavenly-minded men. A truth, to which I shall have occasion more than once to recur in what will follow.

From what has been said, it results that a Church such as we are now contemplating, will possess a profound and accurate system of *moral*, of *ascetic*, and of *mystical* theology. On every other subject except theology it is an universally admitted axiom, and I suppose even in theology few would deny it in terms, that empirical knowledge is worth very little, but that scientific knowledge may be worth a very great deal. It seems very plain, that a person whose peculiar study it is to gather facts from all quarters, to examine them carefully, to classify and arrange them, is likely to take a very much more enlarged view of any given phenomenon, than one whose experience is partial and (as it were) accidental : that one whose special business it is to speculate, whose education has been directed to that very object, and whose life is one continued practice in its performance, will certainly speculate to very much better purpose, than one whose habits have been in quite a different direction : lastly, that principles formed after deep and patient study, under no present bias, and with a single eye to truth, may possibly be very good ; but that principles extemporized on the spur of the moment, to meet a present emergency, and under the bias caused by the peculiar circumstances of that emergency, will to an absolute certainty be altogether bad. But how much stronger does the contrast become, when we remember that the phenomena now in question are not those accumulated by one man, however candid, observant, and indefatigable, but the recorded experience of all past ages of the Church ; and that the speculation is not that of one thinker, however gifted, but of a series of doctors, each one reviewing, and modifying or confirming, the dicta of those who have preceded him ; and whose theories are confronted and verified every year by an almost innumerable number of practical appli-

cations. This then being granted, it follows that, whereas the Church witnesses in the midst of us the great principles of morality; and is bound moreover to assist her children in applying them to their peculiar circumstances, in knowing what is and what is not sin, and how grievous in themselves are particular sins; she must needs have a recognised body of *moral* theology: that whereas she is bound to guide them to the various moral and theological virtues, to all holy and Christian tempers of mind; and to implant maxims of conduct and inculcate practices of piety, which shall lead to those virtues and tempers; her ministers must be sufficiently versed in a certain uniform and recognised body of *ascetic* theology: that whereas her highest office is to train, not ordinary Christians, but those predestined to be Saints, and whereas those of her children, who are climbing up that arduous and dizzy path, are free in great measure from the temptations which beset ordinary men, but exposed to perils of a more subtle indeed and transcendental, but no whit of a less fatal, character; whereas they require to be warned against the very masterpieces of Satan's subtlety, who would fain 'transform' himself even 'into an angel of light,' if by so doing he may rob but one among those exalted spirits of the crown prepared for him; and whereas *their* salvation (speaking generally) is no more assured before the end of their pilgrimage than that of the humblest Christian; she must possess a certain number of thorough proficient in the noble and wonderful science of *mystical* theology.

3. Further. 'The *duty* of a Christian (as distinguished from his gifts and privileges) may profitably be contemplated according to the well-known division of faith and obedience. In the former is included (though much more is also included) *knowledge* of the great Christian doctrines. Christian precept and Christian doctrine, these are the two great external facts which essentially claim the Christian's attention and allegiance.' And in a very remarkable manner they react on, and correspond to, one another. Pure doctrine requires for its reception a purified heart; a purified heart requires for its support and progress in holiness pure doctrine.

‘ In no other way than by the habit of strict and anxious conscientiousness, can that faculty be acquired, which alone hears God’s voice where others hear it not, or interprets His words aright where all hear them.’ In no other way than by the contemplation, reception, and hearty appropriation of sound doctrine, is this conscientiousness made really *Christian* obedience; preserved in its first fervour, or rather in a continually increasing degree strengthened, deepened, extended; led forth into a wider range, and endued with a higher and more generous quality; adding refinement and delicacy to zeal and warmth, confident hope to godly fear, joyous exultation to deep contrition and humility. ‘ Other studies, however profitable; even the religious study of Holy Scripture; much more its *critical* examination, or the knowledge of Christian antiquities, or of Church History; still more again the evidences of religion, or the geography of the Holy Land, or the harmony of sacred with profane history—no part of which latter class indeed has any pretension to be considered any part or parcel of theology at all;—but *all* these, except so far as they are contained in one of the two first named classes, are no *essential* part of the Christian’s knowledge. “ Many barbarous nations,” says St. Irenæus, “ believe in Christ without written memorial, diligently preserving the old traditions:” without reading Scripture, or knowing a word of it, men *may* be good Christians; without obeying Christ’s commandments and believing in His doctrines, they *cannot*. And the Church from the first has acted upon this principle. She has never thought of authoritatively determining the sense of any one text in Scripture, however sacred. She has excommunicated those, and those only, who were sinful in life or heretical in doctrine.’^f

The drift of this theorizing is to explain the intimate and indissoluble connection which exists, between the combats sustained by a pure Church against sin, (which we have already viewed in some of their multiform aspects,) and the witness borne by her to Christian doctrine. There is perhaps no one principle in all history, on which there is so surprising

^f ‘ On St. Athanasius,’ pp. 389, 90.

a consilience of à priori reasonings with observed phenomena, as on this ; that any Church, which shall not contain at her centre a deep dogmatic theology, exuberant with life, indomitable in energy, that Church is languid in her spiritual functions, wavering and unauthoritative in ruling her own subjects, feeble and prostrate in her external relations. And what the wonder ? Saints are the very hidden life of a Church ; and Saints cannot be nurtured on less than the full Catholic doctrine. Nay, even Christian obedience, in an earlier or lower stage of growth, so far as it is really Christian, must be in one certain given direction, not in some other. Nor is there any one object which an ideal Church will recognise as more vitally important, or to the attainment of which she will direct more unwearied and incessant efforts, than the providing that all her children shall have placed before them, necessarily indeed in very varied degrees of advance and of refinement, but still in whatever degrees of advance the very same doctrine, the one real, consistent, orthodox faith.

As to that faith itself, as stored up in its whole fulness within the Church, an ideal Church will be no one whit less sedulous in preserving the ‘unitatem in necessariis’ than the ‘libertatem in dubiis.’ By ‘necessaria’ she will understand such doctrines as in any way concern the moral and spiritual development, even in its most exalted state : by ‘dubia’ those many points of minor importance, which are deduced by the intellect, not impressed on the spiritual nature ; or again, those cases in which the moral impression on holy minds is absolutely one and the same, but the intellectual interpretation of that impression varies, according to the accident of education, habit of mind, mental cultivation and powers. Whether the differences of opinion still allowed within the Roman Church, on the subject of predestination, be of this latter class, is a suggestion which I throw out with the utmost diffidence, and submit to the judgment of those who may be able to decide on it.[§] Again : how far from the vital and fundamental importance of the great office of the

[§] Mr. Newman says somewhere (though I cannot at the moment refer to the passage), that the Augustinian doctrine is merely the form into which minds, cast in a certain mould, throw the eternal truth, that the way to Life is narrow.

Church whereof I have been just speaking, taken in connection with the absolute impossibility of its fit performance by any human wisdom, a probability accrues of the opinion being well founded, which has so generally prevailed in the Church, that a special and divine help is continually imparted to her supreme authority, (whatever that authority may be,) enabling it to decide on doctrines with unfailing accuracy; this is a question which I am not bound to discuss, but throw out for the consideration of those whom it may concern.

Next, as to the Church's method of impressing these great truths on her children one by one. In one of my Articles I have ventured to express an opinion, that in every one who has cure of souls, 'dogmatic theology, an accurate and habitual knowledge of the Church's formal statements of doctrine, will be an essential part of his qualifications. It will be impossible for him otherwise to dispense religious truth to his flock as their spiritual necessities require it; and he may thus most seriously injure the harmonious development of their inward life.'" ^h One advantage resulting from this, and by no means an insignificant one, will be, that parish priests will practically realize the fact, which persons who have not at least mastered its elementary principles will never believe, that there *is* such a science as dogmatic theology; and, there being such, that they who have devoted their lives to its study, when accordant with each other, should meet with absolutely implicit deference on the subject from those who have not. Hence a priest will very carefully and habitually use language precisely orthodox, even on details whereof his own spiritual advancement or else intellectual acumen has not yet enabled him to discern the essential importance. Without this universal and harmonious accuracy of language, unless every thing which comes from authority, authoritative teaching, prayers, ceremonial, conspire with one consent to impress on their conscience, imagination, and reason, one and the same religious faith, one and the same religious character, the Church's task, in itself sufficiently arduous, of providing her

^h 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 52.

children with Christian doctrine suitable to their needs, would be rendered absolutely hopeless. It is a certain fact, however we account for it, and a fact which throws very considerable light indeed on the present condition of the English Church, that in innumerable cases, where spiritual addresses are more or less discordant from one another on important points, those submitted to their influence experience no conscious dissatisfaction, (which would be incomparably better, for it would lead to inquiry and interest,) but rather that these various addresses in great part neutralize each other; and that to a miserable extent the people fall into a habit of hearing religious words without attaching to them any definite meaning, and the voice of the preacher becomes to them almost as ‘sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.’

What I have said shews to a certain extent the rationale of what is continually exemplified in Ecclesiastical History; viz. that certain modes of expressing doctrine, which as used by this or that person may have a precisely orthodox meaning, are nevertheless, in the performance of her bounden duty, proscribed by the Church. The reason being, that if their use be allowed to any Christians, (though they may be neutralized by the spiritual discernment in the case of eminently religious persons, and though of course they will produce no *direct* effect whatever on the unintellectual, still) they will to a most lamentable extent either baffle and confuse, or else pain and distress, many an excellent Christian, who carefully and habitually endeavours to perform the essential duty of realizing and dwelling upon the religious expressions he is taught. Nay, infinitely worse than this is the ultimate result; for if allowed to circulate among the mass of educated believers, much more if carried into their consequences by profound thinkers, they will introduce into the community feelings and methods of thought wholly inconsistent with the true Christian element, and thus sap the very foundations of the faith. This danger can of course be seen, in a particular case, only by those who are deeply versed in dogmatic theology; and this will still further illustrate the indispensable necessity of that implicit deference to the united decisions of

such men, which the Catholic Church has ever yielded. It must not be forgotten in conclusion, that to *proscribe*, in the case of a body whose sanctions are wholly spiritual, is to *anathematize*.

Of course, as was just now implied, the number of those who are directly guided into orthodoxy by means of orthodox *statements* is comparatively limited. In what manner the unlearned and unintellectual are to learn orthodoxy, indeed 'the whole subject of the religious *knowledge* of a saint-like and heavenly-minded believer, who should be wholly without intellectual cultivation, is full of importance, interest, and (we may add) mystery, and well deserves a separate discussion by itself.'¹ On this discussion I have no room nor inclination here to enter; nor to pursue into their ultimate elements, even so far as might be done, the phenomena in question. A very few words however on the matter do seem called for. Mr. Newman lays down, as a foundation for their reception of such knowledge, that 'it would not be safe to deny to the illuminating grace of Baptism a power at least of putting the mind into a capacity for receiving impressions;' a sentiment which, if he had not stated it thus problematically, I confess I should not have hesitated to express confidently. 'The secondary and intelligible means,' he goes on to say, 'by which we receive the impression of Divine Verities, are such as the habitual and devout perusal of Scripture, which gradually acts upon the mind: again, the *gradual influence of intercourse with those who are themselves in possession of the sacred ideas*; . . . again, a continual round of devotion; or again sometimes in minds both fitly disposed and 'apprehensive,' I should be inclined to say especially among the very religious poor, 'the almost instantaneous operation of a keen faith.'² To all these I would add, as one most especial means of effecting the object desired, what is sometimes called the preaching *Christ*. I mean, putting Him before the people as the principal object for their contemplation; leading them on to meditate in private on the various circumstances of His life, under the habitual im-

¹ 'On St. Athanasius,' p. 419.

² University Sermons, pp. 334, 5.

pression that it is God to Whose acts and words they listen ; to address Him spontaneously in all troubles and distresses ; to keep ever present in their mind a sense that He, of Whom they hear or read, created them one by one ; that at this very time He knows all their thoughts, governs all the events which meet them in their daily course, feels for all their trials, gives them strength for victory, will judge them at the Great Day. If His real and proper Divinity be by such methods as this deeply and firmly imprinted on their mind ; if they be carefully taught from the very first the most elementary expressions of orthodoxy on the two principal doctrines of Revelation, such as ' Three Persons, One God,' and ' One Person, Two Natures ;' and are habituated to the frequent recitation of our ordinary doxology ; then the natural use, in sermons and the like, of such Scripture language as " God sent His Son into the world."— " The Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in My name," " He shall glorify Me ; for He shall receive of Mine and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine : therefore said I that He shall take of Mine and shew it unto you"—and other similar expressions ; the use, I say, of such language, joined with the most careful and undeviating orthodoxy of expression in all that is said to them, will lead them forward, in proportion to their spiritual growth, (so at least I cannot but think,) into full implicit belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation. And when Christians, who are proceeding in the path of holy obedience, have realized so much as this, I sometimes fancy that they would almost anticipate the further doctrine of the Atonement, even were it possible that they should not have heard it from without. Certainly, becoming, as they do, daily more conscious of their miserable sinfulness, and of the deep corruption of their nature ; after they have once mastered, in some not wholly insufficient measure, the before incredible truth that God became Man, an equally real apprehension, and an unspeakably deep and grateful appreciation, of the further and now most credible truth, that His death was our redemption, will most easily follow.

4. Such then is the essential and fundamental duty of the Church ; the united maintenance of these two objects, which



cannot by possibility be maintained separately, holiness of life and orthodoxy of faith. Second to this in importance, but second only to this, is the attempt to give to all our high aspirations and affections their adequate and fullest satisfaction, where only it can be found, in God's service. I will instance, as the principal particular under this head, public prayer; or to speak more accurately, the provision of a public office for prayer, praise, and thanksgiving in its various shapes.

This doubtless, if not closely connected with a strict government of the inward life, by an inevitable necessity declines more or less into hollowness and formalism; but notwithstanding, when based upon right individual faith and practice, it supplies us with a most invaluable vent for our social regards and sympathies. In order however that this may be so, it is of primary importance that the accessories of this service shall be divested of every approach to gloom, constraint, pedantry, or formality; that 'the mould into which the united prayers of the Church are thrown shall' not 'be destitute of poetical beauty,' nor 'offend the spiritual taste by inflated declamation, lengthy verbosity, tedious sameness, wearisome repetition;' that it shall 'give sufficient utterance to all those feelings and desires which Christians in public prayers would wish to express,' and 'all the great doctrines of revelation which they would desire to honour;' lastly, that the people shall not be unduly 'restrained by forms; that they' shall be 'allowed and encouraged to vent their warm devotional feelings in such external acts and gestures as naturally express them,' not be 'bound by harsh and cruel custom to an exterior of polite indifference, a cold, cramping, stifling uniformity.'¹ But the principles which a true spiritual wisdom would apply, to the setting in order of the services of the sanctuary, have been so admirably expressed in several articles of the *British Critic*, that it is not necessary here to say more on the subject.

But not only in religious celebrations, universally, the sense of the sublime and beautiful will be one very principal means, whereby the Church will impress on the minds of her

¹ 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' pp. 24, 5.

children those superhuman realities, which it is her office to witness. 'Those mysterious feelings which are called forth by the sense of beauty, are media by which heavenly and supernatural truths are, in various measures, shadowed forth to the believer's mind; by which are impressed faint, confused, and unconnected ideas of that unknown Beauty, whose intuition in its full and harmonious completeness is reserved for a future existence.'^m 'Whether it be solemn ceremonial, or music, or architecture, or again poetry, which draws forth the sense of beauty in the particular case, so it is that he who patiently continues in well-doing and in waiting upon God, *is* addressed by Him through some peculiar channel, and receives "through a glass darkly" perceptions of eternal and heavenly truth.' A Church then, fully furnished for her high calling, will have a school of architecture, of music, of painting, perhaps of poetry, of her own; each setting forth in its peculiar method, and impressing on those who are open to its peculiar influence, the one essential and unalterable stamp of the Christian faith and character. Nor should we suppose, that in times past the accomplishment of this high object has been left to unassisted human agency. 'The vast ceremonial, ritual, liturgical system which is her heritage, the noble building, the solemn procession, the ravishing chant, are, to an indefinite extent, the suggestions of the Spirit Himself to the beloved Bride of Christ. And if to the deep prejudices of modern Englishmen this statement appears at once utterly extravagant, let them read their Bibles, and remember the case of Bezaleel; nay, let them ask themselves whether, in plain reason, the fit outward expression of the Church's feeling, e. g. on Good Friday, would not be an object so far surpassing all other outward things in majesty and sublimity, as to be a worthy occasion for special interposition.'ⁿ

5. But the ideal I am endeavouring to draw out, though even at last it must needs be very incomplete, still will be far from sufficiently specific to suit the necessary exigencies

^m 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 398.

ⁿ 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' pp. 9, 12, 13.

of my purpose, unless I proceed from these generalities, to consider the peculiar circumstances of some among the various classes into which England is divided; and trace in imagination the demeanour of an ideal Church under those circumstances. And first I will consider those, far the dearest objects of affection to the Church as to her heavenly Master, the little ones of Christ, the poor; that class to whose number belonged the Apostles, St. Mary, our Blessed Lord Himself; that class whom He begins by pronouncing blessed; that class whom he vouchsafed to single out from the rest, and say especially that to them the Gospel was preached. And in default of practical knowledge, let me make my statements on the authority of a work recently published,^o which can labour under no possible suspicion of advocating the general views which I humbly support; but which, I believe, has received a very general testimony from the public on the substantial truth of its statements, and which shews indeed, in its whole composition, that the writer has been at the utmost pains, to unite dispassionate accuracy of statement with that warmth of benevolence and zeal against oppression, which are such attractive characteristics of his production.

“In England, the population compelled to labour for daily bread may be arranged generally under the following heads; manufacturing, mining, commercial, and agricultural.” p. 15.

“*The Manufacturing Poor.* The employment in nearly all its branches is unhealthy, wearisome, and irksome; the confinement severe, and the numbers crowded into a given space, such as to *impregnate both the physical and moral atmosphere with poisonous qualities.* Twelve hours in the twenty-four is the minimum for young persons in the mills and factories, which constitute a main department of this branch, and no precise limit is set to the toil of adults. The ordinary day’s labour in these employments, with the time required for going and returning, *occupies fourteen or fifteen hours out of each four and twenty.* What distinction can be drawn between the forcible wresting away of a poor man’s Bible, and the *exhaustion of his bodily powers* to such a degree,

^o ‘The Perils of the Nation.’—Seeley, London, 1843.

that the very little time allowed him for rest scarcely suffices to recruit them, and *leaves him neither leisure nor ability for intellectual or spiritual improvement?*

“*Vice and demoralization reign unchecked in these establishments. . . . There are masters who take an interest in the well-being of their servants, but what proportion do they bear to the bulk of their brethren? Is it as one to twenty? one to fifty? one to a hundred? we fear it is not. This then is the all but universal character of a factory: the labourers consist of persons of both sexes and of all ages, from the hoary transgressor, whose . . . long experience in iniquity renders him no less effectual in Satan’s service, down to the little child that cannot yet attach a meaning to the foul expressions which its ears drink in. These persons, contributing each some share to the common stock of evil communication, . . . from the element in which they live, an ocean of reckless, raging profligacy, are prepared to overpower and engulf every new victim cast upon the surface of its bottomless abyss.*” pp. 18—24.

“*Mining Poor.* The horrors of this department have, like their sable treasuries, been long hidden from the light of day. . . . In many of the mines now working the roads or passages do not exceed *eighteen inches in height.* The closeness of the place would speedily produce suffocation, were it not ventilated from above. . . . If the ventilation be imperfect, the heat in the workings becomes most offensive; and the character of the gases combined, the moisture where the drainage is not very complete, and animal effluvia, render it *the most noisome, most horrible atmosphere that man’s lungs can inhale.* . . . No ray of natural light, no breath of unfettered air, . . . ever visit the miner’s place of work; but perils fearful to contemplate impend over him, requiring above almost any other predicament of human life, that his way amidst the bowels of the earth should be cleared *of all unavoidable enticements to transgression,* and the solemn truth allowed to bear with full force upon his conscience, that ‘there is but a step between him and death.’ . . .

“The nature of the ordinary employment in coal mines is to the stout heart of man appalling, to his vigorous intellect debilitating, to his sinewy frame, in its full maturity, exhausting. . . . What a man by the utmost efforts of willing labour can earn, is often utterly insufficient; whence it follows, that ere *his wife and babes*

can eat, *they must be immersed in the untold horrors of those subterranean hells.* . . . Little creatures of eight, five, yea, four years are chosen, whose fathers carry them down to the pit even in their night gowns, as the evidence has shewn, place each poor babe behind a door, and leave it, crying with cold and terror, in total darkness *for twelve or fourteen hours*, with no one variation of its wretched employment.

“*The most abandoned vice reigns in the mines*, transforming the female character into something so depraved, that their language and conduct are far worse than the men’s. . . . Added to the powerful influence of constant persuasion to sin, is *the total absence of all restraining principle.*” pp. 29—46.

“*Workshop Labourers.* In the iron manufactures . . . the children are put to the vice as early as seven years of age. . . . One even of the more respectable employers admits . . . that he has carried on his works sometimes for nineteen or twenty hours a day, *boys as well as men.*”

“In screw manufactories the *females* constitute 80 or 90 per cent. of the whole number employed.” In manufactories generally “these poor children (girls and boys) are subjected to the” most incredibly “brutal treatment, ‘beaten with a seat-rod—a stick as thick as a ‘finger—every week,’ with ‘a whip with four lashes to it and tied ‘in knots;’ one boy’s master ‘cut his head open five times, once ‘with a key and twice with a lock; knocked the corner of a lock ‘into his head twice:’ another’s ‘hit him on the head with a hammer—the blow cut his head open and he fainted away.’”

“Dreadful also are the sufferings of these poor children from the mere want of food.

“The inevitable consequence of this utter disregard of all the obligations of parent or employer, is seen in *the fearful depravity which prevails among these poor creatures.* . . . ‘Moral feelings and sentiments *do not exist* among them. They have *no morals.*’” pp. 50—62.

“*The Commercial classes.* A young man opens a small shop: . . . in former times what would have been his plan? He must have commenced in a moderate way according to his means; and by sound goods, fair prices, and steady attention, endeavoured to establish a character, &c. Such times however are unhappily at an end; a new system is in operation, &c. A young man . . . cannot long contend against present loss, decreasing custom, and the feverish anxiety inseparable from so exciting a conflict. He perhaps be-

comes more reckless in his dealings, and by the discovery of unequivocal frauds is overwhelmed with disgrace, &c. What his future lot may be, no one can predict; but the ranks of our army, the walls of our workhouses, and, alas! *the hulks of our convict-ships*, could exhibit many a living illustration of this statement.

“*Another class more extensive* :—to begin with stationery . . . a reduction, the amount of which we should be ashamed to calculate, enables the epistolary world to save a farthing on every dozen billets they dispatch, at the trifling cost of driving to *starvation, prostitution, or some summary mode of self-destruction*, the succourless young females whose bread is thus wrested away.” pp. 68—73.

“*Agricultural poor*. The distress existing among the agricultural poor is great; it is also increasing. . . . The utter absence of any powerful motive to honest labour, resulting from the fact that nothing to which he puts his hand is or can be his own, . . . is enough to cramp the energies and deaden the feelings of any man. He feels himself a supernumerary on the earth’s surface; he has no proprietorship in any thing, save perhaps in a helpless family, whose hunger he knows not how he can appease. . . . He becomes a reckless, if not a demoralized being; and the contrast which he cannot but draw between his own condition and that of the landed proprietor whose soil he tills, engenders feelings of *envy, hatred, and a disposition to violence*, of which many are eager to take advantage. . . . Our agricultural poor are wholly and hopelessly dependent on what they can gain by toiling for others; they dwell in hovels, single or clustered,* destitute of comfort, cramping the body and depressing the mind. . . . And thus, *as among the other working classes, personal respectability becomes a chimæra*: they follow *the lowest instincts and impulses of animal life*, and are perfectly prepared to become the scourges of those orders in society who have trampled them down to so wretched a level.”^p pp. 81—87. “England is one vast mass of superficial splendour, covering a body of festering misery and discontent. Side by side appears, in fearful and unnatural contrast, the greatest amount of opulence, and the most appalling mass of misery. . . . Where once was sociable and merry England, we have care and caution in the countenance of the rich man, in the working man discontent, in the poor man misery and depression.” p. xv. 8.

^p See British Critic, No. lxxv. pp. 271, 2. Indeed the whole of that very beautiful article ‘on agricultural labour and wages,’ forcibly illustrates the positions of the writer whom I am quoting.

It has been most justly and admirably said, that 'the Church is the poor man's court of justice. He has no other. It is a saying in the mouth of every one, that laws are made to protect the strong, not the weak. The laws cannot concern themselves with small things. They assert principles, and so are a political testimony to the obligation of justice. They can do little more, as far as the poor are concerned. Nor should we wish to see it otherwise. A multiplicity of particular laws made for the poor, would increase their misery, and be utterly ineffective; for law *cannot* reach their position, any more than it can the relations of parent and child, husband or wife. Law protects chiefly its own creations, wealth and privilege. . . . Generally speaking, the rights of the rich can be asserted by law; generally speaking, the rights of the poor cannot, because they are matters, not of positive institution, but of nature, of feeling, and of custom. When the moral tone of the country is unchristianized, it is all one whether the poor are serfs by law, or citizens by law. Their poverty in both cases is equally weak, contemptible, and ridiculous. It devolves on the Church, therefore, to assert in her own courts the rights of the poor. She must exhibit a picture of Christian equality, as an edifying lesson to the world; and put her poor and helpless in that honourable position, which shall render any thing which injures or degrades them an obvious offence against the Church, and shocking to the common feelings of Christians.'^a

And it is for such reasons, among others, that 'the Church when free, has ever assigned to Christ's poor a quasi-sacramental character.'^b

Truly, this being so, to discuss how an ideal Church would comport herself, if co-existing with such tremendous evils as those just enumerated, involves the same sort of difficulty, which Aristotle notes as to the parallel inquiry, in what manner a perfectly virtuous man would repent. A perfectly virtuous man would have done nothing to repent of; and in like manner, a pure Church could *not* have co-existed with such tremendous evils. 'The sufferings of the poor, in (even very corrupt) Catholic times, are at once known and felt by

^a British Critic, No. lxiv. p. 489.

^b 'On Arnold's Sermons,' p. 303.

the clergy, and 'it is their province to proclaim those sufferings in the ears of the civil rulers.'^c No one can even plausibly accuse our civil rulers of wanton and deliberate cruelty; neglect and thoughtlessness are all which can be laid to their charge, and are quite enough, alas! to account fully for our present extremity of evil. But such neglect and thoughtlessness could have had no existence, had a pure Church then energized in our country; for a pure Church's heart beats with the most ready and spontaneous sympathy with all the troubles of the poor; and she would with eager and urgent zeal have pleaded, clamoured, threatened in their behalf, 'to help the fatherless and poor to their right, that the man of the earth be no more exalted against them.'

Let us suppose, however, an ideal Church to be suddenly placed in charge with a country, in which such a state of things had been allowed to grow up unchecked. What a scene presents itself to the imagination! How careful at once her inquiry, what may be those branches of labour in which, whether from the kind or the amount of toil, the leading of a Christian life would be impossible; and how stern the prohibition, enforced by all spiritual sanctions, against any of her children engaging in those branches! In less extreme cases, how loving and considerate her tenderness to the poor sufferers! with what profound wisdom would an early education be imparted, which might prepare them for the life to which they are destined! with what urgency and care would such holy practices be taught them, as might protect them against the spiritual dangers which surround them on all sides! with what zeal and thoughtfulness would such religious services be prepared for their one day of rest, as might cheer, soothe, and refresh them! Religious ceremonial, in other cases but an accessory, (though a most important one,) becomes in these an absolute essential; for in what other way can religious truths be possibly impressed deeply on those whose minds are worn down by unceasing anxiety and care, and whose bodies are exhausted with severe and protracted toil? Then what employment would she not make of her spiritual censures, in directing them against the op-

^c 'On Goode,' p. 79.

pressors of the poor; what loud and clamorous appeals to our civil rulers; what addresses to those of her own children who are influential in a worldly point of view! Such a sketch may suffice as a faint outline of the picture, and a means of suggesting to the reader numberless points of detail.

6. From the poor we proceed to the rich. And here, when we bear in mind the appalling denunciations against wealth which we read in Scripture, how marked and authoritative an attitude should we not expect such a Church to assume, in her dealings with this class of her children! how urgent and impressive her admonitions to them, to 'place no trust' in those riches, but live as 'poor in spirit.'

A careful and accurate observer of men and things in their secular phase, I should say the most so of any contemporary English writer, I mean Mr. John Mill, gives us the following result of his experience:—

'There has crept over the refined classes, over the whole class of gentlemen in England, a moral effeminacy, an inaptitude for every kind of struggle. They shrink from all effort, from every thing which is troublesome and disagreeable. When an evil *comes* to them, they can sometimes bear it with tolerable patience (though nobody is less patient, when they can entertain the slightest hope that by raising an outcry they may compel somebody else to make an effort to relieve them). But heroism is an active, not a passive quality; and when it is necessary not to bear pain but to seek it, little need be expected from the men of the present day. They cannot undergo labour, they cannot brave ridicule, they cannot stand evil tongues; they have not hardihood to say unpleasant things to any one whom they are in the habit of seeing, or to face, even with a nation at their back, the coldness of some little coterie which surrounds them. This torpidity and cowardice, as a general characteristic, *is new in the world*; but (modified by the different temperaments of different nations) *it is a natural consequence of the progress of civilization, and will continue until met by a system of cultivation adapted to counteract it.*'^d

And what is to supply such a system except the Church? So capital an evil, so enfeebling us in all our efforts to benefit

^d London and Westminster Review, April 1836, p. 13.

the poor or spread the Gospel, so crushing to all growth of Christian perfection, nay, so contradictory to the elementary idea of the Christian character, which is, to fight Christ's battle here on earth, will not long continue uncontrolled, when a pure Church confronts it. Bringing from her treasure things new and old, she will be at no loss for a remedy; nor will she be, from respect of persons, lukewarm or hesitating in its application.

The same accurate and dispassionate observer remarks:—

“As civilization advances, . . . the only motive to action which can be considered as any thing like universal, is *the desire of wealth*; and wealth being in the case of the majority the most accessible means of gratifying all their other desires, *nearly the whole of the energy of character which exists in highly civilized societies concentrates itself in the pursuit of that object*. . . . Thus it happens that, . . . particularly among ourselves, *the energies of the middle classes are almost confined to money-getting*, and those of the higher classes are nearly extinct.” p. 12.

And ‘the love of money is the root of all evil!’ With what unremitting urgency and intentness of purpose, by what varied machinery, by sermons, by personal addresses, by the exhibitions of voluntary poverty, by setting forth the claims of the poor, by putting forward other pursuits as objects for this energy, which thus does far worse than run to waste, will not an ideal Church oppose herself to this most baneful and anti-Christian tendency?

7. Having mentioned the upper classes of society, let us consider the Church's dealings with them, as being the *educated* classes; and first let us conceive an ideal Church, which should virtually possess a control over the whole education of those classes. We should find in such a Church, united with a profound appreciation of the very important place in mental culture held by the study of heathen literature and philosophy, a very keen sense also of the spiritual dangers thence accruing. I speak not only of peril to that, almost highest of all graces, the perfect purity which consists in the absence of the power to realise practically what is sinful and corrupt:*

* See Newman's Parochial Sermons, vol. vi. p. 287.

this of course is the greatest danger, but there are other very real and formidable dangers also. There is danger, e. g. lest unconsciously young persons adjust their idea of the heroic, the sublime, and the beautiful, to a heathen not a Christian standard; lest the highest evangelical virtues, spotless purity, voluntary poverty, extreme sensitiveness of conscience, rejoicing in shame, reproach, and suffering, be rather allowed for or excused, even if not despised and repudiated, than honoured with that artless and enthusiastic admiration, which the Gospel requires, and which is so graceful and salutary in the young. For dangers such as these an ideal Church will have devised, with pains and sagacity, deep and efficacious remedies; she will have 'spoiled the Egyptians,' and made the treasures of heathen antiquity subservient to that Divine fabric which was reared on its ruins.

Here, too, is another most grave circumstance, which the Church in her capacity of educator should most seriously weigh. If there be a character peculiarly removed from human sympathies, peculiarly inaccessible to religious motives, peculiarly proud, selfish, unbelieving, almost diabolical, it is that of one who, with uninterrupted health and prosperity, and vigorous intellectual powers, devotes himself to congenial studies as the one pursuit of his life, without submitting himself to the special discipline suited to his case. In Catholic ages, intellectual studies were indissolubly connected with a range of religious exercises and offices; and a pure Church will be most forward and earnest in training up those, who are called to such a life, in self-denial on small matters, much religious meditation, and frequently-repeated prayer.

8. Again, 'each succeeding age has its own intellectual development, and theology *'scientiarum omnium domina et magistra'* is most deeply concerned in such development. New modes of philosophy, deeper views of history, fresh discoveries and a higher criticism in philology, all should offer their choicest treasures at the feet of Revelation; and yet, when left in the hands of heretics and unbelievers, they fail of doing so. Rather, whether from inadequate premises, or faulty inferences, or at least (which will quite certainly be

found in such persons) deficiency in the true philosophical temper, they will frequently appear to issue in conclusions at variance with revealed doctrine, and will foster, consciously or not, in the minds of the intellectual world the monstrous notion, that increase of knowledge tends to diminish rather than enlarge the sphere of heavenly truth. Systems will be found, most dazzling and imposing from the depth, brilliancy, and varied ability of their devisers, which will strike with dismay the humble and gentle believer, which will deal rudely with his most sacred associations, and sport with his deepest and most certain convictions. And the result must be, that such persons will be led by their very virtues to (what we must call in itself) a narrow-minded and morbid dread of the spread of knowledge, a flurried and excited denunciation of the use of God's gifts of reason and intellectual power; that is, in other words, holiness and mental cultivation must be brought into a state of hopeless and ever-increasing opposition; unless there be some visible tabernacle of the truth, towards which the alarmed and disquieted soul may turn for peace and light to guide him through the entanglement.' . . . Accordingly, to meet this danger, 'the Church, in her high and palmy state, displays an antagonist literature and philosophy of her own; and for such schools of thought as are without her pale, she calmly and soberly surveys them; absorbing from them into herself such high and important principles as they may have introduced; so disentangling them from error and uniting them with other truths, as to lead them forward to more legitimate inferences; and thus using them, to display the treasure committed to her charge, in new and ever-varying lights, and to increase it by new acquisitions and results.'^f

I will proceed to give a few applications of this, without professing in the least to exhaust the subject.

I. The circumstances of the last three centuries have given both increased interest and very remarkably a new character and development to the study of Biblical Criticism. Protestants have accordingly, I believe, pursued this study with great ability and success; while they have, from the necessity

^f 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' pp. 36, 7.

of their Creed, more or less pressed it into the service of rationalism and heresy. I have no wish to assign an undue place to this study; doubtless, it is among the more humble sciences, and to dream of comparing it, in interest and essential dignity, with the great fundamental and normal science of dogmatic theology, would be like comparing the power to spell syllables with the Christian Gift of Faith. Still, in its place it has importance; and it most justly claims at the hand of an ideal Church, a full recognition, and a deliverance from the power of those who now (unintentionally) abuse it to dangerous purposes and results.

Moreover, the surface of the New Testament presents to the unbiassed critic an appearance of contradiction to several Catholic truths; for instance, the Christian Priesthood, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the duty of penance, the honour due to St. Mary: nay, even to undoubted facts; such as the fact that baptized Christians are very frequently found in deadly sin, and again, that the duration of the world has outlasted all the Apostles and first Christians. Doubtless, it is a very sinful course, to adopt an exegetical interpretation of Scripture, as any part of our rule of faith; still it is a duty to diminish as much as possible the temptations to sin. And over and above this, the superficial meaning of the New Testament (the meaning, that is, which may be obtained from it by principles of criticism) cannot *in reality* contradict doctrines which are from the same Author; or, in other words, there must be a sound method of critical interpretation, which admits of being opposed to the unsound. For both these reasons then a Church ought, I do not say to make it at all a primary object, but still not to neglect the task, of gradually discovering and illustrating this method. For reasons not very dissimilar, a good commentary on the 'Romans' and 'Galatians' would be an acceptable service.

II. Here I may mention Physical Science, now so generally and necessarily cultivated, and the peculiar intellectual mistakes concerning its province and capabilities, which in one way or other militate against Christian truth, and against which the Church is bound to warn its votaries.

III. History is another study which is assuming considerable importance at the present time; and that under two distinct aspects. The first may be called critical, and is both absolutely necessary, and I suppose principally important, as preparing the way for the other. I allude to the study which concerns itself with discovering the real circumstances of past ages, 'detecting the meaning of small things, and dragging to light the forgotten elements of a gone-by state of society, from scattered evidences which the writers themselves who recorded them did not understand;'⁷ distinguishing truth from fable, plain fact from allegorical 'myth,' and the like; and thus preparing the materials, by which the philosophical mind may test and verify its theoretical deductions. High and rare powers of mind have been beyond doubt devoted to these inquiries; Niebuhr, judging from what is said of him by competent persons, is the great model and example of an historian of the kind; though he seems considered to have occasionally taken a higher range also.

These writers are brought into direct contact with the Old Testament, and have started many difficulties on the right mode of understanding its historical narratives. But an ideal Church would have interpreters ready at hand, both to solve these difficulties, and to avail themselves of the science itself, as might so advantageously be done, for the purpose of illustrating and clearing up many parts of our earlier sacred books.

A much higher science of history however is in gradual progress of formation, which has a far nearer connection both with poetry and with philosophy. It aims at 'realizing a true and living picture of times past, clothed in their circumstances and peculiarities;'⁷ at probing to the bottom, in regard to those times, 'not the intellectual life of intellectual men, not the social life of the people, but their internal life; their thoughts and feelings in regard to them-

⁷ The passages marked as quotations, in this and the two following paragraphs, are taken from a most interesting article on Michelet's History of France in the Edinburgh Review for January: the authorship of which it is not very difficult to discover.


selves and their destinations; the habitual temper of their minds; the causes of their highest joys and sorrows, hopes and fears. Nay, more than this; it regards 'the whole of the events which have befallen the human race, and the states through which it has passed, as a series of phenomena, produced by causes and susceptible of explanation. All history is conceived as a progressive chain of causes and effects; or (by an apter metaphor) as a gradually unfolding web, in which every fresh part that comes to view is a prolongation of the part previously unrolled, whether we can trace the separate threads from the one to the other or not.' It makes its chief aim 'to find on what principles, derived from the nature of man and the system of the universe, each state of society and of the human mind produced that which came after it;' and to discover how far 'any order of production can be traced sufficiently definite, to shew what future states of society may be expected to emanate from the circumstances which exist at present.'

To regard indeed the successive stages of society as connected, in some degree at least, by an ascertainable order of advance, appears at first sight contradictory to the deep and sure knowledge which all Christians possess, of God's particular providence towards individuals, and generally of His ceaseless intervention, for His moral purposes, in the affairs of the world; and the same apparent inconsistency exists in the case of physical science, as at present studied. That there is no real inconsistency I fully believe; and in an ideal Church there would exist a recognised theory, explaining fully the principles on which, and the degree in which, the Christian can apply himself to the processes of experimental philosophy, with the hope of a true result.

Historical science then being attainable, we see at once the peculiar interest which it will have for the Christian, and the great benefit the Church may reap from the study of it. To have brought before our eyes a successive picture of the past ages of the Church, viewed as a Catholic would view them, and glowing with life and reality; to have made clear and transparent, in the record of past facts, the essential and all-

important distinctions of character, which have separated the heretic from the orthodox; to witness, as if present at successive periods, the gradual and orderly development of Christian doctrine; to have brought before our minds, in all their distinctness and in all their agreement, the great worthies of the Church; to have a Catholic portraiture of such scenes, as those produced in Rome by the conflict of opinion and character, which accompanied the first rise of Christianity, or of the contest between St. Athanasius and Constantius, or between St. Gregory VII. and Henry, or of the reign of St. Louis, similar in kind to Mr. Carlyle's portraiture of the scenes of the French Revolution; to follow into public worship, at some great festival, a religious Catholic in the ages of faith, and learn to understand his feelings, thoughts, and aspirations; or to see in detail all the daily scenes of the monastic life;—such fancies as these almost take away our breath. But to do even more than this; to unfold the connection between the various ages of the Church, and to trace out the mighty results, permanent as the world itself, wrought for her by her great champions; to exhibit distinctly how the seed, sown amidst tribulation and persecution, and to all appearance wasted, springs up a hundred-fold in some marvellous way at a future period; to put in clear and full light the most momentous effects produced on European civilization by the agency of the Church, and the causes which for so many years have so grievously impaired her influence on the course of social and political life; such are the achievements the Church should perform, if she is to preserve Christian literature on a level with the age.

IV. But by far the most important service to the intellectual world which the Church is called on to perform, and the most parallel to the previous course of her intellectual efforts, is connected with the present state of moral and metaphysical science. Whether dogmatic theology would ever have been brought into shape, except for the presence of heresy, belongs to a larger class of questions; such as whether anatomy or physiology would ever have been scientifically studied, had it not been for the existence of



pain and disease: nor, in a world so very full of evils, is it a question likely to admit of a crucial experiment. Certain it is, that in *point of fact* each new theological development has been closely connected with contemporary error; the Athanasian with that of Arius, the Augustinian with that of Pelagius, the especial honour of St. Mary with that of Nestorius: even what might appear an exception, the methodical scholastic system, which finds its most fit and glorious representative in St. Thomas, is stated by an intelligent writer in the *British Critic* not really to be an exception; but to have had its origin in the great honour paid by contemporary heretics to Aristotle, and the consequent necessity of giving a Christian interpretation to the writings of that philosopher.² Protestantism accordingly, being intellectually 'the subtlest and most extensively poisonous' of heresies, just as Lutheranism is morally,^a has opened questions of even far deeper interest and moment than any previous extravagance. The whole inquiry concerning the original elements of moral and religious belief, the evidence appropriate to them, and the moral or intellectual process by which it becomes evidence; why heresy is a sin, and what sort of 'ignorance' is 'invincible;' all this must sooner or later be resolved by a Church, which shall be brought into collision with Protestant principles. It must be resolved, first, in such a manner as to justify the habitual conduct of the Church in past ages; for in this, as in every similar case, the office of the existing Church is but to draw out into consciousness and into form, the principles which, in their *unconscious* and *unformed* condition, have ever animated

² *British Critic*, No. lxxv. p. 139.

^a 'By the Protestant principle, I mean the principle which encourages or allows the examination of those moral and religious doctrines, which we have learnt, and which those who act consistently upon them find more and more satisfactory, the examination of these (I mean for the purposes of acceptance or rejection) by some external test, available to the person who has *not* so acted; whether that test be apparent expediency, or the *primâ facie* appearance of Scripture, or the general consent of non-religious men, or our private interpretation of the works of the fathers, or any other whatever.'⁴ ('On Goode,' p. 75.) In other words, the principle of making the intellect an arbiter of moral and religious truth, instead of the conscience.

the Christian community. Next, they must be resolved also and expressed, in the terms introduced by modern science: for more than one rival philosophy is in possession of the field, giving its own decision upon all these points; and in order to enforce an intelligent protest against existing error, the one eternal Truth must be stated as a function (or I may say in the calculus) of these respective philosophies.

Moreover, it is of great importance that this shall be done as soon as possible. If ever there were a period, when great hope existed that sceptics or infidels might be caught, as it were, in the rebound, that period is the present. A reaction is in course, of the most lively and energetical character, against the stiff, meagre, negative philosophy of the last century. 'The Protestant and infidel philosophies have had full scope to exhibit themselves; and the miserable issue to which they are tending is displayed, with more or less distinctness, to numbers who have been nurtured in them, or have been seduced by their shew of wisdom and depth. The eyes of men seem turned, in a certain inexplicable manner, towards the Catholic Church, as though expecting some unknown good to come forth from her bosom, to help us in our present extremity of both social and speculative perplexity.' But 'if she is to fulfil her appointed office, if she is to be a haven to which those may flee for refuge, who are wearied and exhausted with doubt and speculation; if she is to be a light, whither those may resort for guidance, who have lost their way in the maze of human philosophies; she must be prepared with a view, on the relative position due to the respective tenets of these philosophies; she must be enabled to satisfy inquirers, that the doctrines they have therein learnt, and of whose partial truth at least they have obtained a certain conviction, the methods of inquiry, the principles of evidence, need not, so far as they are true, be neglected (rather may be the more effectually cherished) when philosophers shall receive her authority.'^b

But it must not be dissembled, that there is also an exactly opposite evil to be dreaded: if old philosophical systems are

^b 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 426.

breaking up, so also are old religious prepossessions. 'We have been detained by circumstances, or, as I may say, frozen in an intermediate state between Protestant principles and their rightful inferences. Those circumstances are now, after several centuries, dissolving; and we are gradually gaining a free course, and may choose our haven for ourselves.'^c If a warmer and more persuasive form of religion be springing up, calculated to attract the deserters from dry Benthamism or Conservatism; so is there, on the other hand, (as implied a few pages back,) a more dazzling and specious philosophy, which solicits very powerfully those who have gradually or suddenly broken off from 'Anglicanism' or 'Establishmentism.' There is a spirit of free and independent inquiry, among the more intelligent and imaginative in various quarters, which is as yet but little understood, and which no one can contemplate without being led to very serious musings and questionings. Nor is it necessary to add, what is so very obvious, that independently of that consideration, infinitely the most important, the rescuing of their souls from fearful peril; and over and above the very extensive influence, which such intellectually powerful minds always exercise over the coming generation; considering only our existing exigencies, there is no class of ministers whom the whole Church at the present time so preeminently needs, as men of original, sagacious, and philosophical minds, who shall be really penetrated with the religious spirit.

I shall have to return to this subject again: here therefore I will only add, that this consideration affords a still further argument, for the incalculable importance of the intellectual task I have advocated; of digging, as it were, about the *foundations* of the fabric of Catholic Truth, that the indestructible composition of their materials, and exquisite suitableness of their construction, may be made as clear to the eyes of men, as have long been, to all fitted to discern them, the supernatural harmony, proportion, and majesty of the fabric itself. Two principles especially, closely and indissolubly connected with each other, seem to me so vitally important at the present

^c Newman's *Justification*, p. 141. edition of 1838.

time, that I could wish their very names were familiar to us all 'as household words:' the one, *the absolute supremacy of conscience in moral and religious questions*,^d the other, *the high sacredness of hereditary religion*. It will be indeed one great object of the present work to enforce and illustrate, directly or indirectly, these great principles. For I am deeply convinced, that if fully apprehended and honestly applied, they will furnish a remedy for all our spiritual and intellectual evils; while should they be discredited or put out of view, firm belief in Theism itself will not very long prevail, with the more inquiring and philosophical. It may be added, that when we consider how signally and conspicuously the English Reformation transgressed those great principles, (more so indeed than any other event on a similar scale in the history of the world,) one part of the reason will be seen, for the deep and burning hatred, with which some members of our Church (including myself) regard that miserable event.^e

^d "A truth . . . is implied all through Scripture as a basis on which its doctrine rests, viz. that there is no necessary connexion between the intellectual and moral principles of our nature; that on religious subjects *we may prove any thing, or overthrow anything, and can arrive at the truth but accidentally*, if we merely investigate by what is commonly called Reason; which is in such matters but *the instrument*, at best, in the hands of *the legitimate judge, spiritual discernment*."—Newman's University Sermons, p. 40 (preached in the year 1831). The two or three following pages should be read.

^e It always appears to me, that a great distinction ought to be made in this respect between the English and the Foreign Reformation. In the latter, moral feeling, partly healthy, in greater part perverted, seems to have been the principal agent in forwarding the revolt. Under the first head would be included that zealous and energetic protest against practical corruption, which, rightly regulated, is even a high virtue; and in regard to which, the example of St. Gregory VII. alone is so inestimably valuable, as shewing how fully the feeling may be exercised without impairing the Christian duties of reverence and humility. Under the second head we must class those tendencies (of various kinds) which led to the invention and defence of Luther's doctrine of Justification. No one can suspect me of underating the extreme sinfulness of that most hateful heresy, or if so, the fifth chapter of the present work will fully vindicate me from the imputation; still it does appear that the Continental Reformers had submitted themselves to the discipline under which God's Providence had placed them, until their conscience (most ill-directed, I admit, and morally perverse, but still honestly) seemed to them to command its abandonment. But in England, I cannot find that, among the leaders at least of the Reformation, there was even the allegation, that some doctrine in

9. And now, in the last place, let us consider under some few aspects, what may be called the Church's political duties; those duties, namely, which require that she should enlist in her service a knowledge of political science, and the practical affairs of life. Now first, under our present circumstances, how can she teach aright that so essential Christian duty, Almsgiving; the right performance of which in its wide extent is so extremely difficult of discovery, amidst the complications of our social system, and the allegations of political economy? It would seem absolutely impossible that the purest and most efficient Church should bring any vast and powerful machinery to bear on existing misery, until we obtain the facts, which constitute that misery, brought before us in a connected and scientific shape. I am not now speaking of tendencies or remedies, that is a different matter: I confine myself to what Mr. John Mill would call the *statics*, not *dynamics*, of the case. That we, who are in the midst of it, should be able to see, what the Angels now *are* able to see, the connection of cause and effect, of action and re-action, subsisting between the various branches of

the Ancient Theology was at variance with spiritual truths, which they deeply cherished and prized. They objected indeed to the prevalent corruptions; but even against these I can find no trace whatever of that single-minded and honest indignation, which animated, e. g. Luther: and their real grounds of offence seem to have been mainly of a political order; such as the interference (often I dare say very vexatious) of a foreign court with English Ecclesiastical arrangements. Their principle seems to have been, so far as they had any, that men may without grievous sin, nay innocently, nay laudably, leave the system in which God has placed them, without ever having honestly and heartily tried it, and thus spiritually apprehended its real nature, from having intellectually compared its external appearance, (I mean the appearance it presents to those who have *not* tried it, and therefore a very *false* appearance,) with some external standard: in other words that not conscience but intellect is supreme judge of religious truth. It will be seen, then, that I cannot at all agree with those who prefer the English Reformation to the Foreign; so far from it, I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation. I am not here expressing any judgment on individual Reformers, but on certain plain and acknowledged facts; nor am I at all denying (nor yet maintaining) that the course of events here has been divinely overruled to less disastrous results than among the Foreign Protestants.

commerce and trade; with what phenomena in other directions the fluctuation of each such branch is bound up; what are the contemporaneous circumstances throughout the industrial world when the labourers are in a state of competence, what when in a state of distress; this is the object of which I am now speaking. Nor do I see how the Church can possibly give more than very distantly approximate and altogether empirical rules, on the mode of performing the great duties of almsgiving and personal attention to the poor, until she have at least such a synoptical view of facts as this in her possession.

Again, the education of the whole people is now allowed, by very general consent, to be in itself the legitimate office of the Church. But to perform this duty aright, she must have a very extensive and accurate knowledge of the various callings, which she must prepare her children to fulfil. I do not of course mean that she is to teach them land-surveying, or book-keeping by double entry; this of course could always be done, when necessary, by special instructors: but she must know the peculiar dangers, not only of a spiritual but also of an intellectual kind, to which their way of life is likely to expose them, in order to prepare them against their influence, and give them that special discipline of which they stand in need. Let us take an instance, that we may the more precisely fix our ideas.

Suppose that the increasing tendency of modern civilization is truly expressed in the following passage, taken from a French political writer; surely an educational body is in duty bound most carefully to ascertain the real extent of the evil, meditate on the causes which produce it, and devise deep and powerful remedies which may be applied to it, by anticipation, in training the young.

“The increasing *speciality* of men’s habitual ideas and daily relations must inevitably tend, in every class, to blunt more and more the understanding as a whole, while it sharpens it without cessation in one particular direction; and more and more to separate off private interest from a public welfare, which becomes continually

less visible and direct. In the mean time, the social affections are gradually confined to men of the same profession, and more and more estranged from all other classes, from a want of any sufficient similarity of manners and thoughts. Thus it is that the very principle, which alone has rendered possible the development and extension of the general society, threatens, under another aspect, to decompose it into a multitude of corporations, possessed of no common bond of union, and which hardly seems to *belong to the same species*. So also it is, that the first elementary cause of the start and gradual growth of human art, seems destined at last to produce those minds, very clever in one particular, and monstrously incapable under all other points of view, which are now-a-days too common among the most civilized nations, where they excite universal astonishment. If a just complaint has been often made that, in the material order of things, the workman is occupied exclusively during his whole life in making the handles of knives or pins' heads, sound philosophy ought not, at bottom, to regret less what happens in the intellectual order; the exclusive and long-continued employment of a human brain on the resolution of certain equations, or the classification of certain insects. The moral effect, in either case, is unhappily very similar; it is an essential tendency to inspire most deplorable indifference for the whole course of human affairs, *so only that there may be supplied, without ceasing, equations to solve, and pins to manufacture*. Although this sort of human automatism constitutes fortunately only an extreme case of the dispersive influence of civilization, still its realization, already too frequent, *and continually more imminent*, should make us attach a real scientific importance to the appreciation of such a case; as one eminently fitted to characterize the general tendency of society, and to shew in a more lively manner the indispensable necessity of its permanent repression."

The writer himself goes on to say, that the only means for such a repression would be a Society, holding precisely the same relation to the civil government, which the Church held in the Middle Ages; though his irreligious opinions unhappily forbid him to consider the Christian Church at present, as capable of becoming such a Society. It is very plain, if the description I have quoted be acknowledged as on the whole very accurate, that nothing could oppose so powerful a check to the lamentable tendency in question,

as education really based on religion; and that it would be incumbent on the Church, if performing her rightful part in society, to adapt her education to meet this evil among others. But with how great power of thought, and how wide a knowledge of practical life, must some who work in her service be endowed, if she is really to devise a satisfactory remedy!

Then again, her close relation to her children by no means ceases, when they go forth into the busy world: she must still set before them plain duties, and warn them against plain sins. Now partly from this 'dispersion' and 'specialization' just mentioned, and partly from other causes, so it happens that almost every different trade or profession seems to have its peculiar maxims, and generally immoral ones. There has arisen throughout England a certain (to use a happy name which has been given it) 'class-morality.' But if the Church is really to possess a sound moral theology, and inculcate precepts based upon it, it is included as part of this that she should have a view, and should proclaim it, on the moral value of these maxims; that she should authoritatively declare what sort of causes a barrister ought to plead, and what sort of books a bookseller ought to sell. Such questions as these are very far from being among the number, which are left more wisely to individual conscience and responsibility: there are general principles involved in them, which admit of being stated with the most perfect accuracy; and general rules, which admit of being applied in every particular case. These principles and rules the Church is bound to proclaim in men's ears, 'whether they will hear or whether they will forbear:' and though the number of those who 'forbear' will at first very greatly preponderate, in due course of time the most salutary results will certainly follow, not less as regards the practice of the many, than as regards the conscience of the few. Now in order rightly to adjust these principles and state these rules, to how considerable an extent must practical and secular experience be exercised in the service of the Church!

And now to speak of her highest political duty, her demeanour towards the civil power. In addressing an indi-

vidual, as I implied a few pages back, the Church will put before him general principles, and the application of those principles to what may be called his *general* circumstances; e. g. as being rich or poor, a merchant, or a landed proprietor, or a physician: moreover, individual acts, which are plain and deadly sins, she will punish by her inherent power, in denying him absolution until his repentance and promise of amendment. But the infinitely various particular application of true principles, to particular circumstances and events; that immensely large class of moral acts, on which it is impossible for one man to judge what is right in his neighbour's case; all this she will leave mainly to his individual responsibility and sense of right. God has made men infinitely distinct from each other in character and in circumstances; His Church must not stifle their free growth, or attempt to mould them into a stiff uniformity. Now her addresses to the civil power will, I conceive, be of the same kind. The very idea of attempting to draw into her own hands the actual administration of state affairs, would be no less insane as a matter of Christian policy, than utterly indefensible as a matter of Christian duty. Nor did I ever hear of a single passage in history, in which there was so much as the most distant appearance of such a desire on the part of the Church.[§] But she will feel it her duty, to proclaim aloud the general application of Christian principles to political government; and plain undeniable sins, such as a flagrantly unjust war, or a measure conspicuously oppressive to the poor, she will fearlessly denounce. Against sinful government, of a less glaring and overt character, she will not be sparing in her secret but urgent remonstrances; nor will she consider it any derogation whatever from her proper functions, to direct her children in the wise employment of such constitutional privileges as may be entrusted to them, with the view of obtaining amelioration or redress. The office of protecting the poor against wrong is especially her own; nor will she consider any one of her attributes more noble, precious, or

[§] It is of course evident, that the circumstance of an *individual ecclesiastic* acting as a king's minister, is a thing *toto cælo* different.

inalienable. But, on the other hand, should the civil power appear actuated by a real desire to govern religiously and well, she will herself set the example to all her children of the most dutiful and reverential loyalty. She will still reserve it, as her high privilege, to represent in detail and with earnestness the distresses and sufferings of the poor, to those governors who, as she believes, are so willing and desirous to alleviate them; but will, in that case, submit her judgment, on the appropriate remedies, to the bearers of the temporal sword.

But though an ideal Church will never *aim* at any political position whatever, but occupy herself wholly in performing the various duties of her office, it must be expected, in matter of fact, that her ordinary condition will be one of opposition to those high in worldly station. For her tenderness and loving-kindness will most effectually retain the affections of the poor, while her plain protests against evil will affront and irritate the powerful. ‘The world is strong: men of the world have arms of the world; they have swords, they have armies, they have prisons, they have chains, they have wild passions. The Church has none of these, and yet it claims a right to rule, direct, rebuke, exhort, denounce, condemn. It claims the obedience of the powerful; it confronts the haughty; it places itself across the path of the wilful; it undertakes the defence of the poor; it accepts the gifts of the world, and becomes involved in their stewardship; and yet it is at the mercy of these said powerful, haughty, and wilful men, to ill-treat and to spoil. Can it be otherwise, but that a kingdom which claims so much, which professes so much, yet can resist so little; which irritates the world’s pride, which inflames its cupidity, which interferes with its purposes, which terrifies its conscience, yet does nothing in its defence but threaten; which deals with unseen ill and unseen good, whose only arms are what an unbelieving world calls priestcraft—is it not certain that such a kingdom will be the prey and sport of the world?’^h

10. I have now gone through sufficiently for my purpose,

^h Newman’s Sermons on Subjects of the Day, pp. 293, 4.

though most insufficiently as compared with the mighty theme itself, some of the principal positions which would be assumed by an ideal Church, were such to exist among us at the present time. In most cases, I think, what I have said will be seen at once to follow, from that fundamental view of the Church's office with which we started; where the connection was not so obvious, I have endeavoured to state sufficiently the reasons for what I have said. And now I will make one remark; viz. that even those who may dissent most widely from Catholic principles, will see, by what has gone before, that those who for some years past have been industriously advocating the revival of the idea of a Church as the only remedy for existing evils, have not at all events raised a merely vague, thoughtless, clamour; that at least there is a very definite *meaning* in such a sentiment, whether the sentiment itself be considered true or otherwise. Some years ago, after a most interesting and touching account of the religious state of the manufacturing poor, it was said:—

“Nothing strange has happened to us. No church ever yet succeeded in retaining the allegiance of the people without a larger and stronger, more searching and more elastic apparatus, than is ours. The extent of the popular apostacy in our days is indeed wonderful; but not more wonderful than the degeneracy of the Church's present ways and means. Christianity did once wear that very guise which, while it was good for the rich, was also of that very sort which most appeals to the prejudices and sympathies of the poor. It was once a religion of visible self-denial and holiness, that willingly took on itself the sorrows which to the multitude are inevitable, and lightened their sufferings by its own pain and privation. It was not once that umbratile thing, that feeble exotic, shut up in churches, parsonages, and parlours; but walked abroad, made the multitude both the receivers, the collectors, and distributors of her bounties; compelled cities to wear her livery, and dared to inherit the earth. She once provided homes and forms of operation for the heroic virtues, for lofty aims, and firm resolves, making their torrents flow in the manifold channels of mercy, instead of suffering them to waste the land with a baleful magnificence. She once gave names, and methods, and

ancient sanctions, and solemn order, and venerable holiness, and every quality men love and obey, to the pious bearers of spiritual and temporal aid to the ignorant and poor; as even the many sacred titles, which our streets, our gates, and our bridges are still suffered to bear, do testify. She once did so combine and temper these works of benevolence with other holy employments, with frequent daily prayer, and oft-heard choral praise, that the social acts of temporal and ghostly relief seemed no separate adventitious work, no petty craft of artificial goodness, no capricious adventure or trick of interference, but rather flowing from a something holy, natural, and complete in all its parts. She once had officers and employments for all, that all, however humble in rank, or wealth, or mental culture, might be personally interested in the Church's work. She once could claim her own from every rank, teach all her holy characters, make all acknowledge her marks and passports of sacredness and authority. *We* cannot bring back those days again;—who would wish that man should have this power?—but still *they* may come back to *us*. The times are dark, and a curtain of gloom hangs over the future; but on its dark face we may discern brightening in prismatic hue a vision of past beauty,—the Holy Catholic Church.”^a

^a British Critic, No. lvi. pp. 370, 1.

CHAPTER III.

IS IT UNDUTIFUL TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH TO AIM AT SUCH AN IDEAL ?

1. IF it be maintained that an ideal of the Church, agreeing in substance with that drawn out in the last chapter, is not the highest and the most fitting to be aimed at, there can be no fairer point on which to join issue; and any argument addressed to it shall meet with my most attentive consideration. All that concerns my present purpose, however, is to say, that such was my own view during the time I wrote in the *British Critic*, and to submit (which will I think hardly be denied), that the conception of such an ideal is at least not extravagant nor irrational. But if any one should acknowledge it to be higher than any which he can oppose to it, but should accuse me of disloyalty to my own Church, because it is seen, on its very statement, to follow the Roman not the English pattern, I would beg such an one to reconsider the latter opinion, as it is a very important one in the argument. If on reconsideration he withdraw it, the charge of disloyalty, of course, falls with it; but if he repeat it, (and I confess that it is an opinion in which I myself agree,) then let me observe that it is he and not I, who has given a most unassailable reason for preferring the Roman to the English system; a reason wholly untouched by any amount of *practical* corruption which so many Englishmen attribute to the Roman Church: viz. that Rome has preserved in the main, and we have not, what is so inestimably precious, the high

and true *idea* of a Church; that whatever may be the present lukewarmness of her children, (of which for myself I really cannot judge, nor have ever expressed an opinion,) whenever zeal, energy, and piety revive, they can act immediately on the Church by *means* of the system they find, while among us they must begin by *attacking* the system they find. In no one of my articles have I expressed or implied any comparison more pointed than this; which yet, as I have shewn, is necessarily implied in that very objection, which is most certain to be brought. If this is to be disloyal to the English Church, the supposed objector is as disloyal as I. And I consider that Mr. Palmer should have attempted to prove this, not taken it for granted. He has shewn, by unanswerable evidence, what I can hardly fancy any body reading one of my articles without discovering, and what on one occasion I have asserted in terms, viz. that on a great number of points I conceive that the English Church would act wisely in making Rome her model; whereas he has merely assumed, what was the only real point at issue, that such an opinion argues want of patriotism in an English Churchman. Yet in parallel cases we find the very opposite held universally. No one would call an American of the present day unpatriotic, because he very much indeed prefers the state of things which existed before the revolt, and because he is anxious to do his utmost in restoring, if possible, constitutional monarchy. An Englishman is not patriotic, in that he believes and propagates the belief of one Englishman beating ten Frenchmen; but in that he makes England the one great sphere and centre of his energies; loves to study the feelings, habits, opinions of Englishmen, and brings whatever knowledge he possesses of other countries to bear upon this his favourite subject of thought; is more pained by the vices and more delighted by the virtues of Englishmen, than by those of French, Germans, or Italians. I am not attempting to decide, how far we are justified in allowing patriotism to supersede universal philanthropy: all acknowledge that we are in some degree, and all acknowledge that we are not entirely; but *so far forth* as we are patriotic, so far have

we such sentiments as I just described. On the other hand, to intoxicate ourselves in insular pride, to hug ourselves in the thought of England's real and supposed excellencies, to be blind to her failings, and to believe, even in the utmost simplicity of heart, that she is the envy of surrounding nations and eighth wonder of the world, this is no real patriotism; it is at bottom but base pride and vulgar nationality.

Again, to continue the same illustration, considering the tendency always and every where to national pride, there must ever be extreme danger in using habitually an inflated, boastful, way of speaking concerning our country's greatness. But if the very besetting fault of our country, the very fault against which all our feelings of patriotism calls us to contend, be that very national pride, how infinitely stronger the case becomes! And to speak plainly, believing as I most firmly do, that ever since the schism of the sixteenth century, the English Church has been swayed by a spirit of arrogance, self-contentment, and self-complacency, resembling rather an absolute infatuation than the imbecility of ordinary pride, which has stifled her energies, crippled her resources, frustrated all the efforts of her most faithful children to raise her from her existing degradation, I for one, however humble my position, will not be responsible for uttering one word, or implying one opinion, which shall tend to foster this outrageous delusion. The disease has been too deeply seated to yield to ordinary remedies: experience has shewn that mere hints and implications, *especially when united with disclaimers of superior admiration for other systems*, have wholly failed in their objects: and even had the British Critic during its two last years performed no other service, it has at least succeeded in this; in impressing on the most careless and inobservant minds this fact, that certain members of the Church of England, be they more or fewer, do raise their voices in indignant protest against the system and spirit which so extensively energize within her, and do wish to raise the sympathies of her many holy and devoted children to some higher object, than the maintenance and praise of that system.

Still an objection has been taken, to the *tone* in which my humble yet zealous protests have been made. A word has been used in a private communication, which I have not seen in print, but which, I suppose, expresses the sort of feeling: it has been said, then, that they appear couched not in sorrowful but in 'spiteful' terms. I think I perceive what that element is in them, which has given rise to such a feeling, and I humbly trust that it is neither wrong nor unbecoming.

In the first place, most certainly it does not shew that what appear to me the corruptions in question give me no pain. For years, consciously or not, and in various shapes not recognised by me at the time as modifications of the same symptoms, had my feelings been oppressed and (I may really say) tortured, by this heavy, unspiritual, unelastic, prosaic, unfeeling, unmeaning Protestant spirit; all this time my ears were stunned with the din of self-laudation, with the words 'pure and apostolical,' 'evangelical truth and apostolical order,' and the like most miserable watchwords: those, from whom I learned at one moment some high and elevating truth, at the next crushed and overwhelmed me by some respectful mention of our existing system; with the single exception of Mr. Froude's work, no external response could I find to my ceaseless and ever-increasing inward repugnance, against the habits of thought and action prevalent in our Church. At length I was able to fix, with some definiteness, on the particular cause of my annoyance; and soon afterwards (in writing two pamphlets three years ago) I had the opportunity of speaking out. To say that the hearty and energetic tone, with which I did speak out, indicates my real feeling of sorrow to have been shallow and trifling, is an allegation which I will meet by a parallel case. Let us suppose any one to have been afflicted by some most painful illness for many weeks, but to have been compelled to restrain his outcries hitherto, because of dangerous illness in the next house: the impediment being removed, he cries out with no subdued tone, and with great relief of mind; on which he is accosted by a stranger with

the observation, "Sir, your pain really cannot be very serious, or you would not cry out with so good a heart, and with such evident satisfaction."

And, secondly, I trust that allowing myself to speak in such a tone, was not in itself wrong or unbecoming. When the evils to which one desires to draw attention, are facts whose existence has hitherto been unknown, all men's natural feelings conspire with the obvious rule of right, and the communication is made in a sorrowful and subdued spirit. But when the facts have been known from the first, but not recognised to *be* evils, then I conceive that words of zealous, indignant, declamatory, remonstrance are generally allowable, and are often the most fitting of all possible methods.

2. It will be said, perhaps, that various things I have written have tended to cloud with perplexities many an humble and retiring spirit, who wished but to know his duty and to do it; but was filled with misgiving and alarm, at the strange and fierce denunciations he found in the *British Critic*. If this were true, great cause would there be for sorrow and repentance; but that at least the duty of guarding, to the best of my power, against such a result, had not escaped my notice, the following extract, from the second article I wrote, will sufficiently evince.

"In how many quarters do we not hear, and in how many do there exist without being heard of, humble and teachable disciples of Christ, who have but one wish, to be taught the truth that they may follow it; but who shrink back in dismay from the 'strife of tongues,' so busy and restless in all quarters of the religious world, and seem almost to look in vain for some intelligible guidance, amidst the innumerable confident and conflicting pretensions to which 'our unhappy divisions' have given birth in these later times. Nor is it from one quarter alone that these troubles proceed: one person has been taught by our Catechism and other similar instruction to aim, by God's grace, at 'living a righteous and sober life,' to 'learn and labour truly to get his own living,' to make advances towards 'believing in God, fearing and loving Him with all his soul and strength;' and is told that all this 'avails him nothing,'

nay, less than nothing, since it deadens the conscience, unless he has been conscious of certain definite feelings and impressions, which are the real mark of God's presence. Another has been brought up in fear and shrinking indefinable aversion from every thing connected with Roman theology, and hears of certain new teachers who have come forward to say that the foreign churches, whatever their practical corruptions, have retained many great truths which we in *our* practical corruptions have lost; or has been brought up to think of our separation from Rome as a ground for triumph and just thankfulness, and hears of its being spoken of as at once a punishment and a sin; nay, hears of serious and devoted members of his own communion praying daily for the reunion of Christendom, as the great remedy for our evils and distresses.

Now in respect to that one of these two classes of teachers, for whom we profess ourselves especially interested, if it be imagined in any quarter that those, who have felt it their duty to make such statements, are insensible to the misery of such cases as we have described, great injustice is done them. It is highly improbable of course, that in so extensive a movement several persons may not have said harsh and unkind things, have thoughtlessly suggested scruples and doubts to the humble believer, or unnecessarily shocked prejudices which are the result of very docility and reverence; and, of course, so far as this has been done, individuals have laid up for themselves materials for deep repentance and humiliation. But let it be considered, in defence of both the one class and the other, both of those calling themselves Evangelicals and of those called by their opponents Papists, whether at last it can have been possible to rouse our Church from what all parties seem to consider the carelessness and worldliness of the last century, without causing her to pass through perhaps more than one stage of great trouble and anxiety: whether it be not with societies as with individuals, that sharp pangs and trials are in the way, which leads from the lethargy of sloth and self-ignorance to the quiet and assured peace of an awakened conscience.

How then do we apply our principle? a private individual has, by whatever means, the circumstance brought home to him of the extent and uncertainty of religious controversy at the present time; he becomes anxious and excited, suspicious alternately of the doctrines which he has been taught, and of those which are newly suggested to

him; this at least he earnestly desires to be told, what is his *duty* in consequence of having heard them. We answer, his duty is with *himself*: to leave the course of simple obedience for that of argument and conscious investigation, is to search for truth by abandoning the very path which leads to it; for it is not by inquiry and speculation, but by the practice of good, that truth is attained. Let him be led the more watchfully to guard his own progress in humility, meekness, purity, self-restraint; let him dwell the more lovingly on those good examples which, wherever he is placed, may probably be brought to his notice from among all the existing religious parties; let him look on himself with suspicion, on others with confiding love. Then let him pray *habitually*, and that not with formal and lifeless devotion, but eagerly and from the heart, for gradual guidance into the truth wherever it may be. Let him, as ability and opportunity exist, meditate on Holy Scripture, with the view of discovering what light may be thrown upon its inspired language, by the new faculties he is acquiring wherewith to apprehend it. In proportion as he is honestly and actively following such a course of religious action, he may with a safe conscience dismiss from his thoughts at once any religious sentiment, which meets him from whatever quarter, should it at present shock his conscience or jar against his moral feelings; or rather indeed he is *bound* as a point of duty to dismiss it, to strive against the intrusion of perplexities arising from it, as he would against any confessedly wicked thoughts. It may be, if he be true to God's guidance, that the time will come when some doctrine so dismissed will return to him as sent from God, and as commending itself to his whole nature; when he 'who thought its voice strange and harsh at first, will wonder he could ever so have deemed of sounds so musical and thrilling.'^a

We are not speaking as though there were any certainty, that even by these means an individual will be in fact led into the whole truth; this depends, as before observed, not only on the inherent excellence of the true religion, not only on the moral condition of the recipient, but also on the clearness with which it is brought before him. But were it only for the intellectual prejudices with which each one of us has been educated, it would be impossible to form any judgment whatever, in the case of this man or that, how far such may be the case; and, in addition to this,

^a Newman's Prophetical Office, &c., Introduction.

surely no one, Anglican or Roman, can maintain, that any where in England is Catholicism exhibited so purely and genuinely before the world, as to force on ordinary minds the perception of its true character. This then cannot be promised; what *can* be promised is, that in proportion as the inquirer pursues such a course of conduct as we have sketched, the real doctrines on which his spiritual life is supported will be, *so far as they go*, true and sound; and his conscience may be in perfect tranquillity and stayed upon God, considering that, if ever there were a case of what theologians call ‘invincible ignorance,’ such a case is his.”

It is indeed observable, that the only two passages quoted by Mr. Palmer from my own articles, as tending to shake the faith of humble Christians in our own Church, are found in the *British Critic*, in the immediate neighbourhood of similar statements. One of them (Palmer, p. 53,) is close to the passage I have just cited; and the other (Palmer, p. 51,) to a paragraph (‘On Arnold’s Sermons,’ pp. 334, 5,) of a similar tendency, which I shall have to quote hereafter. If my readers would take the trouble of looking through my articles, they would be surprised to find how much there is of similar language. For instance, two of them (on Mr. Goode and on ‘Church Authority’) are, to a great extent, taken up with the methodical expression of the principle, implied in the citation I just made. A statement, which seems to have startled many more than any thing else I have said, is my defence of the language used towards the Blessed Virgin by St. Bonaventure and St. Bernard: in that very place I take care to say, “so long as” the professor of ‘high-Church’ principles “acts carefully up to the principles he has been taught, and *in so acting* feels himself in no way attracted towards these ways, so long *it would be a plain sin in him to resort to them.*”^a In an article on the ‘Church and Synagogue,’ which, as a whole, has been considered by many to be more Roman in tendency than any other, I have also expressly observed, “if persons, who keep their consciences in a pure and healthy state by attempting a consistent and uniform obedience to God’s commandments, feel that a new

^a ‘On St. Athanasius,’ p. 410.

doctrine, proposed to them on its own grounds, threatens rather to chain them earthwards and fetter their spiritual development, than afford it scope and direction; *we know not how any amount of external evidence can justify them in receiving it.*"^b Moreover, in the same article, I have taken especial pains to shew, that "we are defending a class of doctrines, which have the distinct sanction both of our Church's formularies and of our 'standard divines'."^c

All this, I really think, proves sufficiently, that I have not at least wantonly and carelessly outraged men's most sacred and cherished prepossessions: persons may still think that I have been injudicious, but they can hardly think that I have been cruel. Moreover, a great deal must depend on the seriousness of the evil, which appeared to me to require a remedy. No doubt the appearance of a slight disorder or unhealthy symptom, on the surface of our Church, could never justify such extreme and decided language as that which I have adopted; but believing, as I do from my innermost heart, that our system labours under no superficial disease, but is corrupt to its very core; that "the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint;" that the generally received form of religion among us is "another Gospel, which is not another," for it is no Gospel at all; believing all this, it was a direct duty to use language, which under other circumstances might have justly appeared wanton, cruel, and extravagant. But it is plain that principles, once lost, could never by possibility be recovered, if it were admitted as a final bar against earnest discussion of their value, that incidental scandal may possibly be given in the course of such discussions. How can those be defended, who, half a century ago, called on all Christians to believe, that, unless they were conscious of a sudden conversion, they could not hope for heaven? Or those, who, at a later period, called on their brethren at once to take up an opinion, founded on arguments from the Fathers, that Presbyterians are not within the Christian Covenant? And both these

^b 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 7.

^c *Ibid.* p. 5.

classes seemed by their language to imply, that it was the duty of 'high and low, rich and poor,' at once to receive these respective theologies, so utterly astounding and revolting to all their early prepossessions; whereas in my own case I continually went out of my way to urge on them, that it would be absolutely *sinful* if they did so; and that their duty was to act conscientiously on their *existing* principles.

But we shall see the whole matter in a clearer light, by observing a mode of action, which has ever obtained in the Catholic Church. 'The Church's system alone assigns its rightful place to intellect and practical ability: she uses them, hallows them in using, and yet assigns to them a place far lower than the highest. And for what great purpose has the Church always employed these two classes of character? For this; to guard in peace and tranquillity from the world without (the one from its rude violence, the other from its restless questionings; the one by the barrier of spiritual power and the exercise of political wisdom, the other by that of well-digested, subtle, and deep statements of doctrine) the weak and uneducated poor in Christ; or again, the pure-minded and contemplative few, *whom their very protectors feel to be called to a higher and more heavenly lot than themselves.*'^d

Putting aside the question of ecclesiastical power, which does not here concern us; let us consider what will be the place, held by thoughtful and argumentative Christians in a corrupt Church, corresponding to that held by them in a pure one. It is evident that there is a certain class of men, called by their peculiar endowments to the office of sifting principles, classifying phenomena, analyzing and deducing truths, and the like. These may be considered as making up a certain community by themselves, and separate from others; so that each one of them, in dealing with the rest, may do the most important service, by comparing statements; putting forward plainly the ultimate ends he may wish; enforcing, by means of argument, the desirableness and practicability of those ends; and, with those who agree with

^d 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 39.

him, concerting plans for success in their joint desire. But the multitude of Christians is called to a far nobler and more heavenly lot. Infinitely nobler surely it is, to believe, and act, and grow in faith and knowledge *by* action, than to criticise, doubt, compare, argue. Let us call these two classes, for the present purpose and to make my reasoning clearer, by the respective names of the 'scientific' and the 'favoured' class.

To revere at a humble distance the more heavenly specimen of the latter class, is the highest honour and truest wisdom of the former; and the whole of that class must be regarded with respectful and affectionate interest, by 'scientific' men; who should acknowledge it as their very vocation to labour for their spiritual welfare. No conduct then can be more inexcusable or more unchristian, than to address these 'little ones of Christ' in terms calculated, in any the slightest degree, to do violence to their prepossessions, or pain their best and purest feelings. 'Scientific' men, who desire to draw these others in the right direction, will apply themselves to the task of pressing on their attention precepts, which, when stated, cannot but have the full sanction of their conscience, but which had not been sufficiently considered; or of putting before them doctrines fitted to satisfy spiritual aspirations, which have been already excited and are wandering, as it were, in search of an object; or again, to evoke for the first time that very craving, which they will also satisfy. Such is the course by which these humble souls, so dear to Christ, and with the 'offending' of whom He has connected so fearful a sentence, will be gradually trained towards the full truth. Such is the course, which, if we were wise, we should all regard with a holy covetousness, as by far the happiest and most blessed path, even though we may feel ourselves called by God (in consequence of the faculties He has given us) to serve Him in a lower and more earthly position. Now I have published two little works, directly addressed to this class; one called 'Questions for Self-Examination,' addressed to all Christians; another called 'Questions and Answers on the Church Catechism,' addressed to Christians who are prepared

by education to accept 'high Church' doctrine. And I am sure no one can possibly accuse me, in either of those publications, of introducing one single remark, which would tend to unsettle or distress the mind of either of those classes. And what is true of those little works, is true of a work of far higher value and scope; published by one more fitted for such a task, and who also has been accused of disturbing the minds of men by his articles in the *British Critic*: I mean, 'Devotions on the Holy Communion.' A more salutary, edifying, and comforting book for members of our Church trained in 'high Church' principles it is impossible to conceive.

From what has been said, it is sufficiently clear how eminently valuable, or rather indispensably necessary, are the services of this 'scientific' class, and how incalculable the importance of indoctrinating them with Catholic sentiments. Were a large body of such men to exist; on the one hand deeply penetrated by Catholic Truth, and on the other hand endowed with a most tender and considerate regard, a most deep and accurate knowledge, of the educations, prepossessions, tendencies, desires, habits of ordinary men, one by one; soon, by their united and well-devised efforts, would the holy flame spread from soul to soul; soon would all serious Christians begin to see their real and deep unity of feeling, and once more to 'love one another.' And now, if any one thing is clear in the whole world, it is clear that it was to this object that I directed my articles in the *British Critic*. The style of writing, so argumentative, methodical, and un-rhetorical; the language so harsh, dry, and repulsive, as I have continually heard it called; all this shews that I addressed my words to those who professed argument and analysis, and not to those who take the higher path of following their *unanalyzed* conscience. It seems really too much, that men should claim at once the right of reasoning, and the privilege of intellectual weakness; that they should bring to bear, with great pomp and elaboration, a series of patristic or Anglican arguments; and then, when they are unable to parry the reply made to them, should, as it were, plead their infancy, and claim the prerogative of being shocked and distressed. Let them either

form their opinions by argument, and *meet* the British Critic in argument; or else let them be contented with following their conscience, and not express a judgment on matters, which, by their own confession, they cannot understand. As I said in a passage I just quoted, they may know that various doctrines are, as yet, wholly beyond the range of, and wholly unattractive to, their spiritual nature; and this is quite sufficient to determine their conduct. But when they speak of them as superstitious, idolatrous, and I know not what, (unless indeed they merely profess to take up such an opinion on the authority of teachers in whom they repose confidence, which course, if avowed, would be altogether defensible; but otherwise) they assume the power of appreciating religious tenets, in cases where they have not yet morally apprehended either the tenets themselves or their contradictories. But to do this, (I will not say in any adequate measure, but,) even in such measure as to avoid the most extravagant misconceptions, requires intellectual power of the rarest and most exalted order. And if they possess such power, we have a right to call on them not to use the language of which I speak, without being able to place before us a sufficient defence of it, drawn up in accurate and methodical expression.

It will not, I trust, be imagined, that I am either maintaining the intellect to be, even in the smallest degree, an independent judge of moral and religious truth, or denying the disapprobation of a spiritually enlightened conscience to be a conclusive disproof of any alleged doctrine; *supposing only that the doctrine be rightly understood, and the voice of conscience rightly interpreted*. But then the right performance of these two functions frequently requires an intellectual exercise of the greatest complication and difficulty. Conscience reigns alone supreme in all these matters; but when conscience has at its command a minister so active, comprehensive, powerful, and versatile, as the intellect, the range of its judgments is infinitely enlarged, and the *external* value of its dictates infinitely increased. So much as this indeed is implied in the very objection: for the objection, which I am

considering, is not that the statements in the British Critic shock religious men who rightly understand them; (to *that* objection this whole work is my attempt to reply;) but that they shock large numbers of holy and humble men of heart, who do not profess that intellectual power, which might enable them to appreciate doctrines widely foreign to their moral experience, or expressions of doctrine widely different from their traditional expressions; and to whom, in consequence, these statements cannot but appear harsh, paradoxical, nay profane. If then such a person should read these pages, I would take the liberty of speaking to him plainly, yet with much reverence, as follows:—You complain that you make no profession of argumentative powers; and that you have just reason for dissatisfaction, if expressions are put in your way, which you cannot understand, which do violence to early and holy associations, which perplex, alarm, shock you. I ask, *who* put these expressions in your way? Not only were the articles, which you criticise, written in a tone and language which might have made it clear, that they presupposed in the reader those very powers, which you disclaim in yourself; but also in almost every article, sometimes in almost every page, they enforce the duty, incumbent on such as you, to confine your thoughts either to the doctrines you have been taught, or to those which gradually recommend themselves to your conscience in proportion to your spiritual development. Of course many passages, written primarily with a controversial object, might contain edification to like-minded Christians; and might well be a matter of interest, if recommended to you by a teacher in whom you repose confidence. But when on your own responsibility you enter on the field of controversy, and think of comparing doctrine with doctrine, argument with argument, you descend from that high position in which God has placed you: your proceeding is like that of some hitherto religious hermit, who should leave his peaceful desert, and become candidate for an earthly crown. You are called to a more heavenly course, you wilfully place yourself in a more earthly course; you are called to the life of simple

obedience, you descend by your own act to the life of argument and inquiry; and in one sense I am even glad, should the result of your free inquiry be perplexity and confusion; because it may awaken you to a sense of your misconduct, and teach you to value better the high and noble privileges of your calling.^d

3. Next let me apply myself to the parallel objection which has been raised: for frequently it has been said, not only that the British Critic has scandalized the humble, but that it has encouraged the undutiful; that it has sanctioned a spirit of wanton criticism, exercised on the system and formularies of our Church, or even has been an active instrument in fomenting such a spirit. Now that the claim of the English Church on our allegiance has not been a subject neglected in the British Critic, is at once evident from the fact, that, on looking over my own articles for the purpose, I find not so much as one in which that claim is not directly enforced; while in several I have gone to great length and detail in enforcing it. I am quite confident, that the representation which follows is a fair exponent of the consistent and un-deviating view, on the matter, which has been there maintained. I can perfectly understand then, that a deeply religious person may, under present circumstances, entertain the most serious and anxious doubts, whether he be not in duty bound at once to join the Roman Church. But I *cannot* understand that a religious person should, for any length of time, doubt, that, if he do remain in our Church, he must remain as her faithful and attached son; not standing, as it were, with one foot in England and the other in Rome, but devoting himself with undivided loyalty to his immediate mother. And if it be asked what definite meaning can be attached to these words, let us, for example's sake, take such particulars as the following. He will "fix his affections" immediately "on the

^d I mentioned at starting that it is no business of mine to defend the works of other writers; but I cannot forbear from adding here, that the other articles in the British Critic, almost without exception, seem to me so carefully and habitually deferential towards our Church, that I cannot fancy they would have been even accused of an unsettling or disturbing tendency, had they not been coloured, in the reader's mind, by the tone or expressions of my own articles.

Church wherein God has placed him," and only " *through* that, on the great Catholic community throughout the world;"* the English Church will be to him the visible embodiment and channel of his Lord's presence. 2. Her morning and evening prayer will be the central points of his public and social devotions; he will offer up those prayers, not as one of the accidentally present congregation, nor yet as one of the Catholic Church; but more definitely, as a member of the English Church: through her, with her, and for her, will his addresses ascend to God day after day, in the language she has placed in his mouth. In like manner, should there be prayers for Catholic unity used by certain members of our own Church as such, and others used by Roman Catholics as such, he will unite in the former rather than in the latter. And, 3. the sphere of his practical energies, the turning point of his hopes and fears, interests and disquietudes, the central position from which his view grows forth and expands, will be the Church through which he was regenerated, through which he has communion with the Body and Blood of Christ. He will be careful to make the most of all the salutary privileges she offers him; he will fight without ceasing against any disposition to repine at the comparative paucity of means of grace; he will love to contemplate, with humble and affectionate veneration, the admirable patterns of holiness he may find within her pale, nor suffer any difference of opinion, on a matter of minor importance, to lessen his keen perception of their heavenly graces.

I would gladly add, that he will accept the teaching of the English Church in the first instance, and should he become unable to accept it, leave her communion; if I could attach any sense whatever to those often-repeated words 'teaching of the English Church.' That the phrase 'teaching of the Prayer-book' conveys a definite and important meaning, I do not deny: considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the Prayer-book should on the whole breathe an uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox, spirit; a spirit, which corresponds to one particu-

* 'On Church Authority,' p. 222.

lar body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase ‘teaching of the Articles’ conveys a definite meaning, I cannot deny; for (excepting the first five, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe an uniform, intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory; as well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and the Epicurean philosophies, as could a humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer-book and Articles. This I set out at length, in two pamphlets with an appendix, which I published three years ago; and it cannot therefore be necessary to go again over the same ground: though something must be added, occasionally in notes, and more methodically in a future chapter. The manner in which the dry wording of the articles can be divorced from their natural spirit, and accepted by an orthodox believer; how their *primâ facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves; this, and the arguments which prove the honesty of this, have now been for some time before the public. Others have not been equally open; and we can therefore form no judgment, what the success of ‘Evangelicals’ would be, in shewing how they give their full assent and consent to the Prayer-book. But it is plain, if there be force in the arguments used three years ago, that even *omissions* in the Prayer-book cannot be taken as any direct voice of the English Church; nor can it be said that prayers for the dead or Invocations of Saints are condemned by her, merely because she has dropped such addresses from her service.^f For if those omissions were the result of a disingenuous compromise, (as I endeavoured to shew in my former pamphlet,) and if the very men, who made the omissions, wished to include within our Church Christians who would have preferred their retention; it is plain that there can be no colour for the allegation, that we are bound to withdraw from the English Church, should we be led forward to such practices and devotions.

^f This has indeed been decided by the Ecclesiastical Court on the former subject.

Having alluded to the subject of our Articles, it may be as well to add, that so far has Mr. Palmer been from *arguing* against the British Critic on the ground of alleged inconsistency with those formularies, that he quotes as a part of his indictment a passage (not written by myself) in which Mr. Oakeley is quoted as having "proved historically that the Articles were not designed to exclude Roman Catholics," (p. 66,) and attempts no refutation whatever of the position.

But even were the formularies of our Church accordant instead of discordant, urgent instead of wavering, definite instead of vague, still so long as her practical teaching is in the highest degree uncertain, conflicting, and contradictory; when members of our Church seem hardly to agree in one matter of positive opinion that can be named, except the purity of our Church; and when, even as to that, each party maintains that our Church would be most *impure* if she taught doctrines, which the other party strenuously contends she *does* teach; I can see no possible defence for the position, 'that her formularies, in their *primâ facie* bearing, demand implicit reception from her children. Surely, until she is able so far to invigorate her discipline, as that one and one only doctrine in essentials shall be taught within her pale, she can have no warrant in making this demand. How can that sacredness and divine authority, which attaches to our first instructors, be fairly claimed for the English formularies in their natural sense, when in point of fact they are *not* our first instructors? It is the creed of our parents, which first introduces us to the Creed of our Church, and colours the latter with its own hues. And when our moral development has compelled us to desert that creed, those do not fairly challenge our adherence, who give to our formularies their most *literal* sense, but those who give to them that sense which promises most fairly as a rest and satisfaction to that development.'^s

4. The two objections I have just considered are rather implied by Mr. Palmer, than distinctly stated. There is indeed only one passage, in all his pamphlet, which bears

^s 'On Church Authority,' pp. 231, 2.

with it the profession of *reasoning* against the course adopted by the British Critic:^h in all the remainder he merely expresses his own opinion, that such a course is undutiful and inexcusable. In the passage to which I refer, he proposes three exhaustive alternatives: of which I will proceed to quote that which concerns myself.

“If men are satisfied that it is a matter of duty to remain in the English Church, then I say, that it is wholly inconsistent with that duty to excite a spirit of doubt and dissatisfaction in the Church, and to tempt its members, in every possible way, to secede from its communion. Nothing can be more inconsistent than the practice of disregarding its authorities, encouraging disobedience and disrespect to its prelates, and discontent within the Church itself, as if the great mass of its members were engaged in measures hostile to the true faith. It is sinful even to contemplate the possibility of voluntarily separating from the Church under circumstances of persecution or obloquy. Notions of this kind tend to diminish the horror which every Catholic should feel at the very notion of schism.” p. 67.


This, I say, is that part of the dilemma, proposed by Mr. Palmer, which includes my own case. I suppose indeed that, considering all the various proposals which have been made, and all the various measures which have been rumoured as in contemplation, and considering too *some* among the apparent tendencies of our existing condition, the number is very far from small of those, who have had more or less misgiving, what at some future time might possibly *become* their duty. But I can most truly say, that the very idea of leaving our Church has never been before my own mind as an immediately practical question; that my present feeling is (without for one moment judging others), that I should myself commit a mortal sin by doing so; and that it has been my uniform endeavour to divert my imagination from

^h Mr. Palmer's remarks on 'development' shall be considered before I conclude: but they are directed against the *truth* of opinions advocated in the British Critic; not against the legitimacy of English Churchmen advocating such opinions. The latter is the point now in hand.

dwelling on such a contingency, even as a future possibility. It is very plain then that the paragraph I have quoted contains, if any part of the pamphlet contains, Mr. Palmer's grounds for thinking that 'the tone' of my articles 'cannot be excused,' p. 68.

First then, is it wrong in me to 'encourage' to the utmost of my humble power and opportunities 'discontent with the Church itself, as if the great mass of its members' are 'engaged in measures hostile to the true faith?' The answer to this must surely depend on the truth of the allegation. I willingly adopt Mr. Palmer's happy expression; I do believe that the 'mass of our Church's members' are unconsciously and unintentionally, but most effectually, 'engaged in measures hostile to the true faith;' this I believe, and hope before I end to prove. And believing this, it would surely be the strangest possible mode of shewing loyalty to the English Church, were I to remain perfectly quiet, enjoying the proceeds of my Fellowship, or (to use the ordinary language) 'eating the bread of the Church,' and abstain from drawing attention to evils, which appear to me so imminent, so fearful, so destructive of the very life and essence of a Church. Nor yet do I seek to encourage discontent with our Church herself, but only with that miserable system, to which, for three hundred years, she has been so unfortunately committed.

Secondly, is it wrong in me to 'disregard the authorities of our Church?' This must surely depend on the dicta of those authorities. The Roman Catholics indeed generally say, that Christians are, in matters of doctrine, bound to receive implicitly the decrees of St. Peter's Chair; but those who so think, think also that, by a Divine promise, that Chair is infallibly saved from teaching error. But to reject the doctrine of the Church's infallibility as a figment, to proclaim as a great and glorious truth, that all Bishops are but fallible men, and that the chief Bishop on earth sanctions, nay, practises, idolatry; and at the same time to call for implicit deference and submission to the doctrinal statements of a certain small body of bishops, who are indefinitely at variance with each other, and who, according to Mr. Palmer's own



theory, are separated off from the great body of the Catholic Church; this is a flight of conservative extravagance, an assumption of spiritual despotism, which can find no parallel beyond the circle of Anglican 'high-Churchmen.' My own sentiments on the subject I have already expressed, and find nothing to alter.

'One of the many difficulties,' I say, 'which press upon us in the present most unhappy state of our Church, is the question of the proper course to be pursued by Churchmen, when a bishop delivers *ex cathedrâ* doctrines which are in fact heretical. There is no difficulty of course when the points at issue are short of fundamental articles of faith; for silent submission to his diocesan's will, supposing an injunction to have been laid upon him, is then the clergyman's plain duty: nor again, in the case of fundamentals is the question one of principle; for learned persons tell us, that, according to the uniform tradition of antiquity, even laymen have not the right only but the duty of contending for the faith openly and uncompromisingly, by whomsoever it may have been assailed, and under whatever circumstances. But the *when* and the *how* no doubt present matter for grave deliberation; and which perhaps at last must be decided in each case, as it separately arises, by reference to its own peculiar facts.'¹

Thirdly is it right to 'tempt' members of the English Church 'in every possible way to secede from its communion?' Certainly not. That, for myself, it was in some sufficient measure impressed on my own mind, how serious responsibility on this head is incurred by all who express publicly their opinion on present circumstances, will, I hope, be evinced by the fact, which I lately mentioned, of my constant enforcement throughout my articles, of our Church's claim on our allegiance. But fully acknowledging (which I do), that frank and bold protests against the English Reformation, and the system introduced by it, have an indirect and accidental tendency, in some cases, to hasten, or even to cause, a separation from our Church, I would still most fearlessly meet Mr. Palmer on his own ground and by his own theory; and I would ask him, whether in any age of the Church it would be thought even tolerable in individuals, to be in any way less diligent

¹ 'On Whately's Essays,' p. 225.

and energetic in their protests against heresy, deeply-seated, subtly-insinuating, and widely-extending heresy, because such protests had the accidental effect of inducing one or two orthodox to join a foreign communion? My defence then entirely depends on the truth or falsehood of the views I hold, as to the amount of corruption existing in and ruling our Church. If the evils be such as I suppose, I was justified in denouncing them as loudly as I did.

5. But although what I have said seems sufficiently to answer Mr. Palmer's observations, I feel deeply that there is a natural reason, for great dislike and suspicion of statements such as I have made; and a reason far more serious, and requiring far greater deference of tone in meeting it, than any of the objections which have occurred to Mr. Palmer. It is thought that the most ordinary reverence and docility of mind would secure a willing reception of those principles under which one is born; and that to allow one's self in open dissatisfaction with, or even hatred to, those principles, must imply much holiness, or else little humility. "We do not augur much good," says a writer in the *British Critic*, "of any one, who does not in the first instance throw himself into the system under which he is born, accept the voices of the teachers, divines, and pastors, by whom he is providentially surrounded, as the voice of heaven, and identify their pattern and their faith, with the holy doctrine which they have been the instruments of conveying to him."^k This general principle, thus stated, is that very principle, '*the high sacredness of hereditary religion*,' which I singled out in the last chapter, as all-important at the present moment; and which it was the miserable sin of our Reformers, so grievously to violate. In fact, I wrote an article in the *British Critic* (that on 'Church Authority') with the main object of enforcing, illustrating, and vindicating this principle; in which article I extended it to its legitimate consequence, the case of Dissenters of whatever kind. Still, as the writer just quoted proceeds to say, "of course such implicit confidence cannot last in all cases, as time goes on; for there is but one truth whatever it is, whereas there are 'many kinds of voices

^k No. lxii. p. 385.

in the world,' and it is not to be anticipated that all minds, every where, as they grow, will just happen felicitously to concur with the system in which they find themselves." "It is the trial and mystery of our position in this age and country, that a religious mind is continually set at variance with itself, that its deference to what is without *contradicts suggestions from within*, and that it cannot obey what is over it without *rebellling against what was before it*." And as to the origin, again, of such 'suggestions from within,' in the article of my own to which I just alluded, a passage occurs, quoted in the first chapter of this work, arguing with great earnestness, that 'absolute and great defects of character' frequently occasion them.^m Certainly, so far is it from being the case, that the idea of corruptions within our Church was a congenial idea to my own mind, that I suffered innumerable troubles and perplexities, before it even occurred to me to seek for their cause in its true quarter; the radically corrupt and heretical nature of the system which I had been taught.

A sentiment is often expressed and often implied, not unlike the preceding, which, though substantially refuted by what has just been said, still deserves an explicit notice. We often hear admonitions of this kind, addressed to the 'discontented young men' in the English Church. 'Act up to the provisions of the Prayer-book; when you regularly attend morning and evening prayer, observe rigorously all the fasts in the calendar, and realise that type of character which the Prayer-book implies, then, if still dissatisfied with the English system, you may perhaps deserve a hearing; but not *till* then.' Now I will not be betrayed, by the wish of defending myself, into any such concession, as that the English system *does* place before her children a sufficiently high standard, or that holy men, who shall have complied with the conditions above specified, will not be even more dissatisfied than they were before. But I will fully acknowledge, that the Prayer-book puts before us a very high standard, and one indefinitely above my own humble aspirations or attainments: but so also, let it be carefully observed, did the Jewish Law. 'To keep alive, throughout one nation at least, these truths (the

^m p. 225.

perfection of God's law and our own miserable sinfulness) in all their native freshness and distinctness, to preserve man's conscience from becoming hardened, and his perception of religious truth deadened, over the whole world, was one especial cause, St. Paul seems to say, of the Jewish economy.ⁿ "Ever since the Fall, man, viewed in himself, has remained knowing the law, but not doing it; admiring, not loving; assenting, not following; with the Law not within him, but before him; not any longer in the heart, but departing from him and moving away and taking up its place, as it were, over against him, and confronting him as an enemy, accuser, and avenger."^o Christianity then was essentially and fundamentally a remedial religion; nor has it any object more closely connected with its whole scheme of doctrine and discipline, than that of bringing our power to do right into some illimitably increasing proportion with our power to perceive it. To take a strong instance; the superiority itself of celibacy over marriage, I have confidently stated to be a dictate of the natural conscience;^p but the power of leading blamelessly a single life, is one of the highest and most precious Gospel gifts. Those then who hold such language as that above described, should in all consistency have held the same to the Jews also: Christ came to enable them to fulfil the Law, but these objectors should have said, 'fulfil the Law first, and join Christ afterwards.' Whether or no indeed the English Church *does* give such helps towards the most ordinary Christian life, as frail and humble believers seek at her hands, is a question which will come under our consideration in a future chapter: but unless she does so, though the character she held up for reverence and imitation were really the true evangelical pattern; though she encouraged her children to honour austerity, celibacy, voluntary poverty, as much as she in fact (practically at least, and in her authoritative teaching) encourages them to despise or revile those graces; even then, there would not be so much as an approach to a proof, that she even tolerably fulfils the very primary object, for which the Church was

ⁿ 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 28.

^o Newman's Parochial Sermon. vol. v. Sermon. xi.^p 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 406.

founded ; nor would her children have any reason for withholding their most bitter complaints, if they meet not at her hands with that protection and support, which shall shield them from the implacable enemies of their salvation.

6. "Granting, however, that our corruptions may be as grievous as the British Critic has represented, still," it may be asked, "why is Rome to be taken for our model in the needful task of reform and purification? Why not rather go back to more early and primitive times, than endeavour to place before the minds of Englishmen in such favourable colours a system, which practically issues in the deep superstition and idolatry which we witness abroad?" Such will be the language of many members of our Church; and it certainly requires a reply. The inquiry indeed deserves most careful consideration, whether the Church of the fourth century, (did we see it really reproduced amongst us, instead of being known to us through the less distinct and impressive media of historical documents,) would appear on the whole much less idolatrous and superstitious than modern Rome herself. Waiving however this question, (towards the elucidation of which something may be done in the next chapter,) and moreover without professing to give either, or even the principal, reasons, which lead me to consider the existing Church abroad as the fit model to regard, those which follow will amply suffice to support that opinion. It must be observed, however, that the idea of introducing, as it were, bodily among us some foreign pattern, according to the best conception we are able to form of it, would be absolute insanity; to think of it would be most extravagant, even to attempt its execution absolutely impossible. No! the one principal object of our observation must ever be *our own* Church; to study the nature and extent of her corruptions, and the remedies for them which her present resources are capable of supplying, this must be, beyond any comparison, our principal task; the only question is, in what quarter are we to look for the *suggestion* of appropriate remedies? And the Church abroad is the point to which we are in duty bound first to turn our eyes, were it only for the plain dictates of Christian love and charity. All our existing most unhappy divisions cannot efface the

obligation of that primary Gospel duty, which requires us to consider as brethren all who bear the name of Christ, so only they be not heretical in some essential particular. Now all English 'high Churchmen' agree in denying that Roman Catholics are so to be regarded; the plain duty then remains, to consult first of all with our brethren, in any difficulty wherein we may be placed; and only in the event of failing to find in them what we seek, to turn our thoughts in any other direction. Another reason, which may be given, is the undoubted fact, that great as are the difficulties in either case, they are incomparably less in the way of our rightly understanding a contemporary, than an ancient, system. Those innumerable details which, small in themselves, go so very far, when taken together, in constituting the real nature of an institution as a fact in history; and the knowledge of which is so indispensably necessary in order to the practical working of any imitation; all these we may study on the spot, if we follow a living example; but can by no possible efforts rescue from the abyss of time, when we desire to make the past our guide.

But over and above these considerations, there is another quite decisive on the subject. If our Church be so corrupt in her practical working as I have represented her, we should expect *à priori*, what we find in fact, that we must look for the source of her corruptions in no less vital part, but in the very foundation of all; her system, or rather her total absence of system, of moral discipline. That this is the real truth, it will be the main object of the following pages to shew; and if it be so, until this fountain-head of evil be closed up, the application of any number of more superficial and external remedies will be wholly fruitless. Now it is plain at once, that there is no subject in the whole range of theology, which varies more indefinitely, according to the indefinite varieties of man's inward character, (varies, that is, in every particular excepting the most general and fundamental principles,) than this very subject. And this being so, considering how closely bound up in all the more essential features of their civilization, (whatever important minor differences may exist,) are all the countries of the great

European family, to look for our guide, in the task of constructing a system of moral discipline for modern England, in the Church of fifteen centuries or even of five centuries since, when a Church exists before our eyes in modern France or modern Italy, this would be nothing short of absolute infatuation. To mention only one particular where very many might be mentioned; every one knows that there is no more essential and important characteristic, which distinguishes modern civilization from all former periods, than the vast increase of what is called *subjectivity*: the very much greater portion of man's life and interest which is occupied in observation of his own thoughts, feelings, and actions; the very much less part which is occupied in action unaccompanied by self-consciousness, or uninterrupted contemplation of external objects. We might have been certain then beforehand that, supposing the ancient Church, which we regard, to have been really pure and efficient, the effect of appropriating its discipline to ourselves would be, to lay far too much stress on outward action and devotion, and far too little on the conscious regulation of the thoughts. This is perhaps a partial account of the accusation of formalism, so often brought against the Church by Protestants. They find much less said by early writers, than by Christians of the present day, on the inward life of the soul; and—failing to see that this was the necessary result of the habits and tendencies of the time, and that spiritual habits and desires do not the less exist, because men do not contemplate, analyze, and describe them,—they attribute it to something of a deadening and unspiritualizing character in the creed then professed. As though, from the time that *subjectivity* has obtained so complete an entrance, the works of any other writers could bear even a moment's most distant comparison with those of Roman Catholics, in profound acquaintance with the inmost recesses of the human heart.⁴

⁴ ' A sentiment is commonly found in Mr. Maurice's writings, which puzzles us more than any other of his sentiments; viz. that "the truths, which constitute Protestantism, are those which concern man as a personal being, which assert his individual responsibility and relation to God, and provide that this responsibility and relation shall be realities, and not dreams." We should not

However, if Antiquity is to be our guide in this matter, let us make it fairly and honestly our guide : let us look fully in the face those bodily privations and inflictions, which to us seem so incredibly severe ; and which nevertheless were not the choice of eminently holy men who had a special vocation, and went on towards perfection, but were appointed as the ordinary lot of penitents, nay, in great measure, of all Christians. But if there appears small chance of introducing any approach to the like among ourselves, insomuch that the most sanguine can entertain no hope of its possibility ; (those even, I mean, who think their general introduction among us, in the abstract, desirable ; a sentiment against which I most warmly protest ;) if this be so, we confess with our own lips that we cannot make the ancient Church our model, in supplying our one primary deficiency ; for we cannot hope to introduce that, which was her very principal instrument in performing the work, which *we* desire to be done. On the other hand, I know no more noble and wonderful event in the whole history of the Church, than the mode in which the Roman Church has applied herself, to meet this new and most conspicuous phenomenon which crossed her path. About the time when the Church of Christ was harassed, and outraged, and insulted, by the foreign Reformers, within the Church appeared the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius ; a work, which all who have given deep and careful attention to it, and, far more, those who have used it practically, extol in terms of eulogy, which those who (like myself) have not done so, can hardly bring ourselves to believe is not exaggerated. On the basis of that miraculous work has been reared the whole scheme of occasional retreats,

be more surprised than pleased, if Mr. Maurice could shew us in Protestant writers any knowledge or realization of these subjects, which can for very shame be *compared* with that displayed scientifically by St. Thomas and the moral theologians who have followed him ; and practically by a hundred such works as ‘The Spiritual Combat,’ St. Francis de Sale’s ‘Love of God,’ St. Alphonsus Liguori’s Sermons, and ‘Preparation for Death,’ Salazar’s ‘Sinner’s Conversion Reduced to Principles ;’ we may be allowed to add Mr. Newman’s Sermons. We keep St. Ignatius’s ‘Spiritual Exercises’ for a separate place, since the wonderful insight into such subjects which that work displays, has led many to think it inspired, in a lower sense of the word.’ ‘On Mill’s Logic,’ p. 409, note.

daily meditation, daily general examen of conscience, particular examen, and the rest, which is at present the very vital principle of the Roman religious system. This scheme it is, from which we may really hope to derive remedies for our present need, of proved efficacy, and of the profoundest wisdom ; not by the insane course of servile and literal imitation, but by bringing with us to the study of that scheme a deep and habitual knowledge of the English feelings and habits of the day, and carefully adapting whatever proposals we may make to the exigencies of those feelings and habits.

It will be a great relief to many, who justly claim at our hands the deepest reverence and sympathy, when they are told that the name of St. Mary is so little prominent in these exercises, or generally in the whole scheme of discipline founded on them, that it hardly escapes omission. And I will say plainly that nothing, in my judgment, would be fraught with more omnigenous mischief, or would deservedly incur God's heavier displeasure, than any attempt to introduce generally among us at the present time any of those devotions to the Blessed Virgin, which occupy so prominent a place in foreign Churches. But having said this boldly, I will also say with equal boldness, that this opinion implied no adverse criticism whatever on foreign systems as they exist. On this subject I have really seen no evidence, which enables me to have so much as a bias one way or the other ; nor indeed is it at all practically important that a member of our Church should have such a bias : we know our own duty, and we need know no more. If indeed some religious and unusually intelligent person were to live for a considerable time, say in some particular part of Italy ; if he were able, by a strong and sustained effort of the imagination, to realise and sympathise with the habitual emotions, desires, aspirations of the people ; if he were to follow them into their retirement and their home, converse familiarly with them, and live almost as one of themselves ; and if, after having done all this, his opinion were unfavourable, it would justly deserve the very greatest attention. But the mere random observations of those who go abroad mainly for recreation, and presume to pass judg-

ment on a nation's religion by such mere external forms as a rapid passage through the country enables them to perceive, can surely have no weight whatever, in the mind of any candid and reasonable inquirer. As to stories they hear, they are still less trustworthy than appearances they see; for it is well known that Italian guides continually invent false tales against their countrymen, with the view of obtaining better pay from the English traveller.

Observe, the question to be considered is this; not whether Roman Catholics address very frequent devotions to St. Mary, (this is allowed on all hands,) but whether those devotions tend to cloud or supersede in their minds the thoughts of their and her Creator; whether the form, as it were, in which she is habitually present to their imagination, is as kneeling with uplifted hands to her Son, praying for those favours which they beg from her; or, on the other hand, as scattering down on them those favours from her own treasury. If the former be the case, every invocation they address to her not only does not put her before their minds in the place of Christ, but imprints more deeply on their conscience and imagination her infinite inferiority to Him. For instance, the Rosary, the use of which is continually thrown in their teeth, would most certainly tend very powerfully to this latter result. It consists in meditation on fifteen mysteries of St. Mary, in all of which, except two, our Blessed Lord Himself must be in the mind of those who meditate; and in almost all of these, must be so in their mind as forcibly to impress it with a sense of her infinite subordination to Him. Indeed it must not be supposed, notwithstanding the incalculable obstacles in the way of a fair judgment, on people so unlike ourselves in every particular, which is presented by all our prejudices of habit and education; it must not be supposed that the English are always unfavourably impressed with what they see abroad. When the Queen was in Belgium last year, even the newspaper reporters seemed struck by the peculiarly religious character of the people. And I have put down in an appendix several accounts, given by acquaintances of my own, of their personal experience, that it may be

seen how much there is which presents itself even to Englishmen in a favourable light.

However, it is continually supposed, that a refusal to admit, without proof, the practical corruption of foreign systems, implies some desire of seeing those systems introduced here. Thus, for example, I have seen questions like this: "Is it possible that writers in the British Critic can desire the introduction among us of the state of things we witness in Belgium or Normandy, nay, in Naples or Palermo?" The very question points to the answer that must be given. The respective Churches of Belgium, Normandy, Naples, Palermo, *differ from each other* in numberless matters of ceremonial and observance, of usage, discipline, ecclesiastical taste, nay, and in many minor points of religious opinion: which then of the four are we to adopt? What can be more preposterous than the fancy of our gravely endeavouring to imitate the external gestures, as it were, and demeanour of some foreign system, while all the habits of our mind, all our thoughts, feelings, and dispositions are in marked contrast with that system?

The only legitimate office of the external framework and constitution of a Church, is to be, first, the expression, mould, and protection of a certain given religious spirit; and, secondly, the mode by which this spirit is brought to bear upon a certain given condition of society; to pay any serious regard to it, on any other principles, is the certain road to the hollowest and most hideous formalism. First then let us endeavour to secure what *comes* first; let us learn, to the best of our power, to understand and appreciate the various exigencies, tendencies, tastes, capabilities of the modern English character: and in proportion as we succeed in our attempts, by help of such knowledge, to promote and forward the growth of this same Catholic spirit, the latter will clothe itself in whatever external envelopment may be found ready at hand, which it will quicken, enliven, and re-create, adopting it as the organ of its expression, and the minister of its will. What outward shape this envelopment will ultimately assume, in what

degree Catholicism will modify our existing institutions, in what degree it will itself receive a colour *from* those institutions, and from our national character and dispositions; all this, and much more of the same kind, it is vain and useless to conjecture before the event. We must learn to content ourselves with what lies before us, and not dissipate our energies in barren and unprofitable speculations.

What *will* be the external manifestation of Catholicism in England, is a question then which it is idle to ask; but we may be very certain what it will *not* be; it will not be the same with its manifestation in Belgium or Normandy, Naples or Palermo; much less, with that assumed by it in its conflicts with the expiring efforts of a Paganism, powerful even in its decline; or in its attempts to humanise and soften the wild and lawless hordes, who at a later period became nominal adherents of the Church. Catholicism is something moral and spiritual, not formal, external, circumstantial; in doctrine, in sentiment, in principle, ever one and the same; but elastic and pliant to adapt itself to all conceivable circumstances, vigorous and full of life to cope with all conceivable emergencies. Take the case of an individual, whose religion shall assume a more earnest or more orthodox character: we do not find that his recognisable identity of *mind* is affected, any more than of *body*. His numberless peculiarities of feeling and disposition, taste and imagination, intellectual cultivation and power, still remain undiminished in their native distinctness and energy; although at the same time a new and authoritative element has been introduced, which, to an illimitably increasing extent, controls, harmonizes, and colours those peculiarities. Let a number of serious and Catholic minded men meet together: how very far will they be from exhibiting any artificial conformity to some external and partial standard! and yet for all this, a like-minded observer will very easily discern, by means of indications far too 'subtle, delicate, indirect, and spiritual,' to admit of analysis and formal expression, the essential oneness of principle, which animates and informs those accidental diversities of character. What then would

be thought of some disciple in the school, who being desirous of conforming more fully to the Catholic model, should copy the expressions and gestures, or even the argumentative methods and political opinions, of some one amongst their number, instead of attempting, by legitimate means, to lodge more deeply within his heart that essential principle, which is common to them all? The application of this, from individuals to Societies, is obvious.

Nor is it only external habits, which are thus intimately connected with the inward principle; doctrines also, as I said in the last chapter, are in many cases the spontaneous evolution, in all the appropriate correlative, of a certain moral character. This truth is the foundation of the 'disciplina arcani' which existed in earlier ages; and (whatever real and serious difficulties are in the way of its application on vital and fundamental articles of the Creed) when we are considering subordinate and accessory religious opinions, it is our one chief guide and protection. In proportion as any primary religious principle takes deep root in the mind, or any cardinal doctrine is realised, contemplated, and habitually appropriated, an indefinite number of minor opinions and practices start into existence: of which some are the simple and legitimate result of this doctrine or principle; but other some result, not from it as isolated and energizing by its own power, but as taken in connection with current opinions and feelings, which however deeply and widely rooted in the popular mind, are peculiarities of a nation or of a period, and have an origin wholly independent of revelation.^r We may apply this at once, to that very class of doctrines and practices so lately mentioned. Nothing can be further from the truth, than the supposition that the British Critic has ever advocated their introduction among ourselves. Speaking only for myself, in July last I say, 'so far as later introductions are concerned, such as Images and Indulgences, and habitual Invocation of Saints, we should certainly be travelling out of our way to notice them.'^s In January, 'Those who are

^r See this stated at somewhat greater length 'on Church Authority,' p. 218.

^s 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 7.

pained and distressed by some circumstances in which the mediæval system differs from antiquity, have a most legitimate satisfaction in the history of the early Church, which exhibits Catholic faith as truly active and energizing, at a time when such peculiarities (we allude, e. g. to the pointed and habitual invocations of the Blessed Virgin and Saints) are not prevalent." In the previous October, in a passage quoted by Mr. Palmer, I go still further; 'So long as an English Churchman acts carefully up to the principles he has been taught, and *in* so acting feels himself in no way attracted towards these ways, *so long it would be a plain sin in him to resort to them.*' Nay more; not only have I never expressed a wish (but the reverse), that these devotions should be generally practised by us at present, I have never even implied an opinion that, as popularly adopted, they are not mischievous and dangerous abroad; though neither have I, so at least I trust, implied the opposite opinion. What I *have* said is, (and no greater proof can be given of our degraded and unchristian temper of mind, than that it is *necessary* to say what all ought to admit as a first principle,) that *Saints*, in using the high and glowing language which is found in their writings, have not made even the most distant approach to superstition or idolatry. Why I was called upon to say this, will appear in the course of the work, when I hope to touch on the general subject with which it is connected; I mean, the authority of holy men on questions of religious truth. Here I will only add so much as closely concerns the matter now in hand.

Roman Catholics say, that it is impossible for the Church heartily to embrace and dwell upon the great and fundamental truths of our Lord's Divinity, the indwelling of His Spirit in the souls of His Disciples, and the importance of gaining to ourselves intercessors against His final judgment, without being led on in course of time to similar devotions. And certainly our experience in England does not enable us to deny this; for, as I shall presently have to urge, those great doctrines are either practically disbelieved or most

† 'On Church Authority,' p. 215. 'On St. Athanasius,' p. 410.

insufficiently held, by the great body of members of our Church. On the other hand, whether or no these devotions necessarily *spring* from fundamental doctrines, most certainly in themselves they are *not* fundamental; as Roman Catholics themselves are forward in assuring us. Let us then fairly and honestly try the experiment. 'High Churchmen' of all grades profess belief in the fundamental Verities to which I just now alluded; let them unite in the use of all such means as are in our power, which, I hope to shew in a future chapter, are very far from inconsiderable, to imprint these doctrines on the innermost hearts of our fellow-churchmen, as living and absorbing realities; and let them 'leave the result with perfect calmness, contentment, and tranquillity of heart in His hands, who, by His Apostle has praised Abraham's faith, in that he went out, not knowing whither he went.'^u Should it be found that the more deeply and practically English Christians embrace these essential truths, so much the more powerfully they are attracted to such usages and devotions as are now in question; no stronger proof can be devised that those devotions are not injurious, but ministrative, to the central and paramount doctrines of the Gospel. Should the opposite be found the case, I suppose there is no one member of our Church, who would desire their adoption: and the conclusion as to any given foreign country would be, that in its case either their use is attributable to particulars in the national history and character, wherein it differs from England; or else (which is of course perfectly conceivable), that it is a real practical corruption, to which we may fitly desire that the Church should apply a remedy.

It will be well, however, to enforce still further this very important truth, that Catholicism (should it ever again exist actively in England) will no more destroy English peculiarities of habit or opinion, than it does in the parallel case, which I put above, of an *individual* adopting a more Catholic view of things. And the same considerations will also shew, how utterly fallacious is that mode of judging

^u 'On Church Authority,' p. 211.

as to the merits of some religious system, which is founded on the superficial observation of the various sentiments and practices, which are seen in some particular country to be coexistent with it. Let it be observed then, that there is not a single event which has happened to a nation in the earliest ages, before Christianity had existence, which has not had its permanent and abiding influence in constituting the nation's present character. Without refining however so much as to take this into account, (though all this *must* be taken into account, if we desire a really accurate appreciation of the subject,) such circumstances as the following are not permanent only but most essential, most fundamental, most vital elements, in the formation of that character: the race or mixture of races from which the nation has its origin: the climate; not only as affecting the mind directly, and disposing it to this vicious excess rather than that; but also as obliging the lower classes, when unemployed, to keep mainly within doors, or else allowing and alluring them to meet together in large bodies for recreation in the open air; (the former leading to the more domestic, the latter to the more social life;) as making a certain quantity of food and clothing more or less indispensable, and so giving or not giving an unceasing stimulus to labour; and so with other particulars: then again, the nature of the soil and the geographical position of the country, as directly fixing the principal employments pursued by the people, commercial, agricultural, or the like: the various other countries, with which, in times past, whether by war or by commerce, the nation has been brought into close contact; and the peculiar character of those countries: the nature of the civil government, past or present, and the degree in which it has made the people's welfare its principal object: the number of men gifted with great originality and genius who have flourished in the nation, and the respective bent of their minds; the number of Saints and saintly men who have been raised up among them, and in what rank of life they have principally been. This list might be very much increased; but enough has been said to indicate the extreme complexity of any problem, which proposes to derive

a practical result, from the observation of social and political facts in the concrete. Of these elements, the only one, with which a religious system has any direct connection, is the last; and even with the last its connection is very precarious: for we have no reason at all to believe (orthodoxy and Catholicity being supposed), that a practically pure Church will be honoured by the presence of Saints more often than one of an opposite character: rather God raises up Saints where He will, according to the inscrutable laws of His providence. Yet all of these elements, especially the two latter, have a very much indeed more deep and intimate share in the form assumed even by religion itself, than, I suppose, any one like myself, who has not deeply studied history, can at all realise.

And now, to see more clearly what it is which a religious system is called on to accomplish, let us conceive an imaginary hypothesis; let us suppose that these various causes had by themselves been operating for a long period, and issuing in those results which would follow their combined operation; and that then, for the first time, such a system were projected. It has to act on a large body of men, who are and have been exposed to certain most powerful influences, while *the very ministers, by whom it is obliged to act on them, have themselves been exposed to the same influences.* A system might be absolutely the very best possible, which yet, when acting under this double disadvantage, would present to those, who have themselves been governed by a life-long bias of the most opposite character, an objectionable, not to say repulsive, appearance. And again, it is very plain that precisely the same religious system, acting on a people and by means of ministers, who, in all the particulars above specified or nearly all of them, differ from that former nation, would wear an external dress so absolutely different also, that it would almost require a practised eye, to recognise through that dress the same essential principles at work.

We shall the better understand this, by fixing our ideas on one out of those numberless elements of a national character, and tracing in greater detail the degree of its influence; and

there is more than one reason which induces me to select, for that purpose, the different effect caused by difference of *race*.

‘The division between the Teutonic and the Roman nations is, both in itself the most striking in modern Europe, and also acquires additional interest from the almost universal adoption of the Reformation by those of the former stock,—its almost universal rejection by those of the latter. And if we examine the moral character of those nations, as they are exhibited in their most complete specimens; on the one hand in England and Germany, on the other hand in Spain and Italy; we shall find, amidst the general resemblance which binds together all the parts of European Christendom, marked diversities, which cannot readily be ascribed to any other cause than their original difference of race. Of France it is the less necessary to speak, because the less strongly defined character of the French people, in the leading points which distinguish generally the Teutonic and Roman nations, is exactly what might be expected from a country in which the two elements were from the first most inseparably and equally blended; and exactly accords with the doubtful contest, there maintained so long, between the two contending principles of the sixteenth century, which in the other states of Europe so soon obtained mastery over the national mind. It is not then too much to say, that the two great divisions, before mentioned, coincide as nearly as possible with two of the chief tendencies which divide the human race itself; and in which, so far as we can trace them back to their origin, we find on the one side the ideas of truth and justice, on the other side, those of beauty and love; which, when separated from each other, and exposed to evil influences, are liable to be corrupted, the one into selfish Atheism, the other into a bloody and lying idolatry.* It will be sufficient for the present purpose, to dwell on the exemplification of these tendencies under their more favourable aspect, in each of these two great branches of the European commonwealth.

‘Long before the introduction of Christianity among the

* See the Preface to Dr. Arnold’s fourth volume of Sermons.

German races, Tacitus had contrasted their truthful and independent spirit with the servility of his own countrymen. The English, whilst they are often regarded in the East as a people without religion and without morality, are yet known emphatically as the truth-speaking nation. The Saxon race has been pronounced to be the only one, in which veracity is regarded as an undoubted virtue. On the other hand, it is no less notorious that our very idea and standard of beauty has been derived from Italy—that whatever elements have been powerful in refining and softening the harshness of the northern nations, have been derived almost entirely from the south. How different would have been Shakspeare's mind, without the conception of the Italian atmosphere which breathes through *Romeo and Juliet*! How different would have been all the poetry of Christendom, had it not found its first voice in the immortal work of Dante!

‘In each of these two divisions, the best man will of course rise above the failings of his nation, and the worst will sink below its virtues; but the character of the mass must be judged by the ordinary temptations, and the ordinary standard of excellence, in the race to which they belong. The mere Englishman is conscious of no struggle when he tells the truth—the mere Italian is conscious of no victory when he burns with passionate enthusiasm. The mere Englishman will never be a treacherous assassin—the mere Italian will never be a drunken sot. No Englishman would have written Machiavelli's ‘*Prince*’—no Italian would have written Bentham's *Deontology*.’[†] It is no testimony to his religious system that an Englishman is veracious, nor yet that an Italian is ardent and reverential.

This consideration of the extensively important results, derived from one only among the numberless constituent elements of national character, will sufficiently shew the extremely arduous nature, under any circumstances, of the attempt to draw general lessons from social phenomena: and still more when those who observe them do not suddenly descend from

[†] The passage within inverted commas has been supplied me by a friend who understands the subject, which I do not.

the moon, but are predisposed by their origin, and have been strengthened in their predisposition by every early association, either to undue sympathy, or undue antipathy. No one will at any time be able to make real progress in such a study, to make way against the unavoidable temptations whether to over-lenient or over-severe judgment, unless he unite, in a very high degree, powers of mind seldom found together in *any* degree: painful abstraction, vivid imagination, accurate observation. But in the present, hardly even nascent, state of the social science, no one, even so endowed to the uttermost extent, can derive any general conclusions from these phenomena, except with extreme diffidence and doubtfulness. No! the history of past ages and foreign countries is not as yet productive of results, which may be separated, as it were, from the concrete mass, and applied as general maxims for the guidance of a nation or a national Church. Its benefits are very considerable, but do not amount to this. They are principally the two following. First, such studies protect us against a certain pusillanimity and narrowness of mind, incidental to merely personal experience; on the present subject, they save us from that deep dependency which might otherwise bow us to the earth, that oppressive and stifling fear lest it should be true that Christian doctrines cannot, from their very nature, be the leaven and animating principle of society; it saves us from this, by putting before us in all their details, so as to satisfy our imagination and affections no less than our understanding, the picture of those glorious ages, when religion was "a living power, kindling hearts, leavening them with one idea, moulding them on one model, developing them into one polity; when it was the life of morality, gave birth to power, wielded empire."² And secondly, acquaintance with past ages or foreign countries may suggest to us, in abundant profusion, remedies for those unparelled irregularities and distresses which now surround us: remedies, however, which it can only *suggest*; whose efficacy can be tested by reference to no such merely external sources, but must be determined by the general principles of

² Letters of Catholicus.

human nature, and by a deep and penetrating insight, if it be attainable, into men and things as they really exist in the midst of us.

7. Thus then every thing seems to throw us back on that course of action, which feelings of natural affection would in themselves suggest ; viz. the making our own Church our one great centre of thought, as it must inevitably be our one great sphere of action. We must learn to dismiss all otiose and unfruitful *contemplation* of external models, whether primitive or foreign, and apply ourselves to the more homely task of labouring by their help, to introduce among ourselves that vital principle, which has had so great a share in organizing those models. And just as we should encourage in our minds a warm and hearty affection for serious Christians throughout all the world ; (being confident of this, that so far forth as they are really serious, they have a true principle and sound faith, practically, even if unconsciously, energizing within them ;) so we should also cherish a regard in some respects even more especial and peculiar, to all serious Christians among ourselves, who join with us in affection to the English Church. All who seriously and unaffectedly desire to see that Church such in action, as every Christian Church is in profession, and who are ready to devote their utmost energies to the accomplishment of that object, have in point of fact,—and should be made more and more to feel that they have,—a very real bond of union and sympathy ; however widely they may differ as to the means of that accomplishment. And if this be so, as it plainly is, even in cases where there is a radical contrariety of doctrinal profession, how much more will it be so, in cases where such profession is in fundamentals accordant ! ‘ Numbers there are among ourselves, who fully agree in the profession of attachment to the early Church, and a real wish to conform to its standard ; in the desire to lay far greater stress than heretofore on prayer, obedience, and self-denial ; in zeal for the Sacraments and other Church ordinances ; and a deep sense of the unspeakable blessings which God gives us through their channel. And how painful a reflection to any one, who has imbibed so much

of the Catholic spirit, as to burn for union with all those who so much as bear the *name* of Christ, (so far as truth and faithfulness will allow,) how painful to him the reflection, that all this agreement is felt as yet to give no sufficient scope for genuine, hearty, unsuspecting sympathy, from the vivid perception we have of mutual differences, on points which, if less fundamental, are unhappily felt as even more obtrusive, and in a sense practical.' 'On the primary points of doctrine we all agree [so far as conscious intention goes] in reference to the same standard; yet little do we seem to feel how precious is this heritage of Catholic truth; how constraining and intimate a bond of union it will supply, when cordially embraced, to all Catholic hearts throughout Christendom.'^z

It may appear paradoxical, but is certainly true, that my earnest sense of the importance of mutual confidence and sympathy is one principal reason of the great openness, with which I am speaking in this publication. If there be in our Church at the present time one symptom of her deep-seated disease more distressing, more irritating, more ubiquitous, than another, it is the profound distrust between man and man: no one seems to know how much meaning may be concealed under the simplest sentence, or what ulterior projects may be meditated in the most profound silence. I am not saying that this could at all have been avoided; it may be a necessary law 'with societies as with individuals, that sharp pangs and trials are in the way, which leads from the lethargy of sloth and self-ignorance to the quiet and assured peace of an awakened conscience.' When certain persons desire, by all allowable methods, to 'unprotestantize the national Church,' to supplant one dominant principle by its contradictory; granting the lawfulness of the desire, (which is not the present question,) it is very far from easy to discover what is and what is not the mode of proceeding, likely to carry with it the least of permanent evil. Nothing in the whole world can be more unreasonable, however natural, than the respective complaints which are made. We use open and straightforward expres-

^z 'On St. Athanasius,' pp. 407, 8, 9.

sions; we are condemned loudly as hurrying persons forward prematurely, startling, alarming them, and the like; we write in a more reserved and cautious style; suspicions are insinuated of dishonesty, underhand dealing, nay, positive mendacity. The substance of what we advocate is so extremely displeasing to many around us, that the manner really, I think, hardly receives the credit due to it. However, as I have reason to think from what I hear and see that few writings have perplexed and alarmed religious and excellent men more than my own articles in the *British Critic*, I do hope that it may tend to restore peace and quietness of mind, if I state, with the utmost attainable openness, what I have meant (and do mean), and what I have not. Accordingly, if any thing which follows shall appear unnecessarily uncouth and offensive to existing prepossessions, let it be attributed to my earnest desire of expressing myself frankly and intelligibly.

I have fully acknowledged, in the passage from which I quoted above, that these differences between 'high-churchmen' 'are certainly far more than merely formal or external, and correspond to a real difference of ethical character.' Here is another benefit, which will possibly accrue from openness of speech; for by means of it, we may expect that these differences will be traced the more precisely to their ultimate elements: and all the world knows how much more nearly we are brought to the chance of agreement, when the points at issue are distinctly recognised. Further, even if such differences remain undiminished, I am still not without confident hope, that when we speak on matters of *immediate practice*, several suggestions, which I shall venture to make, may meet with the concurrence of many, who widely differ from each other and from myself, on the final objects they consider desirable. And lastly, since all serious persons have a much more certain knowledge of immediate duties, than they can have of ultimate results, it will be made to appear from this, that those measures on which even at present all 'high churchmen,' in proportion as they may learn to apply rightly their *existing* principles, will tend closely to agreement, are

those very measures of whose propriety they have the most certain conviction.

It will of course be at once asked,—if this be so, why is it that so much has been said on these ultimate points? why is it that we have not been content with dwelling on points of agreement? why is it that the English Reformation has been so warmly attacked; monastic institutions, voluntary poverty, celibacy, and every thing, most plainly and directly opposed to the spirit of that Reformation, so warmly eulogized? I answer in the first place, speaking still only for myself, that I have not at all professed sympathy, even on matters of immediate practice, with *the course now adopted* by most ‘high churchmen;’ rather, I hope to establish, that the principles they profess ought to lead them *to an extremely different course*. Since then it seems to me absolutely necessary, were it only with a view to most immediate and daily duties, to defend most earnestly and uncompromisingly the position, that our Church, in her present practical working, is radically and vitally corrupt, I am not aware that I add materially to the odium necessarily incurred by such a statement, when I go on to the further acknowledgment, that I cannot but consider even the *professed* principles of most ‘high churchmen’ to be, in some important respects, erroneous or deficient.

In the next place, I have to submit, that the number is perhaps not small of those who, like myself, are so utterly averse to the peculiarities, whether in the Church’s constitution, or in Churchmen’s general profession, introduced by the Reformation, that so long as our Church is identified in their minds with those peculiarities, it is literally impossible for them to indulge in that affection towards her, which would otherwise be natural. Moreover, many of these are endued with qualities, to which I can lay no sort of claim; ardent and enthusiastic love of God, intense, self-sacrificing, self-forgetting benevolence to man. These high qualities they are ready, nay most anxious, to devote ungrudgingly to the service of their immediate Mother; but to cheer them in their thankless labours, to support them against so much of hostility, detraction, and reviling as will surround them on all sides, their

imagination must be allowed to rest, as on the ideal towards which they tend, on a vision far more bright, glowing, and cloudless, than may consist with the continued presence amongst us of any part of the spirit now triumphant, or of the external forms, positive or negative, in which for three hundred years it has learned to clothe itself. One of their number has given expression to this feeling. After stating, in language now by frequent repetition familiar to the public, the very serious evils involved in the present necessary struggle, "all this," he adds, "has been done, and all this is worth hazarding, in a matter of life and death; But if, after all, we are not to be carried above the doctrine and tone of the English Reformers; if we are but to exchange a congenial enthusiasm for a timid moderation, a vigorous extreme for an unreal mean, an energetic Protestantism for a stiff and negative Anglicanism, we see but poor compensation for so extensive and irreparable a breach of peace and charity."^b

Others, again, who have not yet seen their way to adopt 'high Church' principles in any shape, will often be much more readily drawn to them, when exhibited in what I must beg leave to call a simply Catholic and homogeneous dress, than when mixed up with foreign and incongruous elements. Nor, when wishing to give the former class of men that encouragement which results from a knowledge how many hearts beat in unison with their own; and to enable the latter to understand what that system is, which one wishes to propose for their acceptance; is it possible to succeed in these indispensable objects, without causing alarm to more timid and cautious minds? The very attempt leads precisely to that practice of significant hints and implications, which has given so great offence. If then objectors say, 'why do you use language so vehement, so unmeasured, so intense?' one answer ready at hand is,—*you* have made it necessary, who so much dislike a tone of caution, suggestion, and (as it were) irony. We wish to convey to others certain strong feelings which we entertain: we *must* do so directly or *indirectly*; you

^b Article on Bp. Jewel.

complain most grievously if we choose the latter ; pray then moderate your indignation when we prefer the former.

But this is far from being even the most important answer that may be given. The points at issue between 'high churchmen,' though not at this moment *externally* practical, must be at all times, as I have hinted above, *internally* so in a very high degree. Take, merely as instances, those particular opinions just now mentioned; the admiration of monastic institutions, of celibacy, of voluntary poverty. Is it not plain, on being once stated, that these opinions spring from real and important peculiarities of mind; from a far deeper sense than is now common among us of the supernatural character of Christian obedience, of the corrupting tendency of this world's goods, of the extreme arduousness of the path to heaven, of the peculiar beauty of virgin purity, of the inestimable value of habitual and abstracted spiritual contemplation? It cannot be of little moment, were it only for their own sakes, whether individuals do or do not entertain opinions such as these; for without them the Christian character is in a fair way to lose all that is most heavenly and most peculiar to itself. And believing, as we do most firmly, that in proportion as the Christian walks more steadily and consistently in the path of ordinary conscientiousness, he is likely to be attracted the more forcibly to these opinions, provided only they be fairly placed before him; it would be impossible to reconcile our conduct with the most obvious principles of duty, were we parties to any compromise, which might tend to withhold the knowledge of them, from any who may be prepared to receive them. And the same considerations render it equally impossible to refrain from the most earnest and almost indignant disavowals of the language, adopted by many 'high churchmen' towards Rome. A small, very small, knot of individuals, in using such language, intend only to attack certain modern developments of doctrine, which they consider corruptions; but with the general body the case is very far different. 'High churchmen' of the present day are not in general (nor have any need to be) subtle and accurate theologians; in attacking Rome, they

attack not this or that particular, but a certain general spirit, to which Rome has ever most prominently and honourably witnessed; that very spirit of which I spoke above. It is a mere theory, refuted by the smallest practical experience, to suppose that these peculiarly Christian tempers of mind can ever be held in due honour and reverence, I do not say by a very few individuals, but by any numerous class, while such language towards Rome, as that to which I allude, receives encouragement or indeed tolerance. Nor in like manner can the all-important principles of dutifulness and faith be apprehended in their true colours, so long as it is supposed to be an acknowledged fact, that the English Reformation (which to me appears the very embodiment of the sins most opposed to those principles) is to be regarded with respect.

Such then is the alliance which, as I cannot but think, may without difficulty be maintained among 'high churchmen.' They will be surprised to find how little necessity there is, for introducing any doctrine or sentiment, which is controverted between us, into the discussion of matters of immediate practice; but, if it is to be a real and lasting alliance, there must be the fullest permission on both sides to state plainly our sentiments on questions of (what some might call) a more speculative character. Let us agree with each other from our innermost heart, as serious and truth-seeking men, to test the value of our respective views on points of difference, by discovering which alternative those adopt, who carry out into most earnest practice our points of agreement. Let Mr. Isaac Williams, if he so please, still publish his opinion, that "human support and human comfort" were needful to St. Mary, after our Lord's Ascension, while the promise of the Holy Ghost was the sufficient consolation of His disciples; let Dr. Hook continue to call Roman Catholics Mariolaters; let Mr. Wilson exercise his judgment on a Pope's bull, and characterize it as almost worthy of a 'railing' censure;^c but let others have equal liberty, and with no greater remonstrance, to honour St.

^c 'On the Passion,' p. 336. 'Preface to translation of Quesnel's Commentary on St. Matthew.

Mary as the highest and purest of creatures; to regard the Roman Church with affection and reverence; and to hold a Pope's dogmatic decree, as at least exempt from our criticism and comment.^d It is impossible for our opinions to

^d It has been considered by some, that subscription to our XIXth Article requires the formation and expression of an opinion that the formal doctrine of the Roman Church is erroneous in some particular; but a very little consideration will shew, that no one is at all committed by this Article to so painfully presumptuous a sentiment. The Article gives a definition of the Visible Church, and then at once proceeds to call the Church of Rome a Church; so much then at once follows, that the Article implies the (local) Church of Rome to be part of that "congregation of faithful men, in the which *the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.*" It then asserts that, like other Churches the Church of Rome hath erred "not only in *their* living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." Even without commenting on the significant use of the word 'their,' which really seems to me at once to point to *members* of the Church of Rome, the general scope of the Article is quite sufficient for my purpose. For, as is plain, the Church of Rome is here asserted to have erred in 'matters of faith,' exactly in the same sense in which she is asserted to have erred in 'living.' Now there is literally no meaning in the assertion, that the abstract Church of Rome has erred in 'their living;' it must by absolute necessity be *certain of her concrete members* who have so erred: *certain of her concrete members* then it is, who are here asserted to have erred in matters of faith, i. e. of religious belief. This sentiment I most fully hold; for instance, many of the opinions held by some in Rome, at various times, on the subject of purgatory, are held, I suppose, by very few educated Roman Catholics at the present day.

I subscribe then the Article in the following sense: I take it to affirm, that whereas the Visible Church of Christ is a certain congregation of faithful men, &c., every local Church, included in that body, will contain members not only who act wickedly, not only who are superstitiously addicted to outward observances, but also who err on one point or other of religious belief. If this appears the solemn enunciation of a mere truism, I quite admit that it is so: but so far am I from allowing that a probability thence follows of its not having been a sense intended by the Convocation of the time to be admissible, that, on the contrary, nothing seems so natural, as that when a large number of persons meet together, of most opposite opinions, each protesting against what clashes with his own, the result of the various eliminations shall be a formula, which gives no offence to any, because it contains no specific meaning whatever. The reader should be reminded, that in my pamphlets, three years since, I distinctly charged the Reformers with fully tolerating the absence from the Articles of any *real* anti-Roman determination, so only they were allowed to preserve an *apparent* one: a charge which I here beg, as distinctly, to repeat. I should not close this note without observing, that at first sight of the Latin Version, (which according to Bp. Burnet's account is neither of greater nor of less authority than the English,) the interpretation I have given

pain *them*, more than theirs pain *us*; yet it will I think be confessed by all, that the British Critic has, in a surprising degree, refrained from all unfavourable comment on 'high churchmen' of a different complexion. Speaking again merely of myself; I have used language of very considerable respect and deference to Archdeacon Manning, Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Heurtley, Dr. Hook, Dr. Jelf, Mr. Ernest Hawkins; and have in no one instance spoken of such divines in a different tone; and so, with regard to the other two writers I just now mentioned, for Mr. Wilson, though most slightly acquainted with him, I entertain feelings of extreme regard and respect; to Mr. Williams I look up with (I trust) single-minded love and reverence. On any *positive* doctrine which persons, such as some of these, should maintain as dear and precious to them, it would indeed be a matter of long and painful deliberation before I could bring myself to dissent from their judgment; but I have pleasure in believing that such is not the case: on the other hand, even *Saints* may be wholly mistaken on matters beyond their personal experience; much less can I follow even such excellent men as these, when they venture to *attack* Saints. But why may we not hold our respective opinions

appears less obvious than it does in the English; mainly from the words 'agenda' and 'credenda,' which seem at first sight to speak of formal appointment. This mistake however is removed on closer inspection; for the words are 'quæ credenda *sunt*,' not *fuerunt*; things which are matters of belief, or things which (as being true) ought to be believed.

I am of course quite aware that the whole of the present argument will be considered as dishonest special pleading by those, who will not give themselves the trouble to look candidly at the wording of our Articles, and fairly to examine the allegation of disingenuousness brought against their framers. Nor do I deny, rather I have plainly said, that the first blush of the Article appears to imply some reflection on the formal doctrine of the Church of Rome: this indeed will make it a more unexceptionable evidence, for the truth of the view which I maintain. *For I challenge any objector to give any meaning to the Article, word by word, which can, by possibility, bring the formal doctrine of Rome within its scope.* For example, if the phrase had been 'their *precepts*,' although the pronoun 'their' would still have been a difficulty, it might have been plausibly enough maintained, that the formal teaching of Rome on *moral* points is condemned in the first clause, and by parity of reasoning her formal teaching on *doctrinal* points in the last. But the phrase being, as it is, 'their *living*,' any such attempt is impossible.

in mutual love and charity, and possess our souls in peace? Why may we not hope, that by building on our many subjects of agreement, their number may be even increased? Why, when heresy and infidelity are at our very doors, shall we waste that force in intestine divisions, which should rather be directed by our united efforts against the common foe? When the Spartan in time of war was challenged by a fellow-soldier to single combat, 'rather,' he replied, 'let us decide the quarrel, by our comparative prowess in to-morrow's engagement with the enemy.' Let *our* zeal, accordingly, whether for the more Anglican or more Roman phase of doctrine, lead us not to barren and wasteful invectives; but to a fair trial of the experiment, which will give us the most effectual help in evangelizing our large towns, in promoting holiness of life, in restoring essential orthodoxy of faith.

8. In a word then, if it be asked by 'high-churchmen' of what are called more moderate opinions, on what grounds a person can feel real attachment to our Church, who should hold such opinions as those maintained in several parts of the British Critic, how he can defend himself for remaining in our Church, and in what course of action such attachment will display itself; the following answers may be given.

I. We feel attachment to our Church, because through it we were born again, and because through its ordinances we obtain Communion with Christ. I have never for one moment wavered in this conviction, from my first article in the British Critic to my last; and here is a marked difference between the attachment entertained by English Churchmen to their Church, and that felt by Dissenters of various classes to *their* respective Societies. If Dissenters enjoy Communion with Christ, (and I rejoice in believing that very many do enjoy it,) it is not *through* their Church that they enjoy such Communion, nor do they profess it to be so; but *our* Church is a channel of Sacramental grace.

II. On the second head, an answer to the objectors, is equally ready. The English Church, they are even forward in asserting, had not its origin in the Reformation, but has existed from far earlier times. Whereas then no one accuses

them of disloyalty in preferring the seventeenth century to the nineteenth, what shadow of ground can there be for accusing *us* of disloyalty any more, in preferring the thirteenth century to either ?

III. To the last question the foregoing pages, for some way back, have been one continued reply. In addition to the other demonstrations of attachment, specified in an earlier part of the chapter, we now see much more strongly, how great a scope her children have at the present time for indulging that sentiment : by fixing their thoughts mainly on the circumstances of her position ; by studying foreign systems, past and present, with the one object of gathering from them what may be suitable to these circumstances ; by endeavouring to obtain some little insight into that hitherto unexplored abyss, our doctrinal and practical corruptions ; above all, by endeavouring to save her from that root of all other national and ecclesiastical sins, which for three hundred years has been our peculiar note of disgrace, I mean *pride*.

CHAPTER IV.

DOES OUR EXISTING SYSTEM RESEMBLE THAT OF THE EARLY CENTURIES ?

1. THAT our Church differs, in a vast number of most important particulars, from the Church abroad, is agreed on all hands; but it is usual for 'high-churchmen' to say, that Rome has departed from the primitive model, and England has not. This is an opinion, which stands directly in our way, before entering on the proposed examination of the English practical system; for certainly, if that system be substantially the same which prevailed in the Church of the Fathers, the most ordinary modesty must forbid one from assailing or questioning it. By 'primitive model,' it may be taken for granted, is meant 'the first five centuries' at least; for although Mr. Stanley Faber speaks of the fourth century as 'grossly apostatical,' and one or two other modern 'high-church' writers may hold similar language, nothing can be adduced in proof of our Church professing to follow Antiquity *at all*, which does not include those centuries under the name of Antiquity. The period of the four first Councils, on this, if on any, has the English 'high-churchman' ever taken his stand. 'In this moderately sized volume of sermons, [the Homilies,] says Mr. Perceval, *I have noted forty citations from Augustine only.*' It is not necessary however to say more on so plain a matter. This opinion then, which maintains the substantial agreement of our present system with the primitive, must be briefly considered; not that I profess in the least to exhaust the subject, but, on the contrary, only to throw out hints, which others may follow up who are versed in the history of those times.

2. First then, let us consider whether our Church agrees with Antiquity in the matter of Church government. For a statement of the primitive constitution of the Church in this particular, I can refer to no better or clearer authority than Mr. Froude: and I must be excused the length of the quotation, in consideration of the importance of the subject; being indeed no less, than whether the Church of Christ be by right an independent society or no. Mr. Froude then observes as follows:—

‘ Though it might be no difficult task to elicit from Scripture precepts sufficient to satisfy this inquiry, it may perhaps be a shorter and a surer process, to refer to the interpretation put upon these precepts by persons better qualified than ourselves to judge of them: and for that I shall refer to one of acknowledged learning, and who will not be suspected of any religious prepossession,—the historian Gibbon.

“ The distinction,” says he, “ of *spiritual* and *temporal* powers, . . . was introduced and confirmed by the legal establishment of Christianity. . . . In the Christian Church, which entrusts the service of the Altar to a perpetual succession of consecrated ministers, the monarch, whose spiritual rank is less honourable than that of the meanest deacon, was seated below the rails of the sanctuary, and confounded with the rest of the faithful multitude. The emperor might be saluted as the father of his people, but he owed a filial duty and reverence to the fathers of the Church; . . . the opposition or contempt of the civil power served only to cement the discipline of the Primitive Church. The Christians had been obliged to elect their own magistrates, to raise and distribute a peculiar revenue, and to regulate the internal policy of their republic by a code of laws which were ratified by the consent of the people and the practice of three hundred years. When Constantine embraced the faith of the Christians, he seemed to contract a perpetual alliance with a distinct and independent society, and the privileges granted or confirmed by that Emperor or by his successors, were accepted, not as the precarious favours of the court, but as the just and inalienable rights of Ecclesiastical Order. The Catholic Church was administered by the spiritual and legal jurisdiction of eighteen hundred years. . . . The important review of their station and attributes may be distributed under the following heads: 1. Popular

Election. 2. Ordination of the Clergy. 3. Property. 4. Civil Jurisdiction. 5. Spiritual Censures. 6. Exercise of Public Oratory. 7. Privilege of Legislative Assemblies." Of these the 1st and 5th are the ones which require attention.

“ 1. The freedom of elections subsisted long after the legal establishment of Christianity, and the subjects of Rome enjoyed in the Church the privilege which they had lost in the Republic, of choosing the magistrates whom they were bound to obey. As soon as a Bishop had closed his eyes, the Metropolitan issued a commission to one of his Suffragans, to administer the vacant See, and prepare within a limited time the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior Clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merits of the candidates; in the Senators or Nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally, in the whole body of the people, who on the appointed day flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the Diocese. . . . The authority of the Provincial Bishops who were assembled in the vacant Church to consecrate the choice of the People, was interposed to moderate their passions and to correct their mistakes. The Bishops could refuse to ordain an unworthy candidate, and the rage of contending factions sometimes accepted their impartial mediation. The submission or the resistance of the Clergy and People, on various occasions, afforded different precedents, which were insensibly converted into positive laws and provincial customs, but it was everywhere admitted as a fundamental maxim of religious policy, that no Bishop could be imposed on an Orthodox Church, without the consent of its members. The Emperors, as the guardians of the public peace, and as the first citizens of Rome and Constantinople, might effectually declare their wishes in the choice of a Primate; but those absolute monarchs respected the freedom of ecclesiastical elections; and while they distributed and resumed the honours of the state and army, they allowed eighteen hundred perpetual magistrates to receive their important offices from the free suffrages of the People. . . .

“ 5. The Bishop was the perpetual censor of the morals of his people. The discipline of penance was digested into a system of canonical jurisprudence, which accurately defined the duty of private and public confession, the rules of evidence, the degrees of guilt, and the measure of punishment. It was impossible to execute this spiritual censure if the Christian Pontiff, who punished

the obscure sins of the multitude, respected the conspicuous vices and destructive crimes of the magistrate : but it was impossible to arraign the conduct of the magistrate without controlling the administration of civil government. Some considerations of religion, or loyalty, or fear, protected the sacred persons of the Emperors from the zeal or resentment of the Bishops; but they boldly censured and excommunicated the subordinate tyrants who were not invested with the majesty of the purple. St. Athanasius excommunicated one of the ministers of Egypt; and the interdiction which he pronounced of fire and water, was solemnly transmitted to the Churches of Cappadocia. Under the reign of the younger Theodosius, the polite, the eloquent Synesius, one of the descendants of Hercules, filled the episcopal seat at Ptolemais, near the ruins of the ancient Cyrene, and the philosophic Bishop supported with dignity that which he had assumed with reluctance. He vanquished the monster of Lybia, the president Andronicus, who abused the authority of a venal office, invented new modes of rapine and torture, and aggravated the guilt of oppression with that of sacrilege. After a fruitless attempt to reclaim the haughty magistrate by mild and religious admonition, Synesius proceeds to inflict the last sentence of ecclesiastical justice, which devotes Andronicus with his associates and their families to the abhorrence of earth and heaven. The impenitent sinners . . . are deprived of the name and privilege of Christians, of the participation of the Sacraments, and of the hope of Paradise. The Bishop exhorts the clergy, the magistrates, and the people, to renounce all society with the enemies of Christ; to exclude them from their houses and tables; and to refuse them the common offices of life, and the decent rites of burial. The Church of Ptolemais, obscure and contemptible as she may appear, addresses this declaration to all her sister Churches of the world, and the profane who reject her decrees will be involved in the guilt and punishment of Andronicus and his impious followers.”^a

‘Such was the independent power asserted by the Church when its champions emerged from the bracing air of persecution, with their armour bright and their loins girded.

‘1. The whole body of Christ’s Church asserted and maintained to themselves the right of freely choosing those who were to be

^a Gibbon, Roman Empire, c. 20.

their Spiritual Rulers. This right they did not think it fit to make over either to the Emperor's ministers or to the Emperor himself. It was their own; it had been bequeathed to them by the Apostles: and they would not sell the inheritance of their fathers. 2. The persons so elected, after they had received the spiritual gift which qualified them for their high office, deemed it in no wise incumbent on them, or consistent with their duty, to consult their civil governors as to the manner in which they should administer it. The sword of the Holy Spirit was in their hand, and they turned it against whomsoever that Spirit pleased.

'I hope then, that when I maintain the incompetence of our present Governors to represent Christ's flock in the choosing who shall be Bishops, and to represent a higher power in controlling them when they are Bishops, I shall escape the imputation of speaking lightly of the Powers that be. . . .

'In the long and obscure interval between the fifth and thirteenth centuries, however unjust and oppressive may have been the encroachments made on the independence of different national Churches by the policy of the Roman Pontiff, still it does not appear that the Church as such had effected any material aggression on the Rights of Christian States. Indeed, *if we compare the claims of Gregory VII. and his austere successors, with those which Gibbon allows to have been conceded by Constantine and other Emperors to the Patriarchs of the Primitive Church, it may be thought on the whole that their policy, with respect to Civil Governments, was directed rather to recovering losses than extending conquest.*'^a

Looking not at theories, but (which is my subject) at our practical system in England, do we find anything even in the remotest degree similar to this? A contemporary writer, who professes to be strictly in accordance with our 'divines of the seventeenth century,' pronounces at least his own opinion, that 'the King has power, if he shall see cause, to suspend any Bishop from the execution of his office.'^b No single Bishop can so much as appoint the Ember Day prayer to be used on the week, preceding his day for ordination, should he see cause to change the latter. The only alterations, now ever made in our Prayer-book, are made by an Order of the

^a Froude's Remains, part II. vol. i. pp. 215—221.

^b Quoted from the Quarterly Review in British Critic, vol. xxxii. p. 222.

Queen in Council. Simply to remind us, and bring home to our feelings what we all so well know, let us take by way of illustration a very few specimens of the ordinary way of proceeding among us. A Privy Council meets, and issues a document such as the following:—

‘It is ordered by their Lordships, that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury do prepare a form of prayer and thanksgiving . . . and that such form of prayer and thanksgiving *be used in all churches and chapels* in England and Wales;’ or, ‘Whereas by the late *Act of Uniformity* which *established the Liturgy*, and enacts, that no form or order of prayer be openly used, other than what is prescribed or appointed to be used in and by the said book; it is notwithstanding provided, that in all those prayers, litanies, and collects, &c., &c., her Majesty was pleased this day in Council to *declare her royal will and pleasure*, that in all the prayers, litanies, and collects, &c., &c. And her Majesty *doth strictly charge and command* that no edition of the Common Prayer be from henceforth printed without this amendment; and that in the mean time, till copies of such edition may be had, all parsons, vicars, and curates in this realm do (for the preventing of mistakes) with their pen correct, &c. And for the better notice thereof, that this order be forthwith printed and published, and sent to the several parishes, and that the *Right Reverend the Bishops do take care* that obedience be paid to the same accordingly.’^c

And of the perfect deference with which our Bishops receive such commands, also, I believe, in the strictest accordance with precedent, take this as a specimen:—

‘To the Archbishop of Canterbury.

‘Victoria R.

‘Most Rev. Father in God, &c. Whereas the incorporated National Society, &c. have, by their petition, humbly represented to us, &c., [inter alia,] that the general principles upon which the Society has conducted its operations have now received *the sanction of the legislature*, as well as the approbation of *our subjects* at

^c The latter of these is copied from the London Gazette of Dec. 14, 1841, the former about a fortnight earlier; but they are, I fancy, strictly in accordance with the precedent.

large.' . . . 'We taking the premises into our Royal consideration . . . do hereby *direct you*, that these our letters be communicated to the several *suffragan Bishops* within your province, expressly requiring you and them to take care that publication be made hereof on such Sunday, &c., and that upon this occasion the ministers in each parish do effectually excite their parishioners to a liberal contribution, &c.

'By her Majesty's command,

'J. R. GRAHAM.'

Sir James Graham signs this as home-secretary: he is himself, no doubt, a very sincere member of our Church; but the office *may* be held by a Socinian. The Archbishop, accordingly, addresses his individual clergy as follows:—

'Rev. Sir,

'In obedience to the commands of her Majesty, I require you to read from the desk,'^d &c.

Mr. Perceval is proceeding with his motion in *the House of Commons* for a national fast, but is stopped by the intimation that *her Majesty's ministers* agree to the proposal;^e and accordingly, in due time, a fast is appointed by—the King in Council. The Archbishop of Canterbury desires to enter into active communion with the Scotch and American Episcopal Churches; accordingly—he brings in an Act of Parliament to allow him to do so. A weekly newspaper, of considerable authority on subjects of this kind, has been of late expressing a strong doubt whether the English Bishops would be *able* to refuse institution to a clergyman, excommunicated by a Scotch Bishop in full communion with themselves. Mr. Froude, in one of the Tracts for the Times, among other striking observations, reminds us that 'a large proportion of our benefices are in the hands of laymen, who may be of any

^d The Times, Saturday, Dec. 9, 1843.

^e See the Mirror of Parliament, Jan, 26, 1832. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (an officer who may be a Socinian, but who in this instance was the present Lord Spencer) ends a short speech on the subject by saying, 'This mode of proceeding (moving the previous question) will not at all imply that the King, if he pleases, may not order a general fast; and, in point of fact, it is the intention of government that a day of fasting shall be appointed.'

religion under heaven ; and the laws of England watch so jealously over the interests of the patrons, and so little over those of the Church, that they *compel the Bishops, except in cases so outrageous that they can hardly ever occur*, to accept at once the person first presented to him, and *commit the care of souls to him* by the process of institution.' But the following summary exhibits the whole contrast in a pointed way ; nor am I aware of any attempt that has been made to answer it, so far as concerns the question here at issue. 'The primitive Bishops were appointed by the members of their own order, with the approbation of the people of the diocese : Bishops in England are appointed solely by the Crown. . . . The primitive Bishops fixed the doctrine of their churches, and ordered their ceremonies :—no single Bishop, nor all the Bishops in England united, can order a single prayer to be added to or taken from the Church service ; nor can they so much as alter a single expression in its language. No Bishop can ordain any man, unless he will take certain oaths imposed by Act of Parliament, and subscribe to the Articles of religion as required by Act of Parliament. No Bishop can refuse to institute any man, regularly ordained, to the cure of souls in his diocese, to which he may be appointed by the patrons : nor can he, except as patron, and not as Bishop, confer the cure of souls on any one.'^f

3. In the matter of Church Government, then, it is impossible to discover the faintest resemblance between the existing and the ancient system. Turn we now to our formularies. Here, first of all, one most remarkable circumstance presents itself to our notice ; viz. that Subscription to certain 'Articles of religion' is required of all the clergy. The laity then are prevented from hearing any doctrine urged upon them, that may be inconsistent with certain propositions, which no one professes to be matter of Divine Revelation, or more than human deductions from the Inspired Word. This may all be very right and necessary ; that is a different question : but what approach to the most distant parallel can be found in ancient times ? When in the first five, or the first fifteen centuries, was such a course ever heard of, as requiring a totally

^f Arnold's Principles of Church Reform, pp. 102, 3.

distinct religious profession in clergymen, over and above that which is required in laymen? or making any belief necessary to the clerical office, which was not also (in its implicit shape at least) considered necessary to Christian salvation? The only approximation to such a course, I believe, that can be pointed out, is in St. Athanasius' not requiring the word 'ἡμωσίων' to be adopted by those who might scruple at it, while he forbade such persons to hold offices in the Church: but the very essential ground of that distinction was, that they really did hold the *doctrine* intended by the word; and that reception of the doctrine (though not of the word) *is* essential to salvation. Mr. Palmer ('On the Church,' vol. ii. p. 266—281, first edit.) brings many instances to support the principle adopted in our Church: but the very earliest of them belongs to the latter part of the fifteenth century; and much as it may be a matter of rejoicing to find points of sympathy between the English and Roman Churches, this throws no light at all on the subject of our agreement with *Antiquity*. Again, recent investigations have proved, certainly to my own complete satisfaction, that subscription to the Articles is really very far from a stringent test; but, in the first place, that does not alter the principle, and, in the second place, those with whom I am now in controversy, do not at all admit those methods of interpretation, which give the Articles so extraordinary a latitude.

Indeed two opinions, very prevalent within our Church, when taken together, land us in rather extraordinary conclusions. For it is frequently considered (1), that the English Church is the only ordinary way of salvation in this country, and (2), that the ministers of that Church are bound, by subscription of the Articles, to teach certain 'distinctive doctrines,' which are indeed represented as the very pride and glory of our Church. It follows then, that no Englishman can hope for salvation, (except on the plea of invincible ignorance,) unless he submit himself to the guidance of ministers, who are required to teach him, over and above the general Catholic Faith, certain characteristic doctrines; doctrines for whose truth there is absolutely no warrant, except that certain Bishops and others, three centuries since,

for whom no one claims any covenanted divine illumination, and who were called upon very suddenly to make most extensive changes, considered at the moment that these doctrines were derivable from Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. A violation this of the sacred rights of conscience, which stands in most startling contrast to all the maxims of Antiquity, as well as to those of the modern Church of Rome.

On proceeding from our Articles to our Prayer-Book, and looking first at the most sacred portion of the latter, the order for Holy Communion, we find alterations so great to have been made by our Reformers, that even in an apologetic letter, deprecating the suspicion of Roman tendencies, nothing but the most indignant language could express Mr. Newman's feelings on the subject. 'The original Eucharistic form is with good reason assigned to the Apostles and Evangelists themselves. This sacred and most precious monument of the Apostles our Reformers received whole and entire from their predecessors; and they mutilated the tradition of fifteen hundred years. Well was it for us that they did not discard it, that they did not touch any vital part; we have it at this day, a violently treated, but a holy and dear possession.'⁵

In the following instances too our variations of ritual are very great from the Church of the Fathers, and which I mention on the authority of a friend, (a clergyman of our Church,) who is very well versed in their writings, and is ready to mention his name and defend his statement should it be called in question. He says that universally in early times Confirmation was given to infants immediately after Baptism, and the Eucharist immediately after that; that unction was used both in Baptism and in Confirmation; that Exorcism was also used in Baptism; that the Consecrated Host was reserved for the sick and the dying; that water was invariably mixed with the wine; that solitaries frequently, for a length of time together, received only under one kind; that *prayers for the dead were universal* in the Ancient Liturgies. Now is it not plain, on its very statement, that such ordinances as these imply an habitual feeling, on the subject of the

⁵ Letter to the Rev. Dr. Faussett, pp. 46, 7.

Sacraments and other similar particulars, which bears a most striking resemblance to that prevalent among Roman Catholics at the present day ; and at the same time, by no means in harmony with the ordinary sentiments of 'high-churchmen'?

Our Prayer-book, as a whole, is so very dear to every Catholic-minded member of our Church, and, taken altogether, is in *essentials* so accordant with the old Catholic services, that I shall not allude to minor differences in detail and even in spirit ; which, however, are very far from inconsiderable.

4. From formularies of worship we naturally turn to institutions of formal discipline ; and here again the same friend must be taken as authority for the following statements. Public penance was universally required for public sins ; no one might receive the Eucharist otherwise than fasting ; it was necessary to go through certain minor orders, before admission was possible to the diaconate or the priesthood. On the celibacy of the clergy, I cannot do better than quote part of a note to the Oxford Translation of 'Fleury's Ecclesiastical History,' which I have already introduced in the *British Critic*. "Earnestness and persecution seem at first to have superseded the use of canons, and all but readers and singers preserved continence. But no sooner had Constantine granted the Christians in Spain liberty of worship, A.D. 306, than we find a council at Eliberis requiring continence of all clerks, 'positis in ministerio ;' and no sooner was universal toleration proclaimed, A.D. 312, than we find two councils at Neocæsarea and Ancyra, both A.D. 314, enforcing the law of continence."^g Can any thing shew more distinctly than this, not the difference, but the fundamental opposition, of our present feelings and habits to those of primitive times ?

The fearfully severe penitential discipline which prevailed in the early Church, is matter of universal notoriety ; I will merely, then, make a short quotation from Marshall's 'Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church,' to call more distinctly into our memory facts which are acknowledged by all. 'This discipline (how much soever *the zeal of those times*

might induce people to desire coming under it) was in reality very severe and rigorous; not only *in* the Church, but out of it, &c. Origen will tell us, that ‘the hardships are very great which the man must submit to, who should not be discouraged by the regards of shame from opening his case to the ministry of God, and from seeking relief at His hands; that, according to that of the Psalmist, he must ‘water his couch with his tears, and that they must be his meat both day and night.’” Tertullian, speaking of the practice which existed in the Catholic Church concerning penitents, says, “They sit in sackcloth, they are covered with ashes, they entreat with sighs, and groans, and bended knees to their common mother.” . . . “The public exomologesis extends its rigour even to his garb and diet, and to lay him in sackcloth and ashes; it obliges him to neglect all dress and ornament, to afflict his soul with melancholy meditations, and to reverse, by a quite contrary practice, the example of his former misbehaviour. As to meat and drink, to use none for pleasure, but merely for sustenance; to *keep up the fervour of his piety with frequent and assiduous fastings*; to groan, and weep, and cry unto the Lord his God both night and day; to prostrate himself before the Presbyters of the Church, and to beg of the servants of God in the humblest posture, that they would intercede for his pardon. All this the public exomologesis requires the Penitent to submit to.” (pp. 76—78.)

None can deny, that the view taken at any time of Christian repentance is more deeply and intimately bound up with the acknowledged type of the Christian’s inward life, than almost any other that can be named; and that two systems, which radically differ in that particular, are quite certainly opposed to each other on the very elementary principles of religion. It is plain, then, that those who think such rules as these wrong in point of *principle*, profess nothing less than a different Gospel from that professed in the early ages: they may say, indeed, that theirs is the true Gospel, and the antagonist a counterfeit; but they cannot say that both are the Gospel.* On the other hand, as I said in the last chapter,

* For instance, a writer in the British Magazine, which professes ‘high-church’ principles,) in the following passage distinctly repudiates the *principle* of volun-

a difference on matters of particular application and arrangement, which should even extend very far indeed, would be no presumption at all that there is any real difference of principle; and accordingly no one who reveres the Ancient Church is at all bound, in consequence of that reverence, to suppose that the discipline, which was most suitable then, would now be even endurable. But surely those who not merely *revere* the Ancient Church, but take it as their *model* in contradistinction to modern Rome, are bound to suppose this. What meaning is there in the very words 'taking the early ages for our model,' if on a matter which no other can exceed in practical importance, we are at liberty to choose for ourselves some other standard? Nor indeed will this dilemma be at all confined to the case of penitents; the extreme austerity of life, practised by Christians who were *not* penitents, is equally difficult of adoption among modern Englishmen. If it be replied that circumstances are most widely changed, that is of course the very reason why the Ancient Church should *not* be our model; but it is no proof that we can, without a contradiction in terms, take it for our model, and yet not imitate it. Let those then who wish to recal writers in the *British Critic* to what they consider a purer and holier standard, seriously consider how much would be involved in the accomplishment of their wish; and let those who dream of our being already not very different from Antiquity, steadily contemplate the real features of the Ancient Church.^b

tary self-chastisement, which is involved in the whole Ancient penitential discipline; whereas it is no disparagement whatever of the principle, to say that in our times its *application* ought to be most widely different. The writer in question protests against that 'notion of holiness' which 'is formed on the routine of monastic life,' and against the sentiments of those who 'hoped to extract from sufferings *which they inflicted on themselves*, the benefits attainable from such as He inflicts on those whom, loving, He rebukes and chastens.' April, 1844.

^b 'If it is our ambition to follow the Christians of the first ages . . . they had the discomfort of this world without its compensating gifts. . . . If we have only the enjoyment and none of the pain, and they only the pain and none of the enjoyment, *in what does our Christianity resemble theirs?* . . . Why do we not call theirs one religion, and ours another? . . . How do the two agree, except that the name of Christianity is given to both of them?' Newman's *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 415.

5. In government then, in authoritative formularies, in discipline, the differences in question are most extensive, deep, fundamental; amounting, indeed, rather to absolute and pointed opposition. Next let us consider what may be called the ecclesiastical principles, which are maintained by 'high-churchmen' in defence of our position. Of these, there is none in the whole range of Anglican theology, so deep, so all-pervading, so indispensably necessary for an essential support of the entire superstructure, as this: viz. that when the 'holy Church throughout all the world' (or at least that which has been hitherto believed to be such) with one voice propounds a certain scheme of doctrine for acceptance, a local Church is at liberty to throw off such doctrine, (not because religious men among her members have heartily accepted it, and then find by experience that it offends against sacred and inviolable principles of conscience, but) because, in the judgment of that local Church, such doctrine is not sufficiently supported by the testimony of early ages. It will not be denied, that it is on this single principle that the English Reformation (I will not say was brought about, but) is by high-churchmen justified. On this principle they praise Cranmer and his associates; on this principle they defend our continued separation from Rome; on this principle they challenge for our Church the allegiance of her members. It cannot then be called a subordinate or secondary maxim; and to shew still more that it cannot so be called, I will recal to the reader's memory what I said on the subject in the second chapter. In that chapter I implied, as my deep conviction, that this fundamental principle of ordinary 'high-church' theology, considered in the temper of mind to which it fitly appertains, is simply Anti-Christian, and, considered in its inevitable tendency, is destructive of all religious belief whatever.

Such being the extreme view which it is at least possible to take of this principle, it is a matter deserving of most serious consideration for those many admirable men who hold it, (wholly unsuspecting, as I should say, of its real nature and results,) it is deserving, I say, of their most serious consideration,—what *warrant* have they for holding it? In that Antiquity to which they appeal, what single feature is there,

which can, with any possible show of plausibility, be taken to give it the most distant sanction? True that the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries always professed, that her decrees were only exponential of the doctrine handed down from the first; but so also did the Church of the sixteenth century. Now in the sixteenth century, the Ecclesiastical definition on the Real Presence was rejected by the English Reformers; and the rejection is defended, because some of the Fathers hold language which appears inconsistent with it. Let us conceive as a parallel case, that some small Church, one hundred years (say) after the Nicene Council, when the whole Catholic Body had given their joyful witness to the *ὁμοούσιον*, and after that this supposed local Church inclusively had herself received it, should have rejected the word, and thrown off communion with the rest of Christendom because they maintained it. Let us then further conceive, that in justification of so wild and wicked a procedure, they should have drawn attention to the language of several Ante-Nicene Fathers, apparently inconsistent with the Council's decree; and moreover (which is really a strong fact) to the circumstance, that a local Council of some repute was generally considered to have *condemned* the word *ὁμοούσιον*, as savouring of Sabellianism.^h What, think we, would have been the general voice of Antiquity, in speaking of that local Church? It is a matter for grave thought.

I am well aware that it will be said by many in parallel instances (though it cannot be urged in thisⁱ), that where the

^h The Council of Antioch, towards the end of the third century.

ⁱ That cannot be said in *this* case, for Mr. Palmer admits ('On the Church, vol. i. p. 211), that the Greek Church *does* use the word 'Transubstantiation.' It seems necessary to add here one or two observations, lest I be supposed in the text to contradict the Articles of our Church. 'High-churchmen' will, I suppose, with one consent agree, that the doctrine denied by our Church, under the name 'Transubstantiation,' is the doctrine of our Lord's Body being present after Consecration, in such sort, that if our senses were not miraculously withholden, they would perceive it. But that doctrine is virtually denied by the Roman formularies, as well as by our own: for, according to the scholastic use of the words 'substance' and 'accidents,' the latter alone *can by possibility* fall under the cognizance of the senses: and it is a ruled point that *they* are *not* changed. The 'substance,' in the case of any body whatever, is wholly unknown to us, and its real nature is just as mysterious, without supposing any change, as it will be *with* that supposition. The Catechism of the Council of

Greek Church has given no sanction, there has been no judgment of the Universal Church on the matter; and therefore that the case is wholly different. That answer does not, I must say openly, in the very least remove my own deep-seated hatred of the principle in question; but it doubtless makes, in the judgment of English 'high-churchmen,' a plain distinction between the cases: still let it be most carefully observed, that this answer does not even remotely affect the purpose for which I have brought the case forward. So far as such an answer is valid, doubtless it tends to remove that

Trent says, 'that Christ the Lord *is not in this Sacrament as in a place* . . . nor as He is great or small, which belongs to quantity; but as He is a substance.' And again, the accidents of the Bread and Wine, after Consecration, 'beyond all the ordinary course of nature support themselves, and rest on no other thing.' (De Eucharistia, xlv. xlv.) The substance of a body then, in scholastic language, is that wholly unknown and inconceivable thing, (not inclosed in, or referable to, space) which is the 'substratum' of 'accidents,' or of what we now-a-days call 'phænomena.' Nor have I ever been able, by the utmost stretch of my abilities, to understand how English Churchmen, in saying that the '*bread*' remains, can possibly mean any thing different, from what Roman Catholics mean in saying that the '*accidents* of the bread' remain.

It must be fully acknowledged, that one hears of a popular notion in the middle ages, contradictory to this doctrine; a 'notion that Christ's body in the Eucharist is "carnally pressed" with the teeth; that it is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and due disposition of parts.' How far such a notion may have received more or less countenance from theologians, (e. g. Bellarmine,) I am not prepared with an opinion. Such popular notion, however, is plainly that which is condemned in our twenty-eighth Article; it is one which all members of our Church *do* readily condemn, and which, as I have said, the formularies of the Roman Church are very far indeed from countenancing or supporting.

I cannot refrain from adding another passage from the 'Catechism,' in regard to the accusation so commonly brought against the Roman doctrine, that it affects to *explain* a mystery; whereas it only affects to do, what the Nicene doctrine does, *define* a mystery. 'Let not the faithful too curiously inquire how that change can take place: for neither can it be perceived by us, nor have we any example of it, either in natural changes or in the creation of the world itself. But what this is must be known by faith; *how it takes place* must not be too curiously inquired.' (xlii.) After what is here said, I hope that a passage in one of my articles is sufficiently intelligible, which, though not in the number of Mr. Palmer's extracts, I have seen quoted in more than one other quarter as peculiarly objectionable. 'The idea that to a Christian, believing all the astounding mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the Incarnation, the further belief in the Real Presence, even to the extent of the Tridentine definition, is a serious additional "tax on his credulity," is not tenable for one moment.' 'On Goode,' p. 71.

appearance of *contradiction* to Antiquity, which is otherwise presented by this principle ; but it does not tend to give it any *support* from Antiquity. Taking then the most favourable view of such an answer that its advocates can desire, this undoubted, startling fact remains, that the very foundation on which those theologians rest, who claim special and paramount authority for Antiquity, is a doctrine of *their own invention, self-devised for their purpose*, without the slightest particle of sanction or encouragement from that Antiquity. In a future chapter I hope to press this point further.

In close connection with this last, is another sentiment, which has more to do than any other element, perhaps more than all other elements put together, in giving its peculiar features and complexion to 'high-church' theology. The very expression used by advocates of that theology would be, that we remain separate from other branches of the Catholic Church, because of their extreme corruptions and superstitions, and their very close approximation to direct idolatry. Mr. Palmer uses even much harsher language.^k Now here again I am not criticising this sentiment, but merely drawing attention to its utter repugnance to all primitive maxims. A local Church remains separate from all the remaining Catholic Body, *the Roman See inclusive*, on the ground of the very grave and serious doctrinal errors, enforced by that body as truths necessary to salvation. Such is the 'high-church' theory at its greatest advantage ; and, for all that I am here saying, it may be very true and 'necessary for these times : ' but what, think we, would St. Augustine have said of a local Church, which should have allowed itself to form such an opinion, concerning those whom it acknowledges to be branches of the Catholic Church ? St. Augustine, with his vehement denunciations of the Donatists, with his ' *securus judicat orbis terrarum* ' ?

Further, there is no more remarkable and interesting feature in the early Church, than the wonderful degree in which they realise St. Paul's language, ' if one member suffer, the whole body suffers with it.' The total want of any such mark of Catholicity among ourselves, follows no doubt by

^k 'On the Church,' vol. i. p. 282, 1st ed.

inevitable consequence from the principles above stated, and is perfectly legitimate if *they* be so. We cannot possibly desire the prosperity, or lament the adversity, of a religious community, which prominently upholds corrupt and superstitious practices; the difficulty is, how we can reconcile it to ourselves to *attribute* so serious blame to Societies, which we acknowledge as Christian Churches. Whichever opinion then is to be censured, the thinking them so corrupt, or the thinking them Churches, I am merely mentioning the result as another instance of our marked opposition to Antiquity. Never perhaps in the history of the Church has there been a more vital and deeply interesting struggle, than that now depending between the Church of France and the University; can it be said that English Churchmen in general feel any very lively or personal concern in any part of the matter? So far as they do think of it, their sympathies are perhaps on the whole rather more strongly (I fully grant through a misunderstanding of its real character) with the Infidel than with the 'Popish' party. Truly, a Church which (for such is the ordinary 'high-church' view of the matter) considers herself so pure, that she cannot even actively sympathise with those, whom she considers her Sister-Churches, in their conflicts against an oppressive civil government, or some other manifestation of evil, presents in herself a very remarkable spectacle. But when she professes to be an exact copy of the Primitive Church, (in which the possible existence of such a phenomenon could never have been conjectured by the most lively imagination,) she contrives to unite in her theory so many apparent contradictions, that we cannot wonder at the difficulty which all other Christians over the whole world experience, be they Catholic or Protestant, in understanding so much as the honesty of these most perplexing professions.

Consider indeed the very idea of the Christian Church, as it existed in early times; which cannot be better described than in the following passage: 'Even in the Apostles' life-time the Gospel had spread East, West, and South, far and wide, and the Church with it. Multitudes had been converted in all nations, and the *Apostles were the acknowledged rulers of those multitudes*. So wide and well-connected a polity there

was not on the earth, even before their martyrdoms, except the Roman empire itself which was the seat of it.' . . . And 'has there not in fact been a *great corporation or continuous body politic, all over the world, from the Apostles' days to our own, bearing the name of Church; one and one only?* Has it not spread in spite of all opposition, and maintained itself marvellously against the power of the world? Has it not ever taken the cause of the poor and friendless against the great and proud? Has it not succeeded by the use of weapons, not earthly and carnal, but by righteousness and mercy, as was foretold? Has it not broken in pieces numberless kingdoms and conquerors which opposed it, and risen again, and flourished, more than before, after the most hopeless reverses? Has it not ever been at war with the spirit of the world, with pride, and luxury, and cruelty, and tyranny, and profaneness?'¹ Yes; one 'great corporation,' one 'continuous body politic;' containing *within* 'governors and governed, with determined relations, with a fixed constitution and laws, with sanctions and punishments;' carrying with it 'the exhibition to those *without* of an united body acting externally in a specific and corporate character;' with 'the fullest sympathy and intercommunication of its respective members, and united zeal against their common antagonist;' with 'observances, forms, what we may call etiquettes, nay, even a language of its own, by help of which its subjects have the bonds of union more closely drawn, and more fully realize their separation from those without.'^m Such is the picture of the Church Catholic, which any ordinary inquirer would derive from all primitive Antiquity: not very different from this in substance is the Church Catholic, according to the Roman doctrine, at the present day; but most strikingly, broadly, signally contrasted with this is the present face of the Church, on any Anglican theory.

We count ourselves a branch of the Catholic Church, yet 'we are in fact cut off from the whole of the Christian world; nay, far from denying, in a certain sense we glory in, that excommunication, and that under a notion that we are so very pure, that *it must soil our fingers to touch any other*

¹ Newman's Sermons on Subjects of the Day, pp. 264, 5.

^m 'On Whately's Essays,' p. 260.

Church whatever upon the earth, in North, East, or South. How is this reconcilable with St. Paul's clear announcement, that there is but one body as well as one spirit; or our Lord's, that "by this shall *all men know*," as by a note obvious to the intelligence even of the illiterate and unreasoning, that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another;" or, again, His prayer that His disciples might all be one, "that the world might know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me?" *Visible unity would seem then to be both the main evidence of our religion, and the sign of our spiritual adoption*; whereas we English despise the Greeks, and hate the Romans, and turn our backs on the Scotch, and do but smile distantly upon the Americans. We throw ourselves into the arms of the State, and in that close embrace forget that the Church was meant to be Catholic; or we call ourselves *the Catholics*, and the local Church *our Catholic Church*,ⁿ [i.e. as though our Church were Catholic in some higher sense than e. g. the Spanish or the Neapolitan Church is Catholic] as if forsooth by thus confining it all to ourselves, *we did not ipso facto forfeit for it all claim to be considered Catholic at all*. What increases the force of this argument is, that *St. Augustine* seems, at least at first sight, virtually to urge it against us in his controversy with the Donatists, whom he represents as *condemned simply because separate from the orbis terrarum*, and styles the point in question 'questio facillima,' and calls on individual Donatists to decide it by their private judgment. . . .

'Flagrant evils cure themselves by being flagrant; and we are sanguine that the time is come when so great an evil as this is, cannot stand its ground against the good feeling and common sense of religious persons. . . . Our eyes and ears

ⁿ Thus Mr. Palmer objects (p. 56) to my saying, that 'the exemption by special gift from venial sin is believed *by most Catholics* to be a privilege appertaining to the Blessed Virgin' as 'identifying' 'Romanism with Catholicism.' Now certainly upon 'high-church' principles my statement is literally true: all Roman Catholics, and all the Greek separated Church, hold the belief in question; and, upon such principles, these together certainly amount to 'most Catholics.' It is plain then that Mr. Palmer's objection is to calling foreign Catholics by the simple *name* of Catholics; while he himself employs that name (p. 67) in speaking of members of our Church. This is precisely an instance in point.

are filled with the abuse poured out by members of our Church on her Sister-Churches in foreign lands. . . . We act as if we could do without brethren, as if *our having brethren all over the world were not the very tenure on which we are Christians at all, as if we did not cease to be Christians, if at any time we ceased to have brethren.* Or again, when our thoughts turn to the East, instead of recollecting that there are Christian Churches there, we leave it to the Russians to take care of the Greeks, and the French to take care of the Romans, and we content ourselves with erecting a Protestant Church at Jerusalem, or with helping the Jews to rebuild their temple there, or with becoming the august protectors of Nestorians, Monophysites, and all the heretics we can hear of, or with forming a league with the Mussulman against Greeks and Romans together. Can any one doubt that the British power is not considered a Church power by any country whatever into which it comes? and if so, is it possible that the English Church, which is so closely connected with that power, can be said in any true sense to exert a Catholic influence, or deserve the Catholic name?°

On all this, however, it is really not necessary for my purpose to express any opinion whatever, beyond this obvious one; that whether or not a great deal may be said in defence of our present position, this one thing *cannot* be said in its defence, that it is at all like any thing which we find existing in primitive times.^p

° British Critic, No. lix. pp. 121, 2, 3.

^p An interesting little work has been published, breathing a most truly religious spirit, with the name 'offices of prayer for private devotion,' and with the profession that these offices 'have been compiled from Catholic sources.' As one instance among several that might be given of the false position in which members of our Church are necessarily placed, when they exercise their private judgment on Antiquity, and dare to speak, on the strength of that judgment, against the Church abroad, let us observe in p. 85, such a prayer as this: 'I earnestly pray Thee to remove all scandals and offences. . . the *scandalous use of images in divine worship*, &c.' Who does not at once see the absolutely different element introduced into the writer's theology, compared with any which existed in early times, by such an allusion as this to the *formal ordinances* of a body, which he would himself acknowledge as a Sister-Church? What would have been thought in early times, if a local Church had abrogated usages which prevailed through the Church Catholic, and then an individual member of that Church had had the presumption to call those usages scandalous?

But not only were these extremely high views held in primitive times, on the essential importance of Catholic sympathy and visible unity,⁴ the Bishop of Rome was also held in very peculiar honour and regard. Here again, as I do not profess to go at all deeply into the question, it will be sufficient to put together a very few passages, from the notes or text of the Oxford translation of St. Athanasius's Historical Treatises; but the whole of that volume will give a far more lively impression of the high preeminence yielded to that Bishop, than any possible number of quotations.

“Socrates says, ‘Julius (the Pope) wrote back that they acted against the Canons the Ecclesiastical Canon commanding that *the Churches* ought not to make Canons *beside the will of the Bishop of Rome.*’ Sozomen in like manner, ‘for it was a sacerdotal law, to *declare invalid* whatever was transacted *beside the will of the Bishop of the Romans.*’ (p. 56.)

“‘Petri in sede suâ vivit potestas et excellit auctoritas,’ Leon. Serm. iii. 3.”

“‘They’ (the deposed Bishops) ‘acquainted Julius the Bishop of Rome with the case; and he, *according to the prerogative of the Church in Rome,* fortified them with letters in which he spoke his mind, and sent them back to the East, restoring each to his own place, and remarking on those who had violently deposed them. They then set out from Rome, and *on the strength of the letters of Bp. Julius,* take possession of their Churches.’ Socr. ii. 15. . . . Sozomon says, ‘Whereas *the care of all pertained to him on account of the dignity of his see,* he restored each to his own Church,’ iii. 8.” (p. 80.)

“Julius, (the Pope) to the Presbyters, &c., of Alexandria.

. . . ‘He (Athanasius) returns to you now more illustrious than when he went away from you. . . . How can one describe the worth of such a man who . . . is now restored to you, being pronounced innocent, not *by my voice only,* but by the voice of the whole Council. . . Receive therefore your Bishop Athanasius,’” &c. (p. 81.)

“‘I have always entertained some doubts,’ says Gibbon, ‘concerning the retractation of Ursacius and Valens’ [who were Bishops]. ‘Their epistles *to Julius Bishop of Rome,* and to

⁴ The Fathers generally, I believe, laid far more urgent stress on the doctrine of Visible Unity, than on that of Apostolical Succession.

Athanasius himself, are of so different a cast to each other, that they cannot both be genuine' . . . Surely [remarks the editor] this is just the difference of tone in which an apology is made *to a superior*, and to an equal, except by very generous, or by deeply repentant, persons." (p. 86.)

What I have urged then under the present head, comes to this; that three different and most important ecclesiastical principles are involved in the 'high Church' defence of our position, of which one has no shadow of support from Antiquity, and the other two are directly counter to Antiquity. The first principle,—that it is lawful to criticise a religious system, handed down by our fathers, and under which God has placed us, by some external standard, without that necessity for so doing, which results from having heartily obeyed it in the first instance, and having been unable to find in it an anchorage for our spiritual nature; the second,—that a local Church may consider all the rest of what it acknowledges as the Catholic Body to be superstitious and erroneous in doctrine, from a comparison of its tenets with (what appear to the said local Church) the tenets of Antiquity; the third,—that the claims of the Bishop of Rome to authority may be summarily set aside on a similar allegation. But a still more important circumstance remains behind. The reasonings of English 'high churchmen,' who criticise Roman doctrine by a comparison with Antiquity, derive their whole force from a denial of the doctrine of 'development.' This is obvious; and Mr. Palmer by implication confesses it, in such passages as the following. The italics are my own.

"Modern defenders of Romanism have adopted a new theory, which is essentially opposed to those of their predecessors. They have adopted the bold expedient of avowing that their doctrines receive but little aid from the testimony of primitive antiquity—that, in fact, the early Church was perhaps unacquainted with those doctrines, since it is the nature of Christianity to *develop itself* gradually in the course of ages, and under change of circumstances; so that Christianity in the middle ages, *was more perfectly developed than in the primitive times*: it was the expansion of a system which existed at first, merely *in germ*; and probably, on the same principle, the existing system of the Roman

Catholic Church may be still more perfect than that of the middle ages, and be itself less perfect than that which is to be hereafter.

“Undoubtedly there is much in this theory which is pleasing to the imagination. The notion that Religion—that Divine truth, *is capable of continual progress*; that we may look for developments corresponding to the advance of art and science, and *analogous to the process of change which we see operating in the natural world around us*, has very great temptations to the human mind. That it has, we need no further proof than the fact that this theory is upheld by Socinians and other Rationalists; the principal difference between their system and that of the philosophical Romanists above alluded to, being, that the latter attribute to the Church that office of development, which the former assign to the reason of individuals. This is not the only affinity between the systems: it is the well known tendency of Rationalism to disregard the sentiments of former ages; to esteem itself superior in knowledge to the primitive Church. Now the doctrine of development has the same tendencies; it leads to the conclusion, that the religion of the present day is more perfect than that of the early Church: it teaches us so far to set aside the testimony of Catholic Antiquity, on pretence that religion was then but imperfectly understood.

“It is not easy to see what may be the termination of such theories. Romanism may not be the only eventual gainer from that theory of Christianity, which supposes it to have existed originally *in germ* only. There is a subtle Rationalism in such a notion; nay, something still worse if possible. If the Gospel is to be developed by reason; *if its lineaments are to be filled up by the human mind*; if it was originally imperfect; is there not some danger of supposing that, after all, it is only a philosophy, a science, a creation of the intellect? And again, if its processes *are analogous to those which we see in nature*, may not the inference be drawn that, like them, it has its period of decay as well as perfection; of extinction as well as of germination? A germ infers growth indeed, and change, but it also infers *corruption and death*.” pp. 57, 58, 61, 62.

Mr. Palmer then considers this doctrine to have been invented by modern advocates of Roman sentiments; and thinks it most dangerous, as being not less likely to subserve the cause of Rationalism than of ‘Romanism.’ Now what

writer in all Antiquity can be taken for our guide, with less objection from English 'high-churchmen,' than St. Vincentius Lirinensis, the great witness to the famous phrase, 'quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus?' His Commonitorium is the very text-book of that theology. Let us hear then his sentiments on this important matter, and see how far it is possible to distinguish them from this 'modern theory.' I quote from the Oxford translation.

'But peradventure some will say, shall we then have *no advancement* of religion in the Church of Christ? Surely *let us have the greatest that may be*. For who is either so *envious of men, or hateful of God*, which would labour to hinder that? But yet in such sort that it may be truly an *increase* in faith, and not a change; since this is the nature of an increase, that in themselves severally things grow greater; but of a change, that something be turned, from one thing which it was, to another which it was not. Fitting it is, therefore, that the understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, as well of every man in particular, as of all in common; as well of one alone, as of the whole Church in general, should by the advance of ages *abundantly increase and go forward*; but yet for all that, only in its own kind and nature: that is, in the same doctrine, in the same sense, in the same judgment. In this case, let the religion of our souls imitate the nature of our bodies, which although with process of time they *develope and unfold their proportions*, yet they remain the same that they were. There is great difference betwixt the flower of youth and the ripeness of age, yet the self-same men become old which before were young; so that although the state and condition of one and the self-same man be altered, yet one and the self-same nature, one and the self-same person, doth still remain. The limbs of infants be small, of young men great; yet not divers, but the same. So many joints as young children have, so many have they when they be men; and if any parts there be, which with increase of more mature years spring forth, those before were *in man virtually planted in manner as the seed*, so that no new thing do come forth in old men, which before *had not lain hid* in them being children. Wherefore there can be no doubt but that this is the due and right rule of growing, the fixed and goodliest order of increasing, if the increase of age complete over these members, those parts and joints, which the wisdom of our Creator before framed, when we were yet but little

ones. But if a human form be afterward changed into some other likeness not of its own kind, or at least if any thing be added to the number of its members or taken from it, then of necessity the whole body must either perish, or become monstrous, or at least be weakened. In like manner, Christian doctrine must follow these laws of increasing, to wit, that *with years it wax more sound, with time it become more ample*, with continuance it be more exalted, yet remain incorrupt and entire, and continue full and perfect in the proportions of each of its parts, and, as it were, with all its members and proper senses. And that it admit no further change, sustain no loss of its propriety, no variety in definition. For example' sake; our forefathers in old time in this field of the Church, sowed the wheaten seed of true faith; it were now very injurious and inconsistent, that we their posterity, instead of the perfect and true grain, should reap the spurious error of cockle: and contrariwise, it is reason and very consistent that, the beginning and ending not disagreeing with each other, we should of the *increase of wheaten teaching* reap the fruit of wheaten doctrine; so that when, with tract of time, *any of those first seeds begin to bud and come forth*, and now flourish and receive culture; yet there be no change of the propriety of the germ; and albeit fashion, shape, and distinction be added, yet the nature of each kind remain the same. For God forbid that those rosy plants of Catholic doctrine should be changed into thistles and thorns; God forbid, I say, that in the very spiritual paradise of the slips of cinnamon and balsam, should suddenly grow up darnel and aconite. Therefore whatever hath by our fathers' faith been sown in this Church, the field of God's husbandry, reason it is, that the same be cultivated and maintained by the industry of the children, that this same flourish and wax ripe, that this same grow and come to perfection; lawful indeed it is, that those ancient articles of heavenly philosophy be, in process of time, *trimmed, smoothed, and polished*; but unlawful that they be changed, unlawful that they be mangled and maimed. And albeit they receive *perspicuity, light, and distinction*, yet of necessity must they retain their fulness, soundness, and propriety. For if once this licentiousness of wicked fraud be admitted, I tremble to speak what danger is like to ensue of extirpating and abolishing religion; for if we give up any part of the Catholic Faith, straightway other parts, and after that other, and again other, and that now as it were of custom, and by a kind of law, shall be given up.

And further, what followeth, when the parts, by little and little, have been set aside ; but that, in conclusion, the whole in like manner must be set aside ? And, contrariwise, if new things and old, foreign and domestic, profane and sacred, begin once to be confounded together, then must needs this custom generally creep on, that nothing hereafter remain in the Church untouched, nothing without corruption, nothing sound, nothing pure ; and so where before was the sanctuary of chaste and immaculate truth, there shall be a very brothel-house of wicked and filthy errors. But God of His goodness deliver his servants from such minds, and let such madness be rather for the impious !

‘ For the Church of Christ, a careful and diligent keeper of doctrines committed to her charge, never changeth any thing in them, diminisheth nothing, addeth nothing.’ pp. 104—9.

I have added this last sentence, to shew plainly how little any of the Fathers, when they speak of ‘ adding nothing to the faith,’ imply any contradiction to the doctrine here so clearly set forth : and my readers cannot but have been struck with the very curious similarity of the language used respectively, by St. Vincentius in advocating a doctrine which Mr. Palmer considers worse, if possible, than rationalism, and by Mr. Palmer in endeavouring to hinder that, which he who hinders is regarded by St. Vincentius as ‘ *envious of men and hateful of God.*’²

Again : the deep feeling of love and union, which existed throughout the various branches of the Church, say in the

² What has been here said is sufficient of itself to supersede the necessity of formally examining a theory often propounded by members of our Church ; viz. that our own Church authoritatively refers us to Antiquity as our standard of doctrine and practice. Without entering then into the other reasons which make me consider this theory wholly untenable, it is obvious here to remark that Antiquity itself remands us back again, as it were, to the existing Church. There is no one truth more plain on the very surface of the history of the early ages, than the exceeding deference which they considered due from each local Church to the whole Catholic Body, and to the Bishop of Rome. And the last quotation in the text shews in addition, if we may take St. Vincentius as a fair representative of their doctrine, that so far from considering the existence of doctrinal developments to be an excuse from the performance of this duty, they would, on the contrary, have considered the Church to have failed in her duty, if she had not given birth to such developments.

time of St. Augustine, when the Arian troubles had been for some time brought to a close, displayed itself outwardly, as all real feelings among men do display themselves, in various observances, regulations, and formal results. One of these would even necessarily be, that a Christian, whether in his own country or in any other, who should separate himself from the Communion of the local bishop and join some other body, would be treated by the whole Church as a schismatic, and considered most justly to have excluded himself from the ordinances of grace. Such a rule had a deep meaning and value, under the circumstances which then existed; but 'high-church' Anglicanism has its being, its only possible life, in most zealously maintaining that those circumstances have wholly changed. If therefore a maxim formerly in force, which had its origin, nay its very meaning, in that particular state of things which has now passed away, be itself retained or rather revived, such revival may on other grounds be wise and proper, or it may not; but to defend it by appeal to Antiquity is absolutely ludicrous. It will be at once seen, that the allusion is to that principle, very generally prevalent among 'high-churchmen,' and so startling and astonishing to an ordinary mind, that English Catholics, who are in Communion with the See of Rome, are in a state of schism. Here again I am not saying whether this principle should stand or fall, but that *on its own merits* it must stand or fall; that to adopt at random, as it were, from early ages some external rule, when the very spirit which gave life to the rule has gone away from us, is not to follow, but to abandon, the principles of those ages; which shrank from no one thing more sensitively, than from a carnal and ceremonial resting in outward ordinances and appointments.

It will be well, however, to state as accurately as may be what this principle is; and I suppose it will be admitted on all hands to be this: viz. that a French clergyman, e. g. who says mass at Calais to-day and crosses the water, should he say mass at Dover to-morrow with the same intention and in the same state of mind, (unless he can

plead invincible ignorance,) commits a mortal sin; receives the Lord's Body to his condemnation; and were he to die without repenting of such sin, would be consigned to everlasting torments. Mr. Palmer adds a still further step; for he denies that invincible ignorance itself can excuse one, who in England remains separate^a from our Church. Whether or no, however, others may follow him in the latter view, the sentiment which he holds in common with other high-churchmen, leads by necessary consequence to a very serious result. The deliberate intention of committing mortal sin under certain conceivable circumstances, is, as every one knows, itself a mortal sin. Now there is not a Roman Catholic living, who does not most fully purpose, should he come to England, to communicate with the Roman Catholics, not

^a Objection "xii. Papists do not admit that the members of the British Churches can be saved, while the latter allow that Papists can be saved. Therefore it is plain that there is greater safety in the Papal communion.

"Answer. The argument ought to be directly reversed, thus: Papists allow that the members of the [English] Church can be saved. *They* cannot allow that Papists are in the way of salvation; therefore the communion of the [English] Church is safer than that of the Papal schism. I prove the two first propositions thus. (1.) Papists allow that we can be saved. Dr. Milner says: 'Catholic divines and the holy fathers . . . make an express exception in favour of what is termed invincible ignorance; which occurs when persons out of the true Church are sincerely and firmly resolved, in spite of all worldly allurements on the one hand, and of all opposition on the other, to enter into it, if they can find it out; and when they use their best endeavours for this purpose. Our great controversialist Bellarmine asserts that such Christians, in virtue of the disposition of their hearts, belong to the Catholic Church.' (2.) On the other hand, the Church of England excommunicates any one who shall dare to affirm that the Romish community in these countries is a true Church; and as we therefore cannot allow Romanists to be in the Church, and as we have no right to admit that any persons out of the Church are or can be in the way of salvation, it is plain that there is much the greatest safety in adhering to our communion, in which alone both parties allow that salvation may be obtained." 'On the Church,' vol. i. p. 254, first edit.—Mr. Palmer seems unwilling to speak quite plainly: but his distinct argument is, that Roman Catholics admit the salvability of members of our Church, in a sense in which English Churchmen do *not* admit the salvability of Roman Catholics in England. But the sense in which Roman Catholics admit the salvability of members of our Church, according to Mr. Palmer's quotation, is merely that invincible ignorance forms a ground of excuse; therefore it is Mr. Palmer's opinion, that English Churchmen do *not* admit that, in the reverse case, invincible ignorance forms a ground of excuse. Q. E. D.

with the English Church: it follows then by inevitable consequence from this theory, that all Roman Catholics throughout the world are in mortal sin; either simpliciter, as Mr. Palmer must say, or saving invincible ignorance, which is, I suppose, the more ordinary sentiment. To base a maxim thus pregnant with consequences on so precarious a foundation as that above described, does seem an inconceivable procedure: but how much stronger does the case against it become, when we call to mind that,—on referring to the chief example in Antiquity which presents any distant parallel to our present condition, and which in consequence has to support no little weight of argument and inference, (the example of St. Meletius of Antioch)—we find no appearance whatever (but the very reverse) of the prevalence of such a maxim; “there is not the faintest trace of any idea, prevailing in any quarter at that time, of casting so strange an imputation on Paulinus and his followers.”^b

6. Let so much have been said on the ecclesiastical principles appertaining to, and adducible in defence of, the respective systems which I am comparing together. The most important particular of comparison, however, is of course that which still remains; a comparison as to the general tone and temper of mind on doctrinal and practical subjects. This comparison has already indeed been incidentally carried out in one or two particulars: nor again shall I here attempt to trace it upwards to its ultimate elements, for that would necessarily imply a discussion on the primitive doctrine of justification; a discussion which on the one hand would lead us far more into controverted matters than is necessary for my purpose, and, on the other hand, would in some respects anticipate what will find a more fitting place in the next chapter. Let us rather, then, confine our attention to various salient points of usage or common language, of whose existence no one entertains a doubt, and which will nevertheless be acknowledged by all candid inquirers, to indicate conclusively the presence and energy of a certain definite character among Christians of that day.

^b ‘On the Synagogue and the Church,’ p. 45.

I. At the risk of appearing fanciful, I will begin by speaking of the tendency so universally found among the Fathers, as among holy men in all periods of the Church, to think the religion of their own age and country the most corrupt that has ever existed, and not worthy to be even mentioned in comparison with that of other times. It should of course be fully acknowledged, that this tendency, even if existing most actively, will in times like the present receive a very decided check, from the growth of historical studies, and our consequent knowledge of the prevalence of similar complaints at other periods. Such causes, however, though they may well prevent the tendency from growing into an *opinion*, will not help at all in accounting for an absence of the tendency itself; nor does it require any very deep research into human nature, to discover how necessarily a high standard of religious obedience, when brought into contrast with that miserable amount of practical evil which must always and everywhere be found here below, will produce this tendency in the serious mind. And if, in addition to this previous probability, the fact adduced be itself found historically true, as on examination it most certainly will; if a continued inclination to think our Church peculiarly corrupt has ever been an especial note of our own religion being pure; what reason have not those for suspecting the real spirituality of their desires and religiousness of their views, who are so little conscious of such an inclination, as the ordinary professors of 'high-church' principles appear to be!

II. This deep principle of human nature has also borne a very chief part, in producing that continual expectation of our Lord's immediate coming to judgment, which so much astonishes all modern readers of early religious writings. Mr. Newman, in his works,^c fully accounts for and defends this expectation; of whose existence, even in Apostolic times, certainly the New Testament itself bears on its surface very apparent and obvious marks. If then in our own days we are disposed to simple astonishment, not to say contempt, when

^c Parochial Sermons, vol. vi. Serm. 17 and 18.

we hear of its prevalence, what else can this possibly shew, except that the habitual character of our religion is wholly wanting in some important element or other, which has exercised an active influence in all other ages of the Church ?

III. If there be one fact more than another in early centuries, which even forces itself on the mind of the most superficial reader, it is the extreme stress laid by holy men on what appear at first sight minute points of faith, and the surprising hold over the popular mind possessed by disputes concerning such points. We find even the unlearned and rude multitude sensitive to the slightest breath of heresy, perplexed by novel statements of doctrine, ready to die for an article of the Creed, miserable under the ascendancy of Arians, filled with joy at the triumph of the orthodox. How completely opposite this is to our present way of thinking, needs not be told ; insomuch that modern historians, while they cannot fail to observe, make in fact no attempt whatever to explain the phenomenon. If there be a view of religion held at the present day, which gives a fair and natural account of this fact, nay, by means of which the fact might have been readily foretold before the event, while the more popular views wholly fail of giving any such account ; then, whether or not this view be true, it cannot be fairly questioned that in its characteristic points it agrees with that prevalent in the early ages. It need hardly be added, that such a view does exist, and that it is essentially contradictory to that now dominant in England. Hear the Christian Remembrancer, in an article distinguished by peculiar kindness of language and earnestness of purpose, but protesting withal very strongly against Rome and the British Critic, and therefore the more unsuspecting witness.


‘ Would it not be possible to preach every heresy condemned by the first four general Councils in nine pulpits out of ten in England, *without a murmur*, to say nothing of a censure ? Nay, is it not a fact, that the clearest heresies, condemned over and over again, are taught not only orally but in print ; and this, too, without an attempt on the part of the Church, at canonical and ecclesiastical

branding? Would the Church of the Fathers have permitted, without formal protest, one half of its Clergy to deny Baptismal Regeneration, and the Apostolic Succession? Can we conceive the early Church *disputing and questioning whether it did or did not hold the simplest fundamentals of the Christian faith?* Would not the communion of Athanasius have risen as one man, with a voice alike indignant and uniform, against what is now passed over unquestioned? a Church claiming 'authority in controversies of Faith,' and yet without a voice; assuming to be the source and bond of unity, and yet permitting not merely discordant, but contradictory doctrines to be taught. . . . Surely we must be deficient, and that to no slight extent, in the temper and in the rigid faithfulness of the primitive times.'^d

It will not be denied that even 'high-churchmen' in modern England are very far less sensitive and keen-sighted on what they would regard as minute points of doctrine, than were the early Christians. So that, whereas we have already seen how fundamental is the opposition between ancient and modern views of repentance and of obedience, we now see the same in respect to faith. Surely it is in mockery that our Church is ever called 'primitive and patristic,' whether she do or do not deserve the name of 'Scriptural and Apostolical.'

IV. Then, again, is there any thing more extraordinary to our modern ideas, than the mode universally prevalent in Antiquity of regarding Scripture? When appealing to it indeed in proof of doctrine, for instance in St. Athanasius's works, very great power is evinced in the way of what is now called 'exegesis;' but when merely applying it to practical purposes, they seem very often hardly to think of the context, but to take some one individual verse, and see beneath it the most surprising depth of meaning and allusion. The discussion in No. 89 of the Tracts for the Times will sufficiently explain what is here meant; and not a word more need be said, to prove how extremely repulsive to our modern taste is this whole method of procedure, how extravagant,

^d Christian Remembrancer, Nov. 1843, pp. 557, 8.



arbitrary, disrespectful to the sacred text itself we are tempted to consider it. Many interpretations most gravely propounded by the greatest fathers, St. Ambrose or St. Augustine, would naturally appear to us rather like the ravings of madmen, than the dicta of sober Scripture expositors. Nay, even in formal argument against heretics, great stress is frequently laid on these mystical interpretations. Now as it is very plain, from other of their writings and from their whole lives, that such men were in an eminent degree holy, sober-minded, prudent, highly-gifted, it follows that there was something very remarkable in their state of mind, which we have wholly lost. Whether or no the whole system of 'double interpretation' be intended by God's Providence to flourish in any modern ages of the Church, or whether the knowledge, then possessed, of the deep mysteries concealed beneath the Scripture text, be connected in some wonderful way with the then existing state of opinion and civilization, we are not perhaps in a condition to pronounce. It is certainly very much to be observed, that it has in no shape been fixed by any Ecclesiastical decree, as part of the inalienable dogmatic heritage, which is to the end of time to be the highest object of contemplation in the Church Catholic. But however this may be, this mode of interpretation was so universal and all-penetrating, that it must, by absolute necessity, correspond to some very important element of character pervading the early Church: which element may indeed very possibly exhibit itself *under a different shape* in modern times, but cannot be *absent* from any modern community without constituting a most deep mark of separation between it and the primitive Church. To shew what is meant, it has been said that the very general Invocation of Saints, and religious use of images and pictures, existing in the Church abroad, is the outward display of the very same inward principle. How far this may be so, is of course no special concern of ours; what *is* our concern, is to look about carefully in every direction among ourselves, and inquire whether we can fairly say that any feeling, widely spread in *our* religious world, looks at

all like the counterpart of this ancient habit of mind. For instance, if religious ceremonial in any shape were extremely popular, that might *conceivably* be an answer to the inquiry. If nothing of the sort can be found, (and, myself, I know not where to look for it,) here is another contrast between the English and the Ancient Church.

V. Speaking of Scripture, one is led to another curious fact. Antiquity with one voice pronounced the Song of Solomon the most sacred and evangelical book in all the Old Testament; and the same have all Saints done from that day to this. An eminent Dissenter, now living, has formally rejected it from the Canon; but, waiving such extreme cases, religious men among ourselves, as is quite notorious, are, to say the least, very far from affixing the same habitual value to this Inspired Poem. Considering its peculiar nature, I do not see how any one can fairly doubt that this spontaneous and unconscious opposition of procedure corresponds to a subtle indeed, but very real and extensive opposition of inward character.

VI. Miracles were believed to exist in the fourth and fifth centuries, to a very far greater extent than in Roman Catholic countries at the present day. The most prejudiced observer could not by possibility give any such account of contemporary Roman Catholics, as Gibbon has given of Christians of that period.

“The grave and learned Augustine, whose understanding scarcely admits the excuse of credulity, has attested the innumerable prodigies which were performed in Africa by the relics of St. Stephen. He solemnly declares, that he had selected those miracles only which were publicly certified by the persons, who were either the objects or the spectators of the power of the martyr. Many prodigies were omitted or forgotten; and Hippo had been less favourably treated than the other cities of the province. And yet the Bishop enumerates above seventy miracles, of which three were resurrections from the dead, in the space of two years, and within the limits of his own diocese. If we enlarge our view to all the dioceses and all the Saints in the Christian world, it will not be easy to calculate

the fables and the errors which issued from this inexhaustible source." §

It is plain of course, and has very often been observed, that in an uncritical age the existence of a large number of real miracles, will most inevitably lead to the popular belief in a prodigious number of imaginary ones. The present Church of Rome (partly from the progress of physical science and of the critical spirit, partly from the great care and profound wisdom with which certain miraculous allegations are examined at the Court of Rome, partly perhaps from the circumstance that miracles really *are* less frequently vouchsafed in these latter days, but from whatever cause) certainly exhibits no such belief in the universal prevalence of miracles. Yet the feelings with which we are inclined to regard even her miraculous stories (such, for instance, as that of St. Januarius's blood), the readiness with which we are tempted at once to disbelieve them before examining the evidence on which they rest, all this shews very plainly, how much more shocked and offended we should have been by the belief of early centuries on the subject, and by consequence how very widely we have departed from the spirit of those centuries.

VII. The universal prevalence of monasteries or other like institutions, nay, of solitaries in the desert, must be immediately felt by all as indicative of a spirit directly at variance with that prevalent in the English Church. On this subject I cannot do better than make the following quotation.

‘ The history of the Church affords us an additional lesson of the same serious truth. For three centuries it was exposed to heathen persecution; during that long period God's Hand was upon His people: what did they do when that Hand was taken off? How did they act when the world was thrown open to them, and the Saints possessed the high places of the earth? did they enjoy it? far from it, they shrank from that, which they might, had they chosen, have made much of; they denied themselves what was set before them; when God's Hand was removed, their own hand was heavy upon them. Wealth, honour, and power,

§ Gibbon, vol. v. pp. 129, 30.

they put away from them. They recollected our Lord's words, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!"^h And St. James, "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom?"ⁱ For three centuries they had no need to think of those words, for Christ remembered them, and kept them humble; but when He left them to themselves, then they *did voluntarily what they had hitherto suffered patiently*. They were resolved that the Gospel character of a Christian should be theirs. Still, Christ, in the Gospels, makes His followers poor and weak, and lowly and simple-minded; men of plain lives, men of prayer, not "faring sumptuously," or clad in "soft raiment," or "taking thought for the morrow." They recollected what He said to the young Ruler, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow Me." And so they put off their "gay clothing," their "gold, and pearls, and costly array;" they "sold that they had, and gave alms;" they "washed one another's feet;" they "had all things common." They formed themselves into communities for prayer and praise, for labour and study, for the care of the poor, for mutual edification, and preparation for Christ; and thus, as soon as the world professed to be Christian, Christians at once set up among them a witness against the world, and *kings and monks came into the Church together*. And from that time to this, never has the union of Church with State prospered, but when she was united also with the hermitage and the cell.^k

VIII. The same writer proceeds at once to another singular feature of early times.

‘Moreover, in those religious ages, Christians avoided greatness in the Church as well as in the world. They would not accept rank and station on account of their spiritual peril, when they were no longer encompassed by temporal trials. *When they were elected to the episcopate*, when they were exhorted to the priesthood, *they fled away and hid themselves*. They recollected our Lord's words, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant;" and again, "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even

^h Mark x. 23.

ⁱ James ii. 5.

^k ‘Plain Sermons,’ vol. v. pp. 44, 5.

Christ, and all ye are brethren.”^k And when discovered and forced to the eminence which they shunned, they made much lament, and were in many tears. And they felt that their higher consideration in the world demanded of them some *greater strictness and self-denial* in their course of life, *lest it should turn to a curse*, lest the penance of which it would defraud them here, should be visited on them in manifold measure hereafter. They feared to have “their good things” and “their consolation” on earth, lest they should not have Lazarus’s portion in heaven. That state of things indeed is now long passed away, but let us not miss the doctrinal lesson which it conveys, if we will not take it for our pattern.’

But why need I say more? why speak at length of the burning desire or rather passion for martyrdom, so common in the ages of persecution? or of the unbounded veneration for relics? or the universal honour paid to celibacy, and the habit of solemnly before the Church making vows of continence? or of the great prominence given to that feature in the Church, which is now called priestcraft? or of the circumstance that presbyters were so generally called *priests*, and that their office was considered to consist more essentially in offering Sacrifice than in any other function? or the habitual thought and remembrance of Angels, and belief in their guardianship both over individuals and over countries? Enough surely has been already detailed, to impress on the most unimaginative and insensible the wide contrariety, between the religious spirit which ruled respectively Nicene Christendom and modern ‘high-church’ Anglicanism.

But sufficient justice will not be done the subject, without drawing the attention of learned men in our Church, who protest against Roman practices, to the following long extract from the Dublin Review. The Roman Catholics have been so long challenged to join issue on the question of Antiquity, that they have a right to claim the most careful consideration of their arguments, when they *do* enter upon that field of discussion. It occurs in a criticism on a little work, called, ‘A voice from Rome;’ which, while it displays a remarkable desire to do justice to the Roman system, complains in very

^k Matt. xx. 27 ; xxiii. 8.

severe terms of many practices which flourish at Rome. The Reviewer thus proceeds :

‘ We may imagine, if we please, some Persian gentleman, of ancient days, going on his travels, through Christian countries, with that instinctive horror of idolatry, and of worship through visible symbols, which became one accustomed to feed his piety only on the ethereal subtlety of the solar rays ; most anxious to collect all possible evidence why *he* should not be a Christian. It is true, he understands very little of the languages of the countries through which he passes, and cannot be supposed to enter much into the habits, the ideas, and the feelings, of their inhabitants ; but, with the help of a dictionary, and a *valet de place*, he can make his way ; and, at any rate, he can see what the people do, and read their books and inscriptions. What place does Christ hold in their worship ?—How does God appear in relation to men ? Surely, we could easily imagine him struck with the prominent place which the martyrs occupy in all the worship, in the thoughts, and words, and feelings, of Christians ; whether clergy or laity, learned or simple. Not a town does he come to but he finds the church most frequented, nay, crowded with worshippers, to be that of some martyr ; while smaller oratories, in every direction, are favourite places of prayer, because they commemorate some other Saint, or contain a portion of his ashes. *Not an altar does he any where see, which is not consecrated by their relics.* Before them hang lamps, garlands, and votive offerings ; around them are palls of silk, and richest stuffs ; their shrines are radiant with gold and jewels ; the pavement of the temple is covered with prostrate suppliants, with the sick and afflicted, come to ask help and consolation from Christ’s servant : the pilgrim from afar, scrapes, with simple faith, some of the dust from the floor or from the tomb ; the preacher, ay, a Basil, or a Gregory, or a Chrysostom, or an Ambrose, instead of cooling their fervour, adds confidence, earnestness, and warmth to it, by a glowing and impassioned discourse in its favour.¹ And if he afterwards goes and interrogates these holy men, who, he might think were carried off by their eloquence and the heat of discourse, what

¹ See *inter alia* the Homilies of S. Chrys. on SS. Bernice, &c. tom. ii. p. 645, ed. Bened. ; of St. Basil in xl. Mart. tom. ii. p. 149, ed. Bened. ; of St. Gregory Nyssen on St. Theodorus, tom. iii. p. 580, ed. 1638.

is their real belief, as he cannot bring himself to go as far as they seem to do, in veneration of saints and relics, he receives some such answer as this:—"What? will you not reverence, but rather contemn, those by whom evil spirits are expelled, and diseases cured; who appear in visions and foretel in prophecy; whose very bodies, if touched, or even honoured, are gifted with as much power as their holy souls; the drops of whose blood, or the smallest symbol of whose sufferings, have as much efficacy as their entire bodies?"^m Or what will he say if one of these grave and learned men shall say to him, by way of extolling the glory and merit of the martyrs:—"Perhaps, as we were purchased by the precious Blood of Jesus... so some may be purchased by the precious blood of martyrs?"ⁿ Surely he may, at first sound of such words, exclaim, that the saints are made equal to their Lord, and that this must be a sad and an idolatrous departure from what He may be supposed to have taught. And if he stops his ears, and does not admit or accept of explanation, what must we expect from him but a most mistaken report?

"Again, he looks about him. At Antioch he finds the church of St. Barlaam richly decorated with paintings; but all representing the life and death of the saint: Christ is introduced, but as if in illustration, or by chance, into the picture.^o At Nola he finds a magnificent basilica, literally covered with mosaics and inscriptions, full of the praises of saints, and especially martyrs.^p At Rome he sees the basilicas of the Apostles, of St. Lawrence and others, adorned with similar encomiastic verses. Surely if he sends forth "a voice from Rome," it will be to proclaim that, to *him*, all this seems excessive reverence, and, if you please, worship, of men, no matter how holy. We should like to know how some great Father would have answered him: for that answer would just serve our case at present. If he descend into the catacombs, the favourite retreat of devout Christians, what does he find? Martyrs every where, their tombs hallow each maze of those sacred labyrinths, and form the altar of every chapel. Their effigies and praises cover the walls; prayers for their intercession are inscribed

^m St. Gregory Naz. Or. ii. adv. Julian, Op. tom. i. p. 76, Par. 1609.

ⁿ Origen Exhort. ad Martyr. Op. tom. i. p. 309. Ed. De la Rue.

^o See the Homily probably by St. John Chrysostom, in St. Basil's works, tom. ii. p. 141. Ed. Garnier.

^p S. Paulini Op. Ep. xxxii. Ed. Murat. p. 194.

on their tablets. He goes into the houses of believers ; memorials of the saints every where. Their cups and goblets are adorned with their pictures ; for one representation of our Saviour he finds twenty of the Blessed Virgin, or of St. Agnes, or St. Lawrence, or the Apostles Peter and Paul.⁹ What shall his "voice" pronounce these? What encouragement will it give to his brother fire-worshippers to embrace the Christian religion? Once more, we should have liked to See St. Jerome's answer to it.

'Certainly, *if we had nothing remaining from the early Church except the Liturgy, the ancient Christians would stand before us, just as we do before others when they look only at our solemn worship.* In fact, the two Liturgies, theirs and ours, are the same. An Anglican fancies that so far, and no further, are we conformable to the practice of antiquity ; and he will agree with us ; unless he takes objection to the prayers for the departed, and the commemoration of martyrs, invariably found in every ancient Liturgy, as in ours, though carefully expunged by the wicked pretenders to reform the perpetual practice of the Church of God—those who spoke of the Spouse of Christ as Pilate did of her Lord : "emendatum ergo illum dimittam."^r But fortunately we have plenty of other documents to shew us what the belief and practice of the ancient Fathers was on extra-liturgical matters, such as form the staple of publications like that before us. We have their homilies, to which we have already referred ; but we have what, in this respect, is even more interesting, a great body of familiar and anecdotic matter in their epistles and biographies, which, more than any thing else, enable us to judge whether those great and holy men thought and felt Catholically or Protestantly ; or, if you please, Romanly or Anglicanly. The evidences of *popular* religion (such is the term which Tract 90 most unfortunately brought into vogue) are sought now-a-days in documents such as would and could only be similarly preserved. The conversion of M. Ratisbonne, for instance, will have probably to be found in after ages, in the letters and *brochures* of the present day, or in some collection of edifying histories ; and many of the verses and descriptions which so much scandalize our modern traveller will possibly fall before a change of taste, or *edax vetustus* ; and unless found worthy of a place in the laborious collection of some Fabretti or Muratori,

⁹ See Buonarotti's Osservazioni sopra alcuni Frammenti di vetri antichi.

^r uc. xxiii. 16.

posterity will only know of them through the gleanings of curious pryers into such matters for controversial purposes. In like manner, many of those lesser feelings, those more homely sentiments and thoughts, which were interwoven with the every-day religion of the ancients, those tales which simple piety recorded for edification, not for evidence, are not to be sought in the solemn records of public deeds, nor often in earnest treatises on great dogmatical controversies, but in the unbosoming of friend to friend in familiar letters, or in the narrative of private virtues and domestic histories. If much of these has been lost, sufficient remains to shew us the great men of the Church bending from their doctor's chair to the warm-hearted simplicity (called, in our age, credulity) of their poorest children; believing and proclaiming, with unsuspecting confidence, tales of wonder, whereby God seemed glorified in His Saints; and telling them in such manner, that they form most interesting tests for ascertaining with whom their feelings and belief accorded—Rome or England; trustful, faithful, joyful Rome, or doubting, suspecting, moody England.

‘ But we are not acting up to our promise. Let us, therefore, come to the point. In proof that the Blessed Virgin is “worshipped as the mother of mercies, temporal and spiritual,” the author before us appeals to the Baron de Bussière’s account of M. Ratisbonne’s conversion from Judaism, “which he distinctly attributes to the immediate operation of the Virgin Mary; for he relates, that it was effected by her actual appearance to him.” (p. 16.) Now what is meant to be granted, and what to be doubted here, we do not know. We suppose no one doubts that M. Ratisbonne, from a Jew, did become a Christian, and has become a religious; having abandoned home and friends, and given up a long-cherished alliance. Any one might as well deny that Sir R. Peel is prime minister. That he went into the Church of St. Andrew a Jew, and came out a Christian, is attested upon evidence as certain as any fact can well be—that of trustworthy and honest men, who saw him and spoke with him before and after. For the change something must account. That it was a *true* conversion from Judaism to Christianity, with great temporal sacrifices, is clear; and such a conversion must have been the work of Divine grace. How communicated is the question. The only witness can be the convert. He tells us it was through an apparition of the Mother of God, who instructed him in the mysteries of our holy religion.

Are we to believe that a person is chosen by the Divine goodness for an object of a most singular act of grace, at the moment that he devises and tells an abominable falsehood, to rob Him of the glory of it, and give it to another; by feigning a vision of the Blessed Virgin? What does the author of the "Voice" mean to throw doubts on? On the apparition, as for such a purpose impossible? Or on the consequences drawn from it? Surely not on the latter; for if the vision was true, it was right to consider the blessed Mother of God, not as the source, but as the channel, of a great "spiritual mercy."

' If he wish to insinuate that it would be derogatory to God's honour, or incompatible with His revealed doctrines, to believe such a mode of communicating grace and religious instruction possible; and, consequently, that the whole must be a figment or a delusion; we will, in answer, *relate another similar story, in which not a Jew, but a Bishop, was the party*, and we will premise that we have it on the best authority.

' The person to whom we allude was a young man of singular piety and virtue. Left young an orphan, he devoted his youth to study, in a celebrated university. There his assiduity in learning was only surpassed by the purity and innocence of his life, which stood the test of severe trials, and escaped the snares laid for him by profligate companions, jealous of his virtue. Having made himself master of all profane learning, he entered on a course of sacred studies, under the most celebrated professor of the day, and soon made considerable progress. He was, however, while yet young, put into Orders, and even named Bishop, before he considered himself well enough grounded in theological knowledge; though probably his humility led him to exaggerate his deficiencies. He found himself quite unequal to the task of preaching the Divine Word, and on the eve of his first undertaking this duty, he lay sleepless on his bed, in agitation and anxiety. Suddenly he saw before him a venerable figure of an old man, whose countenance, attitude, and garb, bespoke great dignity, but who, at the same time, appeared most gracious and affable. Terrified with this appearance, he leapt from his couch, and respectfully asked him who he was, and for what purpose he had come. The old man replied, in a gentle voice, that he had come to calm his doubts, and solve his difficulties. This declaration soothed his fears, and made him look toward his visitor with a mixture of joy and awe; when

he perceived that by steadily pointing with his hand towards the other side of the apartment, he seemed to wish to turn his attention in that direction. Thither he consequently turned his eyes, and there he beheld a lady of peerless majesty, and of more than human beauty, so resplendent, that his eyes could not bear the brightness of the vision, but he must needs bend them and his countenance down, in reverential awe. Thus he listened to the conversation of these two heavenly beings, which fully instructed him on the subjects whereon he felt anxious, and at the same time informed him who his gracious visitors were. For the lady, addressing the other by the name of the Evangelist John, requested him to instruct the youth in the mystery of heavenly piety; and he replied, "that he was ready to do even this, to please the Mother of his Lord, seeing that she desired it." And accordingly he did so.

'Such is our counterpart to the narrative objected to by our author respecting M. Ratisbonne's conversion. Now before giving the names of our authority for this wonderful history, or of the person to whom it refers, we will only beg our reader, if not sufficiently versed in ecclesiastical biography, at once to answer both points, to say to what Church or religion he considers either the writer or the subject of this anecdote belongs. Could he believe us if we told him that it happened to Bishop Ken, or Bishop Wilson, or Archbishop Laud, or that we had transcribed it as gravely told by some Anglican clergyman in a life of any of them? We are sure he could not. The idea of a Protestant Bishop's learning his faith from a vision of the Blessed Virgin, would be deemed repugnant to every principle and every feeling of the religion. But were we to tell the reader that the Bishop spoken of was St. Alphonsus Liguori, or even St. Charles, and the narrator an Italian monk or priest, he would at once allow that such an account from such a pen, concerning such a person, was perfectly consistent with the principles of both; and though, if a Protestant, he might declare that he does not believe the story, he will acknowledge that it does not surprise him to find it in such a place. It must be then a Catholic, and not a Protestant, who thought or said he saw such a vision; and it must be a Catholic, and not a Protestant, who has recorded it as believing it. And so it was. The Bishop who thus learnt his faith was St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *only little more than two hundred years*

after Christ, and the recorder of the vision is the brother of the great St. Basil, St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa.* This would have been a nice anecdote for our ancient note-taker upon the doctrines of Catholics.

‘ We do not intend to pursue any very regular order ; but just to pick up a few incidents, such as may shew us how our fathers in the Faith thought upon matters whereon we are so censured. And as we have begun with the saints, and the wonders wrought by them, we will say a few words more concerning them. Let any one take the trouble to read any of the miracles recorded by St. Augustine in the twenty-second book of the City of God, and let him apply the criterion we have already given, of asking himself in what class of modern religious writings he would expect to meet with similar occurrences. Take for instance the history which he gives of a certain poor tailor at Hippo, named Florentius, who being in great want of clothing, and having no means of procuring it, went to the Church of the Twenty Martyrs, and prayed aloud that he might be clothed. Some young men, professed scoffers, overheard him, and followed him, jeering him as though he had prayed to those twenty martyrs for fifty-pence to buy a coat. The poor old man, however, going his way, found a fish cast on shore, yet alive, which he sold, and a gold ring was moreover found in it, and given to him by the honest purchaser with these words : *See how the twenty martyrs have clothed you.*† Now we are pretty sure, that many a poor Italian would, in his distress, do just what Florentius did, go to some Church of the B. Virgin, or of some saint, and kneeling before the shrine, pray as he did. And we are equally clear that a party of English Protestant youths overhearing him (the *adolescentes irrisores* now-a-days of Catholic practices) would make as good a joke of the matter as did the young Hippo fashionables. So that it requires little to settle the *dramatis personæ* of St. Augustine’s anecdote on transporting it to modern times, and give Catholic and Protestant each his part. And no doubt either an ancient or a modern collector of proofs, that the saints are made conveyers of “ *temporal mercies* ” in the Catholic system, would find the history equally applicable to his purpose— with this exception however, that, as St. Augustine gives it among other proofs that the *Christian* religion is still evidenced by

* De Vita S. Greg. Thaum. Op. tom. iii. p. 545. ed. Par. 1638.

† Op. tom. vii. p. 668. ed. Bened.

miracles, the ancient traveller would have turned it against Christianity, as the modern one would against Catholicity; so completely are the two identified.

‘Let us take a case bearing more minute comparison. In a little work containing the history of the Medal of the B. Virgin, commonly known by the epithet of *miraculous*, there are many extraordinary but well-attested cases of conversion of hardened unbelievers through the prayers of their friends, and the application of that blessed symbol, to the unconscious sinner. These to flesh and blood, to the dull sense and the cold heart of the present generation, are hard to believe, and they are either silently rejected or openly scoffed at—would to God if by our adversaries only! For instance, a soldier, we are told, in the military hospital at Paris, is on the point of death, and rejects every succour of religion. In vain the sisters of charity who attend him, in vain the good curate make every effort to bring him to a right feeling on the necessity of making his peace with God. He rejects every offer, and at last with violent oaths and brutal rage, imposes silence on the subject. Reduced to extremity, the pious sisters have recourse to prayer to the B. Virgin, not expecting him to survive the night; and place a medal secretly in his bed. He sleeps tranquilly, and on awaking mildly sends for the curate, receives the sacrament with great devotion, and dies in peace.” This is only one instance out of many;^x Those who would join in the “Voice from Rome,” cannot be much edified, nay, on the contrary, are likely to be shocked and scandalized by such a narrative. “What efficacy can there be supposed to exist in a mere symbol thus

^u Notice Historique, sixth ed. p. 76.

^x As regards the *doctrine* implied in this extract, which, at first hearing, may perhaps pain the conscience of some who deserve the tenderest and most considerate dealing, it must be observed, first, that the difficulty is *exactly the same*, when, *by means of intercessory prayer alone*, a sudden conversion is effected; and, secondly, that in neither case is there any real difficulty, because any amount of probation may be crowded (if I may so speak) into the smallest portion of time; e. g. the moment of death may be indefinitely protracted *to the individual*, so as to allow opportunity for God’s full trial and justification of the soul. ‘He can condense into an hour a life of trial. He who frames the world in a moment, . . . more wondrously can He deal with the world of spirits, who are never subject to the accidents of matter. He can, by one keen pang of agony punish the earthly soul, or *by one temptation justify it*, or by one vision glorify it.’ Newman’s Parochial Sermons, vol. v. p. 59. [W. G. W.]

placed, like a charm" (so they would say) "near, or on, a person heedless or unconscious of its presence? Who can believe that 'spiritual mercies' will thus be granted upon prayers to a saint? We must enter these down in our note-book, as the deceits or the delusions of popery."

'Be it so, but we must have a corresponding one to enter into the tablets of our ancient inquirer, and here it is: "There was a man at Calama of high rank, named Martial; advanced in years, and having a great repugnance to the Christian religion. He had a Christian daughter and son-in-law that year baptized. They entreated him, with many tears, to become a Christian; but he positively refused, and drove them from him with violent indignation. His son-in-law bethought him of going to the chapel of St. Stephen, and there praying for him, to the utmost of his power, that God would give him grace to believe, without delay, in Christ. He did so, with many sobs and tears, and with the ardour of sincere devotion. Departing, he took with him some flowers from the altar, and, when it was night, placed them at the sick man's head. He slept: but, before daybreak, he called out, requesting that they would send for the Bishop, who happened to be with me in Hippo. On hearing of this, he begged that some of the clergy might be sent for. They came; he declared himself a believer; and, to the astonishment and joy of all, was baptized. So long as he lived, he had in his mouth the words, 'O Christ, receive my spirit;' though he did not know that these were the last words of the blessed Stephen, when stoned by the Jews. They were, likewise, his last, for he soon expired."'^y Here, then, we have our parallel; each part of the modern narrative has its counterpart in the ancient; and if one is to be rejected, so is the other. There is, in both, an obstinate infidel, or sinner, who will not be converted to God: there are pious persons who pray to the saints; there is a badge or symbol of their intercession—for the flower from the altar means the same as the medal;—in each case it is placed in the bed of the unsuspecting patient; and, in both instances, he awakes at morning to ask for God's minister to administer a Sacrament of forgiveness. Yet, the one narrative is of France, in the nineteenth century; the other of Africa, in the beginning of the fifth (A. D. 427). How comes it that such accidental coincidences should be

^y S. Aug. lib. xxii. cap. viii. De Civit. Dei, tom. vii. p. 668.

found, with such distances of time and place, save as fruits of one tree, as plants of one seed, as evidences of one system? And do not they who find fault with such evidences, in our times and countries, equally censure them in others; and thereby place themselves in the awkward position of scoffers of Christianity—not of what they are pleased, in the later instances, to nickname Popery?

We could carry on much further this comparison between miracles which are considered the production of modern Catholicity, and such as are recorded with perfect confidence by ancient writers, and in every instance draw the same conclusion—a conclusion which goes quite as far as dogmatical texts from homilies or treatises, to prove the identity of ancient and modern Catholicity in those matters, on which the latter is most harshly treated as being a departure from the former.

Connected with the subject, there is a point on which we wish to touch, as being one of common reprehension not only in the little work before us, but in many others of a similar tendency. We allude to that species of partiality which seems to be shewn at a given time, to a particular sanctuary, in which some shrine or image is found, through which God is thought to work more wonderfully than elsewhere. Such, at this moment, is the shrine of St. Philomena, at Mugnano, or the church of St. Augustine, at Rome. It would be easy to bring together many passages from ancient writers, that shew the prevalence of a similar feeling and its consequent practice; indeed the book and chapter in the works of the holy doctor just named, to which we have more than once referred, will furnish proofs of the peculiar regard in which certain places consecrated by relics (as the oratories of St. Stephen) were held by him. But such feelings of veneration, confidence, and attachment towards one Saint and his sanctuary, are by no one so well represented as by the learned, the holy, and the truly amiable St. Paulinus. Few of the Fathers let us more delightfully into the secrets of the Christian life and the Christian heart in ancient days, than the Bishop and Poet of Nola. A patrician by birth, the scholar of Ausonius (who compares him to the ancient classics) by education, a poor monk by choice and vocation, the delight and friend of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, and all the great and good men of his day, the admiration of the whole Church, he exhibits in his letters a simplicity of faith, a tenderness of affec-

tion, an innocent playfulness, a cheerfulness, and an unaffected humility, which most pleasingly combine with the depth of his devotion, and the richness of his sacred learning. There are few of the Fathers who gain more upon our every day and homelier feelings, and make themselves more familiar with their readers, than he does. But throughout his works he is the servant of St. Felix, the glorious martyr of Nola. Near his tomb, though himself a native of Gaul, he resides, a poor hermit by choice (having sold all and given the price to the poor), and priest, afterwards Bishop, of the See. To celebrate the anniversaries of that Saint, by poems and festivities; to build a basilica in his honour, and adorn it with mosaics and verses; to make his friends love him and believe in his power, and bring them to visit the shrine of his father and patron, as he styles him—seem his most pleasing occupations. How Catholic his language every where to Catholic ears! How *Popish* it must sound to Protestant! By way of example: the “Voice from Rome” cries out against the following occurrence, or at least the feelings it excited. A young woman is run over by a cart (an empty one, but Roman carts are not very light even when empty) close to the church of our Lady, attached to the hospital of the *Consolazione*, while holy exercises were going on within. She escapes what every one considers an imminent danger of death; and the people cry out “è un miracolo della Madonna!” This is brought as a proof that temporal blessings are sought from the Blessed Virgin. It so happens that St. Paulinus relates a somewhat similar accident, and reasons much in the same way as those poor Italians did. Fortunately, he had no English Protestants near. A person of the name of Martinianus was coming to him with letters, or rather with a message; and, on his way from Capua to Nola, a distance of about twenty miles, he met a man with mules returning home, after discharging their loads—just as one may now meet them among the Tusculan hills, after they have taken wine to Rome—so he wisely bargained for a ride, which was given him cheap.

“Nactus vacantem sarcina mulum (ut solent
Jumenta revocari domum)
Parvo breve per iter ære conductum sedet.”

When about half-way, the mule took fright and grew restive.

Martinianus (who had lately been more of a sailor than of a horseman) was thrown, and flung to a distance. But, though he fell among stones and thorns, he was neither bruised nor scratched. How did this happen? St. Paulinus has no difficulty about it. Had he been expressing it in prose, and in Italian, he would have said, "è un miracolo di San Felice." As he was writing Latin verse, he describes and explains the event as follows:—

“ Medioque mox spatio viæ
 Muli pavore sessor excussus procul
 Vectore subducto cadit.
 In ora lapsus ora non læsit sua,
 In saxa fusus et rubos
 Nec sente vultum nec lapide artus contudit,
Felicis exceptus manu ;
 Qui jam propinquantem ædibus fratrem suis,
 Non passus occursum mali
 Suis periculum in finibus capessere
 Hostem removit invidum,
 Et hunc fidelem compotem voti, suis
Confessor induxit locis,
 Nostrisque juxta sedibus gratum intulit
Felix patronus hospitem.”^a

St. Felix, therefore, St. Paulinus hesitates not to say, prevented this poor man's being hurt, and brought him safe to his journey's end; because he was within some few miles of his church, and was journeying towards his client Paulinus. Surely St. Paulinus was a downright Romanist!

And so he was. For he made it a point to go to Rome every year, as he repeatedly tells us, for the festival of the holy apostles SS. Peter and Paul;^x and he was much consoled by the kindness which the Roman Pontiff shewed him, in inviting him to Rome, to commemorate the anniversary of his election. Now this brings us

^a Poema xxii. 405—421, Op. col. 583, ed. Murat.

^x “ Romæ, cum solemnî consuetudine ad beatorum Apostolorum natalem venissemus.”—Ep. xx. col. 108. “ Cum Apostolicam solemnitatem, votif nostri et itineris annui socius, celebrasset.”—Ep. xliii. col. 254.

to the point for which we first referred to St. Paulinus; his attachment to one particular sanctuary, and his affection to one saint, there honoured. In one of his epistles to his friend Sulpicius Severus (whom he had been disappointed in not meeting that year in Rome), he reproaches him, half playfully, but not without seriousness, for neglecting to come and visit, as he had promised, "his lord (St.) Felix," as he calls him (*Dominum meum Felicem*). He bids him beware how he incurs his displeasure, by promising a pilgrimage and not fulfilling it. "*Scio quidem;*" he adds, "*et in Domino meo Felice viscera pietatis affluere; sed tu quæso, hoc eum magis diligas et timeas, quo melior est et indulgentior . . . ut tanto magis carissimum Dei metuas offendere, quanto promptius dignatur ignoscere.*"[†] This surely is most unprotestant, and, therefore, most Catholic language. We could imagine it used by the good archpriest of Mugnano (St. Paulinus was not yet Bishop when he thus wrote) to some friend who had promised to visit the tomb of his patroness, St. Philomena, and had disappointed him. Had such a letter come from him, what a rich page it would have made in a modern English traveller's note-book! For want of it, therefore, we beg to offer him that of the curate's neighbour in place and in faith—St. Paulinus.

‘Before shutting up the volume of his works, there is another topic, allied to the preceding, which we may be glad to hear him on. But we must introduce it by a little domestic history, on which again we will crave the reader's opinion, whether the parties in it were Catholic or Protestant.

‘There lived in retirement, in a house of religious women dedicated to God, a nun of singular piety and wisdom, the sister of two Bishops, both distinguished for the learning of their writings and the holiness of their lives. One, the more celebrated one, was just dead, and his loss was deplored as a public calamity by all good men. The other, having a little leisure after this event, resolved to go and visit his saintly sister, whom he had not seen for many years. The distance was great: and when he was within a day's journey from the place where she lived, he had at night a most remarkable vision, which turned into fear the hopes of the future. "For I seemed to myself," such is his own account, "to bear in

[†] Ep. xvii. col. 96.

my hands the relics of martyrs, from which darted forth a splendour like that of a burnished mirror, held against the sun; so that my eyes were dazzled by the brilliancy of the light. Three times that night did this vision come before me.”^a Unable to divine its meaning, he looked forward to events to expound it. As he approached the monastery, he inquired about his sister, and heard for the first time that she was somewhat indisposed. His coming had, in the meantime, been made known, and a large concourse of persons went out to meet him. But the holy virgins modestly awaited him in the church, and after he had prayed, and had given them his blessing (they bending lowly to receive it), they retired. On entering the convent, he found his sister very ill in her cell; but instead of a bed, she lay upon a plank on the ground, with another for her pillow. We will not detain our readers with the edifying account of her words and prayers in her last hours; how she dismissed her brother when the sound of the vesper’s chaunt reached her cell, that he might not omit this duty;^a how when she closed her own sublime prayer, she signed herself with the cross on her eyes, her mouth, and her breast; and how her last act was to raise her hand again to do so.^b These things may serve to help the reader in his judgment, as to the religion of the holy persons engaged; but are not what we are seeking. The pious virgin thus expires, and a religious matron, the friend of the deceased, undertakes, as she had promised, to prepare her holy remains for interment. We will now give the words of the bishop her brother. “Vestiana arranging with her own hands that sacred head, and having her hand under the neck, exclaimed, looking towards me, ‘See what sort of a necklace this saint wore; and at the same time loosening a string from behind the neck, stretched out her hand and shewed us an iron cross and a ring of the same metal, which both hung, by a thin cord, over her heart. Upon this I said: ‘Let us share this inheritance. You keep the cross as a memorial; I will be content with this ring as my legacy, for this likewise has the cross carved upon its boss.’ Whereupon she, looking more closely at it, said to me: ‘You have not made a bad choice; for the ring is hollow under the boss, and in it is inserted a portion of the wood of life, (the true cross,) and thus the cross engraved above rightly indicates that which lies underneath.’”^c

^a Ubi inf. p. 188.

^a P. 192.

^b P. 195.

^c S. Greg. Nyss. in Vita S. Macrinæ, Oper. tom. ii. p. 198.

‘ Will any reader hesitate in deciding of what religion were all the persons here engaged? Were they Anglicans? We should be indeed glad to know, how many crosses—not golden ones, worn as vain ornaments outside—but of inferior metals, concealed, and lying over the heart, and how many reliquaries similarly placed, could be collected in the households of English Bishops? But look at the neck of any swarthy peasant who open-breasted digs the fields or plucks the vines of Italy, and you will find the “thin cord” around it, that sustains some similar memorial of Christ’s passion. Nay, in either of our islands, we hesitate not to say, that the poor Catholic might be distinguished from the Protestant by these very badges—the cross, or the relic, or the medal, or even the ring with a cross for its posey, suspended round the neck, and lying on the breast, in life and after death. We have known the body of a shipwrecked Catholic so recognised at once. How tightly and closely does a “little thin cord” like this bind together the belief and feelings of the old and modern Church, and prove them still the same! How home to the Catholic heart does such a trifling incident casually recorded come! Come, how full of convictions, of encouragements, of consolation! How joyfully even can one bear to be taxed with superstition in company with *the holy Macrina, the sister of St. Basil, and her biographer St. Gregory of Nyssa!* For these are the persons of whom we have been writing.

‘ But if those who had chosen such complete poverty as this holy nun, wore but a reliquary of iron, it must not be fancied that this argued any light estimation of so precious a relic as a portion of the holy Cross: for they that could, or might without violation of a religious engagement, would wear it enshrined in gold. We have a beautiful letter of St. Paulinus upon this subject. Severus had asked him for relics of martyrs, for the consecration of a church which he was building. He replies, that if he had but “a scruple of their sacred ashes to spare he would send it.” But as he required all that he had for his own new church, he sends him another present to add to the relics which he must get elsewhere; this was a particle of the “divine Cross.” “*Invenimus quod digne, et ad basilicæ sanctificationem vobis, et ad sanctorum cinerum cumulandam benedictionem mitteremus, partem particulæ de ligno divinæ Crucis.*” The portion which he sends is, he informs him, almost invisible, but he must believe it to possess all the power and

virtue of the entire Cross; a present safeguard, and a pledge of eternal life. "Accipite magnum in modico munus; et in segmento penè atomo astulæ brevis sumite munimentum præsentis, et pignus æternæ salutis. Non angustietur fides vestra carnalibus oculis parva cernentibus, sed internâ acie totam in hoc minimo vim Crucis videat." The relic was enclosed in a small gold tube, "tubello aureolo rem tantæ benedictionis inclusimus."^d When afterwards he sends Severus verses for the inscriptions in his church, he sends two copies for the altar; one in case he puts this particle of the holy Cross with the other relics, the other should he prefer to keep it to wear himself. The reasons which he gives in favour of the latter alternative are perfectly Catholic. "If, however, you would rather keep this blessed portion of the Cross at hand, for your daily protection and care, lest once shut up in the altar, it may not be ready for you and at hand, when wanted for use,"^e &c.^f

Surely such views on the subject of our present duties, as I sketched in the last chapter, are immensely more considerate to humble and obedient members of our Church than is the bidding them to follow Antiquity, if *this* be Antiquity.

With a few words on two more subjects I shall conclude the present chapter.

Another friend of mine, also a clergyman of our Church, has furnished me with the following quotations for publication, in proof of the belief, entertained by the respective writers, of some intermediate suffering to be endured by the soul, between the moment of death and of final bliss. He has himself devoted his whole life to a study of the Fathers; and has been led by that study, without any knowledge of later writers, to entertain a similar belief. He also is ready to give his name, should his statement be questioned.

'In regard to intermediate suffering between death and final bliss, it will be found that on the whole there certainly was a strong tendency towards a belief in it, in those ages which our Church commends to our study and admiration. In his Commentary on the Romans, viii. §. 11, Origen speaks thus:—

^d Ep. xxxi. col. 189.
Dec. 1843.

^e Ep. xxxii. col. 201.

^f 'Dublin Review,'

“ The end of all things is at hand, and in regard to such as are blessed, whether they come from Israel or even from the Gentiles, it is the word of Gospel doctrine in this life present which purifieth them, to make them such as they were to whom the Lord said, Now are ye clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. But he that hath despised the purifying by the word of God and the Gospel doctrine, reserveth himself unto sad and penal purifications; so that the fire of Gehennah may purge him whom neither the doctrine of the Apostles nor the word of the Gospel hath purged, according to that which is written, ‘ I will purge thee with fire unto purity.’ (Is. i. 25. LXX. but the Heb. implies a purgation by fire.) But in this same purgation, which is applied by the penalty of fire, in what long times and during how many ages the torment will be exacted of sinners, He only can know, to whom the Father hath delivered all judgment; who so loved His creatures, as to have emptied Himself for them from the form of God, and to have taken the form of a servant, humbling Himself even unto death, as willing that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Still we ought always to bear in mind, that the Apostle would have the present passage (Rom. xi. 25—27) reckoned a mystery, so that the faithful and perfect should hide within themselves such meanings as these, as a mystery of God, and not offer them indiscriminately to the imperfect and less capable.’

‘ Here we see he contemplates a doctrine of intermediate suffering, as held in the hearts of men: whether or no his statement of it tallies with the subsequently expressed development of it. It is true that St. Jerome, c. Pelag. i. 28, speaks against some such passage as this; yet Vallarsi has shewn upon the place that St. Jerome himself held a similar doctrine. He refers to the closing words of his commentary on Isaiah.

“ This ought we to leave to the knowledge of God alone, seeing that it is not His mercies only, but His torments also, which are justly balanced; and that He knoweth whom to judge, and how to do so, and for *how long*. Let us only say what it befits man’s frailty to say; Lord, correct me not in Thine anger, neither chasten me in Thy displeasure. And like as we believe that the torments of devils and all the ungodly, that say in their heart, ‘ There is no

God,' are everlasting ; so in regard to such sinners and ungodly as are Christians, whose works *are to be tried in the fire and purged*, we suppose that the sentence of the Judge will be *bounded* and mingled with clemency."

' When Jerome and Origen agree, we may be pretty sure that the doctrine is one generally received, even if there be no explicit statement of it sanctioned by the Church. The notion of repentance, repentance continuing after death, is found in St. Clement, Origen's master, Strom. iv. §. 37, p. 580, Potter. After quoting Plato's speculations on the subject, he adds :

"There are two sorts of penitence ; the commoner one is fear, ensuing on what has been done, but the more proper one is a disgust of the soul with itself from conscience, whether in this world *or elsewhere* ; for in no place is God's gracious dealing inert."

' Again, Strom. vi. §. 46, p. 764 :

"If the Saviour preached to all that were in prison, then all that believed will be saved, though they be of the Gentiles, if *there* at least they have confessed Him, since the punishments of God are salutary and corrective, (*παιδευτικοί*,) leading to a conversion and repentance of the sinner, rather than choosing his death ; and this [the rather], as the souls when freed from the body, darkened though they may be by passions, are able to see more clearly from their being no longer attached to the flesh."

' And soon after :

"I think it is thus shewn that the gracious God and the mighty Lord saveth with justice and equity towards such as repent, *whether in this world or elsewhere* ; for it is not here only that the energetic Power of God reacheth, but it is every where and always energizing."

' So too, vii. §. 78, p. 879, of the perfect man he says,

"He being drawn along by his own hope, tasteth not of the good things that be in the world, feeling a high-minded dislike for all herein, and pitying those who *after death* by the correction of punishment are *brought to an unwilling confession*," &c.

‘ With this last passage the following instructive passage of St. Ephrem will come in a natural connection. It will be seen that he considers prayers for the dead to be to procure relief of their sufferings, which indeed is sufficiently apparent from his frequent use of them (in his *Necrosima*) for others ; though more forcibly so from the way in which he asks them of others for himself in his last testament (ap. *Assem. B.O. i. p. 143*, or, with slight variations, among the *Opera Gr. ii. p. 401*).

“ Come, my brethren, stretch me out, for my life is giving way, neither am I long to stay ; by prayer, by psalms, by offerings, give me provisions for the way ; and when my thirty days be full, make, brethren, a commemoration for me, for the dead are profited by offerings that the living make. . . .

“ Be thou patient ; from the Scriptures, if thou wish it, will I prove it. Moses, three generations after, to Reuben gave life by blessings. If the dead are not profited, why should Amram’s son have blessed him ? And if the departed feel not, hear the Apostle, what he said : ‘ If the dead rise not, why then are they baptized for them ;’ and if the men of the house of Mattathias, (who as a type [of us] were possessed of the feasts and commemorations, as ye have read in the Scriptures, 2 Macc. xii. 44,) by offerings remitted the sins of those that fell in the war, that were heathenish in their deeds and evil in their conversation, how much more shall the priests of the Son remit the sins of the departed by their holy offerings and the prayers of their mouths ?”

‘ We see that St. Ephrem here contemplates Moses as praying Reuben out of the curse under which Jacob left him, and insists on the Apostle’s words as at least implying the power of the living to affect the state of the dead.

‘ To this may be appended the following passages, selected from many out of St. Augustine, whose frequent assertion of this doctrine is the more important, because it shews the conviction of one who reviewed and systematized all that had been done before him ; like St. Paul, labouring more abundantly than they all.

‘ In his *Enchiridion ad Laurent. §. 29*, the practices of

the Church for the commendation of the dead are not opposed to that text of the Apostle.

‘ We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things that he did in the body, whether they be good or evil.’ Because each must have obtained a degree of merit while he lived in the body, that such practices may be available to him. For it is not to all that they are availing; and why not, save because of the different life each has led in the body. When the oblations, whether of the altar, or of alms of any kind are put up for all the departed that were baptized, *for the very good* they be thanksgivings; *for those not very bad, propitiations*; for the very bad, if they are even no advantage to the dead, yet they are consolatory in their way to the living. But those to whom they are of avail, they either are so far of avail as to obtain a plenary remission, or at all events that *the condemnation itself should be more tolerable.*’

‘ On the thirty-seventh Psalm, which, according to the Vulgate, begins, O Lord, rebuke me not in Thine indignation, neither amend me in Thy wrath.

“ *O Lord &c.* May I not be amongst those to whom Thou wilt say, Go into eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels! *Neither amend me in Thine anger.* Purge me in this life, and make me such as not further to need the emendatory fire, on account of there being those who are to be saved, yet so as by fire. Why? but because here they are building on the foundation wood, hay, stubble; did they build gold, silver, precious stones, they then would be safe from both fires, not only from that eternal one which to eternity is to torment the ungodly, but even from that which is to amend those who are to be saved by fire. For it is said, ‘ Himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.’ And because it is said, ‘ shall be saved,’ that fire is made light of. So, plainly, though they be saved by fire, yet *that fire will be less bearable (gravior) than any thing man can suffer in this life.* Yet you know how much the bad have suffered here and can suffer: but what they have suffered is no more than the good might suffer. For what is there that any malefactor, robber, adulterer, abandoned, or sacrilegious, man has suffered at the hand of the law, that the martyr has not suffered

in confessing Christ? The evils that are here then are far the most bearable: yet you see how men will do any thing you bid them not to suffer these. How much better if they were to do what God bids them, in order not to suffer those less bearable evils!

To this may be added a vision of St. Perpetua, *who was martyred in the year 203*. I take the account from Alban Butler, (March 7,) but another of my friends, learned in the Fathers, has kindly consulted the original document, and is prepared, if required, to vouch for its authenticity.

“ A few days after receiving sentence, when we were all together in prayer, I happened to name Dinocrates, at which I was astonished, because I had not before had him in my thoughts; and I at that moment knew that I ought to pray for him. This I began to do with great fervour and sighing before God; and the same night I had the following vision: I saw Dinocrates coming out of a dark place, where there were many others, exceeding hot and thirsty, his face was dirty, his complexion pale, with the ulcer in the face of which he died at seven years of age, and *it was for him that I had prayed*. There seemed a great distance between him and me, so that it was impossible for us to come to each other. Near him stood a vessel full of water, &c. . . . By this *I knew that my brother was in pain, but I trusted I could by prayer relieve him*; so I began to pray for him, beseeching God with tears day and night, that he would grant my request. The day we were in the stocks I had this vision: I saw the place which I had beheld dark before, now luminous; and Dinocrates with his body very clean and well-clad, refreshing himself, and instead of his wound a scar only. I awaked, and *knew he was relieved from his pain.*”

Now I do entreat my readers not to put these citations impatiently on one side; but fairly to ask themselves the question, is it possible that Martyrs and Doctors of the Church should have expressed, in a natural, unsuspecting, straightforward manner, such sentiments as these, if the habitual feeling prevalent in the early centuries, on the condition of ordinary Christians between death and final salvation, had in the least resembled that current among

English 'high-churchmen;' or whether it must not have been much more nearly akin to the present belief of Roman Catholics?

The other subject, of which it appears to me that common fairness requires a notice, is the controversy between Bishop Wiseman and Mr. Palmer on the Intercession and Invocation of Saints. Since, however, it might possibly appear to some, that in alluding to this controversy I am going out of my way to attack Mr. Palmer's views, I beg most distinctly to say, that I have no personal complaint whatever to make against Mr. Palmer; on the contrary, that his quotations from my articles have been, on the whole, perfectly fair, and that in using the severe language which he has adopted concerning them, he has been merely performing that which, according to his theological views, was even a duty. I can assure him distinctly, that the great dislike I entertain to those views existed in its full extent, before I could have had the most distant expectation of being ever brought into direct conflict with himself.

But on the controversy in question, I really think that Bishop Wiseman has not received justice. The circumstance that several of his quotations were of very doubtful authority, has made people forget how many remain, of undeniable authenticity, and very cogent in their effect. Attention has been drawn to this, in a pamphlet published at the latter end of last year; of which I should indeed find it impossible to defend the tone in many parts, but which seems so very strong in its main argument, as peremptorily to require an answer. My business here, however, is with the original controversy.

The following passages, quoted by Bishop Wiseman, are allowed to be genuine by Mr. Palmer in his answer.

A monument was found at Ostia, to the following effect: "A. A. Bassus and Honorata his wife with his children devout to *God and the Saints*." (p. 39.) Mr. Palmer in his answer 'fixes the transaction alluded to in the year 433.' (pp. 38, 9.)

"St. Ambrose encourages virgins to chastity, by the thought of

how" St. Mary "*will receive them at their deaths, and present them to her Son as His chaste spouses,*" (p. 41, Palmer, p. 40.)

St. Maximus: "may this our patron" (St. Eusebius of Vercelli) ". . . on our going out of this world . . . *receive us into his abode and into his bosom like Abraham, and as a happy shepherd acknowledge us for his sheep.*" (p. 42, Palmer, p. 41.)

Martyrs "*living in the body guard us, and going forth from the body they receive us.*" (p. 42, Palmer, p. 41.)

St. Basil. "These (the Forty Martyrs) are they who, having obtained possession of our country, like close-set towers defend it from the incursions of our enemies." (p. 55, Palmer, p. 46.)

St. Paulinus, the friend and correspondent of St. Augustine, addressed the (departed) Confessor, Clarus: "Do thou also *protect thy equals, . . . labour in common with Martin, . . . and may your wing ever protect us.*" † (p. 55, Palmer, p. 46.)

St. Prudentius, addressing (the departed) St. Lawrence: "Mayest thou embrace thy fellow-citizens in thy bosom, and nourish them with paternal love." † (p. 56, Palmer, p. 47.)

St. Prudentius again. "She (St. Eulalia) placed under the feet of God regards these things and . . . cherishes *her own people* (*populos suos fovet*)" †. (p. 57, Palmer, p. 47.)

St. Leo: "If anything is in our times rightly done by us, it is to be attributed to [St. Peter's] work, to [St. Peter's] government." (p. 58, Palmer, p. 48.)

St. Gregory of Nyssa says, that a certain person of St. Ephrem's own name had been taken prisoner, and when in great danger and "expecting death, he simply mentioned thy name" (he is addressing the Saint) "saying, *Holy Ephrem, help me,* and he escaped the snares of death." (p. 59, Palmer, p. 49.)

St. Gregory Nazianzen, addressing St. Cyprian: "Do thou *look down mercifully upon us, and direct our speech and life; feed or help to feed this holy flock . . . drive away the wolves.*" (p. 60, Palmer, p. 49.)

Pope Damasus, the patron of St. Jerome, addressing St. Felix: "*Thou who givest all things to them who diligently come to thee.*" † (p. 63, Palmer, p. 51.)

St. Prudentius. "*Unworthy, I acknowledge and know to be heard by Christ Himself; but through the patronage of the martyrs he may obtain a cure.*" † (p. 64, Palmer, p. 51.)

† On these quotations Mr. Palmer observes that they occur in *poetry*. Valeat quantum.

Several more passages might be quoted, the genuineness of which is equally acknowledged by Mr. Palmer. Without at all intruding myself into the controversy between Mr. Palmer and his new assailant, which is not yet, I suppose, brought to a close, the following observations of the latter writer are surely too true to admit of any denial.

“Let [any Anglican clergyman] in a sermon before the most enlightened audience that England can produce, before the Universities, or the very bench of Bishops, use the expressions which are so common in the homilies of the Fathers . . . about the intercession of the Saints, their patronage and protection, the veneration due to them and their relics ; let him even guard all these expressions with explanations ; still he will be considered as broaching doctrines the most unsound and dangerous to the Church.”[‡]

Or, in other words, doctrines, which widely prevailed throughout Christendom in the fourth and fifth centuries, would not be for a moment tolerated by ordinary English ‘high-churchmen’ in the nineteenth.

7. As the controversy proceeds, it will not be a matter of surprise if ‘high-churchmen’ abandon their own ground, and take refuge in the *three* first centuries. Considering indeed that the Councils, which give any sanction to the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, belong wholly to the later period, and considering too how firm a ‘locus standi’ these Councils have been ordinarily considered by ‘high-churchmen’ to afford, such a step would be a bold one. On the other hand, of course at a time when the whole Christian world was kept in a state of separation and depression by repeated persecutions, there was much less opportunity for its real nature to display itself than at later periods ; and those accordingly who are really, though most unconsciously, opposed not merely to later developments, but to Apostolical Christianity itself, will be less triumphantly and signally refuted from the scanty remains of those centuries,

[‡] Character of Rev. W. Palmer as a controversialist, &c. p. 56.

than from the copious records of the Nicene era. However, should such a position be openly maintained and defended by 'high-churchmen,' then will be the time for those competent to the task to assail and overthrow it.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

I. IT is very plain then, that our present system can lay claim to no protection from adverse criticism, on the ground of any supposed similarity to the system of earlier ages; and having therefore disposed of this obstacle in our path, we may at once proceed with our inquiry. Moreover, since the one vitally important question, in regard to any religious body, is the nature of that inward and personal religion which its system tends to foster; and since all outward forms, ordinances, rules, discipline, are more worthless than chaff or dust, except so far as they minister to such religion; the first matter for our consideration will be, the real value of that religious type or character now in esteem among us. Hence we must examine at starting with some little precision, however incompletely, the great and cardinal question of Justification; for the general religious character seen in any Church, depends of course mainly on the answer given by each one for himself to the inquiry, 'by what feelings and acts shall I most please God?' or, in other words, 'whereby am I justified?'

On the Lutheran answer to this inquiry, which has an extensive reception and still more extensive influence within our Church, it may perhaps be remembered, that language has been used of no ordinary severity^a in some articles of the *British Critic*. This language (which has given occasion to much comment) I now proceed to defend; and in doing so, it will be impossible perhaps to act more safely, in order to determine the real essence of Lutheran doctrine, than by taking along with us the remembrance, what it is which

^a 'Rabid violence of language' is imputed to me by the Bishop of Ossory.

Lutheranism professes to accomplish. Now its great achievement, according to the unanimous voice of all its advocates, is, that it provides a full security for personal holiness, at the same time that it rescues the believer from all fear of God's wrath to come. It is impossible then to adopt a course more free from the possibility of cavil, than to make this, its pretension, the test for discovering its real nature and meaning; an attempt of no ordinary difficulty, when we consider the cloudy language and inconsecutive thought so prevalent among its supporters.^b And not to incur the imputation (which would indeed be well deserved) of taking an unfair advantage, by comparing a system which at least lives and energizes, not with another living system, but with the uncertain and unpractical theories built by speculative men on ancient records and writings, I will willingly and most gladly take, as the representative of Catholicism, the Roman doctrine, as decreed at Trent and as practically carried out in foreign Churches: a course by which I shall at once consult my own preference, and give to my opponents every advantage they can possibly desire.

The fact to which I have adverted, I mean the extremely vague and wavering statements put forth by such defenders of Lutheran doctrine as I had met with, and the extraordinary intellectual feebleness which seemed to characterize their efforts,^c I had always felt as a painful difficulty, when duty

^b Mr. Scott, of Aston-Sandford, speaks very candidly of 'that amazing diversity of opinion, and that unaccountable inconsistency and perplexity, which are observable in the conversation, sermons, and writings of many evangelical persons, on this apparently plain and most important subject,' (viz. the nature of saving faith,) p. 691, of the edition of 1834.

^c I have read great part of Luther's Commentary on the Galatians; none of Calvin's works, except a few pages of his Institutes on the subject of faith, which have been shewn me. I had no intention of alluding to Luther personally, as his name occurs very seldom in my articles; but as I happened to hear, that an authority of some weight had expressed an opinion that I had spoken against Luther, without knowing more of him than the extracts from his writings in Mœhler's 'Symbolism;' and as I wish to meet all the tangible charges which I am able to hear of; I hope it will not appear impertinent to introduce a note here, and to defend myself from this imputation. I answer, first, that I *do* know more of Luther than extracts; having read continuously great part of his principal work: and, secondly, that

seemed to require the expression of my intense abhorrence of the doctrine itself. I will not deny at all, that I attributed

the extracts alone, with which one meets, whether in Mœhler or elsewhere, are quite sufficient to justify all that I have ever published in his individual disparagement. First, I most certainly took up the Commentary on the Galatians, with an expectation of finding much to agree with. I did not expect to find it very different from other 'evangelical' works; and in them I had often met with very much which made me feel great sympathy with the writers, and which deepened my perception of the points of agreement among all serious Christians; even though united with more or less of a painful character, and certainly with a far lower standard of holiness, with far less realisation of the sinfulness of sin, and far less depth of spiritual experience, than I find in Roman Catholic devotional works. Alas! I found, in Luther's commentary, no such points of sympathy and agreement as I hoped. Never was my conscience so shocked and revolted by any work, not openly professing immorality. On looking at it again more recently, I think I hardly did it justice in my first perusal; probably the naked expression of his doctrine on Justification (which, in its undisguised deformity, had never been previously presented to my imagination) so seized on my mind, that I did not sufficiently observe the various happy and creditable inconsistencies which were to be found in it. I now perceive in one place (and very likely the same may be found in other passages), that he distinctly admits that Christians after justification, continually advance in conquest over sin; an admission which, however inconsistent with his fundamental principle, (on which I speak in the text,) is still a comfortable fact in judging of his personal character. Still, however, I can see nothing in it shewing any spirituality of mind whatever, or any deep and true insight even into human corruption, much less into the marvels of grace; while there is very much of a most contrary character.

His general principle is very plainly stated in a multitude of passages; of which I shall be doing him every justice in taking, as a sample, those which follow. 'We thus teach faith and the true method of Christianity; that man is first instructed by the Law in knowledge of himself, that he may learn to say "to Thee only I have sinned," &c. . . . Then at length he rightly understands what Paul means, when he says that man is the servant and captive of sin. . . . Here then arises a sigh of this kind: "who then can bring me help?" for man, thus terrified by the Law, wholly despairs of his own strength, he looks around and sighs for the help of a Mediator and Saviour. Here then comes in season the saving word of the Gospel, and says, "be of good cheer, my son, thy sins are forgiven thee; believe in Jesus Christ, crucified for thy sins." . . . This is the beginning of salvation; in this manner we are freed from sin, are justified, and eternal life is given us, not for our own deservings or works, but for the faith whereby we apprehend Christ. . . . Christ definitively is *not a lawgiver*, but a Propitiator and Saviour.' On chap. ii. v. 16, vol. 5. pp. 308,9. (The references are made to the edition in seven folio volumes, dated Witenbergæ, 1554.) 'Hence it may be sufficiently understood what is the difference between the Law and the Gospel. The Law does not justify, because it only

this cloudiness of statement and thought to the circumstance, that no consecutive thinker *could* adopt this doctrine, without

teaches what we ought to *do*; but the Gospel . . . teaches what we ought to *receive*. Therefore the Law and the Gospel are two doctrines *wholly contrary*. . . . Moses, with his Law, is a task-master, ordering us to work and give: in a word, he *requires* of us. On the contrary, the Gospel *does not require of us*; but gives grace, and desires us with outstretched hands to receive what is offered. . . . If the Gospel is a gift, and offers a gift, therefore it *requires nothing*.' (On chap. iii. v. 2, pp. 329, 330.) 'When thou seest a man filled with fear and sorrow from the consciousness of sin, say, Thou distinguishest not rightly brother; thou *placest the law over thy conscience* (ponis legem in conscientiam) which should have been placed over thy flesh. Awake, rise up, and think that thou must believe in Christ, the conqueror of the Law and sin; by that faith thou shalt pass over the Law and enter into grace, where is no Law nor sin. Although the Law and sin are, yet are they nothing to thee, for thou art dead to the Law and to sin.' (On chap. ii. v. 19, p. 316.)

'Here foolish reason is again offended, and chides us, saying, 'in that ye teach that men *should do nothing* for the obtaining of so great a gift, except hearing the word, this seems . . . to make men careless, sluggish,' &c. . . . Our adversaries think that faith, by means of which the spirit is received, is a thing altogether trifling and of no account.' Here then, observe, he applies himself to meet this objection; to explain in *what* the difficulty of salvation consists. 'But how difficult and arduous a thing it is, I experience myself, and so do all who with me seriously embrace it. It is readily *said*, that by the hearing of faith *alone*, the Spirit is received; but not so easily heard, received, believed, and retained as said.' (On chap. iii. v. 2, p. 331.) In another place he explains his meaning more clearly; and particular attention should be paid to this passage. 'But *this is the work, this the labour*, that one thus terrified and dismayed by the Law be able again to raise himself and say: "Now I am enough bruised in heart and disturbed; the time of the law has afflicted me enough; now is the time for grace, and for hearing Christ, from Whose mouth proceed the words of grace." . . . Yea, so great is the foolishness of the human heart, that not only it does not, in that conflict of conscience, when the Law has done its duty and exercised its true function, seize the doctrine of grace which most certainly promises and offers remission of sins for Christ's sake, but even seeks for more of laws whereby it may provide for itself. "If I live longer," it says, "I will amend my life; I will do this and that; I will enter a monastery; I will live most sparingly, content with bread and water; I will walk bare-footed," &c. Here, unless thou *doest the very contrary*, unless thou dost leave Moses, with his Law, for the careless and hardened, and in those fears and horrors of mind dost seize Christ, as having suffered, having been crucified, and having died for thy sins, *thy salvation is desperate*, (planè actum est de salute tuâ.)' (On chap. iii. v. 19, p. 359.) The one difficulty of salvation, he says in another place, is to believe that our own sins, grievous as they are, are fully forgiven for Christ's sake. It is easy to believe that *holy* men are forgiven; but to believe that I, a most miserable *sinner*, am forgiven, this is most difficult. 'Thou wouldest easily say and believe that Christ the Son of

being prepared to plunge, theoretically at least, into the lowest depths of depravity ; whereas all must allow, that on every

God was given *for the sins of Peter, Paul, and the other Saints*, whom we account worthy of such a grace. But it is *most difficult* that thou, who judgest thyself *unworthy of that grace*, shouldst say and believe from thy heart, that Christ was given for *thy* sins, thy unconquered, infinite, and vast sins. . . . Here weak nature and reason recoil, here they dare not approach God, nor promise themselves that so great a treasure is to be given them freely. . . . *In this therefore is the whole force of eternal salvation placed*, that these words [*for our sins*] are taken as serious and true.

The sins of one seeking justification are thus described in a passage just preceding the last sentence. ‘O Satan . . . why dost thou require from me righteousness, when I possess nothing except sins, and those true and most grievous, not feigned or slight? such as . . . the extreme of unbelief, (*summa infidelitas*,) . . . contempt of God, hatred of Him, ignorance of Him, blasphemy of Him,’ &c. (On chap. i. v. 4, p. 281, 2.) And the essence then of Luther’s Gospel is this, that a person so affected has only one great struggle to go through, in order that he may obtain the indefectible promise of eternal salvation ; and that struggle is, not against those sins, but against his own conscience, which would fain impede his full assurance of immediate pardon. Let him only firmly believe that notwithstanding these sins he is for certain saved, and no more, says Luther, is required ; he *is* for certain saved. This doctrine does not come in accidentally here and there ; it is the one burthen of the greater part of the commentary. When conscience has performed its office of frightening and alarming the sinner, its usefulness is over ; from that time it is no longer man’s *guide* to salvation, but the one only *impediment* in the way of his *attaining* salvation. Well was it for Luther that he had enjoyed the unspeakable blessings of a Catholic education and monastic discipline, and so had learnt to feel in some slight measure the real sinfulness and evil of sin, before he turned his mind to the invention of these blasphemies. He speaks, in many places, of his own great difficulty in acquiescing in the system he had devised ; and from himself he seems to have argued to others ; so that, as I observed in the *British Critic*, ‘any one who knows ever so little of Luther’s writings must see how painfully aware he is of the opposition presented by human instincts to his lax system ; and how anxiously he endeavours to deceive both others and himself as to the potency of the remedy, which he had the almost incredible boldness of devising from his own invention, against the plainest testimonies of Scripture, against the unceasing and continuous voice of the Church.’ (On *Arnold’s Sermons*, p. 309.) All this is very pleasing, in considering his personal character ; but what has he to say *in argument* against even the shamelessly profligate Anabaptists ? Let any one read the Commentary, from the thirteenth verse of the fifth chapter, and see the miserable shifts to which he is reduced. ‘If grace or faith,’ he says, ‘is not preached, no one is saved : for faith only justifies and saves. On the other hand, if faith is preached as it must be preached, the greater part of mankind understands the doctrine concerning faith in a carnal sense, and changes liberty of the spirit into liberty

single occasion I have taken the utmost possible pains to do justice to the great amount of earnestness and self-

of the flesh. We may see this at the present day *in all classes of life* This unworthiness sometimes makes me so impatient, that I often wish that swine of this sort, who tread pearls under foot, *were still under the tyranny of the Pope.*' Nay, he confesses very curiously of himself, 'We ourselves perform not our duty now that we are in the light of truth, with so much diligence and earnestness as *we did it formerly, when in the darkness of ignorance. For the more assured we are of that liberty procured for us by Christ, the more cold and sluggish are we in ministering the word, in praying, in doing good works, in enduring evils.*' &c. (On chap. v. ver. 13, p. 413.) And he proceeds in a similar strain. Does he give then any test, whereby true faith, which produces holiness, may be distinguished from false faith which leads into profligacy? He makes no such attempt; he passes off under the veil of vague and unmeaning generalities as best he may.

Of course it should be most fully acknowledged, that he expresses a confident opinion that justifying faith will always lead to good works. For instance: 'Because thou hast by faith seized Christ, through whom thou art righteous, begin now to do good works, love God and thy neighbour, pray, give thanks, &c. These are truly good works, which flow from that faith and joy of heart which we receive, in that we have free forgiveness of sins through Christ.' (On chap. ii. ver. 15, p. 309.) This also is of great importance, when the question is raised concerning Luther individually. Several other considerations should also here be mentioned, bearing in the same direction. First: the Commentary, considered intellectually as a theological effort, is perhaps one of the feeblest and most worthless productions ever written; this of course gives the greater ground for hope, that he had not at all fully realised his own principles. Next, many indications appear from time to time of personal amiableness and simplicity of character. Again, there is a number of very beautiful passages, some of which are carefully brought forward by Mr. Newman, and which certainly imply that in his vague and inaccurate way he was dimly conscious of some very precious Gospel truths. Thus: 'Christ lives in me: he is my 'form,' adorning my faith, as when a light adorns a wall;' and, again, 'this gem (Christ) I possess, as though set in a ring:' and many others in like manner, wherein he speaks of the blessedness of 'apprehending' Christ; both are very beautiful in the Catholic sense of such words, and seem to shew that *he* was not himself without glimmerings of that sense. Then, again, he shews the greatest misconception of Catholic doctrine; so as still further to encourage us in the hope that he did not sin against full light. Thus, over and over again, he speaks as if the very inclination to do penance, on the one hand implied a keeping away from Christ; and on the other hand proved the existence of an idea that sin can be in a strict sense *atoned* for by penance, and consequently proved a very inadequate perception of the heinousness of sin. Now religious persons know full well how widely different is the real truth; they know full well, that in proportion as Christians realise the deep and serious guilt they have incurred by their sins, and throw themselves for pardon on the merits of their Lord, in that very proportion are they more earnestly led to the

devotion, frequently found united with its *profession*. Still it was always open for others to say, that accurate thinkers,

desire of penance and self-chastisement: those even know of this desire, who are the most remiss in obeying it; nay, those must know it, who, being possessed by an heretical theory, are compelled to consider it a desire which it is wrong to gratify. The fact, then, of Luther labouring under this misconception is fatal to the hypothesis of his having been, when he wrote the Commentary, in any true sense a religious man: for a religious man, without experience of Christian repentance, is the same contradiction as would be a religious man without experience of humility, or of self-denial, or of godly fear, or of love to God. Still on the other hand, if we bear in mind this his mistake of fact, we shall see a very true and edifying sense in some passages, which would otherwise altogether scandalise us. St. Augustine says, ‘vis fugere à Deo, fuge ad Deum;’ and Mr. Newman, “The most noble repentance . . . the most decorous conduct in a conscious sinner is an unconditional surrender of himself to God; not a *bargaining about terms*, not a scheming (so to call it) to be received back again, but an instant surrender of himself in the first instance.” (Sermons, vol. iii. p. 103.) Now this same doctrine seems confusedly implied in several passages of this Commentary, such as one of those above quoted: and attaches a far more innocent meaning to them than could otherwise be given. Lastly, he seems to a great extent possessed by the idea (as modern ‘Evangelicals’ are), that Catholics are slow in confessing or seeing the miserable imperfections which sully our best actions, and that they uphold outward works apart from inward sanctity; and this furnishes another excuse for many of his most offensive passages. Still the following extract will shew that he had means of knowing, that even in that age the ‘good works’ of monks were often of a very different stamp. “Under the Papacy it was counted for a most spiritual action, when the monks sitting in their cells meditated on God and His works; when inflamed with the most ardent devotion they *bowed the knee, prayed, and contemplated heavenly things* with so much delight, that *for much joy they shed tears*. Here was no thought of women, nor of any other creature; but only of the Creator and His marvellous works. And yet this thing, most spiritual in the judgment of reason, is, according to Paul, *a work of the flesh*. Wherefore all such religion . . . is idolatry: and the more holy and spiritual it is in appearance, so much the more pernicious and pestilential it is; for it turns aside man from faith in Christ,’ &c. (On chap. v. ver. 20, p. 424.) In the omitted and the contiguous passage, he speaks of these services as done ‘to the exclusion of Christ the Mediator, and without the word and commandment of God.’ The meaning of this most extraordinary and most irreligious statement, I rather fancy, from other passages, to be, that Christians ought to meditate only on the works of *redemption*, not of *creation*.

Another short work of Luther’s, which I have looked through, is his *Sermo de Matrimonio*, preached, let it never be forgotten, publicly before a large congregation. Let those who speak of him as a spiritually-minded man read that sermon. Quotations, however, of that kind are better omitted. The following are extracted from certain ‘*Disputationes pro Veritate Inquirendâ*,’ vol. i. p. 54.

15. It is certain that thy sins are forgiven, if thou believest them forgiven.

if they should apply themselves to its defence, would rescue it from the imputation of leading to such pernicious conse-

18. Those who found forgiveness of sins on contrition, build the faith of God on sand, that is, on man's work.

25. The priest has before him sufficiently clear marks of contrition, if he perceives that the sinner seeks and *believes his forgiveness*.

26. Indeed it is far more important to inquire whether he *believe himself to be forgiven*, than whether he sorrow worthily.

40. Suppose an impossible case, that he who is to be absolved should not be contrite, and should yet believe himself to be absolved, *he is truly absolved*.

The following quotation is made by M. Audin in his life of Luther (p. 265, English translation) with the reference to 3 f. 177. 6: but I have not access to the same edition; so the quotation is made on M. Audin's authority.

'Thus the human will is placed in the middle, like a beast of burden; if God rides on it, it wills and goes whither God will . . . if Satan rides on it, it wills and goes as Satan will; *nor is it in its own choice* to run to either rider, or seek him, but the riders themselves contend to obtain and possess it.'

The following are from Mœhler's 'Symbolism,' English translation.

'Luth. in Gen. c. xix. "In spiritual and divine things which regard the salvation of the soul, man is like to the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was changed; yea he is like a trunk and a stone," &c. (Mœhler, vol. i. p. 124.)

'Luther de Captiv. Bab. tom. ii. fol. 264. "So thou seest how rich is the Christian; even if he will he cannot destroy his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refuse to believe. For no sins can condemn him, except unbelief alone. All others, if faith in the divine promise made at Baptism *return or remain, are absorbed in a moment through the same faith*.'" (Mœhler, vol. i. p. 183.)

Here I may add a quotation I made in the British Critic, (on Heurtley's Four Sermons, p. 438.)

'Be thou a sinner and sin boldly, but still more boldly believe and rejoice in Christ. Sufficient is it that through the riches of the glory of God we know the Lamb who taketh away the sins of the world; from Him sin shall not separate us, no, though a thousand thousand times in every day we should *commit fornication or murder*.'

The following shall conclude my series of quotations. The first is from an article in the Edinburgh Review, (October, 1834,) which it can be no discourtesy to attribute to its universally acknowledged author, Sir W. Hamilton; the second is published by the same gentleman with his name. Sir W. Hamilton's authority is a sufficient voucher for the accuracy of the quotations; but unfortunately he does not specify his references. He divides his classes of quotations from Luther's writings into the heads of 'speculative theology,' 'practical theology,' and 'Biblical Criticism.'

I. God pleaseth you when He crowns the unworthy; He ought not to displease you *when he damns the innocent*. All things take place by the eternal and invariable will of God, who blasts and shatters in pieces the freedom of the will. *God creates in us the evil, in like manner as the good*. The high perfection of

quences, as appear inevitably to flow from it. It gave me therefore peculiar gratification to fall in, a few months ago,

faith is to believe that God is just, notwithstanding that, by His will, He *renders us necessarily damnable*, and seemeth to find pleasure in the torments of the miserable.'

II. 'We (Luther, &c.) cannot advise that the licence of marrying more wives than one be *publicly introduced*, and, as it were, ratified by law. If anything were allowed to get into print on this head, your Highness easily comprehends that it would be understood and received as a precept, whence much scandal and many difficulties would arise. Your Highness should be pleased to consider the excessive scandal; that the enemies of the Gospel would proclaim that we are like the Anabaptists, who have adopted the practice of polygamy, and that the Evangelicals, as the Turks, allow themselves the licence of a plurality of wives. . . . But in certain cases there is room for dispensation In fine, if your Highness be fully and finally resolved to marry yet another wife, we judge that this ought to be done secretly, as has been said above, in speaking of the dispensation; so that it be known only to your Highness, to the lady, and to a few faithful persons obliged to silence under the seal of confession; hence no attacks or scandal of any moment would ensue. For there is nothing unusual in princes keeping concubines; and although *the lower orders may not perceive the excuses of the thing*, the more intelligent know how to make allowance.

III. 'The books of the Kings are more worthy of credit than the books of the Chronicles. . . . Job spake not therefore as it stands written in his book, but hath had such cogitations. It is a sheer argumentum fabulæ. It is probable that Solomon made and wrote this book This book (Ecclesiastes) ought to have been more full; there is too much of broken matter in it; it has neither boots nor spurs, but rides only in socks, as I myself when in the cloister. Solomon hath not therefore written this book, which hath been made in the days of the Maccabees by Sirach. It is like a Talmud compiled from many books, perhaps in Egypt, at the desire of King Ptolemy Euergetes. So also have the Proverbs of Solomon been collected by others. . . . The book of Esther I toss into the Elbe. . . . I am so an enemy to the book of Esther, that I would it did not exist; for it Judaizes too much, and hath in it a great deal of heathenish naughtiness. Isaiah hath borrowed his art and knowledge from the Psalter. . . . The history of Jonah is so monstrous *that it is absolutely incredible*. . . . That the Epistle to the Hebrews is not by St. Paul, nor by any Apostle at all, is shewn by chap. ii. 3. It is by an excellently learned man, a disciple of the Apostles. It should be no stumbling block, if there be found in it a mixture of wood, straw, hay. The Epistle of James I account the writing of no Apostle. It is an epistle of straw. . . . The Epistle of Jude is a copy of St. Peter's and alledgeth stories which have no place in Scripture. . . . In the Revelation of John much is wanting to let me deem it Scriptural. I can discover no trace that it is established by the Spirit.'

The next quotation I make is from a pamphlet by Sir W. Hamilton, on the Scotch Kirk.

'There is no obligation more anxiously inculcated by the Gospel than chastity,

with a work written by the present Bp. of Ossory on the subject; and I read it through with great interest and avidity. Dr. O'Brien has treated, in his Charge, on one or two subjects closely akin to this, with extreme clearness and force of argument :^d here then seemed an opportunity of

and no virtue has been regarded as more peculiarly promoted by the Reformation. Take this precept then, and take it in the hands of the Reformed theologians. Look to the Anabaptists—but no; this instance may be objected to—and I pass on. Look, then, to the great authors and the great guides of the great religious revolution itself—to Luther and Melancthon; even they, great and good as they both were, would, had they been permitted by the wisdom of the world to carry their theological speculations into practice, have introduced a state of things, which every Christian of every denomination will now confess, would not only have turned the Reformation into a curse, but have subverted all that is most sacred by moral and religious law.

^d Among other points of Papal discipline, the zeal of Luther was roused against ecclesiastical celibacy and monastic vows; and whither did it carry him? Not content to reason against the institution within natural limits and on legitimate grounds, his fervour led him to deny explicitly, and in every relation, the existence of chastity, as a physical impossibility; led him publicly to preach (and who ever preached with the energy of Luther?) incontinence, adultery, incest even, as not only allowable, but if practised under the prudential regulations which he himself lays down, unobjectionable, and even praiseworthy. The epidemic spread; a fearful dissolution of manners throughout the sphere of the Reformer's influence, was for a season the natural result. The ardour of the boisterous Luther infected, among others, even the ascetic and timorous Melancthon. Polygamy awaited only the permission of the civil ruler to be promulgated as an article of the Reformation; and had this permission not been significantly refused, (whilst, at the same time, the epidemic in Wittenberg was homœopathically alleviated, at least, by the similar but more violent access in Munster,) it would not have been the fault of the fathers of the Reformation if Christian liberty has remained less ample than Mahomedan licence. As it was, *polygamy was never abandoned by either Luther or Melancthon as a religious speculation*; both, in more than a single instance, accorded the formal sanction of their authority to its practice—by those who were above the law; and had the civil prudence of the imprudent Henry VIII. not restrained him, sensual despot as he was, from carrying their spontaneous counsel into effect, a plurality of wives might now have been a privilege as religiously contended for in England as in Turkey."

He afterwards mentions that he bases this opinion in part "on a *Disputatio sive consultatio, scripta anno 1531, die 23 Augusti, a Philippo Melancthone de Digamia Regis Angliæ*;—which advice, with the fact which it alone establishes, has remained as far as he is aware, hitherto unnoticed, either by English historians or ecclesiastics."

^d The direct object of the Bishop's observations is an application of Catholic principles, which differs in many particulars from the present Roman application

viewing the Lutheran doctrine at its best advantage ; handled by a writer who had shewn himself fully conversant with the laws of reasoning, and fully able to state his convictions in the clearest and most precise language. Some of the results of my perusal shall here be stated.

Nothing can be more unequivocal than Dr. O'Brien's expression of his principle.

‘ Faith in Christ is trust in Christ, or in God through Christ, founded upon’ an assent of the understanding ; ‘ an entire and unre-served confidence in the efficacy of what Christ has suffered for us ; a full reliance upon Him and upon His work.’ p. 14.

‘ The error, by which obedience to God's will is made part of the notion for which faith stands, . . . rests exclusively upon doctrinal views . . . entirely irreconcilable to the fundamental principles of the scheme of mercy which it is the object of the Bible to reveal.’ p. 34.

To ‘ apprehend that this arduous course of obedience to His will is demanded of them as the price or *condition* of reconciliation’ is a ‘ gross misconception of the true nature of the Gospel.’ p. 42.

Also the following are in the number of passages from Protestant confessions of faith which the author cites, to shew the complete agreement of all the Reformers on the subject ; and of which passages, as of others which he quotes, he says, ‘ I agree with them upon all points of real importance connected with this doctrine.’ p. 374.

‘ Our Churches teach that men are freely justified through faith, when they believe *that they are received into grace*, and that their sins are remitted for the sake of Christ, who by His death made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God counts for righteousness in His sight.’ p. 362.

‘ But when the mind has been terrified by the voice (of conscience) accusing of sin, let him hear the promise peculiar to the Gospel concerning the Son of God, and let him firmly believe (statuat) that *his sins are freely forgiven him* for the sake of the

of them ; so that any formal consideration of the argument in the Charge, on this subject, does not come within my present scope. Incidentally, however, what I shall have to say may bear more than a little on the subject.

Son of God, &c. ; when he is comforted by this faith, it is certain that *remission of sins is given him . . .* and that Christ works within us and quickens believers by His Spirit,' &c. p. 362.

'That faith which justifies is not only a knowledge of the [Gospel] history, but it is to assent to the promise of God, whereby remission of sins and justification is offered for Christ's sake ; and that no one may suspect that it is only knowledge, we add further, it is to wish for and to receive the promise of remission of sins and of justification.' p. 312.

'Faith is not only knowledge, &c., but also a sure confidence, enkindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost through the Gospel, whereby I rest in God, surely believing that *not to others only but to me also* remission of sins, eternal righteousness and life, hath been given : and that freely, from the mercy of God, for the merit of Christ alone.' p. 314.

In like manner Melanethon, included in the author's general approbation above quoted.

'Let there be contrition, but let faith be added, whereby each one may truly believe and determine that *to him himself* his sins are freely forgiven for the sake of the Son of God, not of any deservings of his own. By this faith a man *obtains for certain the remission of his sins*, and is comforted again and quickened ; that is, his fears are relieved, and the Holy Ghost is received, and a new life and joy.' p. 329.

In another place Dr. O'Brien designates the objection,—that even according to his view justification is not free, in his sense of the word free, because faith itself is a work,—he designates this objection as 'a miserable refinement,' (p. 162,) and says that,

'With less than this (act of faith required for justification) our part in this procedure could not have been intelligent and voluntary.' p. 106.

In another place he makes still clearer his sentiment, that justifying faith is prior to the most elementary Christian virtues.

'The graces of filial love and filial fear, which is its inseparable companion, from whence spring a genuine desire to obey, and genuine

sorrow at all our failures in obedience, are . . . wrought through the Spirit of God mainly through the instrumentality of that faith which he has bestowed. . . . And to describe the possession of these graces as essential to the genuineness of faith, is to mistake the nature of faith, to misrepresent the order of the Spirit's gifts, and in its direct tendency to frustrate all the effects of faith and the whole design of the Gospel.' p. 47.

Again he says :

'Those who are justified will certainly bring forth good works, for such obedience to God's will is the proper consequence of the principle by which they have been justified.' p. 125.

Again :

'The assurance with which we hold the truth of the sanctification of believers is built upon multiplied and unequivocal promises of God.' p. 212.

And in another place he distinctly states, what his theory indeed implied all along, that 'from believers the fear of punishment is taken away.' p. 221.

Nothing then appears clearer than his account of the case. Justifying faith is no general belief in Gospel truth; but a man's special belief that *his own* sins are remitted, through no merit of his own, but wholly through his Lord's merits. It is a self-abnegating trust in Christ; which, though it *leads* inevitably *after* justification to the greatest personal exertion and self-discipline, *in itself* involves so little of personal exertion, that to call it 'a work' is a 'miserable refinement;'^f which so plainly carries with it its own evidence, that believers may always know themselves to be such; which so certainly, necessarily, inevitably produces final perseverance, that believers not only know themselves to be such, but *as*

^f Dr. O'Brien disavows altogether such an interpretation of his words as—that faith is no work, only because it is the Holy Ghost's work and not our own. He quotes with complete approbation Melancthon's answer: "Others say that faith is no work, because it is the gift of God. This answer is foreign to the purpose, for when it is said 'we are not justified by works,' those virtues also are understood, love, chastity, patience, which *are* enkindled by the Holy Ghost." p. 405.

such are saved from all fear of future punishment. Both these latter sentiments are undeniably involved in the quotation last made from the work.

One cannot desire certainly more complete security against fear of wrath to come, than this doctrine, if true, would provide. But now comes the real stress of the whole difficulty; the security, namely, given by the same doctrine, I will not say for sanctity, but for the most ordinary morality. And here a surprising change comes over the author's whole language. Let the following passage be fairly considered.

'Faith in the Redeemer is founded on the overthrow of pride, and makes a provision for its extirpation.' 'It is founded upon the ruins of human pride: for it only exists in the degree in which self-dependence is vanquished; and grows, advances, and strengthens, as the subjugation is completed. It is not only founded upon the *knowledge* of what the Bible communicates to us of our nature and condition, of our guilt, degradation, weakness, and wants—but the principle *requires* that this conviction shall be so complete and intimate, as to vanquish all dependence upon ourselves or on any thing in ourselves, and lead us to rest our eternal welfare upon the work of the Redeemer and it alone. Its very *essence* consists in the abjuration from the heart of all merit in ourselves, and unfeigned ascription of all glory to Him. *What obstinate resistance* this vice makes before it surrenders, and how often it renews the struggle, none can require to be reminded who have ever sustained the conflict. Even where the criminality of our conduct is too clear to be denied, &c. But if we reluctantly condemn our known vices, how much more slowly and reluctantly do we yield to the conviction, that the very acts upon which we most pride ourselves partake of the same ungodly character!' p. 184.

'And even after we are convinced that if we would stand before Jehovah, it must be in the righteousness of Another, not our own; that we must, before Him, withdraw all plea of merit for our works; how often are we found preposterously substituting for this the merit of our faith! And driven from this more absurd form of pride, still clinging to the notion of some merit in the humility with which we renounce all merit, both of faith and works; and even when we discern the folly of all such pretensions clearly, far from

being secure from a worse form of self-dependence, a reliance upon the clearness of our religious views and the soundness of our religious principles; whatever place our language may give to the Redeemer, still in our inmost thoughts recurring to ourselves insomuch that you will often find men, who have passed a great part of their lives in maintaining the doctrine of justification by faith, as much strangers to this simple exclusive trust in the Redeemer's work, as those who have been their life long opposing it. . . . It is only through that Spirit, that a man is ever brought to come to Christ simply as a blind and needy sinner; to cast down himself and all that he prides himself upon—his works, his faith, his humility, his knowledge—all at the foot of the cross of the Redeemer—glorying only in it, desiring in life and death and judgment to be found in Him that suffered upon it, and in Him to find every thing—wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption. *Now this and nothing short of this is faith in the Redeemer.*' pp. 185, 6.

All religious Catholics, throughout the world, would most cordially agree with the general doctrine of this beautiful passage; in acknowledging, namely, the deep subtlety with which pride ever insinuates its temptations, and the paramount importance of a continued struggle, by God's grace, against its dominion. But observe the strange confusion of ideas in the writer. This, the most arduous, the most vital, the most lasting conflict, in which regenerate man has to engage, is, on Dr. O'Brien's principles, to be carried on with no assistance from Christian grace: not until it is concluded, until victory is gained, and the enemy lies prostrate at our feet, does justifying faith obtain an entrance. Certainly *this* doctrine cannot be said to err on the side of laxity. What Catholic will hesitate most fully to admit, that a Christian, in whom every germ of pride shall have been eradicated, may look forward with unclouded certainty (should he know the fact) to ultimate acceptance? Justified Christians indeed would be absolutely sinless upon this hypothesis; for where pride is absent, what other sin can be present? But then what happiness can there be in Gospel tidings, what comfort to the penitent, what rest to the afflicted, if no one has any

part in those tidings who has not faith; and any one may know for certain that he has *not* faith, if he experience even one transient emotion of pride and self-complacency? Compare with this strange medley the Catholic doctrine.

‘Men are disposed to righteousness (or justification); [1.] when (dum) excited and assisted by Divine grace, conceiving faith by hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which are divinely revealed and promised, and *especially this, that the sinner is justified by His grace, by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus*; [2.] and when, perceiving themselves to be sinners, from fear of Divine justice by which they are profitably alarmed, by turning themselves to consider God’s mercy, they are raised to hope, trusting that God will be merciful to them for Christ’s sake; [3.] and begin to love Him as the source of all righteousness; [4.] and are therefore excited against their sins by a certain hatred and detestation, that is, by that repentance which must be realised (*pœnitentiam quam agi oportet*) before Baptism; [5.] lastly, when they propose to receive Baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep God’s commandments.” §

Such faith as this is not built on the ruins of pride, for it is the preparation for that grace, whereby alone pride can be effectually combated. *Love*, not faith, is in the Catholic scheme the contradictory to pride; and whereas believers have no promise that in this life their love can be fully matured, so neither have they a promise that their pride can be wholly subdued: humility will grow, in proportion as other Christian graces grow.^h Nor yet again does such faith as this confer a certain assurance that the believer will persevere; but then this is a characteristic which no Catholic applies to faith at all in any sense, and which cannot be applied to it, without incurring by implication the anathema of Trent.ⁱ

The subject of pride, which has a most important place in this controversy, will presently come before us again: here it will be better to confine ourselves to the criticism of Dr. O’Brien’s treatise. Similar representations to that above

§ Sessio VI., cap. vi.

^h See Newman’s Sermons, vol. iii. pp. 102—105.

ⁱ Sessio VI., cap. xvi.

quoted will be found in other parts of the work ; one especially in p. 60, which I had marked for quotation, but do not think it necessary to transcribe. The first two sentences of the above cited passage are worded as though the author had some faint perception of the inconsistency into which he was betrayed, and desired to guard himself against it : but some of the words I have put in italics sufficiently shew that I have not mis-stated his meaning. In like manner, when about to quote some of the sentiments of the foreign Reformers, he seems anxious to establish some ' *via media*' between the intolerably lax, and the intolerably harsh, versions of the Lutheran principle. ' They neither taught,' he says, ' nor countenanced, under the name of faith, any fanatical impressions of peculiar personal favour ; or allowed as faith any confidence towards God, which was not grounded upon a believing and intelligent application to ourselves of the offer of mercy which His word makes alike to all.' p. 312. All such attempts however are utterly vain ; and are interesting mainly, in that they shew the struggles of a religious man, unhappily committed to an irreligious principle. Take one of the author's most careful and elaborate accounts of faith.

Faith is ' the act of one who feels himself condemned by God's righteous law, and by its sentence a sinner in thought, word, and deed ; and who feels too the certainty of his danger as well as the reality of his guilt ; and who seeks relief from this terror and remorse in none of those refuges of lies by which such salutary alarm is so often mitigated and finally extinguished ; but who, feeling the nothingness of them all and renouncing them all, has, under this sense of sin, and danger, and helplessness, come in sincerity to Christ for every thing—for safety and innocence and strength.' p. 45.

Now there is no question at all that, in proportion as the Christian grows in grace, this passage truly expresses his religious experience ; that he more and more renounces, with alarm and dismay, all thought of resting on any righteousness of his own ; that he more and more feels Christ his only and

his sufficient portion, and comes to Him 'for safety, and innocence, and strength.' But when this consciousness is represented as the one characteristic of justifying faith, either far too much is included or far too little. These words—'feels himself condemned'—and other similar expressions must necessarily mean one of two things; either something which is below the beginning of a Christian life, or else something which is beyond its last earthly attainment. They must either mean that the sinner holds the opinion, grounded on authority, evidence, reason; that he is by nature powerless and exposed to God's wrath; that his best deeds are wholly unable to endure the severity of God's judgment, and the like: or else they must mean that the miserable experience of this is a most integral and intimate part of his moral nature; that the sense of it is deeply, practically, unceasingly present to his mind; that self-dependence, even in its most subtle and plausible shapes, has wholly and for ever left him. If the former be their meaning, they may be truly applied to numbers who are openly and avowedly irreligious; if the latter, they can *not* be truly applied to the most holy and humble Christian living. And the continually repeated fallacy of Lutheran writers, the principal art by which they bewilder both themselves and others, is, that when they are extolling the *freedom* of the Lutheran scheme of salvation they use these words in one sense, and when they are defending its *moral tendencies* they use them in the other. According to the sense in which such words are taken, their favourite doctrine is either so immoral that the basest of men could not bear to realise and believe it, or so stringent that under it no one born in original sin could hope for salvation; it either asserts that a head-knowledge of the most elementary Christian truths will lead for certain to eternal Life, or else that one momentary lapse from the most profound humility disproves the existence of justifying faith.

Considering now that the question, on which the Bishop has betrayed this extraordinary confusion of ideas, is no episodic or subordinate discussion, but the very cardinal



point of the whole controversy, he does seem distinctly obnoxious to the severest charge which *can* be brought against a theologian as such: for he has taken no pains whatever to give a precise and definite sense even to the very chief technical terms which he employs, and to keep in his mind that sense whenever he uses those words; and has thus allowed his doctrinal language to be, not the accurate transcript of a religious man's experience, but the accidental and frequently inconsistent reflection of external systems. I say, as a *theologian*: I bring no imputation against his private religious excellence; for men continually *act* on religious instinct, even when they *write* on a theory.

2. It will be better, however, before going further, to state with some greater definiteness the points which it will be necessary to bring to issue. In the first place then, there need be no controversy on man's helpless and deplorable condition by nature. True it is that that disregard of moral principle, which is the very essence of Lutheranism in the abstract, has, at some times and places, so infected its individual professors, as to lead them into the most monstrous statements on the worthlessness of moral obedience among heathens: still such statements are at present *consciously* received, I suppose, by very few; and no more therefore need be said about them. Further, the following most essential and vital truths are admitted on all hands. 1. That whatever child of Adam, since the fall, has been saved from eternal condemnation, has been so saved only through the merits (if before His coming, through the *foreseen* merits) of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2. That so much as the first impulse or inclination, which leads towards the way of Christian salvation, cannot be experienced, except through the express and most gratuitous moving of the Holy Ghost, purchased for us by Christ's merits. 3. That the very best and holiest Christians (putting aside the case of St. Mary, as a matter of controversy on which it is unnecessary to enter) have their very best and holiest works defiled by numberless imperfections; nay more, that from the clearness of their spiritual vision and their strict conscientiousness, so absorbed are they in the

thought of these, as to feel an almost irresistible tendency to consider themselves the most wicked and offensive to God of all living creatures: a phenomenon this last, which is exemplified by the Saints of the Church, in a manner absolutely peculiar and unapproached.

These are points of agreement. The *controverted* questions on which it will be necessary to insist, are two: first, whether, at the moment in which pardon is given, an ineffable and supernatural inward spiritual gift be or be not also imparted; secondly, on what terms is that pardon given, and by what evidence is its continuance known? The latter of these questions is even far more fundamental than the former, and it will be well to complete its discussion separately in the first instance: though it may occupy considerable space.

The Lutheran answer then to this inquiry must inevitably be, 1, that the pardon is complete and final, involving no terms or conditions whatever; 2, that the trust in Christ, on which it immediately follows, is a feeling which carries with it its own evidence, and which leads necessarily, without any special pains or effort on our part, to a holy life. This is a perfectly consistent and intelligible answer; and if admitted, would fully bear out the pretensions of Lutheran doctrine: it would unite holiness of life with security as to our future lot. But no answer short of this is either consistent *or* intelligible. The very boast of the Lutheran doctrine, let it never be forgotten, is, that it protects serious Christians from misgiving as to their final condition after death; and no formula therefore, which fails in affording such protection, can be a legitimate exponent or representative of that doctrine. Well indeed can I understand the feelings, which naturally lead earnest men to seek and cherish such a religious principle. When first the practical truth is brought home to an individual, that an eternity of misery may possibly be reserved for him hereafter, well can I understand how welcome to him is any teacher, who may promise to relieve the oppressive dismay which overpowers him. What remedies there may be within the range of Catholic truth, to soften and mitigate this dismay,

is a consideration among the most deeply interesting which can be conceived, and something may be said on it presently; though to treat it fully would carry us very far beyond our present scope. That, after all possible mitigations, the continual knowledge and remembrance of so fearful a possibility will impart a very marked and distinctive feature to the Christian character, is a most certain and most important truth. Nor is it to the purpose to ask, whether the spiritual mind, in proportion to its illumination, would desire the removal of this uncertainty; but whether it would desire that particular *mode* of removal which Lutheranism proposes, and which alone indeed (to speak of all except very extraordinary cases) is consistent with the conditions of our existence here below.

Let us then again repeat our statement of the Lutheran doctrine; which I have been compelled myself to put into this shape, because I have not been able to find any consistent account of it whatever in the writings of its defenders. And the statement here framed, being the foundation of the whole argument that is to follow, I must beg those of my readers, who may be disposed to advocate or extenuate the doctrine itself, to examine this statement carefully point by point; I must beg them to consider the reasons here adduced, why it must be so worded as it is, if Lutheranism is to succeed in its professed object,—that of securing holiness, and yet exempting believers from fear of punishment. The only consistent and substantial account then, as it appears to me, which can be given of the Lutheran theory of man's justification, is as follows: 1. 'pardon once given is complete and final, involving no terms or conditions whatever;' 2. 'the trust in Christ, on which it follows, is a feeling which carries with it its own evidence, and which leads necessarily, without special pains or effort on our part, to a holy life.' If the 'pardon once given' be not 'complete and final,' then our anxiety is *not* removed on our future lot: for it is very possible that we may lose that pardon. If it 'involve' any 'terms or conditions' whatever, then the same anxiety remains: for it is possible that we may not fulfil those conditions; and more-

over in innumerable cases we shall be involved in all the tumult and distress of a doubtful mind, from not knowing whether or no we *have* fulfilled them. This objection is pressed with great force by Lutherans against Catholic writers: it is urged with undeniable truth, that when once holiness is admitted as a condition, all certainty and peace (in *their* sense of that word) is gone; for in proportion to the advances made by any one in a holy life, will be his perception of his own sinfulness, and of the miserable stains which sully his best endeavours. Further 'the trust in Christ, on which pardon follows, is a feeling which carries with it its own evidence;' for if not, how do we *obtain* that freedom from anxiety, which in Lutheran eyes is so inestimably precious? And, lastly, it 'leads necessarily, without special pains or effort on our part, to a holy life.' By the word 'special' (which requires explanation, and which I here use in a technical sense) I mean to express,—any further pains or effort, than that which it will be our actual delight to give, in consequence of our gratitude for mercies received, our hatred of sin, and our desire of holiness. Thus a son, who is filled with love and gratitude to his father, will go through many sacrifices for his sake, not from any calculation of duty, but from the spontaneous impulse of affection; it would be painful to him to abstain from them. But there may be other cases, in which he feels that a certain sacrifice is called for, and makes that sacrifice; while yet he makes it not in *consequence*, but in *spite of* his predominant inclination; not as the direct and natural *result* of his love, but as one principal means of *increasing* his love. Sacrifices of the former kind may be calculated on with unerring certainty; for he possesses a principle, of which they are the necessary result: those of the latter kind, on the contrary, we cannot for certain expect, for they depend on the question, whether or no, in particular instances one after the other, he act conscientiously on his idea of duty; a question which none except God can answer before the event. Nothing can be clearer than the distinction between these different kinds of self-denial: nor can any thing be clearer either,

than that the former alone, according to the Lutheran scheme, is required under the Gospel; that such holiness as is necessary to adorn the Christian character, must, upon that scheme, flow forth as the direct and spontaneous result of justifying faith. For if it be required of the Christian, that from time to time he thwart his predominant inclination under a sense of duty, how can he know that he may not at some future time *fail* in the performance of this important exercise? or how can he know at any given period whether he have sufficiently performed it? It is plain, without saying another word, that if self-denial in the latter sense be required of a Christian, there can be no undoubting assurance of safety, no unclouded prospect of heaven.

The ordinary language used by religious men who profess the doctrine under examination, fully bears out this latter remark; which will not indeed, I fancy, be denied by any one. No expression is so commonly heard from such persons, as that the spiritual illumination, which follows our forgiveness, is in itself a certain and sufficient stimulus to a holy and religious life. Thus to open the Christian Observer almost at random:

‘The justified Christian is born anew to good works; sin has no longer dominion over him; and precisely for the very reason that he is not under the Law, but under Grace. *It has become his delight*, as it is always his duty, to do the will of God; he works cheerfully and diligently; not to perfect his justification, but because, being justified, he is also regenerated; and *in accordance with his renovated nature he desires* to live no longer to himself, but to Him that loved him and gave Himself for him. (Jan. 1844, p. 48.)

The Churchman’s Monthly Review:

‘It is the pervading principle of Aristotle’s philosophy, that we become righteous by acting righteously; as Luther has observed, *the converse rather is true.*’ (Feb. 1842, p. 86.)

In like manner Mr. Scott himself:¹

¹ Mr. Scott’s Essay on ‘Saving Faith in Christ,’ from which this extract is taken, though as an argumentative and theological work misty and confused,

‘These affections, when vigorous and permanent, being connected with a firm dependence on the promises of the new covenant, and maintained in exercise by “communion with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ,” through the sacred influence of the Holy Spirit, are *fully adequate to the ends for which they were intended*, and cannot but *impel and constrain the lively believer to the most self-denying and devoted obedience.*’ (p. 678.)

And with regard to the whole formal statement which has just been illustrated, the phrases in common use among ‘Evangelicals’ will sufficiently vindicate its accuracy, every single particular involved in it must be carefully retained, if there is to be any meaning in those ordinary phrases. Nothing is more common, even in the case of those who may have lived an utterly irreligious life, should they have more serious thoughts on their death-bed, than to find it regarded as sufficient ground for our most confident belief in their salvation, the circumstance that they have died, not with a humble and tremulous *hope*, but with a full *assurance* of pardon. Over and over again it is said of the departed, as if in their praise, that they died in a frame of undoubting confidence in their personal salvation. ‘The eternal law of God,’ it has been said by others, ‘is not binding on the *conscience* of him who has faith in Christ.’ Language, again, such as the following, is familiar to all of us. ‘Other systems have attempted to melt the heart and restore our corrupt nature by severity, threats, or motives of expediency; but the Gospel alone has dared to trust itself to the principle of free and unconditional favour, yet with success as signal as has been the failure of all other methods; for the mere preaching of reconciliation with God, the doctrine of pardon, the command to take and enjoy the blessings of redemption, has been found to act upon the soul in a remarkable way for its conversion and renewal.’ The very mark of a regenerate mind is considered by multitudes to be the adoption of the latter alternative. To pursue the

like the common run of ‘evangelical writings,’ contains very much of a *practical* character, I think, with which the well-instructed believer would most deeply sympathize.

path of humble, watchful, anxious, minute obedience is continually represented as the bondage of the Law ; to practise holiness in that degree which flows from gratitude for our free pardon, and from no other motive than that gratitude, as the liberty of the Gospel. These statements, one and all, are absolutely unmeaning, if any one part be subtracted from the account of Lutheranism which I have given ; as will at once be seen, by imagining any such subtraction.

3. Attempts indeed have been made to escape from this plain and definite position ; but they only lead those who make them into endless confusion and self-contradiction. We have already seen this in the case of Bishop O'Brien ; the present Bishop of Chester, in a tract which has made some stir, exhibits the same spectacle. The following sentence, if it be not presumptuous to say so, is most honourable to his Lordship's religious feeling and principle, but surely quite inconsistent with his Lutheran profession.

'He (the Christian) has no satisfactory evidence that he is entitled thus to depend upon his Lord and Saviour, unless his conscience bears testimony that, "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts," he is living "righteously, soberly, and godly in this present world," and striving to be "perfect, even as his Father, who is in heaven, is perfect."'^m

Who that has any even tolerably clear view of Gospel requirements, who that has any true perceptions of spiritual things, who that enters even a little into the real meaning of the words 'righteousness, sobriety, and godliness,' will

^m Compare with this a sentiment quoted by Mr. Newman from Calvin. 'Equidem si ab operibus æstimandum sit qualiter affectus sit erga nos Dominus, id *ne tenui quidem conjecturâ* possemus assequi fateor ; sed quum simplici et gratuita promissioni respondere fides debet, nullus ambigendi locus relinquitur.' Calvin, Instit. iii. 2. n. 38. (On Just. p. 30.)

On the other hand, Dr. O'Brien, (exhibiting the same moral superiority of opinion over the extravagances of the sixteenth century, which our 'evangelicals,' as a body, *have* so strikingly exhibited ; but losing in consistency what he gains in morality,) observes : Good works are the 'necessary results of justifying faith, and essential marks of justified persons ; so that, *when these are absent*, we may collect *the absence of that internal principle*, which we can only discern in others by its proper effects ; and what may be a guide in the case of others, answers the far more important end of *a safeguard in our own.*' (p. 126.)

dare so to speak of himself? What serious Christian is not rather bowed down by a sense of his miserable shortcomings and imperfections, and is not inclined to confess of himself (the more inclined so to confess and so to think in proportion as the confession is wide of the truth), that "all his righteousness is but as filthy rags"? Self-loathing, self-abhorrence, these are among the surest marks of growth in grace; but the more they exist, the more surely will they indispose and incapacitate the believer's 'conscience' from 'bearing any such testimony' as the Bishop requires. A man's 'conscience may bear testimony,' indeed, that he is free from external acts of gross and overt sin; but Bp. Sumner surely would be the last man living to allow of this as sufficient for salvation. Again: it would of course be wholly unreal and untrue to deny that 'religious men, really such, recollect in the course of years that they have become very different from what they were;' nay, it would be wholly unreal and untrue to deny that even at an early period of their Christian course, those who are habituated to self-discipline and self-examination may have a sufficient consciousness of being free from mortal sin, and honestly desirous of serving God: these are among the grounds of humble hopefulness, which Catholic doctrine supplies. Still such tests are negative; a Catholic Christian, who has made any real advances in holy living, cannot bear to think of his *positive* attainments, so keenly does he feel their miserable deficiency; nor, again, does he even dare to realise and dwell upon the good (not his own, but of the Holy Spirit) which in fact may be in them, lest pride take possession of him, and he fall from grace.

I have called the tests *negative*, by means of which we are able legitimately to obtain a humble confidence, whether that we are in God's favour or that we are growing in grace, because they consist in noting, not the presence or increase within us of given virtues, but the absence or diminution of given defects; and for the same reason, as was implied above, they cannot be made available except by those, who live in the habitual and constant practice of self-discipline and self-

examination. Whether it is to such tests as these that the Bishop in point of fact alludes, it is difficult precisely to know, because of the extreme generality and vagueness of his language; a characteristic almost universally found in the advocacy of Lutheran doctrines. Certainly the very ominous absence of all allusion to those religious exercises, just mentioned as indispensable, makes it most probable that he had no very distinct impression on his mind of any such tests. At all events, the writer is necessarily involved in the following dilemma; the humble Christian who seeks in Lutheranism some refuge from doubt and misgiving, is either referred by the Bishop to a standard, which can give no peace except to the most blinded and carnal conscience, (viz. the observation of his own virtues,) or else learns from him a doctrine, which in its substance diverges not by one hair's breadth from that of Mr. Newman, which he professes to oppose; and in its expression differs only from Mr. Newman's statement, as being indefinite, confused, and perplexing, instead of precise, clear, and edifying.

It is impossible, then, to introduce any further security for holiness of life into the Lutheran scheme, than that which is included in the above statement of that scheme; ⁿ the attempt

ⁿ A position is indeed conceivable, which, as *being* conceivable, ought perhaps to be distinctly noticed; though it may safely be asserted, that it has never been *maintained* by so much as a single writer on the subject. It may be held then, without any formal inconsistency, that the knowledge of our acceptance indeed is attainable by no other means than those specified in the text; but that certainty of salvation follows *upon* that knowledge, forasmuch as God preserves from falls those who are consciously in a state of grace. This theory is no less truly different from Lutheran than from Catholic doctrine: for the former invariably considers a *knowledge* of pardon to follow immediately on the *grant* of pardon; which is inconsistent with such a theory. It may suffice to have mentioned this; or if it be worth while gravely to argue against it, we may point out how directly it is refuted by plain facts. It is refuted, not only by the very many unhappy instances, when those who have once attained this well-grounded belief of God's favour have afterwards fallen from grace, but even by cases in which, through God's infinite mercy, men have been spared this misery, but testify with one voice that they owe their safety to the very circumstance of having lived in habits of constant watchfulness and precaution; habits which have been only engendered by their deep sense that they are every moment exposed to the danger of falling from grace.

to do so destroys its very essence, and transmutes it into Catholic and Tridentine truth. The Lutheran scheme asserts, and must assert if it is to have any meaning or consistency, (once more to repeat my words,) that the pardon given under the Gospel is complete and final, involving no terms or conditions whatever; and that the trust in Christ, on which it immediately follows, is one which carries with it its own evidence, and which leads, without any special pains or effort on our part, to a holy life. And now let us endeavour to suppose it possible that this scheme shall be really and heartily embraced; and let us compare its practical results with the working of Catholic doctrine, first in the case of Christians before, and next in the case of Christians after, that they have received this alleged pardon, and are conscious of this alleged trust.

4. A religious parent, well instructed in the pure Gospel, begins at the earliest possible period to train her child in that which is to be the one great business of his life; the contending against his evil dispositions one by one, and bringing gradually every thought into subjection to the obedience of Christ. She well knows that one single humble action, performed in secret from a sense of duty and against the influence of strong temptation, is the one noblest fact in the whole world; that which most of all earthly phenomena fills angels with joy and devils with dismay: and she desires to obtain for her offspring as early as it is by any means in her power, by means of precept and example, the blessing and dignity of performing such acts. Careful and regular habits of prayer, of self-examination, of repentance, of confession, these are the really precious legacies which a parent may bequeath to her child; for they are the best, the only path to heavenly treasures. 'Not so,' says the Lutheran: 'that faith alone is true Christian faith, which leads to holiness without watchfulness or self-discipline: so long as *these* are the means whereby your child seeks his sanctification, he is a stranger to the Gospel of Christ, he is under the Law, he is under a curse.' What means are placed, according to the Lutheran system, within reach of those who are unjustified

that they may obtain so great favour, it is difficult to say. I believe it is by no means unusual for clergymen of our Church to tell their flock, directly or by implication, that they can do nothing, but remain quiet and expectant, until it shall please God to visit whom He will with His grace. Luther again and the Continental Reformers with one voice proclaimed, so at least it seems generally acknowledged, that the most abandoned sinners were as likely to receive grace, as the most moral and conscientious men living: such indeed is the only possible meaning of their repeated attacks on the Catholic doctrine of congruity. According to this view of the case, the most sedulous ‘training of a child in the way he should go’ confers upon him absolutely no benefit whatever in the way of salvation; or indeed may be even worse than useless, as interfering with the work of grace. Principles substantially such as these have been lately, I believe, in more than one case, maintained by members of dissenting communities; though the task even of specifying and reciting them seems almost a pollution.

Bishop O’Brien however implies, as I understand him,^o a very important modification of this view of the case. He appears to consider (for he is very far indeed from speaking plainly, in a case where the utmost plainness is imperatively called for) that although in all cases full, unconditional, and final pardon is given immediately upon trust in Christ, still those are perhaps the more likely to be moved by the Spirit *to* such trust, who have led sober and virtuous lives in times past. This doctrine, I admit, is entirely consistent *formally* with the Lutheran scheme, as stated above; still it is very different in *spirit*, and entirely contravenes the *arguments* on which those of his school usually insist. For if, as Lutherans commonly say, it is impossible, without ‘self-righteousness,’ to hold that works done even in the Spirit have an effect on our final destiny, how much less possible surely it must be,

^o I have not been able to light upon this passage in my subsequent reference to the Bishop’s work: but I have little doubt of having seen there some such expression as this; that whether or not abandoned sinners are *less likely to have* justifying faith, their pardon, *if* they have it, is in no one particular less final, complete, and unconditional than that of others.

consistently with humility, to believe that works have such an effect, done (as on this view such works *are* done) either by men's unaided strength, or at least before the reception of *Christian* grace! If Catholics, who believe that no one can know his real condition in God's sight as compared with that of others, still must be necessarily self-complacent because they believe that such relative conditions depend on the respective faithfulness of Christians to God's grace given; how much *more* necessarily self-complacent will Lutherans be, who *know* (so their doctrine runs), that they are in a state of justification, if they learn that the being in such a state implies a probability, that their life *before* justification was better than that of others!

However, whether or no Bp. O'Brien holds this sentiment, it is one which very easily *may* be held, and which therefore requires our consideration. It must be observed however that, so far as it goes, it is precisely the scholastic doctrine of congruity; and those who hold it, if they repudiate Tract 90, must reconcile the opinion with our Articles as best they may.^o Of course we cannot but gladly hail all approach to the true doctrine; especially on the part of those whom we would willingly honour and admire: and it is interesting to observe that this modification, how consistent soever it may be *formally* with Lutheranism, is yet greatly in advance of the doctrines universally attributed to the heresiarchs of the sixteenth century. Still, even taking this estimation of the works of the unjustified, very painful consequences cannot but follow. That the careful education of a child in principles of obedience and devotion, even in cases where the child himself most fully corresponds with the education given, and contends against the world, the flesh, and the devil, through his whole life, even in this case that such education and such cooperation will for certain lead to an escape from eternal torments, no

^o It should be observed, that a declaration, recently signed by a considerable body of our clergy, and which has attracted some attention, specifies for *reprobation*, among others, the following doctrine; viz. "that works done with divine aid in faith before justification, do dispose men to receive the grace of justification."

Lutheran can consistently allow. For it is a fact which no one, I suppose, will deny, that many persons have carried on, under God's grace, this life-long conflict, and have exhibited to those constantly in their company the surest marks of all Christian graces, of humility, patience, zeal, diligence, unworldliness, the spirit of prayer, the love of heavenly things, who yet have lived and died without that confident assurance of personal salvation, which, as we have seen, is inseparably connected with justifying faith, in the Lutheran sense of that phrase, even if it be not the very same thing.^p These then have died unjustified, and now await eternal torments. Nay, even to those in whom justification is supposed to follow, what will have been the value of their early discipline? Those habits of watchfulness and self-restraint, that sensitiveness at the very approach of evil resulting from a fear lest it tempt to sin and ruin, the germs of habits such as these it will be the very first object of a right-minded parent carefully to implant; as being the sole foundations whereon the Christian character can be reared. But under the Lutheran aspect their character is changed; no savour have they of the Gospel, no compatibility with grace. They are not rudiments of the Christian character, but rudiments of the world; useful perhaps or even necessary while the 'bondage of the law' continues, but to be changed for fearlessness and security when Gospel grace is given. Lastly, although on this view Christian faith is more *likely* to follow where the early habits have been pure, still in those (not unfrequent) instances where those receive faith whose past lives have been profligate, no detriment whatever is suffered (so says the theory) in consequence of that circumstance, nor have those, who have been saved from gross sin, in one single tittle or particular, any spiritual advantage

^p The Christian Observer must be admitted as an unexceptionable witness on *this* side of the Question. We read there, (January, 1844, p. 16,) 'Thousands of deeply penitent and humble-minded persons have lived many years, and perhaps died, in a state of deep depression, because they could not attain to that confident assurance that their sins were pardoned, *which they were told was essential to salvation*; while *murderers have gone to the gibbet exulting in strains of rapture, as though they were being carried to the stake as faithful martyrs of Jesus Christ.*'

over those who have been most deeply plunged in its pollutions. When we consider the inveterate corruption of human nature, its obdurate resistance to discipline and restraint; and on the other hand the unceasing energy, activity, and forbearance which is involved in the very idea of a good education, both on the part of the teacher and the taught; it requires very little thought to see what must be the inevitable result, in proportion as a doctrine should obtain currency, which so incalculably disparages the importance and benefits of that education.

And now let us consider the condition of those, who shall have arrived at full maturity of years under the dominion of habitual sin; but who shall have been so far visited by God's grace, as heartily to desire release from their thralldom and admission into the glorious liberty of the children of God. To such the Church at once unlocks her treasures of grace; and with Christian grace within, and the whole circle of Christian motives acting from without, the will has fully sufficient power, by means of unceasing care and discipline, to effect its emancipation, and proceed onwards on its noble course even to the end. But let us suppose, that even the modified form of Lutheran doctrine were proposed to a sinner so circumstanced; let us suppose him told that justifying faith may be given him at any moment, and that when given it assures his pardon, and is accompanied by grace which will lead him, without 'special' pains or effort, to a holy life; that if justifying faith be *not* given, no amount of prayer and self-denial can be the means of Christian salvation; lastly, that such prayer and self-denial confers this benefit and only this, that in consequence of it the gift of justifying faith may be hoped for with greater probability. Who is so mad as to doubt that the unhappy victim, with habits of evil immeasurably strengthened by indulgence, and habits of good immeasurably enfeebled by neglect; beset with passions 'craving like harpies for their accustomed indulgence;' repeatedly tempted from time to time by the idea of sin reinvested with its brightest and most alluring colours; staggering and faint perhaps at the same moment, from the weariness and arduousness of the path of

self-watchfulness and self-denial; presented with nothing which approaches to a certain promise of salvation even should he persevere, or a certain threat of condemnation should he give way; receiving as an admitted truth, that if even on his death-bed he can work himself into an assurance of salvation, his salvation *is* assured; who is so mad as to doubt that this unhappy man will be paralyzed and crippled in all his exertions by this hateful spell, that he will become an easy prey to Satan, and return to the vomit he had left? And if this be so under the most favourable form of Lutheranism, how much more will the same result follow if the ordinary doctrine be inculcated; if he be told, that this prayer and self-denial are literally of no advantage whatever in bringing him nearer to Christ, or into the way of eternal salvation!

Such will be the effects of this doctrine on those whom it considers not yet justified. What will it be on those whom it considers justified?

No one can be more fully aware than myself, of the complete unreality both of that part of the discussion just concluded, and of that now about to commence: it proceeds upon an hypothesis, (an hypothesis, blessed be God, wholly chimerical,) that it is possible for the abstract doctrine now in question to be really and heartily embraced by the human mind, and to proceed unimpeded to its legitimate effects. The present then is a task similar to that of the mathematician, who calculates the velocity of a projectile, without taking into account the resistance of the air. That calculation is wholly theoretical, yet is an absolutely essential preliminary to the discovery of results the most practical: and in like manner the present inquiry must of necessity be first carried through, in order that we may be prepared for that subject which will come next in order; the consideration namely of the results which follow from this principle, not imagined hypothetically as an isolated motive, but viewed as connected with, and restrained by, those other motives which must always be found, in varying degrees, in its company, the desire of obeying conscience, the religious instinct, the sense of justice, deference to public opinion, social feeling, and the like.

This too will be a fit place for introducing an explanation, which it is very necessary to introduce. In objecting to the position that justifying faith carries with it its own evidence, it is not for one moment intended to deny, that there *are* truths which carry with them their own evidence. Nothing indeed could be more preposterous than such a denial; for as all reasoning proceeds from truths known to truths unknown, unless there were truths known previously to all reasoning, the reasoning faculty itself could have no materials whereon to exercise its functions: there would be no premises, and therefore no conclusions. I am myself indeed deeply convinced, that the highest and most precious truths which can possess the mind may be received by the religious Christian on the strongest and most certain grounds of proof, with no support whatever from induction, or ratiocination, or any other form of external argument. But we have a right to require that nothing shall be proposed for our acceptance on such grounds as these, unless at the same time practical rules are given, to discern truth from falsehood, to place the dictates of conscience in strong and unmistakable contrast over against the capricious suggestions of impulse or imagination. In the present instance it is a fact acknowledged on all hands, that many, who professed a full assurance of salvation, have lived lives of open and unblushing profligacy; there is no one duty then more peremptorily incumbent on 'evangelicals,' than the laying down some test whereby this spurious faith shall be distinguished from the Gospel virtue. Till this duty is performed, that very feeling of security from fear of punishment, which is their great boast, has no more warrant than a madman's dream; and yet there is no one duty (and this is saying a great deal) in which they have so signally failed. It is of course no matter of blame to any one, that he has failed in doing that which is in itself impracticable; but until they either find it practicable, or else abandon their theory, we possess the most undeniable right of imputing to them the position, that all persons who confidently and without doubt expect eternal salvation, are warranted in expecting it, and will certainly

obtain it. In this shape however their system, I suppose, will find but few supporters.

This advantage, however, though most certainly legitimate, I am content to waive ; I am content, for argument's sake, to admit that it is possible to allow assurance to ordinary believers, without countenancing the self-deceit of profligate fanatics ; I am content, for argument's sake, to admit that there is some distinct principle, called faith, which may be recognised by its own evidence, and which warrants assurance of salvation. It remains for them to defend the other part of their statement ; that this principle leads, without special pains or effort on their part, to as much holiness as the Gospel requires. They will not deny, indeed strangely enough they accuse Catholics of denying, that ' the infection of nature doth remain, yea, even in the regenerate ;' that even justified Christians have from time to time, nay frequently, a very inadequate perception of spiritual things ; and that their evil propensities are innumerable and most unceasingly active. Let us now therefore fix our ideas, by imagining the statement in question carried out in a particular case and in actual life.

A believer, fully possessed by this doctrine, and considering himself endued with this principle of so-called ' faith,' wakes in the morning, his thoughts running on some interesting event of the previous day, a missionary meeting or a charity sermon ; he finds himself altogether disinclined to remove his mind from such interesting topics, and to fix it wholly on God in prayer or meditation. ' He will mourn over this new proof of the strength of the flesh and weakness of the spirit,' he will ' wish earnestly that he were more intent upon things of the spirit ;'^a but he will be in no way bound to resist by an effort his predominant inclination, for that would be one of those very acts of self-denial, as has been fully shewn, which on Lutheran principles are not required under the Gospel. Unprotected then by that atmosphere of good, with which the Christian's morning devotions well performed encompass him, he goes forth to his

^a ' On Heurtley's Sermons,' p. 438.

daily duties. He is tempted to exceed in eating or drinking; sometimes indeed or often it happens, (let us grant it,) that his love of God makes him fully realise the baseness of these gross temptations; but there are other moments (as our adversaries themselves must grant) in which his spiritual emotions are not so lively, and the temptation becomes real: *when* it becomes real, on these principles he is under no obligation to resist it. His temper naturally is not happy; though when his affections are enkindled by the thought of God's mercy, its influence is hardly felt. Again, there may be many moments in which its influence *is* felt, but in which he *also* feels an inclination to pray against its dominion; this inclination is a proof of the spiritual mind, and should be indulged. But if he feels his temper seriously tried, while he feels *no* accompanying inclination to resort for his protection to the spiritual weapons of prayer and self-restraint, it is no part of his duty to do so, or to adopt any other means of striving against his natural infirmity. It is unnecessary to proceed farther with the picture; it will be sufficiently seen, that unless in very extraordinary cases, nothing less than open and unblushing profligacy would *necessarily* flow, from the consistent adoption of this doctrine.

On the other hand, the Catholic-minded Christian has learned such lessons as the following :

‘Self-denial of some kind or other is involved, as is evident, in the very notion of renewal and holy obedience. To change our hearts is to learn to love things which we do not naturally love—to unlearn the love of this world; but this involves of course a thwarting of our natural wishes and tastes. To be righteous and obedient, implies self-command; but to possess power we must have gained it; nor can we gain it without a vigorous struggle, a *persevering warfare* against ourselves.’

He believes that to cease from his daily and hourly opposition to present inclination, would be very soon to fall from grace; he exercises himself in such opposition, as the one warrant for his hope of salvation. Such an one disclaims

then from his very innermost heart the possession of any such principle, as will lead him without 'special' pains or effort to a holy life; he disclaims, that is, the possession of that which alone, on Lutheran grounds, is justifying faith: and he must be regarded by the consistent 'Evangelical' as alien to the Gospel covenant. In what single particular then did I overstep the truth, (though I have been accused of 'calumnious misrepresentation,') when I made the following statement? 'That obedience to the will of God, with whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful; that sin is the one only danger to be dreaded, the one only evil to be avoided; these great truths are the very foundation of natural religion: but 'this modern system denies these to be *essential* and *necessary* truths, yea, counts it the chief glory of the Gospel that under it they are no longer truths.'" Is it not as plain as day that such a Christian as I last supposed, though he should have 'obeyed the will of God' with the *greatest* 'sacrifice of self;' though he should have, by God's grace, made almost incredible progress in the subjugation of pride, indolence, uncharitableness, and the whole circle of vices; though he should be most frequent and earnest in prayer, living in the thought of God, abounding in love to man; still if he believe his own salvation insecure, is, according to the views, termed as if in mockery 'evangelical,' no justified Christian at all? What then can be more certain than that, if those views were true, confidence in our salvation would be a 'thing' more 'needful' than holy 'obedience,' and an alarmed conscience a 'danger' more to be 'dreaded' than wilful 'sin'?

The Bishop of Ossory has introduced a very important modification into the Lutheran doctrine, which I may quote in his own words.

"Besides those differences in the future happiness of moral agents, which naturally results from the difference of their moral state, we have good reasons to look for distinctions in their condition hereafter, depending also on these moral differences; not, however, like the former, resulting naturally from them, but *from a direct appointment grounded on them.*"

* Bp. of Ossory's Charge, p. 190.

† 'On St. Athanasius,' p. 390.

It will be felt by most that this is far from akin to the general spirit of that doctrine ; and he frankly says, that although it is ‘clearly taught in God’s word,’ ‘it is likely to startle and offend many real Christians.’ (p. 408.) On the other hand, it must be admitted to be in statement perfectly consistent ; and I have so worded what I have said, as most fully to include this modification in all my remarks.

It is much to be observed, that it is only in opposing our predominant inclination, that the sense of *duty* can possibly be called into practical exercise. Acts which flow spontaneously from present impulse, may be most fully *sanctioned* by the conscience ; but it is unmeaning to speak of them as *caused* by it, or as tending to strengthen and cultivate its influence. The orthodox believer makes this sense of duty the one prominent subject of his care ; it is the one faculty which is visited by Divine grace, and which, under that grace, leads him onward to salvation. Hence the extreme advantage, in many cases, of *voluntary* self-denial, as a means of giving practice and strength to that habit, which it is of such essential importance that we preserve in full vigour and activity. But from what has been just said, it is plain that according to the abstract Lutheran doctrine, even with the addition of Dr. O’Brien’s supplement, a Christian may be fully assured of salvation, who has not the slightest intention of ever resisting the decided bias of the moment, and therefore of so much as calling this faculty into distinct and conscious existence.†

† I should be sorry to omit so justly and forcibly expressed a passage as the following, which is found in Dr. O’Brien’s work ; how utterly alien in spirit from any part e. g. of Luther’s Commentary on the Galatians ! “The unheeded events of every day and every hour are doing something to form for eternity the character of every human being, calling into exercise some moral principle, developing some propensity, renewing *that strife between conscience and passion*, which tends to the advancement or degradation of our moral nature, according to its conduct and its issue, strengthening some vice or confirming some virtue. What hour in fact of our waking existence, carefully reviewed, even by ourselves, at its close, would not be seen to have brought with it some intelligible demand upon temperance or fortitude, or self-denial ; upon forbearance, or benevolence, or active exertion ; upon zeal for God, or love for man ? And as these claims are answered or not, as conscience and that Spirit who strives with our spirit prevail over evil dispositions and indolence or yield to them, are we not plainly advancing or retrograding in the moral course in which we are treading ; and in

Again, the orthodox believer, as knowing that at any moment he may be called on to thwart and oppose his prevailing inclination under a sense of duty, even in the moments of greatest relaxation preserves his feelings and affections in a real, however latent, subordination to his conscience, and thus preserves his conscience itself in subordination to God. This is that virtue of watchfulness, held in so peculiar value by all who really embrace Catholic doctrine. There is probably no grace, which in its highest earthly perfection is so distinguishingly characteristic of the saintly mind, and which in its various degrees may be taken as so fair a measure of the degree of our Christian advancement; for none other is called into such habitual, such unceasing practice. The consciousness too of its growth within us, is the most comfortable assurance we can possibly have in regard to our future prospects. *This grace can have no place whatever under the Gospel, according to any consistent form of Lutheranism.* Its very existence implies that we have long realised a most serious danger of our falling from God; the very consciousness of our justification, upon the Lutheran theory, implies that we have held from the very beginning of our Christian course, as a matter of divine faith, that there is no such danger. To contend with vigour at special seasons against evil inclinations, with the hope of increasing our heavenly reward, this Dr. O'Brien's principles will fully sanction; but to watch at *all* seasons against the danger of falling away, is a virtue which can be practised by none, except by those who from their heart repudiate the heresy of personal assurance.

5. In proceeding to the practical inferences which follow from this theory, to the consideration of the moral effects produced by Lutheran doctrine as actually witnessed, it is necessary to guard at the outset against two opposite misapprehensions. On the one side it has been supposed, that those who gladly acknowledge the very great piety and seriousness of character, which have been frequently seen in 'Evangelicals,' confess thereby that there is nothing very deeply pernicious in Lutheran

either event *filled for some station* in the world that we are hereafter to inhabit, for the society with which we shall dwell for ever?" p. 231.

doctrine; on the other hand it has been thought, that this whole method of judging doctrines by reference to their practical effects, implies that one sits in judgment, as if from some vantage ground, on one's fellow-men, and professes to dispense praise and blame to each according to his several deserts. The following extracts from the *British Critic* will, I trust, sufficiently clear up the latter misapprehension; and they will include also some incidental allusion to the former.

'In our own age and country it is perhaps hardly too much to say, that the greater part of high-minded and sensitive, if at the same time strictly conscientious, men, will hardly find their rest in any existing school of opinion, or religious system, or accurately expressed theory. Our supposed learner then will be even compelled to the conclusion, that he can regard no single channel as the one appointed medium, through which God shall convey light to his soul; he must look for that light as transmitted to him partly from one quarter, partly from another, refracted, as it were, in its course by the various exhibitions of morality which surround him on all sides. And yet in how different a spirit will his search be carried on, from that eclectic method, which is to religion in general what Protestantism is to Christianity in particular! For let us compare, in imagination, the process adopted by disciples of these respective systems. The one makes the reasoning faculty the single arbiter to which all the remaining powers of the mind must be content to minister, the other makes conscience such. *The one regards his fellow-men as witnesses to be called into court, and questioned at his own bidding: the other thinks of them as his teachers, and in some sense his superiors; as commissioned by God, each after his measure, to build him up in the entire truth.*'^u

'But what then? because we cannot have all, shall we have nothing? . . . Because [our] Church does not teach with distinctness and authority, shall we take refuge in that strange modern doctrine of 'private judgment on the text of Scripture'? Surely it would be as unwise as it is undutiful to do so. True the Holy Ghost speaks not to us now articulately through the Church to which we belong, but does He not speak to us through the holy men around us, whom he inhabits? True, there is much profession

^u 'On Goode,' p. 42.

without reality, much self-deceit, much inconsistency; still has not our Lord Himself said, 'by their fruits ye shall know them,' and may not the inquirer, who is really in earnest, find on all sides *proofs* of holiness not to be mistaken; self-denial, purity, humility, zeal? Let this then be our protection against idiosyncrasy, self-complacency, or a low and disproportionate standard; let us, under circumstances, make to ourselves *in heart* a Catholic Church; let us cling anxiously to the marks of the Holy Ghost wherever we can find them. True it is that we shall find among religious men much essential difference of *statement*, much estrangement and mutual suspicion; but the more gratifying will prove the task of tracing, as best we may, the *principle* of goodness in its different stages, through all this variety of external dress.

This then is the point to which for some time past our argument has been tending; 'the only way,' says Mr. Newman, 'in which the members of our Church, so widely differing at this time, can be brought together in one, is by a turning of heart to one another: till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.' No mathematical axiom is more certain than this moral one, that where the fruits of holiness shew themselves, there is the Holy Ghost, and there is really [so far as it goes] *true doctrine*; for the doctrine which supports men's spiritual life, the principle *on which* they live, may very easily be true, while the language in which they have learnt to clothe it, may be almost to any extent erroneous and dangerous. We do not wish to extenuate the evil arising from *profession* of false doctrines; it must to a certain extent, in some more in others less, vitiate the *principle* itself within them: and of this we are well-convinced, that in proportion as we correct, enlarge, strengthen our own moral feelings by this affectionate throwing of ourselves on the thought and example of holy men, and in proportion as our obedience keeps pace with our convictions, we shall learn to appreciate the [superiority even in kind of the] holiness which has ever on the whole accompanied the *profession* and *explicit belief* of Catholic doctrine; we shall fall back upon Catholic tradition as feeling it the correlative of our nature; and shall be rescued from the delusive and heretical sophisms of the Protestant schools.'^x

^x 'On Arnold's Sermons,' pp. 334, 5.

In the present profoundly disturbed and unsettled state of theological sentiment, no one who has not the happiness of resting with secure and undoubting confidence in some safe harbour, will allow himself wilfully to shut his eyes to any exhibition of virtue and self-denial, from whatever quarter it may present itself; by so doing, he incurs serious danger of losing hold of that thread, which can alone guide him safely through the bewildering labyrinth of opinion which surrounds us. But in proportion as he learns the opposite habit, as he familiarizes himself with the reverent observation of religiousness and conscientiousness in all their different shapes, he will go on more and more to discern the lineaments of the full Catholic character. He need not look beyond our own Church to find models of that character, which will still further assist him in the study; and the contemplation of them will enable him to appreciate still more adequately the same features of mind, as witnessed in their highest earthly perfection by the Saints of the Church. He will more and more understand that that character is, even in its early rudiments, one, distinct, unmistakeable; as truly and pointedly differing from the Christian character conceived by religious Protestants, as that in turn differs from the Socinian or Mahometan.

Having so far guarded myself against misconception, I will relieve my own feelings by saying plainly, as I have said in print more than once before, that though I feel bound at all fitting occasions and in all fitting ways to protest heart and soul against the 'Evangelical' system, I fully recognise many who have at various times professed that system, as so exceedingly my own superiors that the very notion of even a comparison is most painful. Who indeed can so much as mention the names of Cecil, or Scott, or Martyn, without adding from his heart expressions of honour and reverence? but I allude not only to such unusual specimens as these, but to great numbers of admirable men, who, especially at the latter end of the last century and the beginning of this, followed in their train. 'Earnest persons naturally, nay, rightly, embrace that form of opinions, which they find in

their own time to be coexistent with earnestness; and in proportion as the voice of their conscience is brought into distinctness, in the most heretical propositions *they* will see and realise great and Christian truths.* They learn to say that we are justified by faith without inherent righteousness; they mean only that holy men rest their hopes of salvation, in no way on the *thought* of such inherent righteousness, but solely and indivisibly on the merits of their Lord. They learn to say that the justified have assurance of salvation; they mean only to express, as Catholics would express, their humble yet hearty confidence, that 'He who has begun a good work in them will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ,' provided only that they remain (as, by His help, they fully *purpose* to remain) faithful to His grace, watchful against the approach of sin, diligent in the practice of virtue. Thus their conscience, and religious instinct, and holy obedience, neutralize their heretical creed: and the evil which accrues to them from that creed is of a negative not a positive nature. Still very serious evil there most certainly is; for, unless a Christian has either himself intellectually embraced the whole Catholic doctrine, or else lives under a system which is informed and animated by that doctrine, he cannot enjoy the benefit of those various methods of religious culture and discipline, which are indispensably necessary for the formation, even in its very elements, of the true Catholic character. Nay, even so much of excellence and devotedness as I have fully acknowledged to exist in many 'Evangelicals,' will perhaps rarely be found, unless in cases where God by painful visitations, mercifully, however imperfectly, supplies the absence of those salutary correctives furnished by the Church. Have not all the great lights of 'Evangelicalism' been sorely oppressed either by sorrow, or bodily pain, or contempt and persecution? or if by none of these, then by such hardships as necessarily attend the missionary life? a life which, though its original choice was voluntary and most highly admirable and honourable, yet *when* chosen hardly admits of retreat, and furnishes one continued discipline to the Christian who has had grace to follow so high a calling.

* 'On Heurtley's Four Sermons,' p. 446.

And now, to pass by a sudden transition from the highest to the lowest specimens of those professing 'Evangelical' principles, it must not surely be forgotten, that from the invention of those principles to the present day there have always been some among their professors, who (I do not say have carried these principles to their full and true results; the basest of mankind could not bring themselves to *that*; but) have united a confident assurance of salvation with open and undeniable habits of profligacy and depravity. We see this in the abandoned Anabaptists contemporary with Luther, and among some English fanatics contemporary with Charles I.; nay, I fear, from what more than one clergyman has said, there can be no fair room for doubt, that the same exists in a considerable degree among various classes of dissenters at the present time. It is very well to say that this is a corruption or perversion of Luther's system: but he himself deduced a sanction for polygamy from that system: and for the reasons already given, I can only look on these disorders as the natural, direct, and even mitigated consequences of that doctrine, which some have dared to call the 'articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ.'

It is most fully acknowledged, however, that no members of our Church are implicated in such extreme results. Both the habits of education and the force of public opinion so far enlighten their conscience, that they would recoil from open wickedness, and instantly renounce any such principle as appeared to them to involve it. Again, regular habits of morning and evening prayer are, I suppose, universally considered essential; though I have never happened to meet in their books with any very urgent practical advice on the extreme difficulty, and yet the indispensable importance, of keeping our mind, at times of prayer, really fixed on the occupation. And at all events, when we consider the profound subtlety of Satan and the complicated deceitfulness of the human heart, we shall expect to find that those, who lay no prominent stress on the duty of self-examination and of hearty unremitting warfare against their old nature, remain subject to sins of a more secret character, without being even visited by any suspicion of their own captivity; much more without

making any vigorous and successful struggles for liberty. This I believe to be the case with multitudes; and in very many instances to an extent wholly inconsistent with Christian acceptance, or, as we say technically, to an extent involving *mortal* sin. A very few examples will make clearer the sort of sins which this statement contemplates.

Undue reliance on wealth in those possessed of it. The Bible statements on this subject, if we would fairly listen to them, would surely lead us to imagine, that all professing any reverence for Scripture, who either enjoy or expect wealth, would be filled with misgivings and dismay. Under this feeling, holy men at various times, from an earnest desire of salvation, have 'given all that they have to the poor and followed' Christ, as fearing lest to possess earthly wealth, might dim their perception of the preciousness of the true riches. Now surely such persons as experience these misgivings, this dismay, even if they do not feel called, or have not the heart, to follow these high examples, will deeply reverence them, and endeavour, at least at humble distance, to profit by their lessons. But 'Evangelicals' of the present day seem unable even to conceive any motive for such sacrifices, except a desire of 'purchasing heaven.' A remarkable witness truly against themselves! a witness, that declarations, perhaps the most emphatic that are to be found in all Scripture, and uttered by our Lord Himself, awaken no responsive chord whatever in their own minds. And I believe it is very far indeed from an imaginary apprehension, to feel deeply alarmed lest there be many Christians, who would treat as a suggestion of Satan a passing doubt on the certainty of their own salvation; and who yet allow themselves to take pleasure in the thought of their own wealth, of their power to satisfy their own desires, and to exercise an influence over others; and to rest for support on this pleasure; in a degree totally inconsistent with that lively sense of dependence on God and on the merits of Christ, which are peremptorily required for salvation.

A kindred temptation, addressed to a much larger class, is that which leads to an idolatrous reverence of wealth, or again

rank and station, possessed by others. I willingly take the present opportunity of expressing a very confident opinion, that the unhappy relations, established three centuries ago between Church and State, have had a most miserable influence in fostering this sin; for the effect of those relations extends far more widely than might be supposed, and most materially affects the respective position of squire and clergyman in almost every parish in the land. However this may be, it is very much indeed more difficult to prevent ourselves from being dazzled and carried away by rank and station than might have been supposed; insomuch that he who is not conscious of the difficulty, gives great ground for fearing that he is very deeply plunged in the sin. To feel as much abhorrence for the callous selfishness and insensibility of the rich as for the peevishness, querulousness, and discontent of the poor; for the luxurious self-indulgence of the one as for the more coarse and brutal sensuality of the other; for indolent and slothful waste of time and talents in the former as for confirmed laziness in the latter; this is an achievement which few of us perhaps (even though knowing the importance of the object) have at all adequately reached. I am not speaking of our outward demeanour; which ought of course to differ according to the difference of ranks in those whom we address: but of inward sentiment in regard to matters of plain right and wrong. And very few have any idea, until they have thought of the subject, to how wonderful an extent their judgments in such matters are distorted, by the presence or absence of worldly and adventitious advantages. Unless we are most carefully on our guard, there is the most serious danger lest the habit of courting the favour or notice of such persons, if we happen to depend on them or to be thrown near them, may be carried to an extent, quite irreconcilable with the habit of making eternal salvation our principal object; in other words, quite irreconcilable, unless repented of, with the hope of that salvation. 'Evangelicals' have been very frequently accused of courtliness and low adulation; and à priori there can be little doubt, unless there be far more habitual self-discipline than I see at all enforced in

their writings, that they will in many cases not think of struggling against the temptation, and so will forfeit grace.^v

From the same cause other sinful habits also, habits of censoriousness and uncharitable judgment, of pride, of envy, of discontent, of covetousness, and the rest, exist, it is to be feared, in several cases to such a degree as wholly to banish the presence of the Holy Spirit; and in very many most seriously to obstruct His gracious influence; and that, among those who conceal both from themselves and others the wickedness of their heart, by a fluent use of Scripture language, and self-complacent eulogies on their sense of their own sinfulness. Indeed it is a most startling consideration, and one which should surely alarm many who expect most confidently their own certain salvation, that no one, I suppose, embraces 'Evangelical' opinions, who does not hold *his own* salvation to be secure. Now when 'Evangelicals' come to make up so large a class as at the present time, it really demands the most anxious thought, in those who remember the Scripture declarations on the 'strait gate,' how they can safely stake their eternal interests on such a doctrine; a doctrine, which would seem to represent the really serious as bearing so ominously large a proportion to the worldly and irreligious.

II. It is an eternal and irreversible truth of natural religion, that beings whose will is not as yet wholly subordinate to the rule of right and the will of God, have this one paramount duty imposed on them before all other duties, viz. to exercise themselves in obedience to the voice of conscience, by unceasing efforts to reduce their will into a fuller and more complete subjection. The form which this eternal truth assumes under the pure Gospel, is very much as follows. Converts to Christianity, at their Baptism, by faith are jus-

^v The subject only leads me to speak in the text of 'Evangelicals;' but believing as I do that the safeguard, given by the pure Gospel against this habit of sycophancy, is a reverence for the *spiritual* power as such, I fully think that all classes of Christians will, as classes, be greatly infected with this sin, who are not altogether indignant and dissatisfied with the present relations of Church and State: nor will individuals of those classes commonly escape from the infection, except by means of anxious watchfulness directed to this special purpose. The history of our Reformed Church may be confidently appealed to, as bearing out this remark.

tified ; by faith receive pardon for their past sins ; by faith are endued with a most precious inward gift, and are brought into new relations, into a new sphere of unseen agencies. Then begins a new course of solemn trial and conflict, far more solemn indeed than any they can have hitherto known ; a trial which so closely concerns them, that on their behaviour during its progress depends nothing less than their everlasting destiny : and that trial is no other than this, how carefully and watchfully they shall retain that faith which now is theirs, and to how great an extent, by following zealously their sense of duty, they shall engraft on it the habit of love. And whereas, although nothing can be more distinct than the conscience's *claim* to obedience, few things are more feeble than its power of *enforcing* it ; whereas its very voice is instantaneously overwhelmed by the impetuous irruption of present impulses and inclinations ; and whereas the resistance of corrupt human nature to that discipline and restraint, which is indispensably requisite for the continual improvement required of us, is most unceasing, energetic, and obdurate ; the Gospel directs its most powerful motives, collected as it were from all quarters, to the strengthening of this one faculty, which is so peculiarly in need of strength.

And if I begin by mentioning, as among the principal of these motives, the fear of punishment, let it not be supposed, as it is often supposed, that lovers of Ancient Truth have low and carnal notions of the desirableness, for its own sake, of a religious life, or the spontaneous hatred of sin as such, which good men feel. Such passages as the following would shew sufficiently how groundless is this imputation.

‘ This excellence and desirableness of God’s gifts is a subject again and again set before us in Holy Scripture. Thus the Prophet Isaiah speaks of the “ feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees ; of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined.”^z And again, under images of another kind : “ He hath sent Me . . . to give . . . beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they may be called Trees of Righteousness.”^a Or again, the Prophet Hosea : “ I will be as the dew unto Israel : he shall grow as the lily, and cast forth his

^z Isaiah xxv. 6.

^a Isaiah lxi. 1—3.

roots as Lebanon. His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive-tree, and his smell as Lebanon. They that dwell under his shadow shall return; they shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine; the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon.”^b And the Psalmist: “O that My people would have hearkened unto Me . . . the haters of the Lord should have been found liars, but their time should have endured for ever. He should have fed them also with the finest wheat flour, and with honey out of the stony rock should I have satisfied thee.”^c You see all images of what is pleasant and sweet in nature are brought together to describe the *pleasantness and sweetness of the gifts which God gives us in grace*. As wine enlivens, and bread strengthens, and oil is rich, and honey is sweet, and flowers are odorous, and dew is refreshing, and foliage is beautiful; so, and much more, are God’s gifts in the Gospel enlivening, and strengthening, and rich, and sweet, and fragrant, and refreshing, and excellent. And as it is natural to feel satisfaction and comfort in these gifts of the visible world, so *it is but natural and necessary to be delighted and transported* with the gifts of the world invisible; and as the visible gifts are objects of desire and search, so much more is it, I do not merely say a duty, but a privilege and blessedness to “taste and see how gracious the Lord is.” . . .

‘I wish it were possible, my brethren, to lead men to greater holiness and more faithful obedience by setting before them the high and abundant joys which they have who serve God: “In His presence is fulness of joy,” “the well of life;” and they are satisfied with “the plenteousness of His house,” and “drink of His pleasures as out of a river;” but this is, I know, just what most persons will not believe . . . Alas! this is the very thing I lament,—that God’s service is not pleasant to you. It is not pleasant to those who do not like it: true; but it *is* pleasant to those who *do*. Observe, this is what I say; not that it is pleasant to those who like it not, but that it is pleasant to those who like it. Nay, what I say is, that *it is much more pleasant to those who like it, than any thing of this world is pleasant to those who do not like it*. This is the point. I do not say that it is pleasant to most men; but I say that *it is in itself the most pleasant thing in the world*. Nothing is so pleasant as God’s service to those *to whom* it is pleasant. The pleasures of sin are not to be compared in fulness and intensity to the pleasures of holy living. The pleasures of

^b Hos. xiv. 5—7.

^c Ps. lxxxix. 13—16.

holiness are far more pleasant to the holy, than the pleasures of sin to the sinner. O that I could get you to believe this! O that you had a heart to feel it and know it! O that you had a heart to taste God's pleasures and to make proof of them; to taste and see how gracious the Lord is! . . .

'Till our eyes are opened spiritually, we shall ever think religion distasteful and unpleasant, and shall wonder how any one can like it. Such is our miserable state,—we are blind to the highest and truest glories, and dead to the most lively and wonderful of all pleasures;—and no one can describe them to us. None other than God the Holy Spirit can help us in this matter, by enlightening and changing our hearts. So it is; and yet I will say one thing, by way of suggesting to you *how great and piercing the joys of religion are.*' And so the writer proceeds.^d

Those who cordially acquiesce in these sentiments cannot be accused, with any fairness, of disregarding or undervaluing the indescribable peace of mind and joy in believing, which are the portion of an earnest Christian; nor would I deny for a moment that sinners even at the first moment of their turning honestly to God, much more children who have never altogether abandoned Him, are allowed a precious foretaste of that heavenly gift. That which I professed lately to establish, by an appeal to every-day experience, is not the contradictory of this, but a very different proposition; viz. that this foretaste is not such, that a Christian can in any way depend on it as a sufficient preservative against even the most flagrant and permanent apostacy from God. The real habit of love, the habit whereby, from the mere appreciation of holiness and hatred of sin, we mortify the deeds of the flesh, this can only be genuinely engrafted on a keenly sensitive conscience; this is increased in strength and enlarged in range, only in proportion as watchfulness and self-denial have wrought their perfect work. How is it possible, indeed, for heavenly peace and love really to exist within the mind, except, so far as carnal thoughts and affections are rooted out; thoughts which, from their radical contrariety, cannot but disturb that peace and stifle that love? Any professed feeling of religious rapture, which grows not on this foundation,

^d Plain Sermons, vol. v. pp. 124—127.

and which is fostered without assistance from these means, is no holy enthusiasm, but a Satanical illusion; such as have often shewn plainly their real family and parentage, by gliding almost imperceptibly into breaches of the seventh commandment.^e The question then is, what motive is divinely vouchsafed, to help the tottering sense of duty in the arduous task of *creating*, under God's grace, this sensitiveness of conscience; in giving the believer that deep conviction, which *can* result only from personal experience, how revolting and self-contradictory is the very idea of a religious life, divorced from this watchful and minute obedience! Hope of heavenly reward, love of heavenly good, these become in due time most powerful and efficacious instruments in the hands of God; but, as is evident at once, they presuppose the existence, in some considerable measure, of spiritual desires and affections. What is it which is to give strength and courage to the will, in those early stages of the conflict with our old nature, which are a previous and necessary condition for the *growth* of such desires? While our tastes and likings are still so preponderatingly carnal, and while the temptations which assail us are carnal, must not the motive which defends us be addressed to our carnal nature also? No one surely can ever experience Christian love, who has not begun with godly fear.

How strange then and unreal appears a sentiment of Bp. O'Brien, that the efficacy of fear as a motive has been much exaggerated by Catholics! Take the case (which has been the lot perhaps of most religious men among ourselves) of one who turns to God, after having rebelled against Him by habitual worldliness, even if not by gross sin. When the first fervour of his conversion has subsided, and the first disgust at past sinfulness has become far less intense, how feeble, uncertain, fluctuating are his religious affections! how powerful, restless, importunate his sinful temptations! By what means, short of a miracle, could Almighty God support him in his course and save him from a relapse into his forsaken pollutions, unless by placing strongly before his mind

^e See on this most important matter, Mr. Newman's 'Sermons on Subjects of the day,' pp. 135, 6.

the fears of wrath to come? a motive surely this, which in power and importunity is alone fitted to carry on an active conflict against the enemies of his salvation.

Nor, again, can there be in the whole world a more pernicious, a more fundamental error, than to suppose that that careful obedience to God in the details of daily life, of which I have so often spoken, and which so peculiarly distinguishes the Catholic from all Protestant exhibitions of Christianity, that this habit is, at best, but necessary for us here below, through the frailty and instability of our nature. So far from this, it is the very blessedness of Saints and Angels, that their will, at every moment of their existence, is wholly and unreservedly in submission to the will of God. This feature of the Catholic character is merely a conformity with the first principles of natural religion and morality; to disparage it, is to blaspheme against those eternal and immutable principles. It is not that Catholics consider this feature essential, because they believe that a strict judgment is to come; but on the contrary God has revealed a strict judgment to come, that our frail nature may be supported in its efforts to attain what conscience proclaims as essential. These efforts do not become a duty, because God has ordered us to fear; but God has ordered us to fear, because these efforts are in themselves a duty. Since, then, God could not possibly (unless again by a miracle) imprint this feature on the mind of beings constituted like ourselves, except through this motive of fear, it is not that he who is influenced by this motive is below *Christianity*, but that he who is *not* influenced by it (no special revelation supposed) is below even *natural religion*.

An orthodox Church then, in her anxiety to rescue her children from the dominion of Satan, dares not to omit any one part of man's complicated nature; but addresses her urgent appeals, derived from every quarter, to their hearts and consciences. Nor does this particular motive of fear lose its importance, even when great attainments have been made in the Christian life, and hope and love have become very powerful incentives to holy obedience. In one sense, indeed, fear becomes continually more intense and absorbing; for

there is no surer mark of growth in grace, than that the thought of Judgment to come is more constantly and unremittingly present to the mind. And though it be true, that in ordinary Christians that thought issues rather in reverence and wary caution than in any transports of alarm, it is also true that, in the case of several Saints, it has been one especial trouble allowed for their purification, that to the very end of their earthly life they have been visited from time to time by violent accesses of fear, nay, by temptations to absolute despair; fears and temptations, which have arisen from their power of more clearly perceiving their own miserable sinfulness, and the infinite holiness of their Judge.

And this will be a fit place to notice distinctly an objection that may be made; though an answer to it has been implied in what goes before. It may be asked, if the absolute necessity of this habit of watchfulness be a truth of natural religion, why will not the natural conscience, without help from this lower motive, discern it to be such, and take measures for its acquirement? The answer involved in our previous statement is two-fold: first, that conscience is, from its great feebleness, unable, unless supported by some strong external motive, to instigate the whole man even to so much as a gradual, however distant, approximation towards a model which it may think desirable; and secondly, that natural conscience in its rudimental state, previously to moral cultivation and spiritual enlightenment, will *not* perceive this particular model to *be* desirable; conscience, I say, will not perceive it to be desirable, until so much experience has been obtained of its real nature, as *cannot* be attained without the continuous and prolonged agency of this motive of fear. This will elucidate a statement, made a few pages back, that on any consistent modification of the abstract Lutheran doctrine, the virtue of watchfulness could have no place under the Gospel. For it is not implied in this statement nor is it true, that *when this habit of watchfulness has been once acquired*, it may not be conceivably retained without further support from that lower motive; from the intrinsic power possessed by it in common with all habits, and from the perception, now fully possessed, of its intrinsic excellence, of its

indispensable necessity as a constituent of true holiness. Very few Christians, of course, to the last, could be safely delivered from the influence of fear, and who they are, God only can know; but it was incumbent to make this explanation, because, as if in contrast with the Saints lately mentioned, there have been other Saints on record, to whom God has vouchsafed, before their death, a revelation of their final acceptance. St. Paul has often enough been quoted as one of their number; who, though at an early period he 'counted himself not to have apprehended' and made strenuous efforts 'lest he should be reprobate,' shortly before his death rejoices in the thought that 'he has fought the good fight and finished his course,' and in the prospect 'henceforth is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.'

The last few pages must not be considered a digression from the immediate subject; for they have been quite necessary, that we may the more distinctly understand the unfavourable influence exercised by Lutheran doctrine on the moral character of its professors. And whereas the first allegation made was, that 'Evangelicals' remain under the dominion, very frequently of even mortal sins, without suspecting their bondage; so the second shall be, that even when aware of the sinful tendencies which possess them, they continually remain tranquil and secure in mind, without making any really serious effort to overcome them. Of course the same exception must be made as before; they are so far unfaithful to their own theory, that they will usually make strenuous exertions, rather than give way to open and undeniable sins of the flesh: nor is it extravagant to say, that it is really fortunate for an 'Evangelical' should he, from circumstances, have serious difficulty in overcoming such temptations; for it familiarizes him with the idea of conflict, and insensibly moulds his character into a more Christian shape. But as to other sins, such as envy, sloth, discontent, passionateness, and the like, there is every reason to believe, that an upholder of this principle will often confess to himself that they have command over his mind in no ordinary degree; and that after a lapse of time the same confession will be repeated; and yet, though he does not even

fancy himself to have made any real or serious attempt in the interval, by God's help, to subdue them, he will experience no deep repentance in that no such attempt has been made, but rather a certain confident self-complacency ; as though the mere consciousness of their existence, and a sentimental sigh breathed over their sinfulness, were a full proof of the spiritual mind, and a full assurance of security against future judgment. And what else can be expected than this,—if the sense of duty acting against predominant inclination be, as I have endeavoured to shew, the one special means of conquering our spiritual enemies; and if these principles, so far from bringing all possible helps to the support of this sense of duty, confessedly, and as it were boastfully, put its idea altogether in the back ground? The very essence of the Gospel is considered by multitudes to be, that under it the motive of duty is superseded by the motive of gratitude, and they hold that so far as we act on the former we descend from our Christian position; in other words, as I have expressed it in the *British Critic*, ‘that self-denial is Anti-Christian.’ And since the real truth is completely the reverse of this; since it is in support of this very sense of duty, that Christian grace is engrafted within and Christian motives addressed from without; and since the very condition required for our final acceptance is, that we shall, by help of this grace and these motives, carry on to the end an intrepid, persevering, and successful contest against our spiritual foes; it follows, that those who allow themselves in the state of acquiescence I have just described, unless they repent or have the plea of invincible ignorance, are excluded from all hope of Christian salvation.

The corruption indeed and sluggishness of our nature are such, that fallen man will gladly and eagerly seize any pretext, to excuse himself from that painful task of self-discipline and self-improvement, which he is sent into the world for the very purpose of performing; and true religion accordingly opposes itself at every turn to all such pretexts. It may perhaps then almost count as the master-piece of Satan's craft, that a system has been devised in these latter days, whereby such

sinful impulses are counted almost as Christian graces, and whereby a promise is held out to self-deceiving men of enjoying at once carnal security and spiritual peace. This is, I fear, only too true a description of the Lutheran system in its practical working. For, in the first place, the consciousness of that struggle, described in Romans vii., is commonly considered by disciples of this heresy to be the decisive mark of a safe spiritual condition. Yet this consciousness proves nothing more, than that there is some vague, capricious, and, it may be, wholly inoperative wish for holiness, and some sense of the misery of sin; whereas it is plain that this wish for holiness may be, and is, entertained by numbers, who are even plunged in the pollutions of overt and gross sin;^f while the sense of the unspeakable misery of sin cannot *but* be experienced by all subject to it. How much more then will men who, though not gross sinners, are to the last degree sluggards and idlers in the race set before them, how much more will these become hardened to the voice of conscience, and confirmed in belief of their own spirituality, by the adoption of this test! In the second place, a strange idea is spread abroad among the same class, (1.) that earnest and continued efforts for advancement in holiness are connected with some peculiar danger of pride and self-righteousness; (2.) that this danger is our one principal spiritual antagonist; and (3.) that we are preserved against it by abstaining from such especial efforts. From all this it readily follows, that our safest and humblest course is to acquiesce in the consciousness of our evil nature, rather than make any active and vigorous exertions for overcoming it. Here then distinctly the sinful impulse of sloth is blasphemously honoured by the sacred name of Christian humility.

Is it denied then by Catholics, it may be asked, that there is an especial danger of pride, in those who press zealously forward to perfection? I answer, there is not only a danger, but a certainty of pride existing, not only in those who are zealous of good works but fully as much in the careless and

^f Even Balaam said, 'Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.'

irreligious,[‡] unless *special pains be adopted to guard against its inroads*. The danger of pride is not a reason for slackening our efforts, but for increasing them; we must watch against the intrusion of self-complacent thoughts, as of other sinful emotions; we must pray for support against pride, as against all other wickedness. It is plain then that they will be most free from pride, who have acquired the greatest power in commanding their thoughts, and governing their emotions; in other words, those who are the greatest proficients in habitual self-denial. And the small extent to which this self-command reaches among the great body of 'Evangelicals,' is one concurrent cause of the fact, that spiritual pride exists among them, perhaps in a more offensive and hateful form than in any other body of religionists whatever.

III. Another concurrent cause of this pride is the absence from their system of the duty of repentance. In religious Catholics, the practise ends only with their life, of going over in their mind, from time to time, all that they can remember of their past sins, and humbling themselves before God at the remembrance. Every advance they make in spiritual discernment they apply to this purpose among others, that they may understand more fully the sinfulness of those sins, and exercise for them a less unworthy repentance. But ordinary 'Evangelicals' acknowledge no such duty, as humbling themselves before God for their individual sins. They speak indeed sorrowfully of their sinful *nature*: and they say that the love of God, which arises from pardon received, of itself inspires them with lively grief for having in time past been strangers to His love. But acts of penance and special humiliation they characterise as anti-Christian: so that on the whole they are led rather to pride than humility. For their sinful nature is shared by them with the most holy men that ever lived, and cannot therefore be a very humbling thought;

‡ "Nor yet . . . is this 'self-righteousness' greater in him who fasts and prays formally, than in him who lives avowedly to the world; as will be at once evident, if we consider the sensitiveness to insult, the blindness to good above their own standard, the idolizing of such worldly virtues as they have, whether honesty, or kindness, or honour, which is so plainly visible in irreligious men." 'On Heurtley's Sermons,' p. 440.

the sinful habit, for which they feel this lively grief, belonged to a state which they consider to have wholly passed away, and cannot therefore be a very humbling thought either; while they rest with satisfaction on the thought of this sorrow for their sin, as being in itself a proof of their *present* spiritual discernment.

IV. Next let us compare the respective views of the two religions, on the true type of the Christian character. The most advanced Christian, according to a Catholic's judgment, is he, who feels most deeply that it is his one great duty to be ready at every moment to obey his Lord's bidding. Such an one, therefore, aims unremittingly at bringing all the various affections and propensities of his nature under the full control of his will, in order that the whole man, without delay, without internal discord or rebellion, may be fully prepared, day by day, to follow every call from above. Hence he devises ever fresh methods of self-denial, and subjects his lower nature to rules more and more nearly inflexible;^b hence, in part, the unspeakable benefit of monastic and conventual institutions, of holy resolutions, of solemn vows: What would be in general professed by the 'Evangelical' as his ideal of sanctity, it is very difficult to discover: as far as I know their writings, they seem in general very remarkably unwilling to confess that it consists in unreserved submission, in even the smallest particulars, to the will of God; nay, they seem unconsciously to regard such a view of it (fearful to say) as legal or Jewish.ⁱ There is perhaps nothing which

^b I mean inflexible, as against the wayward and capricious impulses of the lower nature itself, not as against the dictates of a higher and more immediate duty. In fact, there is a certain formalism in the earlier stages of Christian obedience, which we observe gradually to diminish in those who make real advances in that path; a formalism displayed in the inability to understand aright what those cases are, in which our positive rules should give way, in order to the more adequate performance of some moral duty. As Christians become more confirmed in well-doing, they are able more certainly to distinguish such instances as these from the very different instances, in which the flesh seizes some pretext of duty with a view to its own gratification; and thus to act aright on the former, with less fear of confusing them with the latter.

ⁱ I am not denying that *when afflicted by sickness or sorrow*, they will acknowledge submission to God's will in that respect to be their only wisdom or duty;

so forcibly brings home to one's mind the close affinity of Lutheranism to Antichrist,^k as this most truly observable circumstance. If it is possible to analyze their way of looking at things, it would appear that they regard complete independence of God's will, as worldliness and carnality; complete and (so to speak) abject dependence on it, as superstition, legality, and monkery; that they consider true Christianity to consist in a certain 'via media,' whereby in very important matters our own will goes spontaneously in the same direction with God's will, in other matters we follow our own will without fear or responsibility, but in neither case are called on to *submit* our own to His.

Certainly the Protestant religionist bears witness against himself, that he has no sympathy with the view here laid down as Catholic: for when he hears of those who have at various times resorted to such methods of self-discipline as I have specified, he can find no place whatever for them in his theory. He professes to discover, with especial quickness of sight, the snares and temptations involved in worldly engagements; yet what is his comment, when holy men shew their keen and vivid appreciation of the same truths, when such men, still making the world and concourse of men the main sphere of their exertions, take nevertheless the most infallible means to escape these temptations, to prevent any worldly affections from encumbering them in their duty of following the Lord's call; when they break off, accordingly, all worldly ties, and look for rest and comfort only to spiritual exercises and heavenly thoughts; when this takes place, what, I ask, is the Protestant's comment? It is not that he merely considers such a course mistaken, (which alone indeed would be miserable enough,) but that he can literally give no explanation of a behaviour which appears to him so alien to all true religion, except by referring it to 'self-righteousness,' and to pharisaical confidence in the merits of their own works. Nothing in-

but I deny that, speaking of them as a class, they receive the general principle, that in all cases this slavish subjection of the will to God, is that in which alone true holiness essentially consists.

^k 'ὁ ἄνομος,' 2 Thess.

deed, (not to speak here of the extreme *moral* sinfulness of such an opinion,) nothing can be more extravagant intellectually than this account of the case: for there is no one fact to which history bears a more undeviating witness, than to the unparalleled humility of such holy men; their most painful and ever-increasing sense of their own miserable shortcomings and imperfections; their undivided trust for salvation in Christ's Atonement.

And as to 'self-righteousness,' under which system are we ordinary men most exposed to its inroads? Under the one, we look up to these exalted specimens of our common nature with the most unbounded reverence and love; we regard them as called to a life far higher than we have had the heart to pursue: we dwell on the thought of them as a continual memento of our own sinfulness, and a continual incentive to our own exertion. Under the other system, should our conscience be for a moment aroused and alarmed by the view or thought of these eminent servants of God, of their unwearied labours in Christ's cause, their independence of earthly comforts, their single-minded regard of heavenly things, their patience, humility, zeal, and devotedness, it will be immediately lulled again by the pleasing opiate of our Lutheran profession. We shall remind ourselves, that for all this these men are strangers to the true Gospel, and on their way to eternal condemnation; while we, who avoid this unchristian excess of self-sacrifice, who shew our knowledge of the true Gospel by our ungrudging enjoyment of all the various earthly blessings offered by our lot in life, and guard against all danger of self-righteousness by recoiling with horror from all voluntary self-denial, that we may continue the same way of life in tranquillity of mind, enjoying our heaven-sent confidence in the certainty of our salvation. So long as pride and sloth are among the most dangerous and besetting sins of our nature, and Satan retains his subtlety in the mode of addressing himself to that nature, which system appears most to deserve the name of 'Satanical,'¹ that or this?^m

¹ Bishop of Chester's Charge.

^m The following, though not a very strong, is an amusing instance of the

V. This leads naturally to a further observation; viz. in how small a degree real sanctity, in any shape, is appreciated

readiness with which the argument from practical fruits is put aside by 'evangelicals,' when it seems to tell against themselves; though none are so ready to adopt it in their own defence. I frankly acknowledge, indeed, that I very much deprecate the answer usually given by 'high-churchmen' to such appeals, as if they were almost beside the true question; whereas 'by their fruits ye shall know them,' is the very direction given by our Lord Himself for the discernment of truth from falsehood. The extract is from the 'Churchman's Monthly Review' for June, 1841, (pp. 350—4,) and the article begins by making a most creditable and honest confession of an existing evil among 'evangelicals.' The writer, having quoted from the British Critic a satirical description of an 'evangelical' clergyman, proceeds to say, 'It would be self-delusion to set the whole down as a fiction, a mere calumny. . . . The lovers of Evangelical truth have been rejoicing of late years—perhaps too hastily and unthinkingly—in the rapid progress of their views . . . almost universally has the inevitable danger been overlooked, that as evangelical religion became more popular and more fashionable, it might become in its turn more pliable and more accommodating. The world could not quietly come into the Church without bringing a mass of worldly principles and maxims along with it.' Not very far after this most honourable avowal, the writer proceeds: 'We were much struck the other day with the description given of a continental Romish priest, by one who had escaped the snares of that apostate Church. He spoke with no fondness of the communion he had left, when he said, "The priest of my parish was most laborious, most charitable, most devoted. If he had twenty sick persons on his list, he would allow no day to pass without seeing *every one of them*. And I have known him not unfrequently *part with every thing he had in the world*, except the mere clothes he wore, in ministering to their necessities.' These ministers of Rome are multiplying in England. Many of them are monks vowed to poverty. Against such an one, if really enthusiastic, devoted, and laborious, what kind of contest can be maintained by the 'flash evangelical young clergyman' described by the British Critic? In estimating the powers of the opposing principles, there is one thing which we ought never to forget; and that is, that while false principles generally act with their full force, the truth always acts with diminished force. . . . Let a man lacerate his body, like the flagellants in the Church of Rome, or like some recent followers in fasting, 'bodily exercise,' &c. at Oxford; and let him expect by these austerities to gain the favour of God and a place in heaven—to such attempts Satan will offer no opposition. He will rather encourage such a worshipper in his mistaken course; knowing that Christ is the only Way to the favour of God; and that all other ways, however holy or meritorious they may appear, in reality tend *from* heaven and holiness and not *to* them. . . . The Romish devotee, believing that his labours and his self-denial are working out his salvation, and being left by the Tempter in this his fatal error, swims with the stream of natural corruption, and is aided by Satan's flatteries and counsels. The believer in the Gospel, on the other hand, knowing that a man is not saved by the works of the Law, and shunning therefore all reliance on his own doings, is immediately beset by the temptation to do

by the common run of 'Evangelicals.' The religious Catholic, while he enjoys a deep peace of mind unknown to the disciple of any other religion, obtains this on the very tenure of renouncing all carnal security: just as part of the very habitual frame of mind, which insures that peace, is a consciousness that it may be his duty at any moment to follow some new call of God: so part of it also is a consciousness that at any moment he may be called to realise, in an increased degree, some practical virtue. In all the circumstances then of daily life, he is eager and forward to discern the indications they may convey to him of God's will: and in like manner, on all his fellow-men, who may be brought before his notice, he fixes what we may call an earnest and loving attention, in the hope that he may perhaps learn from each some new feature of the Christian character which he has not yet considered with sufficient distinctness, or at least obtain a warning and incentive for the more faithful performance of those duties which he *has* habitually recognised. Thus it is that he avoids any thing 'one-sided or disproportioned in his own religious development,' and obtains that inestimably precious gift, a quick and true perception of the good qualities of others. Thus also it is, that should he be habitually in the company of eminently holy men, his contemplation of their character grows daily in interest and intensity; and he learns to appreciate, beyond the possibility of all mistake, and with ever-diminishing inadequacy of comprehension, its depth, consistency, unearthliness. But the 'Evangelical' dwells for assurance of his salvation, on a mere inward feeling of con-

nothing—to look upon his salvation as already secured, and thence to relax in any exertions, either for his own growth in grace or for the good of others. *The corruptions of human nature and the arts of the Tempter thus help forward the devotees of a false religion; while they retard, by every possible means, the progress of one who is in the right way.*" In other words any sanctity visible in one, who anathematizes with abhorrence the Lutheran formula in its natural sense, may be safely ascribed to diabolical agency. I should be very sorry not to do justice to the great candour implied in acknowledging so much as is acknowledged in this article, of the present tendency of some among the 'evangelicals' to unholiness and laxity; but it is evident that such a view of the case as is here stated, so long as it lasts, must steel the writer's conscience against all appeals founded on the visible fruits of the Holy Spirit.

fidence, which he considers himself to recognise infallibly as existing in his soul: and so far therefore from improving his own most narrow and partial idea of the Christian character by his observation of external models, he is tempted more and more to measure and judge of *them* by reference to his own dwarfish and disproportioned standard. As though 'sitting in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God,' he is tempted more and more to make *himself* the measure and rule of holiness, whereas God alone is such; and to sit, as it were, apart from the vulgar herd, in judgment on the various classes of men who are brought under his notice. One is daily receiving some new surprise, and I have often heard the observation from others, in seeing how little appreciation of real sanctity is displayed by 'Evangelicals,' and how indescribably low and paltry are the temptations, which they consider unconquerable even by Christian grace; nor is it at all matter of wonder, that some of them go on even to deny in terms the Pentecostal Gift, and to speak as though internal righteousness were some mere figment or delusion.

VI. Closely connected with this habit of mind is the 'Evangelical' rule of faith. More than once indeed in the *British Critic* I have fully acknowledged, how much higher both morally and intellectually is *their* doctrine on this fundamental question, than that adopted whether by Archbishop Whately and his school, or else by ordinary English 'high-churchmen.' For both these latter classes undisguisedly refer the Christian, as the ground of his belief in all that most deeply and intimately concerns his eternal welfare, to a methodical exercise of the intellect, to a conscious and deliberate examination: to considerations therefore, which are wholly inaccessible to the chosen objects of God's love, the poor; and which are appreciable in proportion not to our moral, but our intellectual attainment. They openly and undisguisedly bid us derive our knowledge of Christian truth from a critical interpretation of the Sacred Volume, or a careful and discriminating study of the Fathers of the Church.^a It is hardly possible to use language too strong

^a It is desirable to lose no opportunity of impressing on our minds, how utterly

in expressing one's hatred of such carnal and worldly-wise views ; which, except for our inveterate prepossessions, must carry with them, one would think, their own condemnation in the eyes of all serious and religious men. Still the 'Evangelical rule of faith, though far removed from such lamentable rationalism, has its own tendency to ill effects of no ordinary magnitude, and contributes in no slight degree to that habit of self-deification specified in the last paragraph. The belief that individual study of the Bible, with prayer, will lead by Divine promise to Christian truth,—considering the peculiar structure of the Sacred Volume, which is so very far indeed from forcing its true meaning on those who may be unprepared or unwilling to receive it,—this belief seems a certain method of still further obstructing the avenues, by which new religious truths might otherwise find access to the mind. Here, as in the former instance, if such views be admitted, the whole company of believers become, if I may use such a phrase, so many independent centres of truth, when they should be rather distinct atoms tending by the force of gravitation to the One Only Centre. For we find by experience, as might have been safely predicted *à priori*, that the vast majority of 'Bible Christians,' day after day, rise from the perusal of their chapter of the Sacred Volume, holding the very same religious sentiments with which they began it; we find them reaping no other doctrinal fruit from its habitual study than this, that opinions which are in

untenable intellectually (over and above its moral odiousness) is this last strange and extravagant theory. 'If any one has preserved up to this period a floating idea, that personal study of the Fathers is capable of becoming an available rule of faith to the private Christian, by which he can test the formularies of his own Church, or criticise those of other Churches, this volume and these notes (Mr. Newman's edition of St. Athanasius's *Doctrinal Treatises*) must, we imagine, undeceive him. To think of an ordinary person having to examine for himself the question, how far St. Athanasius's doctrine agrees with St. Hilary's and St. Basil's, and how far it is the legitimate development of Ante-Nicene statements, (in many particulars so different); and on what principle the various Eastern councils were not ecumenical and authoritative between the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan, but these were: and how far St. Athanasius's severe language towards the Arians was from the accident of his position and the habit of his time, or how far it claims our deference, &c., &c.' ('On St. Athanasius,' p. 412, note.)

reality the offspring of their education or other preconceived bias, obtain an adventitious sanctity and importance in their minds, as being supposed to flow directly from the Word of God, brought home to their souls by His promised blessing.

And the probability of this will be still more plainly seen, when we consider what I myself most undoubtedly believe to be the method really appointed by God, for discerning in the Bible the principal doctrines, which, by His Providence, it contains. No single man, (I would most earnestly maintain,) however wise, however intellectually gifted, however religious, can really, even in a tolerable degree, understand the text of Scripture, so far as to obtain from it its very choicest and most valuable treasures; none can 'penetrate, and as it were become diffused throughout the recesses of God's Word, so as to apprehend the whole counsel of God contained in it, unless it be the whole Church, the temple of that Spirit "Who searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God:"^o nor have ecclesiastical statements and decisions on the subject, weight, or authority, except as the formal expressions and results of this collective contemplation. According to that divine scheme, which we in England through our fathers' sins have for the present forfeited, one and the same doctrine in essentials was to be taught by an external living authority to all members of the Church; and in proportion as an individual Christian should receive and act upon this doctrine, in connection with a generally strict and blameless life, and should study with humble reverence the text of Scripture, he would obtain a conviction of their absolute harmony and agreement, incomparably deeper than could be gathered by any collation of texts, and most utterly beyond the power of external arguments in the opposite direction. Hence it follows, that in our own degraded condition, our best chance of discerning the precious and wonderful truths, stored up within the bosom of Scripture, will be not the isolated and unbiassed study of its pages, but the very contrary; to preserve watchfully and realise laboriously

^o 'On Arnold's Sermons,' p. 325.


the doctrines we have already learned, to look out with wistful and anxious eyes for an external guide, and to put ourselves, as far as possible, in communion with the thoughts and feelings of holy men throughout the Christian world. It would not be necessary, on any other subject or with any other opponents, to state explicitly that I am not for a moment impugning the great and important doctrine, that the Holy Spirit Alone teaches Christian truth, but only speaking of the means *whereby* He teaches it." ^p

VII. Another observation naturally follows in this place, which may be expressed in words I have used in the *British Critic*. 'So long as [the Lutheran] system had undivided sway in the religious world, so long as those who aimed at something higher than the mere careless performance of outward and social duties, who thirsted for a life of more extended prayer and more spiritual contemplation, so long as these, speaking generally, acquiesced almost as a matter of course in this scheme of religion, doctrinal discussion was of little importance. . . [The disciples of this system] fix their spiritual gaze *not on him who is without them, but on the supposed marks of His presence within them*: on those supposed proofs of a renewed heart, which satisfied them both of the soundness of their creed and the sufficient rectitude of their conduct.'^q Hence not only is their apprehension so vague, fluctuating, and unstable of other doctrines, whether belonging to natural or to the Christian religion, but even (a greater matter of surprise) so comparatively little of attachment to the *person* of our Lord, or to the thought of His sufferings, is generally found in their writings; though from their professions, indeed, one might suppose that they engrossed all such feelings to themselves, and that Catholics have no heart, save for outward ceremonies or the worship of Saints. But 'let us consider how certain a fact it is in

^p For a fuller account of the mode in which, as appears to me, Holy Scripture may be expected under our present circumstances to lead forward rightly disposed Christians towards a reception of the full truth, I may be allowed to refer to the article, 'On Whately's Essays,' pp 286, and 'On Goode,' pp. 54—58.

^q 'On St. Athanasius,' p. 391.

human nature, that love for an individual displays itself in an anxious and eager earnestness of curiosity about all his ways and actions; we love to hear and dwell upon the thought of his words, his deeds, his very gestures; we have a relative and subordinate love to all which has come closely into contact with him. He then, who really loves his Lord, will be expected to make the Four Gospels his principal study and delight; to have engraven on his heart even the little peculiarities (if it be right so to speak) and the minute subordinate circumstances, but much more the general tone and bearing, of His manner of life on earth. Now it forcibly illustrates the substantial truth of the accusation so often brought against the 'Evangelicals,' that it is not Christ whom they love and worship, but the supposed signs of love for Him which they try to recognise within them, when we observe how little is the picture [I] just now drew a true image of their habit of mind. *It is not where Christ is mentioned in Scripture, but where faith is mentioned,* that they are active and awake and dwell with interest on the inspired page; it is not He whom they profess to love, but the (supposed) absence of self-righteousness, which would appear (as far as outward signs can shew) to engross their regard and affection.' To what single work can they point, written by one of their number, which exhibits, within any assignable degree of approximation, such loving and reverent contemplation of the details of our Lord's life and passion, as is seen in multitudes of Catholic Works, like Father Thomas's 'Sufferings of Christ,' St. Alphonsus's 'L'Amour des Ames,' St. Bonaventure's 'Life of Christ,' St. Ignatius's 'Spiritual Exercises,' &c., &c.? 'True love forgets self in the thought of the object; they forget the Object in the thought of self. And as to the other mark of which [I] spoke, the love, from thought of Him, of all which has come near Him, so far are they from even professing a tender reverence for her, in whose bosom He lay, to whom He approached with such ineffable proximity, that they even (O shocking thought!) denounce such reverence as Anti-christian.



“ Think too, as a further instance of this lack of sensitiveness for his honour, that the writer who by common consent is accounted the most orthodox of living Dissenters, and who certainly at one time enjoyed a very high reputation within the English Church, has been found to sanction and praise the [language^r] of Mr. Abbot, who in speaking of him, says that “ the spectacle of this deserted and defenceless sufferer, far exceeds that of Napoleon, or *even* that of Regulus,” and that from “ *delicacy* he refrained from speaking of (His death) to those who were to reap its fruits.” And a divine enjoying no less degree of respect and confidence in the ‘ orthodox Protestant ’ world than Dr. Chalmers (as indeed who can speak of him without true respect?) has been found^s to realize so little *who* it was that lived on earth and died on the Cross for us men, as to call it a *proud thing* for the religion *He* died to found, that it was embraced by *Sir Isaac Newton*.^t

In these passages, I have spoken as though this exceeding blindness to religious truths were altogether the *immediate* result of their habit of unhealthy self-inspection : whereas it partly results from an *intermediate* result of the same habit ; I mean from their great deficiency, to which I have so often adverted, in moral and religious discipline. For it is a truth of natural religion, that only in proportion to our attainments in holy obedience, can we receive into our minds any just and accurate representation of spiritual realities ; and hence those who are not really zealous and careful in aiming, by all practicable means, at this obedience, live in the dim twilight caused by a most inadequate refraction of Gospel rays, when they might otherwise enjoy the full effulgence of their blaze.

It may be as well here to allude to another instance, which

^r I have omitted here a harsh expression ; nor can I mention Mr. Abbott’s works at all in terms of reprobation, without alluding to that interesting letter, sent by Mr. Newman to the ‘ English Churchman,’ on the subject of his visit to Littlemore. I trust he would not be pained by the tone of my remarks as they now stand.

^s See British Critic for July, 1839, p. 244.

^t ‘ On Goode,’ pp. 79, 80.

has often of late been the subject of comment, in which 'Evangelicals' practically deny this essential truth. They consider, namely, that men plunged in wilful and habitual wickedness will be able at once to receive so deep and sufficient a knowledge of our Blessed Lord's Atonement, that the thought of it will excite in *their* minds the same horror of sin and perception of its hatefulness, which that thought *does* excite in Christians of practised holiness; nay, that it will be a fully sufficient motive, to sustain them in life-long faithfulness to God. And I have one reason among others for mentioning this, that I may draw a broad line of distinction between this manifestation of their heresy, and a practice very common among Roman Catholics of the present day, which has been confused with it by revered members of our own Church. This is not the place to discuss the reasons which made the 'disciplina arcani' of such exceeding importance in the early ages: but whatever may have *been* the reason, I would most earnestly submit that a certain principle was *not* the reason, or any part of it; I mean the principle, that the doctrine of the Atonement is not a most perfectly fit topic to urge, along with others, in endeavouring to rouse sinners from their fatal lethargy. I see no principle on which it can possibly be maintained, (it was part of *Luther's* system indeed to maintain it,) that the promises as well as threats of the Gospel should not be most fully urged on such unhappy persons; and I believe that in very many cases affectionate or high thoughts, which may have been slumbering within their breast overlaid with evil habits and carnal tendencies, have been called into active and intense energy, by the wonder of Redeeming Mercy; when it has been set before them most lovingly and tenderly, by devoted servants of Christ, and received by them even in such utterly inadequate and disproportioned measure, as that in which they are *capable* of receiving it. The real distinction between Catholic and 'Evangelical' principles appears at the next stage: for the 'Evangelical' supposes that when the sinner's heart has been reached by such appeals, his continuance in holiness and final salvation are irreversibly

assured ; while the Catholic, on the contrary, regards this as no more than the first beginning of that arduous and all-important conflict, which is to be henceforward the great business of his life, and on the issue of which depends his final destiny. Accordingly, the object to which Catholic preachers at once apply this newly awakened fervour, is to lead the disciple into preparing himself diligently for a general confession. Thus the fundamental necessity of moral discipline is at once brought before his mind ; and after such light and almost nominal penance as the infancy of his Christian habits will enable him to bear, he is then led, if possible, into a short spiritual retreat, in order that the great truths of death, judgment, heaven, and hell, may be impressed on his conscience and imagination, before he returns to the troubles and temptations of the world. Such seems the fit application, under present circumstances, of the important principle we have been discussing ; but a perversion, rather than fit application, would be a one-sided inculcation of the severe doctrines of the Gospel on the worldly and irreligious : an inculcation, which in many cases might terrify and overpower them, and even quench some faint stirrings of God's grace leading them to repentance.

VIII. Here may be fitly introduced a description, which applies to many 'Evangelicals' within the Establishment, not less truly than to Dissenters without it.

'Indeed so natural is the connection between a reverential spirit in worshipping God, and faith in God, that the wonder only is how any one can for a moment imagine he has faith in God, and yet allow himself to be irreverent towards Him. To believe in God, is to believe the being and presence of One who is All holy, and All powerful, and All gracious ; how can a man really believe this of Him, and yet make free with Him ? it is almost a contradiction in terms. Hence even heathen religions have ever considered faith and reverence identical. To believe, and not to revere, to worship familiarly and at one's ease, is an anomaly and a prodigy unknown even to false religions, to say nothing of the true one. Not only the Jewish and Christian religions, which are directly from God, inculcate the spirit of "reverence and godly fear," but those other

religions which have existed, or exist, whether in the East or the South, inculcate the same. Worship, forms of worship, such as bowing the knee, taking off the shoes, keeping silence, a prescribed dress, and the like, are considered as necessary for a due approach to God. The whole world, differing about so many things, differing in creed and rule of life, yet agree in this, that God being our Creator, a certain self-abasement of the whole man is the duty of the creature; that He is in heaven, we upon earth; that He is All-glorious, and we worms of the earth and insects of a day.

But [some among us] have in this respect *fallen into greater than pagan error*. They may be said to form an exception to the concordant voice of a whole world, always and every where; they break in upon the unanimous suffrage of mankind, and determine, at least by their conduct, that reverence and awe are not primary religious duties. They have considered that in some way or other, *either by God's favour or by their own illumination*, they are brought so near to God that they have no need to fear at all, or to put any restraint upon their words or thoughts, when addressing Him. They have considered awe to be superstition, and reverence to be slavery. They have learnt to be familiar and free with sacred things, as it were on principle. I think this is really borne out by facts, and will approve itself to inquirers as true in substance, however one man will differ from another in the words in which he would express the fact itself.^u

IX. The respective peculiarities of character exhibited by 'Evangelicals' which I have already mentioned, all tend in various degrees to spiritual pride, or, to use their own expression, 'self-righteousness;' a temper of mind which appears to me generally characteristic of 'Evangelicals' in the present day (with whatever honourable exceptions) far more than of any other part of the religious community. To sum up then what has been said merely in this point of view, their system tends to Pharisaical and complacent self-exaltation, 1. as encouraging self-ignorance; 2. as providing no sufficient incentive to self-restraint and government of the thoughts, and so a sustained contest against the insidious and most subtle advances of this sin of pride; 3. as not inculcating special remembrance, one by one, of past sins, an ever-increasing humiliation of heart and prostration of soul before God, and

^u Plain Sermons, vol. v. pp. 169, 70.

earnest cries to Him for mercy, caused by that remembrance ; 4. as tending most materially to diminish or even destroy that reverence for an austere and mortified life in others, which is so great a security for personal humility in ourselves ; 5. as fostering self-satisfaction in that it blinds its adherents to the piety of all those whose mind is cast in a different mould from their own ; 6. as inflating them with an idea of their own spiritual knowledge, in that it permits them unmolested to mistake their own prejudices for Scripture doctrines, and conceals from their view truths which are most certainly in the Bible, and may be most distinctly and undoubtedly there discerned by those who study it in the right method ; 7. as depriving them of what would be so peculiarly efficacious in inspiring lowly thoughts of themselves, the real and unfeigned contemplation of the awful truths of natural religion, and of the still more sublime verities which the Gospel discloses ; and 8. as taking from them that safeguard for humility, which would be afforded by a spirit of reverence and self-abasement in contemplating and addressing Almighty God. And I now add, 9thly, that their very cardinal doctrine, their belief in justification by a personal inward feeling, connected with no habitual self-examination, nor carefully confronted with the whole circle of external duties, this belief in itself and by itself, tends most powerfully and unceasingly to the same result, to engraving day by day on the heart, with ever increasing distinctness, the Pharisee's sentiment, ' Lord, I thank Thee, that I am not as other men.'

In order that we may judge more fairly how far experience confirms this observation, it may be useful to observe, that a quickness to take offence, the habit of actively resenting or else angrily brooding over real or imaginary slights and injuries, these are among the most infallible marks of a proud and unhumiliated spirit. On the contrary, to carry out gladly and rejoicingly the full spirit of our Blessed Lord's precept, " whoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also ;" to receive the most galling and contemptuous treatment as infinitely less than the just due of their sins ; and thus to derive even the highest joy and gratification from

such treatment; this will be the demeanour of Christians, in proportion as they are really humble. And though Protestants have from time to time exhibited in their measure such a temper of mind, I know no class of Christians whatever where this temper shines forth in its full Christian perfection, or of whom it can be considered as among the most prominent characteristics, except the Saints of the Church Catholic. Nor do the general run of Protestants leave us to derive our knowledge of *their* sentiments on the subject from mere argument or observation; they are loud and earnest in condemning or denouncing all especial exhibitions of this part of the saintly mind, as the results of formalism, or superstition, or mental imbecility. The very idea of what Christian humility is, must be far from the mind of those, who allow themselves in language such as this.

X. It must not be supposed, because I have just spoken of those defects in the 'Evangelical' character already specified, in the particular point of view of ministering to pride, that I forget the evil influence which they exert in numberless other directions also; an evil influence, frequently of a very extreme character. They all seem very remarkably to foster pride, but they have many other miserable results too, and in those which remain to be mentioned, that individual evil seems to me by no means so prominent as in those which have gone before. The next particular I shall mention, is the tendency of these principles to a certain indescribable and most repulsive formalism, which results of necessity from the empty, unreal, shadowy, delusive nature of the whole theology in question. To believe that all who really entertain a confident expectation of salvation are warranted in this expectation, is a sentiment from which, honourably to themselves, the conscience of 'Evangelicals' recoils: on the other hand, to hold that by means of habitual self-discipline a *hope* of salvation may be indulged, continually better grounded and more assured, never however, except in most extraordinary cases, amounting to a certain promise, to hold this would be to overthrow their whole structure of doctrine from its very foundation. In this dilemma then, having no really spiritual basis on which to rest, refusing to adopt that

test of holiness which Catholic doctrine would supply, and which I have already mentioned, they are obliged to take as their test some more external form, either necessarily unconnected, or not at all necessarily connected, with the inward life of the soul.

Of the former kind is the use of certain (as we may most truly call them) '*cant*' terms and phrases; the fluent and familiar enunciation of which, seems considered by multitudes an almost unfailling note of spirituality, and the absence of which is taken as a *quite* unfailling note of worldliness. True it is, no doubt, that whereas religious *Catholics* have impressed on their moral perception various most definite, most important, most individually distinguishable, ideas, during the course of Church History technical terms have been invented to express those ideas. Such terms too it is of the very utmost importance to appropriate most scrupulously to the particular object for which they were devised, else well-instructed Catholics must be indefinitely baffled and perplexed, and the less-instructed could be hardly guided into the true reception of these ideas themselves. But though technical terms are always confined to particular ideas, these ideas on the contrary are *also* expressed in every variety of *untechnical* terms. St. Athanasius, (to take an extreme case,) the proverbial champion of strict orthodoxy, hardly uses in his works, so we are told by learned men, that very word *ὁμοούσιον*, which was the technical term then in dispute; and nothing is more common than to read Catholic books, in which the deep orthodoxy of the writer appears in every page, but into which no terms whatever of the kind have found their way. On the other hand, the 'Evangelical,' using *his* technical terms, not to express already existing ideas, but to conceal from others and from himself the *absence* of all such, is full of trouble and dismay at the slightest variation from the established formula. The Catholic, as being sure of his ground, conscious of his position and of his doctrines, expatiates throughout all the range of ordinary language, adopting now this expression now that, as best may suit his momentary purpose; but the 'Evangelical,' should you omit one single phrase on some occasion which, according to their strange

and pedantic etiquette, is considered to require its use, has no means left whereby to judge the soundness of your belief; for he has no *idea* to fall back upon. No! no one substantive idea is in his mind, distinguishing him from the orthodox, but only a confused medley of conflicting and inconsistent ideas, drawing him one this way one that; some leading in all consistency to sanctity in the fullest sense, some leading in all consistency to wickedness of the deepest dye. He has no *idea* then which he can recognise as his characteristic mark; and so is obliged to constitute as such, the stiff stereotyped adoption of certain strange and uncouth expressions.

Belonging to the *latter* class of forms I specified, are exercises, worthy of all honour in themselves, but which sometimes become snares to the soul rather than means of grace, when an external compliance with them is made the sufficient passport to Christian brotherhood. The principal of these is the strict observance of Sunday; an observance of which I would not for the whole world speak disparagingly, and which, I cannot doubt, has been blessed as a means of grace to thousands, and has rescued them from much of the pernicious consequences flowing from their religious views. It is very plain, however, that men of the most unsanctified hearts, of the most worldly and carnal affections, will readily compound, by a scrupulous performance of ceremonial duties (such as going to Church and reading at home none but religious books) on one day of the week, for the free and unbridled exercise of their thoughts during the other six. While on the contrary those who during the week have been engaged, not merely in their worldly occupations, but in an incessant struggle against the temptations, whether in a more open or more subtle shape, which encounter them *amidst* those occupations, require on their day of rest much more of actual relaxation and refreshment than would otherwise be needful: a circumstance this last, which on every account deserves especial notice.

That 'self-righteousness' and 'formalism,' the very charges which religionists of the day are so fond of bringing against Catholics, should in so remarkable a manner recoil on them-

selves, is merely one instance of what seems a certain inherent fatality. Thus, as has been often enough said, no sect is so superstitiously formal, as the Quakers who boast of rejecting forms; few so unreasonable, as the Rationalists who profess to go by reason; none (says Mr. John Mill) are so incompetent judges of history, as those who think to build political science *on* history; none argue themselves so weakly, as those who accuse Catholics of arguing weakly; none most certainly are so shallow intellectually, as those who dream of supporting religious conviction on an intellectual basis.

XI. Again, an evil of which I spoke several pages back as necessarily resulting from the abstract tenet of Lutheranism, flows from it, in no small degree, as found existing in real life. 'Evangelicals' have, I should say in general, very far from an adequate impression, how deeply important is the early training of their children in habits of obedience.^u Some I know, perhaps many, consider all punishment as wrong, and supply its place by prayer in their closet for the child's conversion. This arises probably from an idea that fear is no really Christian motive; but it will not be considered necessary, I suppose, by any of my readers, that I should trace in detail the most pernicious consequences that must flow from such a course.

A further observation here suggests itself, bearing however on the effects of 'Evangelical' principles on others rather than on their upholders. The ordinary language used by these religionists, as to the necessity of passing through a stage of doubt and alarm into a state of unclouded peace, this language so unreal, so technical, so contradictory to all genuine experience, must most seriously impair, in many cases even destroy, the influence over the youthful mind which religious precepts might otherwise attain. I know myself a young man of extreme seriousness and strictness of

^u Mr. Burns has published a beautiful little tale called 'Little Alice and her Sister,' which impresses on the mind true ideas on this most deeply important subject, more successfully than any other I have happened to see; though I dare say, if I were well acquainted with his series, others also would be found equally excellent. There could hardly be, I should think, a more useful present to a child than this little tale.

life, who on reading Doddridge's 'Rise and Progress of Religion,' (a work in many respects so beautiful and so instructive,) was perfectly bewildered and amazed by meeting with a sentiment of the kind. It is impossible indeed to conceive the degree in which the young may be perplexed and confused by such statements; nay, the more sensitive may be brought by it almost to utter despair and recklessness of living.

XII. Lastly, it is involved in the 'Evangelical' theory, that the misery of man in his natural state consists, not in the sense of sin, but in the fear of punishment. This, I say, is involved in the 'Evangelical' theory; because while on the one hand it is acknowledged by all that it is the very object of the Gospel to relieve this misery, 'Evangelicals' proclaim that a knowledge of our personal pardon is the great Gospel gift, and denounce Catholics for considering inherent righteousness to be such. Peace of mind, say they, follows on an assurance of certain salvation, even before sanctification has begun; it cannot exist without that assurance, though an inward gift of sanctity be poured into the soul. It is difficult to conceive any principle more contrary to all experience, and more disparaging to the attributes of God: certainly the latter, for the universal reconciliation of happiness with holiness may be taken as the elementary truth of natural religion; and certainly the former, for it is even proverbial that sin and sorrow are indissolubly connected, that our evil passions are our worst and most deadly enemies. "The happiness of the soul consists in the exercise of the affections: . . . this is our real and true bliss, not to know, or to effect, or to pursue; but to love, to hope, to joy, to admire, to revere, to adore. Our real and true bliss lies in the possession of those objects on which our hearts may rest and be satisfied. . . . The thought of God, and nothing short of it, is the happiness of man; for though there is much besides to serve as subject of knowledge, or motive for action, or instrument of excitement, yet the affections require a something more vast and more enduring than anything created. . . . If we are allowed

to find that real and most sacred Object on which our heart may fix itself, a fulness of peace will follow, which nothing but it can give. In proportion as we have given up the love of the world and are dead to the creature, and on the other hand are born of the Spirit unto love of our Maker and Lord, this love carries with it its own evidence when it comes."*

This being so, it follows that a continued mortification of our earthly affections is the one only road to true peace of mind; for by that means alone can our heart be opened, in ever-increasing measure, to the presence of God. But 'Evangelicals' consider that peace of mind is sufficiently secured by the emotions which follow from a knowledge of our pardon; and the result is, that when they feel a blank and dreary melancholy stealing upon them,—not understanding that its remedy must be sought in a vigorous and self-forgetting contemplation and performance of duty,—they endeavour by a direct effort of the will to stimulate and renew these emotions. It is not necessary here to speak of the extreme and most deplorable consequences which have at various times flowed from this, especially among Dissenters whether here or in America; we may confine ourselves to what persons, even with but little experience, have witnessed in members of our own Church. 'A revulsion of mind ensues; a violent distaste for what pleased them before; a sickness and weariness of mind; or a great disappointment; or a confusion and perplexity and despondence.' "The way of peace they have not known," yet are bound by their principles to consider themselves as infallibly knowing it. I believe that even madness in some shape has before now ensued from a similar state of mind.

And thus I bring to an end this most invidious part of my task; a part in regard to which I feel, that nothing can excuse me for having entered upon it, except absolute necessity: yet surely quite necessary it is. I most gladly and willingly acknowledge it as one of the many benefits our

* Newman's Sermon's, vol. v. pp. 357—363. But read the whole of this wonderful Sermon.

Church has received from the 'Evangelical' party, that they have borne a steady and consistent witness to the extreme importance of holiness, as a test of religious truth. So far am I from being able to follow those who protest against such a view, and appeal rather to the argumentative collation of Scripture texts or patristic writings, that I know no ultimate result, short of atheism itself, in which such a line of argument must consistently issue: as I hope to express more at length in a future chapter. I am most deeply convinced, that next to the plain voice of our own conscience, the one great note given by God to guide us into the truth, is the visible work of the Holy Ghost in others; nay, that the latter has no inconsiderable place in checking and directing our conscience itself. I most fully agree with the 'Evangelicals' then on the ground of appeal; what remains, but to join issue *on* that ground? What line of argument have I been pursuing, which *their own* line of argument does not clamorously *call* on me to pursue, when I desire to hold up to hatred and obloquy their characteristic principles? The Bishop of Ohio in his charge, as one among many others, appeals to the universal confession even of opponents on the spirituality of 'Evangelicals,' as a proof of their doctrines; and what single 'Evangelical' has expressed himself on the subject, who has not appealed to the alleged formalism and 'self-righteousness' of Catholics as a conclusive argument against *their* system? They have themselves chosen the topic, I only adopt their choice. That Catholics are *not*, as such, formal and 'self-righteous,' it is one principal object of great part of the present work to prove; that 'Evangelicals' as a body are *not* in any true sense 'spiritual,' is what I have been just now attempting to establish. Nor have I resorted for my materials to the mere accident of chance observation, but in every case have shewn the connection between the faults I complain of and the doctrines of those I am accusing; nor yet have I drawn merely theoretical deductions from abstract premises, but have laboured carefully to confine my remarks to what I believe will on the whole be borne out by an extensive experience. That even at the present day there are

many 'Evangelicals,' far more attached to the truths accidentally connected with their system than to the heresies which essentially distinguish it, I most gladly believe; nor could any result be more deeply gratifying to my own feelings, than if only one such should be led, by means of what I have put forth, to perceive how much more deeply and genuinely the same truths are witnessed, in the pure and undefiled Gospel preserved through every age by the Church Catholic.

One misconception which might perhaps ensue, both from what has been said and from what remains to be said, had better be distinctly removed in this place. On looking back at what I have written for the last fifteen or twenty pages, I am not without fear that I may be considered as representing the Christian life in gloomy, cheerless, and repulsive colours. Nothing, however, has been farther from my intention; and nothing, I am quite sure, can be farther from the truth. To take the most obvious case, all that has been said on the perpetual watchfulness of conscience, is in no way inconsistent with the fullest allowance of necessary relaxation and refreshment of mind. It is not to be denied, indeed, that saintly men find continually more delight in heavenly and spiritual occupations themselves; but this is no reason why we, who are not saintly men and therefore require other enjoyments, may not, with the fullest sanction of our conscience, enjoy in the highest degree innocent gaiety and exhilaration of spirits. As a father regards with affectionate complacency the sports of his infant children, so we may represent our conscience, as regarding from the inward recesses of our mind our external and superficial merriment, ready to interpose at any moment, if anything dangerous or doubtful should be introduced. And to speak of what is so infinitely more important, true peace of mind and deep happiness; what is there which can compare, in that respect, with our gradual emancipation from the power of sin? Those, too, who are conscious to themselves (as we *may* be^y) of purity of intention, derive unspeakable relief, in the midst of their increasing perception of sin, (for the *perception* of sin

^y See this explained and vindicated, Newman's Sermons, vol. v. serm. 16.

increases in a far greater ratio than *conquest* over sin,) from the thought of the infinite mercy of God, shewn forth so preeminently in our Lord's Atoning Death. Again: the study, one by one, of the events and sufferings of His life; the contemplation of Christian doctrine in its full and varied range; the exercises of private and of public devotion; in their degree, even the wonders of Catholic art, and the solemnity of religious ceremonial (should these be accessible); above all, the reception of the most Holy Sacrament; all these are full of sweetness and consolation to the soul, which is wearied with the toils and temptations of life, and with the remembrance and deep feeling of sin.

6. Now a little consideration will shew us, that the practical importance of the discussion just concluded extends to great numbers among ourselves, besides those against whom it has been more immediately directed; that the vitally fundamental truth, which Lutheranism formally denies, is, to say the least, disparaged and most inadequately apprehended by very many, who cannot with any justice be ranked in the 'Evangelical' party. There are indeed, I fear, comparatively few among us, who do not consciously or unconsciously entertain the idea, that habitual and laborious watchfulness; the painful effort to change our will and purify our hearts by exercising ourselves day by day in the events of ordinary life as they occur; the humbling ourselves and doing penance in remembrance of our past sins, one by one; the labouring constantly to keep before our mind the thought of Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell; that all this is at least not *so* imperatively required under Christianity, as under natural religion. Whereas in truth the peculiarity of Christ's religion is not that, in any the smallest particular, it dispenses with the obligation to obedience, (a righteous God *cannot* dispense with that obligation,) but that it gives most wonderful and unprecedented help towards *carrying out* obedience; and since 'to whom much is given, from him will much be required,' it follows that the amount of obedience which God demands at our hands is so much the greater, by how much Christian gifts are more wonderful and transcend-

ant. This it is, I say, which all the various heretical parties within our Church in one way or other disparage, and which I heartily wish that even the more orthodox in general more fully realised. Men speak as though, in some sense at least and in some degree, the Gospel were a *reversal* of the natural Law; instead of being solely and exclusively its *complement*.² And I would beg of my readers to pay particular attention to this statement; because it is the very central point of that view of our present circumstances, which it is the object of this work to submit with deep deference to my brethren. And it is because this truth seems to me so all-important at the present time, and the Lutheran doctrine of Justification is that particular heresy which plainly and in terms denies it, that I have felt bound from time to time in the *British Critic* to protest so emphatically, and in language of such unbounded and indignant reprobation, against that doctrine.

The objection which is at once in every body's mouth against the truth I am defending, is such as the following: that it implies some slight on the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, especially the Atonement and Sanctification by the Holy Spirit, if Christians, who have been favoured with their knowledge, are still bound not less than before to impress on their minds an habitual sense of the truths of natural religion, and to act laboriously on those truths; that Christ would almost seem to have come upon earth in vain, and the Holy Ghost to have descended in vain, if duty, repentance, self-denial, fear of Judgment to come, are still to remain, (as the

² 'That the Church, during her whole course from first to last, has made it so prominent a part of her office that nothing whatever has been more so, to bear witness to the holy and eternal Law of God; this is very obvious, and is seen on the very surface of her history. It is evidenced alike in the strict discipline and careful adjustment of penitential inflictions prevalent in the early ages; in the scientific theory on the subject, in the detailed examination of the sources, the comparative turpitude, and the remedies of each several transgression, which Catholic doctors in the mediæval period so carefully elaborated; and in the nice and subtle questions of casuistry, in which the same principle has naturally issued, under the complicated and entangled circumstances of modern civilization, in the hands, whether of foreign theologians or of those among ourselves (such as Sanderson and Taylor) who have drunk most deeply of the genuine Catholic spirit.' 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 21.

Church has ever proclaimed that they *do* remain,) so prominently in the very front ground of the Gospel system, that they may not be displaced nor set aside, no not a hair's breadth, even by those most wonderful and gracious doctrines to which I have alluded. There are three several answers which may be given to such a representation of the case; either of which alone would amply suffice, and which, when taken together, issue in nothing less than a complete and triumphant overthrow of this very plausible objection.

1. These doctrines and precepts of natural religion, to which I have adverted, receive unspeakable accession of light and of sacredness, *by means of* the Gospel; insomuch that the latter has no more precious peculiarity, than the supernatural dignity and elevation which it gives to those doctrines and precepts. For let us consider to what extent the laws of natural religion are observed, or its truths known, in a *state* of unaided nature. That man feels a most deep and intimate perception of the ideas conveyed by the words 'right' and 'wrong;' that he feels the essential duty of humbling himself and doing penance for evil deeds; that he has a consciousness, whether latent or developed, that it will be the worse with him through all eternity in consequence of these last; all this cannot be denied, and it is very important that it be distinctly affirmed. But over and above this, I am sure we shall be stating the matter even beyond its best advantage, if we suppose existing in his mind such convictions as the following: a real and firm belief in the All-Holy, All-mighty, All-merciful God; a knowledge of the more prominent and essential features of the natural law; and a humble hope that by honestly doing what may be in his own power towards the following after blamelessness and purity of life, even though little else than repeated failure and disappointment be the result here on earth, he may obtain some unknown but precious reward hereafter. And if even all this be supposed, still how miserable is his state! The original and deep disease of his nature remains unshaken; and only inflicts on him a keener consciousness of misery, for every new attempt he may make to escape its influence. The

Law stands over against him, not indeed understood in all its fulness, but still sufficiently recognised to overwhelm him with dismay, to make it continually clearer to him how hopeless is the effort of making any sustained progress towards its fulfilment. The feeling of repentance and humiliation is, by his very aspiration after good, called into a more grievous and ceaseless exercise; and alternates with the renewed commission of those very sins for which it has been called forth. The consciousness of a gradual approach to his standard of right, of evil tendencies continually weakened and good continually strengthened, of a consistent, however imperfect, fulfilment of the whole law; in a word, *the experience of a good conscience*, which should sweeten the path of self-denial and repentance, and impart rest and peace even in the midst of godly sorrow and godly fear; all this is unknown to him, and beyond the power of his attainment. The reward held out to him on earth for a sustained attempt at well-doing is, that his sense of the great want of his nature shall become to a fearful extent keener and more overpowering, and his conviction, how powerless man's natural strength to supply that want, more intense and habitual. What then is even the truly religious course for one so circumstanced? 'Surely to be in gloom, to view ourselves with horror, to look about to the right hand and to the left for means of safety, to catch at every thing yet trust to nothing, to do all we can and try to do more than all, and after all to remain in miserable suspense,' wholly unable to judge whether we *have* honestly exerted ourselves according to our power; to wait 'naked and shivering, among the trees of the garden, for the hour of His coming, and meanwhile to fancy sounds of woe in every wind stirring the leaves about us,—in a word, to be superstitious,—is nature's best offering, her most acceptable service, her most matured and enlarged wisdom, in the presence of a holy and offended God. They who are not superstitious without the Gospel, will not be religious with it.'^a

It is not at all necessary to discuss the question, how far it might be humbly hoped that in point of fact spiritual aid

^a Newman's University Sermons, p. 106.

would be extended to a heathen, who should really so exert himself as is here supposed: for that aid would be no part of the natural system: it would be but a partial anticipation of Gospel gifts, and due to the foreseen merits of our Lord and Saviour. Now let us suppose, for a moment, that Christ's coming had done no more than this; viz. imparted the power of avoiding for ever, by means of prayer and watchfulness, all mortal sin (all such sin, that is, as strictly implies the will's *rebellion* against God); and that as regards all other sin whatever, it had both assured men's pardon, and given them the means of gradual victory; that it had promised forgiveness even of mortal sin on certain conditions of repentance and penitential exercises; that it had distinctly revealed future judgment according to works, and promised to faithful disciples such an eternity of happiness as consists in the perfection and full gratification of our natural faculties; nay, further, if you will, that in order to give mankind a pledge in action, of what their sinful consciences make them so slow to believe in promise, the death on the Cross had followed, merely as an assurance and visible demonstration of the loving mercy of God. Had Christianity done no more than this, how much would it not have done! what a message would it not have been to the wretched and degraded heathen, as of life from the dead! Now for the very first time, would the natural duties of obedience, repentance, fear, hope, diligence, love, begin to assume, by degrees, that very shape and those very mutual relations for which they were intended, and into which nevertheless, without special help from God, in vain they attempted to rise; now for the very first time would the religious character display the rudiments of that harmony and proportion, for which man had before possessed the materials but not the power, the external form but not the quickening, animating spirit. Every act of natural duty, every ceremonial of natural religion, would be a fresh homage to the wonders of *revelation*: and every new triumph of *nature* would be a fresh ground for the thankful remembrance of *grace*.

But, blessed be His name, Christ's Gospel is all this, and far more; His death is not merely a *pledge* of God's loving intention towards us, but the *means* whereby it works, the *price* of our redemption; it is the death of God, who died on the Cross as Man, that He might make men as gods. The power, whereby we are enabled to fulfil, consistently and in illimitably increasing measure, the natural Law, is no mere complement of our natural faculties, but a most marvellous and *supernatural* gift; 'a well of water springing up into everlasting life;' an inward spiritual presence, which raises us indefinitely in the scale of creation; by means of which our acts of penitence, self-denial, obedience, become other *in kind* from what they were; and the direct issue and consummation of which is no lower and less determined gift of eternal bliss, but the 'beatific vision,' the seeing of God face to face. The Gospel does not then remove these primary and essential duties of natural religion *from* their place, but to an unspeakable extent elevates and sanctifies them *in* their place; their habitual and unceasing inculcation can involve no disparagement of Christ's Atonement and the Spirit's Mission, for they are what they are in *consequence* of those great Gospel Verities.

This also must be remarked, to complete our view, that the God of natural religion not only becomes more deeply and intimately known to Christians because of His Presence within them through His Spirit, but also because of His Manifestation without them through His Son. Through His words and deeds in the flesh, our knowledge of the Divine attributes becomes incalculably more consistent and persuasive; 'His Majesty, His love, His mercy, His holiness, His fearful anger,' become ideas with a far more impressive and definite meaning.^a Thus then all the duties of natural religion, worship, repentance, faith, obedience, penance, and the rest are raised, in the case of us Christians, in regard to our knowledge of the Object to whom they are addressed, not less than in regard to the power whereby they are done. Add to this, that the most solemn among all the truths

^a See Newman's University Sermons, pp. 35—37.

of natural religion, that of Judgment to come, is emphatically 'christianized,' by our knowledge of that most encouraging, yet almost overpowering fact, that, not God the Father, but God the Son, He who has lived among men as he that serveth, is to judge men one by one at the Great Day.

And as it is with the duties of natural religion, so it is also with the precepts correlative to those duties. If consistently obedient men be the fountains from which moral truth flows to the world, and if, without special grace, consistent obedience be unattainable, we shall be prepared to expect what in fact we find, how miserably inadequate was that knowledge and perception of the Eternal Law of God, which was generally diffused before Christian times. It is not till the first promulgation of *the Gospel*, that we find among men in general any tolerable appreciation of *the Law*; but 'from that period downwards we find that which was before but hypothesis and capability, converted into actual achievements, into living and energizing results. For eighteen centuries and upwards has the Church faithfully witnessed the great truths of morality and natural religion in their full circle, whether against Manichæan heretics in earlier, or Lutheran in later times. She has drawn out the scientific statement of God's nature;^b she has proclaimed and enforced the various holy tempers required by the natural law, explored the theory of their mutual relations and dependency, discussed the mode of their application to the outward state of things at each succeeding period of her progress, and provided her children with invaluable help and support for their attainment; all this she has done with a confidence, completeness, depth, and illumination of view, so absolutely beyond comparison with any feeble efforts in that direction which may have existed in heathen times,^c

^b See e. g. Petavius 'De Deo Deique proprietatibus.'

^c It would of course require great acquaintance with heathen literature to pronounce a confident opinion on their real progress in philosophy. Mr. Newman has not hesitated to say that the 'great endowments of mind' which existed in those times 'had been expended on vanities or dissipated in doubt and speculation.' (Univ. Sermon. p. 314.) And a very different writer has drawn attention

as most fully to justify Bp. Butler's remark, that it would be difficult for us adequately to appreciate the blessings we have obtained through the Gospel, even without reference made to the information and gifts peculiar to itself.'^d

But, without doubting in the slightest degree the extreme and indispensable importance of scientific statements, it will not be questioned, that the idea of holiness is impressed on our minds with incomparably greater clearness, precision, and persuasiveness, by the presence of living examples, or the record of such in past ages; and in this respect, even more signally than in the other, has Christianity established and enforced for the first time the full truths of natural religion.

Here immediately a circumstance occurs to our mind, which must be placed altogether by itself, as absolutely one, singular, and unapproachable, in the whole history of the world. The circumstance, I mean, that God has taken on Him our nature; that in that nature He has visited this very earth of ours, and vouchsafed in person to represent to us outwardly that Law which He has implanted deep within our hearts: nor only this, but that his words and actions in the flesh have been preserved to this day in an inspired record, for our reverent observance and contemplation. This is that fact, so marvellous beyond all power of our previous conception, 'that it might well have been doubted by the Holy Angels, whether men could bear to hear of it without losing their senses.'^e And this is that record, on which all the Blessed Saints, as one after another they have appeared on the scene of life, have supported their faith, by which they have enkindled all holy affections, and which they have made their one great model, the one great interpreter to them of the Eternal Law of God. From the 'Mystery of His Incarnation, His obscure birth, His hidden life, the labours of His public ministry, His sufferings, His ignominies,

to the barrenness of heathen philosophy, with a view of gaining support, from that consideration, to the wretched sentiments he is endeavouring to uphold. I allude to Mr. Macauley's article on Lord Bacon.

^d 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 401.

^e 'On St. Athanasius,' p. 487.

His death, the work so merciful of our Redemption, His all-glorious Resurrection, the earnest and lively faith of the Saints has ever, without wearying of the occupation, derived new feelings of gratitude and love, astonishment and shame, contrition and confidence. That lively faith which possessed them was a restless impulse, which, from the sight of what the Saviour had done for them, continually urged them on to the practice of humility, of poverty, of penitence, of patience; to works of zeal, to all the labours of a Christian and Apostolic life, and to realising in their own hearts the mystery of his death and resurrection. It ceased not to place before their minds Jesus Christ acting or speaking, Jesus Christ praying or fasting, Jesus Christ living among men and mixing with them, Jesus Christ preaching, Jesus Christ enduring with incredible sweetness the revilings, cruelty, and ingratitude of the Jews, Jesus Christ travelling, or taking his repast,^e &c., and they applied themselves to the task of doing the same actions in union and conformity with those of the Saviour.^f And for us also, to read that record as we ought should be one habitual study of our lives: to bring home to our feelings and imaginations the events there described, not in that barren, lifeless, unreal manner in which too often the sacred narrative is read, but in all fulness of detail and circumstance as living and breathing facts; yet, on the other hand, to impress on our minds with equal care, with sedulous caution, with laborious effort and meditation, Who it is that fills the principal place in those pictures, to what an unspeakable extent all that we read is matter of personal interest to ourselves one by one, that each one of us redeemed Christians was as fully the object of His love and thought during His earthly humiliation, as though no other being lived in the whole universe.

But just as, while acknowledging the Four Gospels to be in a singular and peculiar degree raised above the rest of Scripture, we yet believe all Scripture to be inspired, and

^e Members of our Church may now see, in the translation of St. Bonaventure's 'Life of Christ,' a specimen of this most prominent feature in the saintly character.

^f Népotion, ou l'Elève de Sanctuaire, (Lyon, 1837,) p. 82.

endeavour to learn from every part its intended lesson: in like manner, the recognition of the unapproached eminence, on which our Blessed Lord's life stands out in the history of the Church, implies no denial of the excellent fruits to be derived from the recorded lives of all His Saints. These are in every age the great external evidences of Christianity, the great visible notes of the Church. They bear witness in their own persons, a far surer witness than could be borne by any other external sign or proof, to the depth, reality, and efficaciousness of Christian doctrine; their living example is the warrant, whereby we receive the recorded actions of holy men in times past as possibilities and truths; their habits and ways of thought, their very personal presence, are as it were the quickening and informing spirit, whereby the great events of the Church start from the canvass, and present themselves to our imagination as realities with a definitive existence and meaning; while at the same time the same holy men, not by means of formal calculation but by the spontaneous impulses of the Holy Ghost within them, are the great originators of that infinite variety of external shape, which the one Ancient Truth assumes in every successive period, that it may cope with the peculiar evils and meet the peculiar exigencies of that period.

Such are the benefits which their contemporaries derive from their life on earth; nor is their history less productive of fruit, when they have gone to their reward, and reign with Christ in Heaven. In two particulars, indeed, departed Saints may serve as our models, where their Master's example will not in any way attain the same object. For, first, they have been men like ourselves, born like us in original sin, and endued with no higher privileges than are granted to us also; while He, though fully invested with human nature in all its completeness, still had no human personality, was not *a* man but God-man; so that the power is granted to ordinary Christians of indefinitely near approach to them, while from *Him* they must ever remain infinitely removed: and, secondly, our examples, whether of saintly *self-discipline* or of saintly *penitence*, must of necessity be derived only from *them*; for they only had sins to repent, they only had

the rebellion of nature to keep in check. Can there be a more deeply touching or profitable task, than to contemplate the gradual triumph of Saints over temptations, whether from within or from without, similar to those of which we have ourselves daily the miserable experience ; or to study the manner and degree of their repentance for sins, far less grievous and hateful to God than those which we have committed in the same kind ? ‘When we read how many young noblemen and tender virgins have despised the world and joyfully embraced the cross and the labours of penance, we feel a glowing flame kindled in our own breasts, and are encouraged to suffer afflictions with patience, and cheerfully to undertake suitable practices of penance. Whilst we see many sanctifying themselves in all states, and making the very circumstances of their condition, whether on the throne, in the army, in the state of marriage, or in the deserts, the means of their virtue and penance, we are persuaded that the practice of perfection is possible also to us in every lawful profession, and that we need only sanctify our employments by a perfect spirit and the fervent exercises of religion, to become saints ourselves without quitting our state in the world. When we behold others framed of the same frail mould with ourselves, many in age or in other circumstances weaker than ourselves, and struggling with greater difficulties, yet courageously surmounting and trampling upon all the obstacles by which the world endeavoured to obstruct their virtuous choice, we are secretly stung within our hearts, feel the reproaches of our sloth, and are moved from our state of insensibility.’^f Then, too, in studying the endlessly various specimens of the saintly character, we more and more clearly discern, ‘in each one of those individuals, indefinitely varying from each other in natural disposition, in period, rank, education, sex, and age, a certain inward character surprisingly similar to that of all the rest,’ and ‘evidencing a certain complete and singular fulfilment of the natural law.’^g Thus we learn the peculiar expansiveness and elasticity of the Gospel Gift, and the wonderful capabilities of human nature, so infinitely beyond all that could

^f Butler’s Lives, p. xlii.

^g ‘On Mill’s Logic,’ p. 417.

have been even imagined before Christ came ; and by means of these we bring home to our imaginations (which is my present subject) the perfect and entire Law of God, with a minuteness, particularity, and diversity of exhibition, which could in no other way have been attained. Above all, the lives of Saints are as it were spiritual ladders, by which we rise into a continually fuller and less inadequate appreciation of *His* Life, Who is the One Full Embodiment of that Law.

This then is the first answer that may be made to the objection in hand. To lay a very prominent stress on the precepts of natural religion, implies no blindness to the paramount value of Gospel peculiarities ; for that we know those precepts as we know them, and are able to perform them in the consistent, though imperfect, measure, and in the supernatural manner, in which we do perform them, this is one of the most admirable among those Gospel peculiarities.

II. Next, I lately drew attention to part of our common nature, (that nature which has been in no way reversed under the Gospel, and of which, in this respect at least, no religious man surely would desire the reversal,) that only in proportion to our moral culture are we enabled to apprehend religious truth. The Christian, who is frequent in self-examination and constant in self-discipline, derives incomparably more of real Christian knowledge from two or three verses of the New Testament, or from a single repetition of the Creed, than could be obtained by one careless in such matters, even by perusing chapter upon chapter of Scripture, or by studying whole volumes of theology : or rather indeed the latter derives *no* Christian knowledge whatever ; however fluent he may be in the use of sacred terms, or ready in the citation of texts, the impression he derives from what he reads is altogether wide of the mark, altogether heterogeneous from that real and true impression, which is received, in various measures, by the rightly prepared disciple. It is plain at once, then, how extravagant is the allegation, that zeal for such culture implies indifference to revealed truth ; for even were that culture in itself not a duty, still it would be cherished and exercised by all Christians, exactly in proportion to the earnestness of their love and keenness of their

desire for Christian knowledge. Moral culture being the only path to Christian knowledge, he who best loves the latter will most practise the former. Suppose (if it be not too light an illustration) that a man should apply himself to learning the German language, for the express and sole purpose of reading the works of some German poet; and that he should be found deeply plunged in all the intricacies and difficulties of German grammar: what sense would there be in the charge, that all this careful and methodical study implied some latent *preference* of grammar to poetry?

III. And, lastly, I will fairly challenge objectors to devise any other means, by which these very truths, the Atonement of Christ and Sanctification by the Spirit, shall be (I do not say so rightly apprehended, *that* I have just been urging, but) so *habitually present to the Christian's consciousness* as they are by this very habit of moral watchfulness. In no other way will the feeling be so deeply and indelibly impressed on our very innermost heart, of the fearful and miserable amount of our sins and imperfections; for in no other way shall we have obtained light to see one thousandth part of those which we *thus* obtain the power of seeing, and in no other way shall we be enabled to preserve the remembrance of them so constantly in the mind, amidst all the tumult of the external world, the excitement of pleasure, or the engrossing occupation of thought and study. Nothing can effect this except habitual self-mastery; self-mastery comes but gradually, and only by one kind of agency, by successive acts of conflict against dominant inclination. Now it is plain, without saying another word, that as habitual as is the *thought* of our own sinfulness, precisely so habitual is the thought of the Atonement, and as deep as is the *sense* of our own sinfulness, so deep is the sense of the benefits we derive from the Atonement, and so real our gratitude to Him who died for our sins. Nor is a constant remembrance of the Holy Spirit's influence less intimately bound up with watchfulness and self-denial, than is a constant remembrance of Christ's Atonement. For it is those who use most constant diligence in removing those obstacles within them which thwart the free movings of the Holy Ghost, who are also

most unceasingly sensible of the presence of that supernatural Power; a Power, wholly alien in origin from their own natural powers, and which carries them onwards, as if without their will, from grace to grace, with no assistance on their part beyond that *negative* cooperation, the unwearied and self-mortifying exercise of which I have spoken so much. This consciousness it is, which is the deep origin of that supernatural humility characteristic of the mortified and ascetic Christian: this it is which impels the faithful, in proportion to their zeal, diligence, and self-denial, to use in the most natural and straightforward way that language about their own utter unworthiness, which many doubtless adopt from affectation or imitation of others, and which to men of the world appears so singularly paradoxical and extravagant.

7. The specious difficulty then, lately mentioned as standing in the way of this all-important truth, seems most satisfactorily disposed of; nor does it appear to me any exaggeration to say, that the neglect of the truth itself is the sufficient cause of all the spiritual evils which surround us. Without alluding to individuals, I can see no *system* in this country, except the Roman Catholic, which attaches any particular weight whatever to a principle, which if true must *deserve* more weight than all others put together: I can see no system, which wholly or even partly bases its inculcation of Christian truth on its careful enforcement of moral discipline. The Roman Catholics indeed, in this as in so many other respects, have witnessed the pure Gospel to a blind and carnal age. I am told on the best authority, that no serious Roman Catholic would omit any one day the usual 'examen of conscience,' without making the omission a subject of mention as a sin at his next confession; while in religious houses and seminaries for the priesthood they frequently enforce the 'particular examination' (of which more hereafter) three times in every day. To this we should add repeated meditations, according to a set plan, on such subjects as 'sin,' 'death,' and 'judgment to come;' and moreover the practice itself, which alone would so powerfully tend to secure moral discipline, of Sacramental Confession. But our own Church, (not to speak here of the

Dissenters, who are even more in fault,) whether in the recognised system of education or of later instruction, most obviously implies a belief, that the reading of the Sacred Volume will convey religious and practical truth to a mind unprepared by special and wisely-devised discipline. A more senseless and perverse superstition cannot be conceived.

And what is the result of this most monstrous and fanatical notion? The cultivation of conscience is indissolubly bound up with self-denial, if it be not even the same thing in another shape; self-denial is of all exercises the most repugnant to man's fallen and corrupt nature; therefore if this duty be not enforced with the most urgent, energetic, and repeated appeals, it will by inevitable consequence either be performed with utter inadequacy, or wholly neglected. The voice of conscience then, being thus allowed to remain dormant, is confused, without possibility of distinction, with the caprice of imagination, or with individual peculiarities and associations. Hence it follows, that those who (like, I suppose, most 'Evangelicals' and Protestant Dissenters) regard themselves as visited with some personal divine illumination, are led to look upon even their narrowest prejudices or absurdest imaginations, as the very dictate of the Holy Ghost; to look upon themselves and the few whose prejudices and peculiarities agree with their own, as the fountain of divine truth; to shut their eyes to the plainest marks of sanctity in those who abhor and denounce their 'cant' phrases; and to regard with a compassion closely bordering on contempt us ordinary men, who earnestly disclaim any such personal illumination in ourselves, and refuse to recognise it in them. I most gladly believe that many are more or less involved in this strange way of proceeding from the accident of their circumstances and position, to whose better nature it is far from congenial, and who, consciously or otherwise, feel their system a galling chain and grievous impediment: but I speak of the system itself, and not of individuals; and most sorry should I be to appear wanting in deep respect and sympathy for such as these.

Even this system, however, is very far from the most un-

spiritual which has been devised, in these dark ages wherein we live. Here, as in so many other cases, from lowering their practice men have gone on to lower their theory. Having taken effectual means, from the absence of all exhortations to moral discipline and all stress laid upon it, that 'as many voices as there are in the world,' so many consciences shall there appear to be, they go on to deny plainly that conscience *has*, when duly cultivated, one plain, clear, articulate voice; and to maintain that we may discover religious truth, without submitting ourselves, for such truth, to its sacred dictates. Some have openly upheld the shocking principle, that Scripture will teach us Christian doctrine if we interpret it according to the maxims of criticism which we apply to classical writings; that a knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, and a just estimate of the force of prepositions in compound words, will give us a more valuable proof of the Atonement, than we could otherwise obtain. And others have referred us to a critical study of the early Fathers, with the same object in view; and called on us to submit both reason and conscience to what we gather from them on sound principles of critical interpretation. More monstrously untenable this last indeed in one respect even than the former: for the Bible *is* the Word of God, intended to illuminate and instruct the Church in every age; however perverse the Protestant attempts to discern the sacred doctrine which it contains: but on what possible principle have the writers of one particular age 'dominion over our faith'? Speak indeed to us of their sanctity, and we acknowledge from our heart's depth their claim to be heard with reverence and docility; nor can there be a task more full of interest and more pregnant with practical results, than drawing forth the deep harmony which exists between saints of every age, their absolute agreement in substantial truth, their interesting and even edifying diversity in matters of inferior moment. But when, instead of a procedure which at last involves no real difficulty whatever, the very contrary course is adopted; when we hear the words of early Saints wrongfully and perversely quoted, to censure the words of men whom no one can

consider less holy ; when we hear St. Chrysostom brought as an antagonist over against St. Bonaventure, or St. Cyril against St. Alphonsus Liguori, we shudder at (the most unintentional) profaneness of such daring and reckless criticism.

Nay, to such an extent has this mania for external evidence been carried, that a principle is most plainly implied by numbers amongst us, though its maintenance by any sane person would have been incredible but for general experience, that it is lawful to summon Dissenters to leave that community wherein God has placed them, wherein they have learned sacred truths from their parents or teachers, and with which their most holy associations are interwoven, to summon them, I say, to such a course, not by appeals to their conscience ; not by leading them through their system to another, and fixing their minds on those truths which it contains, till from them they go on into further truths ; nor yet, again, by awakening their spiritual desires for a gift, which Sacramental grace can alone supply ; but by an argumentative exposition of Apostolical Succession and the Divine right of Bishops. In other words, it is considered (though I am conscious that the naked statement looks like a burlesque) that religious men of the lower classes *cannot* estimate a higher idea of sanctity, when fairly set before them, but *can* do justice to both sides on such questions as these ; 1, whether Episcopacy, though universal in early times, be necessary, while prayers for the dead, which were equally universal, are *not* so considered ; 2, whether Episcopacy *did* universally exist in early times, with an examination of the famous passage of St. Jerome, and the famous examples of Corinth and Alexandria ; 3, whether in point of fact the English Church *has* the succession, with an historical digression on the Nag's Head controversy, and a ritual discussion on the forms necessary for ordination ; 4, and chiefly of all, whether visible union with what is considered to constitute the rest of the Church Catholic be not also necessary ; visible union, on which learned men tell us that so much more stress was laid in early times, than on the Apostolical Succession. And it is seriously implied by multitudes of English Churchmen, that Dissenters may, without grievous sin, leave the community

which to them has been in so high and true a sense the ordinance of God, from no better reason than the ridiculous child's play of professing a view on such questions as these ; and that ministers of our Church may, without grievous sin, tempt them to such a course.^h

^h The author of the most able and valuable 'Appeal to the Members of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge,' (p. 11,) mentions with reprobation a sentiment of the Bishop of Chester's, that "if a man feels that he has been personally benefited by the instructions of a Dissenting teacher, the only instructions within his reach, no argument can persuade him that he ought never to have listened to them ;" and censures also the Bishop's further remark that "perhaps it is too much to expect that . . . all men should think alike upon such subjects as diocesan episcopacy, or infant Baptism," &c. For one, I incline to be more hopeful than the Bishop of the *ultimate* reunion, by God's grace, of all Christians ; but take the matter in a practical light, can the excellent writer really mean that ordinary Christians are able to form a judgment on such matters as these last, or that they are *not* able to form a very sufficient judgment on the plain question, whether, by help of advice from a Dissenting minister, they have been able to contend more successfully against habits of sloth, or selfishness, or impurity, or anger? It may be better, lest I be misunderstood, to add here a note belonging to one of my articles. 'Would it be thought a promising trait, if a Wesleyan, e. g., born of parents religious up to the average, were, at the age of ten years, seriously to consider the question whether or not he were in a state of schism, and how far the institution of Bishops was apostolical? And if not at ten years, what is the proper age for him to call in question all that he has been taught, and sit in judgment on his parents and elders? On the contrary, surely the position of our Church as regards Dissenters, if we rightly view it, is no unfavourable one. We believe Catholic doctrine to be perfectly consistent with our formularies ; and we know it to be such that, in proportion as it is adequately exhibited, it attracts most powerfully the religious instincts of the serious mind, under whatever system trained. We believe too that after the conscience has been awakened and a course of obedience begun, the heart of those with whom we have to do, is still unsatisfied and their mind restless, from their want (however unknown to themselves the cause) of that inward gift, which the English Church for one is entrusted by God with the power of dispensing in her Sacrament. No need of a spurious liberalism, or of any the least compromise of truth. Let us aim at making the English Church such, that by her appearance and bearing she may exhibit outwardly what she contains within : and let us hold, whether by words or actions, this language to Dissenters : "We are witnesses to a doctrine and dispensers of a blessing far higher than you can attain in your present position, and which are the appointed medicine for the ills and miseries from which in vain otherwise you will seek an escape. Act the *more* diligently, in consequence of what we say, on your *existing* principles ; the greater your diligence, the earlier will be your conviction of the comparative worthlessness and inefficacy of your present system, the greater will be the eagerness with which your whole moral nature will yearn for what *we* can give you." It has been said

However such a mistake of principle as this, however grievous, can lead to little of practical evil, though it will most seriously obstruct the spread of practical good. Attempts to convert Dissenters by such methods of procedure will fail signally, as they deserve to fail; and very much doubtless of energy and time, which might have been employed to great advantage, will have been unprofitably wasted: still this is not in itself a positive, but a negative evil. On the other hand, those respective religious theories now so prevalent, which, as I lately shewed, depend for any appearance of truth they may possess on a denial of the supremacy of the well-disciplined conscience, these *are* positive and very serious evils; still neither from *them* can I fancy any real danger to impend. No! As regards those who will influence the course of opinion within our Church for the coming period, I have no fear whatever that they will either adopt 'evangelical' sentiments, or perpetuate an illusive distinction between the earlier and later ages of the Church: nor yet again, that they will become what is sometimes called 'sound and attached members of the English Church,' or in other words, that they will concur with Mr. Palmer's general views. I am not speaking of that multitude of men, who have neither great moral sensitiveness, nor great intellectual keenness; they doubtless in every age accept very readily the state of things in which they find themselves placed, and

that great numbers of Dissenters are in a state of the most abandoned profligacy. Whether they are worse in this respect than churchmen, we have no means and no wish to decide; of course in *such* cases the English clergyman would "be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort," as claiming authority, and appealing to their conscience in confirmation of his words. And should he succeed in any one such case in "converting the sinner from the error of his way," there could not be much question that the poor rescued soul would gladly follow, with implicit deference, the spiritual instruction of his preserver. But he has not this argument in dealing with persons who are not grossly vicious; and the question before us is, how is he to address *them*? That a Dissenter may have been often enough perplexed and confused by being confidently, and as if angrily, told he is in a state of schism (as though he had placed himself there) we can readily conceive; that he may have been deterred by it from religious action altogether, under a persuasion of the impossibility of discovering truth, this we can imagine; but that he should have been persuaded by it, and become a sound and docile churchman, this we *cannot* fancy. Can any one? 'On Church Authority,' pp. 216, 7.

profit by it more or less according to its value and their diligence: nor can any thing be more praiseworthy than that they should do so, except so far as this deficiency of moral sensitiveness is attributable to their own fault. But I speak here of those more consistent spirits, who in every generation determine most certainly, for good or for evil, the character of the following generation: and of these I say, (and I beg most earnestly to submit this to the careful and deep consideration of those, who think that all will go smoothly with our Church, if they can but expel from it, or silence in it, the advocates of Roman doctrine,) that the danger to be feared, should they by whatever motive be repelled from the course which leads to full, consistent, and complete, Catholicism, is very far more serious and alarming than the attempt to reinvigorate the 'Evangelical' or 'High-Church' party.

In truth, systems have been devised, most imposing from the brilliancy, depth, and varied ability of their inventors, which having 'slain their tens of thousands' in Germany and France, are endeavouring, with secret but mighty force, to obtain a footing here. These systems, though it would be the most cruel injustice to charge the disciples in general with intentional and conscious, or even as yet virtual, unbelief, still are in themselves, and in their inevitable issue, absolutely infidel in character. The name of Mr. Carlyle will suggest one class of these systems; the writings of Kant, which are very much and increasingly studied in this country, a second; Mr. Michelet's history, (which has been just now warmly advocated as a subject for study in England,) a third; Mr. Milman's History of Christianity, (though less deep than the others,) a fourth.^h The principles, implied in different ways and degrees through these respective writings, are widely different indeed from the shallow, unscrupulous, and rancorous sophisms, put forth by infidels of the last century; they are far deeper, and therefore far more dangerous. Such writers as most of those whom I just mentioned, have the fullest disposition to do justice to Christianity, 'as

^h Let me again repeat, as I have mentioned the name of a clergyman of our Church, that I am speaking *exclusively of tendencies.*

a fact in history.' 'There are men,' we are told by the able and interesting writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, 'who, *not disguising their own unbelief*, have written deeper and finer things in vindication of what religion has done for mankind, than have sufficed to found the reputation of some of its most admired defenders.'¹ Nay, many of such thinkers will even admit the main facts contended for by Paley; and will yet consider the Gospel to have been rather a divine and gracious interposition (for the purpose of introducing a higher range of sentiments, and a more perfect morality^k) than to be authoritatively binding on ourselves as a law. And to shew still more plainly, how little we can calculate that respectfulness of language guarantees the absence of fearful error, it is to be observed that even Strauss, who denies (if one may give utterance to such words) the personal existence of our Blessed Lord, writes, we are told, in a spirit of great calmness and sobriety; nor may it be useless to add, that a friend of mine was told by an eminent foreign bookseller in London, that he sold more copies of Strauss's work than of any other in his shop. And let it not be supposed that this leaven is not very widely working, and very rapidly spreading, because it has not yet appeared much on the surface; the present state of the English mind, so unfavourable to all free and consecutive speculation, good or bad, accounts sufficiently for that: and I cannot but fear, that a wide experience will on the whole bear out the truth of what I am now saying. I believe that the unspeculative, common sense, Procrustean, spirit, which has hitherto governed English thought, is most certainly destined to fall, and is even now fast falling: it may be succeeded by something far better, or by something far worse; but it will certainly be succeeded by something very different from itself.¹ This danger and

¹ Jan. 1844, p. 2.

^k See Tracts for the Times, No. lxxxv. p. 99.

¹ 'There seems a sort of atmosphere of unrest and paradox, hanging around many of our ablest young men of the present day, *which makes me very uneasy*. I do not speak of religious doubts, but rather of questions as to great in moral and intellectual matters; where things which have been settled for centuries seem to be again brought into discussion. This restless love of paradox is, I believe, one of the main causes of the growth of Newmanism; first, directly as it leads

its remedy have been observed, now seven years since, by the great seer of our time, whose words it will be well to quote. Having related a vision of St. Martin's, Mr. Newman proceeds :

“ The application of the vision to Martin's age is obvious ; I suppose it means in this day, that Christ comes not in pride of intellect, or reputation for ability. These are the glittering robes in which Satan is now arraying. *Many spirits are abroad, more are issuing from the pit* : the credentials which they display, are the precious gifts of the mind, beauty, richness, depth, originality. Christian, look hard at them with Martin in silence, and then *ask for the print of the nails.*”^k

I think in fact that a student of able and enlarged mind, and endued with great intellectual ardour, who should be mad enough and miserable enough to seek for truth by taking up a position external to all existing systems, rather than by humbly and diligently working in that where God has placed him, till his conscience shall tell him to advance from it ; that such an one would see much in Catholicism, attractive to him in the same sense in which worldly systems attract him. ‘Evangelicalism’ or ordinary ‘Anglicanism’ he would altogether put aside ; for he would not understand the moral persuasiveness exhibited by those respective schemes to persons trained in them, while he would see very plainly their utter theoretical baselessness and incoherency. But in Catholicism he would see a wonderful harmony of parts, depth of view, and consistency of progress ; he would fairly recognise it as the majestic and wonderful development of a real idea ; and he would acknowledge in it a surprising suitability to human nature under certain aspects : he would see moreover how plausible an account it gives of a vast number of external facts, which it is at first sight difficult otherwise to understand ; and again, in an æsthetical point of view, he would do justice to its great and perhaps unapproached excellence.

men to dispute and oppose all the points which have been agreed upon in their own country for the last two hundred years . . . than when a man finds that he is cutting away all the ground under his feet,’ &c. Dr. Arnold's Correspondence, p. 225. I wish ‘Newmanism’ were likely to be the only gainer by this.

^k ‘ Church of the Fathers,’ p. 414.

Such truths as these, unbelievers and misbelievers of the present day, unless grossly narrow-minded and uncandid, fully admit. But notwithstanding, he would consider himself to see in Catholicism a certain want of enlargement and comprehensiveness: a certain formalism, stiffness, and absence of elasticity; an incapability of adapting itself to circumstances; an excessive regard of detail; nay, still more than this, a something, which would even excite his contempt, as imbecile, superstitious, and anile. As an eminent instance of this, what we see of the language and arguments, adopted even by religious Protestants, may give us some little idea, how indescribably childish and contemptible the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence would appear to one, who should have been neither educated in its belief, nor disciplined by moral and religious action. And in addition to all this is the consciousness, most influential even though latent in deterring him from accepting the Church's authority, that it would curtail his licence of action and speculation; that it requires a submission of reason and will to no ordinary extent.

And the consequence of all this will be, that he will consider it an incomparably more philosophical and more reasonable course, to give some account of such external facts as those I just alluded to, which may have considerable show of reason and plausibility, and yet not imply the duty of humbling himself before the voice of the Church; rather than suppose that a system, as he thinks so deplorably superannuated, has any claims on his reception. He will avail himself of the difficulties which surround the question of Inspiration, (difficulties wholly insuperable to the mere intellect,) in order more certainly to convince himself and others, how little *the Bible, any more than the Church*, can have been intended to furnish a strict and inflexible rule of faith or morals. He will enlarge on the duty of adapting the Christian scheme to the wants of each successive period; and—since the very circumstance, of his having taken up his present position on merely intellectual grounds, proves him wholly ignorant that holy obedience is the one illuminating principle which enables us to distinguish the essential from the accidental, and that saints are accordingly the only autho-

rities we can safely follow on such subjects,—he will enter on the unspeakably arrogant task, of determining for himself these vital questions by the mere light of intellect, and under no higher influences than the carnal spirit of the age. Should he believe in our Lord's Resurrection (on which I suppose the external evidence is very difficult of evasion); and should he be pressed by the argument, how impossible it is to conceive that so wonderful an event should have taken place, and yet that the religion, founded on that event, should contain no definite, substantive, unalterable body of doctrine, to be received by faith and grown into by obedience; this argument, which to serious Christians appears so very cogent, will strike him with no force whatever. He will say, that the results of Christianity *have* been most glorious and noble; that in the early and in the middle ages it assumed that very form which most suited those ages; and that all he wishes is, to adopt it himself in the form most suited to *this*. Nay, he will perhaps fully acknowledge, that such events as those to which Catholics point as marks of God's especial Providence,—for instance the absence of the later emperors from Rome and consequent growth of Papal power,—*are* marks of such Providence: for that the very errors of Mediæval Christianity were matters of salutary belief, much more was the Church polity, then existing, admirable and beneficent in its results.

Now I cannot deny that one cause of this painful appearance, presented to such minds by the Church, is the circumstance, to which I must hereafter return, that Catholicism abroad *has* in the present age been very far from intellectually adequate to the exigencies of its position; and has been, I suppose, very much excelled by human philosophies, in the genius and powers of mind, which it has, quite of late, called forth and cultivated. But another much more powerful reason is the obvious fact, that these other theories have never come in direct contact with the masses, nor influenced at all, much less in a very wide extent, the course of practical life. A system, which has for so many centuries acted so conspicuous a part in the busy and practical scene of life, must in all necessity have its prosaic side as well as its

poetical ; while those will naturally be more attractive to the imagination, which have their main origin *in* the imagination. This reason however seems to a considerable extent included in the two which follow, and which appear to me to approach more nearly the bottom of the question.

First, the sacred and essential truth is cherished and displayed in every detail of the Catholic system, of the infinite superiority of moral over intellectual greatness ; the truth, that one temptation to evil consistently overcome, through God's grace, by the humblest Christian, is an infinitely nobler object of contemplation, than the most brilliant theories, or the most wonderful generalizations and deductions. Now a Christian who, to the most enlarged mind and profoundest wisdom, should superadd the possession, so infinitely more precious, of a tender and watchful conscience, causes in the mind of a candid observer, who may happen not to sympathise with this latter, a peculiar admixture of surprise and contempt with whatever there may be of admiration. Such a Christian appears, after having proposed to himself the most exalted and comprehensive designs, to be restrained by weak and superstitious scruples from measures which are necessary to follow them out. Or he will neglect their prosecution at an important moment from the call of duty, or as it will appear to those not understanding such a call, from the mere effect of feebleness of mind, and religious caprice. Or his habitual trust in the aid of Providence, and anxious dependence on slight intimations of God's pleasure, will produce an effect, which looks like deficiency in the power of pursuing a continued and well-planned course of action. Or even without reference to its bearing on political exertion, the continual check on the free course of thought and conversation, caused by habitual watchfulness against sin ; e. g. against any thing approaching to slander or profaneness ; appears to ' them that are without ' stiff and pusillanimous. Again, the love and desire of suffering, to which a very sensitive conscience infallibly leads,—the hair-shirt, or self-inflicted stripes, or long fasts,—if they do not appear most admirable and excellent, appear childish and superstitious. Or when the worldly-wise observer, reasoning only from

analogy, may expect that some particular line of conduct, which is expedient, will be thought wrong by such a Christian, he will find the reverse ; and the reasons given for the distinction between this and some other line which he *did* think wrong, will appear hair-splitting and frivolous in the very highest degree. It is most important always to bear in mind, that this last is precisely the appearance presented, by all attempts to explain the most real and fundamental distinctions to those, who, from not having cultivated the appropriate faculties, have not at present the power of apprehending that particular class of truths. To take a very serious instance: even the more religious men at present have a tendency to consider the differences, between orthodoxy and Arianism or Nestorianism, at all events less vital and fundamental than they were considered by contemporary Catholics. To take a more familiar case: a person destitute of taste for music will consider any attempt to explain, in methodical language, the toto-cœlo difference *in kind* between the effect caused on the mind respectively by Beethoven's and Rossini's music, as over-subtlety, or over-imaginativeness, or the two united. Just so, any one who has not lived in the habit of hourly regulating his conduct by a regard to the rule of right, will be blind to the most essential distinctions of morality, and will consider the attempt to explain them sophistry, and the habit of acting on them dishonesty.¹ And thus it will happen, that the wisest and most sagacious Saint would be considered by the world at large, if they have not deep faith in Catholic Christianity, to unite no small degree of littleness of spirit, nay, of positive moral obliquity, with his undeniable genius, greatness, and power of mind. Nor would it be difficult, were it worth while, to draw a similar picture, in the case where his sphere is that of abstract speculation, not of practical action. And from all this, we see at once how similar will be the effect produced by the Church herself; which, in her united action, may be expected to display on the whole the same principles and qualities of mind.

¹ It must be observed, that I am not denying that dishonest casuistry *has* existed within the Church, but am only saying that honest casuistry will certainly to multitudes of men *appear* dishonest.

The other characteristic of true Christianity, to which attention should be directed in this connection, is, that whereas rival systems of philosophy have their seat in the fancy or imagination, the Gospel has its seat in the affections. But, 'in the case of all our deepest emotions, it is the very law of our nature, that those possessed by them shall appear in the world's eye to dote on trifles and be childishly intent on forms; that they shall cherish, with a loving and reverent regard, every thing which may serve to remind them of, every thing which has the most distant connection with, the beloved object.'^m Now supposing hypothetically for a moment (what is the very contrary of the truth), that such peculiarities and tendencies implied any the slightest weakness of mind, even then we know how great a part of the interest of life in worldly men, whose minds and affections are at all elevated above the herd, arises from the indulgence of such feelings; nor is it obvious e. g., why to kiss fondly a mother's portrait or lock of hair is more manly, than to cherish and bear about a crucifix or a fragment of the true Cross. And the contrast becomes much greater, when we consider the common herd of irreligious men; for surely the taking of pains to secure the comforts of every day life, the being solicitous about the cooking of our dinner, the finding it difficult to refrain from unwholesome indulgence in the article of food, the greediness of present praise or posthumous renown, the powerlessness of commanding our temper, in the little minor miseries of life, the difficulty of bearing sickness cheerfully, and a thousand similar weaknesses, to which in various measures most of us, I suppose, must plead guilty, and to which certainly very eminent philosophers and mathematicians have been in subjection, but from which saintly men are eminently emancipated, all these are surely, on any possible view of things, incomparably lower and more contemptible, than even what some might call a superstitious regard to sacred relics or images. But then human philosophy, being as I have said

^m 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 15.

unpractical and imaginative, puts aside from our view this degrading aspect of human nature, it represents its hearers as the ideal personifications of intellectual power or artistical grace. Here then we see great cause for the ridiculous mistakes continually committed by the Protestant or man of the world, in judging the great luminaries of the Church. In their case human affections and emotions indefinitely purified and exalted, and fixed on a Heavenly Object, are the very vital principle of their conduct. This it is which gives unity to their life, whether speculative or active; the earnest habitual devotion of their whole heart and soul, not to some abstract principle, but to a Living Person, and for His sake to those most dear to Him. Those mental habits then and external practices, to which in the case of worldly heroes, philosophers shut their eyes, that they may gaze on what appears to the carnal perception more great, splendid, and glorious, these cannot be removed from public sight in the Church of Christ; but are then most prominently displayed and most zealously defended, when the most arduous conflicts are to be waged, or the most noble deeds to be done. To be ashamed of devotion to the Blessed Saints, or to the relics of their earthly tabernacles, or to holy images, is to be ashamed of the Cross of Christ, and to lower the standard of high and heavenly philosophy before the supercilious, specious, empty, philosophy of the world. For by so doing, we shrink from publicly professing the great Christian truth, that ardent personal love to Christ, whose friends those Saints are, who has dwelt by the agency of the Holy Ghost within those earthly tabernacles, and who is Himself represented in those images, that this ardent personal love for Him is the very centre of all true philosophy, and, as from an eminence commands all the powers of our intellect and imagination submissively to bend before it and do its bidding.

These are I think the principal reasons of the certain fact, that 'Christ crucified,' as preached by the Church, is in great measure 'foolishness' to the philosophical world now, as it was in the first ages of the Gospel; and that men of high aspirations and capabilities, if undisciplined and unchastised,

will be far more readily attracted by the dazzling brilliancy of human philosophies, than by the severe and unearthly grace of the Bride of the Lamb. I have said, as in the first ages; but I should rather say incomparably more than in the first ages; for, in this as in very many other particulars, there is even a marked contrast between this and the primitive period on the very matter in hand, on the respective position of the Church and those that are without: a contrast which gives much greater force to the argument. Then human philosophies were effete, unattractive, 'waxen old,' while the Church came forth as it were unto an unoccupied arena, promising to 'declare Him whom they ignorantly worshipped;' but now, while the Church has to bear the responsibility of all the assailable points in her past history, which must of necessity have arisen from her long and close proximity to the world, human systems have come out new and glittering, and as it were with the gloss on them; which, as being the *products* of the age, have a natural suitableness and promise of satisfaction at least to the more obvious and superficial *requirements* of the age.^a And thus it is now, as I have just said, that the undisciplined and unchastised, should they be endued with high aspirations and great capabilities, will be attracted by the 'shams' rather than by the reality; and for the very same reason those who *are* duly disciplined and chastised will cling to the reality, and despise the 'sham.' Those in whom powerful intellect, brilliant genius, active imagination, lord it over the other faculties, will suffer the penalty of their misconduct by following the ignis fatuus which lures them from their true rest and peace; but those others who, whether by the right use of outward sorrow, or the right application of inward discipline, have a sensitive conscience, and a tender heart, will be irresistibly attracted by such very characteristics as those I lately named, which

^a Of course a very far more important point of contrast is afforded, in the high and admirable religious attainments of great numbers among the Protestants; a fact forming so marked an opposition to any thing witnessed in the heathen world, during the early conflicts of the Church. This consideration I omit in the text, merely as not bearing on the subject I am now upon.

promise support and satisfaction to the conscience, and consolation to the heart.

But the intellectual and philosophical results, which flow from a denial of the supremacy of conscience, must be pressed still further; and that alas! not only to shew theoretically in what direction we may be unawares going, but to shew by living examples how far we have already gone. Now, first, a denial of the *supremacy* of conscience is a denial of its *existence*; if conscience really exist, and speak with an articulate voice, then in all moral and religious subjects it must be absolutely paramount and dictatorial; the intellect must confine itself to the humbler, yet most honourable, office of classifying and connecting phenomena, that they may be fairly submitted to it; and again of rightly interpreting its dictates. and scientifically analyzing and expressing them.^o This is evident at once: for conscience is the only guide which even *professes* to give us knowledge on the invisible world, or on the eternal laws of right and wrong; it must be therefore *either* a delusion, *or* authoritative and without appeal. This is so very obvious, that no one has ever denied it; all without exception who professedly deny its authority in any particular on which it speaks, deny the very fact that it *does* speak, and attribute the phenomena in question to other causes, such as excited feelings or delusive imagination. Now I wish to put forward plainly and in the face of day this further truth, which is equally evident; *if conscience does not speak, we can neither apprehend the idea, nor have any ground for believing the existence, of God Himself.* A very few words will suffice to shew this. The idea of God has no archetype, either in the visible course of things whereof our senses give us experience, nor yet in the *à priori* field of space and time whereof alone the intellect is exclusively cognizant: we can neither derive the idea then from our intellect, nor from our senses, nor from any faculty which does not possess the power of putting us into communication with *realities and essences*: in other words, only

^o See this explained at greater length 'On Mill's Logic.' pp. 400—402, 407, 8.

from our conscience ; for no other faculty even *professes* this power. It is accordingly acknowledged, I believe, by all philosophers at the present day with one voice, that the consideration of final causes is most edifying indeed to the religious believer, and most useful as a support to languishing faith, by exhibiting as it were a visible pledge of God's power and attributes ; but that, as a sufficient basis for Theism, it is absolutely and completely worthless. This is very important ; for vast multitudes are fruitlessly endeavouring to occupy some middle position, between granting all to conscience and denying all ; yet is it so very plain, that, notwithstanding its great importance, I can find no words to make it plainer. Let me then repeat what I have said. If conscience be not on all moral and religious subjects paramount, then it does not really exist ; if it do not exist, we have no reason whatever, nay, no power whatever, to believe in God.

This, I have already said, is no mere theory. I was obliged, in writing an article on Mr. Mill's Logic, to express a most serious doubt whether he could fairly be considered, from his system, to possess religious belief of any kind : and I certainly am not aware of any living English intellectual speculator, in a non-theological line, who appears to me at all Mr. Mill's equal in power and acquirements. Since I wrote that review, I have read great part of a work, which Mr. Mill cites with the warmest approbation, and without one word of qualification as to its religious tenets. I allude to M. Comte's 'Cours de Philosophie Positive.' Here is to be found a series of plain, direct, and even earnest disavowals of Theism in all possible shapes, and the expression of a confident expectation, that in a few centuries hence the very existence of any religious belief will be only known as a matter of history. Moreover, the very argument on which M. Comte grounds his Atheism, is the one of which I have been speaking ; the circumstance, that (as he considers) we have no such faculty as a conscience.^p I hardly think that

^p I was told in the shop of a foreign bookseller in London that this work enjoys a considerable sale in this country.

under any circumstances, such views as these can ever obtain extensive reception; *naturam expellas,* &c., and even M. Comte, very much more Mr. Mill, shew plain marks that at last conscience is more than a match for them. But though firm and undoubting *disbelief* in the power of knowing God's existence may be always rare, I fear that a very extensive subversion of firm and undoubting *belief* in Him, that belief which alone can enable man for a continuance to resist the evil tendencies and temptations which assail him, this I fear is very far from improbable: indeed it seems to me the precise issue and consummation, to which the course of speculation (judging from what one hears of it) in the European world is fast tending. For many years among ourselves (who are most creditably backward in the race) physical science has been cultivated, on principles absolutely inconsistent with belief in the efficacy of such prayers as we have, for 'rain' or for 'fair weather;' and multitudes even of clergymen have pursued scientific studies on these principles. To the best of my belief, not one of them has ever seemed so far to realise the doctrine of intercessory prayer and Providential interference, as even to observe this discrepancy; much less has any of them attempted to solve the difficulty. In many quarters the task is in progress (I think very healthfully in itself) of extending the principles of physical science to psychological and political; and Mr. Mill's *Logic* is a very interesting repertory of facts illustrating this statement. Even so admirable and high-minded a periodical as 'the *Christian Remembrancer*' contained an article on Mr. Mill's work in the October number, the writer of which seemed to have no suspicion of the Atheistical taint with which the work is infected. In my article on the subject, I have endeavoured to shew the perfect consistency between the free progress of experimental science, and complete disbelief in that 'fatal' course of physical nature, which had hitherto been assumed as its fundamental tenet. But the authority whence the principles were derived which, I really believe, establish this most conclusively and satisfactorily, was no 'scientific' clergyman, no writer of Bridgewater treatises, but an old

article of Mr. Newman's on "Milman's History of Christianity." Seeing then that even in the most unsuspected quarters this atheistical leaven has made (of course wholly unknown to themselves) such alarming encroachments, what have we not to fear from the continued progress of human thought, if we do not obtain grace from God to abandon our proud rationalism, and restore His Voice within us to that place of honour and supremacy, from which almost all parties just now seem madly conspiring still further to dethrone it?

Such then is the course which speculation seems certain to take among us, unless we be wise in season, and precipitately retrace our steps. We find that even those whom so many of us are disposed more or less to trust as our guides in moral inquiries, the profound philosophers of this world, will be at last but 'blind leaders of the blind,' and lead us with continually accelerated progress towards 'the ditch.' Moral and religious truth must be acquired by moral and religious discipline; we must stoop to enter by that 'narrow way,' if we desire ever to wing a sustained and lofty flight in the atmosphere of pure and invigorating philosophy.

8. But now when we are pressed overwhelmingly with this preliminary difficulty, where are we to *learn* this inward discipline of which I speak, and in what school to practise and foster it? Conscience is in the main a critical not an active faculty; it must be cherished and supported by continued help and motives from without, or else, almost before it be called into conscious existence, the various evil passions and propensities of our nature will have hurried on the whole man, into a sinful course which will *blind* conscience. There must of necessity then be for all of us some constant and uniform external guidance from the first; or 'the light that is in us will be darkness,' and we shall be left to grope our way at random. And the considerations we have been lately pursuing, shew us that the same is the case even with those possessed of the highest intellectual gifts. We have found that these have no real advantage over more ordinary Christians in their means of discerning the Divine Will: there is

no royal road opened to the wisdom of this world; not 'one law for the rich and another for the poor;' the temptations to a false judgment are different in the two cases, but are equally real temptations. Conscience alone can guide us aright; and by following our intellect instead of our conscience, we shall be led even more fearfully and widely astray, than by acquiescing in the more humble but not more sinful suggestions of indolence and self-interest. In what school then, and under what instructors, are we, all of us, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, intellectually deep and intellectually shallow, to learn that degree of moral discernment and self-mastery, which may enable us to see aright what further step it may be God's pleasure that we take?

Blessed indeed with unusual blessedness are those who, in whatever age and country, have been placed from the first by God's Providence within a pure and orthodox Church, and have been led by His grace to cooperate faithfully with her teaching. These go on day by day purifying their hearts more diligently by the methods wherein she has trained them, appropriating more deeply and entirely the doctrine she has taught them, and exercising more joyfully and exultingly the habits of mind, acquired by these fundamental duties, in the exercises of private or public devotion, of secret meditation or solemn ceremonial, which she places before them. And then as time goes on, and their various tendencies and capabilities are manifested, they will find one by one the fullest provision for their requirements in her Divine System.

Are they, for instance, endued with high and piercing intellectual power? They apply themselves to the deep study and further development of that wonder in the world's history, the edifice of dogmatic theology which the Church has reared, and which all, who have given their minds to it, with one voice proclaim, to be an intellectual prodigy, as absolutely singular, as absolutely beyond all possible comparison with the achievements of human philosophy, as heaven is above earth, or the wisdom of God above the theories of man. The intellect is then only the best of its kind, when it rightly understands its place; and that it should consider

itself as a supreme arbiter in moral and religious questions, implies a deficiency which must unfit it for the due performance of its own functions. An intellect which oversteps its fit province, shews itself, by that very circumstance, to be a shallow intellect; but placed where God would have it placed, in humble and abject submission to the conscience, then at length it is able to develop its wonderful powers, and rise to those lofty heights which might have been thought wholly beyond its range.⁹ This then is the central position, from which Catholic students of philosophy will view the current theories of the day; and the assumption of which will enable them to impart valuable and even necessary accessions to the fabric itself, from the truths accidentally discovered or illustrated in those theories. Such is the legitimate and most satisfactory scope for those high and rare powers of mind, which God has granted to some, and which so often,—by being allowed to conflict with our higher nature instead of bending before it,—become a snare or burden, rather than a blessing, to those possessed of them.

Others again, instead of this, are endued with a brilliant fancy or warm imagination; and these are allowed ample satisfaction in all the æsthetical and poetical side of the Church's ordinances. Those who are rather called to a life of practical exertion, may lead the life of missionaries or of parish priests almost like missionaries, by help of the admirable training the Church has given them for that purpose, and the admirable machinery with which she puts them into connection. Others, who are led rather to deep spiritual contemplation, will find a sphere of mental exercise most appropriate to their disposition, by sounding the depths of the Church's ascetic and mystical theology, and becoming fit guides in the spiritual life to the higher and purer souls who may desire their help. Others, from continued sickness or sorrow, will

⁹ The pure intellect really exhibits to the full its astonishing capabilities, I think, only on two subjects: pure mathematics, which are its creation, and in which it legitimately claims absolute supremacy; and dogmatic theology, in which it submits contentedly to the only position allowed it on the field of morals and religion, the humble and dutiful subserviency to the spiritual nature.

come to the Church rather for comfort than for means of usefulness; and will obtain what they seek. The multitude of men again, who are immersed in secular business, will desire from the Church, not a new calling, but continued direction and edification *in* their calling; and these will receive at her hands, through her various instruments, such deep and holy lessons as their necessities require. But all without exception, in proportion as they have submitted themselves with faithful and true hearts to the lessons they learn, from whatever side they view the great fabric in connection with which God has placed them, (speaking only of secondary causes, and without allusion to the great Gift which gives such causes a supernatural effect,) obtain, both from personal experience and from the mysterious sympathy which exists with others like-minded, a conviction of the divine and unearthly character of this 'pillar and ground of truth,' of its claims on their hearty allegiance and unquestioning belief, far deeper and more intimate than any other conviction of which our nature is susceptible.^f

But, alas! speaking generally, for us English the practical question is, not how those who have learned the pure Gospel from their childhood acquire a conviction, which may rather be called even knowledge, that their Church is a trustworthy and heavenly guide, but how those who have been placed under systems in various degrees imperfect or erroneous, may learn to better their doctrine or even their position. Now surely, if we would only discard theories and look at facts as they really stand, we should have no real difficulty at all in answering this question. The conscience, it appears,

^f 'If any one should suppose the idea itself of unquestioning submission to authority, in its appointed sphere, unworthy of a rational being, let him fancy the imaginary case of a son blessed with an infallible father. With what a confiding and enthusiastic tenderness he would regard him! Yet how hopelessly would he attempt to recall to his mind all those incidents, in every hour of every day for so many years, which, taken together, justify such confidence! how confused would he be if questioned on the subject! how enraged, or rather astounded, shocked, and bewildered, if seriously advised, nay, clamorously called upon, to investigate his father's claims on his deference, with an impartial and critical eye!' 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 393.

may be called into active exercise from a very early period; cannot however be so called forth or fostered without a present and active external guide; and cannot *choose* for itself, with any prospect of success, one guide rather than another, until it has arrived to a very considerable growth and maturity. Where can our eyes be, if we do not at once see the fact, so signally and conspicuously placed over against *this* fact, in God's dealings with the world? Why is the child to *seek*, what God has placed immediately in contact with him? Is not the sacred and mysterious *parental* tie the holiest of all God's natural ordinances? are not a child's parents, according to the arrangements of Providence, addressed by almost every imaginable motive, which can lead them to guide him aright, at least during his earliest years, in matters of principal importance? and have not children themselves, as the mysterious correlative to this last circumstance, a deeply implanted tendency to accept with the most implicit and unsuspecting confidence all that their parents place before their minds? And when we have these plain facts before us, what madness to theorize about Apostolical Succession, or Visible Unity, or independent study of Scripture, and to call on the young, who have hardly, or not yet, left the tutelage of their parents, to tear up by the roots their most sacred prepossessions, and enter forsooth on the solemn mockery, of a free and candid inquiry into the religious doctrines they have learned?

Far different is the divinely appointed method of acquiring new religious truth. 'How early a course of probation begins with children, need not be said; nor what decisive influence their deportment under that probation has on their future fortune. The word of their parents, from the very first, supplies to them the place of the *external* voice of God, correlative and responsive to His voice within them. In proportion to their confiding trust and ready eager obedience, does that inward faculty give a deeper and fuller meaning to the lessons of *truth* which they so acquire; while that which is *false* in statement or even in principle, as meeting with no kindred atmosphere, like the notes of a musical instrument

in a space exhausted of air, convey no definite meaning to the conscience. Such are God's ordinary dealings with children; nor is this process interrupted, when the parent commits them to a school-system, or trusted friend, or ultimately *to some religious community*; they repose their confidence in this new object of regard with the same implicit, unreserved, submission as before. How long this simple, peaceful, heavenly, course of action will proceed, varies of course indefinitely with all varieties of external statement or inward endowments; but whenever it ends, it has left the pupil in certain and unalienable possession of an invaluable stock of moral principles, of whose truth his conviction is most certain and secure, and which will be in time to come his main stay and support, in temptations from without, in perplexities from within.*

Whether we should endeavour spontaneously to shake the confidence of a person, so situated, in his first instructors, depends on the doctrines they profess. Should their teaching express in words, more or less directly, Lutheranism or virtual Antinomianism, as is the case, I suppose, with very many dissenters, and certainly with a great number of 'Evangelicals' in our own Church; then doubtless, when the time of full intelligence has arrived, we should appeal to the Christian's conscience and higher feelings, either by words or by bringing before him a better system, and do our utmost in drawing his attention to the utter incompatibility which exists, between the doctrines he hears and the first principles of morality. Nay, even before the period of full intelligence, should he be seriously dispirited and perplexed by the strange, unreal, anti-moral, language held by his instructors, we should do well in relieving him, as far as possible, from his anxiety, by imparting to him a knowledge of the pure Gospel; though we should earnestly endeavour so to guard all we say, as to involve the least possible reflection on those, whom it is so highly his duty to reverence. In other cases, we should rather fix his mind on the truest and highest parts of his ex-

* 'On Goode,' pp. 39, 40.

isting system ; not concealing perhaps from his knowledge those further truths towards which we hope to attract him, but at the same time earnestly impressing upon him the maxim, that it would be even sinful in him to leap forward, as it were, to reach them, before his conscience should be fully ripe for their reception. Above all, we should, with our whole heart and soul, urge upon him the continued practice of such duties, as daily self-examination, habitual watchfulness of conscience, frequent prayer ; for these are the only safeguards he can possess, against liability to the most outrageous and extravagant delusions. The greater stress he lays on these duties, the deeper sense he acquires of the sinfulness of sin and the craft and constant hostility of his great spiritual enemy, the more zealous and earnest will he be in pressing forward towards a new range of doctrine, which may promise him increased help and support against their assaults. It will frequently happen, that he will suddenly observe himself to have reached, by such means as these, a series of truths, the very contradictories of which he had otiosely held in times past : here is a most unexceptionable mode of abandoning early prepossessions. Or if he be intellectually gifted, he may discern that the doctrines, witnessed to him by his conscience, are theoretically inconsistent with some of his traditionary opinions, to which his conscience bears no witness : here also he will obviously please God by giving up those traditionary opinions.

But what shall we say of other opinions he has imbibed in a similar manner, and which have therefore the sacredness of early association : which however conscience does not *witness* on one side, nor yet does either conscience or intellectual inference from conscience *contradict* on the other ? As a strong illustration of what I mean, I may instance the sacredness he may have learned to attach to the ministers or ordinances of his religious community. Most certainly it *may* be his bounden duty to abandon such opinions ; but as certainly the ‘onus probandi’ lies signally and emphatically with those who call on him to do so. He has learned these opinions from

God Himself, for they were part of that very system to which God consigned him for early instruction; nothing then short of the most urgent and irresistible proofs, will justify him in resigning them. This is a question of the deepest practical importance at the present time, as is very plain; and I hope in a future chapter to consider it with greater particularity. Here I will only add, that it has often struck me, as one conceivable reason for that inscrutable dispensation of Providence, whereby the English Church is placed in her present most anomalous condition, gifted with the power of dispensing sacramental grace, and yet wholly destitute of external notes, and wholly indefensible, as to her position, by external, historical, ecclesiastical, arguments;^d one purpose, I say, designed by this may be, that the whole Church may have her mind attracted to those all-important truths, to which I drew so particular attention in the second chapter, and which there seemed great danger of many among her members forgetting;—the absolute supremacy of conscience;—and the high sacredness of hereditary religion. This latter most important principle is one of the two great *conservative* elements in our moral nature; the other being (what I have spoken of ‘*usque ad nauseam*,’ and only wish that I practised it as constantly as I mention it) the laborious realisation of the doctrines we profess, the careful and habitual practice of watchfulness, self-examination, prayer: while the *impulsive* element arises indeed from the last-named conservative element; and is that tendency, whereby the spiritual mind, in proportion to

^d In saying this, I am hardly saying more than Mr. Newman in his last volume, who says, that the outward notes of our Church are ‘partly gone and partly going.’ (p. 378.) The existence of those inward notes which he mentions, I most undoubtingly believe; the only point on which I cannot follow his teaching on the subject (waiving perhaps one or two difficulties, which are mainly questions of words, and if the very mention of difference from him be not unpardonable presumption, as I humbly trust it is not) is this; that putting aside the outward mark which consists in the visible fruits of the Holy Ghost in others, (a mark indeed by far the strongest in kind of all external marks,) I am wholly unable to discern the outward notes of which he speaks, during any part of the last three hundred years.

its enlightenment, presses eagerly forward in every direction in search of fuller satisfaction, and day by day, even unconsciously, develops its existing creed into fresh results, derives more of admirable and sublime truths from Scripture, and assimilates to itself and inwardly appropriates fresh nutriment from every object which meets its view. The eagerness with which this is done, is simply an excellence under the head of a theological virtue; being *quickness of faith*: nor is it possible for the mind to be too actively and unceasingly devoted to the task, so long as it is steadied and directed by those two conservative elements of which I have spoken.

Reverting now to the observations a few pages back, on the inevitable consequence which would result in regard to the more intellectual, ardent, and imaginative minds, from that most sinful course, an unbiassed and independent search for moral, philosophical, or religious truth; let me again entreat for what I have said, the careful consideration of those, who disparage, in one way or other, the sacredness of individual conscience, and substitute, as our guide to Christian knowledge, criticism from without in the place of development from within. It matters not whether they do so in the shape of inculcating a free examination of the text of Scripture, or of the writers reputed orthodox during the early centuries, or of the various external notes of truth which different bodies at this time may present. These different applications of the principle are the symbols, as is well known, of very different theologies: but the principle, the most sinful principle, is common to them all. See then, I beseech you, in what your exhortations will issue. They will not effect the more ordinary and acquiescent minds: these, except for strong external impulse, will always remain contented with their existing position. Nor yet will they affect the most spiritual and heavenly-minded Christians, who may be ill furnished with intellectual gifts: for *their* mind is wholly insensible to the force of any argument on the opposite side, though they often fancy themselves to be influenced by reasoning on their own side; the real truth being, that, though they learn parrot-like to *repeat* reasoning on their own side,

their conviction does not depend on argument at all, but on far higher, more legitimate, and more satisfactory grounds. As regards either of these two classes, your exhortations will pass over their heads as 'idle wind,' neither controverted, nor yet regarded, nor even understood. Others, more weak and unstable in faith, and possessed of sufficient intellectual power to understand a difficulty, without sufficient power to devise its solution; such men as these you may, in very great numbers, frighten, perplex, and discourage, so far as to render them faint-hearted and cowardly in their Christian course, and distrustful of their ability ever to discern religious truth: to that extent you will succeed in shaking them, and no further; and a truly honourable victory you will obtain. But it is those of whom I was speaking a few pages back, and whose course of opinion will be incalculably influential on the fortunes of our Church, it is these and these only, that you will really persuade into adopting the course you recommend; these will understand your meaning much better than you do yourselves, and have already only too much of evil inclination corresponding to your evil words. These men you will succeed in moving; and in what direction? not towards Catholicism, nor towards 'Anglo-Catholicism,' nor towards 'Evangelicalism,' nor towards moderate 'Church-of-Englandism:' but towards *infidelity*. That a nominal reception of Scripture itself is no security whatever against this, was always evident enough from abstract reasoning; but German examples have proclaimed the truth, beyond all possibility of doubt or mistake.

You above all, O Roman Catholics in England, what madness urges you to a course, so contrary to your own principles, so fatal to your own claims? Members you are of that Church, which, by special Divine Gift, is so spiritually and mysteriously ordered, that the course of submissive and dutiful loyalty to *any* existing system leads forward humble Christians,—in proportion, on the one hand, to the devotedness of their spiritual exertions, and on the other hand to their opportunity of removing misconception, of recognising their own doctrines, and of knowing yours,—

leads them forward, I say, in that proportion to love and reverence *for* that Church. And what madness then urges you to check their course in that very path, which is leading them in your direction, and to impel them, of purpose aforethought, into the highway of free inquiry and speculation, where they will find other philosophies far more dazzling and attractive to their, as yet carnal, sight than your own? I am not speaking of your wish to include immediately within your fold those whom in doctrine you consider already ripe for admittance; nor even of appealing to those who are less advanced in opinion, still on the ground of their sympathy with your religious system, your faith, your sanctity: as regards these indeed I humbly but firmly express my utter dissent and bitter sorrow at many of your usual methods of procedure; but still I see much naturally to be urged in your defence. I am speaking of a habit far more obviously indefensible; that habit whereby you summon inquirers indiscriminately, without regarding in any way their moral preparation of heart, to a sifting investigation on the first principles of their belief; whereby you endeavour, whether in print or in personal addresses, to shake their confidence in all the doctrines and principles which they most certainly hold, and exhort them at once to abandon, on recognising its lack of argumentative basis, the system they have learned to revere. That attempts so utterly contradictory to the dispensation of nature have hitherto met little success, I gladly acknowledge: but were you to succeed in your baleful endeavours to unsettle and disturb, what would follow? For one hundred whom you might render dissatisfied with their existing position, I doubt if there is so much as one whom you would attract and retain in your own Church: all classes of the community would have cause to sorrow for your success, but none such bitter cause as yourselves. What! is it by means of *free inquiry* that the very sympathy and reverence for yourselves has been created within our Church, of which you think thus to take advantage? was it by *free inquiry* that Mr. Froude was led first boldly to sound the note of love

and honour to Rome? nay, was it by *free inquiry* that any one of your more distinguished converts was led the first ninety-nine of the hundred steps which placed him among you? You know very well how far this is from the fact; and be sure of this, as of a first principle, that free inquiry may perform, and that in a very short time, the office of making a religious people sceptical (for that, witness the Reformation); but it must be a very opposite method which will bring them back, or give you any hope of completing your benevolent and religious desires for our highest welfare.

9. This whole question will come before us again, and with greater detail, in a future chapter; when I hope to shew more at length the *intellectual* emptiness of this proud and carnal philosophy: enough at all events has been said here (and it is the purpose for which it has been introduced) to shew the extreme importance of the subject. Such then being the fearful mischief with which the rationalistic view is pregnant, it bears closely on our purpose to observe, that it never could have existed in our Church with any degree of plausibility, but for the extensive and blighting influence of Lutheran doctrine; a doctrine which in its abstract profession wholly repudiates, and in its practical effect so fatally disparages, the most primary and fundamental truths of natural religion. Had such duties as those to which I have so repeatedly referred, watchfulness of conscience, self-examination, and the like, been enforced among us in a degree bearing even any ascertainable proportion to their indispensable necessity, the clearness and articulateness with which conscience pronounces its dictates, and the deep unity which really exists on moral and religious matters among all who make holy obedience their first, their one, care, this fact would have forced itself on the notice of many even uncandid inquirers. At the same time ordinary Christians would have learned to see more and more into the depth and unearthliness of the saintly character; and thus the religious experience of eminently holy men would have been generally admitted, as the appointed corrective and guide to the individual conscience.

Now how full of hopefulness is this whole view of the matter,

in respect to that object, which must be so very near to the heart of all who love their Lord with any life and sincerity, — the ultimate reunion of all faithful Christians; and the consequent reedification of the Church in all its characteristic glory, as the rallying point of all that is high and holy: whereby the forces of good might be concentrated in action against their common enemies, instead of being weakened and exhausted by their intestine divisions, and thus affording an easy triumph to the powers of the world! Oh! to whom would not the labour of a life appear but dust in the balance, if it were permitted before death to see even a distant prospect of so glorious a consummation? And how deeply interesting then is the present discussion, if the views here maintained be indeed well-founded! For surely there is no religious community in the land, among whose members we might not be able to circulate (in writing or otherwise) such appeals to their conscience as these; appeals which should make it a point of careful solicitude to avoid all allusion to such matters of infinitely minor importance, as external ritual or other outward forms; nay, which might put aside matters, in themselves so vital and essential even as sacramental grace, but which belong to a later period in the religious course, and will be eagerly accepted, nay sought for, by those who begin in the humble path of obedience and self-denial; appeals which should lay their whole stress in enforcing on the conscience of all, those great duties, to which the conscience of all would most surely, sooner or later, be found to respond. I am not meaning, of course, that such appeals should be confined to barren and general exhortations, which would be next to useless. But every thing surely might be hoped from more definite and practical addresses; as, e. g. the description, in its various details, of the real Christian character; of the humility, non-ensoriousness, charitableness, contentment, cheerfulness, zealous labour in our worldly calling, humiliation for past sin, and the rest, which are its characteristic features: again, from the suggestion of definite practical rules, minute, accurate, details and helps for the real and earnest performance, day

by day, of such duties as the following, and the performance of them as *being* duties: careful self-examination, regular and well-performed prayer, earnest and habitual meditation.

But if there would appear so much ground for hope even in dissenting communities among us, how much more in that Church where God's mercy has placed us, and where the Prayer-book itself affords such powerful cooperation in moulding the youthful mind on an anti-Lutheran model. It will be my anxious endeavour, then, in the two following chapters, and on a subject so painfully serious and important I earnestly wish and pray for God's guidance to my endeavour, to express at least in some very inadequate degree, 1st, the extreme, the almost incredible corruption of our actual system in such particulars; and 2dly, the kind of practical remedies which promise most hopefully for a gradual restoration. But in addressing members of our own Church, to God be the praise, this need not be all. A Church which, even in the dark times that have succeeded the Great Sin of the 16th century, has borne, in some limited measure, so constant a witness to many great Catholic truths, affords common-ground in several other matters, besides this great foundation of all. I trust I may be able to shew English 'high-churchmen,' on how very wide a field, without going one jot or tittle beyond their existing principles, they may be able fully to cooperate with many, whom they now regard with distrust and uneasiness; and how willingly these last would reciprocate any confidence that might be reposed in them, by most strictly confining their practical exertions to the same objects. A further point then will be, to shew how miserably imperfect is the witness borne by our present system to doctrines, which all 'high-churchmen' agree in considering paramount and essential; I mean even such as our Blessed Lord's Divinity itself. And from this, the subject will naturally lead to such other particulars mentioned in my second chapter, as cannot be considered, by any possibility, to tend, even distantly, towards the transgression of what are sometimes called 'the distinctive principles' of the English Church. How far, should we ever succeed in carrying out

even to a limited degree, the *non*-distinctive principles of the English Church, (those I mean which 'high-churchmen' hold in common with the whole Catholic world,) the said 'distinctive' principles will be found to possess any solid existence whatever;—this is a question, on which I have my own very definite opinion, but which I would most gladly leave to be determined by the event.

And I beg in all sincerity and humility to repeat what I said some way back. When I feel called on to use strong language about the corruption of our own Church, or the sinfulness of the Reformation, or similar matters, I really am not at all conscious of being influenced either by desire of eccentricity, or by a spirit of undutifulness. The words I use do not even fully express the convictions that are among the very deepest I feel. And I use them, that I may, at fit time and place, bear my witness against those opinions on the subject of English purity and Roman corruption, which seem to me not only *not* innocent and amiable mistakes, but among the greatest snares and temptations which lie in our path. Nay, even if any one is perfectly convinced that he will always differ from me in his view of such matters, I beg at least that he will prefer doing so *after* consideration of what I have to urge, rather than *without* that consideration.

10. I must not however conclude the present chapter, however disproportionate the length to which it has swollen, without taking a parting view of the Lutheran doctrine.^z We

^z In doing so, I am inclined to notice distinctly an objection to the preceding denunciation of this doctrine, which on the surface has an ingenious appearance. It is asked, can any one say that the *average* of Evangelicals is conspicuously inferior in Christian excellence to the *average* of Roman Catholics? And if not, how misplaced all these severe attacks! A moment's consideration shews the fallacy. No one, I suppose, adopts 'Evangelical' opinions, who does not profess religion to be his chief concern; nay, who does not consider himself quite certainly in God's favour. The only fair comparison then is, not with the mass of worldly Roman Catholics, but with those of them who are in a similar category: of those, that is, who are regular at Confession and Communion. Take the comparison in this, the only fair way, and most striking is the contrast. If we compare the *average* specimens, multitudes of the 'Evangelicals,' from the fearful amount of their 'self-deceit,' are in most imminent danger of eternal ruin: and

have just concluded our consideration of that its fundamental extravagance, whereby it considers the Gospel to be in some sense the reversal, and not merely the complement, of the Natural Law. Another parallel error is, that it considers *grace* in some sense the reversal, and not simply the complement, of *nature*. The utter mistake of such a view is at once obvious. What!

“Does then the Christian, in proportion as he is imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, lose his appreciation of music or of natural beauty? does the ‘*monitus locorum et temporum*’ no longer appeal to his affections? does he find himself endued with some sudden and intuitive perception of religious truth, without graduation of progress, without medium of communication? On such a point the appeal is to *fact*, not to reasoning; and will any one say that the picture we lately attempted to draw, is not true, as far as it goes, of Christians in particular, not less than of men in general? Those theoretical dreamers, who speak as though they fancied that the Christian religion *revolutionizes* (if we may so speak) man’s moral nature, shew the utter baselessness and unreality of their language, exactly as often as they are compelled to confront facts. This is one, out of the many reasons which may be given, for the signal failure of any attempt to form a theology on ‘evangelical’ principles. Certain persons have devised a theory, that under the Gospel, whether from the nature of its spiritual influence, or (as they more commonly represent it) of the truths which it discloses, gratitude for mercy received is a sufficient foundation, whereon a life of consistent holiness may be reared. And what is the result? This, that they cannot give one single practical rule, no not one, for the exercise or improvement of any virtue, without plainly abandoning their fundamental principle. No! Christianity makes no profession of performing on any one, who may have a taste for the experiment, an immediate, sensible, radical transformation, as though by some magical enchantment; ‘the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation,’ whether to the individual or to the world. The natural man forms habits of virtue by single

if we compare the *best* specimens, on the one side we have the Saints of the Church, on the other side a body of men who, however excellent, possess not, to speak generally, (from what I know of their recorded lives I should incline to consider the exceptions extremely few,) so much as the first rudiments of the full Christian character.

acts of obedience and self-denial, looking to God for help, and with his thoughts fixed on heavenly truths ; so also does the Christian : but, beyond any comparison, the spiritual influence which acts on *his* soul is more mighty and ‘instrengthening,’^a and the heavenly truths, on which his faith is supported, more awful and transporting.”^b

But it will be here very pertinently and justly asked, if nature be *not* changed by grace, what force can be given to such very primary and important passages of Scripture, as those which speak of the ‘new creation,’ ‘all things becoming new,’ our being ‘born again’? nay, is not the very phrase ‘change of nature’ adopted by both parties in modern controversy? The reply to this, includes in it a reply to the remaining one of those two fundamental questions at issue, which I mentioned towards the beginning of this chapter; and this reply though I have been compelled in several places already to forestal it, it may be better to repeat once for all. Since the Day of Pentecost, our justification has consisted, not in the mere forgiveness of sins, (which indeed is all that the word itself *means* in Scripture,^c) but in the presence of the Holy Ghost himself within us. He does not supersede our natural faculties, but the very contrary: He elevates, invigorates, quickens, and informs them, making them in a very true sense His own organs and ministers;^d He develops their hitherto latent capabilities, and moulds them into forms, which, but for His Presence, would be unsustainable. That the result of this His wonderful working is a most sufficient fulfilment of these texts, the Protestant himself bears a most unsuspecting witness. For when he reads of mortified hermits, or missionary monks, or holy ascetics; their enthusiastic humility and self-abnegation; their love of suffering, contempt, privation, celibacy; their deep-seated love of orthodoxy, as

^a Dr. Pusey’s translation of *ἐνδυναμοῦντι* in one of his sermons.

^b ‘Church and Synagogue,’ pp. 11, 12.

^c See Newman on Justification, chap. 3.

^d See an expression, parallel to this, defended and shewn to be consistent with the fullest and most entire recognition of the freedom of the will, in Suarez de Gratiâ, lib. vi. chap. 5, 6, 7.

some most dear personal possession, and repugnance for heresy, as for some distasteful and deadly poison; their life of unwearied labour, devotedness, prayer, and their joyousness in that life; their most tender and unspeakable love of the brethren, as witnessed in the incredible pains they will take to turn only one sinner from the error of his ways; their love above all things, and in all things, of their Saviour, insomuch that the thought of Him is the one great vision whereon they support life, and the moment in each day of receiving Him in the Eucharist is felt as the most sufficient, nay, superabundant, refreshment for all their toils and sorrows; when the Protestant reads or hears of all this, he half-pities and half-despises them, and calls their life 'unnatural.' 'Unnatural' is the misbeliever's way of expressing the idea '*supernatural*.'

11. It may be as well to mention, in order to prevent misconception, that in speaking of the Catholic doctrine, in the particular of pride and 'self-righteousness,' I rest not merely on the formal decrees of the Council of Trent, but also on all the devotional works that have repute and celebrity in the Roman Church, and on the universal sentiments of all Saints, whether in early or later ages. I mention this, because I am not prepared to deny that in one or two *dogmatic* treatises there may be expressions on the subject of merit, which are more or less painful to the ear; expressions which probably have their origin in the circumstance, that the writers did not see at the moment the precisely fitting and sufficient answer, to those Lutheran blasphemies which they were called on to oppose. One or two quotations had perhaps better follow here, from works which enjoy the very highest authority; but must be taken merely as *specimens* of an innumerable multitude.

The first is from Rodriguez on 'Spiritual Perfection.' The author is a Jesuit, and the work is generally considered, I believe, the best practical ascetic work in the Church.

"How just and holy men may, with truth, look upon themselves as the worst and last of men; and style themselves the greatest sinners in the world.

“Having shewn that we ought to try to arrive so far, as to reckon ourselves the least of all, and to look upon ourselves as the greatest sinners in the world; it will not be a vain curiosity, but a very profitable inquiry, to explain how the greatest saints could truly have such thoughts of themselves as these. . . . To him that is truly humble, it is easy to look upon himself as the least of all. For, in his brethren he sees nothing but what is good, and nothing in himself but his own faults; and he is so taken up in considering, and seeking how to amend them, that believing he has cause enough to weep for them, he never looks up, to behold what is amiss in others; and for that reason he has a good opinion of all his brethren, and an ill one of himself alone; nay, the more he increases in sanctity, the more easy he finds it, to humble himself in this matter; not only because, as he makes proficiency in other virtues, he does so in humility, and in the knowledge of himself, and comes thereby to have a greater contempt of himself; but also because the more sensible he is of the goodness and mercy of God, the more acquainted he is with his own misery; and thus, one abyss carrying him into another; from the abyss of the greatness of God, into that of his own nothingness; he sees by the light of grace into the very least of his own imperfections. Now, if we set any value upon ourselves, the reason is, because we have little knowledge of God, and are not illuminated with light from heaven; the rays of the Sun of Justice have not yet penetrated into our soul; and so far are we from being able to discover the least atoms of dust, which are our small faults, that we become so blind as not to discern the greatest imperfections. . . .

“St. John Climacus says, that the devil, who seeks nothing but our destruction, endeavours to set continually our virtues and good actions before our eyes, that so he may make us proud; and that God on the contrary, who desires only our salvation, gives particular light to His elect, to make them perceive even the least of their imperfections; and hides the favours He bestows upon them in such manner, that often they perceive not when they receive them. All holy writers teach the same doctrine; and St. Bernard says, that it is by a particular disposition of the divine goodness, which is pleased to keep us humble, that the greater progress one ordinarily makes in perfection the less he thinks he has made; for when any one is arrived to the highest degree of virtue, God permits that something of the perfection of the lowest should yet remain to be

acquired, that he may not think he is advanced so far as he is. Thus the comparison, which is made between humility and the sun, is a very just one; for as the stars disappear, and hide themselves before the sun, so when humility shines truly in souls, all other virtues hide themselves before it in such manner, that they who are humble indeed, seem to themselves to have no virtue at all. They are the only persons, says St. Gregory, who see not in themselves the exemplary virtues which all the world admires. When Moses came down from Mount Sinai, where he had forty days conversed with God face to face, his countenance shone so bright, that all the children of Israel, says the Scripture, beheld it, and he alone knew not that his face was shining, because of the conversation he had had with the Lord. So it is with the humble man; he alone sees not his own virtues; and whatever he does see in himself, appears full of imperfections; nay, he even thinks, that he sees but the least part of his faults; and that those which he sees not, are much more numerous; and thus can he easily look upon himself as the least of all his brethren, and believe that he alone is the greatest sinner in the world. . . .

“When St. Francis was one day pressed by his companion to tell him, how he could have so low an opinion, and speak of himself as he did,—I am, said the saint, fully convinced, that had the greatest sinner received the same favours that I have, he would have made better use of them than I have done; and, on the contrary, I firmly believe, that did God withdraw His hand from me but one moment, I should fall into the most extravagant enormities in the world, and be the worst of men; therefore do I look upon myself as the greatest and most ungrateful of all sinners. This answer is very just, and flows from a great stock of humility, and at the same time contains admirable doctrine. For it is thoughts of this kind moved the saints to humble themselves, and to stoop to the very centre of the earth; and made them fall down at every one’s feet, and truly reckon themselves the greatest sinners. The knowledge of our own weakness, which is the root of humility, was so fixed in their hearts, that they easily distinguished what they were in themselves, from what they were by grace; wherefore considering, that if God had left them but one moment, they might have grown the greatest sinners, they always looked upon themselves as such; and upon the gifts of God, as borrowed favours, which instead of making them less humble, did, on the

contrary, inspire them with a more profound sense thereof. Because they always thought, that they made not that use they ought, of the benefits they had received; so that on whatever side we turn our eyes, whether we cast them down upon what we have of ourselves, or lift them up to behold what we have received from God; we shall always find occasion, to humble and esteem ourselves less than all others."^e

The following is from that celebrated little work, 'The Spiritual Combat;' a work which every Roman Catholic, I suppose, of any seriousness, has in his possession.

"The third kind of temptation is vain-glory. Dread nothing so much as giving the least way to an opinion of yourself and your good works. Take no glory but in the Lord, and acknowledge that all is due to the merits of His life and death. To the utmost verge of life, look upon yourself only with hatred and contempt; let your humility increase every moment, and never cease giving thanks to God, as the author of all the good you have ever done. Beseech Him to succour you; but beware of esteeming His assistance to be the reward of your merits, even though you may have gained the most signal victories over yourself. Be ever in fear, and confess ingenuously, that all your endeavours would be vain, unless God, in whom is all your hope, crowned them with success. Follow this advice, and rest secure that your enemies cannot hurt you."^a

The last shall be from St. Bonaventure's *Life of Christ*.

"As pride is the groundwork of all sin, so is humility of all virtue, and the first step to salvation. It is but a tottering edifice that is not built upon the foundation of humility. Trust not then to your chastity, to your poverty, or to any other virtue you may possess, except it be joined with humility."^b

12. It may be observed that I have avoided in this chapter all discussion of the Scripture argument, and all allusion to the Sacraments.^c In any case the former argument would

^e Vol. ii. pp. 247—252.

^a Chap. lxv.

^b p. 72. (New Translation "For Members of the Church of England," 1844.)

^c A short allusion however in a note to the latter subject may be perhaps allowable; to point out how singularly inconsistent are 'Evangelicals,' in ob-

have been out of place, in a work like this: for there is of course no room for a commentary on the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians; and except some chapters of these Epistles, and one or two of our Lord's parables and sayings, I know not any part of the New Testament which can appear to any mind, not absolutely blinded by prejudice, as sanctioning the Lutheran doctrine. I should as soon think of setting to work gravely to prove from Scripture our Lord's Resurrection, or St. Paul's Conversion, as of proving from it the truths which that doctrine contradicts. Since however, when orthodox persons acknowledge the difficulties in St. Paul's Epistles, notwithstanding they have the sanction of St. Peter's authority, it is often regarded by 'Evangelicals' as a confession of weakness; I beg to state my strong conviction, that those very chapters in those Epistles on which they rely, present incomparably more formidable difficulties in the way of Lutheran than in the way of Catholic doctrine.

But the main reason is the same for both omissions; I am very anxious to urge the certain truth, that Lutheranism is not chiefly a heresy against *revealed*, but against *natural*, religion. To denominate it, as some excellent men do, the 'anti-baptismal' heresy, is to say what is true, but absurdly less than the truth. Doubtless it disparages a principal ordinance of the Gospel; but in addition to this, it denies essential and fundamental truths of natural religion, and contradicts eternal and immutable principles of morality. Without caring to distinguish accurately here between these really distinct classes, and including both under the common

jecting to the Scriptural doctrine of the 'opus operatum.' They continually complain of Catholic theology, as tending towards Pelagianism, and leading men to forget the necessity of grace and the helplessness and sinfulness of unaided nature. Now no doctrine can be devised, which would more habitually impress on the memory and imagination the very truth, for which Evangelicals contend, than does the 'opus operatum;' the very meaning of which is, that grace comes wholly from without, and that men, though *afterwards* under an obligation of faithfully cooperating, are in the first instance wholly passive recipients of the Christian Gift; who may indeed oppose a *barrier* to its entrance by means of mortal sin, but have no *active* work whatever in its first admission.

head 'natural religion,' I will mention two or three among the great number of such truths, which the abstract Lutheran doctrine denies and the practical Lutheran doctrine disparages.

I. That to do what is right because it *is* right and from a motive of duty, is the highest and noblest of all habits; for example, far nobler than the doing what is right out of gratitude for free pardon or for other mercy received. Or in other words, that beings, whose will is not as yet wholly subordinate to the rule of right and the will of God, have this one paramount duty imposed on them before all other duties, viz. to employ unceasing efforts in the task of reducing their will into a fuller and more complete subjection. Or again, (which comes to very much the same thing, and is the mode in which I have expressed it in the *British Critic*,) that obedience to the rule of right, at whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful, and that sin is the one only danger to be dreaded, the one only evil to be avoided.

II. That deep repentance, self-abasement, and the spirit of penance, is an indispensable and primary duty in all who have seriously sinned.

III. That moral and religious truth can only be apprehended in proportion to moral discipline.

IV. That holiness and happiness are indissolubly connected; insomuch that every sinful act or thought lessens the happiness of our final lot, and every good act or thought increases it.

V. That in no other way than a course of right acts, can a habit of acting rightly be acquired.

VI. That the true misery of unregenerate nature is not the fear of punishment, but the consciousness of sin; and consequently that a revelation would afford no relief to that misery, which should remedy the former evil and not the latter; which should give assurance of pardon, without infusing inherent righteousness.

Lutheranism then is wholly inconsistent with the essential principles of natural religion. Again, considered in its Christian aspect, 'it corrupts,' as I have expressed myself in the

British Critic, 'the very principle of orthodoxy itself.' For in the first place it leads its victims to fix their gaze on the internal workings of their own minds, instead of the great Object of Revelation, as their main stay and encouragement: and in the next place, orthodoxy has neither meaning nor basis, except as the correlative of holy obedience; and a theory therefore which disparages the paramount duty of obedience, is equally hostile to the whole fabric of Christian doctrine. And lastly, Lutheranism is also a *specific* heresy; for it denies the essential dogma of inherent righteousness. I trust then that I have sufficiently explained the meaning of various most severe expressions, which I have used on the subject in the British Critic; explained them at least so far as this, that even those who may continue to dissent from the views I hold, will acknowledge that I used such expressions with a precise and definite meaning, not with inconsiderate and hasty vehemence. Since however these expressions have been so often quoted, I think it will be better again to put down on paper the principal among them; as a proof that I have every desire to repeat, in my own name, the extremely condemnatory language which I have used anonymously.

'The two grand heretical paradoxes prevalent among serious minds in this age and country are . . . 1. That the news of forgiveness of sins can convey peace to the afflicted soul before holiness is implanted; or, in other words, that man's misery in his natural state is fear of punishment only, and not consciousness of sin: 2. that such news of forgiveness, if really apprehended, will lead, without pains and trouble on our part, to obedience and holiness; or, in other words, that self-denial is anti-christian.'^a

'In the Catholic church, from first to last, there has been one and only one consistent type of the interior life. The Christian pilgrim has felt himself placed in this world in the midst of a severe and unceasing conflict, his demeanour under which determines his lot hereafter; contending for a prize which needs all his efforts to secure it; climbing up towards it by a severe and rugged path (certain indeed of saving him, be he true to himself and faithful to God's guidance, yet so arduous that sluggishness or self-security

^a 'On Arnold's Sermons,' p. 38.

will be certain ruin); surrounded on all sides by supernatural agencies, evil angels assailing him, good angels supporting him; a spectacle in his struggles to the whole heavenly court; gifted indeed by God with blessings the most ineffable and transporting even here, even in his pilgrimage, yet but faint foretastes these of the far greater bliss in store for him when he shall reach his Home: every suffering rightly endured, every exertion daringly and religiously ventured, increase, as he feels, the reward purchased for him by One who "first bore His own cross," a cross infinitely heavier and more grievous than He has laid on any that follow Him. Apostles, prophets, saints of the early, of the mediæval, of the later Church, whatever differences they may have had in their *objective* theology, (differences however in no way affecting the highest Object of faith,) have had this one uniform *subjective* view of the Gospel scheme; and this the Lutheran system cuts down at its very root. For labour cheered by hope, it substitutes the listlessness caused by assurance; in the place of *sin* as the one only evil to be dreaded, the one only enemy to be feared, it puts its absurd chimera of "self-righteousness" (as though there were almost as much danger in obeying too much as too little); for spiritual blessings reaching to the very innermost heart and soul, it speaks of the cold knowledge of our external and forensic pardon; for a noble and sustained triumph over the old man, it has as if peevish and querulous complaints of his power. To speak as if this latter scheme of doctrine were *in itself* otherwise than radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical, and anti-christian, shews but an inadequate grasp of its antagonist truth

'And in proportion as we believe that this hateful incubus cripples the noblest energies, stifles the loftiest aspirations, oppresses the tenderest feelings of those whom it has claimed as its own, will we from time to time lift up our voice in plain and intelligible warning, if haply its victims may bethink themselves of testing its strange and arbitrary decrees by—we care not what standard—which even *professes* to be divine, by Scripture, by conscience, by the voice of the Church.'^e

'The very first aggression then of those, who labour to revive some degree at least of vital Christianity, (in the room of those gross corruptions and superstitions, which have in these latter days

^e 'On Heurtley's four Sermons,' pp. 445, 6, 7, 8.

among ourselves overlaid and defaced the primitive and simple truth,) their very first aggression must be upon that strange congeries of notions and practices, of which the Lutheran doctrine of Justification is the origin and representative. Whether any heresy has ever infested the Church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine, it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous. It is not only that it denies some one essential doctrine of the Gospel (as, e. g. inherent righteousness); this all heresies do: it is not only that it corrupts *all* sound Christian doctrine, nay the very principle of orthodoxy itself; though this also it certainly does: but its inroads extend further than this; *as far as its formal statements are concerned* it poisons at the very root, not Christianity only, but natural religion. That obedience to the will of God, with whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful; that sin is the one only danger to be dreaded, the one only evil to be avoided; these great truths are the very foundation of natural religion: and inasmuch as this modern system denies those to be *essential* and *necessary* truths, yea counts it the chief glory of the Gospel that under "it they are no longer truths, we must plainly express our conviction, that a religious heathen, were he *really* to accept the doctrine which Lutheran *language* expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss, in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error. Our readers must admit that we have never been slow in acknowledging how much of sincerity and self-devotion there has *in fact* been among those who have embraced this heresy, and to how very great an extent, where that has been the case, individual conscientiousness has neutralized the anti-religious infection. But neither may we forget, on the other hand, how miserably also has this same system in its turn crippled and enchained the religious instinct of its victims, and prevented them from carrying that instinct forward to its legitimate development, the Catholic scheme. Hence the inconsistency, both moral and intellectual, which is so surprising a phenomenon among the "evangelicals;" surprising, that is, at first sight, but no longer surprising, when we regard them as possessed really with religious feelings which draw them *to* Christ, but possessed also by a human, traditionary, and most unscriptural system, which draws them directly *from* Him. Hence that feebleness, ambiguity, uncertainty of doctrinal statement, that inequality, unshapeliness, dwarfishness

of spiritual stature, which persons at all conversant with Catholic models are so pained and disappointed in finding (with very few exceptions) in what they hear or see of religious Protestants.^f

‘ ‘ Evangelicals’ . . . cleave to the soul-destroying heresy of Luther on the subject of Justification.’^g

‘ A religious person who shall be sufficiently clear-headed to understand the meaning of words, is warranted in rejecting Lutheranism on the very same grounds which would induce him to reject Atheism; viz. as being the contradiction of truths, which he feels on most certain grounds to be first principles.’^h

‘ If it be true that the idea of duty is more deeply rooted in our nature even than that of God (though it is painful to make such comparisons) a serious result follows in regard to Lutheranism. . . . When . . . we speak of Lutheranism, we speak of an abstract doctrine, which cannot, we verily believe, be held consistently even by the devils; but which is held to an alarming extent among ‘ Evangelicals’ though inconsistently. And of this abstract doctrine we now say, that the considerations in the text shew it to be worse, that is, to be more fundamentally at variance with our higher and better nature, than Atheism itself.’ⁱ

And speaking still of the said abstract Lutheran doctrine, there is no one circumstance connected with my humble efforts in the *British Critic*, on which I look back with so much satisfaction as on this; that I have ventured to characterise that hateful and fearful type of Antichrist in terms not wholly inadequate to its prodigious demerits.

^f ‘ On St. Athanasius,’ pp. 90, 91.

^g ‘ On the Synagogue and the Church,’ p. 63.

^h ‘ On Church Authority,’ p. 232.

ⁱ ‘ On Mill’s Logic,’ pp. 406 407.

CHAPTER VI.

ON OUR EXISTING PRACTICAL CORRUPTIONS.

1. IT now becomes my business, in accordance with my promise in the last chapter, to enter upon the more directly practical part of the present inquiry. It might have been expected indeed with the utmost confidence, that such duties as those on which this repeated stress has been laid, would be most inadequately practised in a Church, where a doctrine had been allowed extensively to flourish, formally denying their paramount necessity. For so repulsive are these duties to our fallen and corrupt nature, that nothing but the most urgent and strenuous exhortations, the most careful discipline, can ensure so much as their tolerable performance. No wonder then, when principles have been so long tolerated among us, which expressly discourage, nay denounce, such exhortations, that the pure Gospel should have been darkened and overgrown by human traditions and practical corruptions.

2. To ascertain this fact in detail, let us first turn our eyes to that most essential of all a Church's duties, the education of the poor. Other duties are very holy and important, but none so holy and important as this. Incalculable as is the value of a religious education to all men, to the poor it is far, far greater than to any. For men of other ranks have their intellect in numberless ways sharpened and quickened, so as to retain the power of apprehending in a general way new ideas that may be laid before them; and thus their mind always remains open, in a certain sense, to religious appeals: and moreover should they, either in consequence of such appeals, or by the internal workings of their own mind, be led to take a serious turn, they have sufficient access to means of instruction and edification. But

for the poor, it is a matter of common experience, how infallibly, unless their mind be softened and disciplined by early education, a torpor creeps over the faculties, and the very avenues are frozen up by which religious truth might find access to the mind; while the heart within is, on spiritual subjects, cold as a very stone. Add to this, that from the absence of taste for more refined enjoyments, the lower propensities of our nature, at their appointed season, assail them with overwhelming force; and, unless they be protected by confirmed habits of obedience and self-mastery, hurry them madly along at their pleasure. On the Church then, to an indefinite extent, hangs the alternative, whether in the midst of the cheerless and ill-requited toil to which they are called, they may be allowed the unspeakable peace imparted by the Holy Ghost to a good conscience, a peace whose depths remain unruffled by all the external tumult, anxiety, and pain, which agitate the surface; or whether their lot shall be the dark, sullen, indescribable misery, which results from the union of moral wickedness with physical suffering, and which is relieved only by momentary snatches of feverish and unlawful gratification. Such is the issue which depends to so great an extent on the Church's system of education. Full-grown men, hardened in insensibility to religion, are almost beyond her reach; but those inestimably precious years, when the character is easily impressed, the affections easily moved, and habits of docility and obedience easily implanted, these years are her own. On every account, too, the poor must be considered the objects of her tenderest care; both because that condition of life has been so especially singled out by our Lord Himself as sacred, and because of that helplessness and dependence which so touchingly appeal for guidance and direction. Can there be a fairer test of the purity or corruption of a Church, than the success with which she acquits herself of this most urgent, most solemn duty?

The habits whereby a religious life is secured, or in which it consists, are such as these. Chiefly of all, the power of resisting evil inclination, the wandering eye, the hasty word,

the slothful or discontented thought; and, as indispensably necessary for this purpose, habitual watchfulness of conscience and remembrance of God's presence; regular and earnest prayer; deeply-imprinted knowledge of our own peculiar weaknesses, whereby the enemy of our souls finds the readiest access; a profound sense of our miserable sinfulness, and utter powerlessness to support ourselves, even one moment, against serious temptation, by our own unaided strength. I am speaking, it will be observed, only of moral and religious habits, not of Christian doctrine; but it is only by means of these, as I argued at length in the last chapter, that Christian doctrine can so much as find an entrance into the mind in any true shape: these therefore it will be necessary to consider first in order; and reserve the question of doctrine for a connected view, at a later period of the present chapter. Here then will be the first object of every right-minded Church; to make this her one principal and paramount care, that Christians shall not be removed from her more immediate guidance and launched into the turmoil and trials of life, until chiefly by the initial acquirement of such habits, and partly also by receiving at her hands wise and admirably adjusted rules for their future conduct, there may be every reason to anticipate that, so only they do their part in faithful co-operation, they may by God's infinite mercy stand unharmed against the temptations which will assail them. Let us consider therefore how this may best be done; for it is plain that habits such as these, are so pointedly and directly antagonist to the whole family of evil inclinations let loose by original sin, that their acquirement will be a matter of incomparably greater labour, and to instruct in their acquirement an office of incomparably greater arduousness and difficulty, than in the case of any other habits whatever.

We desire to impress on the Christian's mind a deep sense of his sinfulness, when by nature he is proud and 'self-righteous.' How is it possible to do this, except by carefully instructing him day by day in the primary duty of self-examination; beginning by the more open and obvious sins of his daily life, ill-temper, sloth, gluttony, and going on

by degrees into the more refined and subtle forms of evil? ^a We wish to teach him gradually the habit of self-mastery; we must carefully then impress the habit on his mind, not by theorising about it, but by shewing him its practical application in small matters; encouraging, praising, and assisting him, when he is using his best endeavours to acquire it; rebuking him and remonstrating, with tenderness indeed, yet with the most earnest warmth, when he relaxes such endeavours. We wish him to learn the all-important habit of regular prayer: we must begin then by teaching him short prayers; we must continually examine him as to the progress he makes in giving them his undivided attention, interrogate him as to the principal difficulties which impede him in the effort, and give him practical rules for the removal of these difficulties. We feel it to be of great importance that he should bear about with him a continual sense of God's presence: daily self-examination will help him in this; but a very necessary help also will be, that he should be taught for some short period in the day or in the week to employ himself exclusively in meditating on God's Presence. ^b We know it to be indispensable, that when he is of mature years he may be well acquainted with all the more material particulars, which make up his duty to his neighbour: we must begin then now by carefully teaching him his *present* duty; the duty of honesty, veracity, fidelity, courteousness, obligingness; for in this manner, as his duty gradually grows and expands, so also will his knowledge of its extent. Of this nature is the fundamental and most absolutely indispensable part of Christian education; and any Church, not perversely corrupt will feel such exercises as these to be so primarily important, that to their due performance every other branch

^a The strange idea that humility can be implanted in the mind by telling men the doctrine of the Atonement, or that the Holy Spirit will ever implant it in the mind by bringing home to it that doctrine, independently of careful self-discipline in the Christian himself; this immoral and fanatical delusion has been fully exposed in the last chapter.

^b I will make it plain, further on, that meditation on some part of our Lord's life is one very good, probably the best, way of performing this duty.

even of Christian knowledge, much more of secular, must yield the undisputed precedence.

I fear I shall appear jesting on a very serious matter, when I simply express what appears, as far as I can discover, the view taken of her duties on this head, by a Church calling herself pure above other Christian Churches. Our practical system, I believe, professes to prepare Christians for a manly behaviour in the great conflict which we are sent on earth to wage, by teaching them to read, putting before them the Scriptures, and then (for I will suppose the most favourable case) explaining them as clearly as they admit of being explained to minds not disciplined in holy obedience; or, for in my opinion it comes to the same thing, not explaining them at all.^c Now to judge of this conduct as it deserves, I will be content to admit for argument's sake the supposition, that Holy Scripture was intended or adapted to teach ordinary Christians, one by one, their practical duty: a most preposterous supposition indeed, still for argument's sake I am content to admit it. And now let us suppose that those who wished to teach a child the art of baking, should first teach him to read, then put into his hands the best rules that have

^c As about the most favourable example that can be taken, let us refer to the 'Scheme of Lessons,' mentioned in the Report of the National Society for 1843, as existing 'in the boys' central school:' which I understand to be appended as a kind of official model for other schools. The 'Religious Instruction' is specified as follows:—'For the fourth class—'Catechism, with Analysis. The Psalter read daily with Catechetical explanations.'" For the third class—"The Catechism with Analysis and Scripture proofs; Types, &c. The New Testament read every day. The Gospels." For the second class—"The Catechism with Scripture proofs and Analysis. Liturgy, and Sacred Chronology. The New Testament read daily. The Evangelists or Acts of the Apostles." For the first class—"Catechism with Scripture proofs; Liturgy; Prophecies; Types; Chronology, &c. The Holy Bible read daily. One chapter in the Old Testament, and one in the New, alternately; occasionally the Books of the Prophets and the Epistles.'" (pp. 49, 50.) Not the most distant allusion to such matters as 'examen of conscience,' 'mental prayer,' or the like; and yet without such foundations as these, what, alas! is the sort of paper theology here expressed, but as 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal'? "*Music*" is taught both in "theory and practice;" for small indeed would be the musical attainments of the pupils, if they were taught music as they seem to be taught religion. I have not alluded to Catechisms, &c. in the text, because they only profess to bear on *doctrine*, not in any way on *moral discipline*.

been yet devised for making a loaf, explain them with the utmost clearness compatible with the absence of *practical* guidance and instruction, and then, having placed him in a room with the necessary ingredients, expect him without further help to produce a loaf. The reader perhaps is tempted to laugh at the illustration. Well! That method which, from its intense absurdity, we cannot hear of without laughing, in the lowest and most mechanical art, we apply with no consciousness of the ridiculous, with no sense of shame, to the noblest, the most all-important, and very far the most difficult and complicated of all arts; the art of holy living. We dream, like madmen, that the deep corruption of human nature can be remedied by so superficial an application, as the head-knowledge of Scripture texts; that we can teach men religion, without instructing them, one by one, in individual *habits* of religion; that men can learn to recognise the first approaches of sin, to flee temptations, to fix their thoughts on God in prayer, to order their daily life as in His Presence, to open their heart by self-discipline to the gracious, cheering, and peace-bearing influences of the Holy Ghost; that men can learn all these most difficult acquirements instinctively, or by accident; certainly without any methodical discipline addressed to the object. When such has been our idea of education in Christianity, it is not so very extravagant as it seems at first sight, that not many years since a multitude of well-intentioned and respectable persons were found, who thought to benefit the poor by superseding, at least to some extent, education in Christianity, by education in physics. But I beg the candid inquirer fairly to consider, whether I go in the least beyond the limits of sober judgment in making the following statement. "Should the pure light of the Gospel be ever, by God's grace, restored to this benighted land,"^d I do believe that our posterity,—when they hear that two rival parties, in the earlier portion of the nineteenth century, to a great extent divided the country between them; one of whom sought to train the people in habits of self-denial and virtue by teaching them

^d 'On Arnold's Sermons,' pp. 339, 40.

to read Scripture, and understand its meaning in that sense in which alone the carnal mind *can* understand it, and there leaving them, while the other sought to remedy this deficiency by teaching them mechanics and astronomy; moreover that the age of which the latter party was the product boasted of peculiar enlightenment, and the Church of which the former party was the representative claimed as its distinguishing characteristic the epithet 'pure and apostolical:' and lastly, that both age and Church looked down with no little contempt on the thirteenth century, as barbarous in comparison with the nineteenth;—I do believe, that when they hear of this, they will be tempted rather to suppose all the documents spurious which assert it, than to believe it possible that partakers of our common nature, much less men possessed of so very much practical wisdom in other ways as the English most undeniably display, could, on this one subject, have sunk into such ignorant and infatuated arrogance, such abject imbecility of intellect.

I have not here alluded to the great excitement now existing within our Church on the subject of education, because it hardly seems to bear on the subject. It is very well known that our Church for years most shamefully neglected this duty; but that of late she has been wonderfully awakened to its importance, and that much admirable munificence and admirable zeal are now devoted to its full performance. It is well known also that 'high-churchmen' contended as zealously and jealously for her 'purity and apostolicity' at a time when, according to the present confession of her functionaries, she most sinfully neglected her very principal duty, as they do now, when she is very religiously attempting to execute it. The subject however leads me only to consider, not the amount of diligence with which, at any particular time, her system may be carried out, but the value of that system itself.

Take the following, and contrast it with our own method of teaching the young. A friend of mine went into a Roman Catholic school in Lancashire, where he found a troop of very young children, quite lately taken in from the streets,



and not yet so much as knowing their alphabet. His conductor asked them in his presence the following questions: "How many gods are there?" "How many Persons are there in the Godhead?" "Where will you go, if you take care to do what is right?" "Where will you go, if you do what is wrong?" They answered these, of course, very accurately; and when mentioning Heaven, appeared very much impressed with the great happiness reserved for them there. My friend's conductor told him, that they impress these fundamental truths on their minds in every variety of shape, so that they thoroughly apprehend them, before they proceed further. In the mean time they were occupied in learning their letters, and had got as far as F. But when the truths above mentioned had sunk deeply into their hearts, their instructor would then proceed to explain to them a few more of these fundamental Verities of the Faith. Then at the age of seven the practice of confession ordinarily begins; a practice which not only disciplines the young in the duty of self-examination with an efficacy to which no other institution could bear a moment's comparison, but also, by means of the peculiarly confidential intercourse between priest and penitent, gives the full opportunity of training the pupil in such other duties as I specified above, with an union of authoritativeness, affectionateness, and minute particularity, which no other machinery could possibly admit.

The same substantial account is furnished me by a Roman Catholic priest, who has had a very wide experience in parochial ministrations.

"The first things," he says, "taught to [a child] . . . are the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the Angelical Salutation, and the acts of faith, hope, charity, and contrition, which afterwards became the necessary part of his morning and evening prayers. So also the first book he is taught to spell is the catechism-book, or an abridgment of the four parts of the doctrine of our religion, namely, the doctrine concerning faith, hope, charity, and grace: hence it generally happens, that when a Catholic child reaches the age of reflection, which, according to the discipline of the Church, is the

age of seven years, a child is prepared for Confession ; and every parish priest in the Catholic Church takes care every year, that all children who are arrived to that age should go first *every day for two or three weeks* to the parish church to be instructed, and then should go to Confession.

“ Children go to Confession at that age in which they may be deceived by Satan ; in order to make peace again, if necessary, with God by a sincere repentance, a purpose of amendment, and the Sacramental Absolution by which Christ cleanses their souls in His infinitely precious blood. Thus, as they are apt to relapse by the inexperience and ignorance of their age, as well as by the temptations of the world and the violence of their youthful passions, so they are taught to go often to Confession ; because Confession is not only a remedy for sins committed, but a preservative from relapsing into sin. Then it is that they receive a great deal of advice ; and *not in general, but in particular, for their own spiritual wants*. Then it is that they are directed in the path of virtue ; then that they are taught to love God above all things, and to hate sin ; to fear hell ; the judgment of God ; and so to live, as not to fear death, which at every moment may be at hand ; and then it is, that, in order to impress the more their minds with these truths, they are taught to *meditate* ; namely, they are instructed in mental prayer.

“ Another pious practice we very much insist upon is the examination of conscience at night ; and children are taught to direct their attention to the resolutions taken in the morning meditation, and to examine themselves first on them, and then on the faults they have committed against the Ten Commandments, and the others of the Church.

“ I say nothing of the continual instructions on morality that are given to them, by which they are accustomed to admire, love, and esteem virtue, and to have a horror and detestation for vice ; but I will only say, that the Catholic Church, whilst it does not neglect the cultivation of the mind, takes *particular* notice of the *hearts* of her children, and directs every attainment of their mind to the improvement of the other. Man is not made for this world, but for heaven ; he must be then educated for heaven, and not for the world ; this is the principle of the Church, and the desertion from this principle is the cause *why we see no education at all*. But man cannot be educated for heaven, unless he is taught and brought up in the principles and practice of true religion. Hence

it is, that children are brought up in the practice of vocal and mental prayer, in the practice of examining their conscience, and of frequenting the sacrament of *Confession*, which is the medicine of our spiritual infirmities."

And now, as this mention has been made of it, a word on the subject of Sacramental Confession. The next chapter will shew, that I feel as strongly as any one can feel, the fearful evils which would inevitably result from the premature introduction amongst us of its compulsory performance; and the writer of the admirable and most tenderly considerate article on the subject in the *British Critic* has very strongly expressed the same opinion. Let us only in some poor measure learn to realise the inveterate corruption of our own system, and the excellent lessons we may learn from the Roman Church, towards supplying our deficiencies on such points as these: let this be really acknowledged; and it is hardly possible that the actual introduction of external and formal changes can be too gradually or cautiously made. On the other hand, many serious objections are made by most excellent men to the practice itself in the abstract; objections which appear to me, I confess, worthy of no consideration at all, when comparison is made with its great recommendations.^d But in this, as in so many other cases, argument in point of fact appears superfluous; the truly difficult and important step (and it is indeed most difficult and most important) is to introduce a full recognition of the primary necessity of this habit of self-examination; let this only be accomplished, and for one I have no belief at all in so much as the possibility of our remaining content without the Sacramental ordinance.

But when the poor man has gone forth into the world, prepared by the best education that can by possibility be given, and furnished with the best rules for guidance that theory can furnish, how innumerable are the temptations which beset him in his course, not only unknown to those more favoured by fortune, but which it is most difficult for them

^d On the commonest class of these objections I need hardly refer the reader to what he probably knows very well, the most excellent observations in the *British Critic*, No. lxvi. pp. 325—8.

in any degree, even by laborious effort, to understand and realise! Frequent want, importunate anxiety, corroding care, these are his appointed lot; he has neither the opportunity nor the taste for many innocent enjoyments; nor has he that great assistance, which the restraints of society and the cultivation of mind give to those above him in earthly stations, in preferring the future to the present, the real to the apparent. Thus is he situated throughout his weary pilgrimage: with little power of choosing either his occupations or his companions: fighting his forlorn battle in the midst of a hostile world as best he may: every thing around soliciting him towards sin; oppression or harshness towards sullenness, anger, or discontent; friendly companionship towards sloth or sinful gratification; nay, the mere force of suffering towards the omission of spiritual duties and forgetfulness of God. Against this he has to support an unceasing conflict, in which even one failure exposes him to the most fearful danger of not recovering his footing; and in which, nevertheless, continued success, even with full help of the Holy Ghost, seems to his desponding mind far more than the frailty of human nature can possibly hope. Oh! how unspeakably cheering, refreshing, soothing, comforting to the Christian so circumstanced, is the Confessional! to the careless and worldly, the proud, selfish, and luxurious, an object doubtless of unmixed distaste and repulsiveness; but to the weary servant of God, trying with a faithful heart to serve Him in the heat and dust of the world, a very harbour of rest and refuge. Here he may find that 'prime want of man,' 'true guidance in return for loving obedience;'^e here he may find a friendly ear into which, with perfect security, he may pour his tale of temptations, perplexities, and misgivings, perhaps of serious sins; here may he listen to a friendly voice, which he may safely hear without danger of being led astray, and whose accents will comfort and reassure him, and pour peace into his troubled soul; here he may gain some support to his languid faith, by spiritual intercourse with the priest, who stands before him as the visible repre-

^e Carlyle.

sentative of God in an evil and treacherous world. How incalculable the help he may obtain for his daily efforts against sin, by the thought of this one period in the week, and the censure or praise he may then receive!

What help do we give the poor man similar to this? In the first place, how many of our clergy believe and realise, that to urge their flock, one by one, to a life of daily conflict with their sins, open and secret, and to encourage, direct, and assist them in that conflict, is so absolutely their principal duty, that all others are utterly, nay immeasurably, subordinate? This is a question on which it is better to leave readers to answer according to their own experience, than to venture on a positive opinion: though we may quite safely say, that clergymen who do not see the indispensable necessity of disciplining the *young* carefully in habits of prayer and self-mastery, will not commonly see the desirableness of carrying on such discipline in after life. It is, however, a less invidious test as involving less of comment on individuals, while it is even more to my purpose, to inquire what means are resorted to in our Church for *indoctrinating* our clergy with a sense of the unparalleled importance of the methodical moral training of their flock one by one. And to give this inquiry all the force of a practical comparison, I will append an account sent me for publication by the Superior of a priests' seminary in France, who is describing a system of which he has had for years the personal cognizance and direction. It must be acknowledged, I think, that priests so trained are likely to enter on their parochial ministrations, with no very inadequate conception of the primary necessity of spiritual discipline, and no very inadequate power of understanding and sympathizing with the spiritual difficulties and distresses of the humblest of their flock.

“ In order to form our candidates for the priesthood to the holiness, necessary to the state of life for which they are destined, the rule prescribes the following methods :

1. “ Vocal prayer at half past five in the morning. It is short, and proceeds as follows : 1. The student puts himself in the presence of God, by a special act of faith in the truth of His universal pre-

sence, and adores Him. 2. He thanks God for the gift of the day, thus beginning, and consecrates to Him, all its actions, promising to do them all in imitation of Him. 3. He recites in the ecclesiastical language the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Credo. 4. He commends himself to the Blessed Virgin, to his patron Saint, to his guardian Angel, that they may watch over and protect him during the day, and by their prayers obtain for him the grace of which he has need. The whole concludes with acts of faith, hope, and charity, of contrition and renewal of baptismal promises.

II. "Mental prayer or a meditation :—in which the student first bows down in adoration before God, acknowledging himself unworthy of keeping himself fixed in His divine presence, and calling upon the Holy Spirit to help him in his meditation. He then enters on the consideration of the object proposed for meditation, all the while frequently entering into himself, by acts of humiliation, by making good resolutions, and one special good resolve for that very day. These two exercises, the vocal prayer and meditation, last half an hour. In those seminaries directed by the community of St. Sulpice they last an hour.

III. "The holy sacrifice of the Mass. It is offered up immediately after the meditation. During the first part each one present, by prayers and special thoughts, offers himself up with our Lord Jesus Christ. At and after the Consecration, each one adores Christ really present on the Altar; immolates himself with Him; and communicates in His Sacrifice, either sacramentally, if he has permission from his Confessor, or spiritually.

IV. "Holy Scripture. Every one is in the morning to read a chapter of the Old Testament, and in the Evening one of the New. The rule warns us that the object to be sought for is the quickening of the heart (*vie pour le cœur*). It would be a departure from this object, if any one were to read the Scriptures at this time in order to improve himself in learning, or to satisfy his curiosity.

V. "Spiritual reading. This takes place either in the morning, or in the evening. The books recommended, are the Imitation, the Spiritual Combat, the Christian perfection of Rodriguez, the *Mémoriale vitæ Sacerdotalis*, &c.

VI. "Examination of conscience. A quarter before twelve all go to the chapel for the particular examination. This means an examination as to the progress made in some virtue specially proposed by each for his own acquisition, or in conquering some vice

proposed in the same way for correction. The book used in this exercise is Father Tronson's 'Examens Particuliers,' a work full of profit for the ecclesiastic. This particular examination does not supersede the general examination made in the evening, and which includes all the thoughts, feelings, words, and actions of the day.

VII. "Visit to the Holy Sacrament. Each student is bound to go every day for a quarter of an hour into the presence of the Holy Sacrament. This exercise, the special joy of the devout soul, consists in adoring our Lord present under the eucharistic elements (espèces), in thanking Him for the happiness of being in His holy presence, in begging His pardon for the faults which we have committed, in asking of him to grant us the graces of which we have need, and in praying that He will deign to manifest to us His holy will, and lead us on to do it.

VIII. "Spiritual conference. This name is applied to a religious discourse spoken every evening by the Superior to the whole community, from half past six to a quarter to seven. It is a familiar instruction on the duties of a Christian, and of a Clergyman in particular.

IX. "The Chapel. After the discourse of the Superior, each student recites five decades (dixaines) of the Pater Noster, and Ave Maria. These prayers are sweet to a Christian's mouth, and never seem long, however often they may be repeated. Advice is given that at each decade the person reciting the chaplet should think upon some virtue which he would acquire, and beg of God to grant it to him by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

X. "Evening Prayer. This finishes the day. The prayers then said are the Lord's Prayer, the Angelical Salutation, the Apostles' Creed. The confession of sin is made by a prayer, called the Confiteor; then acts of faith, hope, and charity, and of contrition, are made. Prayers are offered up for the dead. In conclusion, the Superior gives out the subject for next day's meditation. Sometimes the choice of it is left to the students. The rule advises them to *fix their thoughts upon it just before going to sleep and as soon as they awake.*

XI. "I had almost forgotten to say, that the studies, lectures, (classes,) and meals, are begun and concluded with prayer. Also, in the morning, at mid-day, and in the evening, the prayer called the Angelus is recited, and this is done to pay honour to the mysteries of the Annunciation and Incarnation.

XII. "Confession. Every student is bound to confess *at least once a fortnight*. Few of them wait so long. The object of this confession is, to obtain absolution, and leave to communicate.

XIII. "Holy Communion. The rule does not prescribe Communion, but it expresses a wish that all should communicate at least every Sunday. The Confessor, in the secrecy of the holy tribunal, determines how often the holy Sacrament should be received. He judges by the state of the penitent's soul. In order to communicate frequently, it is requisite that the recipient lead a life of faith (*vie de la foi*), and that by his spiritual progress he make it evident that this heavenly food does him good. For some years past we have had the comfort of seeing our students communicate some two, others three, four, five, or six, times a week. We are indebted for this consolation to the good state of *the smaller seminary*, from which our students come to us almost entirely formed.

XIV. "The monitor. Every pupil *is bound to choose one of his fellows for a monitor*. The pupil who agrees to undertake the office is obliged to warn him to whom he is monitor of all that he sees wrong in him. This advice given in a spirit of charity, is commonly of great benefit.

XV. "The spiritual director. Every pupil is also obliged to take from among his masters a director, to whom he from time to time applies *to confer with him on his spiritual state* (*ses dispositions intérieures*) on the way to correct, improve, and perfect it. This laying bare of the heart to the director thus chosen, contributes in an especial way to the spiritual welfare of the students, provided it is made in a great spirit of faith. Generally each pupil makes choice of his Confessor for his director.

XVI. "The relations with the superior. The rule advises the student to enter into communication with the superior, to visit him often in order to receive his advice, and if need be his private rebuke. This wise provision enables the superior to *gain a knowledge* of the pupils, *to form them*, and *to assure himself of their vocation*.^f For this reason his door is never shut against them: and he feels himself called upon to give them all his time. The Superior of a seminary must thus cease at once to be a man of study. He must give up the notion of being a learned man, otherwise he will not be able to do the good which the diocese expects of him.

XVII. "The retreat. The year commences and finishes with a

^f i. e. to the high and laborious office of a Roman Catholic priest.

retreat. The retreat which ensues on the meeting of the seminary after the vacation lasts three days, exclusive of the day which opens and that which closes it. All these days are passed in silence. Each one then examines his conscience, confesses, makes plans for the good employment of his time, and prescribes himself with this object in view a special rule, in order to help himself on in the ways of Christian and clerical perfection. In some seminaries the retreat lasts nine days. The retreat at the end of the year is shorter. Its object is the good employment of the vacation.

XVIII. "The vacation. It lasts three months. The rule makes them long, less for the sake of giving rest to the students, than in order to give them an opportunity of trying their faith in the world. During this time their superiors are the priests of their respective parishes, who have them in charge, and from whom they are obliged to bring a certificate to bear witness to their life.

"This is what the rule prescribes; but all the students add to this a certain number of little schemes practised by them in private. These consist in frequent liftings up of the heart to God, little visits to the chapel, spiritual conversations with their superiors in recreation time, conventional means to recall a sense of the presence of God. They place on their table for this purpose small crucifixes, pictures of the Holy Virgin, or of those Saints with whose history they are best acquainted. A number of them agree to pray together or to give each other charitable warnings, and these associations have the happiest results."

I have sufficiently explained on former occasions, that in proposing similar examples, I am very far from meaning to imply, that the particular details there mentioned could be suitably introduced among ourselves; but am only bringing it forward as a clear and distinct indication of *principles*, which are as necessary for us as for them. I can hear no where in our Church of any establishment, for training whether the clergy or other educators, where it seems in the least understood, that personal religion is in no way secured by bringing pupils together for public worship, with whatever help from the charms of music or of architecture: nor can it be secured, unless the chief pains be bestowed on what must be the basis of the whole, the formation of a spiritual and devotional character in individuals. And those who

have been taught on a radically vicious method, will teach others on a similar method; so that the matter is one of most overwhelming interest and importance.

It must be acknowledged then, that whatever proportion of our clergy there may be, who feel the direction and assistance of the individual conscience to be their one primary duty, they have certainly not learnt that opinion from our Church; her whole system tends in the opposite direction. And such being the case, we might fairly anticipate, that neither does the same system furnish any very efficacious machinery for carrying out this opinion. Accordingly, there is no one thing on which the voice of all such clergymen is so unanimous, as on this. They complain that our Church has absolutely no hold at all on the popular mind; that the poor man goes on day after day, cold, hard, utterly insensible to religious considerations, and that they know not how to reach his heart and conscience. They say that our Church-service passes as it were, over his head; that it interests neither his feelings nor his imagination, and is not even partially *received* by his understanding. Were it in an unknown tongue, helps, translations, paraphrases, would be offered him in great abundance: some of which might suit his particular bent or capacity, and give him an interest in divine worship: but as it is, the service professes to be intelligible to him, and therefore the clergyman gives him no substantial help; while Latin itself could hardly be more foreign to his daily habits of thought.

It will be replied perhaps that, though it may be true that few clergymen really feel the paramount necessity of personal and individual intercourse with the several members of their flock, still those who *do* feel this have the means in their own hands of supplying the omission. That this is partially true, I hope even to urge in the next chapter: but it must be wholly by methods of their own devising; there is no part of our *system* which gives them any help whatever in this fundamental duty. What our Church *has* formally done on the subject is, to abolish the obligation of Sacramental Confession: while she bears witness against herself, by

enunciating in the Prayer-book the principle of Confession and Absolution, and thus shewing that it was through no deliberate adoption of a wrong opinion, that she has allowed the practice to fall into desuetude. Let us consider then what is the value of so much religious communication as occasionally takes place between our clergymen and their adult parishioners, under our present loss of compulsory Confession.

The ordinary domestic visit, which is all that is left, will seldom surely afford scope for communications on matters of such deep moment; and even when it does, when the clergyman's advice is asked on some point of conscience or on the means of encountering some temptation, (though on minor matters he may often be of great service,) if it be really a case which is closely bound up with the whole spiritual being of the applicant, no real benefit will be obtained. For no advice can be given with any ground for believing that it may not be even most pernicious, unless there is a far greater security for the whole circumstances being fully and fairly put before him, than can possibly be obtained, where confession is not sacramental; where there are not the most powerful spiritual sanctions, to break through that barrier of false shame, which restrains the penitent from the temporary misery of a full disclosure, and also to ensure, on the part of the priest, the most sacred and inviolable secrecy. Then even were *this* difficulty surmounted, it is essential that the faithful Christian shall have had cause to repose such entire confidence in the priest's competence, that his injunction shall be, without doubt or question, at once obeyed. Further;—for one person who is bold enough to ask advice in a spiritual difficulty, there will ever be a million who are sunk in carelessness and disregard of religious obligation, who yet might possibly be reclaimed if confession were required of them; and hundreds who may feel a strong desire to unburden their souls, but cannot force themselves to the requisite effort. In both these cases our present system is confessedly powerless; the clergy must stand looking on with folded arms, while these classes are, the one daily more hardened in their

careless way of life, the other from want of that support which our Church does not give them, are carried away, at some fatal moment, by the eddy of temptation, and from that time forward seek in vain to recover their firm anchorage. So that, with the exception of a few most rare and fortunate cases, a really confidential communication with the priest does not take place, till heavy sickness comes on, and death and judgment seem close at hand; when advice is asked, not that the conflict on earth may be less unworthily sustained, but that the approach of death may be less tremblingly and cheerlessly expected.

But now, even supposing a most extreme and imaginary hypothesis: supposing that compulsory confession of penitent to priest were suddenly resumed on a wide scale among us: the effect would be most mischievous. Why? Because the nature of those perplexities which cloud the conscience and bewilder the judgment of faithful servants of God in the lower ranks of life, or of those sins which oppress their memory, cannot be understood in their real nature, or rather will be most utterly misunderstood, by one whose whole past experience has been of the most opposite character; unless indeed he unite the rarest moral and intellectual gifts. Unless you expect every parish priest to combine the highest qualities of genius and imagination with the most winning gentleness, tenderness, forbearance, compassionateness, he will chill the heart of Christ's little ones, by treating as light and fantastical, perplexities, which they feel deeply to be most serious and to require most careful consideration; or he will crush and overwhelm them by forming a harsh and severe judgment on sins, quite opposite in character to those towards which he has ever been tempted, but which, if he were able distinctly to place before his imagination the whole circumstances of the case, he would at once feel were rather subjects for tender and loving expostulation than for stern rebuke. Nothing can possibly prevent this, except what I mentioned in my second chapter, the existence of a recognised body of moral and ascetic theology; and the making it among the most essential

parts of a priest's whole education, that he shall be sufficiently versed in the main particulars of these sciences. In foreign Catholic countries this is made more prominent than any other single study, in preparing a priest for his high office; insomuch that M. Gueranger, who desires to claim a larger share for liturgical studies than has of late been given, addresses the French clergy even in complaint of their too exclusive devotion to preparation for the Confessional. Without giving any opinion on the justice of this remonstrance, it shews us in the most lively manner how singular a stress they lay on it; and it is plain that a priest of no uncommon abilities, who learns by such an education the ordinary temptations and sins of humble life, their relative magnitude, and the fit conduct of a Confessor in dealing with them, and who afterwards adds to this theoretical knowledge daily practice in the Confessional, will dispense on all sides of him the highest and most admirable blessings; and that he will naturally draw to himself from the flock that deep affection and reverence which is so proverbially the general lot of Catholic priests.

Here it may be objected, that from time to time there must still be instances which, whether from peculiarities of outward circumstances or of inward character, will exceed the competency of an ordinary priest; which will refuse to admit of solution, either from the formal system he has learnt, or from the resources of his own mind. This is most true; but it does not interfere at all with the general statement, that the vast majority of serious Christians in the lower ranks will be almost certainly directed right by priests who have been carefully trained for the Confessional, and will be almost certainly directed wrong by those who have *not* been so trained. Again, should an exceptional case derive its difficulty from some unusual complication of external facts, the priest will of course forward it to the recognised body of doctors in moral theology; who give themselves wholly to its study, and are ready to bring its general principles and all the other facts whereof they are cognizant, fully to bear on any new case brought before them. It is by this very mode, by hearing continually of new cases, that their science continually enlarges its grasp and completes its view.

But it may easily happen that Christians here and there shall exist, who are perplexed by unusual and eccentric troubles of mind, and whose mental disease is of a more recondite and anomalous character; or again, who, from walking constantly by God's grace in the higher paths of devotion and obedience, are brought within the sphere of temptations and troubles unknown to more ordinary Christians. In such case the good Roman priest, who may feel himself unequal to the task of disciplining and directing such souls, will think no pains too great, no arrangement too troublesome, that he may accomplish the object of bringing such Christians into communication with some one, more deeply acquainted than himself with the mysteries of the human mind, and more profoundly versed in the deep secrets of ascetic theology.^f What is the existing practice of the Roman Church in such cases, I do not happen to know: but if my readers are at first tempted to consider it a fanciful refinement to suppose that the course of active life is seriously to be interfered with, that a weak brother's scruples may be alleviated, or that advice may be given under temptations and distress which they may be inclined to fancy equally imaginary;—if that thought cross their minds, they bear against themselves stronger evidence than words or arguments of mine can bear. They shew themselves to be so spiritually blinded by the carnal and worldly atmosphere of our Church-system, by the foul atmosphere of Lutheranism

^f In case my observations in the second chapter may not have sufficiently explained the distinction between moral and ascetic theology, it may be as well to say here a few words on the subject. The former (in technical language) is an *à priori*, the latter an *experimental* science; the former decides on *ends*, the latter on *means*. What thoughts, words, or actions are right or wrong, and in what degrees, whether to societies or to individuals, and under every variety of external circumstance, all this is contemplated by moral theology; which includes, accordingly, casuistry as a small part of itself, and contains also the very interesting controversies of the last and previous centuries on probabilism. Ascetic theology considers such questions as these; what habits, observances, rules, method of self-discipline, will best help to the *attainment* of certain qualities which moral theology teaches to be virtues, or the abandonment of certain others which moral theology teaches to be sins. And *mystical* theology is the ascetic theology of those, who are unusually advanced in the Christian course, and leading a life of unearthly and noble sanctity.

which as some pestilential vapour overspreads us, that the sight which God and the Holy Angels behold with far more interest and sympathy than any other earthly object, the solitary and severe conflicts of a holy and spiritual soul, *they* think of little moment, when compared with the undisturbed and unruffled course of this world's affairs.

It must not be forgotten, that in many parts of Catholic Christendom a poor man who, at any period of his life, is strongly impressed by religious truth, and moved by the Holy Ghost to a higher and stricter life, may join a religious order, in which, without at all diminishing the amount of manual labour which his earthly vocation involved, he may add to it devotional and penitential exercises of inestimable value, and may have the blessing of a Confessor who is no ordinary parish priest, but (as Confessors to monastic bodies are bound) deeply versed, not in ascetic only, but in mystical theology. A community of this kind may now be seen in Leicestershire by any who have the curiosity; and a conversation with any of the monks (who are all of the lowest classes, and work all day long in the fields) will afford matter both of surprise and edification.[§] And if in early years a strong religious disposition is evinced, in all Roman Catholic countries a ready access is open, even from the humblest ranks of life, (nay the more ready from the humblest ranks,) to the priesthood; the aspirant is separated from an early age for his future calling, and receives a careful and complete education.

I should not conclude this part of my subject, without giving two different accounts, received from the best authority, on the subject of institutions, which the Roman Catholics call 'missions;' the object of which is to revive the embers of piety, and powerfully summon the multitude to more serious thoughts. Let it be observed, how much of family likeness there is to the 'religious revivals' of dissenting communities; and yet how securely it is protected against the fearful dangers which attend *those* religious observances, by the uniformly *moral* character of the preaching: how the

[§] Those who have been struck by the picture of monastic habits in the life of St. Stephen Harding, will be peculiarly interested in the strict observance of the Cistercian rule by these monks.

‘missionaries’ speak not of *feelings* but of *duties*; not of *experiences* but of *sins*: how all, whose mind is awakened, are at once relegated to the Confessional, that their good desires may not remain inoperative, but be committed at once to good effects. The latter of the two accounts has come into my possession from a priest who has frequently conducted a ‘mission.’

I. “There are several religious orders, and associations of secular priests, for the purpose of giving missions; i. e. of preaching during a limited number of days in a town or village, on the great truths of salvation. Such are the *Missionaries* (the religious of St. Vincent of Paul) as they are called in Italy, from being specifically devoted to this duty, the *Jesuits*, the *Redemptorists*, (founded expressly for this purpose by St. Alphonsus Liguori—see the lessons of his office in the Brev. Aug.) the *Passionists*, &c. Among recent associations of priests is that of “*the most precious Blood of our Lord*,” established by the Canon Del Buffalo, who lately died, 28 Dec. 1837, at Rome, in the odour of sanctity, and by whose intercession a splendid miracle was last year wrought at Nice, and at whose preaching the writer has had the happiness of attending. (It may be observed how the very *names* of every one of these orders declare that Christ Crucified is the subject of their preaching, and that they do not lose sight of Him and His merits.) Besides these, the Capuchins, Reformed Franciscans of the B. Leonardo a Porta Maurizio, and other religious orders, are ever ready when called to give missions.

II. “The entire lives of St. Francis de Girolamo above referred to, and that of Ven. Paul of the Cross, the Founder of the Passionists, may be said to be made up of the details of the missionary life. The xxix. chap. of b. i. of the latter (p. 116, Rome, 1786,) gives the method which he pursued.

III. “In general a mission is composed of at least two, generally more, priests. They make a solemn entry into the town or village, being met outside by the people, clergy, and authorities, and conducted chaunting to the Church, or often, for want of room there, to some public square or open space. This is in the afternoon, and an introductory discourse, at the foot of a large crucifix, is delivered, upon a platform, round which the members of some confraternity stand. The mission is in fact the Spiritual Exercises [see *postea*] *preached*, instead of meditated on. In country places and small

towns they are divided between early in the morning and late in the evening, that the people may be able to attend to their work. As early as four a.m. they assemble in the Church, and an energetic discourse is delivered on one of the great Truths—as death, or sin, &c. A familiar catechetical address follows, expounding some great duty in a popular way, then mass. In the evening, there is another catechetical discourse generally on preparation for Confession and Communion, then another sermon on a great truth of salvation. The rest of the day is filled up with the Confessional, reconciling feuds, (a particular duty of the missionary,) instructing the children, seeking the conversion of notorious sinners, and the correction of scandals; perhaps in giving some retreat in a convent, or in preaching to prisoners or the sick. In this way Del Buffalo used, when in mission, to preach ten, twelve, and sixteen times in one day. (Short MS. inedited life in writer's possession.) The lives before referred to, and those of St. Alphonsus and many others, furnish most interesting examples of the wonderful and often miraculous success of these missions. But they are of ordinary occurrence. The writer has seen the congregation of an entire village crowded in its church, all melted in tears, sobbing aloud, and calling on God for pardon. The mission ends by a general communion, and bad books, cards, and dice, and unlawful arms, are often publicly burnt in the market place. A marked improvement in the moral condition of the population is sure to follow; and many a permanent conversion follows.

IV. “Bishops who are zealous for their flocks will procure such a mission in every town and village at least every three or four years. The missionaries go from place to place, and sometimes are out for many months without rest. Not only is the machinery *there* and at work, but so far from there being any lukewarmness in the missionaries, there is perhaps a more active spirit among them than there has been at any former period.”

“These retreats [see *postea*] are one of the most powerful means to convert sinners, to enlighten penitents, and to make the perfect advance rapidly in the way of sanctity; hence it is, that in every Catholic community, regular or secular, a retreat is performed once a year, and in some of them twice; and, that those who do not live in communities should not be deprived of so great a blessing, it is customary in Catholic countries to give a retreat at different times to whole parishes, or villages, or towns.

“ A retreat in such a case is called a *mission*, because three, four, five, or more priests are sent by the Bishop to assist in so holy a practice.

“ A mission is a body of reserve, in the continual war that the militant Church wages against sin. When, for some cause or other, or by the natural weight of our corruption, the Christian fervour decays in a parish or a town, the Bishop sends a mission, as the only remedy against all evils, and the effect is infallible.

“ The mission is announced a month or two before, that every one may so arrange his temporal occupation, as to be present at it.

“ Then, at the appointed day, the whole clergy of the town or parish go forth in procession with all the confraternities to meet the missionaries, who many times travel the whole or a great part of the way on foot; and as soon as they arrive, all the bells are rung, and without declining to the right or to the left, they repair with the procession to the church, or to the spot where they have to preach, (if the mission is to be given in the open air,) and immediately begin, by inviting all the town to come every day to listen to the word of God, to the embassy that they have to deliver to them in the name of Christ, saying, that the Lord sends peace to them, and mercy, that He does not wish to punish them, but to call them to repentance. Then they give them a rule of life, to be followed during the ensuing days, and the distribution of hours for the spiritual exercises during the retreat.

“ Four sermons are delivered to them; two in the morning, and two in the evening. Masses and prayers are said in the morning before and after the sermons, and in the afternoon psalms and canticles are said or sung, and a spiritual book is read at different times suitable to the occasion; so that the people continue in the church almost all the day long in a succession of different spiritual exercises.

“ It would be long to give all details; but I will only say, that after a few days you would say that the face of the earth there is changed. Public houses are deserted, enemies are reconciled, stolen things restored, wrong connections given up, bad books burnt, detractions retracted, children asking pardon of parents for their bad conduct, the town solemn and still; passing along the shops, you would hear men at work saying prayers; some ask publicly pardon of the whole town for their scandals; others resolve

to leave the world and become monks or nuns; the covetous give abundance of alms to the poor; several poor girls are married who otherwise would be in danger of seduction; the baptismal promises are solemnly renewed; the confessionals crowded day and night; so that, like St. Peter, the missionaries are obliged to send for all the clergy of the neighbouring parishes, and to beckon to them for assistance to draw the nets to the land; and in the last day, after all being reconciled with God, they all go to communion. Then you would see thousands and thousands approaching the holy table, in tears of such devotion and such fervour, that you are overpowered, and cannot refrain from shedding with them tears of consolation, and blessing the Lord, saying, 'This is the change of the right hand of the Most High.'

"A procession takes place in the afternoon to some spot, where a large cross is carried and planted, as a memorial of the mission given in such or such a year, and as a monument of the covenant renewed by the people of that place with God. There the resolutions are publicly and solemnly repeated, and offered to God, and then blessed by the missionary, who implores the peace of God and His blessings upon the ecclesiastical and civil authorities of the place, upon all parents, upon all children, upon the poor, &c., &c.; and after having sung a solemn *Te Deum*, the mission finishes.

"You may understand that such a work (which, after all, is the work of God, and His grace) is not like a passing storm, but it continues to stand for years, and sometimes for many years; and when at last is forgotten, it is revived by another mission."

And what is the effect on the general character of our poor, resulting from this absence of spiritual discipline? Here there is an universal agreement as to phenomena, however wide the differences or the cause of the phenomena. It seems agreed on all hands, that our agricultural poor, considered as a class, are oppressed by a dull, heavy, torpid stagnation of the faculties, which renders all attempts to interest them in religious subjects hopeless; while the most frightful immorality extends in all directions, which even those who do not practise it hardly feel to be sinful. It seems agreed that our manufacturing poor, taken as a class, if their intellect be sharper, are only in consequence more actively

inimical to religion; if they be less obtuse and unimpressible, are only the more arrogant, self-conceited, and turbulent. God forbid that we should exercise any severity of judgment, on that which to so fearful an extent is our own work! no, not even in those extreme cases, when self-defence requires vigorous *measures* of repression and punishment. Without presuming to sound the unfathomable abyss of God's judgments and dealings with man, or conjecturing what unknown means of probation He may have in store for those, who seem here on earth to sink, almost without fault of theirs, into the gulf of wickedness, opening wide its jaws to receive them, it will be well at all events to impress on our minds the following passage of Scripture: "When I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die: and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, *but his blood will I require at thy hands.*"

We make our boast of professing what we are pleased to call a Scriptural religion: let us compare our system with the *test* of Scripture. Some years since a member of our Church was so unhappy as to imply, that "the highest state of moral and religious elevation can be attained only by the educated and polished classes of society, and even among these by none except persons of higher intellectual powers;" while the "less abstracted and contemplative minds" are capable only of "strong though not refined feelings of devotion." On this Mr. Froude, burning with holy indignation, expresses himself as follows:—

"What! are we to be told that the fishermen of Galilee were strangers to the high devotion of a modern philosopher? Is the Gospel of St. John a methodistical rhapsody, resulting from 'strong though not refined feelings of devotion?' and what shall we say of Mary, the sister of Lazarus, and of the other Mary, whom 'all generations shall call blessed?' and who are they that shall 'sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' when 'the last shall be first and the first last?'"

"In fact, this notion is one which cuts at the very root of the Christian spirit; and instead of teaching us to love the things

which Christ commands, and desire that which He doth promise, proposes to us a new calling, whereunto He has not called us. 'Ye see your calling, brethren,' says one, 'incapable of abstracted contemplation;' 'how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and the base things of the world and the things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, the things that are not, to bring to nought the things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence.'

"The religion of Jesus Christ is in an especial manner the religion of the poor; and it was to these that the Gospel was first preached; it was these that heard it gladly. The fisher's cot by the lake of Gennesareth, the shop of the wandering tent-makers at Corinth, and of the purple-sellers of Thyatira, these were the good ground where the seed of the true Faith fell, and brought forth its thirty, its sixty, and its hundredfold."^k

Now let us fairly ask ourselves the question, Have we ever realised the fact, or when we look at the poor as we find them around us, can we by ever so great an effort bring ourselves to realise the fact, that the Mother of God, the holy Apostles, the great body of early Christians, belonged to the same class with our agricultural and manufacturing poor? Would it not involve a revolution in all our habits of thought, fully to believe that those devoted to life-long manual labour may contemplate heavenly things as habitually, desire spiritual blessings as earnestly, and despise earthly joys or sorrows as triumphantly, as the most educated of us all? Would it not be our immediate tendency to ridicule the idea of a man with rough hands, soiled dress, and homely speech, oppressed with bitter sorrow for some deficiency in the hearty performance of the labour covenanted with his employer, or for some one discontented or angry thought, or seriously complaining of the aridity which he from time to time experiences in prayer and meditation? Yet such is the account we over and over again read, of Saints or saintly

^k Remains, 2d part, vol. i. pp. 306—8.

men in the Catholic Church. How deeply and fundamentally opposed then are our habits and tendencies to that Scriptural standard, which Protestants *profess* to follow, but to which the Church Catholic alone has faithfully witnessed!

3. Let us now turn our eyes to the educated classes; and let us again begin with the beginning; viz. the care taken by the English Church of their education. Here as before Confession enters into the foreign system with the greatest advantage. If either of the parents have a profession of religiousness, her Confessor impresses on her the duty of carefully training her child in habits of prayer and obedience, and instructs her in the best means of training him. At the age of seven, the child's own time of confession begins; and thus the Church brings to bear directly upon him, through her specially educated minister, those maxims and rules, by means of which his whole education, secular or theological, may be throughout leavened with a religious spirit, and wholly grounded on a religious basis. This affords us an excellent test, to discover what are the real reasons for that dislike of Sacramental Confession, so general among us; whether we really agree with Roman Catholics on the paramount importance of moral discipline, and only object to Confession because of evils supposed to attend it ('priestcraft' or others); or whether we are in real truth miserably blind to the fundamental duty of early inculcating moral and religious habits. For if the former were the case, how zealous would our Church be in supplying by *other* means the need which she so deeply regrets her inability to supply by *this* means! how numerous would be the manuals of self-examination placed in the hands of the young, or books devised for the purpose of instructing parents in the best mode of religiously educating their children! How systematically and uniformly would the priest lay before those parents in his parish, who do not send their children to the church school, the indispensable importance of at least carefully disciplining them at home in prayer, religious meditation, hatred of sin, self-denial, penitence!

Instead of all this, what do we find? in what single

particular can our Church be said so much as to concern herself with the education of those above a state of pauperism? She acts, as though her authoritative scheme of instruction were very well for those who could get for themselves no better; but that where she is not asked to give education gratuitously,¹ she has no duty of labouring that it be given religiously. Nay, even if a parent be earnestly desirous of doing her duty in this particular, and painfully and distressingly conscious of its unspeakable importance, what systematic, well-devised scheme, complete in its parts theoretically, adjusted to human nature practically, does our Church offer? where is this or any thing like this to be found? On questions so essential above all others as—whether punishment be necessary or even allowable, whether even the most essential duties should be directly taught the young or they should be left to gather them from personal study of Scripture, whether they ought or ought not to be at least encouraged to confess particular sins which they may have committed,—such questions as these, with a multitude of others, are as freely discussed and as variously decided, as though there were nobody among us at all, which professed it as her function to educate the young. And, in reciprocity, our Church seems to look on as contentedly and unconcernedly, while these discussions proceed, as though she were in no way called on to arbitrate in the matter; as though she laid no real claim to the prerogative of educating her own children; but only professed such a claim, as if by a sort of etiquette, when any overture to Dissenters is made by the civil power.

Let us now contemplate members of the same class, who have advanced from a state of childhood. The temptations which beset these as they advance in years, are strikingly opposite in character to those experienced by the poor. The sins to which these latter are solicited, are of a nature which are at once recognised as sins by all whose conscience is not absolutely hardened; for even sullenness,

¹ I am not quite sure that the word 'gratuitously' is *strictly* correct; I have heard, at least, that a nominal sum is frequently exacted, on the principle that people in England value nothing but what they pay for.

discontent, sloth, anger, in the shape they wear among the poor; or again, neglect of daily and regular devotion, these impress their real nature even on men under their influence, unless they have fairly abandoned the very profession of a religious character. Far different is the case with those who have a competent provision of the necessaries of life. In these, first of all, as I said more at length in the second chapter, a deep, subtle, all-pervading worldliness may exist, wholly unsuspected by themselves, sullyng their best actions, nay even fatally tainting them, and depriving them of real acceptableness in God's sight. The poor, speaking generally, have no present enjoyment to tempt them, which does not bear on its very surface the brand of sin; if they preserve respectability, decorum, and a formal observance of religious duties, they preserve very much more also; if they do what is externally right, they do it on high and religious grounds. While those who live in the midst of gratifications which are attractive and absorbing, and yet not in themselves sinful, may be well assured, that unless they be provided with some special and sharp discipline, their affections and interests will be centred on things of earth, without any violent shock being given to their moral feelings; and they will be led on to the most fearful peril of forfeiting their salvation.

In exercises of what kind should this special discipline principally consist? Before considering this, let us observe a farther contrast which exists between the higher and lower classes, not unlike that which I mentioned in a previous chapter as distinguishing later from earlier times; I mean, the great prominence given among the former to *self-consciousness*: the circumstance, that the observation and knowledge of their own thoughts, habits, feelings, and acts, will be immeasurably greater in educated men than in uneducated; in refined than in rude; in those who, as being free from external anxiety of an overpowering and absorbing nature, have leisure to look within, than in those whose life is an unceasing conflict with the inclemency of their outward lot. Over and above this, as though God would impress on our minds at every turn the impossibility of avoiding misery here below, unless we place our trust and rest in Him, it is found

universally, that as men are brought beyond the range of one kind of distresses or temptations, they are only brought within the sphere of another, which are neither understood, nor even suspected to exist, by those not exposed to their influence. In the former rank may be placed the pang of unrequited affection, the keen sense of loneliness and yearning for sympathy, sorrow from domestic trouble, the mere feeling of unhappiness without assignable cause, perplexing and disturbing scruples of conscience, peculiar agitations of mind connected with the anxious conflict of opinion now proceeding, and a thousand others; in the latter, (what is included in the observations of the last paragraph,) idolatry of family and friends; and, again, the more subtle, but often even more deadly, forms of envy, pride, vanity, discontent, sloth, self-complacency, disregard of others, not to mention that most fearful of all, scepticism of one or other kind. These often assail the mind of those removed from more ordinary trials, with an acuteness and intensity of torment, which naturally enough has no justice done to it, nor receives any adequate sympathy, from those who have not experienced it. While then the rich are exposed to a most powerful and continued temptation, from which the poor are free, viz. to seeking a refuge for their sorrows in the thought or enjoyment of worldly goods, instead of applying to them the true medicine; it seems really to admit of fair doubt, whether in all cases those sorrows themselves are less oppressive and severe.

For both these reasons, then, it appears that the primary discipline, under our present circumstances, should be a mental discipline. For the first, because if we *must* unavoidably dwell more or less constantly on the thought of ourselves,—the task is one of no ordinary labour and difficulty to take care that we think not on our own good qualities, but on our bad; not on the slights we may have received from others, but on the slights we have ourselves offered to God; not on the sufferings God may have sent us, but on the benefits with which He has so abundantly blessed us: and also, because if we are almost compelled in so great a measure to *know* our own thoughts, the duty is on that ground the

more incumbent, in an equally increased measure to *watch and regulate* our own thoughts. For the second; because the only real remedy for mental disorders is the re-establishment, by the agency of the Holy Ghost, of that inward harmony of our nature, and subordination of our will and affections to God, which was lost by the fall. The secondary means, therefore, which those must apply, who suffer under these peculiar troubles and distresses, are such as may best provide, that the first-fruits of these more recondite and complex feelings, now first called into active energy, should be more and more undividedly offered to God; in other words, these means must be mental, rather than bodily, observances. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that, without constant discipline, it is quite impossible for us to grow in faithfulness to our Master's service, or rather quite certain that we shall decline in it. Those whose mind is thronged by sinful, by painful, by busy thoughts, have abundant scope for the exercise of this discipline, in resisting the first, preserving the sense of overflowing thankfulness to God notwithstanding the second, and at fixed times by a strenuous effort banishing the third, that the mind may be given wholly to God. But so far as this is not the case with any one of us, and so far as severe and continued external sufferings sent by God do not supply the place for purposes of discipline, in that proportion the necessity of serious bodily self-inflictions becomes more obvious and undeniable.

Two different kinds of mental discipline, prominently enforced by the Roman Church, seem fitted in a very peculiar way to these two kinds of mental peril, each to each; i. e. to the peril arising from self-consciousness, and that arising from what we may call intellectual and imaginative refinement of the feelings. The first kind is the system of self-examination, on which such careful guidance is given; and of which a very general outline shall here follow, not derived from any recondite sources, but from the 'Garden of the Soul:' the manual which is in the hands of nearly all Roman Catholics in this country.

“An Examination of Conscience for every night.

[“First place yourself in the presence of God; humbly adore Him, and give Him thanks for all His blessings, especially those bestowed on you this day.]

“O Almighty and eternal God, whose majesty filleth heaven and earth, I firmly believe Thou art here; that Thy adorable eye is on me; that Thou seest and knowest all things, and art most intimately present in the very centre of my soul. I desire to bow down all the powers of my soul to adore Thee; I desire to join my voice with all the angels and saints, to praise Thee and glorify Thee now and for ever. I give Thee thanks from the bottom of my heart, for all Thy mercies and blessings bestowed upon me and upon Thy whole Church; and particularly for those I have received from Thee this day, in Thy watching over me, and preserving me from so many evils, and favouring me with so many graces and inspirations, &c. O let me never more be ungrateful to so constant and liberal a Benefactor! And now, dear Lord, add this one blessing to the rest: that I may clearly discover the sins that I have committed this day, by thought, word, and deed; or by any omission of any branch of my duty to Thee, to my neighbour, or to myself; that no part of my guilt may be hidden from my own eyes; but that I may see my sins in their true colour, and may detest them as they ought to be detested.’

[“Then examine yourself, how you have passed the day; how you have performed your prayers, and other spiritual exercises; in what manner you have acquitted yourself of the duties of your calling; what care you have taken to perform well your ordinary actions of the day; what company you have been in, and what your conversation has been; and, in particular, how you have behaved yourself with regard to your customary failings and your predominant passions.

“After having diligently examined your conscience, and discovered the faults you have been guilty of, endeavouring to be heartily sorry, humbly beg pardon of the Divine Majesty for them, saying for this purpose the psalm ‘Miserere, Have mercy on me, O God,’ &c.

“Then make a firm purpose of amendment for the future, and especially resolve to be more watchful over yourself the following day; to be more diligent in flying the occasions of your sins, and to

take such and such precautions with regard to the faults you are most subject to.

“ Conclude this exercise by endeavouring to put yourself, as much as possible, in the condition you would be glad to be found in at the hour of your death : in order to this, make the best acts you are able, of a lively Faith, of an humble Confidence in God, and of a perfect Resignation to His holy will : embrace with all the affections of your soul Christ crucified, and aspire to an eternal union with Him. For which end you may pray as follows, &c.]”

“ This or the like examen of conscience,” adds the writer, “ ought *never to be omitted* by such as desire to serve God in good earnest, and to secure their soul’s eternal welfare.”

This account includes what is called the ‘particular examination.’ A few words, however, may be added on the latter subject, from that most admirable and standard work, the ‘Treatise on Spiritual Perfection’ by Rodriguez.

“ The Devil takes all care imaginable to know the most feeble part of our souls, to make his attack afterwards in that part, that thereby he may more easily reduce us to his subjection. Let us make use of this admonition, to keep ourselves on our guard, and to take precaution against our enemies. Let us attentively seek and find out which is the weakest part of the soul, and the most naked of virtue ; let us see where our natural inclination renders an attack more easy, and what part is most of all decayed and ruined by ill habits ; and let us labour everywhere to repair and fortify *the weakest places* by strong ramparts...Let us overcome *that vice in us which is king of all the rest*, and we shall easily tame and vanquish all the others.

“ When we have any exterior defects that offend and scandalise our neighbours, it is *these that we must begin to retrench by means of our particular examen*, though we should have interior defects *far more considerable*. For example, if one speaks too much, or too harshly, or too sharply to his brethren ; or lets himself be carried so far, as to say things that affect their reputation ; and, in fine, if one is subject to other failings that may hurt the neighbour, reason and charity oblige us *first* to correct ourselves in what *may give pain or trouble to our brethren*.” vol. i. pp. 352, 4.

“ There are three times for this examen, [he is speaking directly of regulars, who of course are bound by a much stricter rule than those

who live in the world,] and of these three there are only two in which we can examine ourselves. The first is in the morning when we awake ; at which time we have nothing else to do, but to make a firm purpose to abstain during the day, from what vice or imperfection we aim at correcting. The second time is at noon before dinner . . . the third time is at night before we go to bed ; and then we must renew the examen we made at noon But to root out still more readily any vice or defect, which we wish to free ourselves from, St. Ignatius gives us four excellent instructions. The first is, that every time we fall into the defect or vice, we presently make an act of repentance, laying our hand upon our breast ; . . . secondly, that after the examen of night we compare the points we have noted with those noted in the morning, to see if after dinner there be an amendment ; the third and fourth, that in like manner we compare the points of the day with those of the day before, and those of that week with those of the week before." p. 370.

"We must take particular notice that . . . all the virtue and efficacy of our examen consist in *compunction and true repentance* for our faults and in a *firm resolution* not to relapse into them . . . A *real compunction and true repentance* of our faults is a powerful remedy to hinder us from relapsing ; and it is [of the greatest] importance to *dwell sometime and remain hereupon* in our examens." pp. 372, 4.

"There are five points in the *general examen* of conscience. The first is to give thanks to God for the benefits we have received ; and this is put in the first place, that by afterwards comparing His benefits with our sins, we may be moved to greater sorrow and confusion The second point is to beg grace to obtain a perfect knowledge of all the sins we have committed. The third, to call ourselves to account how often we have sinned, since the last resolution and good purpose we made ; beginning with the examination of our thoughts, and afterwards continuing it on our words and actions. The fourth is to beg pardon of God for all those sins into which we find we have fallen, and to repent and conceive a great sorrow for them. The fifth is, to purpose a firm amendment, and afterwards end with reciting the Lord's Prayer. This general examen ought always to be joined to the particular ; and to this end the first thing we ought to do every morning when we get up, is to offer to God all the actions we shall do during the day. For though in speaking of the particular examen I have said that as soon as we awake we should purpose to abstain from that vice we have undertaken to correct and

that in this we should employ the beginning of our examen; yet this ought not to be done, till after we have offered up to God all our thoughts, words, and actions, referring them all beforehand to His greater glory. And having made a firm purpose and resolution not to offend Him, and having begged His grace for this end, we must afterwards twice a day, at noon and night, join the general examen with the particular." p. 378.

"Sickness itself, which dispenses with our ordinary hour of mental prayer, dispenses not with our general or particular examens. We must hold it therefore for an infallible maxim, that we must never exempt ourselves from it on any account whatever." p. 351.

This examen, as I lately observed, is considered so essential by Roman Catholics, that the omission of it on any one day would be made a subject of confession. There is a different exercise also, called by the same name of particular examination, commonly adopted, I believe, in Seminaries over and above the other. It consists in taking the various parts of the Christian character in succession, and making them the subject of meditation; so as to impress our minds at once with the full idea of what we ought to be, and also our own miserable short-comings and imperfections. The book commonly used in France on this subject is M. Tronson's 'Examens particuliers sur divers sujets propres aux Ecclésiastiques, et à toutes les personnes qui veulent s'avancer dans la perfection.' (Lyon.) In fact, much the greater part bears practically on all serious Christians, as well as on regulars or seminarists. To shew the plan of this work, I cannot do better than take, almost at random, a few specimens.

"107th Examen. On conformity to the will of God.

"First point.

"Let us adore our Lord; who during his whole life, but especially at the approach of His Passion, shewed forth a wonderful conformity to the will of His Father. The most cruel torments and most terrible afflictions present themselves in a crowd before His eyes, and however the lower part of His soul may shrink from them, He submits Himself to them with a loving resignation. O rare and beautiful example of conformity to the will of God!

“ Second point.

“ Let us examine ourselves if we have had a perfect conformity to the will of God.

“ Have we not desired other places or employments, than those which God’s providence has given us, and should we not have been well-pleas’d to choose for ourselves those which might be to our taste and inclination ?

“ Have we been satisfied with the talents which we have received from His divine goodness, without complaining that we had not as much as some others ?

“ Have we been contented with the condition in which He has plac’d us ? and have we not wish’d some other more convenient, more conspicuous, or more suitable to our fancy ?

“ Have we received all troubles as coming from the hand of God ; and instead of wasting the time in complaining of them and thinking of them, have we considered that God sent them for our salvation and for His glory ?

“ When we have thought of death and contemplated its approach, have we done so without trouble or murmuring, and with a perfect resignation ?

“ Have we had the same resignation in public calamities ; such as wars, pestilences, famines ; looking on all these calamities as flowing from the will of God, who disposes them according to the secret counsels of His wisdom, and to derive from them the advantages most suitable to His glory and His service ?

“ Have we not desired with inquietude spiritual enjoyments ; so as to be discontented, uneasy, and despondent, when God has permitted us to be deprived of them ?

“ Finally, have we adored the Providence of God in adversity as in prosperity ; in spiritual aridity as in spiritual consolations ; in privations as in enjoyments ; and have we put our trust in Him for time and for eternity ?

“ Third point.

“ O my God, since it is certain that nothing can happen in the world except by Thy governance, and that worldly blessings and sufferings, death and life, poverty and wealth, come equally from Thee, it is most meet that we submit ourselves to Thy hand with love and with reverence, and receive with grateful heart all that happens, painful or pleasing. This it is, O my God, which I am resolv’d to do in future by means of Thy holy grace. ‘ My heart is ready, O God,

my heart is ready ; it is ready for adversity, it is ready for prosperity.' Augustine.

“ 109th *Examen*. *On the love of our Lord*. (The 108th was on the same subject.)

“ First point.

“ Let us adore our Lord, resplendent in the glory of His Father, and possessing the fulness of His treasures. Nothing so beautiful, so worthy of love, as this divine Jesus. . . . In Him His Father is well and fully pleased ; is it not right that He should be the only object of our love ? He is our Father, our Saviour, our Master, our Shepherd, our Head, our Spouse, our All. Let us love Him, love Him again, embrace him as nearly as we can.

“ Second point.

“ Let us examine if we have conceived for Him all the love that His attributes deserve.

“ Have we loved Him as Man-God, above all things, more than all creatures and than ourselves ?

“ Have we had delight in considering that He is the very Living God ; and have we had supreme joy in gazing on all the greatness and perfection which He possesses in that respect ?

“ Have we loved Him as our Saviour, being ready to do all and to suffer all in return for what He has vouchsafed to do and suffer for our salvation ?

“ Have we loved Him as our Sovereign Lord, having towards Him the obedience of a servant, the faithfulness of a subject, the dependence of a slave, and being enraptured to think that He has over us that right of life and death which His sovereign power confers ?

“ Have we loved Him as our Master, submitting teachably to His instructions, embracing His maxims, maintaining His doctrine, and having no greater wish than to see it spread over all the world ?

“ Have we loved Him as our Head, wishing to receive from Him alone movement and life, offering all that we have to defend His glory, as the members offer themselves to defend the head ?

“ Have we loved Him as our Shepherd, who nourishes us with His own blood ? and have we been disposed to give Him our blood in return, and to shed it for His love ?

“ Have we taken delight in listening to His Voice and following it, and sought no other pastures except those to which He guides us ?

“ Have we loved Him as the best of Fathers, having for Him a

love of tenderness, reverence, and trust ; and fearing no one thing so much as to displease Him ?

“ Have we loved Him as the only Spouse of our soul ; have we no other interests at heart but His ; desiring only what He wills, and placing all our idea of happiness for time and for eternity in being inseparably united to Him ?

“ Lastly, have we loved Him as our All ; Who wishing to be every thing to us, ought Alone to occupy our hearts and fill our affections ? ‘ He who gave Himself for us, seeks from us our heart also whole.’
St. Bernard.

“ Third point.

“ When I consider, O my Jesus, on how many grounds Thou deservest to be loved ; and that Thou dost without ceasing solicit us to give Thee all our affections, and that Thou dost cover those who love Thee with grace and favours : what sorrow ought I not to feel, to find myself as yet so little affected with love for Thee ! Grant, O my God, that my heart may be wholly enkindled with love of Thee, and that I may not be so miserable as to be included in the anathema pronounced by Thy Apostle, ‘ If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be Anathema Maranatha.’

“ 110th *Examen.* *On the love of our neighbour.*

“ First point.

“ Let us adore the infinite wisdom of our God which shines forth with lustre in the manner whereby He commands us to love one another. He knows the great benefits which we should derive from that love ; but since He foresees that the flesh and the Devil will exert all their effort to destroy it, or at least greatly to lessen it, not only He makes it an express commandment ; but He wills that the love which we have for ourselves should be the measure of that which we shall have for our neighbour. ‘ Thou shalt love,’ He says, ‘ thy neighbour as thyself.’ Let us return thanks to this God of goodness and of love.

“ Second point.

“ Let us examine ourselves whether we have loved our neighbour as ourselves.

“ Have we entered heartily into all his interests, and made them our own personal concern ?

“ Have we rejoiced at his blessings, and taken as much interest in the good that befalls him as though it befel ourselves ?

“ Have we felt as sensibly his sufferings and annoyances as our own ?

“ Do we take as much care of him as of ourselves ? Do we seek the means of being able to help him ? are we beforehand with him in his necessities ? Are we always ready to serve him ?

“ In all the conversations, work, business, in which we come in his path, do we shew him a great deference, a Christian courtesy ; do we carefully avoid all that may pain him ?

“ Is his reputation as dear to us as our own ? Have we endeavoured whenever we could do it without failing in our duty, to hide his faults, excuse them, extenuate them, and turn the conversation when others speak of them ?

“ Do we interest ourselves with love and zeal for his health and all that concerns him ?

“ Have we his salvation at heart ? do we make aspirations and prayers in his behalf ? do we shed tears for the faults or sins which he commits ? do we observe with joy the graces which he receives, and his faithfulness in corresponding to them ?

“ Lastly, have we followed those two great rules which the Scripture gives us : Do not to another what you would not have done to you, and do to him what you would have done to you ?

“ Third point.

“ O my God, how well do we learn the manner in which Thou desirest that we should love our neighbour, from what Holy Scripture says of the love of Jonathan for David ! ‘ The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul.’ Thus it is that we desire henceforward to love our neighbour : we most humbly beg this grace of Thee, O my God, and we beg it of Thee by the great love which Thou Thyself hast borne to us.”

[There are nine further examens on this subject.]

Such exercises as these must have the most powerful tendency towards the due regulation of our thoughts, words, and actions ; being a remedy mainly founded in that very self-consciousness, from whence flow the evils to be remedied. From the other characteristic of the refined classes to which I drew attention, arises that unprecedented divergence of individual character, so observable in our times ; the very great extent to which peculiarity and ‘ individuality ’ of mind extend on all sides of us. Now the soul, as I just now observed, cannot receive aright the Spirit of God, and thus obtain that wholesome and invigo-

rating quality which alone will brace and strengthen it against the temptations peculiar to such a character, unless the first-fruits of these habits of mind be offered up more and more undividedly to God. It is quite necessary then that the Church should teach and encourage a practice, of more individual, free, natural, unrestrained, heartfelt, *personal* prayer, than consists with the exclusive adoption of appointed forms; that to divergence of individual character should correspond variety of individual devotion; and that each peculiarity of mind should have its full and unfettered scope, in fastening itself on some Heavenly Correlative. On the other hand, Mr. Newman in one of his Sermons¹ has drawn out a formidable array of the evils which may probably result, from the use of such individual and self-devised prayer; irreverence, wandering thoughts, over-excited feelings, and others. Now is it possible for human wisdom to conceive a plan more fitted to meet the necessity for such prayer which I just now urged, while it guards against those dangers which *Mr. Newman* urges, than the whole system of meditation, as practised in the Roman Church; and which I believe there are very few of the educated classes, who think of going on at all into real strictness of life, who would not be earnestly exhorted by their Confessors to practise? If it be said that religious men are, without taking all this pains about it, at spare moments throughout the day praying in a natural, unconscious manner, this only makes such discipline as I speak of more important, in order that such habitual prayer may be of higher and more practised quality.

In this, as in the former instance, the advice placed before ordinary English Roman Catholics in the 'Garden of the Soul,' will be the most appropriate account with which to begin: though indeed to understand at all fully the various counsels which have been given to secure concentration of the mind in mental prayer, the various editions of the 'Spiritual Exercises' should be read.

¹ Vol. I. Sermon xx.

“Instructions for Meditation, or Mental Prayer, proper to be made every Morning.

“ I will meditate on thee in the morning. Psalm lxii. 7.

“ The wise man will give his heart to resort early to the Lord that made him, and he will pray in the sight of the Most High. Eccles. xxxix. 6.

“ Meditation, consisting of *considerations* on the great truths of Christianity, pious *affections*, and manifold *elevations* of the soul to God, and serious *resolutions* of devoting one's self to Him, is allowed to be one of the most important exercises of a Christian life, and such as ought to be performed daily, by as many as would serve God in good earnest. The *time* most proper for it is the morning; the most proper *place* one's closet, or any other where one can be most recollected. The chief subjects to be meditated on, especially for beginners, are, the end for which we came into this world: the benefits of God, and the many motives we have to love and serve Him: the vanity of the honours, riches, and pleasures of this life; and how very suddenly all these things vanish away: the enormity of sin, and the multitude of our own sins in particular: the certainty and uncertainty of death; and the necessity of preparing for it: the account we must one day give to an all-seeing Judge: the eternal joys of heaven, and the eternal torments of hell: the presence and majesty of God: the life and death of Jesus Christ: the examples of His saints: the state of our own interior, in order to the knowledge of ourselves, our passions and vices, &c.

“ The method of meditation prescribed by that great master in spirituality, St. Francis de Sales, in his Introduction, part the 2d, is as follows: First, Place yourself in the presence of God, by a lively faith that He sees and beholds you, and is most intimately present in the centre of your soul: prostrate yourself in spirit before Him, to adore this sovereign Lord, whose majesty fills heaven and earth; make an offering of your whole being to Him; and humbly beg His pardon for all your past treasons and sins.

“ Secondly, Implore with fervour and humility His light and grace, that you may perform this important exercise as you ought.

“ Thirdly, Consider attentively upon the subject which you have chosen for your meditation (which you ought to have prepared over night), and let the truths of heaven sink deep into your soul. Dwell most upon such points as you find yourself most affected with.

“ Fourthly, From these considerations draw pious *affections* of the love of God, of gratitude for His benefits, repentance for your sins, and the like, which are the principal part of mental prayer, and what you ought most to insist upon.

“ Fifthly, From these affections pass on to good resolutions of a serious amendment of your life, particularly with regard to such failings as you are most subject to : and determine with yourself to begin that very day to put these good purposes in execution on such occasions as shall offer.

“ Sixthly, Conclude by thanksgiving to God for the affections and resolutions He has given you : offer them to Him, and beg His blessing on them.

“ Seventhly, Lay up in your mind such points of your meditation as have touched you most, and oftentimes in the day reflect upon them : which the saint compares to gathering, as it were, a nose-gay, in the garden of devotion, to smell at all the day.

“ Eighthly, Such as find difficulty in meditation may help themselves by using some good book, reading leisurely, and pausing upon what they read, and drawing proper affections and resolutions from it.”

Then follow ‘ Ten Meditations out of the first part of St. Francis de Sales’ Introduction : which may serve as examples of this exercise ; and are very proper to bring a soul to a resolution of serving God :’ which it is not necessary to transcribe.

The following is a valuable account, in short space, of ‘ mental prayer :’ it is taken principally from the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori, and is prefixed to the English translation of his ‘ Preparation for Death.’

“ Mental prayer is not absolutely necessary ; but it certainly is morally necessary in order to obtain perseverance. This necessity arises from two causes : the first is, that the eternal truths are seen, not with the eyes of the body, but by the reflection of the understanding. Hence he who neglects meditation does not see these truths ; and, in consequence of not seeing them, he shall scarcely see the importance of salvation, the means which he ought to adopt, and the obstacles which he has to overcome ; and thus he shall scarcely be saved. Secondly, the soul that neglects medita-

tion does not pray for God's graces ; but to pray for them is necessary, not only because it is strictly commanded, but also because it is a means without which we cannot observe the Divine precepts, since God does not ordinarily give His graces to any adult unless he prays for them. Now, he who does not make mental prayer, neither sees his spiritual wants, nor the necessity of asking aid from God to resist temptations and save his soul. Hence he seldom or never prays for God's assistance, and, by neglecting to pray for it, he is lost. They who neglect mental prayer, pray with a distracted mind ; hence many who say the Rosary, the Office of the Blessed Virgin, and other prayers, continue to live in the state of sin. But it is impossible for him who continues to make mental prayer to remain in sin ; he shall either give up meditation, or renounce sin.

“ Mental prayer contains three parts : the preparation, the meditation, and the conclusion. In the preparation there are three acts : first, an act of faith of the presence of God : secondly, an act of humility ; thirdly, a petition for light. They may be made in the following manner. 1. My God, I believe you present within me, and I adore you from the abyss of my nothingness. 2. Lord, I ought now to be in Hell on account of my sins ; I am sorry for having offended You ; pardon me in your mercy. 3. Eternal Father, through the merits of Jesus . . . give me light, that I may draw fruit from this meditation . . . The preparation should be short, but made with fervour.

“ In the meditation, after reading the points, reflect on the part by which you feel your devotion most excited. But remember that the advantage of mental prayer does not consist in reflecting on the truths of faith, so much as in the three great fruits of meditation. More of the time of mental prayer should be given to reflections on the eternal maxims by those who live in the world, than by those who live in religious communities, and devote a good deal of time each day to spiritual reading and other devout exercises.

“ The three principal fruits of meditation are—first, *pious affections* ; secondly, fervent petitions to God for *all* the graces necessary for our salvation ; thirdly, firm resolutions to perform some particular acts of virtue, or to avoid some particular defect. The first fruit of meditation consists in pious affections ; that is, in making interior acts of the different virtues, such as acts of adoration and praise of God's majesty, acts of thanks for His infinite benefits, acts of love of His

infinite goodness and perfection, and desires to love Him as much as He wishes and deserves to be loved by us ; acts of acknowledgment of our unworthiness to receive from Him any thing but Hell : accompanied with acts of confidence in His infinite goodness, mercy, and power, and in His promises to save all who invoke His aid, and in the Passion of Christ, and the intercession of His mother and the saints ; acts of sorrow for our past sins ; acts of resignation to the Divine will in all things ; and acts of oblation of ourselves to God, that He may dispose of us as He pleases. Some of these, or of similar acts suggested by our reflections, should be made in all our meditations. But there are three of them which should never be omitted in any meditation.—First, acts of sorrow for all our past sins ; secondly, acts of resignation to the Divine will, and of oblation of ourselves, and of all that we are and have, to the love and glory of God for time and for eternity ; thirdly, acts of the love of God, and desires to love Him as much as the angels love Him in Heaven, and as much as He deserves to be loved by us. These acts must be made with the heart ; but they may be also expressed in words.

“ The second fruit of mental prayer consists in fervent petitions to God for the lights and graces which we see in our meditations that we stand in need of, and for *all* the graces necessary to bring us infallibly to eternal life. This is, perhaps, the most important and essential part of meditation, or mental prayer ; because, of all the different kinds of prayer, that which is called PETITION is the most indispensable. It is this kind of prayer that all theologians commonly teach to be as necessary for the salvation of adults, as baptism is for that of infants : and as no infant can enter the kingdom of Heaven without baptism ; so no adult shall obtain eternal life without asking of God the graces necessary for salvation. Hence St. Liguori relates that the celebrated Father Segneri said of himself, that, until he studied theology, he was accustomed to spend the greater part of the time of his meditations in reflections and pious affections ; but that afterwards God opened his eyes, and thenceforward he employed himself generally in asking God’s graces. And he adds, ‘ If there is any good in me, I ascribe it to this practice of recommending myself to God. St. Liguori tells the reader to do the same. On account of this strict and indispensable necessity of asking God’s graces, St. Liguori says that he made it a rule of his Order, that in every mission conducted by the members of his Congregation, there should be a sermon on prayer. Hence he says that every preacher should

in almost all his sermons, exhort his hearers to the practice of prayer, and should admonish them never to cease to call for aid in all their temptations... Hence he concludes his book on prayer in the following words: 'I say, and I repeat, and I shall repeat while I live, that our salvation depends altogether on prayer, and that, on that account, all writers in their books, all preachers in their sermons, and all Confessors in the tribunal of penance, should continually exclaim and repeat: Pray, pray, and never cease to pray; for, if you continue to pray, your salvation is secure: if you give up prayer, your perdition is inevitable.'

"In our meditations we should ask, not one, nor two, nor a thousand graces, but all the lights and graces, without a single exception, which are necessary to bring us, and to bring us efficaciously and infallibly, to eternal glory. 'All things, whatsoever you ask when ye pray, believe that you shall receive, and they shall come unto you.'^c The Son of God was not content with saying, *all things*, or, *whatsoever*; but, to exclude the possibility of a single grace being excepted, he said, *All things, whatsoever you ask when ye pray, shall come unto you*. Prayer, then, is an universal means, by which every single grace necessary to bring us infallibly to eternal life, may be obtained as infallibly as that the Son of God cannot be a liar. In this respect it differs from the Sacraments, from penitential works and the other means which God has given us in order to obtain eternal life. These are particular means, each producing or procuring particular graces; Baptism produces one grace, and Penance another; the same for the other Sacraments or means of salvation. But, to none of these, nor to all put together, without prayer, has God promised all the graces necessary for eternal life. *Prayer is the only means* to which He has promised all the efficacious helps and graces necessary for our salvation. Hence, in meditation, when the heart is excited to fervour by the consideration of the eternal truths, we should make frequent and fervent petitions in the name of Jesus Christ, for all the efficacious lights and helps and graces which are necessary to secure infallibly our eternal happiness. These petitions must be always made in the heart, but may also be expressed with the tongue. But, though we should ask in our meditations for all the graces we stand in need of, and especially for the graces suggested by our reflections, we must be careful to pray in every meditation *for three graces in particular*,—first, for the *pardon of our past sins*;

^c Mark xi. 24.

secondly, for the *gift of the love of God*; and thirdly, for the *gift of final perseverance*. We should ask these three graces not only in our meditations, but also at mass, after communion, and in all our spiritual exercises. We ought first to pray for the pardon of all our past sins; because we do not know, and shall not know till death, whether they have been pardoned or not. The Scripture tells us that we know not whether we are worthy of love or hatred.^d And though God had revealed to us that our sins were forgiven, we should still continue till death to beg of Him to wash us still more from our sins, and to cleanse us from our iniquities; for, after the guilt of sin has been remitted, the temporal punishment due to it frequently and generally remains. *Among the temporal punishments due to sin, after the remission of its guilt, the Saints count the withholding of many of God's graces.* From eternity God prepared for us all abundant graces to work out our salvation. Some of these graces were necessary to lead us to a high degree of perfection, and to make us Saints; others were so necessary for our salvation, that without them we should not be saved. In punishment of sin, even after its guilt has been remitted, God sometimes withholds *both these classes of graces*; and, therefore, our past sins, after they have been forgiven, may be the cause of our damnation, by preventing God from bestowing upon us certain graces, without which we shall be certainly lost. Hence the Holy Ghost tells us not to be without fear about sin forgiven. "De propitiato peccato noli esse sine timore."^e In order then to secure not only the pardon of all our past sins, but also the graces which may be withheld in punishment of them, and particularly the graces without which we should be lost, we must pray frequently and fervently in our meditations for the complete and entire remission of all our sins, and of all the penalties due to them. By frequent and fervent petitions for these objects, every one, even the most abandoned sinner, however enormous his crimes may have been, can easily and infallibly avert the chastisement of sin, which consists in the withholding of God's graces; and may thus infallibly prevent the danger of his past sins being the cause of his damnation, after their guilt had been remitted. Secondly, we must ask with fervour the gift of God's love. St. Francis de Sales says, that the gift of Divine love should be the object of all our prayers, because it brings with it all the other good gifts of God. In begging the grace of God's love, we ought to ask the gift

^d Eccl. ix. 1.

^e Eccl. v. 5.

of perfect resignation and conformity to the Divine will in all things, particularly in all crosses and afflictions. Thirdly, we must, above all, pray with great fervour in our meditations for the grace of final perseverance. This is the grace on which our salvation depends: if God gives it to us, we shall be saved; if not, we shall be lost. This is the gift which distinguishes the elect in Heaven from the reprobate in Hell: if the elect had not got it, they should be lost; and if the damned had received it, they should now be in glory. It crowns all the other gifts of God: without it they shall be a source of greater damnation. This gift God gives to infants without any co-operation on their part, by taking them out of life before they lose their baptismal innocence. But St. Augustine teaches that God never gives it to any adult that does not pray for it. The Council of Trent has declared that the grace of final perseverance is a special gift, which we cannot merit by good works. We cannot merit it by the sacraments, nor by penitential austerities, nor by almsdeeds. *God has given us only one means of infallibly obtaining it, and that is by praying for it continually till our last breath.* It is not enough to ask this gift once, nor twice, nor for a year, nor for ten years: our petitions for it must cease only with our life, and must be frequently offered in meditation, which is the fittest time for asking God's graces: we should also often ask the grace to persevere till death in praying for God's graces. This part of mental prayer, which consists in asking of God *all* the graces which we stand in need of, is most important for all Christians, but particularly for priests, who are exposed to all the dangers of persons living in the world, and who are at the same time bound by the obligations of the priesthood and by the daily and hourly and awful obligations arising from the care of souls. It is by attending to this part of meditation that we acquire a habit and a facility of turning to God for help in all difficulties, dangers, and temptations: without attending to it, we shall scarcely ever acquire this habit and facility. Now, without this habit, it will be impossible to avoid mortal sin in the discharge of our duties, and in the difficult temptations by which we are often assailed. St. Augustine teaches that ordinarily God does not give, even to the Saints, grace to fulfil difficult precepts or duties, unless they pray for it. Without our asking it, God gives us all grace to do what is easy, but not what is difficult. Even to the Saints He only promises to give grace to pray for strength to do what is difficult,

and to conquer violent temptations : and this grace He grants to the pagan as well as to the saint, and has given it to every adult that ever lived, from the time of Adam to the present day. Now, all Christians, and particularly Priests, whose obligations are all very difficult, have frequently to discharge duties which are painful and very difficult to flesh and blood, and to combat with violent temptations to neglect these duties and to offend God. If then we do not send up frequent petitions for it, God will not give us the strength necessary to fulfil these difficult obligations, and to resist these violent temptations. Moreover, every human being, the moment he arrives at the use of reason, engages in a warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil,—three powerful enemies, who are actively employed every instant of his life, in laying snares for the destruction of his soul. This warfare shall cease only with his life. Can he expect to be victorious in his daily and hourly struggles with these enemies, unless, by unceasing petitions to the throne of mercy, he obtains the omnipotent grace of God to enable his weakness and sinfulness to conquer, and to persevere till death in conquering, such powerful opponents? Of the rebel angels, St. Gelasius says that, ‘receiving the grace of God in vain, they could not persevere, because they did not pray.’ The rebel angels were pure spirits; they were more perfect than we are; they had not to contend with the corruption of their own flesh, for they had no bodies: but our flesh is constantly rebelling against the spirit. They were not subject to the corrupt inclinations of concupiscence; all their natural inclinations led them to love God above all things: our inclinations constantly draw us away from God, and lead us to sin. They had no temptation from the world; for all creatures only served to inspire them with sentiments of admiration of the power and goodness of the Creator: but every object around us fixes our heart on the world, and takes away our thoughts and affections from Heaven and God. Neither had they any devil to tempt them: but all the devils in Hell are leagued against us; they are constantly going about like roaring lions, seeking whom they may devour. Now, if, in spite of all their perfection, though free from all the attacks of the enemies by which we are constantly assailed, the angels fell, and could not but fall, because they did not pray, shall we, who are all weakness and corruption, without continual prayer, be able to persevere till death in victoriously repelling the unceasing assaults of the world, of the flesh, and of the

devil? No; unless, by making, in our meditations and other spiritual exercises, frequent petitions to God for His graces, we acquire a habit and a facility of turning to Him for help against our enemies in all difficulties and temptations, it will be morally impossible for any Christian, and particularly for any Priest charged with the care of souls, to persevere till death in the faithful discharge of all the difficult duties and obligations that shall fall upon him, and in escaping all the dangers of perdition to which he shall be exposed. To enable weakness and sinfulness like ours to conquer till death the enemies that are constantly opposed to us, God must impart to us His own omnipotent grace; and that He will not do unless we ask it continually. To preserve and perfect and render permanent the habit acquired in meditation, of begging God's graces, it will be very useful to accustom ourselves every day to raise our hearts to God at least once in every hour, when we hear the clock strike, and to offer to Him ourselves, and all our thoughts and words and actions, through Jesus Christ, to His glory, and to obtain for ourselves the grace of eternal life, and always to accompany that oblation with a secret petition for the three graces mentioned above; that is, for the pardon of all our sins, for the gift of God's love, and for the gift of final perseverance. In the chapter on meditation, in the *Nun Sanctified, etc.*, St. Alphonsus recommends religious to raise their hearts to God every quarter of an hour. By this custom we shall fulfil the obligation of praying always; because by offering all our actions to God through Jesus Christ, in order to obtain eternal glory, we make every act of our life a prayer for the grace of eternal life. The third fruit of mental prayer consists in making a firm resolution to do some particular good acts, or to avoid some particular defects. It is always necessary to ask God's help to be faithful to our resolutions; otherwise we shall certainly violate them.

“ The conclusion contains three acts: first, an act of thanksgiving to God for the lights received in meditation; secondly, a firm purpose to practise the resolutions made; thirdly, a petition to the Eternal Father, through the merits of Jesus, for grace to be faithful to them. Let the meditation be closed with a *Pater* and *Ave*, to recommend to God the souls in Purgatory, the Prelates of the Church, all sinners, and all our relatives, friends, and benefactors. We should never omit to pray at the end of our meditation for the holy souls in Purgatory, and for poor sinners. At the end of our meditation, we should, according to

St. Francis de Sales, gather a nosegay of flowers ; that is, we should call to mind some sentiment which we would remember during the day, and thus excite our fervour in God's service. St. Alphonsus recommends all to make two meditations every day, each of half an hour, or, at least, one meditation of half an hour every morning."

It is shewn still further, how carefully, in giving rules for meditation, attention is bestowed upon the object which I just now mentioned, viz. giving scope for the peculiar taste and bias of individuals, by the continually repeated precept, to dwell on any point which comes home to your feelings and interests you deeply, even though you spend all the time that remains of the meditation in that one particular. Thus M. Tronson's work, from which I lately quoted, in the examen on mental prayer, asks the question :

" Have we profited by the advice given by masters of the spiritual life, not so far to attach ourselves to these various acts of devotion [which have been just recounted one after the other] as to go on to perform them all, even *when God gives us a particular taste for some in particular*, which are of themselves sufficient to occupy us in prayer ?"

In saying, some pages back, that mental discipline appeared more directly and primarily important than bodily, under our present circumstances, I did not rest on so precarious a basis, as the conclusion which a private individual might draw from his own theories on the human mind ; but on the plain fact, corroborating such theories, that the Roman Church has so decided. When we observe how completely at variance is the modern Roman practice with that of Antiquity, and on the other hand when our reasonings from probability and experience would precisely lead us to expect such variance, here is surely proof of the strongest and most cogent sort. This variance has been frequently mentioned, sometimes as a reflection upon Antiquity, oftener upon modern Rome ; but surely it is both happier and more reasonable, rather to consider that at each period the Church adopted that discipline, which was most adapted to her children's spiritual needs. ' If there be one problem more deep and inscrutable than another in the science of mind, it is the apprehension of the

recondite and subtle principles which are at the bottom of that external fact, the change which *human nature itself almost seems to undergo*, from change of manners and habits.'^f As great and striking as is the contrast between modern and ancient character and way of life, so great and striking is the contrast between the modern and ancient discipline of the Church in Communion with Rome: can we have a stronger corroboration of the divine wisdom of both? It must be remembered indeed, that it is only as regards the great body of serious Christians, that the Roman Church has so remarkably relaxed her discipline; that the rules which she has almost revolutionised, are those only, which are binding on her members without exception, who are not incapable of observing them by reason of bodily infirmity. But those who *desire* a more stringent and severe discipline, she in every way cheers and encourages: as men go on to perfection, now as of old, they in a degree almost miraculous forsake and renounce the ordinary supports of life; nor can any one observe the slightest inferiority of bodily austerities in her later Saints, as compared with those of far earlier times.

What judgment has our own Church passed on this most essential and practical question? Here again, notwithstanding the extreme seriousness of the subject, one cannot express the inquiry without a consciousness of the ridiculous. As far as her formularies go, she advocates the stricter determination: for all the fast days remain in the Calendar, exactly as they were 300 years ago. But then the question is, how far circumstances, which have reached their present state *since* that period, affect the subject; and on that matter, the very few changes she has made during the interval cannot be said to imply any authoritative view; while for the last almost 200 years she has preserved a profound silence. And certainly, if we turn to living authorities, we should not gather the conclusion that our present rulers desire to enforce those 'antiquated' laws; for, not to mention more familiar facts which are known to all, the greatest of all the extraordinary festivals which have occurred for fourteen years, the Queen's Coronation, was fixed, apparently with the full sanction of

^f 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 27.

the dignitaries of our Church, on a day marked in the Prayer-Book as a fast. Some again of those high in station among us would deprecate all special discipline whatever, and urge us, if we would lead a religious life, to stimulate our affections by the thought of the Atonement. However, that in point of fact the anxious soul, who may be tossed about by a tempest of most oppressive and bewildering troubles, will meet with neither guidance, advice, nor even sympathy, from any recognised function of our Church, this may be asserted without the possibility of contradiction.

Turn now to our public Schools and Universities; the acknowledged seminaries of the principal part of our clergy, as well as a great proportion of our laity, and placed almost exclusively under the control of ministers of the Church. It would be most unfair to deny the surprising improvement which has taken place of late years, in the religious discipline of those bodies, and the great amount of piety and zeal which have been brought to their support. In speaking of these in connection with public schools, the lamented name of Dr. Arnold will at once be in every one's thoughts; nor can we either read his Sermons or his Letters, without being deeply impressed with his great and paramount anxiety to make his school a place of really religious education: while from Dr. Moberly's interesting and most honourable avowal, (Arnold's Life and Correspondence, vol. i. pp. 171—3,^g) one is confirmed in the opinion, that Dr. Arnold was the one great and sole originator of the new life now breathed into public schools. Let us take then Rugby at its best; what were the means which our system placed at Dr. Arnold's disposal, in order to leaven his boys with religious principles and habits? A very striking and plain sermon once in the week; two or three lessons in the Greek Testament; the imperceptible infusion of more or less of a religious tone into the ordinary lessons; and an appeal to religious rather than secular motives in cases which came before him for censure or punishment. To this may be added, the very important and unusual influence

^g Had some of the materials in this work been accessible to me when I wrote on Dr. Arnold's Sermons in the British Critic, I should not have used one or two of the expressions in pp. 361, 2.

exercised by him, over the affections of those who were high enough in the school to be acquainted with him personally. Now it is obvious at once to remark, that all the more essential particulars here mentioned had no reference whatever to the English system, and could not outlive the individual. Very few clergymen indeed, as all the world knows, possess the gift of preaching sermons, which will in the least interest boys or young men; not one schoolmaster in a million will have Dr. Arnold's power of influencing minds by the mere instrumentality of ordinary conversation, as distinct from the Confessional; and as to the remaining principal agency, viz. the infusion of a religious spirit into classical teaching, on which I shall presently speak more at length, when did our Church, as a whole, ever consider this most important subject? what combination of wisdom has been devoted to its deep and methodical investigation? what uniform view is recognised throughout our Church? or rather, as Dr. Arnold might have *his* theory on the best mode of doing so, and Dr. Moberly his, is it not equally certain that Dr. Arnold's successor will also have his, and Dr. Moberly's successor (if by accident he be equally impressed with the importance of the subject) will have his? And all these theories, granting fully the very best intentions in the teachers themselves, will be thoroughly mixed up with the individual peculiarities of each, and will to a perfect certainty, be most miserably inadequate to the necessity of the case. To a perfect certainty; because in so very difficult and complicated a question, no one individual can ever approach to a true result: this result must be the ultimate issue of long continued labours, undertaken by a series of profound and highly-gifted men.

But, again, let us take the system as practically worked by Dr. Arnold himself. We all understand the careful practice and discipline, by which the schoolboys one by one learned the difficult art of construing or of writing Greek; how the first poor efforts gradually improved, from the master being ready at hand to correct mistakes; and how the student, when quite at a loss how to perform his appointed task, was able at once to apply to some master for help and instruction.

But where was this common-sense process adopted, in teaching them the far more difficult art — of daily examining their consciences, of fixing their thoughts on God while at prayer, of keeping in their minds a constant sense of God's presence, of recognising the first approach of a sinful thought, of fighting against it when it persists in knocking for admittance? You will say that this art, however difficult, cannot be taught in class: so *I* say; therefore you must have the Confessional. Here will be another very seasonable opportunity, for discovering the real cause of that aversion to Sacramental Confession, which is so general amongst us. For if it really arises from some innocent motive, and not rather from a most sinful disregard to the necessity of moral discipline, what zeal would not have been displayed in all directions, to supply the absence of this efficacious instrument, by other methods which should most nearly approach it in potency and comprehensiveness! Has this, or any thing like this, been the case? Public opinion will give a sufficient answer to the question.

Every one knows, how loudly the praises of our public schools have at various times been sounded, as affording so admirable a preparation for the busy scene of life, in that they impart habits of manly independence, vigorous exertion, sturdy reliance on self. I am not here inquiring whether such praises have been well deserved, though presently I may have something to say on the subject: certainly if the system has been good, it has been so by a surprisingly happy accident; though on the other hand it cannot be denied, that there is at first sight much plausibility in the grounds of defence above stated. However, the chief object of a school is not to prepare men for active life in this world, but for active Life in the next; and the most bigotted of Conservatives cannot gravely maintain, that to *this* object any happy accident has adapted our school system: no one can say, that the habits of boys at our public schools are eminently fitted to discipline them for an Eternity of praise and divine contemplation. The chapter of accidents then having here at least confessedly failed, whither are we to look for the deep spiritual wisdom which certainly does

seem a more promising agent for such a task? Those who have had influence in our public schools, have not trusted to accident for the pupil's progress in Greek or Latin; but to what else *have* they trusted for his progress in all holy living? Can there be a more striking or more unspeakably disgraceful contrast, than that which exists between the stream of Lexicons, Grammars, Prefaces to Hecuba, Editions of Æschylus, &c. which has perennially flowed, and the most ominous dearth (ought we not rather to say total absence) of works intended to teach the young—what sins are most likely to assail Christians placed in *their* position? what will be the fittest remedies against them? what will be the best mode of performing that duty, (difficult beyond all others to a serious boy, placed in the midst of a multitude far from like-minded with himself,) the uniting deep and watchful conscientiousness with the absence of all that is peevish and puritanical? How infinitely more precious in God's sight is the Christian course of one single boy, amidst such temptations trying to serve Him, than the progress of hundreds in Latin Verses or English Essays! but can it be said that our system is formed on such a principle? I most willingly admit, that very admirable and praiseworthy efforts have been lately made, to amend the more atrocious part at least of this great wickedness; and sorry indeed should I be, to forbear from expressing all gratitude and honour to those who have made them.[§] But taking all that has been done at its utmost, can it even now be said with any approach to truth, or would not the very idea excite unbounded astonishment, that a boy entering one of our public schools would be daily impressed with the supreme and unapproached importance of religion? that he would feel the spiritual welfare of himself and his fellow scholars to be the one central object on which the whole system con-

§ Dr. Moberly has republished an excellent work of Bp. Ken's for the use of the Winchester scholars; a devotional and practical work has been compiled, by desire of the present head master of Rugby, for the use of the boys there, which contains very much of an edifying and improving tendency; a manual, intended to give help in the methodical practice of self-examination, has been extensively circulated in Eton school: all these are cheering movements in the right direction.

verges? that he would find no questions meet with so ready and full an answer from his instructors, as applications for advice under the influence of this or that temptation?

Consider, as a contrast to this, some particulars in the plan pursued at St. Mary's, Oscott; which I the rather mention, because I may add from my own personal observation, (when I was there more than a whole day nearly three years ago,) that a more lively and joyous assemblage of boys and young men, with greater appearance of youthful happiness and buoyancy, and more complete absence of the most distant approach to gloom or restraint of manner, I can never expect to behold. All, at a fixed time in each evening, perform their examen of conscience. All above the age of seven go regularly to Confession; few, I believe, less frequently than once in a fortnight: insomuch that the routine of study is altogether interfered with on the Saturday, that time may be given for this holy exercise. Every time they go into the public study or to a class, a prayer, with 'Veni Sancte Spiritus,' &c. is recited by the person on duty or the Professor; so that every new act of study is commenced by prayer. At the three different times in the day when the 'Angelus' sounds, the appropriate prayer is recited; if it be in recreation time, play is for the few minutes suspended. In the course of every day all attend Mass, hear a chapter of the New Testament, a visit is made to the Blessed Sacrament with an appropriate prayer, and part of some spiritual work is read, and explained, if necessary, by each master to his class. It need hardly be said, of course, that the priest who hears their Confession at stated times, would be most ready and delighted to give them advice and help at any time; nor would there be any backwardness on their part in consulting him.

Two particulars there are of extreme moment, which it is impossible to leave the question of public schools without briefly noticing. The first will be fitly introduced by a passage from one of Mr. Newman's Sermons, which was cited in a former chapter, but shall here be given at length.

"Men who indulge their passions have a knowledge, different in

kind from those who have abstained from such indulgence; and when they speak on subjects connected with it, realize them in a way in which others cannot realize them. The very ideas which are full of temptation to the former, the words which are painful to them to utter, all that causes them shame and confusion of face, can be said and thought of by the innocent without any distress at all. Angels can look upon sin with simple abhorrence and wonder, without humiliation or secret emotion: and a like simplicity is the reward of the chaste and holy; and that to the great amazement of the unclean, who cannot understand the state of mind of such a one, or how he can utter or endure thoughts which to themselves are full of misery and guilt. And hence sometimes you find men of these days, in which the will of the natural man is indulged to the full, taking up the writings of holy men who have lived in deserts or in cloisters, or with an angel's heart have ruled Christ's flock, and broken with holy hands the Bread of life, and viewing their words in their own murky atmosphere, and imputing to them their own grossness; nay, carping at the words of Holy Scripture, which are God's, and at the words of the Church, as *if the sacred mystery of the Incarnation had not introduced a thousand new and heavenly associations into this world of sin.*"^h

The inestimable value of the high and lovely grace here eulogized, and the absolute impossibility of regaining it if it be once lost; not to mention the misery beyond expression of the remorse stored up for future years, by those acts or thoughts which destroy it (that is, if the unhappy victims *are* to be penitent and to save their soul); all this must ever place its careful preservation and culture among the dearest objects proposed to herself by any Church, not utterly blind to her primary duties. An ignorance, indeed, that might be simply admirable in one destined for a life of monastic seclusion, is full of imminent danger for those who are to mix in the world, whether as priests or laymen; for they might perish almost without knowledge of their danger. But though it is quite necessary that their mind be carefully and deeply impressed with a sense of the peril which awaits them, nay, and of the dazzling and attractive dress which it often wears

^h Vol. vi. pp. 287, 8.

in order that the mode of encountering it may be the better understood; it is only for that reason the more important, that during the season of youth it may never be placed before them, surrounded with any other associations than the hideousness and depravity of its own natural shape. It is deadly poison to the soul, that for one moment it should consider this most hateful enemy, as either on the one hand a matter for mirth and merriment, or on the other hand as connected with aught that has any attraction either for the affections or the imagination. Now it would, I suppose, be difficult to find books which more contravene this principle, which tend more to lessen the reader's horror of wickedness,—by either treating it in a light mirthful tone, or clothing it in an attractive garb,—than some of those commonly read in schools. To suggest distantly as a reply to this, that classical taste cannot be acquired without real danger of this kind, is merely to acquit yourself of a charge of gross neglect by pleading guilty to a sin of deliberate and set purpose. As soon as indignation allows one to find words, one asks, which will be most important to a Christian for all Eternity, a pure soul, or a classical taste? or which would a teacher have rather to confess at the Great Day, neglect in the former or in the latter particular? If such an answer be given, so far from extenuating, it increases the sin tenfold.

Let it be observed, however, that I by no means acknowledge the justice of the allegation, that a classical taste *cannot* be implanted with perfect freedom from all stain of sinful suggestion: I feel convinced that it can; though it would carry me too far to pursue the subject. Nor yet am I complaining, that the Church of England takes a different view of this matter from that which appears to me the true one. If, under the implicit and practical sanction of the English Church, a number of religious men, fairly and in the presence of God, set themselves to consider the subject, and came to the conclusion, — that to read works, in which immorality is made the occasion of exquisite wit and humour, or else is decked out in all the graces of poetry, that this is

not deeply and irretrievably injurious to the youthful mind,—my present charge would not be preferred. I must be allowed, indeed, altogether to doubt the probability of such *being* their decision; but that is another matter: the charge I am now bringing is, that whereas the system, pursued at our public schools under the sanction of ministers of our Church, has on the surface every *appearance* of transgressing Christian rule, and of most seriously impairing the Christian character, there has been given no deep and methodical discussion of the subject whatever. A question, as important in its bearing on the final destinies of all her children as any that imagination can conceive, seems to have excited no deep and permanent interest in her authorities; but the present system is left to take its own course, as the accident of the moment, or the taste and judgment of an individual schoolmaster may happen to decide.

It may very probably be replied, that however desirable is this innocence of mind in itself, in a miscellaneous body, conducted on the plan of our present public schools, it is unattainable; that the boys must learn evil from each other, even if not from any recognised part of the system. I do not deny this allegation: I admit it. Then pray let us put this overwhelming and prodigious evil, side by side with the ‘manly independence, vigorous exertion, sturdy reliance on self,’ which have been the subjects of such unbounded eulogy. There are two opposite ideas of a great school, which it is impossible to combine together; we must choose between them. The one considers the boys, out of school-hours, to form a sort of little commonwealth together; a few being entrusted by the master with power over the rest. He himself very seldom interferes with anything which takes place in those hours, unless especially called in; and then appears as a magistrate, to perform a judicial act, and to be guided by a fixed code of rules. And exactly as in civil society, according to the common remark, punishments, and not rewards, are the main-spring of the whole machinery; exactly so; however full he may himself be of the milk of human kindness, he is compelled by his very office to retain an external front

of dignity and severity; to act as a judge rather than a father; to punish extreme cases of turbulence and disobedience, rather than by encouraging smile, gentle accent, affectionate interest, support and cheer the gentle, conscientious, and sensitive. Except in the case of boys very high up in the school, he cannot, without certain imputation of favouritism, notice any one more than his companions on any such ground. This is the idea of an English public school. Its advantages, as stated at their very best, have been just recited. Its disadvantages are such as these: that a false standard of right and wrong is by absolute necessity most widely diffused; that the many bad are overbearing and tyrannical, the few good pusillanimous, timid, enfeebled; that the great majority, who are open to impressions either way, and whose course is the peculiar test of the value of the system, are generally turned to bad rather than good; that that part of school-life which is really moral discipline, (for good or bad,) is far more at the 'arbitrium' of the boys than of the masters, and is unrestrainedly swayed to and fro, by the mere accident of the character of the more influential members at any particular time; that in most cases (I think Dr. Arnold has shewn that it need not be so necessarily in all) that sort of purity which I before mentioned is an unattainable virtue.

The opposite idea requires, for its tolerable fulfilment, a much greater proportion of masters to boys, and a much more carefully-disciplined class of men for masters. Its principle is to make the master as nearly as possible supply the place of the parent; that he should sympathize fully, even when he does not share with all the amusements of the boys; that he should be always in their company, insensibly guiding their thoughts and ideas to good, while he is no check whatever to their gaiety or exuberance of spirits. Punishment of course will not be omitted; but the chief agent at work will be affectionate help and encouragement. It is plain at once, that to unite firm and uncompromising principle with a perfect absence of pedantry or formality, is the indispensable requisite for a master under such a system; and indeed there would

be commonly special discipline for the education of such masters. I have been told, that those abroad who have given their mind to the subject of education, apart from religious considerations, on the mere principle of fitness and expedience, adopt more and more such a view as here stated; and the name of M. Fellenberg has been mentioned as a very prominent instance of this. What may be the value of his authority, I know not; but my informant told me, that his pupils in all their after-life retain even a passionate attachment both to the school and master. In one particular, the statement went on, M. Fellenberg confesses failure; he confesses that when his pupils arrive at a certain age, he has discovered hitherto no method of restraining them from open sin. Strong testimony indeed to the powerlessness of all, save Christian, methods to effect this object! However, whether or not M. Fellenberg's name deserve weight, such on the whole as I have described, seems the general system of Roman Catholics; and it is plain at once that the ordinance of Confession harmonizes most appropriately with such a scheme of discipline.

The question between these two respective ideas is one of very considerable importance; though like so many of a similar nature, it will be far more satisfactorily solved by experience than by argument. To me it does seem most plainly a providential appointment, if anything in the whole world deserves that name, that young persons shall not be exposed, without human protection, to the assaults of evil, until, by long discipline in a peaceful and holy moral atmosphere, they shall be sufficiently clothed in that panoply of grace, which may resist without receiving injury the 'fiery darts' of the evil one. And to reverse that appointment, in the degree our public schools do reverse it, to open so wide an access at so early an age to the polluting and degrading knowledge of evil, seems a degree of hardihood, which could not have been expected in ministers of a Christian Church. However, the one method which carries God's blessing with it of reforming a bad system, is first of all to load the *existing* framework with all

possible good : if it bear it, well ; if not, God Himself has solved for us the question, and the system breaks down with no direct agency of ours. Our gratitude then to those eminent men, who have been or are engaged in the great work of reforming English education, need not be one jot qualified or disturbed, by any serious doubts we may entertain of the possibility of that precise task they are at present proposing ; nor will the fruit of Dr. Arnold's labours be less immensely great, though their ultimate (or even early) result should be, not the firmer establishment, but the more speedy overthrow, of the whole system of our public schools, as it now exists.

The second question to which I was proceeding, when I was drawn aside by this digression, is the general effect of classical reading on the student's character. If the religious belief, prevalent at some period, has so great a share as we all think in forming the habits of that period ; if its influence be so deep and extensive on the conceptions not less of the admirable and of the beautiful than of the good ; surely it must be a matter requiring the gravest consideration, that the higher classes of this country have placed before them, as the principal instrument of their education, a heathen literature and philosophy. There can, I fear, be no fair doubt, that the majority of young men leave a public school, with their ideas of beauty and of virtue formed far more on a heathen than on a Christian model ; and that they are wholly unprepared to regard with that deep reverence which is its due, (can it be said that they are even prepared to regard without pity or contempt,) that character which should be the most perfect fulfilment of our Lord's precept : " Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." I am not saying, that a less proportion of classical instruction should be given ; I have formed no such opinion : I am not *here* even saying, that at least a most powerful corrective is imperatively required ; though on that I *have* formed a very decided opinion : I am only drawing attention to the total indifference of our Church on so momentous a subject. The flower of the English youth, at that age when impressions are most readily and permanently

received, and the character most easily moulded for good or bad, are supplied by ministers of our Church, from heathen Antiquity, with the principal objects on which their aspirations, tastes, and affections may rest. And though this most astonishing fact be undoubtedly true, and has been so for a long series of years, in vain do we look for any trace of that anxious solicitude as to the possible results, or the appropriate remedies for such results, which one could not have thought it possible, before the event, that any Church calling itself Christian could have failed to display.

It will not be necessary to speak at any length of our University system; for all that could be said on the subject has been already implied. On every account, indeed, our existing evils are very much less here than in schools. An undergraduate at the University is able to command the fullest privacy, and to choose to a very great extent his own society; he is saved from the necessity of witnessing any public exhibition or defence of evil; while, again, he is less exposed to danger from its assaults. Add to this, that from his being older and the tutor younger, very much more of confidential and intimate acquaintance between them is possible than at school; a circumstance which, I conceive, bears far more closely on the real religious advantage of the place, than do the lectures, whether theological or other. Here, however, the same melancholy contrast is exhibited, to which I just now drew attention. How many are the books published almost every year, with the object of giving facilities for the examination or other similar purpose! and where is there so much as one, which a tutor can place into the hands of an undergraduate on his arrival, advising him as to the details of his daily life; how much time he should devote to prayer; what will be the most favourable time to choose; whether his prayers should be mainly mental or vocal, or on what principle the choice between those two classes should depend; what will be the fittest method for daily self-examination, and what the especial sins to which his new way of life is likely to expose him; on what principles he should decide the proportion of his money to be given away in charity, and

other like particulars? The scheme which I lately mentioned of self-examination and mental prayer, would be of the greatest service to young men at the age they come to Oxford and Cambridge; but special advice might well be added, suited to the peculiarities of their position. Merely as one instance, where very many might be given, who can deny the most real and serious danger which exists, that even those who are considered the most praiseworthy and exemplary, may habitually pursue their studies even more from a desire of human distinction, than from the wish to do right and please God? Most unwilling should I be to appear at all harsh or inconsiderate, in judging of temptations different from my own. But surely, if the chief thought which encourages the student to rise early, to avoid late hours and much company, and to apply himself diligently and incessantly to his studies, if the *chief* vision which floats before his eyes while he does all this, be the prospect of Academical distinction; and if the thought of God be plainly secondary and subordinate in the whole matter; I do not see how it is possible to call his condition by a less severe name, than an habitual state of mortal sin. What powerful machinery have the clergymen in our colleges devised, to guard the souls of those committed to them from a sin, which in some respects is even more deadly than others, in that it does not so plainly carry with it its own condemnation? Of course—Confession not being supposed—I am not dreaming that they should endeavour to find out, whether this or that pupil on the whole pursues his studies with a pure intention; the question I ask is, what powerful machinery have they adopted to impress on *all* the students the danger which threatens them, and so, it may be, awaken the conscience of individuals to the fatal nature of a habit, into which they might otherwise fall, with no suspicion of its real character? In truth, however undoubted and important in itself is the obligation to cultivate and invigorate the understanding, still,—considering the absorbing interest and self-exalting tendency of such pursuits,—until we have some discipline incomparably more efficacious for preserving to conscience its despotic supremacy,

I do not see how we could regard a sudden revival of intellectual ardour at our Universities as less than a public calamity. We shall be fit for the vigorous and independent thought which is said to have characterized Oxford in the middle ages, when we shall have regained the habits of prayer and religious belief inculcated in the middle ages.

The absence of Confession indeed is an evil felt, not by one age or profession, but by all ages and all professions. I spoke in the second chapter of the duty incumbent on a Christian priest, to admonish most constantly and impressively the wealthy who may be under his care, of the very serious perils which attend their worldly calling; of the rocks, all the more dangerous from being sunken, which threaten to make shipwreck of their religious course. Should he fail in this most important duty; much more should he accept of help for religious purposes from, and allow himself to mix in familiar society with, one, whom he has some reason to think really possessed by the secret yet most deadly sins of deep pride and selfishness, and whom he has nevertheless not yet warned plainly of his danger, (whether in plain and direct addresses from the pulpit, or in other ways,) surely he almost makes himself partaker of his sins. Now the Roman discipline of Confession affords a ready method to acquit himself of this difficult and necessary task, without compromise and yet without any sense of awkward intrusion. Communion, and Confession as preliminary to Communion, is required by the Roman Catholic Church of all her members once in every year. If a wealthy man, in his unchristian pride and arrogance, refuse compliance, he is ipso facto excommunicate: he may still externally attend the religious assemblies of the Church, but he is severed from the heavenly body and from the ordinary path to salvation. He has had then his warning; he knows that the Church has denounced him; and she, in denouncing him, acquits herself of responsibility for his sin. On the other hand, if he obey her requirements, here is the very opportunity the faithful priest desired; an opportunity, to warn him solemnly of his especial danger, to interrogate him on such particulars

as tend to prove the justice of the suspicion, and, if necessary, even to defer his absolution till he may give proof of his intention to amend.

Indeed, let us place before our minds the ideal picture of a wealthy man, encrusted in all that intense pride and selfishness, which so naturally results from the unlimited power of gratifying his wishes, and from his habit of seeing all men and things around him placed at his disposal. Conceive him kneeling before a humble priest, praying absolution at his hands, answering his questions on the habits of his daily life, receiving stern rebukes or earnest exhortations; who can fail to see that this is the very medicine suited to his disease, the very moral discipline which may at least make a *beginning* of that necessary task, (and the beginning is proverbially the most difficult part of any task,) the gradual overthrow of his anti-christian habits and principles! Well—the English Church has destroyed this discipline; what has she substituted in its place? She cannot destroy the unparalleled denunciations found in Scripture against the rich as a class; and she professes herself preeminently a Scriptural Church; in what single particular does her practical system recognise those denunciations? It has been profoundly observed by Mr. Froude, that obedience to spiritual rulers is the same trial to the rich, that obedience to temporal rulers is to the poor: but our Church has sunk all claim to the former, in her earnest and repeated inculcation of the latter; she has given up that part of the Ancient System then which bore hardly on the rich, and added new strength to that which bears hardly on the poor. This does not seem in accordance with the Scriptural model.¹

There is no particular in which the depraving effect of riches is more signally displayed, than the habit of mind, whereby the wealthy man tends unconsciously to consider

¹ “Our Church bears and has ever borne the marks of her birth; the child of regal and aristocratical selfishness and unprincipled tyranny, she has never dared to speak boldly to the great, but has contented herself with lecturing the poor. ‘I will speak of Thy testimonies even before kings, and will not be ashamed,’ is a text which the Anglican Church, as a national institution, seems never to have caught the spirit of.”—Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold, vol. ii. p. 372.

the poorer classes of society almost as beings of a different nature from himself; to fancy that they are bound from their very position to labour incessantly for his convenience and enjoyment, while he incurs from *his* position no corresponding duty of self-denying labour for *their* benefit. The only effective manner, of course, in which a Church can possibly witness against, and tend to remedy, this miserable sin, is by displaying the opposite principle in the most lively and energetic manner in her own practical action; by shewing, in a manner not to be mistaken, how dear to her are the poor, with what sympathy she regards their sorrows, with what consummate wisdom, with what ungrudging devotedness of purpose, she labours for their removal. That this cannot be said of our own Church at present with the most distant approach to truth, seems now pretty generally acknowledged. On her then, far more than on any other body, (as professing to *be* the National Church,) lies the grave and serious responsibility, of that wide gulf of separation between rich and poor; that contrast of selfish and careless neglect on one side, with the union of rankling suspicion and hollow, cowardly servility on the other; which (whatever honourable exceptions may exist) is now so actively and increasingly mischievous throughout our social system. But if a Church should be not even content with this acquiescence in evil; if in urging on the rich the Christian obligation of educating the poor, she lay her principal stress, not on the duty of repairing in some very slight degree their most wicked negligence in times past, but, instead of this, on the unutterably base motive, that unless the poor be rightly educated the rich cannot hope for secure enjoyment of their earthly goods; in such a case, she would distinctly imply, that the rich may without grievous sin make their own enjoyment the main object of their dealings with the poor; and she would thus overtly and directly *sanction* that principle, which it is a sin and a shame to her that she does not actively and energetically *denounce*.

To come now to another class,—very different in many respects are the temptations of those who are *enjoying* wealth,

and those who are *acquiring* it. The latter are ordinarily exposed to such passions as these; feverish thirst of gain; corroding care and anxiety, arising from the fluctuations of prosperity and the vicissitudes of trade; sour, uneasy, envious dislike of their neighbour's gains. Such temptations as these are, in the main, common to those who are playing for a stake of millions or of hundreds of pounds; whatever minor difference there may be between the two cases. Truly 'the love of money is the root of all evil;' for can there be more formidable obstacles than these, to the peaceful and equable Life of God in the soul of man? Even a secular writer (as I quoted in the second chapter) has been able to see, that the desire of wealth is, to speak generally, the only principle which acts at present with real life and energy on the middle and upper classes. Has our Church seen this? If so, where are we to look for her wise and watchful agency in applying remedies to so fatal a disease, and in guarding the minds of the rising generation against its infection? It will be in place here to mention more particularly the Roman discipline of the Spiritual Exercises; for it will, I think, be acknowledged, that they are hardly less than a Divine medicine for the disease on which I have been speaking; and that no system could have been devised by human wisdom, more exquisitely adapted to calm the tumult of the soul, and still the throb of trouble, restlessness, and anxiety.

On the present discipline in the Roman Church on this matter, and the facilities afforded, I cannot do better than insert the following communication which has been made me on authority that may be relied on.

I. In every College and religious house, whether of men or women, there is at least *one* spiritual retreat every year. In Italy in Colleges there are two; one at the commencement of term after the long vacation, another before Easter. One of them is generally of ten days', the other of three days' duration. In most religious houses it is the same. Thus the Sisters of Mercy have one full spiritual retreat in August ending with the Assumption, and another at Christmas for the renewal (as it is called) of the vows. Besides which they must devote the first Sunday in every month, to pre-

paration for death, in retirement. (La Regola e la Costituzione delle Religiose nominate Sorelli della Misericordia. Parte I. Cap. x.)

II. Before receiving the tonsure or minor orders, a retreat of three days is usual, but not obligatory. Before each of the three holy orders a retreat of ten days is of obligation. This is enjoined in the Constitution of Alexander VII. *Apostolica Sollicitudo*, Aug. 7, 1662, and by the Decree of the *Congregation of Bishops and Regulars* (a Congregation of Cardinals that administers affairs involving their rights) issued by order of Innoc. XI. 9 Oct. 1682. (V. Monacelli *Formularium Legale practicum Fori ecclesiastici* tom. i. p. 61.) The *Epist. Encyclica* Clem. XI. 1 Feb. 1710, enjoins that Regulars also make the same spiritual retreat before orders, only in their own houses; a privilege likewise granted to some Colleges, as the German, English, Irish, and Scotch. Otherwise the retreat for orders must be made in the house of the Congregation of the Mission (the order of St. Vincent of Paul) in Rome.

“*Exercitia Spiritualia ante Diaconatum, aliquando a Vicario Urbis, vigore Rescripti (a special rescript from the Pope) dispensantur, sed in iis duntaxat, qui Apostolicam dispensationem super extra tempora obtinuerunt, ac insuper ratione Canonatus, Beneficii seu Cappellanæ ad Sacros Ordines arctantur, tempusque habent valde limitatum. Non sic Exercitia Subdiaconatus et Presbyteratus, quæ nunquam omnino dispensata aut diminuta fuerunt, etiamsi supra dicta aliæque causa intervenerint.*” Praxis Secretariæ Tribunalis Cardinalis, Urbis Vicarii, auctore Romualdo Honorante, Roma, 1772, p. 59. All this is in force, and rigidly observed.

III. In many dioceses (indeed wherever there is convenience for the necessary arrangements) there is a spiritual retreat for the clergy generally every year. This is the case in all the dioceses of Ireland, and in England. This year there have been retreats for the Clergy, during the vacation at most of the seminaries, for the London, Central, Yorkshire, and Northern Vicariates. The present Cardinal Feretti, when Bishop of Rieti, built and endowed from his own patrimony a house for the retreat of his clergy, having three retreats of ten days a year, so that all might have opportunity for going through one, he joining all three. There is an admirable pastoral of Bened. XIV. while Archbishop of Bologna, (*Institutiones Ecclesiasticæ* P. Lambertini, &c. Romæ, 1747, fol. Inst. c. iv. p. 512,) in which he strongly exhorts all parish priests to retire into retreat once a year as advised by Clem. XI. in his *Encycl.* “*ut semel per*

annum hæc Spirituality Exercitia aggrediantur." . . . "Insuper omnibus Ecclesiasticis plurimum commendamus, ut convenient frequenter ad spiritualia exercitia," &c. [In the same *Institution* or pastoral he lays down the rules for retreats before orders as given above, and quotes in addition the decree of St. Charles Borromeo in the 5th Provinc. Synod of Milan in 1576, to the same effect.] His *Institutio XLI.* is on the establishment of an annual retreat for the Clergy. (p. 263.) Many, indeed most, of the clergy, including Cardinals and Prelates, even where it is not obligatory, make an annual retreat, as do many laymen.

IV. For this purpose *there are houses in great Catholic cities for the purpose of allowing persons of different ranks to make retreats.* This distinction is of course necessary, as the order followed and the instruction given must vary according to the state of life and education of the parties.

In Rome there are the following :

I. The house of St. Eusebio, conducted by Fathers of the Society of Jesus for ecclesiastics and persons of education. A director and assistants reside there entirely devoted to this purpose. Persons are admitted singly, or in companies of about thirty, at certain stated periods. Perhaps it may not be out of place to refer to the history of Dr. Augustine Theiner as related by himself. He was brought up a Catholic, but with his brother (Professor in the University of Breslaw) took the lead in the semi-protestant movement against celibacy, the Roman liturgy, &c., in Silesia about 1820-27, and published several very learned works on Canon-law. He quite lost his religion, and travelled in England and France, and at last came to Rome in a most unhappy frame of mind. He allowed himself to be persuaded to go into this house in holy week 1833; and entered chiefly through curiosity and the idea of writing a description in some paper of what he should see. Before many days were over, his heart was completely changed, and he came out quite a new man. He lived for some time with the Jesuits, and then joined the Oratorians, having a deep veneration for their founder St. Philip Neri, and the Ven. Card. Baronius. He has received orders, and is now engaged in continuing the *Annals* of that great historian. See the full account in his "*Seminario Ecclesiastico*," Rome, 1834, pp. 1—41.

II. *Ponte Rotto*, a house so called from being near the remains of a ruined bridge, a large establishment for retreats for the poor

and soldiers. The latter are paid for by the Government, the former by charity of the rich. The house is conducted by priests who gratuitously devote themselves to it. The good done by this house is incalculable, among both classes : and the eagerness of persons to get tickets of admission is truly great. Some go in perhaps from curiosity, others are sent in by authority, (e. g. all who have not fulfilled the precept of paschal communion,) some enter from the worst motives, (some have been sent in by secret societies to disturb the retreat, &c.) but it is rare if they come out unreformed and unconverted. I do not know what to compare them to better than to the water one sees in the filtering machines in shop windows—mud when it goes in, and pure crystal water when it comes out. The conversions made are remarkable for their durability. The writer has had much consolation in attending the soldiers in the great hospital of the Holy Ghost in Rome, when sick or dying, and has been surprised to find many leading the most regular and truly Christian life ; but in every instance this had begun with a spiritual retreat.

III. A house for laymen, similarly conducted in the street of Le Mantellate.

IV. For ladies, besides two public retreats each year in the Oratory of the Caravita, there are several convents to which they may retire for the purpose of making one.

V. And for both ecclesiastics and laity, there are many houses of religious communities *which are always open to persons wishing to make a retreat*. The lessons of St. Vincent of Paul in the Breviary (July 19. lec. v) mentions this of his order—the Lazarites. The same may be said of the Jesuits, Passionists, Redemptionists, and many others.

VI. It is customary in Catholic countries (and in some places at least in England) to make a spiritual retreat before the first communion. In Rome there are two houses expressly devoted to this purpose for boys. One is part of the Roman College, contiguous to the cell (now a chapel) of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, thence called "Le Camarette di S. Luigi," the other is near the Basilica of St. Maria Maggiore, and has the same name, from being destined to the same purpose. For young people of the other sex there is the house of the "Divino Amore," the "Bambino Gesù," and others conducted by religious women.

One of the best books for explaining the system or mechanism

of the Spiritual Exercises, is the Abbate Rosmini's "Manuale dell' Exerccitatore," in addition to the *Directorium* usually annexed to St. Ignatius's Exercitia. There are many works in which the meditations are expanded, among which the most distinguished are Bellecius, Siniscalchi, the younger Segneri, Daponte, &c., &c.

There is an interesting work by Rosignali, entitled "Notizie memorabili degli Exercizi Spirituali," printed in the third volume of his works, Venice, 1723, and lately published separately in Rome. It contains accounts of the wonderful effects of the Exercises. See also the "Vita di S. Francesco di Girolamo," libro i. cap. viii. His entire life (4to. Rome, 1839,) is most interesting, respecting Missions, &c.

As to the course of the exercise, an analysis of it is given in the ordinary French edition of the 'Spiritual Exercises,' a small part of which it may be better to insert. The original plan was disposed for a *month's* course; and the writer I quote expresses a doubt, whether its present compression into a week or ten days be not very seriously detrimental to its fruits. It would be better, he considers, if, instead of compressing the whole four weeks' course into little more than one, some one of the four weeks were chosen, and its course given entire.

'One person,' he says, 'for instance, makes a retreat, to fit himself for a good Confession: he needs only the exercises of the first week. Another wishes to retire some time from the world, that he may make choice of his state in life, or to examine his present state and amend: the exercises of the second week will suit him. A pious soul is in trouble: the exercises of the third week may give him rest. If one desires only to purify himself, and go on more and more unto perfection, after having taken up some exercises chosen from the first three weeks, it is those of the fourth to which he should unite himself.' p. xxvi.

'By the word 'week' is not understood [in the original exercises] the precise space of seven days: some of these weeks may be shorter and others longer. To obtain remission of sins, which is the end of the first week, some may require much more than seven or eight days; others much less. The weeks then must be lengthened or shortened according to the needs of those who perform the exercises.' p. xxiv.

First Week.

The foundation of all the exercises, or the fundamental exercise by which we ought always to begin, is the end of man. It is essential to penetrate our minds deeply with this truth.

The next meditations are on sin: plans for a first and second meditation on sin, and two repetitions of those exercises.

Then a meditation on hell: plan of this meditation.

To this it will be well to add, meditations on death, judgment, in a word, on all the great truths of religion.

St. Ignatius supposes that these meditations will occupy the whole first week, until the Confession is made. But if they do not suffice, it will be possible, in order to prepare one still more in detail for Confession, to meditate on the Commandments, the different kinds of sin, &c. These meditations will help greatly for the examen of conscience. p. xxix.

Rules to be followed in the Meditations of the First Week.

To avoid all thoughts which can cause joy; however pious the thoughts may be.

To deprive one's self during the meditation, as far as possible, of the light of day.

To avoid all laughter and cheerful discourse.

To look at no one without indispensable necessity.

Objects to be proposed to one's self in the First Week. p. xxx.

We have already said, that the object of the first week is to purify our conscience by contrition and confession of sins.

All the subjects of the meditation tend to inspire us with contrition.

The means of arriving at a good confession, is to dispose ourselves for it by an exact and rigorous examen. St. Ignatius gives two methods of examen.

[Confession, particular examen, external penances and mortifications, here follow.]

But since it is hardly possible that a soul should think seriously of conversion, without being at once exposed to the suggestions of the evil spirit, who seeks to disgust or at least disturb it by violent temptations, by scruples, sometimes even by illusions, our Saint gives the most exact and wisest rules about scruples. In the same way he gives them admirable protection against all the snares of the devil, by his rules on the discernment of spirits. p. xxxi.

Second Week.

After having exactly purified the conscience, by the exercises of the first week, our business now is to begin to govern our life. To govern it well, it is Jesus Christ whom we must take for our example. He gives us two different models of life; one of simple and common life, all the merit of which consists in observing the necessary commandments of God; the other of a life which reaches forward to evangelical perfection.

The first of these two states is necessary for all; we must make up our mind absolutely to embrace it; then we must examine *whether God does not call us to the second state*, and how far He calls us.

This week then must be divided into two parts. During the first days we make our resolution to practise faithfully the *essential* part of Christianity, *on the model of the thirty years of the hidden life of Jesus Christ*, which He passed wholly in obedience and submission. St. Ignatius consecrates the first three days to exercises bearing on this object. The rest of the second week is employed in examining what God requires of us; and consequently in choosing for ourselves a state of life, if we have not yet decided, or in strengthening ourselves in what we have chosen, if it be irrevocable.

St. Ignatius gives the wisest rules to determine well and surely what God requires of us. p. xxxiii.

Subject of the Meditations of the Second Week.

The first is the foundation of all the others. To determine ourselves to imitate the obedience of Jesus Christ to all the will of His Father, and even of His parents after the flesh, we begin by realising to ourselves that Jesus Christ is our King, whom Only we ought to follow. Then we meditate on His Incarnation, Birth, Presentation, Flight into Egypt, and the other mysteries of His hidden life, &c.

The fundamental meditation for the second part of the week, is that of the two standards; one of Jesus Christ our King, the other of the Devil His enemy. It is followed by another, hardly less essential, on the three different classes into which we may reduce all men.

We can hardly give sufficient attention to what St. Ignatius says on the manner of making a good choice. We may employ all the

rest of the week upon it ; but we must at the same time meditate in detail on all the mysteries of the public life of Jesus Christ, &c., &c. p. xxxvi.

Third Week.

. . . Jesus Christ is still the model which we should place before our eyes. During the second week we have meditated on the mysteries of His life ; the third is fixed for meditation on those of His passion and death. These objects, still more interesting and touching, are beyond doubt the most fit for strengthening us in the good resolutions which the meditation on the actions of His life have led us to form.

All the meditations then of this week are on the passion of Jesus Christ.

During all this week we should endeavour to procure ourselves inward sadness and desolation by the memory of what Jesus Christ suffered for us ; and absolutely banish from our mind every consoling thought. p. xxxix.

Fourth Week.

The exercises of the first week are those of the ‘*via purgativa*,’ of the second and third the ‘*via illuminativa*,’ of the fourth the ‘*via unitiva*.’ The object of these last is to put the crown and finish to the spiritual work ; Jesus Christ Risen is the model of it ; it is the mysteries of Jesus Risen which should be the subjects of meditation during its course.

The essential exercise of the ‘*via unitiva*’ is doubtless *charity*. It is then to the object of extending, purifying, perfecting, charity, that our constant study should be given ; to that end *all the other exercises should be referred*. For that purpose, it will be very important to make carefully and often repeat the beautiful meditation on the ‘*love of God*,’ &c., p. xlii.

The priest who gives the exercises adjusts them to what he discovers to be the moral and religious needs of the recipient ; again, to his power of mind and body, &c. The Confession is very useful in guiding him as to the future course.^a And it is of course understood, that during the

^a The following extract of a letter from a Roman Catholic priest illustrates the benefit of these exercises, even under very disadvantageous circumstances :—
“ I remember that Archbishop Polding, when he was in England, stated that the [Roman] Catholic convicts [in Australia] had for a time been placed en-

whole retreat there is an absolute retirement from the world without, and all thoughts, not bearing on the exercises for the day, are sedulously banished from the mind.

These retreats are admirably fitted also to answer another purpose, which I specified in the second chapter. I have heard it stated, that there is no more common cause of insanity in England at the present time, than sudden reverse in worldly business. An unhappy man feels that the very object, on which his interests and desires have been mainly anchored, gives way; he is adrift, as it were, in a barren and pathless sea; his affections wander to and fro in search of an object, and find not what they seek. Who can tell the blessing such a man would derive, were access at all times open to some place of holy seclusion, where those heavenly objects might be placed before his mind which are best fitted to step, as it were, into the vacant throne, and placed before it in that very manner which shall be most winning and attractive? Or perhaps from some other cause a sinner's heart is softened; he begins to feel that in being 'troubled about many things' he has 'forsaken the better part,' and to desire to make peace with God whom he has left and insulted. Surely, if he be wise, he will be anxiously desirous to save himself from the temptation caused by the immediate presence of those objects, which have been hitherto the resting-place of his affections; he will wish not to expose himself again to their influence, till he may have, in some faint measure, known the power of those truths which he now hopes may be the guiding star of his life, and been disciplined in those religious habits which he now hopes may continue even to the end. He will at once seek then, if it may

tirely under him and his priests, at certain hours, for several days together. The poor men had, by the neglect of their religious duties, and by the contagion of their companions, fallen into a frightful state of spiritual sickness, and this induced the worthy prelate, whom God had sent to them, to petition that it might be permitted that he might give his full attention to them, and they their full attention to him. The authorities kindly consented; and so happy were the results, that every facility has since been given to the priests in their labours amongst these unhappy men—perhaps I should call them happy men. Thousands of them now approach the Sacraments, who, in the state of things that existed a few years ago, could not possibly have done so." The 'Sacraments' include Confession.

be found, an institution where holy men, instructed both by theory and experience in the needs and temptations of penitent souls, may bring their power to bear in his own behalf, and prepare him for the arduous and relentless conflict he has now before him.

Arduous indeed and relentless may the conflict well be called, even when holy men have done with him their best, and he returns to the sights and sounds of earth. We all know the strange untowardness with which a man in advanced life applies himself to the acquirement of some new habit; of reading, say, or writing: how difficult he finds it to accommodate himself to these new ways; and how uncouth, probably, even to the last, are his attempts at the exercise. But in this case the new habit to be acquired is not merely to be occasionally practised or displayed, it is to be a new habit of thought throughout the day: it is not to be added to the existing stock of habits, but substituted in their place: to the exceeding difficulty of cultivating and directing the new, is added the still greater difficulty of combating and supplanting the old. Those who have deferred repentance "are overwhelmed with the arrears of their great work; they are entangled and stumble amid the intricacies of the Divine system which has progressively enlarged upon them."^o Under such circumstances as these, the very alternative of success or failure in the attempt at consistent obedience may depend, humanly speaking, on the question, whether a spiritual adviser be at hand, well versed in the depths of the human character, and the multiform arts of Satan: a Confessor, who will, by his advice, guard the penitent faithfully from relapse into wilful sin, without attempting to hurry him prematurely into high and austere virtue; who will direct and chasten the first transports of conversion; who will carefully distinguish between the sloth of lukewarmness or indifference, and the feebleness and tenderness which result from the worldly life he has in time past pursued. Where has the English Church her training-school for *such* spiritual advisers?

In allusion to the subject of insanity from mental distress,

^o Newman's Sermons, vol. i. p. 120.

to which I lately adverted, the following extract from the Dublin Review, which I give as I find it, deserves notice. The writer says, that the number of serious Roman Catholics who go out of their mind, is far smaller, in proportion, than of other classes : but statistics of this sort always require ample examination and confirmation, before a wise man will place any confidence in them. The other observations are as follows:—

‘ A mind well disciplined in our religion can scarcely ever fall a victim to mental disease, unless it arises from the irresistible pressure of positive physical causes. Cases of this kind are wonderfully few, in comparison with the number of those that are produced by imaginary woes ; by mere want of power to resist the temptations to evil ; . . . by the state of nervous excitement to which uncertainty as to salvation often gives birth ; by the absolute want of any substantial light for the intellect to turn to, when its path becomes clouded by misfortune ; and by the destitution of all resource when the poor, hunted, wearied stag falls trembling in its agonies on the ground.

. . . ‘ For the more deeply seated maladies of the intellect, those that are traceable chiefly to the wants of the mind itself ; to fears connected with future stages of existence ; to the absence of any firm reliance upon modes of faith which . . . are destitute of the great charm of truth ;—the medical practitioner has no remedy whatever. All cases of this character belong to the Divine. It is he who must administer to minds affected by diseases of this class ; diseases much more numerous than many persons suspect or will easily believe : and we will take it upon ourselves to assert, that it is in the bosom of our Church alone, are to be found the ministers, who can really afford substantial relief in all such maladies as these, or indeed, in any of the intellectual maladies arising from other than mere physical causes.

‘ The soothing language of our Church spoken by her clergy, generally men mild in their demeanour and most conversant, from their practice in the Confessional, with the human heart, having no object to promote save the eternal welfare of those committed to their guidance, would seldom fail of finding its way even to that reason wandering through the labyrinth in which despair, grief, misfortune, passion, disappointed ambition, ill-requited affection,

jealousy, or remorse may have involved it. The very grandeur of our public worship . . . would of itself dissipate from the oppressed bosom a thousand woes.' *May*, 1841, pp. 368—371.°

In connection with the class of subjects I have been discussing, as an illustration of the sympathy which deep and poignant feelings of repentance are themselves likely to receive in general amongst us, let me ask whether there are not multitudes, even of the more religious, who, on hearing of the practices adopted by individuals in Roman Catholic countries and sanctioned by the Church, of scourging themselves, or walking barefoot in penance for sin, will not at first experience a feeling far more nearly akin to contempt, than is any of which they are conscious on hearing of some serious sin? As though, not the commission of grievous sin, but the avenging it on ourselves, were really unworthy our Christian illumination.

In conclusion, a brief allusion may be made to two further and very important purposes, which are answered by Sacramental Confession: viz. that those whose pursuits are mainly intellectual, are saved by it, in some degree, from the evil tendencies to which, as I said, in the second chapter, (p. 35,) such men are peculiarly liable; and secondly, that the great encouragement held out to making, from time to time, a *general* confession of their whole past life, is of the utmost benefit in deepening and realising repentance for past sin. It is hardly necessary to observe that the English Church has taken no measures for securing either of these benefits.

4. The topics on which I have now touched, will suggest to the reader's mind a vast number of similar particulars, which it is not necessary individually to rehearse. My object has been, to shew the miserable failure of that system

° A friend of mine was told by an eminent London physician whose practice has been in cases of insanity, that he considered its chief causes in England to be, 1, the unsettled state of religion, and, 2, the pressure of our commercial system upon weak minds, both from the ruin in which it sometimes involves whole families, and from the constant strain upon the faculties in the endeavour to *get on*.

which has oppressed our Church and nation a long three hundred years, in performing one of the two fundamental and essential duties incumbent on every Church; and that duty too, which is the necessary basis and condition for the other: I mean, the duty of moral and religious discipline. What has been the result in these our days of this most sinful neglect, I am spared the invidious task of reciting at length. Holy men in our Church (including some in their number whose deep attachment to her no one can dispute) have lifted up their voice in solemn admonition and complaint; they have deplored the absence among us of so much as an appreciation of even the most obvious and striking features of the saintly character; the low and carnal standard of religion which has prevailed; the positive discouragement offered to those who are impelled, by aspirations within them, towards a higher mark. Most humiliating facts indeed if true; and I see not how their truth can be doubted. The task I have here undertaken then has been wholly of a subordinate character: theirs has been the responsible office of protesting loudly and zealously against the spirit they have found predominant; I have humbly endeavoured to specify those defects and corruptions in our system, which will have amply sufficed to produce that spirit. In one sense indeed what I have said may be considered to corroborate their conclusions: for taking my stand on facts which no one can dispute, I have endeavoured to shew *à priori* that certain results must, to a practical certainty, follow; and these are the very results, to which, as matters of their own experience these writers had drawn attention. The reasonings then here contained may strengthen *their* testimony to facts they conceive themselves to have observed; while that in turn adds increased probability to the justice of these reasonings.

If our Church has been so incredibly supine and indifferent to her very principal duty, as guardian of, and witness to, morality, that of carefully training her children one by one in holy living, it is not to be supposed that she would have taken any pains in the performance of other duties incumbent on her in that capacity, but which are of a less

vitally momentous character. Accordingly, to choose one from a multitude of cases,—when subjects have been discussed so closely connected with right moral action as the question, to what extent the duty of a barrister towards his client supersedes his general duty to society;—the very idea seems never to have occurred to any of her authorities, that it is a matter with which, as a national Christian Church, she has any concern or interest. Or to turn our thoughts into a different channel; when the most grave and serious doubts have been entertained, whether the principles on which our Indian Empire has been acquired, and on which it is retained, are justifiable on grounds of Christian morality, or whether we are not, as a nation, daily committing a grievous sin in our demeanour towards the subjects of that Empire; any such conception, as the duty of a national Church to protest (if so be) against a national sin, seems never to have practically found admittance into the mind of either Church or nation. It is very questionable indeed on which side the surprise would be greatest, the Church-authorities or the State-authorities, if a proposal were gravely made, to begin a solemn inquiry, with the view to an Ecclesiastical decision on this great question. I must guard myself against being supposed to have any bias, which way a fair inquiry would be likely to terminate; for I really have none: but the doubt has been felt in many a Christian mind, and affords therefore matter for illustration, on the general blindness which prevails to the very existence of so important a part of the Church's duties. Nor can it be either expected or desired that she should turn her thoughts to such questions, while her apathy remains unshaken, on duties so incomparably, I may with truth say so infinitely, more momentous, as those on which the present chapter has been hitherto occupied.

In like manner, since the origin of every science has ordinarily been the practical requirements of some art, it was not to be expected that a Church which has taken so little pains in teaching her children the *art* of holy living, should have given herself any particular pains to cultivate the corresponding sciences. Accordingly few English clergy-

men, I suppose, have so much as heard the name of moral or ascetic theology; and as to mystical theology, since it has been for some time past the common belief in England that Saints and saintly men do not exist in the later ages of the Church, it is hardly to be supposed that attention would have been given to the investigation of principles, for the religious discipline of these holy men.

5. Let us now turn our thoughts to the other primary duty of a Church; the preservation of orthodox doctrine. And here at first sight my task might seem easier; for although, as is natural, members of our Church are very unwilling to admit that we are inferior to earlier times in cultivation of the inward life, they almost make it matter of boast that we are less zealous than Christians of a former age in laying stress on what they would call the more minute peculiarities of the Gospel Creed. Every one knows how languidly a charge of Sabellianism or Nestorianism is responded to by the 'religious world;' and how general the opinion, that belief in these heresies is perfectly consistent with spirituality and heavenly-mindedness. However, one doctrine there happily is, which is still maintained among us as essential, as placed beyond the sphere of lawful compromise or concession: I mean, of course, the doctrine of our Blessed Lord's Divine Nature. It will be well then to base the present inquiry on an examination of this particular; of the faithfulness with which the Church of England has really guarded this most precious deposit; for we shall thus measure the value of her system by that very test which the advocates of that system would most desire. I am not of course really conceding, that Nestorians and Sabellians can possibly believe the doctrine of the Incarnation; but only arguing 'ad homines' against religionists of the day, that we may see whether they can defend their position on the very ground they have themselves chosen. The well-instructed believer will indeed enter upon this inquiry, with the decided anticipation of an adverse result; for where there is no provision for ensuring a strict life or a sensitive conscience, the very soil is not supplied, in which alone a sound faith can firmly plant its roots: while on the other hand,

those who by habitual discipline are ever actively engaged in weeding out all carnal desires and affections, these have heavenly truths brought before their spiritual sight with a liveliness, power, and keen reality, of which we ordinary men can form no conception: though even from our own experience, on occasions of increased watchfulness and care, (independently of the great moral principle involved in this statement,) we should be fully prepared and disposed to receive the testimony of holy men to that effect. Such subjects of contemplation as—the protecting arm of God the Father, ‘the Horn of our salvation and our Refuge:’ or the human nature of God the Son; the unspeakable beauty of his human soul, and sweetness of His human affections: or the inward presence of God the Holy Ghost, binding all Christians into one mystical body: such subjects as these fill pure and mortified souls with indescribable peace and delight. To defend the Faith is with them not merely a labour of love, it is a struggle for the only objects they value in the whole world. No wonder then that the monastic bodies have in every age been the great defenders and champions of orthodoxy; for they have been also the great witnesses and exemplars of an austere and supernatural life. But we have no monasteries, no recognised exemplars of the supernatural life; what then is to be the security for *our* orthodoxy; who is to be the guardian of *our* faith? Still it is quite possible to preserve one’s judgment unbiassed in the inquiry; however strong may be the prepossession, that it will issue in one particular result.

The doctrine that He, Who was born in a manger, Who was subject to St. Mary and St. Joseph, Who mixed familiarly and conversed with sinners, Who died on the Cross, is Almighty God, the Creator of His disciples, and His murderers, nay and of the Holy Angels; Who was from all eternity in the bosom of His Father, when space and time did not exist; this is surely most difficult to believe, and one might think almost impossible in any degree to realise: nor can it be impressed, in any real measure, on the moral nature of an individual, without the most careful and diligent labour bestowed for that end. This is quite plain at starting: and the

only question which can be doubtful is, whether our Church *has* bestowed this great labour. And let us, as before, begin with the highest class in Christ's Kingdom, the poor.

It will be urged at once, that the New Testament reveals our Lord's Divinity, and that our Church is now at least, in every quarter, more effectually performing the duty of teaching her children to read the New Testament. That this doctrine is contained in almost every sentence of the New Testament, and will be more and more seen there by the well-grounded Christian in almost every sentence, I do not admit only, but most earnestly maintain. But it is a widely different thing to say, that a poor uneducated person, who is by degrees taught to read, and then, as long as his parents can leave him at school, spells text after text, that such a person as this will learn, from such reading as this, so wonderful, so inconceivable, a mystery. To suppose that such a result is possible, seems paradoxical almost to the degree of insanity; unless it be alleged, that *by special Divine promise*, the efforts of all, who open the New Testament to learn for themselves Christian truth,^p will be supernaturally blessed and directed. However, we may let this pass, to go to a much more important subject. For surely all serious Christians will agree, that as well might this awful truth be disbelieved altogether, as believed only by the head; that a practical realisation of it is the object to be desired: a hearty appropriation of these most blessed and incredible tidings; a living and energetic consciousness, that He Whose words and acts they may learn one by one, is a Living Friend, Who created them, Who redeemed them, Who had them, one by one, in His thoughts, during His agony, and His passion; Who is ever close to them seeking for admittance, labouring to soften their hearts, to shield them from temptation, to give them final perseverance; and Whom they may

^p On this, not uncommon, allegation, I spoke in the last chapter; where I said that, however unable to adopt such a sentiment myself, nay, however persuaded that most serious and multiform mischief must come from it, I still cannot but very much prefer it to either of the views which may be respectively called by way of distinction, Archbishop Whately's view, and the ordinary 'high-church' view. See pp. 229—232.

address in prayer with the sure confidence of being heard and loved. Now it is quite plain, as I said at starting, that a fact, so utterly diverse in kind from all sights and sounds of this world, cannot be constantly in their mind, nor can a habit so alien to all their naturally acquired habits be really formed within them, unless by some special discipline suited to the purpose. For instance, if it were the habit of the teacher, after they have read some miracle or other action of our Lord, to impress on their imaginations the scene of which they have been reading, as a living and breathing fact: and then, while our Lord's very figure and gesture, as it were, remain full in their thoughts, to teach them to kneel down and pray to Him for help against the trials and temptations of life. Or again, if for only so much as five minutes in each day a child were taught to fix his attention on the thought of his Lord, as revealed in any part of the Gospels, and then, with that thought deeply impressed on his mind, confess before Him his sins, and pray for strength to resist them. And there may be probably many other methods for reaching the same result;⁹ but to say that the mere reading of Scripture is such a method, shews that he who says so has never fairly placed before his imagination the object to be attained.

How widely a belief in the *statement*, that our Blessed Lord is God, extends among the poor, I cannot tell; that among the educated classes of our Church it is general, and caused by the agency of our Church, I willingly admit. At the same time, as to them also, no pains whatever is taken by our Church to indoctrinate them with that kind of belief, which alone is of real importance. For instance, a very common subject among Roman Catholics for such daily meditations as I lately spoke of, is some event in our Blessed Lord's life;

⁹ I have already protested in the strongest terms, against any attempt to introduce among us directly the devotion to St. Mary, which exists so extensively abroad. I shall not be misunderstood then when I say, that as the Church's protest against Nestorianism is considered by learned men to have occasioned the special and peculiar devotion offered by Christians of later ages to the Blessed Virgin, so that devotion (whatever may be its incidental dangers) must be at all times a very strong and unflinching defence against the inroads of that same Nestorian heresy, from which our Church at this time is so deeply suffering.

which they thus view intently for half an hour or an hour together as the case may be, making it the central point, for the time, of their devotions and religious affections, and bringing before their imagination, in every possible way, the truth that the Principal Agent in these scenes is Almighty God. A work in eight volumes by Père Nouet, called 'L'homme d'oraison' is wholly occupied by meditations of this kind, arranged for every day in the year; so also is a small work in one volume in English called 'The Journal of Meditations;' so, again, is that exquisite book, St. Bonaventure's 'Life of Christ;'^r we have seen how great a part of the 'Spiritual Exercises' is similarly arranged; and there are other books with a like object. All this is plainly a most powerful instrument for impressing the minds of Christians, in continually increasing measure, with this fundamental Verity; but I know no instrument whatever, employed by our own Church for a similar purpose. And it might be concluded almost with unfailing certainty, even before recurring to practical experience, that a truth, which requires such effort and habitual discipline in any degree to master, as does this awful mystery, will, in cases where this effort and discipline have not been bestowed, possess no real hold on men's minds; that it may be professed with their lips, and received in a certain most inadequate sense by their understanding, but will be in no true sense apprehended by its only appropriate correlative, the spiritual nature. And the mere fact that English Churchmen still with one accord *profess* belief in it, is plainly no presumption whatever against what I have said; for nothing is more common, in every age and on every subject, than for a dry formal statement to be nominally received, while the vital spirit which ought to animate it has almost or even wholly fled. Members of our Church are fond of pressing this undoubted principle against the Church of Rome; they are fond of urging, that to profess in words our Lord's supreme Divinity, is in itself no guarantee that He reigns supreme in their hearts. The principle, I say, is undoubted, whatever

^r Except that in this latter instance there is no orderly arrangement for successive days.

force there may be in their particular application of it; and they can make no complaint therefore, when I adopt the same principle in arguing against themselves.

But it may be objected to this representation, that members of our Church not only profess in words this belief, but are most honourably and eagerly zealous for it in act and protest. But here is no valid objection; for this phenomenon, again, constantly recurs: men learn from their fathers, not the statement only of some principle, but *zeal* for that statement; while yet the principle itself has almost entirely escaped them. The Roman emperors never dared assume the title of king; so zealous were the people for the *name* of liberty, years after they had lost the reality without a struggle. However, in this instance there is a further reason; which by itself fully accounts for that zeal, without implying any real attachment to the doctrine. For the statement of our Lord's Divinity is absolutely necessary, as a condition for the statement of His Atonement: and the latter statement again is absolutely necessary, in order to belief in the non-necessity of careful self-discipline, and of penitential exercises; and in order to the habit of pitying, or even condemning, an austere and monastic life, in the place of reverencing it with deep humility and awe. To say that the sacred doctrine of the Atonement is wrested to such a purpose, implies no disparagement to that marvellous and ever-blessed work of mercy; nor yet, again, any extenuation of these unchristian tempers of mind. No doctrine can be conceived more essential, than that of God's mercy, or, again, than that of God's justice; yet open Antinomians pervert the former to serve the cause of immorality, and Novatians have before now perverted the latter to serve the cause of heresy: and the very zeal and affection we entertain for the truths themselves, make us more uncompromising and ardent in opposing their wicked distortion. Nay, it has often most truly been said, that Antinomians and Novatians do not hold *really* the very truth they seem to hold exclusively; and, in like manner, those who, consciously or unconsciously, are more or less deeply tainted by the Lutheran heresy, do not

rightly apprehend that very doctrine of the Atonement, on which they profess to build their system. The deeper then our sense of the unspeakable sacredness of this doctrine, (the central point, as it has been well called, on which the whole Christian scheme converges,) the more will our holy indignation be roused against that miserable perversion, which would make it the minister of lukewarmness and carnal-mindedness. Still if it be true, that a very large portion of our Church is really, in one degree or other, inoculated with this fatal infection, one symptom of their very disease will be, a self-deceiving zeal for the formal statement of our Lord's Divinity.

It is plain that to prove demonstratively the prevalence of a certain temper of mind among large classes of men, is from the nature of things impossible; one may have the strongest grounds, from observation and experience, to hold an opinion on the subject, and yet have comparatively little of producible evidence to bring forward. It happens however in the present case, that there is much more evidence, and of a more cogent character, than could à priori have been expected, from the very nature of that allegation which I desire to maintain. And first, I will mention a work, to which I alluded in my last chapter, which, in one of its most prominent and most striking passages, said, in speaking of our Lord, that the "spectacle of this deserted and defenceless sufferer . . . far exceeds that of Napoleon, or even that of Regulus:" the spectacle of God Incarnate "far exceeds *even* that of Regulus!" I am most anxious to avoid any disrespectful allusion whatever to the writer of the work himself; I wish to think merely of its reception here, as a test of the sensitiveness to our Lord's honour, really felt by our 'religious world.' Where was the loud protest, or the silent distress? where the stern rebuke? or where the deep-felt pity for the state of mind indicated by such a sentiment? Where indeed? The 'Evangelicals' as a body praised the book in very high terms, and circulated it in all directions; nor did any exposure of its real nature come from what are called the more sober members of the 'high-church' party; until a Tract for the Times spoke plainly and strongly on the question. It is not often that so decisive a proof can be brought to bear on

so indefinable and indeterminate a matter, as the *practical* belief of a class of men.

But other instances are ready at hand ; and in citing them, I beg to say, once for all, that neither here nor elsewhere had I ever the most distant intention of charging any clergyman of our Church with conscious Socinianism, with intentional denial of our Lord's Divinity or of His Atonement : I firmly believe that there is not one of her ministers, who would not recoil from the very idea of formally contradicting those doctrines. I may have elsewhere spoken of the direct implication or meaning of particular passages, and here I am speaking of the *unconscious* and practical belief which really energizes in some men's minds ; but in neither case have I even dreamt of imputing the deliberate and conscious denial of these solemn Verities. Let me now draw attention to a view, taken by Archbishop Whately in many parts of his works, and to which I alluded in my article on 'St. Athanasius.' The main object of his second 'Sermon' is, to prove that Christ is *the authorized image* of God ; insomuch that *on that ground* we are bound to pay Him divine worship. "The question is," he says, "whether God was with Jesus of Nazareth only as with a most eminent prophet, or *in some such manner* as authorizes and requires us to *worship God in Christ.*" (p. 40.) It is sometimes, he says, replied by Trinitarians to those who charge them with idolatry, that it cannot be idolatry, since we *intend* to direct our worship to God ; but this is no valid reply, for idolatry has its very essence in the worship of the true God in some *unauthorized* image, emblem, or representation ; and "the same act may be idolatrous or not, *according as this divine appointment is wanting or not.*" For instance, when God first revealed Himself to Moses, "*in the appearance of a flame of fire,*" . . . Moses "fell on his face and worshipped. Now if Moses had . . . himself kindled a fire, and *worshipped before it as a suitable emblem of the Lord,* he would clearly have been guilty of idolatry." He proceeds with other illustrations, and then "applies" what he has said "to the great question," which he thinks will "be settled by these considerations. . . . Those who pay divine worship to Christ Jesus . . . are cleared, if the Scriptures

authorize and enjoin us *to worship God in Christ*. . . . We differ from the worshippers of any mere man, . . . or of a graven image, or of a fire, in this *the essential circumstance*, that their worship is unauthorized, presumptuous, and vain, while ours is divinely appointed." Moreover, "Jesus Himself describes Himself, as not only conveying to us a notion of the Father's character, but as possessing the Father's power, offices, and attributes, and claiming the honour due to the Father," so that he is "an image in which God is to be adored." (pp. 40, 55.) 'It is pretty clear from all this, that supposing any baptized Christian to have lived, by special privilege, free from venial as well as mortal sin, and fully possessed by the Spirit of God, the author would consider it as a matter of formal and positive commandment, not of abstract propriety, whether God might not appoint that He should be worshipped *in* that Christian; and when we have imagined this hypothesis, and supposed further some indefinite and provisional communication of Divine "power, offices, and attributes," we shall have formed the whole idea which Dr. Whately thinks deducible from Scripture, of our Lord's Divine Nature.'

Now the belief, which the religious Christian, who has once learned it, would rather die a death of torment, than abandon the belief enshrined in the very depth of his spiritual nature; the belief which is the one main external motive animating his courage, elevating his religious perceptions, drawing his affections to the invisible world, is a belief that He, who lived and died on earth for us, is not an authorized image only, or emblem, of Almighty God, but *is* Almighty God. The difference between these two is absolutely infinite: we love our Blessed Lord as a *Person*; is His Personality human or divine? This is no question of scholastic subtlety: but it is the question, whether the Christian's most cherished affections and aspirations have been rightly bestowed or wrongly; whether he be allowed to retain that belief which is the happiness of his life, or be rudely summoned to part with it. And should such a summons come from those who profess, nay, consider themselves, to

† On St. Athan. pp. 3, 7.

agree with him in all essential matters, but who call on him not to refine unduly, nor insist on a particular form of words,—if it come from these, rather than from the professors of open heresy, surely the attack is even more painful and distressing. “It is not an open enemy that hath done me this dishonour, for then I could have borne it; but it was even thou, my companion—we walked in the house of God as friends.”

The contrast between the Archbishop’s statement and the Catholic doctrine will be placed in a striking light, as I observed in the *British Critic*, if we take the instance of our Blessed Lord’s prayers. “When He prayed to His Father,” says Mr. Newman, “it was not the prayer of man supplicating God, but of the Eternal Son of God, Who had ever shared the glory of His Father, addressing Him, as before, but under far other circumstances, and in a new way; not according to those most intimate and ineffable relations which belonged to Him Who was in the bosom of the Father, but in the economy of redemption, and in a lower world, viz. *through the feelings and thoughts of human nature.*” But the Archbishop had before ruled, that to suppose that God, when He said “Let us make man,” addressed himself to the Son, approaches very closely to the Arian Tritheism, (Logic, Article, “Person”); and according to his statement just quoted, what can these prayers have possibly been (if they were not a mere external representation and mockery) but prayers of *the Man* Christ Jesus to that God, Who dwells in Him without measure; Whose authorized image He has been constituted? What real or substantial difference is there between this and the Socinian statement? what difference is there *not*, as the very instinct of a well-instructed Christian will perceive, between this statement and the Catholic Faith?

The object of this examination is not the comparatively unimportant and very invidious one of commenting on the belief of an individual, but the object, extremely important and free from all personal invidiousness, of commenting on the belief prevalent in our Church. For the Archbishop of Dublin, however much his opinions have been disliked

on various matters of minor importance, most certainly is not *generally* considered unsound on the highest points of faith; or in other words, language, which would inexpressibly shock the highest feelings of those who practically believe and realise our Lord's Divinity has *not*, in point of fact, at all shocked the great body of even serious and religious persons in our Church. Again, the sentiment just quoted had been expressed many years ago still more plainly by Dr. Hinds, whose works are frequently referred to by the Archbishop, and with great praise.

‘In Christians, as in Christ Himself, there is an union of the Godhead with man; but we must beware of supposing that in the two cases it is the same. Scripture declares that it is different; but does not further explain the difference, than by intimating that He was individually, we only collectively, the temple of God.’^r

A pamphlet, published nine years since, drew attention to this quotation among others, and made the plain comment, that “no Socinian that ever lived would scruple to acknowledge” our Lord's Divinity in such a sense.^s However this may be, here was the passage fairly exhibited to the public, and their judgment, as it were, demanded on it. Every one knows, that that pamphlet was considered by numbers of serious persons at the time to state things a great deal too strongly; while on the other hand no general feeling even of alarm, much less of horror, seems to have been elicited by such a passage as that of Dr. Hinds. The same tone, again, is remarkably exhibited by Mr. Milman in his “History of Christianity,” as I observed in the same article. ‘As instances where this tone breaks out into the language of open disbelief in His proper Divinity, I may mention such as the following; though they might be multiplied, I believe, indefinitely, for I have almost taken the first which came to hand. After the murder of St. John Baptist, “indications of hostility from the government seem to have put *Jesus on*

^r Hinds' *Three Temples*, p. 48.

^s ‘*Foundation of the Faith assailed in Oxford*,’ p. 31.

His guard." (p. 240.) Shortly before our Lord's Passion, "at every step *He feels Himself* more inextricably within their toils:" He dwells with a profound, though chastened melancholy on His approaching *fate.*" (p. 300.) And in this instance too, though on other grounds the work has been unpopular, this, infinitely its most serious defect, has hardly, I believe, received notice. In other words, the majority of those who have read it, have not themselves any deep and practical perception of that truth, which such a tone as I speak of essentially contradicts.

It will now be clearer to the reader's mind, what is the *sort* of practical unbelief which I impute to vast numbers in our Church. From my own observation I should say, that among many who would be reputed even preeminently 'safe and orthodox,' there is a great repugnance to the use of such plain and straightforward expressions, as—'God died for us,' 'God was smitten on the face,' or St. Paul's own phrase, 'God's Blood.' I do not mean that such persons would merely shrink from using such expressions on light and trivial occasions; but that they would dissuade us from framing them in our own heart at the most serious moments; in solemn addresses, prayers, or meditations. They would prefer confining themselves to the phrase, 'Son of God;' which of course was amply sufficient before heresy rose, nay, would be amply sufficient in a Church not pervaded by a deeply heretical atmosphere; but which, in such cases as I speak of, cannot be even plausibly attributed to any other cause, than an unwillingness fully to look in the face the true doctrine, that 'The Man Jesus,' is not only the Son of God, but *is* God; and that He is the Son of God, not in that He is Man, but in that He is God.

Mr. Oakeley has expressed the same opinion with great clearness of language.

'Among the heresies, upon the brink of which we stand, a certain Nestorianism is far from being the least rife, as it is certainly one of the most fearful. This peculiar spirit, the absence of a firm and confident grasp of the great doctrine of our Lord's Divine

Personality, seems to operate in different ways, according to the character of the mind which it influences. The less reverent fall, under it, into a painfully familiar way of speaking upon our Lord's actions as Man, just as if . . . He were 'a man,' as any other man, and not God made Man. Thus persons speak of Him in words which can be hardly breathed without profanation, as 'the greatest of men,' or the like; as though mere heroism might be predicated of Him, who was Perfect God in every the least and lowliest of his actions on earth. . . . With reverent minds this loose hold of Catholic doctrine operates in quite another, far less dangerous, and yet very dangerous, way. Not starting with a confident possession of the great Athanasian Verity, that our Lord was one Christ, . . . 'by taking of the manhood into God,' they are, so to say, shy of confronting the doctrine of the Perfect Humanity in all its bearings and necessary consequences. They cannot think of our Blessed Lord, *at least in detail*, as Perfect Man, without an apprehension, (worthy in them of all respect,) lest what they give to the idea of His Humanity should be so much taken from His Divinity. Thus they tend, however unconsciously, and at whatever distance from formal heresy, to reduce the Manhood of our Lord to a kind of shadowy existence.'[†]

Let us now then once more revert to the *proofs* which may be adduced for the justice of this allegation.

Another very significant symptom of the same disease is the general feeling towards the Gospels. If we in real truth heartily believed, that the words and acts of God Incarnate are, by the unspeakable mercy of God, preserved for our reverent contemplation, we should look upon that record with feelings wholly different in kind from our regard to the rest of Scripture, however great should be our veneration for the whole: other parts we should read, but this part we should, as it were, pore over and spell. And this has been found to result, in times or countries in which men have really believed in Him as God. They have dwelt on every little particular of the visit of the Shepherds, and worship of the Magians; or they have counted His last words, and honoured, one by one, His adorable wounds; just as they have looked with feelings of awe and love towards the ground

[†] 'Introduction to translation of Life of Christ,' p. xxiv.

which His sacred feet trod, and felt it a scandal and a shame that infidels should possess it. But so far is this from being the case amongst ourselves, that men of very different religious parties have united in professing that the Epistles are even a *preferable* study for the Christian. They defend this statement, by saying that Christian doctrines will there be found most clearly drawn out : were we to grant this for argument's sake, what would follow, but that they love our Lord's doctrines more than His Person ? the very charge childishly and absurdly brought against Catholic believers. And if we love His doctrines more than His Person, we either love certain doctrines more than we love God, or we do not practically believe in Him *as* God.

Again, observe to how great an extent the very idea had gone out from our Church, until quite lately, of afflicting ourselves at stated times in sympathy with His sufferings, or of so realising His sufferings as to make the thought of them a matter of personal sorrow and depression of heart. Is it in human nature to read such accounts as those contained in our services for Holy Week, and to know that each sin of ours bore its part in aggravating the pangs He endured, and yet feel nothing like distress and anguish of mind, if we really love Him ? or shall we say, that those multitudes in our Church, to whom the notion of such distress and anguish has seemed strange, fantastical, unaccountable, contain in their number none who really love God ? If this be, as I most readily acknowledge, an unbearably harsh censure, what follows (as in the last case) but that they do not really feel that He *is* God ?

To the same head may be referred the strange misconception, so common among Protestants, on the Catholic belief in the Real Presence. Members of our Church have quite commonly regarded the doctrine in question, as being nothing more (if such words may be uttered) than a sort of unmeaning conjuration ; and have felt no little contempt for those, who could erect it into a sacred article of faith. Now, whether or not they ought themselves to accept this doctrine (which is another matter), that *this* should be their opinion of its real nature, is a fact which I find it very difficult indeed to

reconcile, with any real belief on their part (speaking of them as a class) in another doctrine which they *do* consider themselves bound to accept. For if union with God be our only happiness here below, a belief in that closer and more intimate union, which must result from His mixing, as it were, His human nature with ours, and thus drawing us into ineffable proximity with the Divine Essence,—such a belief must be to those able to receive it an occasion for the liveliest joy and gratitude. And those who are unable to fancy that any real value is attached to it, and regard the zealous and unflinching maintenance of it as the mere mark of formalism and unspirituality, afford surely the strongest presumption, that they have no real and true grasp of that fundamental doctrine, which gives this other belief its meaning and its preciousness, the union of the divine and human *natures* in *One Divine Person*. Indeed, there is no subject on which the contrast is so striking, to which I have had formerly to draw attention, between the intellectual apprehension of those who spiritually realise a doctrine and of those who do not. For a religious Catholic regards this miracle as the very master-piece, the very crowning instance, of exuberant love; beyond which even God's Infinite Mercy can hardly find it possible to have vent: and its scientific discussion and definition he contemplates with that deep and breathless emotion, which is naturally called forth by the mere circumstance of the mind being occupied, for a length of time, in the thought of what it prizes beyond words. And as the believer regards this as the sublimest display of Divine Mercy, so does the unbeliever (may he be forgiven the blasphemy!) as the lowest exhibition of human imbecility. The astonishment of the Infidel or the Protestant is as full of bitter contempt, as the wonder of the Catholic is animated by the highest emotions of love, gratitude, and adoring awe.

Lastly, the circumstance of the question being even entertained,—whether modern Unitarians are in any true sense Christians,—implies, in those who entertain it, a strange ignorance of the truth which Unitarians deny; for surely their point of difference with orthodox Christians, is incomparably more momentous than their point of difference with avowed

infidels. In fact, who *can* compare in moment the question,—whether God has, or has not, made, by His servant, a special revelation,—with that other question,—whether He has, or has not, Himself taken on Him our nature and visited this earth? or how is it possible for those, who answer the latter question in the affirmative, to regard their opponents in any other light, than as rejecting that one fact, which gives to human nature itself its unapproachable interest and importance? If those are looked upon as on the whole brethren, who agree with us in the external visible facts of Christianity, but who differ, not less than infinitely, as to the real meaning of those facts; while those are looked upon as adversaries, who disbelieve the external facts also; those who take such a view of things (considering them as a class, and allowing for individual instances of prejudice or intellectual indistinctness) bear witness against their own belief, and testify that they have hardly a more real appreciation of the meaning of those facts, than have the Unitarians themselves. But that a professed Unitarian should come among a body, which claims to be the chief pillar of an orthodox Church, and should receive at their hands, not courtesy merely or attention, but public honour; that in a place where the students recite many times in the year the Athanasian Creed, with its damnable clauses, and where a profession is made of teaching them accordingly, of teaching them that, except for invincible ignorance, an Unitarian is wholly out of the way of Christian salvation,—that in such a place a project should have been entertained of introducing an individual openly avowing that heresy into the Academical assembly, with a highly eulogistic speech, and placing him ‘*honoris causâ*,’ before the eyes of those students, in the highest rank; nay, that this project should either have succeeded, or have failed of success only by an unforeseen accident; this is a circumstance, which of itself might lead one seriously to ask, how soon open apostacy from the faith is likely to take the place, among us, of the huge mass of secret and unconscious unbelief.

I trust no one can attribute either this statement, or the course taken on the occasion to which I allude, to feelings of

personal hostility or Academical discontent. Those who then acted a most painful and trying part, certainly took every means in their power to guard against such a misconception. And again, speaking for myself, I am sure that the language I have used in the *British Critic* towards Mr. John Mill, whom his writings have compelled me to charge with far worse unbelief than Unitarianism, may shew that I have no desire to join in an indiscriminating and fanatical outcry. But surely it is one thing to make every allowance for individuals, under the fearful eclipse which the Truth now suffers, or even to be ready and anxious in displaying all courtesy and considerateness in our private demeanour; and quite a different, or rather a very contrary thing, to allow them to forget that we consider the matter at issue between us as infinitely momentous, or to give them public honour in an institution founded on Christian belief. The very contrary thing, I say; for it is precisely that feeling of personal considerateness and tenderness inclining us to the first, which would also at once forbid the last. *They* may be wholly blameless in their unbelief; it is impossible to form even a guess whether they are not so; but we cannot be blameless, if, seeing the truth, we take one single step which may lessen *their* sense of the importance of seeking it.^u

Indifference then to the very central Verity of the Gospel being prevalent among us, to the fearful extent I have endeavoured to describe, we cannot wonder, however keenly we may mourn, at the decline and fall of dogmatic theology. When the faith itself becomes again precious in our eyes, so also will that superhuman science, which alone can defend and secure it. As it is, the great body of 'high Churchmen' seem hardly more alive to its preeminent dignity than others. For example, Mr. Newman's translation and notes on St. Athanasius' doctrinal treatises, have hardly excited the least sensation; though that work (to say nothing more) is certainly

^u 'Seeking it:' I mean, of course, not by Scripture exegesis or free inquiry, but by more earnestly acting on their existing principles; by self-discipline, much prayer, *devotional* reading of Scripture, and studying the life and the belief of holy men.

the most remarkable accession to dogmatic theology that has been made within our memory, and is perhaps the greatest of all his works. Nay, and the very authorized education for Orders seems to consist far more (a thing that would have been thought incredible in other ages) in the exegetical interpretation of Scripture, or else the discussion of such merely ecclesiastical subjects as Episcopal jurisdiction and the validity of lay Baptism,—than in the scientific analysis and exposition of those great Mysteries, the Trinity and the Incarnation; those Mysteries, the science of which has ever been considered in the Church the one fit and adequate object for the Christian intellect, as the thought of them is the life and happiness of the Christian soul. All our attention seems directed to the outworks; while we leave the world to wonder, what can be the *cause* of that jealous care with which we labour to preserve them, when we ourselves speak so little, and seem to think so little, of the very treasure which they were given to defend. Dr. Wordsworth, as one symptom of this, publishes a volume, (*Theophilus Anglicanus*,) ‘the occasion and object of which,’ so his preface tells us, ‘is to supply a book suited to the purpose of catechizing scholars in the highest class of a Grammar School’ such as Harrow. The whole work is, if I may use such a phrase, *ecclesiastical*: no methodical teaching about—sin, original and actual; the efficacy of prayer; the gift of grace; the union of the Divine and Human natures in our Blessed Lord; the mysterious Trinity in Unity; or whatever else most closely concerns the inward life: but all his energy is directed to such matters, as ‘lawful ministry,’ ‘uninterrupted succession,’ ‘Church and State;’ topics in themselves quite essential to be considered in due time and place, but which cannot surely be made the prominent features of any exhibition of Christianity, ‘without causing our notions of religious faith and precept to be stiff, barren, and most distressingly formal.’

I cannot be supposed to mean any thing disrespectful to Dr. Wordsworth personally; for I am merely citing this work as an example, ready at hand, of a method of procedure, which seems even on the increase among us, as ‘high-Church’


principles advance. And what can be the result of all this in our pulpits and general teaching, except that, according to a quotation I lately cited from the Christian Remembrancer, doctrines are held by our flocks, according to the accident of their locality and opportunities, irreconcilably discordant from each other on matters which are the most intimately bound up with the life of the soul; nay, on *all* matters, except only our Church's immaculate purity and Rome's incurable corruptions. And hence it further follows, by necessary consequence, as I said in the second chapter, that to a miserable extent the people fall into a habit of hearing religious words without attaching to them any definite meaning, and the voice of the preacher becomes to them almost as 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.'

Such being the practical disbelief of English Churchmen in the truth, which they consider themselves to prize beyond all others, it will not astonish us that in particulars, which they themselves consider less important, as till greater indifference exists. The doctrine, which may be perhaps considered to come nearest in practical moment to that which we have been discussing, is the Indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This is almost in terms denied by numbers, who preeminently claim the character of spiritual Christians; they plainly profess, that our works done under the Gospel are, as a matter of doctrine, 'filthy rags:' or in other words, are not intrinsically acceptable to God. Since then they cannot believe that the Holy Ghost is the Agent of these works, they are led to confine his office to the inspiration of good desires; and since it is certain that Christians have the Holy Ghost in some distinct sense from heathens, the more clear-sighted and consecutive are led on to Luther's shocking sentiment, that the heathens had *no* good desires. So few are sometimes the steps, which lead, from abstract heresy, to practical paradoxes the most repulsive and demoralizing. Yet even of those among us who are not avowedly infected with this heresy, numbers are so far at least tainted as to shrink from *calling* it heresy; or, in other words, to be unconscious of its utter irreconcilableness with the most essential principles of the Gospel. In like manner,

a doctrine which, as belonging to natural religion, is even more primary than the most sacred of Revelation, I allude to future judgment according to works, is formally repudiated as antichristian by multitudes of the same class; and even those who do not proceed to such utterly fanatical and immoral lengths, are sometimes slow, in positively affirming that our future reward is proportioned to our works done in the Holy Ghost on earth; and still oftener slow, in affixing the brand of heresy on the error which *denies* this.

We cannot wonder then that a dimness of spiritual vision, which could not beforehand have been thought possible in ordinarily serious Christians, does in fact characterise great part of the more religious among ourselves. Nothing, e. g., is more common, in attacking Roman Catholics, than to say that Purgatory (as it is more ordinarily received among them) is a frightfully cruel doctrine, because it speaks of purgatorial flames as being equal in intensity to those of Hell. Roman Catholics answer, that souls in purgatory preserve not faith only and hope, but even the love of God; and that this makes the widest possible difference between the two cases. But such a reply is continually treated as a 'hair-splitting' subterfuge, a mere evasion. Yet St. Alphonsus, like other spiritual writers, not once only, but repeatedly expresses the sentiment,—that where love of God exists, *there* must be really happiness, whatever the accompanying pain; and that where it is absent, there must be misery, whatever the accompanying pleasure. The distinction then between having and not having the habit of love, is not merely not unimportant, but beyond all others important; yet Protestants (even some who appear not destitute of religious seriousness) continually speak, as though the very idea of the happiness caused by this habit were a stranger to their mind. What I have said will probably recall to the reader's mind a number of similar instances, which are perhaps more often met in this particular controversy than in any other; but which it is not necessary to specify.

Lastly, when a Church not only omits to take the necessary means for teaching orthodoxy, but manifestly and in



the face of day tolerates heterodoxy, a still graver matter is suggested for our consideration. It is a notorious fact that from the Reformation downwards three parties have, in varying measures, divided among them the English Church; the 'high-church,' the 'evangelical,' the 'latitudinarian:' and all have received practical toleration. Those who graft the Gospel on natural religion,—those who have devised or inherited a Gospel which *contradicts* natural religion,—and those who deny that there is any one assemblage of doctrines which possesses an exclusive right to be called the Gospel,—all these it has been sometimes, in the blindness of our arrogance, made a matter of *boast* that the English Church includes within her pale. And to go to other controverted questions, (not so vitally important indeed as these, but still of exceeding importance,) the experience of the last few months shews, that a public denial of Sacramental grace, and an assertion of the right possessed by each man to draw his faith for himself from Scripture, may be publicly and formally put forward by a number of her ministers, with no censure from ecclesiastical authority. The extracts again, which I made from Archbishop Whately, have received no formal censure or disavowal; nay, a writer, whom the present Bishop of London characterises as a Socinian, died a Bishop of our Church.* A Society so ordered, may be still, by God's inscrutable mercy, a channel of Divine grace, as our Church *is*; but it is literally unmeaning to speak of it as a Dispenser or Witness of religious Truth. We cannot learn doctrine from the English Church, if we would; for she *teaches* no uniform doctrine to be learned.

6. So powerless has our Church been to train her children in these most essential of all requisites, an obedient life and an orthodox faith; it is no matter of wonder then that we see among us so few who exemplify, nay, who possess the power of appreciating, the true Catholic character. For we

* Bishop Hoadley. The Bishop of London compares with this case that of Pope Leo X., whom he represents to have been an infidel. Waiving the historical controversy, such an opinion could not be based on his writings or on any overt act, but only on surmises and rumours, well or ill-founded. But this makes the whole difference between cases which a Church *can* notice and those which it *cannot*. Bishop Hoadley's heretical opinions were plainly *avowed*, and yet not censured.

shall perhaps not wander far from the truth, if we say that wherever such characteristics are found as the following; 1. a consistent, however frail and imperfect, fulfilment of the *whole* law; 2. a belief (implicit or explicit matters not) in such fundamentals as the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Office of the Holy Ghost; 3. a practical realisation of the Communion of Saints in daily devotion and daily action;—there the Catholic character exists in all its essential and universal features: and most certainly we shall not wander from the truth, when we confidently assert the converse; that wherever any one of these features should be absent, (supposing the impossible case that one *could* be absent while the others remain intact,) an indispensable constituent of that character would be wanting. Now on the mutual action and reaction of *the first two*, among the three characteristics just recited, enough has been said in what has gone before: while *the last* may readily be implanted as an offshoot from either of those two; from the first, as springing from that veneration of the saintly character which holy obedience inspires; from the second, as intimately connected with a fit appreciation of the Office of the Holy Ghost. It follows then at once, as I started by saying, that it is no possible matter of surprise, when we observe how little the Catholic model is understood among us, and how small the amount of gratitude due to our present system even for that little. It follows also, that those who desire, in their place and according to their power and opportunity, to assist in the great task now in progress of building up our unhappy and prostrate Church, must concentrate their energies on this one object; the object of devising the means whereby, saving her existing framework, she may be able to perform, with less deplorable inefficiency, these her primary duties.

Indeed until these are in some adequate measure performed, others are incapable of performance. For instance, that attention to the public Service of the Church both in its more frequent and more solemn celebration, which is doubtless one of the many cheering features of our time, must surely be considered rather as encouraging for the

future, than conferring any extensive benefit for the present ; and must so be considered, until our attention shall have been more generally and methodically directed to the maintenance and cultivation of *personal* obedience and *personal* orthodoxy : for, as I observed in the second chapter, any formal and stated service of prayer, ‘ if not closely connected with a strict government of the inward life, by an inevitable necessity declines more or less into hollowness and formalism.’ On the other hand, it must never be denied or concealed ‘ that an ordered and minute ceremonial, solemn ministrations, prostrations, obeisances, and other external signs of our religion, —that all these, which to the world appear but the dictates of a miserable and contemptible formalism, are full of beauty and delight to the Catholic mind. It is the very characteristic of all beauty, that those who happen not to have a temperament disposed to receive its impressions, regard those impressions as absurd and fantastical. What can appear more trifling and childish, than the love of natural scenery, except to those who feel it as beautiful and transporting ? That a rational being shall derive pleasure from fixing his eyes on a mere assemblage of trees, hills, and hedges,—nay, shall go a journey of many days, and of much trouble and expense, with the sole object of enjoying such a sight,—how weak and ridiculous ! Just so argue men of the present day, when there is a question about Catholic Ceremonial ; they fall into the common mistake of the bigotted and narrow-minded, and fancy that external objects cannot be to *others* most ravishing and transporting, merely because to *them* they are but empty husks and an unsubstantial outside. Even of Shakspeare’s often-quoted eulogy on music (‘ the man that hath not music,’ &c.) a celebrated commentator has been found to say :

‘ This passage . . . furnishes the vacant fiddler with something to say in defence of his profession, and supplies the coxcomb in music with an invective against such as *do not pretend to discover* all the various powers of language in inarticulate sounds ;’

‡ Steevens ad locum.

where we find that tone of bitter and contemptuous sarcasm, even in regard to so very general a taste as that for music, which will at once remind my reader of the would-be philosophical Protestant, in his remarks whether on the Athanasian Creed, or (which is more to the present purpose) on the Apostolical Liturgies.

However, as I began by fully acknowledging, nothing but formalism *can* result, if we make outward ceremonial our first or most prominent object; nor can we therefore revive it with any advantage, until we have made a foundation for it by implanting the first elements of the Catholic character. Take, again, such other duties of a Church as I specified in my second chapter; and first consider what may be called her *intellectual* duties. For example, how can an authorized view of Biblical Criticism be obtained, unless that science be wholly based on a living, energetic, and consistent fabric of dogmatic theology? Until we have deeply and fully realised, as a whole, the faith which St. Paul preached, how can we profitably distribute it, as it were, rightly among the various passages of his Epistles? Who would tolerate a similar absurdity in common life? who would profess to interpret the letters addressed by some human philosopher to the students he has instructed, without first acquainting themselves, by every attainable means, with the philosophical doctrines he had taught? Nor is this any denial of the truth, that Scripture furnishes a sufficient proof of Christian doctrine to those who have learned it from the Church; so far from it, that in the parallel case there could not be devised by possibility a more satisfactory proof, that the inquirers had rightly understood the philosophical system, than the circumstance, that it would give a meaning to these letters, so far deeper and more pregnant than they would otherwise receive. Biblical Criticism then will ever remain on the whole a delusive science, (whatever valuable materials may be in course of preparation for the Catholic Expositor, through the intellectual power and activity of Protestant inquirers,) until it shall be cultivated by thinkers, who have been, as a preliminary, deeply imbued with the Catholic Faith. Just as no one could understand the spirit and drift of Luther's expressions, one by

one, except he who shall have laboured to imbibe what may be called the Lutheran atmosphere of thought; so neither can any one enter into the deep words of Scripture, except in proportion as he shall have been indoctrinated in the faith by a pure and Scriptural Church. And as to Catholic history and Catholic philosophy, it is still more evident, on the very statement, that they can be only promoted by one deeply rooted in the Catholic Faith.

And this is even more the case, with what I have called the Church's *political* duties. How can she hope to obtain so much as a hearing from a luxurious nobility, or from a legislature almost compelled to be the slave of momentary shifts and time-serving expedients, or from a middle class wholly absorbed in the ceaseless press of secular business and the feverish thirst of worldly gain,—how can she, I say, hope to obtain so much as a hearing, (not from this or that individual, but) from these *classes* of men, when she endeavours, as God's Vicegerent on earth, to impress on their consciences the duties of their several stations, and eagerly and clamorously warns them against their besetting sins? How can she hope to 'cry aloud and spare not,' and meet with aught in return save insolent contempt or forcible suppression of her voice? There is only one fashion of instruments, which will avail her; of one and one only kind are the weapons, which she can oppose to worldly haughtiness and cruelty: these instruments, these weapons, are Saints and saintly men. The very presence of a class of Christians, who shew in their whole lives and demeanour that they are dead to secular cares and pleasures, and that their hearts and affections are absorbed in Heavenly realities; men who live a mortified life, a life above the world; who choose poverty, and *vow* celibacy, and refuse wealth and distinction even when offered; this it is, which is an evidence of the unseen world that none can gainsay or resist, and which exercises an influence over the most careless or the most obdurate, against their will, almost without their knowledge. Contempt here is impossible; respect and admiration are extorted from the mass of men, in spite of themselves. And for that other alternative, to

which I just alluded, the silencing them by force, (an alternative, in respect of which we have already very significant indications, how far greater a tendency there will be to its adoption, than the maxims now generally current would lead us to imagine,) let it be remembered, that such men as I describe will impose on their oppressors the full labour and odium of persecution carried to its extreme length. Nothing will stifle their importunate clamours, except irresistible physical force; and it is by this time pretty well understood in politics, that such force, when exerted against a righteous cause, inflicts on the individual a suffering which he covets, and carries forth to every corner of the land the truth which he witnesses.

Still more obvious is the truth here maintained, in regard to by far the most important part of all a Church's political duties; the protection and consolation of the poor. On this subject, human science is even at the present moment brought to a stand, like some powerful steam-engine without hands to work it, for want of a mass of data, which, with our present machinery, cannot by possibility be supplied. Let us see a band of enthusiastic men, self-devoted to the cause,—many of them following at an infinite distance the steps of Him 'who, though He were rich, yet for our sakes became poor,'—all of them like to the poor in their manner of life, and like to the rich in their knowledge and education, except that the latter is deeply impregnated, in every particular, with the Catholic doctrine and spirit;—let us see such men as these dispersed, as one may say, in swarms, among our crowded manufacturing towns, bringing by their very presence both encouragement and edification; full of that tender loving-kindness, which Catholic discipline alone implants; and looking on the poor, in the light which Catholics *do* look on them, as sacramental tokens of the Lord's nearer presence; what would not be the result? Soon would that suspicion dissolve, which is perhaps even the most fearful sign of the times, that deep and rankling suspicion entertained by the poor, that those above them are not really interested in their happiness and well-being; soon would

they open all their griefs to these loving and intelligent sympathisers:—what distresses, bodily or mental, most severely press upon them;—what are their chief spiritual or temporal enemies;—what the causes of their most corroding anxiety, or their most desponding apathy;—these and a thousand other particulars, now so hopelessly concealed from those who might devise a remedy, would come forth to light; and human science, powerless while confined to definitions and abstractions, might now at length exert its mighty aid in devising means of solace and relief.

Nor are these holy men, or again, devoted women, less imperatively required as ministers of relief, than as investigators of distress. Science is no less hopelessly unequal to the task of relieving without a body of special and trained ministers, than to that of theorizing without a body of diversified and well-authenticated facts. Never has there been a more ill-omened separation, than that which has taken place of late years, between the spirit of exuberant and religious charity and the deliberate calculations of methodical and cool-headed science. It is perfectly conceivable, for all that I know it may be quite true, that the existing race of political economists have been shallow and superficial; but to deny that there *is* a science on the subject, and one most closely concerned with human happiness in such a state of Society as our own, this is one of the most extraordinary allegations that has been made even in *our* age; an age so fertile in extraordinary allegations.⁷ And on the other hand, to dream that such a science can in any the slightest degree supersede, or can have by possibility a more worthy or more important function than to direct and facilitate, the personal self-sacrifice and self-devotion of the rich, is a fancy that tends even to excuse the former allegation; and is the dictate of a more stupid and bigotted fanaticism, than any of which I ever heard in the history of religions, true or false. The presence

⁷ See an admirable article of Mr. John Mill's on the province of Political Economy, in the London and Westminster Review: now published separately with a few other essays.

of such men as I have described, among our crowded and miserable population ; imparting such spiritual discipline and instruction, as that to which I have alluded in the early part of this chapter ; and administering also the temporal relief supplied by the Church's richer members, according to a wisely-devised and well-digested plan ; their presence, I say, would be as some fertilizing and irrigating stream, which should be caused to flow upon a parched and dreary waste. True comforters would they be, true ministers of the Holy Ghost in His Blessed Office ; performing, as His instruments, the work which the Church in communion with Rome yearly prays Him to perform :

“ O Lux Beatissima, reple cordis intima tuorum fidelium.

“ Sine Tuo Numine nihil est in homine nihil est innoxium.

“ *Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium,*

“ *Flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium.*”^z

When we consider the festering mass of misery prevailing among our poor population, of which I gave a few specimens in the second chapter, and which even the most reckless begin now to regard with something like dismay, insomuch that the continued preservation among us of our idolized ‘peace and order,’ seems almost a standing miracle ; surely the promise of rearing such a body of men is one which the mere worldly politician will hail with sympathy, and with an anxious hope to find the promise fulfilled. But the notion of rearing them without the discipline of the Confessional, or without the inculcation of the full Orthodox Faith, is a theory than which no dream of Utopia was ever more fantastical ; reason disproves it, experience refutes it. Strange as it might have seemed, the science of dogmatic theology has a more essential place in the conferring of temporal benefits on our large towns, than (what I am sure I have shewn no disposition to under-rate) the science of political economy

^z Sequence on Whitsunday. This most beautiful hymn, ‘Veni Sancte Spiritus,’ is attributed to Innocent III.

itself. The indispensable and paramount importance of the former science, is indeed a subject of which I must not be considered to have exhausted my defence, in the few hints I have thrown out in the present work ; so far from it, that I have only touched the more superficial features of the subject. To draw out the full case for it, would require by itself not less than a volume : and it would both take me much too far from more immediate and pressing matters, and would also require the application of more careful thought and analysis, than my present time allows. Even in the political world, Mr. John Mill has made the striking observation, that, “speculative philosophy, which to the superficial appears a thing so remote from the business of life and the outward interests of man, is in reality the thing on earth which most influences them;” and when the facts are brought into full light which corroborate this remark, it will be a comparatively easy task to shew, how far more deeply and extensively true would be the same observation, applied to dogmatic theology. Having guarded myself then against misconstruction, I will here add another incidental benefit of this study, closely bearing on the present subject.

If any one supposes, that we can enjoy the services of a large class of men, who shall be ardent and enthusiastic in their devotional feelings, and yet precise, technical, and measured in the language of their religious and practical addresses, he is of course extravagantly mistaken. Those who are really, and not as a mere matter of words, impressed with the necessity of unremitting individual exertion in order to escape condemnation, will call on their hearers, like St. Paul, to *save themselves*; those who really feel the efficacy of personal ministrations, will speak, with the same holy Apostle, of saving *others*; those who desire that their hearers shall understand the great benefit of preaching or the unspeakable power of prayer, will say, with St. James, that ‘the word’ or that ‘prayer’ is able to ‘*save*;^a those

^a ‘By hope we are saved’ (Rom. viii. 24); ‘In doing this thou shalt *save thyself*’ (1 Tim. iv. 16); ‘The word is able to *save your souls*,’ (James i. 21); ‘If by any means *I* might *save* some of them’ (Rom. xii. 14); ‘How knowest

whose thoughts are ever with the citizens of the New and Heavenly Jerusalem, will exhaust the human language in finding epithets to praise worthily the Blessed Saints and their Queen. And so far will all this be from implying a momentary forgetfulness of the doctrine of the Atonement, or of the *infinite* superiority of God over His Saints, that on the contrary the deep and habitual impression of these truths on their mind, the full possession and appropriation of them as of first principles, will prevent them from even suspecting the possibility of such language leading to misconception: nor, in a healthy state of things, *will* it lead to misconception unless indeed possibly in the last case, of which more a few lines on. But among us at present, ordinary Christians, nay, men of a confessedly indevout and careless life, have the effrontery to carp at such expressions as those just cited, and to criticise the individual phrases of holy and mortified men; not as calling them injudicious, (which is quite a different matter,) but as gravely imputing to them unsoundness of faith. This habit of wanton and most presumptuous suspicion must cease to receive one moment's toleration from our rulers, if they desire really to obtain the services of holy and devoted men. It is impossible for Christians to ripen into Saints, if ordinary men are allowed to sit in judgment on their conduct and expressions; any more than in practical life a man could learn a difficult art, if he were required to adjust his course of study to the wishes of the uninstructed multitude. There must be the fullest and liveliest acknowledgment, that self-discipline and holy obedience are the only keys which will unlock the treasure of religious truth; and that the multitude have to learn from them, not they from the multitude. We *cannot* unite contradictories; we cannot have Lutheran doctrine and saintly

thou whether thou shalt save thy husband' (1 Cor. vii. 16.); 'The prayer of faith shall save the sick' (James v. 15); 'He shall save a soul from death' (ib. 20); 'Others save with fear' (Jude 23); 'By hope we are saved' (Rom. viii. 24); 'By the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost he saved us' (Tit. iii. 5); 'Baptism saves us' (1 Pet. iii. 21).

These instances, except the last, are taken from Dr. Pusey's first Appendix to his Sermon for the 5th of November.

practice: we cannot have Christ and Antichrist; we must make our choice between them.

Now as to those who cannot fairly say that, in any true sense, the doing of God's will is one principal object of their life day by day,—when such men express an opinion on their own responsibility as to religious doctrine, they perpetrate the same absurdity, as if a person who has not learned his letters were to criticise another's orthography; and they should receive no reply, except stern rebuke and reprehension. But it is a very different matter with serious and earnest Christians; nor can any thing be more deeply deplorable, than that Christ's true servants should be kept asunder by mutual misunderstandings and suspicions, instead of uniting as one body against sin and the world. Such men should remember, that however invaluable their conscience may be as a guide to themselves in important matters, and however quick and sagacious in recognising holiness and detecting unreality and hypocrisy, it can give them no help whatever in understanding the individual statements of a holy man. And this they *would* learn, to come to the more immediate point, if there were an authorized body of doctors, who have made dogmatic theology the one study of their lives, and whose practical pursuit is to keep guard on it, as it were, throughout the Church. No one hears of a vulgar prejudice against Newton's theory, however strange or paradoxical it must appear to the popular mind; and theological prejudice would be equally rare, if *there* also a body of instructors existed, accordant in their decisions, and possessed of the people's confidence. These would be able by deep acquaintance with the subject, and a practised habit of observing the phenomena connected with it, to see at once the real and deep orthodoxy of such holy men; an orthodoxy so incalculably more real and deep than that of the objectors. And seeing this, they would lead the praiseworthy zeal for purity of faith, which they have found existing, into a more wholesome channel, by directing it against those who, possessed neither of a single-minded zeal nor of lofty spiritual aspirations, are in real truth

sapping the foundations of religion by introducing the intellect as lord of the spiritual heritage; and whose sentiments are the more poisonous, from the very circumstance that the abstract discussion turns on points, whose unspeakable importance cannot be made clear to the non-theological eye. At the same time this body of dogmatic teachers, while doing the fullest and most loving justice to the deep orthodoxy and holiness of these quasi-missionaries, might exercise their judgment on a farther point,—viz. how far such language about the blessed Saints might at least be of a misleading tendency: and thus it might quite possibly happen, that certain expressions, fully allowed and approved for private devotion, should be proscribed by the Church's rulers, acting under the advice of these theologians, as addressed indiscriminately to the people.

I must not however quit the subject, from which I have been led into this digression, without one additional course of remark. For it has been so generally professed of late years, that a Christian Society is bound to be a 'poor man's Church,' and that it is the high and peculiar prerogative of the Church to alleviate the misery of the humble and oppressed, that the task seems incumbent on me, however ungracious, of estimating the praises heaped on the English system, by this standard also. Let me ask then, while all the frightful and accumulated mass of misery which now oppresses our land, was gradually during the last sixty years growing to a head, where was the voice of the National Church heard in drawing attention to its growth? That the civil government, who are obliged to cope day by day with present and passing emergencies, should not have had the leisure or the thought to take a deliberate and far-seeing view of our social condition, this is hardly a matter of blame: but where was the 'poor man's Church'? How is it conceivable that she can at that time have really thought or cared for the poor, without becoming cognizant of the fatal disease in progress, and loudly proclaiming its existence to the country and to the world? What other appellation than that of 'grossly and miserably corrupt' can we give to a system, under which

such monstrous neglect was so much as possible? Well,—at length, through no agency of hers, the attention of the whole nation *has* been called in some insufficient measure to the perils under which we lie; all honour to Lord Ashley and his precursors and coadjutors in the noble task! Has the English Church at least exhibited the grace of humiliation and repentance? Has the blush of shame been visible on our cheek? have her ministers sorrowfully and contritely confessed their sinful and unpardonable dereliction of duty, and taken on themselves bitter shame, as fact after fact was brought to light? facts, which it was their bounden duty long since to have dragged into the face of day, and which place in still stronger colours the godlessness and depravity of vast portions of her flock. Incredible as it might have appeared, the very conception would seem never to have occurred to them; with unruffled brow and complacent voice they have still repeated the insane watchwords ‘pure and apostolical,’ ‘holy and venerable,’ Church, and have dared to speak of the corruptions of other Christian bodies, when they should rather have been in lowly and penitential abasement, mourning those of their own.

Or again, have we witnessed on the whole within our Church, since the existence of this misery *has* been understood, an anxious desire to make the services of the one day of rest as soothing and refreshing, as our curtailed ritual will allow, to these afflicted souls? Has there been an anxious and burning desire to crowd every innocent gratification into our service, while we endeavour to keep alive their views of religious truth on the Lord’s Day? By what process of effrontery can we bring ourselves so much as to breathe the name of ‘the poor man’s Church’ in connection with our own system, if we are compelled to acknowledge that nothing like this has been the case? For more than ten years the great principle has been echoed from mouth to mouth, that our Church is no creature of the State, that she derives her duties and her privileges from a far Higher and more August Authority. Has the zeal, displayed for this principle, been only caused by our desire of having some-

thing to say which shall close the mouth of Roman Catholic and Dissenter? Or if not so, how is it that we have failed to see, that the more triumphantly we vindicate this great truth, the more plainly we publish our own shame? for if it be directly by God, and not by the State, that the poor are committed to our charge, no supineness or neglect of our civil governors can do aught but even aggravate our own guilt, in that we did not compensate for their slackness and insensibility, by a double measure of zeal and watchfulness. When members of a Church, which has thus basely betrayed her trust, find it even difficult to conceive that some among their brethren can, without the most serious moral delinquency, abhor and denounce the system, under which such betrayal was possible; when they accuse us of violence, eccentricity, and paradox, because we cannot consider a Church pure, which neither bears witness against wealth, nor protects poverty; I can only say, that our hatred of the existing system cannot more offend *them*, than their toleration, nay, admiration of it, perplexes and astonishes *us*.

7. The sum then of this most painful review of our present system has been, that it most signally fails in performing, or more truly makes no efforts whatever to perform, those very duties, without which it can perform no other duties aright. One observation is so painfully forced on my mind by this review, that I cannot conclude without giving it expression. There has arisen during these later times, as we all know though we give very different accounts of its origin and real nature, a very hateful habit of mind, which we call Rationalism. Perhaps no better definition can be given of its essence, than that it consists in an exaltation of the claims of reason over those of conscience. Hence immediately follows a denial of the all-important truth, that the spiritual discernment of a holy man is the one fountain-head, from which true interpretations of Scripture as a whole, and indeed true doctrines on all religious subjects, flow forth to the Church; and again, that the edification of the faithful is the one object, which every part of a pure Christian system, every intellectual

effort, every practical exertion, ought directly or indirectly to subserve.

Now the sciences on which I have already so often spoken, dogmatic, moral, ascetic, mystical theology, most especially the former, are model-instances of the fitting application of intellectual power to religious inquiries. For all of them, though the first certainly calls forth in its service, and gives full scope to, higher mental powers than does any human philosophy, all, I say, nevertheless, compel the intellect, while engaged on them, into not less than slavish subordination to the conscience; while again the one central and paramount object, on which their separated streams converge, is the spiritual benefit of the little ones of Christ's flock. These sciences therefore the rationalist neglects and despises, that he may occupy himself in a more congenial field. First of all,—whereas it is a labour of love with Catholics, to contemplate the deep oneness of faith, spirit, and principle, implanted by the Holy Ghost, in every age and country wherein His abode, the Church, has taken up her position; and to see daily with greater clearness, how wholly unaffected, in the case of saintly men, is this vital unity, by the accidental variety of external circumstances, of doctrinal statement and development, (a variety indeed which serves only to place in clearer and fuller light this real and profound agreement,)—the opposite process is the first achievement to be attempted by the Rationalist. That the intellect may find admission as judge and arbiter on sacred ground, this 'great sight,' the wonderful and mysterious harmony which exists in the voice sent forth by the conscience of holy men, must be concealed from our eyes, and its very existence denied. Accordingly the rationalist takes up a position *ab extra*, and is copious in his comments on the different dress worn by Christianity at the different periods of its progress: this he does, that he may deny the real identity of inward character and faith impressed by means of a religious life; that he may claim the right of calling holy men as witnesses, before the tribunal of his own intellect: that he may criticise the fourteenth or the

eighteenth century by an argumentative comparison with the fourth and fifth, or these last again by an argumentative comparison with the first three, or (to which it soon comes) *all* ages of the Church indiscriminately by his own critical interpretation of the sacred text.

Here then we have already the 'mouth speaking great things;' here we behold Antichrist 'sitting in the temple of God;' he has effected his entrance; what shall be his next step? The rationalist has come to think, that a grammar and dictionary are fitter exponents of the words of Revelation, than is the conscience of a humble and holy man, inhabited, after his measure, by the Spirit which inspired those words; but how can he rest here? A further question remains to be decided;—what claim has Scripture itself on his deference and regard? The grammar or dictionary then are put on one side, till sufficient progress may have been made in *this* inquiry; and accordingly he soon doubts this book of Scripture, makes a distinction in the case of a second, absolutely rejects a third. In the mean time his intellect, now more unblushingly asserting its usurped and baleful supremacy, grapples with that phantom, which has so long baffled and perplexed its inquiries, the belief in *inspiration*. A shadowy and unsubstantial phantom this in truth, when projected, as it were, on the range of the carnal, unchastened, unhumiliated intellect; and weak and poor are the efforts it can make in that most uncongenial sphere, for resistance and self-protection. The extreme issue of this unhappy history, is when the victim of his principle sees the necessity of fairly grappling with the preliminary question of all,—the trustworthiness of his impressions on duty and on God; when he finds still less of reality in them even than in his former subjects of inquiry; (for on the one hand surely there *is* much less of external evidence for them than for Scripture, and on the other hand he has become by habit more insensible to the kind of proof really appropriate to these inquiries;) and he becomes a feeble, irresolute sceptic, neither daring wholly to disbelieve, nor able wholly to believe, and seeking perhaps, in the pursuit of gain or of

sensuality, to drown the misery brought on him by his perverse and unhappy speculations.

All these are but different stages in the same ladder, different links in the same chain. And now, being unconscious of any save the simplest and most loving intention, I would, with the utmost earnestness and importunity of supplication, beg those many most excellent men, who are disposed to defend or extenuate the English Reformation and the system which it has introduced, fairly and impartially to consider,—in how great a degree we have been involved by that movement in the very same spirit. In considering its *ultimate* results among ourselves (just as we do in considering foreign rationalism) and viewing therefore the spirit, which has had almost undisputed possession of our Church from 1688 to 1833,—what essential difference do we find between Reformed England and Protestant Germany? Holiness of life and orthodoxy of faith cannot have been less cared for abroad than here: for here the inculcation of them has been utterly neglected; and more cannot by possibility be said of any Society calling itself Christian. Dogmatic, moral, ascetic, mystical theology, are as strange to us as to the German Protestants. Who can affirm that the worse than Sabellianism of Archbishop Whately has excited greater distress or commotion in England, than the (I believe not worse than) Sabellianism of Schleiermacher, in Germany? Who can affirm that the perplexities of a sensitive conscience, or the distresses of the poor, or the meek cry of the gentle and humble, have received from us a more tender, loving, and considerate response, than from the most hardened and unspiritual rationalist of the whole number? Who can affirm that saintliness has been more revered, celibacy more honoured, earnest and habitual prayer more cultivated and cherished, by the school of Tomline, or of Warburton, or of Tillotson, than by that of Neander, or even of Paulus? Nay, to come to a more shocking thought still; English ‘high-churchmen’ are in the constant habit of attributing to the most holy and mortified men, to St. Bonaventure, to St. Bernardine of Sienna, to St. Alphonsus Liguori, a close ap-

proach at least to positive idolatry; what more fearful approximation to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost has the wildest German ever devised?

If it should be objected, that in dating the full development of this spirit from 1688, I have implied that the political events of that period, rather than the Reformation, were its main origin, I answer that such an objection cannot be fairly, nor even plausibly, maintained: there is no fact in history clearer, than that this spirit has had a very deep and extensive influence in our Church from the very first dawn of the Reformation; as indeed must have inevitably followed, putting aside all other considerations, from the mere fact of Puritans and Latitudinarians having been crowded into the same Society with 'high-churchmen' of all various grades. Again, that very feature of our theology, with which, as with the most fearful of all, I concluded the last paragraph, is alas! even more signally characteristic of 'high-churchmen' than of others. I have no desire to impute any blame to those most admirable persons, who have but dutifully handed down what they have received, and have in no way personally realised their statements; I am speaking only of the class, without occupying myself with the invidious task of adjusting and distributing the individual blame. But I do most earnestly submit, that the class, as a whole, have invented for themselves a principle, new in the history of Christian theology, and in many respects even more conspicuously offensive in God's sight than the more avowed results of the rationalistic spirit. For surely it does seem even more wilfully and presumptuously sinful, more justly provocative of God's wrath, to appreciate and reverence, in some sufficient measure, the graces of Athanasius or Augustine, and then bring 'railing accusations' against Hildebrand or Bonaventure, than to put out of sight altogether the very idea of Catholic sanctity, and to profess that the whole Church, from the death of the Apostles to the birth of Luther, was little better than a manifestation of Antichrist.

If there is one feature more than another in rationalism grossly repulsive to the serious mind, it is this; that men,

highly gifted with learning and ability, are not carefully trained to a deep veneration for uneducated sanctity, nor to feel it the highest honour if they may be allowed to exercise the humblest ministrations in its service; but on the contrary, are allowed to indulge in arrogant and besotted dreams of exaltation, and to consider that they have peculiar access to the fountains of religious and moral truth, while such access is barred against the unintellectual. Hence they fancy that they may, without grievous sin, criticise the faith of humble and devout believers; not as being imperfectly analysed and erroneously expressed, (for to analyse and express *is* an office of the intellect,) but as being, even in matters which bear the weight of daily and hourly spiritual action and realisation, erroneous, superstitious, nay, contemptible. This is that self-exalting spirit of Antichrist, which, in these our days, has been unchained among us; and where has it exercised more certain and unmistakeable influence, than in our own 'high-Church' theology? It is the very principle on which this theology is based, that men, whose lives have displayed a love of God beyond our power even to apprehend;—a love of man venting itself in the most incredible and sustained toils for the service of their brethren;—a profound humility;—a rejoicing in contempt, and persecution, and suffering;—a mortification of the senses, nay, an unceasing crucifixion of self;—that these men, whose 'conversation is in Heaven,' whose thoughts and affections have rested without interruption on the invisible world, have had, for all this, their spiritual vision so dim and clouded, that they were (not mistaken in this or that minor particular, nor again injudicious and unguarded, for the sake of others, in this or that expression, but were) in the habitual commission of that cardinal sin, giving to the creature the honour due only to the Creator: that they, whose spiritual gaze was for ever fixed in heaven, mistook the comparative radiance of heavenly objects;^b and that it requires only

^b In a future chapter I hope to give a few quotations, merely by way of specimen, to shew the words of fervent, and tender, and glowing, love and devotion, with which St. Alphonsus Liguori was in the habit of speaking of our

a critical knowledge of the Fathers of the early centuries, to justify ordinary men in taxing them with this sin, and in claiming for themselves, in consequence of these studies, a higher degree of spiritual illumination. Who can wonder at the small degree of favour which God seems to have shewn to the Anglican 'high-Church' principle, when it has its very origin and life in this appalling blasphemy?

At an earlier part of this volume, I implied that I was unprepared with an opinion, whether or no the course of Protestantism had been more disastrous here or abroad. This doubt arose, I trust, from no absence of hearty admiration and reverence for the noble and most evangelical virtues of Andrews, or Ken, or Wilson, or Butler; ^c much less from any insensibility to the wonders which God is now working in the midst of us. But considering, not individual instances, but the general atmosphere which has pervaded our Reformed Church,—and remarking that the natural tendency of Germans is towards being too exclusively intellectual, of

Blessed Lord; a devotion, to which, I believe, one may read the whole works of English 'high-church' theologians, without finding the most distant parallel: and I say this with a full remembrance of Bp. Andrews's most beautiful 'Preces.' Here indeed I may as well add, that St. Alphonsus, in his Sermons, urges on all his hearers without exception, as a primary duty, that *every day of their lives* they should meditate intently at least a *quarter of an hour* on our Blessed Lord's Passion. How many of those who censure him as dishonouring our Lord, teach such doctrine as this? I hope it may not be irreverent to him, if I put forth what some may mistake for a defence or an apology; but it is of course simply our loss and not his, if we fail in giving him his fitting honour; and it is wholly for our sake and not for his, that I wish to remove stumbling-blocks from members of our Church,—to do what may lie with an individual, that they may be saved from the most grievous sin under which so many unconsciously lie, of criticising, nay condemning, Saints. Mr. Palmer, who has read his life, and does not profess any doubt of its trustworthiness, speaks against the Blessed Saint in language, which I should myself be unwilling to use, in speaking of the most ordinarily serious Christian.

^c If my preceding observations appear to imply the reverse of this, let it be remembered, (as I have often enough observed in the British Critic,) that it is no disrespect whatever to good men if we hold opinions (such as I may hold about the Saints) which they merely did *not* hold; that is, of which they did not hold the *contradictories*. But it is the most blasphemous irreverence to think, *on our own responsibility*, that a belief is *idolatrous* which Saints *have* held. I believe that good men in our Church have *inherited* this shocking sentiment, and *not* held it on their own responsibility.

English towards being too exclusively practical,—I should be glad to feel more assurance than I do at present, that there is any greater difference between the two cases than this: that the same evil spirit, which in them has led to a self-willed and arrogant questioning of all that has been received as most sacred, has led among us (in accordance with *our* national character) to such phenomena as those with which we are familiar: an unbridled thirst for gain; selfish neglect of the poor; disregard of the claims and of the distresses of conscience; a habit of miserable and cowardly compromise; a deeply and widely extending secularization of the Church. To be lukewarm, to be insensible of her own corruptions, to be loud in her own praise, are the notes given in Scripture of that Church, which our Blessed Lord will ‘spue out of His mouth’ (Rev. iii. 16, 17); to retain the faith and be zealous against doctrinal error, (Rev. ii. 6, 13,) as redeeming features even in the midst of many corruptions. What is His judgment of our Church’s practical system? a system, under which she tolerates almost every variety of condemned and branded heresy; and under which her authorities seem really offended and disgusted at one only class of opinions, those which speak of her present condition as corrupt and almost apostate. The closest approximation to denial of our Lord is permitted, as I have shewn, without protest, much more without condemnation; but an imputation on *herself* she cannot forgive.

CHAPTER VII.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS IN THE WAY OF REMEDY.

AN article appeared in the 'Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review' for October, 1843, from which I have already made one quotation; an article distinguished for a peculiar kindness of language and tone, in regard to a class of theologians, from whom the writer himself widely differs in many most important particulars. There has hardly yet appeared so encouraging an omen on the prospects of our Church, as is afforded by such thoughtful considerateness: surely if all serious persons among us would but agree to put aside the spirit of anger and acrimonious censure, to dwell with loving eagerness on their points of agreement, and aim at obtaining a full comprehension and appreciation of each other's meaning on points of difference, daily would our points of agreement increase in number, and our points of difference diminish; and the eyes of us all would be gradually opened to discern, what is that body of external and substantive doctrine, which really corresponds to the perceptions, the desires, and the aspirations, of the holy and spiritual mind. I wish that the writer of that article, and those who agree with him, could fully understand, how acute is the pain which many who dissent from their views experience, when a plain sense of duty urges us to put forward direct and open statements, which we cannot but know will occasion them much distress and misgiving; and how earnestly we desire them to believe, that the most frank and uncompromising opposition to their fundamental views, on what may be termed ecclesiastical politics, implies no want of the deepest respect and sympathy, not only for their high personal character, but also for the

straightforward and unflinching zeal, with which they bear witness to the claims of religion in the face of statesmen and worldly politicians.

The immediate reason of my allusion to this article, is the writer's mention (p. 595) of 'that deadly chill with which many of' our 'ordinary writings' in the *British Critic* 'freeze the very life's blood of many that repair to them to be taught, how they may unite loyal love to their own immediate mother, with a true acknowledgment of brotherhood to the Roman Church.' If I wished to be critical, I should rather demur to the last expression; I trust certainly for myself, that none even of my earlier writings in the *British Critic* imply any such equality of the English Church to the Roman, that I should presume simply and without qualification to call Roman Catholics, as such, brethren; and indeed all through his comments on the 'extreme section of theologians within the Church of England,' he understates the amount of reverence, gratitude, sympathy, and faith, which for myself certainly I always desire to feel towards Roman doctrine. In this particular, I am bound to acknowledge Mr. Palmer's description as more just and accurate than the Reviewer's; for when the former says that 'it is quite curious to observe how on all occasions this devotion to the Papal See manifests itself,' (p. 55, note,) though the immediate occasion of the remark is an article by another hand, it does no more than justice to my own habitual wish and intention. It is plain however that this very understatement in the Review, of which in reference to my own feelings I should be tempted to complain, is itself caused by the writer's kind and friendly disposition towards the objects of his criticism.

The general bearing, however, of the objection which he makes, so far as it has not been already met in the third chapter, is, I suppose, such as follows: that the *British Critic* has confined itself to bitter and sweeping denunciations of our existing system, without taking any pains to suggest definitive remedies; that those who might desire on the whole to concur with the principles there advocated, and to serve the

English Church with earnest and affectionate zeal *on* those principles, instead of being guided, cheered, and inspirited in their most admirable and necessary course, would rather be depressed and repelled, through the representation, there so frequently implied, on the hopelessness of our prospects and the imminent approach of our fall. Should such be indeed a faithful account of the general tone of the British Critic, it is most deeply to be lamented; for I am fully persuaded that there is hardly one Englishman living, perhaps not one, whatever his position in Church or State, whatever his intellectual powers and peculiarities, whatever his degree of moral advancement, who has not opportunity, if he will, of bearing his part in the great task now in progress;—the task of endeavouring to restore our Church to a more Christian position, and to eradicate one by one those evils, which the Reformation, and our other sins, national, ecclesiastical, personal, have let loose upon us in such fearful profusion. I hope indeed that what has been already said, especially the preceding chapter, has sufficed in great measure to evince the truth of this remark; while on the other hand to draw out in detail the various particulars of every kind which would place it in the fullest and most unclouded light, would both require volumes, and would imply a far greater amount of practical knowledge and experience than any to which I lay claim. All that can be further expected is, that I shew the *kind* of remedies which are within the reach of the respective classes of churchmen, and the promise which they hold forth of efficaciousness and success.

Were I called upon indeed to shew, that it is possible to work the machinery of our existing *religious Societies* with any prospect of a good result, I should indeed be met by insurmountable difficulties. If there be any truth in the representation I have made, that at least *two* principles most vitally and fundamentally opposed to each other (to omit here any mention of the Latitudinarian party) are struggling within our Church for mastery, it is plain how idle, or rather how deeply sinful, is any idea of compromise or conciliation. Those who graft the Gospel on the law of nature, (to

repeat a classification already introduced,) and those who have devised or inherited a Gospel *opposed* to the natural law, profess doctrines which, *as* doctrines, must ever wage an unrelenting and internecine war one with the other. I am not for a moment implying, that we should put from us the hope of conciliating religious 'Evangelicals;' so far, so exceedingly far, from it, that, as has been observed by the author of the article on Bishop Jewel in his 'explanation,' there is no more auspicious result which may be hoped from a fuller and freer development of Catholic Truth, than that an embodiment and visible witness of Divine wisdom and holiness will be shewn forth, which will more and more persuade and absorb into itself the more religious minds from among all parties of our Church. But 'Evangelicals' must be reclaimed, not by mitigating our expressions of abhorrence and detestation for the abstract principles which characterise their profession, but by shewing them more and more, how utterly at variance are those principles with their religious instincts and aspirations. To unite with their professors in the prosecution of religious measures on a large scale, would be insane as a matter of policy, and misprision of heresy as a matter of morality. I am not speaking of a momentary combination, for some one defined and specified object: but I say, that we cannot unite in 'propagating the Gospel,' with those who differ from us fundamentally as to what the Gospel is; or in forwarding the great work of education, with those whom we deem mistaken on the very first principles of education; or in 'promoting Christian knowledge,' with those who uphold, as Christian truth, principles which we anathematize as condemnable heresies. And if there be one class of men with whom each party would be still more unwilling actively to cooperate than with the party most opposed to itself, it would be the class who regard the matters at issue as secondary or unessential. None who shrink from fairly anathematizing Lutheran doctrine as a heresy (saving individual cases of intellectual weakness and misconception) can have any real hold, as a body, on Catholic and Christian truth. And the whole of the last chapter is one continued

comment on this sentiment; for who can say that those who have been opposed to the 'Evangelical' party in our Church, have displayed any enlightened zeal, nay, on the whole any more zeal than 'Evangelicals' themselves, in raising a firm and stable foundation of moral and religious discipline, whereon Christian doctrine may in safety repose? Or who can say that those Societies, to which allusion has just been made, have given proof of so much as a passing thought bestowed in that direction, any more than if 'Evangelicals' themselves, who professedly disparage the truths of natural religion, alone made up the entire sum of their members? No! those who hold Lutheran doctrine, or those who refuse to denounce it as heretical, may be very probably innocent in their sad error; but they can be no fit parties for the practical cooperation of orthodox Christians. We may love and admire the various graces which distinguish members of their body; but they differ from us, in external profession, as to *first principles*. While on the other hand those who embrace and realise this one great unalterable axiom, which it has been my one object in this work to illustrate and enforce, however they may differ as to the ultimate results they expect, *agree* in first principles. All 'high-churchmen' then who are prepared to embrace this axiom and act on it, may I think confidently indulge in the hope that a lasting and cordial union will be the result; they may confidently expect that when certain further questions, from being theoretical, shall have become immediately practical,—it will not be until, from having been points of difference, they shall have become points of agreement.

The same consideration leads to a remark in another direction. A very general sense has been quite of late mysteriously growing up, of the incalculable benefits that might be derived under our present circumstances from the revival of monastic bodies; a most cheering circumstance indeed as a sign of the times, and a most honourable opinion to those who entertain it. Now, considering that our Reformed Church had its beginning in the overthrow of these institutions, and has had its continuance in the contempt and slander

of them, it might have been confidently anticipated, that *this* opinion at all events implied some adequate consciousness of our deplorable defects and corruptions. But no. The blind idolatry of our present system, so carefully instilled from his earliest years into the mind of the English Churchman, has shewn itself, in dreaming that we are already prepared for such institutions on a large scale. The same arrogance and self-complacency, which till lately impelled our Church to *denounce* the word Catholic, is now in many places only at work under another shape in urging her to *claim* it. Excellent men have omitted to consider the profound sagacity and experience, required for the ordering and governance of such institutions as those which I have mentioned, and the unbounded humility and self-sacrifice indispensable in their inmates: or if they have *not* omitted to consider it, they fancy that such qualities are readily and widely attainable among ourselves at a moment's notice; or at least without any long course of previous preparation, which might be founded on a new and wisely-devised system of education and moral culture. Nay, as if it were their wish to bring our Church into contempt, they have talked of appointing our present Bishops visitors of such bodies; prelates of whom surely it is no disrespect to say, that they have not, as a body, displayed in their public language any deep and unquestioning reverence for the doctrines of asceticism and mortification, nor professed any profound and systematic acquaintance with the science of saints. Surely the very dilemma involved, either in proposing such an arrangement, or in projecting an extensive monastic scheme without it, should shew how little prepared our Church is at present for such a sudden development. I am not of course denying, that individual Christians, who share in the Catholic feeling which now springs up on all sides of us, will derive great benefit, and edification, and happiness, from uniting themselves voluntarily into small societies bound together by definite rules and frequent offices of devotion; but arrangements of this kind may be quite safely, and will be far more profitably, left to adjust themselves: while any expectation of esta-

blishing such a system on a fixed and recognised basis within our Church is altogether visionary, until many well and wisely employed years shall have elapsed. No! we must direct all our energy to devise some really powerful and available machinery for the moral education of the many, if we desire to reap any sufficient harvest of the mortified and contemplative few.

And on similar grounds, in consequence of the deplorable disorganization which prevails among us, and the fearful heresies which are allowed to remain without authoritative check or discouragement, many ordinary maxims of ecclesiastical order become altogether obsolete and inappropriate. I will mention one instance, that I may more precisely illustrate the principle for which I am contending. If things were so ordered among us, that one doctrine in essentials were inculcated throughout our Church, there would be no more obvious and natural duty, than attending ordinarily divine worship, each one in his own parish; while under our present circumstances no precept could be more extravagant and paradoxical. If a preacher enforces doctrines which, in your certain deep conviction, are adverse to the first principles of morality, and destructive to the souls of men, (and such *are* the doctrines you will frequently hear from 'Evangelical' pulpits,) it seems at first sight almost a dereliction of duty to afford so much encouragement to these impieties, as must result from being present without remonstrance during their utterance. Add to this, that not a few Catholic-minded persons experience, from the mere sound of very extreme heresy, a keen and piercing distress, differing in kind from any other to which our nature is exposed. If it be replied, that suffering is our very condition here below, I answer, that there is one kind of suffering, from which it has always been the very office of a pure Church to protect her children; and in regard to which, the most direct and certain proof must be given, before we believe even in any single case that duty requires our exposure to its infliction: I mean the suffering which arises from the near presence of heresy and immorality. Let it be distinctly observed, that I am only ad-

vocating a general principle, not attempting to deal with individual cases of casuistry, for which this is not the place. Each case must be decided on its own merits as it arises, and there are various conflicting considerations which we must endeavour to take into account. Those who have families and dependents, will shrink from exposing them to spiritual danger, even when not unwilling to expose themselves to pain. Of those again who have only themselves to consider, some will attend the Church prayers under such circumstances, and attempt to leave the Church unnoticed before the Sermon begins; or will abstract their mind from the Sermon, and read the Bible or some Spiritual book; but others again endure a similar suffering in kind, however inferior in degree, from the very mode of ordering and performing the service which heretical principles occasion. It is plain, that those who are so keenly sensitive, should feel it their bounden duty to take very considerable trouble, and expose themselves to very considerable worldly sacrifice, that they may not be exposed to this dilemma; while, on the other hand, I quite believe that there may be several cases, in which an individual will most fitly perform his duty to our Church, by remaining at home, and reciting throughout the Church of England office for the day; putting himself into spiritual communion with the various members of our Church, who, throughout the land, are at the same time putting up the same prayers, reciting the same Psalms, pondering on the same passages of Scripture.

One last preliminary remark shall here be made. An individual Christian, on first turning to God from evil courses, will practise himself for some considerable time in the duties of obedience and repentance, before he will think, unless imperatively required, of so marked a profession as is implied in rebuking or publicly witnessing against his brother's sin. The case is not materially different with Societies; and the English Church, after having so long neglected so much of her duty, must begin by teaching the teachable, and affectionately warning the reclaimable, before she thinks of putting herself forward in the way of public protests, before she attempts to exercise acts of discipline; acts

which may hereafter indeed be just and salutary, but which ill correspond with her present degraded and corrupt condition. When she has, by a long course of moral training and of orthodox teaching, established her empire over the hearts of a faithful and orthodox laity, she may be able gracefully, and we may humbly hope successfully, to declare war in the name of the Lord against wickedness in high worldly places; and to draw the spiritual sword, which has so long rusted in its scabbard.

2. In proceeding now to the general and merely superficial task which, as I have said, is all there can be room for in a work like this, let us take as the first instance the priest of a country parish. If he should be persuaded of the general truth of such principles as have been hitherto enforced, the effect on his practical conduct is not difficult to conceive. He will endeavour to lay his foundation within the heart of his flock; he will not consider any attendance of theirs on Divine Service, even the most regular, even (if so be) daily as well as on Sunday, to be any real security for so much as the beginning of a truly Christian life. It is the feeling of *accountableness* throughout the day, the habitual thought of judgment to come, the careful regulation of thoughts, words, and actions, which he will impress on his flock as the one thing needful. Their presence in Church may be useful as giving him the power to address them, but he will use that power for the very purpose of impressing on their mind, that true religion must have its spring from *within*. With those who are more promising, he will most earnestly seek opportunities of private and confidential conversation: and *in* such conversation, he will endeavour to put before them the duties one by one of their daily life; the duty of combating against sloth, against discontent, against anger, or other worse thoughts; the duty of fixing their whole mind at stated times, by ever so great an effort, on God; the duty of avoiding all evil conversation, and the demeanour which they ought to adopt when such conversation is hazarded by others in their presence; and the rest. From this he will seek to instruct them in the indispensable habit of daily self-examination; that habit which alone can

succeed, and which by itself is almost certain to succeed, in impressing on the conscience and imagination of Christians an unceasing sense of their accountableness and responsibility. Again, he will teach them to understand how sacred and inviolable is his obligation to secrecy, in the case of any confidential communication in their spiritual perplexities and distresses, which they may desire to impart; he will make them understand that no earthly compulsion whatever can make it lawful for him, and that none shall in fact induce him, to violate the *sacramental* trust they may repose in him. He will make them clearly see, that no one subject has more engrossing interest with him, is more certain immediately to arrest his deepest attention, than any communication they may wish to make, any question they may wish to ask, on the right-governing of their daily thoughts and acts. He will encourage them more and more to look on him as their truest and most unfailing earthly friend; and to fix their thoughts, through him, on that their Heavenly Friend, who has deputed him to act towards them in His behalf, and as His visible representative, till He come again and claim His own.

But of course he will have, beyond any possible comparison, better hope of influencing the young, than those who have grown up in habits of carelessness and indifference. In the schools under his direction, the children will feel deeply, that the training them up in habits of careful conscientiousness is the one object, on which every single detail and particular of the system converges. To perform aright their daily examen of conscience; to fix their thoughts on God in prayer without distraction; to contend one by one against evil thoughts; to imbibe habits of humility, reverence, and docility; they will be conscious every moment, that no interest is so near the heart of those set over them, as that they may learn ever to make advance in such holy and necessary exercises as these. It will be impressed on them beyond the possibility of mistake, that their priest is infinitely more anxious that they should pray well, than that they should spell well; that they should know their own faults habitually, than that they should read the Scriptures fluently; that they should open their heart to the influences

of the Holy Spirit, than that they should trouble their heads with adducing texts which prove His Personality. At the fit age he will encourage and counsel them, so far as he feels that he safely *can* do so, to the practice of Sacramental Confession ; but he will so deeply feel the serious evils which may flow from misdirection, and the serious danger, arising from his deficiency in any special education directed to that object, of his possibly directing them amiss, that he will be even forward in urging on them, that they should cease from the practice, if they find on a fair trial that they do not profit by his advice. By such methods as these, their hearts will become that well cultivated and rich soil, in which the seed of Divine truth takes a firm and abiding root; and their acquirement of Christian doctrine, their religious perusal of the text of Scripture, will spring up in fruit thirty-fold, sixty-fold, one hundred-fold.^a

It has often struck me, that we do not at all make that use of *the four Gospels*, in addressing the poor, which their capabilities, and their very structure, seem almost clamorously to suggest. Roman Catholics of the educated classes, as I said in the last chapter, are very much in the habit of meditating methodically day by day on the sacred narrative; but even among them much use hardly seems made of them for the poor. Now surely it is the merest truism to say, that no one possible habit could be so beneficial to the poor, could serve them so well as a preservative against every kind of sin, a security for the growth of every kind of virtue, a charm to soothe and relieve every kind of sorrow, as the unceasing thought of our Lord's intimate and mysterious presence, so to speak,

^a The two little works of my own, which I mentioned in an earlier chapter, were occasioned by my strong conviction of these principles. The first was intended as a manual of self-examination, for young persons even in the lower ranks of life; the second as an illustration of the sort of Christian doctrine which, as appears to me, the same class may most profitably learn, and the great use which may be made of our Catechism as the means of instruction in such doctrine. As to this latter work, (Questions and Answers on the Church Catechism,) I derived the greatest help from a little work by another hand, which was withdrawn soon after its publication; the compiler of which deserves the undivided credit of the suggestion, and most part of the credit of the execution. But both his work, and also my own on self-examination, were almost exclusively adapted from the most ordinary Roman Catholic sources.

close beside them; the thought of Him as of their Living Friend, who created them, redeemed them, and loves them with unspeakable love. True it is, that any thing in the way of formal meditation would be probably unsuitable to their circumstances and to their intellectual powers; but what if, before going forth to their daily work, pains were taken to put before them some miracle or other event in our Lord's life, in all the reality and individuality, which such a work, e. g., as St. Bonaventure's 'Life of Christ' is eminently calculated to ensure? Particularly if from their early years they were exercised in such a practice, this one scene would be, as it were, the central picture present throughout the day to their mind's eye, on which all their acts of meditation, worship, self-restraint, watchfulness against evil thoughts, would converge; and which, before the day ended, would be indelibly impressed on their memory and imagination. When we consider the surprising diversity and variety of character, so conspicuous in the pictures presented to us by the Evangelists, and the mysterious and unearthly stamp with which they are impressed, it can hardly I think be doubted that the acquisition of this habit would most powerfully tend to refresh and support the spirits; to cheer the most monotonous employment; to preserve them even against the more subtle temptations of pride or self-will, much more against the grosser forms of evil which are their more frequent assailants. And this is the more true and important, in proportion as the employment of the steam-engine, and other causes, confine the ordinary workman more and more to a class of labour, in which his mind is unoccupied, and in imminent danger of becoming torpid and stagnant, even when his hands are most busily and fatiguingly employed. Nor should we forget, that the essential truth of our Blessed Lord's Divinity, which, as I said in the last chapter, we just now incur such alarming danger of letting slip, would by such means as this be really impressed on the mind of the poor, in the most healthful, natural, and persuasive manner that can be possibly conceived.

The people are now so generally taught to read, (in itself a very great matter of thankfulness, if more important things

had not been neglected,) that the object would be sufficiently attained, if some work were carefully written, most closely adapted to their capacities and habits of thought, which might assign for the different days in the year portions of our Lord's history, and give such hints in each section as might best help the reader to call up into his imagination the scene described ; and if the portion for each day were read by them every morning, before going to their worldly occupations. There can be no question however, that this would be more effectually done, if a priest, thoroughly fitted for such a task, were to read the passage *vivâ voce*, and supply such comments at the moment, as his knowledge of the individuals present might suggest as most calculated to arrest their attention. Did a clergyman feel himself capable of doing this, I conceive that there is nothing in the Ecclesiastical Laws now existing which would at all interfere with his desire. He might fix the daily service at so early an hour, as to meet the convenience of those engaged in work ; and might preface the service with a short lecture of the kind here in question. Nor would it at all follow, that all who came for the benefit of the lecture would be expected to remain throughout the service : on the contrary, after having, e. g., joined in the early penitential part and in the Psalms, as many as pleased might reverently withdraw. There is no allusion in our prayer-book to any obligation of individuals (not clergymen) remaining through the entire service ; and indeed the daily prayers are plainly not arranged on a model at all appropriate for such a requisition.

This subject indeed deserves mention as a separate particular. I cannot but fear that multitudes absent themselves wholly from daily service, in parishes where it is celebrated, who would most gladly avail themselves of some short portion, but have really not the time to give from labour and necessary refreshment, which is occupied by our entire office of morning prayer. This will in one way be even more felt, should vital religion, by God's blessing, gain ground among us ; for many will learn that there are other religious duties of far greater importance even than public worship, because more immediately personal ; such, e. g., as private self-examination

and prayer : and these duties, having by right a prior claim on them, will still more completely prevent them from attending the whole public service. And surely it might very easily be understood that no disrespect or irreverence whatever is implied, but the very reverse, in coming to Church for the privilege of reciting even a single prayer or a single psalm, in company with our brethren, and 'in the courts of the house of our God.' Till this principle indeed be fully admitted, at least as regards week-day prayers, we shall never succeed in getting rid of that chill air of stiffness and formality, which now hangs, like a dead weight, on all the ministrations of our Church, repelling the affections of the humble, and oppressing the aspirations of the ardent and devotional.

Another great difficulty which parish priests will more and more feel, on the subject of the public services attended by our poor, will be the impossibility of their following the words of our prayers. To keep up our attention, as one idea follows another in the Prayer-book, requires an intellectual strain and effort of no ordinary kind ; insomuch, that those of us even who are habitually versed in intellectual studies, find it, I suppose, a matter of extreme difficulty. I am not here speaking of the *moral* difficulty, implied in keeping our thoughts and affections away from earthly objects while we are engaged in prayer ; this *is* a moral difficulty, and is conquered only by religious means : it is not the educated, but the obedient and the spiritual, who are more and more emancipated from its influence. But I here speak of a matter altogether distinct,—the *intellectual* difficulty which arises from the quickness with which one idea follows another in our Prayer-book, and the consecutiveness of thought, the quasi-*argumentativeness*, of great part of our prayers. Until some remedy for this has been devised, surely it will be next to impossible to make Divine Service a really devotional act to the poor ; for they neither understand what is going on there, nor yet are they taught how to occupy their thoughts devotionally while it *is* going on. Here I think we may learn a very important lesson from the Roman Catholics. Their mass-service, in itself, is fully as unintelligible to the poor as our Prayer-book ; some will say more so, because it

is in Latin; and others, because many parts of it are even ordered to be said 'secretò.' What is the course adopted, in order that hearing mass may be a really intelligent and devotional exercise? The faithful are carefully taught the meaning of each part of the ceremonial they witness, and are ordered at definite times to join their intention with that of the priest. This gives the service its congregational character. At other times, they use prayers accommodated to each successive stage of the Holy Sacrifice; but by no means all the same prayers. It is plain that one kind of language is best adapted to impress devotional ideas on the educated, another on the uneducated; one on the old, another on the young; nay, that each variety of character has its peculiar needs and requirements. In the case then of the poor, who have not the opportunity of choosing for themselves, the Confessor puts into their hands such books, to accompany the mass, as he thinks best adapted to their individual 'captus.' And thus we have one way, whereby this great difficulty is surmounted; the service is in one sense congregational, while yet each individual Christian is able also to make it, in the fullest sense, personal and individual. If a similar plan were not considered objectionable among ourselves, I conceive that the very greatest benefit might be derived from it; from putting into the hands of our poor short sentences of prayer, which might be used by them when their attention is fatigued, in lieu of their attempting to follow in their mind the whole prayer read by the priest. For instance, one penitential sentence, such as, 'Forgive me and all my brethren our grievous sins, O Lord, for Jesus Christ's sake,' might be recited to himself over and over again by an uneducated person, while the 'general confession' is going forward. By such means he would be not the less fully conscious of his communion with all present, for he would know that the meaning of the public prayer is the very same; while he would have time, in some sufficient measure, to realise and ponder on the *devotional* act itself,—instead of being, if I may so speak, utterly bewildered, hurried, and confused, in the *devotional* act, by the arduousness of the *intellectual* act. A similar plan might surely be adopted for all the different prayers; and again,

some acts of prayer on the subject of Holy Scripture might be given him, in order that he may make use of them, in case, which must so commonly happen, that great part, e. g., of the first lesson, is wholly unintelligible, and as such unprofitable.

In this respect, then, the Roman Church seems an admirable model for our imitation ; in another, (if I may venture on imperfect knowledge to express a criticism,) she seems hardly herself to have framed a definite and uniform plan of action : I mean, training her poor in a devotional use of the psalms. In some cathedrals abroad, indeed, I have heard of the whole people chaunting the Latin Psalms with one voice and with every appearance of enthusiasm ; as though, by help of the vernacular translation, they were able to enter into them and enjoy them. But in England, they often substitute some English service on the Sunday afternoon for the regular Vespers ; and again, where the latter are recited, the people in no way join in them, but meditate, as at mass, from their private devotional books. The whole subject indeed of the desirableness of public services in the vernacular (as distinct from the mass) is, I believe, one on which there is a very growing spirit of inquiry among Roman Catholics, in whatever way it may be likely to terminate. Certainly the Psalms, as being poetical rather than, like the rest of our Prayer-book, (what I have called) *argumentative* ; and, again in consequence of the quality which seems to characterize more or less, every part of the Inspired Volume ; require, for their fit apprehension and appreciation, far more an obedient life and a spiritual mind, than a cultivated understanding. Under our present circumstances, we hear of the very religious poor being wonderfully affected by various parts of their contents ; and the same edification and enjoyment would spread far more widely, if they were carefully taught the Christian meaning of such phrases as ‘ Israel,’ ‘ Jerusalem,’ ‘ our enemies,’ ‘ the arrow and the bow,’ and other like expressions. A still further help towards the purpose of receiving readily the Christian sense of the Psalms, would be a practice, advocated in one of those beautiful articles in the *British Critic* on the Church service ; I mean, if the people

were taught to vary the application according to the season of the Christian year; to recite the Psalms during Lent in the person of Christ Suffering, during Easter of Christ Triumphant, in the weeks after Pentecost of the Church left behind Him and fighting in His name and strength against her spiritual and worldly enemies.

It is quite unnecessary to add the very great desirableness of making our services attractive to the poor, by all outward emblems and lively ceremonial; and still more of teaching them music, and encouraging them to devote the knowledge to religious celebrations; for all this is much and increasingly felt among us; there is far less danger at present of our neglecting such helps as these, than of our fancying that we can make the flock good Christians, without some far deeper and more personal cultivation.

3. In turning now to the corresponding task, of throwing out hints for the consideration of those clergymen who are brought more directly into connection with the educated classes, it is necessary to repeat, with much greater prominence and distinctness, a warning already given in the last section; a warning against any attempt, under our present circumstances, I will not say to make Sacramental Confession compulsory, but even to urge it strongly and perseveringly on those who feel unwilling to adopt it. How sensitive is the Roman Church on the sacred rights of the individual conscience, will appear from an anecdote, in which two Saints are the parties mainly concerned. St. Jane Frances de Chantal and St. Francis de Sales, before they ever met, saw each other severally in visions; and though the former Saint had made a vow to her original director that she would never submit herself to other guidance, yet as his spiritual counsel was not found adapted to her needs, St. Francis considered that this vision was sufficient warrant for considering the vow dispensed with. The result was, that she derived the greatest benefit from his direction. It is not necessary to discuss the truth of this story with Protestants, who will of course disbelieve it; because the fact of its commonly receiving credit among Roman Catholics is amply sufficient for the point I desire to establish. It appears then, that not

only every penitent has the privilege of irresponsibly choosing his own director, but also even a vow of obedience to some particular director should rather be violated, than a holy soul left in the hands of one, who is not able rightly to understand the case with which he has to deal, and so will be deficient in that deep tenderness, wisdom, considerateness, which are so indispensably necessary. Nor does the existence of a *precept* of confession at all interfere with this argument: for in the first place the hearing of a Confession by no means implies of necessity so much as spiritual direction; and in the second place, considering the multitudes of priests in every rank of life, and with every variety of bias and natural disposition, who are educated for the Confessional, it is indeed an extravagant supposition to imagine, that one may not easily be found, competent to deal even with the more eccentric tendencies of individual minds.

With us it is unnecessary to say how striking is the contrast. The most competent Confessors we could possibly supply, can have had extremely little of practical experience; and there is literally *no* theoretical system recognised among us, to fall back upon in default of such experience. Surely then it is impossible to be too wary and cautious in feeling our way. Grievous as are the evils which flow from our present anomalous and anarchical condition, great as is the amount of careless and unholy living it has engendered, even more fearful and miserable would be the result, if there were any approach to an attempt on the part of any section of our clergy to exercise arbitrary or dictatorial power. Can we, by the utmost stretch of our imagination, conceive any misery (not resulting from sin) more exquisite, than that of one who with a sensitive conscience, shrinking delicacy of mind, and strong tendency even to morbid peculiarities and idiosyncrasies, should be subjected to the irresponsible power of some (say) conceited young clergyman, who might entertain strong views on 'the power of the keys,' and little sense of the fearful magnitude and importance of the task he undertakes? And most serious as is this evil in any case, there are circumstances in our position which make it very far more serious in our

own. A Roman Catholic will have been at least *educated* in a strict and definite system of moral discipline; and even though he should fall from grace and remain long a stranger to God, still, on his return, he will have his early habits and associations to fall back upon. But I fear it is no exaggeration to say, that in our own Church the very idea of responsibility for our acts of every hour of the day will come on us at first quite by surprise; and our first effort to act on such an idea, will bring us into a region of scruples and harassing anxieties of mind, which we had little suspected. Every one knows how great is the blankness and dreariness of feeling, which attends the first attempt to adjust our feelings and habits to any wholly new manner of life; precisely similar will the case be, though in a far more grievous degree, in the present instance. Here then is a fresh and very great evil, which must result from any attempt to enforce a rude and indiscriminating rule of arbitrary dictation: for these perplexities, of which I speak, will vary indefinitely in each individual case, according to the particular direction which licence and self-indulgence may have taken; and in many cases they will not be at all understood, except by a director, who shall have devoted the rarest powers of mind, joined with the most affectionate and anxious watchfulness, to the inquiry.

Another admonition of considerable importance may also be derived from contemplation of the Roman model; and it will be fitly introduced by a quotation from the *British Critic*. ('On Mill's Logic,' p. 409.)

'The *art* of morals, be it then observed, while making incidental use of an indefinite number of other sciences, employs as habitually the science of psychology, as that of morality itself. For instance, I have injured my neighbour's fame by random talking; the science of morality pronounces as the dictate of natural justice, that I am bound to make him restitution, humble myself before God for my sin, and take pains to reform my character in respect of unguarded use of the tongue. Waiving the second of these duties; to perform the first, I must have recourse to a knowledge of practical life; to perform the last, I consult the study of psychology. In the first, *I receive no help from practical religious works; nor will a serious*

Christian be likely to understand better, rather worse, than others the best means of performing the object in view: in the last, on the contrary, I receive every help from such books; and religious men, from the interest and care which they, and they only, take in such matters, understand the way to such an object incomparably better than other men: but in either case the source of the knowledge is experience.'

My readers, who remember a note in the last chapter, will at once see that it is *ascetic* theology which treats on such subjects as these last mentioned. Now it is the dictate of common sense, that a priest shall decide very far more peremptorily on subjects which he *has* studied, than on subjects which he has not; and it is his province to study both moral and ascetic theology. Accordingly a very little observation of Roman practice will shew us, that priests not unfrequently exercise a judgment altogether final and authoritative, not only in ruling certain classes of words, thoughts, and acts, to be sinful, but—in dictating the means whereby a cure may be best effected; in deciding the signs of repentance and amendment to be required, before they will give absolution; in ordering this or that penance; and in giving other rules of a similar kind. On the contrary, as I observed in the second chapter, 'the infinitely various particular application of true principles, to particular circumstances and events; that immensely large class of moral acts, on which it is impossible for one man to judge what is right in his neighbour's case; all this is left mainly to his individual responsibility and sense of right.' It will continually happen, that on questions like these the penitent (even under all the risk of dealing unfairly with himself) will be a far better judge than the priest: because he has much more of that knowledge of the course of worldly things which gives their whole character to acts of the kind; and again, a much, very much, more lively perception of the various facts of the case, than he can by possibility communicate to another. It will generally happen then that on such matters as these,—whether a man ought to enter upon this or that line of business, fix his residence in this or that place, live in this or that degree of external splendour, and a

thousand other particulars, a priest will not wish to intrude advice at all; and, if specially consulted, give it only with great qualification and reserve. It may quite possibly indeed happen, that circumstances of this kind *do* turn on questions absolutely within the priest's sphere and cognizance; and when the case is otherwise, a faithful director would continually put general principles before the mind of his penitents, which he might think them in danger of forgetting, even where he might altogether leave the particular application to themselves. Now I believe, both from probability, and from my knowledge of individual cases, that there is no effect which the earnestness now reviving within our Church will more certainly be found to produce, than the craving for spiritual direction and for habits of confidential communication with a religious guide. If this be so, it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the consideration I have just been urging; the neglect of which might entail more evil than they suppose, both on the director and the directed. And if it be further granted as true, that it is any attempt of priests to overstep the line here laid down, which in a very peculiar degree excites the jealousy and suspicion of worldly men, another reason will have appeared for its importance; because, though, if a thing be right the world's hatred of it ought only to brace and invigorate us in the task of more zealously doing it; if it be wrong, it is doubly wrong when raising obstructions to the advance of truth and of sound doctrine.

The distinction between Sacramental Confession and spiritual direction, to which I lately alluded, corresponds in some measure to that between moral and ascetic theology: the former is required of all in the Roman Church; the latter is offered to those who desire it, and I suppose in various degrees of urgency and minuteness. There may be some perhaps in our own Church who might receive the greatest benefit from the first, though they may not be able to trust any English priest in the second; or on the contrary who might occasionally consult a priest for advice and direction, though unable to bring themselves to that unreserved openness absolutely requisite for Sacramental Confession.

But if cautions such as those which have preceded be requisite, even in regard to confidential spiritual advice; if the cases be so numerous, in which, with all the advantage of unreserved disclosure of facts, it is an impossible task to understand rightly the peculiarities of individual character or circumstances; how far greater is the danger of uncharitable judgment, if bystanders allow themselves in severe comments, who cannot even know so much as the external circumstances, past or present, which influence their brother's conduct! Never was there, perhaps, a time, in which it was necessary so carefully and prominently to enforce the distinction between acts that are undeniably wrong, and those which are not so in themselves, but which there is a natural tendency to regard as marks of a worldly or irreligious mind. At the present time numbers have come or are coming to a reception of the pure Gospel, who, perhaps under the impulse of those very ardent aspirations which have at last impelled them towards their true rest, have been given up to every variety of self-will, in the way of speculation, of feeling, of action. The cases are many, and will be continually increasing, in which the mere endeavour to impress on the mind a sense of constant responsibility, to perform religious exercises with strict and punctual regularity, and to keep himself unspotted by mortal sin of thought or action,—when this is in itself so anxious, laborious, dreary a task, to the humble beginner,—that any attempt to press him unduly forward into modes of action or behaviour not absolutely required for his salvation, would be unspeakably harsh and inconsiderate; nay, might have the result of overstraining the bow, of 'breaking the bruised reed,' and of 'quenching the smoking flax.' To conceive, even within any assignable degree of approximation, the trials and distresses of those, who in temperament and habit of mind widely differ from ourselves, is an intellectual task so difficult, as to be within the reach of very few; but all may cherish the virtue of Christian charity, which will accomplish the same object far better than any merely intellectual candour; charity, which loves to believe all that is good of a brother's state, and will shrink with alarm and repugnance from the

formation of a harsh judgment, till the proofs of misconduct are flagrant, palpable, incontrovertible.

All that I have said in the way of dissuasive against too eager exhortations on the part of clergymen to the practice of Sacramental Confession, make it the more important to urge on the consideration of religious and Catholic-minded laymen the inestimable value of that holy practice ; and the great importance, that they should use serious efforts to get rid of any feelings of false shame or delicacy which might prevent them from obtaining the benefit they really might derive from its performance. That which in prospect appears inexpressibly formidable and repulsive, will often afterwards, when they have forced their resolution up to the mark and boldly unveiled to some orthodox, considerate, and affectionate priest their secret sins and temptations, prove full of sweetness and consolation. ‘ I state my deep conviction,’ says Mr. Newman, ‘ when I say, that *nothing healthy can be expected in the religion of the community*, till we learn that we cannot by our private judgment manage ourselves ; that management of the heart is a science which it needs to learn ; and that even though we have paid attention to it, we are *the least able to exercise it in our own case*, that is, when we most need it. We must use in religious matters that common sense, which does not desert us in matters of this world, because we take a real interest in them ; and as no one would ever dream of being his own lawyer or his own physician, however great exposures, whatever sacrifice of feeling, may be the consequence ; so we must take it for granted, if we would serve God completely, that we cannot be our own divines, and our own casuists.’^e It may be, as I have most fully admitted, a duty to abstain from this attempt, because of the impossibility of reposing sufficient confidence in any priest to whom we have access ; but we must learn to impress on our minds, that if it be so, it is a duty which summons us to the renouncement of a very high privilege and very signal blessing. To set this in a clearer light, the reader cannot be referred to any more satisfactory authority, than the admirable article on the

^e ‘ Sermons on Subjects of the Day,’ p. 57.

subject in the British Critic, which I have already mentioned. Here it will suffice, to specify two spiritual maladies of a very opposite character, which stand peculiarly in need of this salutary and invigorating medicine.

There are perhaps several persons, endued with that noble and most precious treasure, a keenly sensitive conscience, who suffer, and severely, from the evil tendencies which accompany this blessing, as some evil or other accompanies all blessings in this fallen world. There are persons who brood over faults of thought, word, or act, committed in time past, with an intensity of sorrow and remorse, which forbids them to see any extenuating circumstances, which magnifies the sinfulness of those faults in a degree utterly disproportionate (not to the faults themselves—no one living sees even in approximately true colours the sinfulness of sin—but) to their *comparative* magnitude as placed in the scale even with other of their own faults, much more with faults of other men. From this, a sort of what may be almost called monomania may occasionally follow; and more miserable still, there may be a very real danger, lest the heart be closed against a grateful reception of the Gospel message of mercy, and the unhappy person fall from the Christian virtue of hope. Much to be desired indeed it is, that there were far more danger of mental disease in this shape among the world at large than there is; many, I suppose, find the account of it so utterly heterogeneous from any feeling of which their own consciousness gives them experience, that they regard the very notion of such a suffering with a kind of disdainful compassion. Blind and miserable are such men: the callousness of a hardened and indifferent conscience is a misery, which would be dearly purchased by ten thousand times the heaviest agony inflicted by scrupulousness and morbid anxiety. Still such pangs as I have mentioned are fearfully severe; while, as is evident, they take their origin in no circumstance so much as in this, that the sufferer is shut up in the region of his own consciousness, is unable to find any with whom to communicate his gloomy thoughts, nay, has not the courage even fairly to raise them as it were to the surface for his own inspection. But the effort

required by Sacramental Confession; the intellectual task of putting into shape and expression the sins whose memory tortures him; much more than all, the mere recital of them for the first time in the ear of another human being; all this, even prior to any active ministration and advice from the priest, strips them of the exaggerated and fantastic colouring with which his imagination had invested them, and at once dissolves the spell which had so long enchained him.

An opposite evil is perhaps more frequent: namely, that a penitent may see in the clearest intellectual light the wickedness of past misdeeds, but cannot bring himself to realise morally their offensiveness to God; he cannot be full of shame, as he feels he ought to be; but enjoys life with all its blessings, as naturally as though he had not grievously sinned. Here too, as the author of the article alluded to points out, the Confessional is the very remedy suited to his disease: the shame he feels from reciting them in the presence of a fellow-sinner will impress on his imagination and feelings, in a degree otherwise unattainable, the shame which he ought to feel from having committed them in the presence of God and of the Holy Angels.

In proceeding to the other religious exercises, which are fully in the power of educated persons, and are most likely to succeed in training them on the true Christian and Catholic model, but little can be added to what was said in the last chapter. Nor in what I may say further, do I profess any further responsibility, beyond the mere endeavour to *translate*, as it were, practices, which bear so rich fruit in the Roman Church, into the language of our own habits and country. As I observed then, daily self-examination assumes even a more prominent importance with the higher classes than with the poor, and requires still greater care and precision in its performance: both in consequence of the far subtler nature of the sins to which they are in bondage, and also the increased amount of self-consciousness which their education entails. Those who have not hitherto regularly observed this practice, will do more wisely perhaps if they make a beginning with only the daily *general* examen; but

should make it an undeviating rule under no circumstances to omit it. When they have sufficiently disciplined themselves in this foundation, the *first* class of *particular* examination (see p. 340) will naturally and readily follow : and, when once begun, should never be omitted without indispensable necessity. The natural time for both these exercises is of course the evening : but there is no reason why some other part of the day (e. g. the morning) might not be chosen for good reasons ; e. g. if our fatigue be often too great at night. It is plain, however, that the time once chosen should be faithfully adhered to.

According to the observations of the last chapter, the next place should be given to meditation. And some very admirable remarks, addressed to members of our Church who are beginners in this holy exercise, will be found in the new translation of St. Bonaventure's *Life of Christ*: remarks which I wish there were room to extract in this place.

As a starting-point, perhaps a quarter of an hour at the beginning of each day will be sufficient ; especially when the task is found irksome and difficult. But we should not rest content, till we have brought up our habit at all events to *half-an-hour* ; for this is the time recommended in Roman Catholic books to all who perform the exercise at all. As regards the subjects of the meditation, no book perhaps can be mentioned likely to be by itself altogether satisfactory : one of the most interesting and available is the '*Journal of Meditations*,'^d which assigns some event in our Blessed Lord's life for meditation almost every day in the year. Many persons will probably prefer selecting from several books, according to the particular bias of their mind and disposition ; a consideration this last, which from the very object of the exercise, ought to be considered beyond every other. Only the subject ought to be carefully chosen and considered over night, that it may be present to the mind the first thing in the morning, and that we may not rush as it were unprepared into the presence of God. St. Alphonsus's '*Preparation for Death*' is another work, extremely liked by some who have seen it, while others again are *not*

^d ' Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, 1834.'

so much affected by it : the various editions of the 'Spiritual Exercises' will furnish again further materials. It has sometimes occurred to me that an arrangement of this sort (with whatever modifications) would be on the whole suitable to the circumstances and needs of many among us ; if some competent person would take the pains to compile such a work. From Christmas to the Epiphany, the circumstances of our Blessed Lord's Infancy : thence to Septuagesima the most signal manifestations of His glory during His life among men : from that time to Lent, His general sufferings on earth, (as set forth in the latter part of the first volume of Father Thomas's work,) such as 'Christ in His obedience,' 'Christ in His poverty,' 'Christ in the austerity of His life,' 'the obligation of living among sinners,' 'the rudeness of His disciples,' 'the obstinacy of the Jews,' 'the false judgments that were made of His actions,' &c. &c. : from Ash-Wednesday to the first Sunday in Lent inclusive, the suffering in particular (viz. the fasting in the wilderness) with which His ministry began : from that day onwards the details of that with which it ended : at Easter His glorious appearances, including perhaps that to St. Paul ; and as this would not naturally fill up all the time, some passages from our Blessed Lord's discourses in the third, fifth, sixth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of St. John might afford inexpressibly interesting texts, on which meditations might be founded, on those great doctrines—the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharistic Presence, which are enigmatically there contained, and which our Blessed Lord may be considered to have revealed more clearly to his Apostles in those mysterious forty days : Ascension-tide and Whitsuntide supply their own subjects : from Trinity to All-Saints perhaps the subject of meditation might be the *second* class of particular examination, (see p. 342,) going over in our mind the various Christian tempers, and making a practical comparison of them with our own conduct : (this would be no interference whatever with the habit already spoken of in regard to the poor, of still choosing some event in our Blessed Lord's life to keep in our mind during the day ; for there is no necessary inconvenience in making the subject of our

recurrence, so to speak, through the day, different from that of our morning meditation :) from All-Saints to Christmas, the various topics involved in what is called the 'Via Purgativa,' and which are contained indeed in the 'Journal of Meditations;' such as—the sinfulness of sin, mortal or venial; and of our chief sins, one by one; Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell; and all this interspersed, as Christmas comes nearer, with meditations on the events which preceded our Lord's birth; and perhaps on one or two principal prophecies or types of Him in the Old Testament.

The habit of meditation will be peculiarly valuable to those, who are immersed in the turmoil of commercial life; and who, in consequence of the incessant anxiety and competition now prevalent, have more difficulty than others are able even to conceive, in reposing their mind throughout the day on their True Good. Indeed, after no long time, their welfare might be still further consulted, by the establishment, here and there, of something in the nature of 'Spiritual Retreats:' for the fit performance of which the habit of meditation will have been so excellent a preparative.

Under the head of mental prayer, must also be classed the regular and methodical performance of the duty of intercession. Another kind is, where *continuous* help and guidance is given by a book: a beautiful work of this kind, which contains nothing that *any* 'high-churchman' can object to, is Gother's 'Sinner's Complaint.'

According to the advice given from Rodriguez and St. Alphonsus in the last chapter, it would appear that daily self-examination should be considered an *indispensable* duty even in sickness; and that, in cases where one or other must be given up, mental prayer should be *retained* rather than vocal. Of vocal prayer, of course our own Church Service has the first claim upon us: and, as I said some way back, should be recited by each one of us, as members, and in the name, of our own English Church. A further manual of vocal prayer, which will be of great help in impressing us with a deep sense of the Communion of Saints, is the Roman Breviary. How much of this there will be time for in the day, varies of course in every degree. Some may find great

happiness and refreshment from reciting at night Vespers and Compline, who may have time for no more; others will perhaps add over-night the next day's Matins; others again will recite in the morning Lauds, with or without the Nocturns, and Prime. The present Roman practice of always anticipating even the Lauds of the following day, depends on the principle, that our mind is fresher in the morning and fit for intent mental prayer; while in the evening the use of a form, and the sense of communion with the Church in what we recite, sustains the flagging spirits and attention. As our own service is recited in communion with our own Church, the Breviary service would be of course recited in communion with 'the Holy Church throughout all the world;' while at the same time each individual would most carefully, *as a matter of the plainest duty*, omit any Invocations or the like, for which his mind is not fully prepared; or which would have in his case any the most remote tendency to obscure the Vision of the Son of God. This caution understood, there are still two different arrangements of the Breviary service, which find favourers in our Church. The first of these takes ordinarily the ferial office; and introduces the festivals of those Saints only, who are mentioned either in Scripture, or in our calendar (including of course the 'black letter' days), or in our prayer-book and homilies; the other prefers following simply the Roman arrangement of festivals, and taking the authorized 'ordo recitandi' as its guide. The advantage of the first is considered to be, that the ferial office is much more frequently retained than according to the existing Roman practice, and that it keeps more carefully within the limits prescribed by our Church; the advantage of the last, that it enables us to be more simply and heartily in communion with the Church Catholic, and implies less of a critical and eclectic spirit.

It may be confidently hoped, that by a continued course of such devotional exercises, those three elements of the Catholic character which I mentioned in the last chapter,—strict conscientiousness of daily walk,—strict orthodoxy on the principal Gospel Truths,—and a full consciousness of the Communion of Saints—may be realised with daily increasing depth and comprehensiveness; while on the other hand no part of what

is here suggested can surely have any tendency to frighten the timid spirit, or to assail early prepossessions with hasty and rude violence.

Such advice then as this may surely be given with every prospect of success, in those instances, already numerous and daily increasing in number, where feelings of acute repentance have been excited, and trembling anxiety as to spiritual prospects aroused, while on the one hand there is a keen perception of the hollowness and worldliness of Lutheran profession, and yet on the other hand a most natural misgiving, as to the possible consequences of prematurely closing with what are called extreme opinions. Such religious practices as I have mentioned, carry with them their own evidence and warrant; and they bring comfort to the mourner, the power of repentance to the sinner, the power of perseverance to the weak, the power of discerning religious truth to the feeble and perplexed. To do no more than realise gradually those truths, which we have always professed with the lips—what is there in this which can alarm the most cautious? and yet what more is wanted as the true medicine for all spiritual evils? Such is the great blessing we derive from that profession of orthodoxy, which our Church has retained: the Creeds and the prayer-book have stored within them all that the sorrowful or sinful soul can need; all, that is, except supernatural grace; and *that* our Church is also privileged to dispense. Why should we be downcast and dispirited, however fearful the corruptions which abound among us, when we have such vantage-ground as this? what need we, but firm faith in our position, and in the presence of Christ with us His outcast flock?

Two more observations will bring to a close this part of the subject. Great as would be the care taken that humble and dutiful Christians be not pressed unduly forward to doctrines for which they may not yet be ripe, another precaution should be even more sedulously maintained; viz. that all their religious and devotional reading should breathe the one true Catholic spirit. The possession of Mr. Newman's Sermons is a most truly happy circumstance for our Church; and many of the more ordinary Roman Catholic works, by

means of suitable omissions, will be very available for the purpose. The other observation, to which I alluded, is this,—that parents in the higher ranks of life will be fitted for a charge, which could hardly be intrusted with safety to the uneducated classes; and one of considerable importance. They will be fully able to train their children in the habit of regularly confessing to them their more serious faults, and to give them suitable advice as to repentance and amendment. I have known of this practice being adopted with the very best effect; nothing indeed can be more fitted for implanting habits of careful conscientiousness, and preparing them perhaps for regular Confession to a priest, should the opportunity be presented.

4. Thus inestimable are the benefits which may be conferred, on the spread of the Gospel within our Church, by those who, from their position and their powers of mind, are able to exercise an influence on ‘holy and humble men of heart.’ Nor let these latter think that they have no share in forwarding the great work. So far from it, that there is no more efficacious instrument for removing misconception and softening prejudice, than the personal presence of such as these. A humble Christian, who shews in his whole demeanour—a profound humility and consciousness of sin; thoughtful, unselfish, unceasing considerateness for all around him; a reverent sympathy for good from whatever quarter it presents itself; an unpretending zeal in performing all the duties of his state of life; such an one (little as he dreams of exercising any influence upon others) avails more than a thousand controversial arguments. He proves to those who see him, that the love of Catholic doctrine arises, neither from blind and carnal formalism, nor from sectarian bigotry, nor from a puerile love of splendour and external ornament, nor from the dreams of a poetical temperament, nor from the reasonings of deep erudition, but from a most deep and experimental conviction, that this doctrine gives help, such as no other doctrine in the world can give, towards rescuing the soul from the power of Satan, and promoting its progress in every Christian virtue.

5. That such are our present duties and privileges, will be at

once admitted by all who have concurred with the general statement of principles which has gone before. That very much more is also required, if the work is really to be accomplished which we may humbly hope that God is performing for us, if genuine Catholicism is to be restored to our desiring eyes,—this the same principles also establish. But in all such cases, God carefully keeps from man the power of *positive* cooperation: what will be His times and instruments in forwarding His own cause; when and in what degree He will raise up men in the midst of us fitted for carrying out His gracious purpose; and on what part of our existing system these men will firmly take their stand; all this we must dutifully leave to Him. To trouble our minds with conjectures on such questions as these, much more to think of taking the matter out of God's hands into our own, would be a mark of that worldly and scheming spirit, which occasionally pains us in passages of the Church's history; and which is, of all tempers of mind, the most certain to fail in bringing down blessings, that are really blessings, on the Church. By labouring, each in his place, to keep his conscience pure, and seeking to know and do His will, members of our Church are fitting themselves to *be* His instruments, should He require their services; they are placing themselves as it were, in that position for which He has predestined them, and where, if He needs them, He will look to find them. Nay, should the glorious work be really consummated, in what degree each one has been an instrument, in what measure his prayers or efforts may have contributed to the result, will be among the secrets reserved for the Great Day. That there may be individual exceptions to this, I admit; but surely, on the whole, such is the sober and simple truth.

But on the other hand, what may be called *negative* cooperation is in our power; nay, is incumbent on many, according to their tastes and capabilities. We may have a most certain conviction, that under such circumstances as ours the existence of one or other definite class of spiritual instruments, at present wanting, is indispensably necessary, that the pure Gospel may really energize in our Church; and we may most firmly and acceptably labour in our

respective spheres, in following out this conviction. Of what kind, in my own judgment, these instruments are, the preceding pages will have sufficiently shewn; while the great space I have already occupied, forcibly urges the necessity of brevity. I will merely then recapitulate, as concisely as possible, the desiderata to which I have already alluded.

I. It is absolutely necessary, that there be manuals, from which those educated for Orders may be scientifically and accurately instructed in the primary elements of moral, ascetic, and dogmatic theology. It is of course quite certain that educated men will really (whether or no they do so professedly) lay far more stress on, have a far greater portion of their minds occupied with, subjects which they have studied methodically, than subjects on which they merely pick up information at random for themselves. Till quite lately, *nothing* was taught methodically to the future clergy as such: so that at least all subjects had their fair chance. But now there is a rising tendency, to train them with pains and precision in the theory of Apostolical Succession, or the ecclesiastical controversies with Roman Catholics and Dissenters, while those other, infinitely more important, sciences are still wholly neglected. Under such a system, zealous and active young clergymen may spring up, who have acquired habits of mind which it makes one uneasy to contemplate; clergymen, who are far more anxious to draw their flock to Church, than to train them in the daily battle against sin; who are far more deeply impressed with the sin of joining Dissenters, than with the sin of habitually neglecting self-examination and prayer; who are keenly sensitive to the most distant suggestion which tends to extenuate the sin of schism, but remain quiet, unconcerned, and conservative, though Sabellianism and Nestorianism be rampant at their very doors. It is perfectly consistent to say that the Scripture, humbly studied, will teach all essential truth; but to abandon this principle, and teach one minor class of truths methodically, while those that are the most vital and essential are still left to be gathered by individual perusal of Scripture, this is a course self-condemned of formalism and bigotry.

For dogmatic theology, it would be no difficult matter,

I conceive, to a person sufficiently versed in theology, to compile a work, which might answer a similar purpose with us, that Perrone's lectures do abroad; it would be of course much less extensive in scope; but should contain a clear and methodical statement of the acknowledged Catholic doctrines on the Trinity, Original Sin, the Incarnation, and Grace—a statement, not professing to go deeply into the matter, but accurate and precise, and fitted for the ordinary student; while at the same time it should refer those, who may be disposed to go more thoroughly into any particular topic, to such larger works, as are most valuable and authoritative.

For ascetic theology,^e the regular, careful, and methodical study of such a work as Rodriguez on 'spiritual perfection,' would be of the utmost value to a candidate for Orders; and would powerfully impress on his mind the reality and high importance of ascetic science. It is true that this work is intended rather to teach Christians generally how to direct themselves, than to teach priests how to direct others: and the same must be said of other works, which I have heard most highly praised; such as the two great works of Father Lewis of Granada, 'the sinner's guide' and 'the memorial of a Christian life:' but this would be no sufficient objection to its use.^f I am told however on the best authority, that there is a very admirable scientific work, intended for *directors of consciences* as such, called the 'Direttorio Ascetico,' by Scaramelli, 2 vols. 4to.; in which directors are instructed how to act, from the fruits of an immense experience collected

^e 'Ascetic theology is the science of conducting to a holy life. It treats of the obstacles to perfection, of temptations, of sin, of the world, &c.; of the means of perfection, as prayer, meditation, mortification, &c.; of virtues, their characteristics, degrees, and means of attainment.' See also p. 326.

^f It would be very desirable, that any one who should translate such a work as this of Rodriguez for the use of members of the English Church, should omit, not only any expressions about the Blessed Virgin, which might pain English Churchmen, (of which indeed there are in this work few or none,) but also a great number of legends, which in the present state of feeling among us would rather cause ludicrous than edifying associations. I cannot forbear from adding here, how very important a service must be in course of time rendered to our Church, by the series now in progress of translation from books of Catholic devotion. The editor of this series is thereby adding to his claims on the deep reverence and gratitude of English Churchmen, which might have seemed hardly to admit of increase.

by the pious and zealous author, a most distinguished missionary.

On moral theology, it will not perhaps be so easy to compile a serviceable manual. The work reviewed in the *British Critic*, 'le Manuel des Confesseurs,' would doubtless afford many most useful hints to clergymen, who wish to make some beginning in directing individual souls, but are at a loss for counsel or assistance. But our circumstances are in many respects so peculiar, that it can hardly be until after much feeling of their way and personal experience, on the part of Catholic-minded clergy in various parts of the kingdom, that any really valuable rules can be given for general guidance.

Such are the most immediately pressing of our desiderata. Since, however, I have alluded so frequently to mystical theology, and it is to be hoped that the science of directing men in the higher paths of Christian sanctity may become every day more practically needful, it will be better to add on this subject also, what I have received from trustworthy authority.

Mystical theology is the science of comparatively few. It may be said to begin where the ascetic ends; its object is to carry forward souls, specially favoured, into the sublimer regions of contemplative devotion, "*supernatural* and *infused*," as it is called. For though the *science* of directing rightly such gifts may be taught, the gifts themselves *cannot* be taught or communicated. Such are the twelve degrees of contemplation, the intellectual vision of God, ecstasies and rapture; and connected with these are the mysterious trials and purifications, by which the soul is prepared for them, or humbled under them; like the sting of the flesh inflicted on St. Paul. Standard works on this branch of theology are the writings of St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, St. Peter of Alcantara, &c. But here again the most practical and classical work is Scaramelli's "*Direttorio mistico*," 4to. Venice, 1754. In this, every thing is laid down simply but fully, and so as to guide the director in leading souls through this higher walk of rare and sublime perfection.

Connected with this science is another branch of theology, which may be said to be common to both the ascetic and the mystical. It is what is known by the name of "*Discretio spirituum*," or the rules for distinguishing the inspiration of the Holy Spirit from the illusion of the enemy. This is a study most useful in ascetic, and absolutely

necessary in mystical, theology. Some excellent rules for the purpose will be found at the end of St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises. The best modern treatise is again Scaramelli's "Discernimento de Spiriti," 4to., Venice, 1800. There is a work also by Cardinal Bona, "De Discretionem Spirituum."

3. These studies are by no means confined to the directors of religious houses, but may be useful, and sometimes necessary to a general confessor. Scaramelli gives as the experience of his many missions, that "in almost every place there are souls which God leads forward through those extraordinary ways to high perfection," (D. M. p. 1,) and whose Confessors therefore ought to understand their direction.

II. But such manuals as I alluded to above, on dogmatic and ascetic theology, would be the mere hollow reflections of an external system, rather than an exhibition of life among ourselves, unless we possess also those among us, who devote themselves to a really scientific and profound study of such subjects. On the *objective* doctrines of theology, there will be no difficulty at all in this; or rather such is actually in a degree the case with us at present. I believe I am correct in saying, that the part of Petavius's great works to which Bishop Bull objects, is an extremely small portion; and when in addition to this we consider the circumstance, that Petavius is considered by learned men to have been the great reviver of patristic studies in Christendom, it is plain that no 'high-Churchmen' could at all object, were the careful study of his works, (with the correction, as they might say, of Bp. Bull's 'Defensio,') to become an acknowledged practice of leisured students of Divinity in our Church. Nor must we forget that, over and above the possession of Petavius's works, when Mr. Newman's translation and notes of St. Athanasius's doctrinal treatises, with the prefatory matter promised, shall have been brought to a close, we shall possess in our own Church a work on the Trinitarian controversies, which may amply suffice for the most keen and ardent inquirer.

But on the *subjective* doctrines of theology, since they have been only called into controversy in these later times, times

in which 'high-Churchmen' are not in the habit of considering Church-decrees to have been authoritative, these will offer a very much greater difficulty. The objection indeed, to which I have alluded, is probably not insurmountable; even in very moderate quarters (Mr. Holden is a striking example) the idea is becoming not uncommon, that there is nothing in the *abstract* decrees of Rome on Justification, to which English 'high-Churchmen' can fairly object; and the idea will probably become universal, in proportion as both sides explain their own meaning. Still, for many reasons, it would be impossible to name any existing work on these subjects, which would of itself be fitted for the English student. In the first place, the sort of objections and misapprehensions which we in England are required to encounter, are very different from those which would be contemplated and allowed for in such books: for here one principal duty is, to shew those who are implicitly orthodox, that they have no real difference at bottom from Catholic doctrine; while abroad the duty is mainly incumbent on them, of exhibiting the immorality and profaneness of the heretical systems they oppose. In the second place, the science of these doctrines is intimately connected with metaphysical questions; and foreign works could not be rightly understood here, unless there were a full preliminary account of the system of philosophy which they presuppose. On the other hand, if it be true, which is at least probable, that much of new light has been, quite of late years, thrown on the subject of psychology, then it would be rather necessary to adapt these treatises to the present state of metaphysical science; a course which would involve a considerable modification of their language. A third particular deserving mention, is one to which I must hereafter allude; that on a most important doctrine connected with these controversies, no foreign theological writer seems to have carried the analysis so far as is absolutely required for these times. On these and other grounds, no more valuable service could be conferred on our Church, than a deep and comprehensive treatise on the

doctrines of grace; nor would the labour of a life be ill-bestowed, if one competent to such a task were to devote himself to this one object.

It is worth while to remark, that in such a work as is here supposed, would be included the scientific statement of these truths, which are the subject-matter of ascetic theology. Moreover, closely connected with the psychological exposition which must be its basis, would be the discussion of such questions as one to which I have before alluded,—I mean, the dangers resulting to the mind from an unmixed devotion to physics; and the best remedies for those dangers. A question this, on which the admirable letters of “Catholicus” leave nothing for future writers to do, except to systematize and develop the views there brought forward. There are a vast number too of other inquiries of a similar sort, connected with the spiritual dangers of our present stage of civilization, which clamorously call for a scientific and dispassionate study.

A full and systematic moral theology must be still more exclusively our own work. A study of the treatises on the subject in repute abroad, would no doubt be of the utmost value; but still, so far as my own knowledge or information extends, I should altogether doubt whether any of them singly is even fitted to form the basis, on which a work should be built, which might be adapted to satisfy our existing requirements in England. It is very important, moreover, that much more ground should be covered, than is, I believe, covered by Roman works on moral theology: I mean, that questions of right and wrong connected with the various employments of man in our present state of society, or again with international morality, should be probed far more deeply, and considered under the light of a far wider and more generous induction, than, as far as I know and believe, has ever hitherto been attempted. The parts of Paley’s ‘Moral Philosophy’ which treat on such matters, are in many respects an insult to common-sense; so superficial are the arguments by which they are illustrated: nor can I find or hear of any successful efforts in the same direction, on the part of Roman Catholic writers. Nothing would be more

appropriate,—both as a cause and also as a sign of increased attention being paid, in public affairs and the throng of practical life, to the category ‘right and wrong,’—than such a work as is here specified.

III. Such particulars as I have mentioned, may in their general outline be considered as indispensable necessities for a pure Church. Under our present circumstances it is hardly less necessary, that some Christianly-minded and most tenderly compassionate, if at the same time clear-headed and precise, thinker should betake himself to the study of political economy. It is merely idle to suppose, that we can really and permanently benefit the poor in their temporal relations, unless we bring all the lights of science and of system to bear on the subject.

IV. The office of christianizing the study of the classics is a most important subject, to which those who are both Christians and scholars might, with the utmost advantage, devote the whole power of their mind. Hitherto, since the ‘revival of letters,’ the effect of classical studies seems to have been in a very high degree anti-Catholic and anti-Christian.

V. I spoke in the second chapter on the great importance which historical studies are just now assuming. Most remarkable it is, that anti-Catholic writers have been the main instruments of bringing into clear light the momentous influences of the Church on European civilization. This is eminently true of such historians as Thierry and Michelet; and those who have read Guizot’s works say the same of him. By far the most striking instance however with which I am acquainted, is that of a writer whom I have already mentioned, M. Comte. He professes unbounded obligations to M. de Maistre for having directed him into that line of historical investigation; but as far as one wholly unversed in history can judge, I should say that he very far exceeds his instructor in depth and enlargement of view, as to the *political* effects wrought by the peculiar relation of Church and State in the mediæval period. I had hoped to quote part of his work; but find that I must hurry rapidly.

over what remains of ground to be trodden. It is a very anxious thing indeed to say any thing which can lead to the study of M. Comte's work; not that his irreligious arguments have any weight, for an atheism more bigotted, fanatical, and unreasonable cannot be conceived: but the mere reading such works is a pollution to the mind, unless guarded by special devotional exercises. However, any one who will be aware of the danger, and will read the work merely as a conscientious duty, may derive from it, I think, invaluable help towards the discussion of a question, the full consideration of which is daily more necessary; the question, namely, of the effects on the temporal happiness of man, produced respectively by 'Church and State according to the idea of each.' And as to the new historical school generally, it would be a very great help towards the great object of unheathenizing our literature, and thus unprotestantizing our Church, if those who should be the first to introduce generally among us the works of the school, were Catholic-minded and Christian men; who should be able to supply that other side of the picture, which anti-Catholic writers can never understand. Thus we might learn at once to read—of the ideas which constitute the life and support of Christian energy, which were those, at each particular period, impressed with especial distinctness on the mind of religious men *within* the Church, the subject of their controversy, the matter of their devotions; and also—what were the *external* efforts of the same Church, at the same period, in humanizing, softening, and christianizing the world.[§]

VI. The desirableness of much deeper and more enlightened principles of 'exegesis' than have hitherto prevailed among us, has been already alluded to.

Such are some of the discussions, into which those may enter with every prospect of conferring inestimable benefit on our Church, whose power of mind and opportunities lead them to a life of abstract study. Many of them are such,

[§] Under the term 'the world,' I am, as is plain, including, for convenience' sake, baptized persons, who had not as yet been fully indoctrinated with the Christian ideas.

that it is impossible to pursue them without having laid the foundation in a general knowledge of dogmatic theology. The history of any particular age of the Church cannot be understood, even in its most essential features, unless the principal stress be laid on that particular Christian doctrine, whose intellectual formation and development was at the time mainly engrossing the thoughts of holy men ; nor again can this be understood, without a general knowledge of that system whereof it forms a part. Again, no Catholic Christian would study morals or psychology, except in the closest relation to direct theology ; and in Biblical Criticism I have already made the same observation. (See p. 412.) But I should be inclined, with deference, to submit, that all thinkers, endued with vigorous intellectual and scientific power, would do far more wisely in making some course of dogmatic theology part of their preparatory education ; there will be otherwise, I cannot but think, very serious danger lest they become less sensible of the reality and transcendent claims of religious truth, and acquire the habit of balancing the questions which come before them by other weights than those of the sanctuary.^g

6. The considerations in the last section lead to a reflection, which it would be wrong to suppress. In looking for guidance in that quarter, where my own eyes are always first directed when in search of spiritual wisdom,^h I mean the Church of Rome, one cannot but painfully feel, that on such subjects as have been just discussed we find there at present no sufficient model to follow. However the fact is to be accounted for, we cannot conceal from ourselves, that in those subordinate duties of a Church which I have called

^g The subject does not call on me here to allude to what I have already mentioned more than once ; the very serious danger of deep and ardent intellectual pursuit, whatever its subject, hardening the conscience and the heart : a danger this, which nothing except an unremitting and vigorous course of Christian discipline can avert.

^h I mean to which, as an *organized Society*, my eyes are so directed : many, I suppose, will understand and echo my feeling when I say, that the first quarter, to which I always look for spiritual wisdom, is nearer home.

‘intellectual’ and ‘political,’ the Roman Catholic Church has, in these later ages, assumed a most widely different position, from that which it occupied in the mediæval period. This it is, which makes worldly men, who do not understand that the real life of a Church lies in the performance of higher and more sacred functions, look upon that Holy Church as decrepid, and tending rapidly to decay: and all of us must surely acknowledge with sorrow, that the fuller possession of ‘such accidental and superabundant gifts as are not absolutely necessary to the Church’s essence,’ would be still of the very utmost benefit towards spreading the pure Gospel; and is an object worthy of the labours and prayers of all serious and Catholic-minded Christians. As to ‘political’ duties, who can say that Rome, at the present day, is actively influential in leavening European politics with Christian principles, in protesting against unjust wars, in securing subjects from oppression? And as to ‘intellectual’ duties, the following has been drawn up by a friend of mine as a sample, not an exhaustive enumeration, of the sort of questions, primarily important in their bearing on religion, which have arisen in these centuries; and to which her doctors have not as yet appeared to give any methodical and scientific consideration.

I. ‘There has been no attempt to exhibit the past influence of Christianity on the social and moral state of the world.

II. ‘There has been neglect of the study of Exegesis and of History; so that the literal meaning of the text of the Scriptures, and the points of resemblance or dissimilarity between the Scriptures and human historians, have to be sought from other writers.

III. ‘There has been no indication of the proper use to be made of the heathen classics.

IV. ‘There has been no attempt to point out the nature or the remedies of any of the great social evils which have grown up during the last three centuries.

V. ‘The allegations brought, in reference to Scripture interpretation, from Mythical History, have not been met.’

And another omission, still more important than these, remains to be considered in a future chapter.

On the other hand, in those two necessary and fundamental duties of a Church—the maintenance of moral and religious discipline, and of an orthodox faith,—never in any period has the Roman Catholic Church shone with a brighter lustre, than since the Reformation. The whole system connected with the ‘Spiritual Exercises’ is a standing memorial of the first particular; and such great names as Petavius, Suarez, Vasquez, with a host of others, a lasting attestation of the second.

7. I trust then, that during the present chapter I have kept sufficiently to the engagement which I made. I trust that such particulars as those which I have specified, imply no allusion to any matters of doctrine, which are at issue between ‘high-churchmen’ of different complexions. Why then may we not all combine in the prosecution of such designs as these, and leave the questions, on which we differ, to be decided by the practical effect which may be produced, by actively following out the principles on which we agree? If it be granted, that the aiming at such objects as I have ventured to put forward as desirable, implies of itself no set purpose of ‘Romanizing’ our Church, I must beg leave to doubt whether any single one of her members entertains any such purpose. For as to secret negotiations and understandings with members of that Church, these and similar rumours, to the best of my own knowledge, are without the very slightest foundation in fact. And surely, if high-churchmen are slow to cooperate in the prosecution of objects, which *on their own principles* are desirable, from a fear of the direction in which such a course might tend,—they are taking the most effectual way to confirm us in what they consider our most serious error; our belief, namely, that high-church principles, honestly carried out on their positive side, *must* lead to Rome. If ‘high-church’ principles be really substantive and distinct, what possible danger can there be in heartily and ungrudgingly carrying them forward

to their results? and if they be not substantive, who could grieve that this fact should be established by means of a fair trial? For my own part, I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction,—that were we, as a Church, to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration.

CHAPTER VIII.

A FEW WORDS ON OUR AUTHORITATIVE FORMULARIES.

THE same reasons, which made it necessary to compress the last part of the preceding chapter, compel me to put here the merest sketch, in the place of a fuller discussion which I had intended.

Complaint is often made against maintainers of Roman doctrine, that they evade the spirit of the Articles in a very disingenuous way, and ought not to subscribe them. It is answered by many of these, that they *do* evade the spirit but accept the statements; that the original sanctioners of the Articles *intended* those who held Roman doctrine to subscribe them; but that from various causes, partly the disingenuousness of the Reforming party, the general spirit and flow of them is Protestant. This has been plainly put forth three years ago, (not to mention No. 90,) by Mr. Oakeley and myself; by the former historically, by myself from the internal evidence of our formularies. An answer soon appeared to mine, to which I at once rejoined, and was not further replied to. Now considering how plainly and argumentatively those things have been said in the face of day, and how extremely little has been said in the way of answer, I am at a loss to understand the denunciations I hear about dishonesty and the like. I have seen it said, that we profess to be justified in subscribing, through the witness of our *conscience*: I began my second pamphlet with expressly *repudiating* any such ground; I said it was a question for

external argument alone; and by *external argument* alone I considered it. Our adversaries profess to *go by* argument: for three years they have made no reply to Mr. Oakeley's pamphlet or to mine: if they *must* denounce, pray let them at least argue first, and denounce afterwards.

The Bishops of Exeter and Ossory have answered No. 90; but not having happened, I suppose, to fall in with the two pamphlets I speak of, they leave *their* line of argument untouched. On the twenty-second article, e. g., I shall quote a few sentences from my first pamphlet, to which I can find no answer at all in either of those works; premising that in all ages the practical system of a Church will be more or less corrupt, though doubtlessly at that time it was most distressingly so.

'I have heard it said in the last fortnight, that the same principles which reconcile subscription to the twenty-second Article with the opinions maintained in the Tract, might reconcile subscription to the second Article with the Socinian heresy. Now I would almost stake the whole case on the fair issue of that question. Can any thing be more dissimilar in manner and tone than those two Articles? The second contains an accurately drawn up dogmatic positive statement of the high mystery on which it treats, such as the Church has ever had recourse to for the preservation of the Faith committed to her, and such as it is the tendency of the present day to consider subtle and overstrained. The twenty-second contains *no one positive statement*: it puts together four or five topics, *which cannot be said to be all very closely connected with each other*, and declares that 'doctrina Romanensium' on those topics is a fond thing, &c. Would not any one naturally infer from this opposition what Mr. Newman *does* infer? that the framers of the Articles see two things before their eyes, the Creeds which have come down to them from the early ages of the Church, and the corrupt system in existence practically to a great extent overlaying these Creeds; that the former they hand down as they have received them, the latter they protest against, as they see it, generally, and in the mass: not being careful to draw up accurate statements of those true principles which are contradictory to the existing abuses, nor again tracing up the latter to their [supposed]

ultimate principles and condemning *them*; but without busying themselves with such investigations, requiring as they would leisure, accuracy of thought, and *unity of opinion*, condemning what they saw *as* they saw it, energizing and practically active throughout the Church.'

Now let me carry the war into the enemy's camp; and first into Dr. O'Brien's. The two fundamental principles of his theology are, 1st, that nominal Christians are divided into two classes; the justified, who also *know* themselves to be justified, and the unjustified; 2d, that the quality on our part which indicates acceptance with God, is undivided trust in the Atonement: and that to say that keeping of the commandments is that quality, is carnal and anti-Christian.

Take the first of these. What would be the public worship of a Church, which held such an opinion? It is very difficult to fancy: it would, I suppose, as in Scotland and Germany, consist mainly in preaching; that the justified may receive comfort, and the unjustified warning. How can there be 'common prayer' at all? for the one great devotional act of the justified would be to thank God for their justification; and of the unjustified, to *pray* for justification: no necessity for the former to pray for holiness, since it is quite certain to follow; no use in the latter doing so, for holiness before 'justification' is 'hollow and carnal.' But certainly such worship would not most distantly resemble our own Prayer-book. To use the language of those who personify 'our Church's doctrine,' as though there existed some such substance,—if our Church held any such doctrine as this division of Christians into two such classes, every page of the Prayer-book must shew it: but, in fact, every page of the Prayer-book negatives it. I wish there were room to illustrate this at length: but we have only to look through prayers and litany to see it. "Create and make in us, &c. that we worthily lamenting, &c. may obtain perfect remission." Those who, on Dr. O'Brien's theory, know that they have remission, and those who may know that they have not, unite in praying that they *may* have it. In the

Catechism all the children 'thank God' for being 'called' to a 'state of salvation,' and pray Him to give them 'grace' to 'continue in the same:' in both points contradicting Dr. O'Brien: asserting that all the baptized are justified, and that justification does *not* involve perseverance. And in the Visitation of the Sick the priest, instead of trying to discover whether the sick man is justified or not, 'exhorts' him to remember the profession' made to God in Baptism; and then proceeds, 'forasmuch as after this life there is an account to be given unto the righteous Judge, . . . I require you to examine yourself and your estate,' &c. Here, at the most solemn moment of a Christian's whole life, words are put into a priest's mouth in addressing him, which no 'Evangelical' could willingly use: for surely *his* wish must be, to discover whether the sick man is in the number of the justified; and if so, there is no such fear as the Prayer-book expresses, lest he be 'accursed and condemned in that fearful judgment.' Let me ask, how many 'Evangelical' clergymen could bring themselves to read this exhortation to their parishioners at the point of death?

The second principle is even more plainly at variance with the Prayer-book. Instead of all the unjustified *praying* God for this one grace, (Lutheran 'faith') and all the justified *thanking* God for it, I doubt if the very idea of 'renouncing trust in our own merits' is met with explicitly in the Prayer-book; except indeed in the Collect, where the *whole congregation says*, 'O God, who seest that *we put not our trust in any thing that we do,*' which must prove, on Lutheran principles, that the English Church supposes every one of her members justified. — In the Office for adult Baptism — 'we call upon Thee for these persons, that they *coming to thy Holy Baptism* may receive *remission of sins.*' And whereas presently the Office speaks of 'these present persons truly repenting and coming unto Him by *faith,*' it very soon makes clear whether the latter word be used in the Lutheran sense; for the testing questions asked them are, — 'Dost thou renounce the Devil . . . the world . . . and the flesh?' 'Dost thou believe in God the Father,' &c. (the Atonement not even

expressly specified,) ‘Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?’ ‘Wilt thou obediently keep God’s holy will and commandments?’ In the Athanasian Creed—‘Whosoever will be saved *before all things it is necessary*’—that he renounce all trust in his own merits?—that he close with the Gospel offer?—that he believe himself freely pardoned by Christ’s Atonement?—No: but ‘that he hold the Catholic Faith:’ ‘to *believe*—not ‘to *trust*’—is the Prayer-book version of ‘faith;’ and among the objects for belief which follow in the Creed, the Atonement only receives a passing allusion. In the Visitation of the Sick again, there is no attempt either to find whether the sick person has a fiduciary apprehension of Christ’s merits, or to teach him how best he may obtain it: in other words, the priest at that awful moment is called on to pursue a course, which neglects the *only* particular that Dr. O’Brien thinks essential. The priest examines him, whether he ‘believes as a Christian man should do,’ (and then follows the Creed as before, with not so much as an explicit mention of the Atonement,) and whether ‘he repent him truly of his sins;’ he ‘earnestly moves’ him ‘to be liberal to the poor,’ and ‘moves’ him ‘to make a special Confession of his sins.’ But of renouncing trust in his own merits, apprehending Christ’s Atonement, and the rest—not one word. Surely *if* our leading Reformers were serious men and cared for religion on its own account (which of course I do not myself think the case; but *if* so,) this proves to demonstration that their principles, on the fundamental question of Bishop O’Brien’s theology, were precisely contradictory to Bishop O’Brien.

I make no imputation at all against the Bishop of Ossory; I quite understand how naturally persons retain what they have received, without realising its full force. I see the same among our own friends; many of whom are as firmly, and to me as astonishingly, convinced that the Articles in their natural meaning are Catholic, as the Bishop seems to be that the Prayer-book is Protestant. But I do think that Bishop O’Brien, who has given his full assent and consent to the Prayer-book and has declared that there is nothing in it

contrary to the word of God, is not the person who ought to have started such an idea as that of 'shifting, evasive, and disingenuous sophistry' in interpreting formularies which one has subscribed.

Now take the case of anti-Roman 'high-churchmen.' Their controversy with 'evangelicals' turns on the question, whether *self-denial* and a repeated *exercise of the will* be necessary to holy living, or whether the justified possess a principle which will carry them into a good life *by itself*. Our twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it on the 'evangelical' side: (observe in particular the word 'necessarily':) of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense: but I know no Article which 'Romanizers' have to distort so much, as *all* 'high-churchmen' have to distort this. Bishop O'Brien in his work on Faith (pp. 121—4, 389—396) argues very powerfully on the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth Articles; and ends with thus summing up the matter: There is a 'justification, which we have by faith only, (Art. XI.) which good works *follow*, (Art. XII.) which no good works precede, (Art. XIII.)' I strongly urge the passages above cited on those, who think that 'high-churchmen' can subscribe our Articles, without violently distorting, and, as I may say, dislocating them. The very phrase 'justification by faith only,' invented by Luther for his heresy, is incorporated; nay, Art. XIII. seems directly to assert that Cornelius, notwithstanding the angel's address to him, (Acts x. 4,) was no more 'meet to receive grace,' than the most proud and blinded Pharisee. I repeat it: any one who shrinks from this last atrocious and most immoral sentiment, has a far greater difficulty in subscribing Art. XIII. than I have in subscribing the most apparently anti-Roman of the number. The twenty-first Article on General Councils is curiously enough left unnoticed by the Bishop of Exeter; and numbers of 'high-churchmen' wish, I suppose, to believe that *certain* General Councils are infallible. Unless indeed we think so, we fall against another rock: for who could subscribe the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed, unless he

believed that its statements are more than mere *human* expositions of Scripture? Yet the twenty-first Article is far more difficult of explanation to such 'high-churchmen,' than the nineteenth Article ('the Church of Rome hath erred') is to me. (see p. 100.) So the notice at the end of the Communion Service is far more difficult to reconcile with *any* belief in the Real Presence of our Lord's Body, than the twenty-eighth Article with the *Roman* belief. (see p. 118.) As to the twenty-second Article ('on Purgatory,' &c.) the real distortion seems to be the *applying* it to abstract Roman doctrine at all: this seems to me quite a forced and unnatural construction: as much so as the construction which *I* put on the twelfth Article. So again a comparison of the sixth Article, the twentieth, and the twenty-first, will shew them utterly irreconcilable *in spirit* with the idea of any authorized interpreter of Scripture in times past, whether Pope, Council, or consent of the Fathers; and quite as irreconcilable with the last as with the first. Yet a Canon came out at the same time *ordering* authority to be given to the Fathers, and the Homilies exemplify the same in their language.

In some particulars 'high-churchmen' adopt a less reasonable interpretation than any others at all. For instance, the oath of supremacy may most naturally be understood as denying spiritual authority to the Pope, and *attributing* it to the King: only in Article XXXVII. the Reformers shrink back again from this; for 'ministering of the Sacraments' is precisely that prerogative in which spiritual power consists. So again it is reasonable, much more consistent with Article XXXVII., though much less consistent with the more *obvious* meaning of the oath of supremacy, to interpret the latter as Dr. Pusey interprets it, considering the word 'spiritual' in that oath to be merely synonymous with 'ecclesiastical;' like the other synonyms 'power, prince, potentate,' &c., so as merely to refer to power in the ecclesiastical courts, &c.: *temporal* power in things spiritual. But what is so absurdly untenable, is the ordinary interpretation of this oath; which introduces into an oath of *royal* supremacy a determination on the respective place of Pope and *Bishop*; which tries to

impose a yoke on our conscience, and make us believe that in that oath we *deny* something to the Pope which yet we do not *attribute* to the King. An extravagance this, which need only be stated to be refuted.

Are the Latitudinarians then better off in their subscription? Allusion to the Athanasian Creed, and to the strong language of the Prayer-book on Baptismal Regeneration, sufficiently disposes of *that* question.

In a word. I am firmly convinced that no one clergyman of our Church, who will look honestly in the face the formularies which he is called on to subscribe, will be able to subscribe them *all* in a *natural* and *straightforward* sense. I attribute this fact to the utter want of fixed religious principles displayed by the leading Reformers;^a and I attribute *to* it much of the disingenuous and unmanly spirit, which has so often been the shame of religious controversy in our Reformed Church. But how those who look on the leading Reformers as serious men, as having been zealous for doctrine, and as having realised their religious expressions, how *these* can subscribe our formularies, it is for themselves to consider.

^a Hear an admirer of the English Reformation. In that movement Dr. Arnold "used to say it was necessary, above all other historical periods, 'not to forget the *badness of the agents* in the goodness of the cause, or the goodness of the cause in the *badness of the agents.*'" Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 290.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE SUPREMACY OF CONSCIENCE IN THE PURSUIT OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

1. **ATTACKS** are continually made on integral parts of the received Christian system, which imply such a maxim as the following; viz. that a fair, and unbiassed, and searching examination of any doctrine we have been accustomed to hold, is under all ordinary circumstances a means of increasing the certainty of our religious knowledge; and that he, who when fairly challenged to the task of investigation refuses to comply, exhibits a consciousness of the weak basis on which his faith rests, and a marked deficiency in the true philosophical spirit. On this principle it must be, that the rationalist is so loud in his complaints, or so contemptuous in his comments, when—notwithstanding the very serious and numerous difficulties he succeeds in raising on the genuineness and the authority of the various books in Scripture, and the inextricable confusion in which he is able to involve the whole question of inspiration; notwithstanding the unanswerable, or at least unanswered, difficulties which he is able to place in the way of those who maintain the ancient reverence for the inspired volume;—Christians nevertheless proceed to read the Bible as devotionally, or to draw doctrinal truths from its individual texts with as much of unconcern, as much of humble and unquestioning reverence, as though he had spared himself the trouble of his deep research; and as though all the labours of the modern German school had been devoted to some subject wholly unconnected with religion,—to mathe-

matics, or to astronomy, or to gunnery. On the same principle the Socinian enlarges, with no modified feeling of contempt, on the bigotry and narrow-mindedness which the orthodox display. In vain does he put in the clearest light the difficulties which surround their doctrine; in vain does he shew them, that their tenets are simply unmeaning and self-contradictory, unless they go on to admit the whole patristic scheme of technical theology;^a and that no two things can be more openly and undeniably opposed in spirit and general bearing, than the text of the New Testament and the technicalities of the fourth century; in vain does he bring before them passage after passage in Scripture, of which it seems to him absolutely inconceivable that it could have been so worded, were the Trinitarian doctrine Apostolic; in vain does he adduce texts to shew how little *need* be understood by the high and glowing language, here and there applied to our Blessed Lord; he cannot obtain from them even a confession that there is the slightest difficulty in the matter. 'They take for granted,' he says, 'the truth of their own interpretation as unblushingly, as though they had most carefully examined the whole question for themselves, or as though the whole world agreed with them in opinion on the subject. Not one in ten thousand will so much as take the trouble to find out that there *are* any arguments on the opposite side; and of those even who go so far, not one hundredth part will take the further step, of fairly giving their mind to the task of appreciating the force of those arguments.'

Nor are similar comments confined to unbelievers. The Protestant is not less excited to anger, or contempt, or a mixture of the two, by what appears to him the strangely arrogant and inconsecutive course adopted by 'high-churchmen.' They profess, in the main, to base their belief on the faith of the primitive ages. Now it is well known that many Protestant thinkers, of most undeniable qualifications for historical research, and certainly no more (indeed much less) fairly chargeable with prejudice than 'high-churchmen,' have come

^a An observation of Mr. Blanco White's.

to conclusions on the history of these times widely different from theirs. Yet will these theologians, with unruffled brow, nay with professions on their lips of the deepest and most shrinking humility, speak of their opponents as 'unhappy men,' or 'miserable men,' or 'misguided men,' and of themselves as beyond any possible question in possession of the truth; nay more, private Christians, who do not profess to have studied the matter at all, but take their opinions on trust from others, will speak of their peculiar doctrines (e. g. the Eucharistic Presence) with as much undoubting dogmatism, as though these doctrines rested for support, not on a difficult and disputed historical inquiry, but on the clearest and simplest mathematical proof. 'What can we do with such men?' say the Protestant world; 'we drive them in argument from one position to another; yet they still confront and attack us as resolutely as ever. After all their confident and boastful language on the favourable and striking contrast afforded by their doctrines to the Roman schools, we find them—not only softening their tone every year, but—quietly giving up, one after another, points which they *had* maintained as confidently as any which they *still* maintain; nay, we find them remaining silent under the irresistible attacks of Roman theologians, and yielding them the victory without a struggle. Looking at the opposite quarter—in the midst of their assumptions on the impregnable nature of the historical ground they have occupied, we obtain from them by the way the cool admission, that at last the evidence is no more than enough to prove, that "there are three chances (so to say) for revelation, and only two against."^b And yet for all this, there they remain as pertinaciously and undoubtingly upholding their present views, and as unreservedly charging with moral culpability all departure from them, as though they had made good their historical argument to the satisfaction of all; and as though they had never hitherto been mistaken, in a single position which they confidently maintained."

Nay, the 'high-churchman' himself, who, one might have

^b Tracts for the Times, No. 85, p. 112.

thought, would have remembered the proverb about glass houses, attacks unfortunate Roman Catholics in the same strain. 'You invoke St. Mary, as the ordained channel of all grace; prove to my satisfaction from Church History your warrant for doing so. Or if you cannot, listen to me, and I will shew you, that for five, six, seven, or eight centuries' (whatever the number is) 'such a belief was never heard of in the Church. Nay, consult your Bibles, which in England your priests dare not take from you, and see that there seems an intentional harshness in the very manner in which she is addressed; as though to protest against the great heresy, which should arise in the Church in these later days under the pretence of doing her honour.'^c And when the answer he gets to such language is—the recoil of horror, and a natural and praiseworthy indignation at such a tone of language and such a line of argument, he too follows the example of the Zuinglian, the Socinian, the Rationalist; he moralizes on the narrow bigotry of the Roman Catholic Creed, and the 'superior purity of our Apostolic Church.'

It must be acknowledged, that all this affords a strong *primâ facie* presumption against the maxim in question: every one seems to act upon it, in dealing with those who believe more than himself; and every one still more plainly to neglect it, in dealing with those who believe less. Let us now proceed with other presumptions in the same direction. For that this maxim, as popularly received, is utterly false and pernicious, is perhaps the deepest conviction I entertain; and when its untenable nature has been shewn, our course will be clear, and we may proceed to consider the principles which really do lead to the acquisition of moral and religious truth. Nor should it be omitted, as a further preliminary, that although there has been perhaps generally on both sides some considerable confusion of ideas, this maxim is at bottom that very principle of private judgment, which has

^c Such words as these have, alas! been used by members of our Church, whom their high spiritual attainments have not wholly rescued from the influence of our tainted atmosphere.

been so hot a subject of debate between writers of Protestant and of Catholic sentiments.

It may be observed that the statement of this principle with which I began, is far from being either full or precise. In fact, no task is more invidious, than that of attempting to give expression to your adversary's views; and I am very glad to be spared the difficulty and responsibility of such a task, by finding it done very sufficiently to my hand. The present Archbishop of Dublin has written an essay on the subject, in which the following very plain statement is to be found: and should it appear, as I fully anticipate, axiomatic rather than paradoxical, I shall be wholly saved from an imputation very frequently cast on those who anathematize the Protestant principle; the imputation of attributing to their adversaries some extreme and distorted sentiment, that they may proceed to make therefrom very extravagant and senseless deductions, which in real truth are no necessary results of the principle itself.

The Archbishop's statement is as follows:

“ One who has an aversion to doubt and is anxious to make up his mind and come to *some* conclusion on every question that is discussed, must be content to rest many of his opinions on very slight grounds. Such a one therefore is no lover of truth, nor in the right way to attain it on any point. *He* may more reasonably hope this, who, though he may on many points perceive some (and perhaps a great) preponderance of probability on this or that side, is contented to come to a decisive conclusion only on those few, which he has been enabled thoroughly to investigate.” And a few passages earlier: “ A good man will indeed *wish* to find the evidence of the Christian religion satisfactory: but a wise man will not for that reason *think* it satisfactory, but *will weigh the evidence the more carefully, on account of the importance of the question.*”^d

I trust then that I may consider myself to have overcome the temptation to unfairness, when I state the Protestant maxim as follows:—‘it should always be the object of our careful endeavours, that our *belief*, on subjects of religion, shall be as nearly as possible proportioned to our *evidence*.’

^d Essays, (second series,) pp. 36, 24.

2. Having obtained then a sufficient *statement* of this principle, let us proceed to consider its worth.

I. The first result that it occurs to mention as flowing from the adoption of such a theory, is, that a stop would be at once put to all moral and religious action. Let us take two particular doctrines, which I therefore choose, because the denial of them is more familiar to English minds, than are fortunately the more extravagant and fanatical excesses of unbelief: let us take the Divinity of Christ, and the Eucharistic Presence. Defenders of the last doctrine ordinarily base it on tradition as well as on Scripture; defenders of the former doctrine sometimes do the same, but sometimes also they support it on the critical collation of Scripture passages. It does not at all matter for my present purpose which alternative be adopted: for in either case the truth depends on a kind of proof, generically distinct from demonstrative or mathematical reasoning. Take even the traditionary argument, which seems to admit of more certainty. When we consider the Arianism attributed by so many writers to several of the early Fathers, and the great delicacy and complexity of the task of investigating this allegation; when we consider how many learned and accomplished men have altogether denied the sufficiency of any traditionary arguments as a proof of Apostolic teaching; nay, when a writer, who has been prominent in upholding these very doctrines, and, if any, is deeply versed in primitive antiquity, says, (as just now cited,) that the historical evidence at last is only such that 'there are (so to say) three chances for revelation, and two against;' it must be the very extreme of narrow-minded bigotry to deny, that there is, at all events, much to be said on both sides; even though it be thought, on the whole, clear in which direction probability preponderates. And if any one says, that on the former subject, at least, the Scripture evidence is more decisive;—that the study of the New Testament, on the principles of exegesis, will prove, with the force of demonstration, that our Blessed Lord's Divinity is taught in the New Testament;—he only shews (what is very far from an imputation), that he has never

fairly given his mind to the arguments adduced on the Socinian side.^e

Now, not to speak here of the outrageous paradox involved in the idea, that men, immersed in worldly business, are able rightly to hold the balance between conflicting arguments of this nature, let us confine our view to the studious and philosophical. These then are not to have a *certain* conviction of the two doctrines above specified, but only a *probable* conviction: a conviction proportioned to the degree in which one side of the argument outweighs the other. Let us try and bring this strange idea home to our imaginations. Let us try and conceive a person meditating on the events in our Blessed Lord's life, while he endeavours, as a duty, to preserve in his mind an abiding impression, that the probability of His Divine Nature is three to two: or praying God through our Lord's merits, under the consideration urged by the Archbishop, that it is, at all events, the safer course to do so, and that there is, moreover, a preponderance of probability, that his words have a meaning. The very idea of so much as the possibility of all this is so wild, that we cannot form any sober conception of its hypothetical

^e Consider, for instance, (as I urged in the article on Mr. Goode, p. 73,) how such a passage as John x. 34—36, must strike those not previously prepossessed in favour of our Lord's Divinity, not merely as in itself opposed to that doctrine, but also as taking away the effect of other texts which might else appear to support it; for it appears to shew that our Lord Himself claims the appellation 'God,' and yet claims it only in a figurative sense. We shall see more plainly how natural would be this effect of the text, by observing how precisely in the same manner (as observed in Mr. Newman's Sermons, vol. vi. p. 161,) Protestants pervert the parallel passage, John vi. 63, into an explaining away of His declarations on the Real Presence. I alluded in the same article to such other texts as Luke ii. 52; Mark xiii. 32; John xx. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 28; while the *negative* evidence would strike such unhappy persons still more forcibly. Mr. B. White again adopts the following argument:—'is it conceivable that if the Apostles preached in public our Lord's Divinity, the unbelieving Jews would not have put, *in the very front ground* of their objections, the apparent interference of such a belief with the doctrine of the Divine Unity, to which they were so zealously devoted? And does not the total absence of such objection prove to demonstration, that no such doctrine *was* preached in public?' I confess that this argument appears to me extremely forcible, as against those who deny that the Apostles *reserved* this great doctrine; that they unfolded it only by degrees to their converts.

results; and again, there is the most imminent danger of appearing irreverent ourselves, in the straightforward exposition of an irreverent theory started by others. Still as it is very important that my readers should understand this principle in its true light, let me ask, how could an earnest and eager love for our Blessed Lord grow up in a Christian, whose belief should be so fantastically ordered? nay, how could it be even *safe* for one so minded to give himself up to such a feeling, bound as he is ever to remember the adverse probability (two chances to three) that the solemn doctrine which sanctions that love is *not* true? Any one who, from his habit of mind, is exposed to such temptations, knows very well the misery he experiences from sceptical thoughts: he knows how their intrusion falls like ice upon his heart; and threatens to paralyze all vigorous and healthy action of the moral nature. A right-minded person indeed, on the moment, by prayer and an exercise of the will, aims at their violent expulsion; and the principle shall be presently stated, on which this prayer and these efforts *are* his duty. But should he, in their stead, resort to the means of argument, and inquiry, and careful deliberation, the necessary result must be, that in the place of a momentary chill, there would grow up a callous insensibility of heart to all the wonders of Redeeming Love; and those doubts, which at their first coming *threatened*, by their continued presence would *enforce*, a final abandonment of Christian action and devotion.

In like manner, those who rest their belief in the Catholicity of the English Church on private judgment, that is, on an examination (in person or by proxy) of historical and ecclesiastical arguments, are involved in the same dilemma. They cannot, for very shame, say that the proof from those grounds is simply demonstrative: they may say that such objections as those contained for example in the fourth chapter of this work, have by no means the same force in their eyes that they have in mine; but they cannot say that they have *no force whatever*: they cannot say, that our deficiency in all regular provision for moral discipline,—our

toleration, or rather encouragement, of almost omnigenous heterodoxy,—our loss of all visible union, nay, sympathy, with those which we claim as sister-churches,—they cannot say that these considerations are of no weight at all, when the question is to be decided on the principles of Antiquity. The arguments then *for* our Catholicity outweigh the arguments *against* it, in some definite and proximately ascertainable proportion; and those therefore who profess to rest their belief *on* those arguments, are bound to attend the Lord's Table in our Churches, not with a simple, undoubting *belief* that they there receive His Body and Blood; that would, on such views, be utterly unreasonable: no, but with an *opinion* that they receive this Gift; an opinion, the strength of which must be adjusted to the balance of evidence in its favour. I look up, of course, far too lovingly and respectfully to many English 'high-churchmen,' to doubt for a moment that they would indignantly repudiate such an unreal and hollow mockery of all religion as this absurd fancy; but what does this prove, except the very point for which I am so anxious? it proves that they radically and fundamentally misstate, in their intellectual exposition, the real nature and quality of their spiritual conviction; that they profess to build on history and antiquity, while they really and truly adopt no such (in result) Antichristian and immoral course, but build on *conscience* and on *faith*?

II. Next let me draw attention to an acknowledged principle of human nature; viz. that persons are utterly unable to form an unbiassed judgment, on questions in which their feelings are really and deeply interested. To some who are so affected, the strongest arguments will appear worthless and contemptible; to others, the weakest will appear sufficient grounds for disquiet and alarm: nay, frequently the same person will be swayed to and fro, between the former state of mind and the latter. The most able and accomplished physician loses all his power of judgment and true discernment, when the question is, whether the child, in whom all his hopes and affections are centred, be really on the bed of death. Or, to take a still closer parallel, the miser, who

year after year has devoted all the powers of his mind to the one purpose of accumulating wealth, may be at times visited with dismal and oppressive doubts, whether the object have been worth the labour; while at other times the same object rises up before his imagination, clothed in the most dazzling colours of reality and attractiveness: but who would look to him for a calm and dispassionate summing up of the evidence on both sides, and a decision *upon* that evidence, as to the existence and worth of that supposed good to which he has devoted his life? Now it is plain that the utmost devotion to wealth, which miser ever displayed, cannot even admit of comparison with that devotion to heavenly treasure, which is the Christian's true wisdom. The self-sacrifice of the very highest Saint in the Christian Church, whose life has been given us in detail and full particulars, falls *short* surely of that, which plain reason would dictate on the hypothesis of Christianity being true. Here then we see another instance of the hollowness of Archbishop Whately's strange theory, that we should *act* indeed on the safer side, but *believe* according to the evidence. To act on the safer side, will make it impossible to form a *judgment* on the evidence: unless the Archbishop supposes, contrary to the experience and the dicta of all mankind, that when a certain object has been, and is, the one absorbing, animating principle of a man's every thought, feeling, and action, he is in a condition to balance evidence on the trustworthiness of that object;—that we may expect a philosophical view on the value of glory, from a commander flushed with conquest and pursuing his successes,—or of physical knowledge, from one who has devoted every waking hour of his life to its pursuit. So much as this is plain on the surface, (though much more may be said with truth,)—that in order to form a judgment on the external evidence, whether of Christianity, or our Lord's Divinity, or our Church's Catholicity, we must, by a violent effort, suspend for some considerable time the stress and impetus of our Christian action; that we must lie on our oars, as it were, till we have become cool; that we must cease for the time to pray God in the name of Christ,

cease to look to Him as God for protection when temptations assail us, cease to seek strength in our Church's ordinances against the world, the flesh, and the devil.

III. Further ; were this principle of private judgment true, not the good but the clever, not the spiritual but the intellectual, not the heavenly-minded but the well-educated, would be the real originators of moral and religious truth ; the real fountains, whence its streams flow forth to the world. Those would best know whether to accept or reject Christianity, who by natural power and acquired habit are best fitted to deal with historical investigations ; those would best know whether or not to worship Christ as God, who are greatest proficient in Hellenistic Greek ; those would best know whether to remain in our Church or to leave it, who have the greatest genius in applying principles and understanding facts. And the poor and uneducated in every country, in every age, would be drifted at random from one belief into another, according to the accidental bias of the philosophical world for the time being. The very idea of such a dispensation fills me with such horror and detestation, that I should not perhaps be able, even were it necessary, to discuss it calmly ; I borrow therefore with great gratification a passage from a most able and thoughtful article, in an old number of the *British Critic*.

‘ Now it certainly would involve great disadvantages, if moral knowledge was gained by mere intellectual processes. Uneducated people would be more unable than ever to judge themselves between right and wrong, and those who were most capable of guiding them would not necessarily be inclined to guide them right, nay, by that very knowledge would be enabled more easily to guide them wrong. Much knowledge of good would be wasted on men who did not wish to profit by it ; and clever persons, without much energy of character, would be overwhelmed by seeing at once the extent of that change of nature which they had to effect in themselves if they were to conform themselves to what was really right.

‘ Now, so far as moral discrimination is acquired by practice and not by reasoning, these imperfections are avoided. Viewed as a means of improvement for ourselves, knowledge is given where it will be

used ; of power over others, where it will not be misused ;—viewed as a blessing, it is given to the deserving ;—viewed as a trial, it is accommodated to the infirmity of the weak.

‘ And on the other hand, who are they who require the brand of ignorance to mark them in the sight of their fellow-creatures, who deserve to be left without knowledge of any thing beyond their own miserable desires, but those who have refused to obey such knowledge ? What wiser, and what juster, and what more really merciful law, than that man shall not be able to receive into his head what he will not receive into his heart also ? What less to be wondered at, than the sentence, dreadful as it is, that if man hardens his will, God will harden his intellect against truth ? Surely the true difficulty in the world, if we are to find one, is not that such a law exists, but that it does not exist more exclusively. Surely it is only the unwarrantable value which is set on intellect in this particular age, which prevents us from seeing how very strange it would be, if knowledge of this kind were given only, or even chiefly, to the wise in this world, to the sharp, clear-headed, and argumentative, and not to the humble and conscientious lover of goodness ? What business would they have with such advantages ?’^f

IV. These considerations will, I hope, be sufficient to alarm several most excellent persons who have unawares committed themselves to this spurious philosophy, and to induce them to reconsider the question and retrace their steps. But more extreme disciples of the school will be even confirmed by them in their evil ways of thinking : for as to the last argument, they will say, that they consider nothing more desirable than for intellectual philosophers to be acknowledged as the oracles of moral and religious truth : and as to the two former, those only furnish an additional reason for what they have long held,—the unreasonableness of any firm belief in revealed religion ; “ a belief,” said one of their number,^g “ which I will *then* entertain, when I see a message from God written on the sun.” Such topics as I have already mentioned do not affect the trustworthiness of

^f British Critic for January, 1841, pp. 35, 6.

^g I think, Paine.

their intellectual arguments; and it is on these, as on an impregnable ground, that they take their stand. It *will* be however an imputation on their intellectual acumen, if they be shewn inconsistent with themselves. This therefore I shall next attempt to do; taking in an inverse order the four classes with which I started.

To those then who call on the Roman Catholic to produce, from Scripture or Antiquity, definite and tangible grounds for his belief in the universality of St. Mary's intercession, I would say,—have you ever thought of producing definite and tangible grounds, from Scripture and Antiquity, for *your own* articles of belief? That you have read both Scripture and Antiquity, and seen much which coincides with your views, I do not deny; but we know very well, that if all the evidence bearing on a subject were produced in Court ever so fully, yet if Counsel were heard only on one side, there is not much doubt of the decision. Many learned and most able men have thought, that there is no sufficient evidence from Antiquity for the Apostolic origin of the principal doctrines you hold; many other learned and most able men have thought, that there *is* evidence from Antiquity for the indivisibility and infallibility of the Church in every age, and her power therefore, in any century, of developing new results (about St. Mary or any other subject), and imposing^b them on her children. You have been habituated probably for many years in a view of history distinct from either; it is perfectly idle and absurd therefore to imagine that you can really judge of the evidence, unless, by a sustained and prolonged effort of the imagination, you have supposed yourselves in the respective position of your opponents, and have endeavoured to read the examples and innumerable facts of the time from *their* point of view. Unless you have done this on principle, and not once only but repeatedly, it is ridiculous to say that you ground your opinions on Antiquity. If you will not accept the high ground of

^b It must not be supposed from this, that the Roman Church *has* imposed on her children the belief that St. Mary is the ordained channel of all grace; it is a very general subject of belief with them, but no article of faith.

conscience, nothing is left for you but the low ground of *prejudice*. Will you answer that not one man in a million is capable of the task I suppose? I think you have understated the matter; and should doubt if a man ever lived who was competent to perform it.¹ This however is no

¹ The argument from Antiquity of the 'high-churchman' with one class of his opponents, I have drawn out at some little length in the *British Critic*, and shall beg leave to append it.

'First, let it be observed, that the question which he is to consider is one of *history*; a science whose real difficulties, uncertainties, and perplexities are every day more clearly seen, and of which we predict that it will be one triumph achieved by the present generation, that its real nature will be more fully understood. It is getting more and more to be perceived, that the historian requires not merely a profound, accurate, and most miscellaneous knowledge of facts; not merely a great measure of what is commonly called "knowledge of the world," by which is meant an ever energizing insight into the motives of action, the sentiments, the habits, the tendencies, of the crowd of ordinary men (though this is indeed indispensable); if he is to be really such, he needs much more than this; he needs even more absolutely a deep and penetrating knowledge of the innermost recesses of the human heart. The real movers of great events are ordinarily great men; he must have then a glowing appreciation and hearty sympathy for greatness; he must be able fully to recognise, understand, and assign to its due place in the scene of life, the eccentricities of genius, the waywardness of keen sensibility. Then the subtle influence of mind upon mind, the process whereby national character is formed, or again whereby each several age is distinguished by that assemblage of notions and instincts peculiar to itself, which by so universal and felicitous a figure is called its atmosphere; this is closely connected with the deepest metaphysical problems, and yet meets the historian at every step, as one of the very principal facts, which claim his recognition, comprehension, and explanation. But in ecclesiastical history, the powers of mind he requires are even rarer, by how much he has to do with a more unfathomable element, and with phenomena less open to the ordinary view. Who shall analyse the secret communings of the holy and mortified soul with its God? Yet of this kind are the materials which have even the principal share in those events, which are the objects of his science.

'To shew this more in detail, take the case of an inquirer pursuing the investigation marked out for him in this sermon. (Dr. Jelf's 'Via Media.') First will come the necessary task of obtaining a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of all the religious writings and proceedings of the period. This, if he includes the fourth and fifth centuries (which he must do if he is to defend, on historical grounds, the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, as our Church receives them) will, with indefatigable diligence, be the labour of many years. Next comes the task of penetrating below the surface of these words and actions, and imprinting on his mind a vivid and accurate picture of the whole current of religious thought and feeling then prevalent; to the achievement of this he will direct all his powers of analysis and of imagination, nor can he place any con-

fault of mine, but of the worthless principle you desire to maintain.

Now let me ask the ordinary Protestant ;—have you ever carefully and deliberately, as in the sight of God, endeavoured to understand the method of Scripture interpretation on which the Socinian relies? Have you endeavoured to do justice to his reasons for not seeing what you see in the passages to which *you* appeal, and to apprehend clearly and distinctly the light in which he regards those to which *he*

fidence in the success of his efforts, until he arrive at a view, which shall bear with it this argument for its truth, that he will see all the religious sayings and doings of the period, as natural and obvious results, which might on the whole have been even predicted to follow from this their supposed habit of mind, when taken in connection with their outward circumstances. But every age, as every individual, has numberless peculiarities of its own, quite irrespectively of its religious creed: there are ten thousand modes of thought, of expression, and of action, which would have existed had a revelation never been given; which, though indefinitely affected by its influence, still exist altogether independently, and can be in no way called part of it: while on the other hand, those very truths, which the revelation has brought to light, will be necessarily viewed through the colouring of this medium, and will, according to all probability, be carried by the unanimous consent of the age into certain consequences, which, true or not, were yet never part of *revealed* truth. Now it will be remembered that Dr. Jelf has not sanctioned the principle of considering *Church decrees* as the appointed method, to assist us in separating the divine from the human element, in distinguishing the doctrines which are ever to remain part of the Church's heritage from temporary and (to use such an expression) *relative* opinions. Hence our inquirer will next have to discover for himself, as best he may, the nature and extent of this human element; he must study deeply the contemporaneous philosophy, the poetry (so far as it exists), laws, institutions, language, the habits of mind in which converts from heathenism have been educated, and the whole range of similar disturbing forces; for the effects of these must be all deducted from the received opinions and practices of the time, in order that we may be at last presented with real, vital, unadulterated Christianity. When this process has been adequately performed for the ages which Dr. Jelf considers pure, it must be repeated all over again for those which he considers corrupt; and the comparison then made between the two *residua*, in order that the final question may be resolved, whether the latter be a legitimate and true development of the former. Merely to state this is of course sufficiently to expose the extravagance, amounting almost to insanity, which could consider one poor, frail, fallible man competent to such a task; sufficient to shew how presumptuous, beyond our ordinary conceptions of the possible extent of human audacity, will be his procedure, who shall think of taking up a position for himself apart from all early associations, and of criticising one whole age of saints by his personal comparison of them with another.' 'On Church Authority,' pp. 217-19.

appeals? Have you, as a matter of principle, read Socinian books of controversy with serious and methodical attention? Have you, in short, contended by every possible way against the misleading effects of those prepossessions, in which you have been so carefully educated? If not, surely the texts you adduce are not really the *grounds* of your belief; the two are as it were stereotyped in your mind together; you learn your doctrines, and you learn the texts to prove them, just like an undergraduate preparing for examination. And with what front then can you blame the ‘high-churchman,’ for regarding as little *your* Scripture arguments against our Lord’s Presence in the Eucharist, as you do the *Socinian’s* against His Divine Nature?

And joining ordinary Protestant *with* Socinian, let me farther ask them:—Have you fairly investigated the origin and authority of the Bible? Have you done every justice to Schleiermacher’s view, and Paulus’s view, and Strauss’s view? Or, otherwise, how can you blame those who believe, as you think, without *Scripture* proof, when you believe Scripture itself without *any* proof? You will answer, perhaps, that the Bible commends itself to your conscience: a very excellent answer indeed, but one that suits strangely with your philosophy. If the Bible commend itself to the conscience of one, why may not the Eucharistic Presence to that of a second, and the doctrines about St. Mary to that of a third? You are bound then to give some *note* whereby the dictates of the conscience may be truly discerned, or some proof why your conscience is good and your neighbour’s bad. If any note or proof of this can really be devised, except that which it has been throughout my one great object to enforce, —the keeping of the commandments of God,—it will surprise me not a little.

And now to consider the school itself of Schleiermacher, or of Paulus, or of Strauss. Surely if *they* proceed on unconsidered presumptions, they are of all men the most unreasonable: for it is their very boast that they probe things to the bottom: and it is the very reproach they cast upon others, that the world at large proceeds on an unreasoning

faith. Now in all their criticisms on the Sacred Volume, they assume of course, as a matter beyond dispute, the doctrines of *Theism*: I would ask, have they ever systematically examined those doctrines? have they ever made the deliberate and methodical attempt,—to resist the incalculable influence which they well know must be exercised on their judgment by all the prejudices of early habit and education,—to do full justice, both in their reason and in their imagination, to such arguments and sentiments, e.g., as those of M. Comte,—and in fine, only to believe in God with that degree of belief, which the preponderance of argument on that side justifies? And even supposing them to have done this; have they done the same as to the first principles of morality? ‘*Naturam expellas,*’ &c., man *cannot* bring himself to this. Philosophers examine the question, perhaps, whether Christian humility be really a virtue, and *assume* in the discussion that justice, liberality, veracity, are such; yet what ground have they for this belief more than for that, except the mere accident that, in their time and country, one has been brought into question and not the other? Let me repeat a quotation I made in the *British Critic*, to shew the result of this principle, according to the confession of a very friend to the Reformation.

“The Reformation (which was the vehement protest that authority was no longer the ground of belief, but that reason alone could claim that title) had stirred all minds to new and vigorous action; and the philosophy of Descartes is the most striking product of the newly enfranchised reason. Dissatisfied both with the scepticism and dogmatism he saw around him; unable to find any firm ground in any of the prevalent systems; *distracted by doubts of every thing high or low, holy or trivial*; mistrusting the conclusions of his own understanding, and seeing that his own senses often deceived him; he resolved to make his mind a *tabula rasa*, and reconstruct his knowledge. He resolved *to examine the pretensions of every conclusion, and to believe nothing but upon the clear evidence of his reason*. He began by universal doubt. He not only cleared his mind of all his previous stock of opinions, but *pursued his doubts to the very verge of self-annihilation.*”^j

^j *Westminster Review* for May, 1843, p. 383.

V. And now let us seriously consider, to the best of our ability, the chief question of all: how much knowledge should we really possess, if this principle were consistently carried out? Consider the solemn truth, Theism, of which I have been just speaking,—what are the grounds on which we receive it? Now I will allow for the moment far greater force than I believe justly due, to the argument from final causes; and I will waive also the reasoning which I used in p. 276, to shew the *necessity* of consulting conscience for so much as the very idea of God. Still Paley's argument cannot at all events be considered to prove much more than God's Power and Wisdom; qualities which in fact we believe Satan to possess in great excellence. But what are those attributes of God which really interest ourselves as moral and rational agents? Goodness, (I mean, His being the perfect Concentration and Embodiment of our scattered and unconnected ideas of the good and the beautiful,) Justice, Mercy. Now when we consider the fearful amount of suffering, mental and bodily, which exists in every direction, even after giving its fullest weight to Paley's ingenious plea, we cannot profess, with the slightest colour or plausibility, that from the Visible Creation alone we should obtain a belief in the Creator's infinite love for man and for His creatures; while those other attributes, Goodness and Justice, have nothing even commensurate with such arguments as Paley adduces. And, in the last place, where in the natural world shall we see indications of God's *Personality*?^k Accordingly, it is, I fancy, universally acknowledged by thinkers of the present day, that we must look to our moral nature for such a real and convincing proof as we are in search of. Nor can there be a more satisfactory response than we shall obtain from that nature; I believe, without any admixture of doubt, that he who lives daily in the thought and fear of God, and presses forward in all virtuous and godly living, has a *knowledge* of God's existence, which belongs to a kind, not less than infinitely more certain and direct than any other kind of knowledge whatever. But then a religious Catholic has the

^k See Newman's University Sermons, pp. 23, 24.

very same, on the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, and of its necessary complement the Eucharistic Presence; and, moreover, it rests at all events with 'high-churchmen' to shew, that the Roman Catholics may not have a similar knowledge of various doctrines connected with the Blessed Virgin.

It may be said indeed that Catholic believers have sometimes confessed to the occasional intrusion of doubts; and I confessed this myself, two or three pages back. But these were doubts which, even when present, differ in kind from the certainty which we feel, and which, paradoxical as it may appear, have no real power to overcloud it: for *they* are addressed to the intellect or the imagination; while the spiritual *knowledge* is seated in the spiritual nature. If they are treated, indeed, not as trials or temptations, but as just and lawful arguments which we are to ponder and consider; in other words, if we suspend that course of moral and religious action, which calls forth into distinct and unmistakeable consciousness the dictates of our spiritual nature; then I fully acknowledge that they may overthrow the firmest faith: which is precisely tantamount to acknowledging, that a continued admission of angry thoughts will overthrow the deepest patience. All this, however, may be more fitly considered hereafter; the matter I wish now to urge is, that doubts of the very same kind frequently knock for admittance, on Theism as well as on Trinitarianism, on God's mercy as well as on Christ's Atonement. It may be perhaps true, that at a time like the present doubts on the latter subject are more frequent. If so, this is only because belief in a God is universal, at least on the surface of Society, while the disbelief of many in the Atonement is matter of notoriety: so that—both our *imagination* is more impressed with the uncertainty of the latter, because we know that it is not considered certain; and our *understanding* is perplexed with its difficulties, because we have been in the way of hearing them. But this, even if true, shews no real difference between the basis on which the respective doctrines rest: had we lived five centuries ago, we should have as little

dreamed of doubting the Trinity as the Unity ; should things go on in their present course for two centuries more, unquestioning belief of the latter will be as difficult as it is now of the former. And certainly, if I may speak from my own personal experience, being by temperament exposed to the irruptions of speculative doubt, I must fairly say that the case is not with me as the objection supposes. I have had not a few visitations of intellectual and imaginative perplexity on Theism, though even when upon me their shadowy and unreal nature was very obvious, and they did not even *tend*, as I have said, to affect my most unclouded, most certain, most undoubting, conviction of that great truth. But I have never had, since I turned my mind to the subject, even in this form, even as addressed to the imagination or understanding, *any* doubt, that *if* Theism be true, (that is, if the spiritual nature may be trusted,) Trinitarianism is true, and Sabellianism, Arianism, Nestorianism, are in various ways God-denying heresies, and St. Mary is the highest and purest of all creatures, and so with other doctrines that might be named.

But now let me draw out an incidental observation in the last paragraph. I said lately, that a habit of energetic obedience and devotion will supply us with a spiritual and infinitely certain knowledge of this fundamental doctrine of all true religion. But it is a very different question indeed, whether such knowledge be attainable, even with all the help derivable from internal consciousness, on the principle of private judgment,—on the principle of requiring examination before action, and proof before belief. It is most difficult indeed to try the question with so much as an approximation to fairness and reality ; for so distinct and unequivocal is Nature's protest against this outrageous extravagance, that the habit of belief is most deeply rooted in our mind from our very earliest years, while the idea of examination and the search for proof enters not at all till at a far later period, and then very partially and disproportionately. It is not difficult, however, to see, that if the real proof of Theism must be found, where I have placed it, in moral and religious action, he who has grown up to

maturity without that safeguard, has within himself no really stable proof on which he may rely. It follows then, that if he be in the small number of those intellectually gifted men, who are able *really* to inquire into the grounds of their hereditary belief, (instead of *playing* at inquiry, while in fact they merely learn by heart a parrot-like repetition of professed arguments, and rest on the authority of others, for their proof as well as for their doctrine,) if he be in this small number, and if he have not the grace to discern the ridiculous incompetency for such inquiries which his bad habits have entailed on him,—he must fairly give up all belief in Theism to its full extent: he must content himself with an uncertain and wavering suspicion, that there *may* probably be an unseen world beyond this visible sphere; and that the marks of design, observable in the universe, have probably some other origin than the unbending agency of natural laws. But of what nature this unseen world may be, or this mysterious agency, are questions, he will add, which it is our wisdom to put from us, as admitting of no solution while we remain subject to the conditions of time and space.

But let a man have grown up in habits of constant prayer, of the fear and of the love of God, and thus penetrated to his very innermost heart with a sense of his Personality and His Attributes; will it follow that even such a believer as this, should he be led captive in his mature years by this spurious and worldly philosophy, should he be tempted to exercise *bonâ fide* the Protestant's highest prerogative of consciously examining the grounds of his belief, will be able to retain that belief in its full security and completeness? It must be carefully observed indeed, that the very circumstance of his *possessing* this evidence must be attributed to a practical neglect of his present theory; for it has been obtained by a faithful and undoubting obedience to God's commands, exercised previously to any inquiry on *His* nature and *their* obligation. Then again, his power of fairly estimating the testimony borne to religious truth by his inward nature, will be indefinitely impeded by the well-known constitution of our mind, that 'those thoughts

which are most really precious, shrink back, as it were, the more from observation, in proportion to the intensity of the effort made to gaze fixedly upon them.’^k But this is very far from being the most efficacious instrument employed by Satan, to hide religious truth from the inquirer. The one phenomenon in the whole world most hateful to him and to his ministers, as I have urged throughout the work, is a course of consistent obedience against the influence of passion and temptation. Now in proportion as any one masters the theory of private judgment, which so many profess without mastering, or rather indeed with the deepest ignorance of its real nature,—he suspends that very course, in order that he may inquire into its warrant and no longer prosecute it in blind faith. Indeed, as I urged some way back, and as is quite plain, he cannot inquire with any thing like impartiality, until he shall have for some time discontinued any vigorous course of action *presupposing* that doctrine, which is to be the *subject* of inquiry.^l He gives Satan then in his own case that very advantage, which of all others the latter most ardently seeks; he gives him in his own case that fulcrum, by means of which, were it universally given him, he could move the world from all genuine knowledge of God. From the moment this course ceases, the course of earnest obedience, habitual prayer, continual thought of God, unceasing reference to future judgment, from that moment belief in God is not a *present consciousness*, but the result of memory and of reflection; while those difficulties, from the intellect or the imagination, which had been chained down and unable to stir under the force of religious action,—that being removed—break their bonds, and start up before the mind, fearful in their stature and alarming in their menaces.^m And

^k On ‘Mill’s Logic,’ p. 390.

^l See pp. 490—492. I wish the reader would, in this place, look over that paragraph again; as illustrating my present position: viz. that in order to examine the evidence for religious truth, we *must* cease some sufficient time from religious action; and that by ceasing from religious action, we *lose* the evidence itself. Hence a real examination of the evidence is simply impossible.

^m ‘I believe that any one *can make himself an atheist speedily* by breaking off his own personal communion with God and Christ.’ ‘When a man’s religious practice

as day after day the same principle is allowed, the memory of past religious experience becomes fainter and more uncertain, and the difficulties, of which I speak, more definite in their lineaments and consistent in their mutual relations; while, for want of the accustomed motives to self-discipline, the standard of morality becomes daily lower, and the power of acting even on his low standard becomes daily weaker: until he is tempted into that delusion, the very favourite snare spread by Satan for men of powerful and irreligious minds,ⁿ the attribution of the clear voice of conscience to highly wrought feelings, or to morbid imagination, or to unfounded traditionary impression. Unless, before it be too late, the unhappy victim feel the misery of his case, abandon with terror and with anathema private judgment, that great principle of the Reformation, and cling *in faith* to his early creed, that once more by prayer and obedience he may learn to know and realise the presence of God,—unless he be so favoured, what awaits him, except a gloomy and cheerless scepticism, and the indescribable misery of sinking farther, day by day, first from good habits, and next from good desires?

An argument in all respects precisely similar admits of being carried out, on our knowledge of *duty*, of there being such a thing as ‘right and wrong.’

It would appear then, from what has been said, that the Protestant principle, consistently adopted, must lead us to M. Comte’s philosophy; it must lead us, so it would appear, to hold that the invisible world is radically inaccessible to our faculties; that ‘God’ is a word to express ‘not our ideas, but our want of them;’^o and that if we are wise,

has degenerated, when he has been less watchful of himself, and less constant and earnest in his devotions . . . his impression of God’s real existence, *which is kept up by practical experience*, becomes fainter and fainter; and in this state of things *it is merely an accident* that he remains nominally a Christian.’ Dr. Arnold’s *Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 56, and vol. i. p. 280.

ⁿ A memorable lesson to those, who, having neither powerful *nor* wholly irreligious minds, dabble some little way in the same philosophy, and require intellectual proof for religious principles and doctrines.

^o This is a sentiment of the elder Mr. Mill’s, in his ‘*Analysis of the human mind*.’

we shall confine ourselves to those branches of knowledge which are realities and not illusions,—those, namely, which are conversant wholly with phenomena, and which are advanced by means of a further acquaintance with those fixed and unalterable laws which regulate the universe. But is this really so? or how can we possibly *know* that fixed and unalterable laws regulate the universe? I know no more wonderful fact in the whole history of philosophy, than the simple, easy, natural, unsuspecting manner, in which M. Comte, after having declaimed and argued against all *à priori* ideas, subsides as a matter of course into the *à priori* idea of *fatalism*. What, let me ask, do we know about *fate*, on his principles, any more than about *God*? about fixed and unalterable laws of phenomenal succession, any more than about regular and undeviating principles of moral government? So necessary to all science is the assumption of some first principle; and so stupid and contemptible may be the intellectual exhibition presented by the most powerful minds, when influenced by the narrow bigotry of unbelief.

Waiving however the ‘*argumentum ad hominem*,’ it is really of great importance seriously to consider the question, whether we *have* any means of knowing, what all experimentalists assume *without* proof as a *locus standi*, that nature proceeds, not in a capricious and arbitrary course, but on definite and established laws; laws which may accordingly be a subject for investigation and for gradual discovery. Now whether or no we have at present any really sufficient proof of this, it is virtually confessed by Mr. John Mill himself, the prominent champion of experimental science and of free inquiry, that when first physical investigation began, there was *not* sufficient proof; he confesses that the proof, which we now have, is owing to the discoveries made by those, who believed the principle *before* it was proved.^p Let this be observed: physical science, the very result and energizing testimonial, as it is generally considered, of the principle of free inquiry, could not have had existence except for

^p *Logic*, vol. ii. pp. 114, 15.

the principle of faith: belief without proof is the very basis on which it has been reared.

But have we *now* sufficient proof of this, and of what nature? From the progress which physical science has made under the assumption of this principle,—from the very great number of seemingly unconnected facts which it has succeeded in grouping together, and of apparent exceptions to general laws which it has been able to explain,—let us grant it to have been made in the highest degree probable, that from remote antiquity up to this time there have been established laws of nature. Now does this, by itself, warrant so much as even the faintest presumption, that such law will continue, and so consequently that physical science can at any given moment be prosecuted with reasonable hope of a true result? Surely as useless as would be the experience of external phenomena, unless we had the *à priori* idea of space wherein to locate them,—just so unavailable for any practical conclusion would be the knowledge of past uniformity, except for the *à priori* idea we possess, that consistency, harmony, regularity, are in themselves heavenly and majestic qualities, and specially appropriate to the works of God. Suppose two persons, one having an ear for music, and the other totally destitute of it, were both listening to a symphony; the former would consider himself warranted in confidently expecting the continuation of harmony, while the latter would be in no way surprised by a sudden change into the most barbarous and clashing dissonance.⁹ And, in like manner, the most constant experience of undeviating regularity in the course of nature up to this time, would be no ground whatever for expecting its continuance, except to those who should perceive something of itself more admirable in order than in disorder, in harmonious government of the whole than in the chance and random dispersion of parts. Will it be said, that this natural judgment of mankind would be itself one of the premises on which free inquiry would ground its con-

⁹ This illustration is borrowed and adapted from Archbishop Whately in his notes on King's 'Predestination'.

clusion? I ask, how is it to be shewn, that such a judgment has any real value or authority? Grant us indeed the principles of Theism, or the trustworthiness of conscience, and the whole is plain enough; but excluding these, how can we possibly form even a conjecture whether this sentiment, however universal, may not have its origin in these very fixed laws of the universe, or in the accidental disposition of phenomena, or in the handywork of some lying spirit who implants it in order to deceive?

Have we now carried to its extreme point the scepticism in which free inquiry must plunge us? By no means. For what warrant have we for trusting our mental faculties, unless there be one in their number which is cognizant of eternal truth? To take one instance, where the conception of the difficulty will be less bewildering perhaps than in others—on what ground do we trust our *memory*? ‘There is no one thing’ on such a principle ‘of which we are absolutely certain, except our *present* consciousness. *That* doubtless admits of no error; that at this moment of time I am writing, that my mind is occupied with certain ideas, that when I look at my desk I perceive the colour of green, that on looking up I receive an immediate impression which I take to be that of distance, that I believe in a certain chain of events as being those of my past life,—all this is the mere statement of a matter of fact; but when I proceed beyond this, when I think that those events really had existence, when, e. g., I call to mind that an hour ago I was taking a walk and pursuing a certain train of thought, much more when I *infer* from past remembrances that walking is good for health, and also for thinking, and so on, for anything that the argument from experience has to tell me to the contrary, how can I know that I am not the victim of some miserable and complete delusion? how can I know that an hour since I was not seated on Mount Vesuvius, or carried beyond the bounds of space and time?’^p Grant indeed the doctrines of Theism, and we cannot be wrong in trusting the faculties which God has given us;^q but then these doc-

^p ‘On Mill’s Logic,’ p. 371.

^q See Newman’s University Sermons, p. 351.

trines, as I just now argued, depend, for their establishment, on the renouncement pro tanto of free inquiry, and on the adoption of the principle of faith. And this brings me to the climax of the argument. *If* faith be admitted, the whole structure of Catholic doctrine rests on a basis which cannot be shaken; and if it be denied, we have no reason for believing so much, as that we were in existence one minute ago.

3. It is very plain then that the principle of private judgment,—of proportioning belief as far as possible to evidence,—cannot be accepted as a full account of the process which leads to moral and religious truth. That it has a place, and that an important one, I am far from denying; but it has not the *chief* place. And so long as it is acknowledged that no sight in the world is more contemptible than a boaster who fails egregiously in those very qualities which have *been* his boast, it must also be acknowledged that those who have allowed themselves in a spirit of scoffing derision at the ‘credulity’ of Catholics,—while *their* whole studies have taken for granted the trustworthiness of our intellectual faculties and the permanence of the laws of nature,—that these men are far more appropriate objects of contempt and ridicule, as having professed free inquiry to be their very *forte*: or rather that they *would* be objects for this, ‘except that on so awfully serious a subject the sense of the lamentable overpowers that of the ridiculous.’ M. Comte sneers at M. de Maistre, half-bitterly, half-compassionately, for invoking the Blessed Virgin; what prevents Christians from returning in kind his self-complacent arrogance, except that on the one hand religion inculcates humility, and that on the other hand Atheism is so fearful an exhibition of Satan, that we may not ridicule even its intellectual blunders?

Let me now endeavour to sketch in its elements the antagonist principle of *faith*, to shew its reasonableness, and to trace the progress by which it leads to truth.

In the British Critic I have advocated in some detail the position, that a habit of acting throughout the day under a sense of responsibility, of doing what we think right *because* we think so,—that this habit, as it grows up within us, in an

illimitably increasing extent purifies and illuminates the conscience.^r Over and above this, it has another very important effect; that of humbling the mind, and disposing it to look in all directions for external guidance. A study of the visible universe tends to engender pride: for we obtain a continually deeper knowledge of the laws by which it is governed;^s and we are thus able to influence or make use of it more efficaciously for our own purposes, by summoning the phenomena, as it were, before the tribunal of our intellect, collecting and weighing evidence, balancing probabilities, and pronouncing a verdict according to the result of our inquiry. The visible world seems placed around us, as it were, for the very purpose of being made subject to our arbitrary and despotic investigations and researches: we examine what part of it we please, and when we please; every day we receive fresh indications of the supremacy of the intellect and the sovereignty of man.^t But a course of moral action leads us to know the existence of *realities* and of *essences*, as opposed to mere shadows and phenomena; it leads us to know that, wholly without those limits of space and time which bound the intellect, there exists an Objective Somewhat,—call it, if you please, Moral Truth; that the real form and lineaments of this Somewhat are absolutely beyond the reach of our faculties; that we cannot possibly know more of it here on earth, than that (in all probability) infinitely small part, which happens to come in contact immediately or mediately with our own conscience; lastly, that our knowledge however *of* that part may increase with rapidly advancing progress, in proportion as we bring the

^r ‘On Mill’s Logic,’ pp. 397—406. ‘A mind, habitually and honestly conforming itself to its own full sense of duty, will at length enjoin or forbid with an authority second only to an inspired oracle.’ Newman’s University Sermons, p. 22.

^s How far the instinctive reliance which *all* persons have, good or bad, in the permanence of the laws of nature, throws discredit on the theory which I have thrown out, that the proof of them depends on *moral* considerations,—this is a question which most certainly requires discussion: I only wish that I had the space here to consider it.

^t See Letters of “Catholicus” *passim*.

intellect and the lower part of our nature into servile subjection to our will, and that again into servile subjection to this external law. Knowledge of phenomena is obtained by the intellect, knowledge of realities by the conscience; knowledge of phenomena by inquiry, knowledge of realities by obedience; knowledge of phenomena is obtained by us as masters and as judges, knowledge of realities is obtained by us as disciples and as slaves; the one pursuit tends to pride, the other indispensably requires and infallibly increases humility.

He who is thus disciplined, who feels deeply his exceeding blindness, helplessness, and ignorance, and the existence without him of an unknown and unspeakably precious Reality, will eagerly believe and appropriate whatever is placed before him in the course of nature, professing to be a voice from, or an economical representation of, that Reality. Again, he will have fully learnt—that real truth is acquired, not by an enlarged view of phenomena, but by individual *acts of duty and sense of responsibility*: that duty lies where trials and occasions of obedience lie, that is, in behaving rightly towards those circumstances with which we are placed in immediate connection, not in voluntarily leaving their sphere: that the real nature of any external doctrine cannot be even approximately understood, until it has been received and carried into practical action; lastly, that the mere act of argumentative deliberation on the authority which he is to follow, suspends that very course of believing and unsuspecting obedience, which is the one illuminating principle of the moral nature. From all this it will follow as a primary axiom, that a system of whose real nature, as having practically obeyed it, he *can* know something considerable, must not be left for another, of which he can really know nothing, without some singularly plain and indubitable reason; in a word, that should his parents have brought him into connection with some body professing to teach with authority, so long as he is able to repose unchanged confidence in that body, it is that very oracle for the conveyance

to him of eternal truths, before which duty requires him to bow.^u Should the case be otherwise, in a heathen country 'he will be able to discriminate with precision between the right and the wrong in traditionary superstitions, and will thus elicit confirmation of his faith,' and accessions to it, 'even out of corruptions of the truth.'^x But rather would he anticipate, that there is some home in which this moral Reality may have a secure rest and lodgment, that it may be dispensed to men according to their needs; or at least he would be drawn with a most eager and spontaneous longing towards any body, which should profess to be that home. And those marks, in any Society, would especially attract his view, which appear to be most kindred in their natures and origin to Eternal Truth itself; for instance, to use Ecclesiastical language, *Unity*, in doctrine throughout all ages, — *Sanctity*, — *Catholicity*, its proclaiming one and the same message in all lands — *Apostolicity*, its referring back to some signal interference with the visible course of things from the world 'beyond the veil.'

The highest and most principal of the facts which faith thus learns, I need not say, is the Personality and character of God. That the very idea of a Law implies a Lawgiver,

^u That I may not be misunderstood here, the following extract will be in place : " It may have been, that proceeding onwards in a tranquil and unsuspecting course of obedience, he has come to the knowledge of some (to him) new and surprising system ; or has become acquainted with the person or writings of some distinguished individual : or in some other way has been brought to the perception of a range of external ideas, which reveal to him depths in his own heart formerly concealed from his observation ; which are the objective embodiment of truths, floating hitherto in his mind unrecognised, nay, unsuspected ; or which promise the satisfaction of feelings and needs, of which, up to this time, he has been *unconsciously conscious*. If indeed those truths, which he has *already* recognised and appropriated, be not also a real and solid portion of this *new* system, he can give to it no implicit trust ; and thus we see one most important protection he has already obtained, against the temptations of dreamy sentimentality or the deceit of unreal speculation. But otherwise, after due and cautious deliberation, or very possibly indeed by an almost unperceived process, his confiding allegiance will be transferred to this new authority, the object varied, but the sentiment of *trust* the same." 'On Goode,' p. 40.

^x Newman's University Sermons, p. 22.

is a proposition with which I am not prepared to concur; but that it predisposes the mind, in a most signal and peculiar degree for the *reception* of that idea, cannot surely admit of doubt. And the knowledge of God, when fully realised by faith and devotion, will of course give an indefinitely higher sacredness to such particulars as those just mentioned. It is no unknown Somewhat for whose indications the disciple watches in the path of obedience, but the Voice of God whose accents he desires to recognise; the Church of his birth is not merely the oracle before which duty summons him to bend, but it is the ordinance of God; his parents God's Visible Representatives; and when he is summoned forth in search of a new guide, those external marks of which I spoke are no mere vestiges and 'indicia' of Eternal Truth, but are symbols of God's Presence and notes of His Church.

We are now then able to see, with some distinctness, the fundamental maxims of the philosophy of faith. Conscience, viewed in the abstract, has no power of discovering more than the immutable principles of morality. But in proportion as it is pure and well-disciplined, it discriminates and appropriates moral and religious truth of whatever kind, and disposes the mind to listen to this external message rather than to that; while each new truth thus brought before it from without, in proportion as it is deeply received and made the subject of religious action and contemplation, elicits a deep and hitherto unknown harmony from within, which is the full warrant and sufficient evidence of that truth. Viewed then in the concrete, as found in the devout believer, we may regard *conscience* and *faith* to be one and the same faculty: considered as submissively bending before external authority and ever deriving more of doctrinal truth, we call it faith; considered as carefully obeying the precepts of which it has knowledge, and as laboriously realising and assimilating the truths of which it has possession, we call it conscience.^y And thus we see in part the reasonableness

^y In the case of Christian doctrine 'whereas the information is supernatural, so also a most wonderful gift is poured into the Christian's heart, whereby the moral action' which appropriates it is 'supernatural also.' 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 402.

of unquestioning belief; for, on the one hand, it is by this very act of firm belief, that we are able really to grasp a moral opinion, and derive from it the full treasure of truth with which it is charged; while, on the other hand, our preservative against real error, is not the balancing of evidence, but the witness of a good conscience. The external opinion may be in greater or less degree erroneous; but the inward *belief*, the impression which we derive from it in our innermost heart, in our spiritual nature, (so only our conscience be pure,) may be inadequate indeed, but so far as it goes is true and sound.

Another illustration of the reasonableness of unquestioning belief, is derived from the circumstance that (continuing to use the words in the same sense as in the last paragraph) by that means our *belief* continues to increase in amount, and our *opinions* to approach without limit, towards true opinions. For it is the very characteristic of erroneous opinions, so far as they are such, that they present no substance which may be grasped by the spiritual nature; hence, in proportion to the action of a pure conscience upon external doctrines, the attention is absorbed and engrossed by that part of them which is true, while the error contained in them, even if not consciously discarded, is made no account of nor practically remembered; while if there be great intellectual powers, its inconsistency with the spiritual impression is discerned, and it is openly banished and rejected from the mind. At the same time all serious believers, whether intellectual or un-intellectual, are obtaining from all quarters fresh religious truth, which will still further draw the mind away from erroneous views; and which moreover disposes them, both to apprehend, and to feel, the superior attractiveness of any religious creed, which may be more simply from God than that which they have hitherto followed. It is a great relief to be able to state the sort of shape which this process would take among ourselves, in other words than my own.

• Nothing is more common than to think that we shall gain religious knowledge as a thing of course, without express trouble on

our part. Though there is no art or business of this world which is learned without time and exertion, yet it is commonly conceived that the knowledge of God and our duty will come as if by accident or by a natural process. Men go by their feelings and likings; they take up what is popular, or what comes first to hand. They think it much if they now and then have serious thoughts, if they now and then open the Bible; and their minds recur with satisfaction to such seasons, as if they had done some very great thing, never remembering that to seek and gain religious truth *is a long and systematic work*. And others think that education will do every thing for them, and that if they learn to read, and use religious words, they understand religion itself. And others again go so far as to maintain that exertion is *not* necessary for discovering the truth. They say that religious truth is simple and easily acquired; that Scripture, being intended for all, is at once open to all, and that if it had difficulties, that very circumstance would be an objection to it. And others, again, maintain that there *are* difficulties in religion, and that this shews that it is an indifferent matter whether they seek or not as to those matters which are difficult.

‘Doubtless, if men sought the truth with one-tenth part of the zeal with which they seek to acquire wealth or secular knowledge, their differences would diminish year by year. Doubtless, if they gave a half or a quarter of the time to prayer for divine guidance which they give to amusement or recreation, or which they give to dispute and contention, they would ever be approximating to each other. We differ in opinion: therefore we cannot all be right; many must be wrong; many must be turned from the truth; and why is this, but on account of that undeniable fact which we see before us, that we do not pray and seek for the Truth?’

‘No one who does not seek the truth with all his heart and strength, *can tell what is of importance and what is not*; to attempt carelessly to decide on points of faith or morals is a matter of serious presumption; no one knows *whither* he will be carried *if* he seeks the Truth perseveringly, and therefore, since he cannot see at first starting the course into which his inquiries will be divinely directed, he *cannot* possibly say beforehand whether they may not lead him on to certainty, as to things which at present he thinks trifling or extravagant or irrational. “What I do,” said our Lord to St. Peter, “thou knowest not now,

but thou shalt know hereafter." "*Seek* and ye shall find;" this is the Divine rule—"If thou *criest* after knowledge, and *liftest up* thy voice for understanding, if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for *hid* treasure, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God."²

' This is a subject which cannot too strongly be insisted on. *Act up to your light*, though in the midst of difficulties, and you will be carried on, you do not know how far. Abraham obeyed the call and journeyed, not knowing whither he went; so we, if we follow the voice of God, shall be brought on step by step *into a new world, of which before we had no idea*. This is His gracious way with us: He gives, not all at once, but by measure and season, wisely. To him that hath, more shall be given. But we must begin at the beginning. Each truth has its own order; *we cannot join the way of life at any point of the course we please*; we cannot learn advanced truths before we have learned primary ones. "Call upon Me," says the Divine Word, "and I will answer thee, and shew thee great and mighty things which thou knowest not."^a Religious men *are always learning*; but when men refuse to profit by light already granted, their light is turned to darkness. Observe our Lord's conduct with the Pharisees. They asked Him on what authority He acted. He gave them no direct answer, but referred them to the mission of John the Baptist—"The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or from men?"^b They refused to say. Then He said, "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things." That is, they would not profit by the knowledge they already had from St. John the Baptist, who spoke of Christ—therefore no more was given them.

' All of us may learn a lesson here, for all of us are in danger of hastily finding fault with others, and condemning their opinions or practices; not considering, that unless we have faithfully obeyed our conscience and improved our talents, we are no fit judges of them at all. Christ and His Saints are alike destitute of form or comeliness in the eyes of the world, and it is only as we labour to change our nature, through God's help, and to serve Him truly, that we begin to discern the beauty of holiness. Then, at length, we find reason to suspect our own judgments of what is truly good, and perceive our own blindness; for by degrees we find that *those whose opinions and conduct we hitherto despised or wondered at* as

² Prov. ii. 3—5.

^a Jer. xxxiii. 3.

^b Matt. xxi. 25.

extravagant or unaccountable or weak, really *know more than ourselves*, and are above us—and so, ever as we rise in knowledge and grow in spiritual illumination, they (to our amazement) rise also, while we look at them. The better we are, the more we understand their excellence; till at length we are taught something of their Divine Master's perfections also, which before were hid from us, and see why it is that, though the Gospel is set on a hill in the midst of the world, like a city which cannot be hid, yet to multitudes it is notwithstanding hid, since He taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and the pure in heart alone can see God.

'Let not the diversity of opinion in the world dismay you, or deter you from seeking all your life long true wisdom. It is not a search for this day or that, but as you should ever grow in grace, so should you ever grow also in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Care not for the perplexing question which many will put to you, "How can you be sure that you are right more than others?" Others are nothing to you, if they are not holy and devout in their conversation—and we all know what is meant by being holy; we know whom we should call holy; to be holy is to be like an Apostle. Seek truth in the way of *obedience*; try to act up to your conscience, and let your opinions be the result, not of mere chance reasoning or fancy, but of an improved heart.

'Those who thus proceed, watching, praying, taking all means given them of gaining the truth, studying the Scriptures, and doing their duty; in short, those who seek religious truth by principle and habit, as the main business of their lives, humbly not arrogantly, peaceably not contentiously, shall not be "turned unto fables." "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him;" but in proportion as we are conscious to ourselves that we are indolent, and transgress our own sense of right and wrong, in the same proportion we have cause to fear, not only that we are not in a safe state, but, further than this, that we do not know what is a safe state, and what an unsafe,—what is light and what is darkness, —what is truth and what is error,—which way leads to heaven and which to hell. "The way of the wicked is darkness; they know not at what they stumble."'^c

4. From this view of things, if once admitted to be true,

^c Prov. iv. 19. Plain Sermons, vol. 5, pp. 291—295.

corollaries follow, or as I may call them canons, of the most unspeakable importance in religious inquiries. It would require volumes to illustrate and apply these in any sufficient measure; here therefore I must perforce content myself with stating some among their number, and applying them merely in one or two questions, which are of pressing importance at the present moment.

I. Holy men are the great fountains, from which moral and religious truth flows to the world:^d if a Revelation be given, they are its authorized interpreters; if there be a living authoritative tribunal, their spiritual experience furnishes materials for the *decrees* of that tribunal; if no special Revelation, on them must the task be imposed of collecting and discriminating the various scattered traditions, which are afloat in the current of human speculation.

II. In order however to apply the principles which they originate, intellectual gifts of the highest and rarest kind must be called into exertion. As one instance out of many—it is necessary to appreciate rightly, 1. the circumstances under which they were placed when they gave expression to some concrete opinion,—not only as to their external and more obvious features,—but (what is very far more important) as to the general habits of thought, action, and feeling then prevalent, which make up the very atmosphere, as it were, in which alone their words would carry to our ears their true sound: and 2. the circumstances under which *we* are placed, as to the same particulars. So difficult it may be, on some occasions, from their expressions to learn their *opinions*, and from their opinions their *moral judgments*.

^d ‘On Mill’s Logic,’ p. 339. ‘The man of the world goes on from day to day without even the thought of thwarting his present inclination, except for the prospect of some other worldly good, health, wealth, respectability: the Saint every minute of every day is sacrificing his own will to considerations of right. Is there any other faculty we possess, of which the cultivation is one thousandth part so disproportionate in different men, as this is?—and if not, we are absolutely introducing no new law whatever into the theory of our nature, when we assert that the Saint possesses within himself a guidance on moral subjects, in its own sphere next to infallible; while the man of the world has inherited this punishment from his way of life, that the “light within him” has almost become “darkness.”’

III. Their *moral judgments* are themselves authoritative, in proportion as the whole circumstances, bearing on the case, were fairly presented to them. Hence it is highest, and it may be truly said infallible, on subjects simply divine, contemplative, devotional; the Trinity; the Incarnation; the Eucharistic Presence; Grace; the immutable obligation of the Moral Law; the glory of celibacy; the prerogatives of St. Mary and other Saints; and many others.

IV. Next to such matters as these, their judgments deserve our submission, in proportion as they refer to a state of external things habitually present to their minds: while even on these, an inferiority on their part of intellectual power will most materially affect their authority; as making it less probable that the facts of the case have been brought before them, as it were for judgment,—in their true colours, and with all their mutual relations explained or understood.

V. On a state of things, in the midst of which they have *not* practically energized, unless they had a very high and unusual degree of genius and imagination, their judgments may be (if the expression be irreverent, may their powerful intercession prevail on God to pardon it! but I do not mean it so) even utterly baseless, mistaken, untrustworthy. For example, their judgment on the moral and religious character of some heretical body, living and acting in the midst of them, would probably be altogether final and decisive; while their judgment on a similar body, at a distance from their own experience and sphere of action, might be of no real weight whatever.

VI. I have already mentioned (II) one class of subjects, in which it frequently requires the highest intellectual power, to derive a knowledge of the *moral judgment* of Saints from their expressions or even from their opinions. Under quite a different head, the same difficulty is experienced; viz. in rightly understanding what those Heavenly Objects are on which their faith and spiritual life was fed, in the midst of the vague and sometimes discordant intellectual shapes into which they may have learned to throw their religious impression.

“A very little thought will suffice to shew, how frequent a case it is for men to take up externally a set of notions, which are far from the rightful property of their moral nature. We are not now speaking, be it observed, merely of inaccurate *expressions*, but what may be called inaccurate *opinions*. A man may think himself all his life long an utilitarian, or a disciple of Locke; and yet were a party to arise, to whom such principles were really congenial, and who should accordingly fully appropriate them and carry them forward, he might be the first to shrink back from so repulsive an exhibition. Great numbers of men profess one system as it were on the *surface*, of which alone they are conscious, and which they put into formal expression; while a far higher and truer doctrine is really energizing within them, and carrying them on from truth to truth without their knowledge. It is a far better test of a man's real sentiments that he joins the right *party*, than that he professes the right *opinions*. Let us apply then a similar principle to theology. The impression conveyed, on the highest doctrines of the Gospel, by the Apostles to their disciples, was surely far more accurate, subtle, and delicate than any words can express, and they did not directly *use* words.”^e

‘Such was the feeling of awe and love mingled together,’ says Mr. Newman,^f ‘which remained for a while in the Church There was silence, as it were, for half an hour.’ ‘I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the primitive Church; because technicality and formalism are in their degree inevitable results of public confessions of faith.’^g

‘What might be almost expected to follow from this, before the Church had promulgated formal decisions on such matters? Mr. Goode (e. g. vol. i. p. 288) accuses some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers of Nestorian language. Now, nothing is more common in the present day than certain modes of thought, as regards our Lord's acts and words, which display themselves in such ways as speaking of ‘His prudence,’ ‘His forethought,’ or ‘His infinite superiority over *other* men,’ expressions which may bear an innocent meaning, but of which, as used, the real account is the Nestorian heresy; yet if those who are enslaved to such habits were asked,

^f Sermons, vol. ii. p. 28.

^g Ariens, &c., p. 14.

‘Do they or do they not hold a human *personality* of our Lord?’ they might know the right answer to give, though they would probably regard the question as scholastic trifling. Others, on the contrary, may habitually so act and speak, as to make it clear to the religious mind, that they *do* realise the Agent of those works to be Almighty God; and yet may use the words ‘nature’ and ‘person’ in a manner *abstractedly* heretical. Yet what can be more extravagant than acquitting the former or accusing the latter of real heresy? And if Churchmen from the very first uniformly exhibited this solemn, reverential, and awful tone in speaking of our Lord, which sufficiently shews their deep impression how intimately His Divine Nature was connected with all that He did in the flesh, what an absurd, unmeaning, and narrow-minded procedure, to make them the objects of our criticism, because some of them, if so be (which Mr. Goode however has not attempted to prove), may have fallen into *language*, which at a later period became the symbol of heresy! In like manner the Apostles may have impressed on the Church the full idea, that our Lord is Very God, and yet God *the Son*; and it may be true also that the detailed system, afterwards sanctioned by the Church, alone rightly expresses this truth, so as neither on the one hand to involve logical contradictions, nor yet on the other hand to lead, by necessary moral or intellectual process, to an absolutely heretical result. All this may be most true, as it is; and yet the earlier Fathers, who may have had the true *idea* most fully impressed on their whole being, may yet have adopted certain *notions*, which in themselves were liable to one of these two objections. How can it be any want of reverence for those holy men to think so? no one has claimed for them either inspiration or infallible powers of logical discrimination; while at the same time had they *seen* the moral or intellectual consequences contained in these notions, much more had they been witnesses of a party embodying them and carrying them out, they would have disavowed them with horror. But heresies had not arisen in their time to require wary thought on such matters; while even when heresy was active and energetic, and the whole Church in consultation, it was found no easy matter to harmonize and draw into system the Revealed Truth.”^h

^h ‘On Goode,’ pp. 93, 4. ‘In the early centuries writers of the Church used language which may bear an Arian appearance; after the Council of Nicea they do

I have said, that it is difficult to discern the real Objects of their faith, amidst the indistinctness of their opinions and expressions : I should rather have said,—*impossible* to those who have not in other ways (e. g. as being taught by the existing Church and having acted on her teaching) *mastered* the sacred ideas ; but, on the other hand, not very difficult, if there be sufficient intellectual power, to those who in their measure *have* so done.

VII. It would appear then, that there are many cases, in which the particular course adopted, or opinions expressed, by a Saint, is of little or no authority, while the *principles*, which led him to that course or those opinions, might probably be of the greatest. There are other cases in which the very reverse is true ; viz. when the circumstances, under which the action took place or the opinion was given, were matters with him of daily and most intimate experience ; part, as it were, of the very atmosphere he breathed. The right action in such cases as these is the spontaneous result of a holy instinct ; the reason given is an after-thought, framed perhaps on even a hurried and superficial analysis of his real state of mind when he acted. The reason then is so far only authoritative, as we have ground to consider the analysis really sufficient for our purpose ;—which it will very seldom indeed be, except so far as the point *now* at issue had been *then* a matter of controversy, and the intellect of the Saint was subtle and penetrating.

VIII. From the circumstance that some doctrine, wholly foreign to our own moral experience, appears to us to have literally no foundation whatever either in reason or in Scripture, not even the faintest probability arises that it may not be true. And if holy men, who have cherished and acted on it, profess to prize it most dearly, and to view it as the necessary result of acknowledged Scriptural principles, while

so no longer : the earlier Greek Fathers fall into expressions with a Pelagian sound ; after a certain epoch such expressions cease.' On the other hand, during all the early centuries, the intellectual expressions of doctrine on the Eucharistic Presence were different with different writers.

no holy men can be found who have realised it by spiritual action and yet thought otherwise; if this be so, it is the wildest and most extravagant presumption, to hesitate for a moment in accepting it.

IX. A reason, incomparably more worthy of respect and sympathy, is sometimes given, for demurring to tenets which appear witnessed by holy men; viz. that they seem to *contradict* doctrines, which we most fully and entirely realise as true and divine. Thus the view taken by many Saints of Predestination frequently oppresses ordinary men, as if it were inconsistent with such certain truths as—free will, human responsibility, God's earnest desire that all men should be saved, Christ's death on the Cross being an Atonement for *all*. Again, the belief entertained, it may be said, by *all* the Saints of later times, on the peculiar privileges and prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin, is, it is well known, extremely painful to many most admirable Christians who have been differently educated, as being inconsistent with our Blessed Lord's sole Mediation, or other fundamental Verities. But—when we consider the mystery and unearthliness of the saintly character; and the extreme fanaticism of the supposition that ordinary men can really scan their thoughts, or again, measure them by their own standard, (so as to suppose opinions to be inconsistent with each other in the case of Saints because they find it so to be in their *own* case,) it will readily appear, that to take exceptions on such a ground would be a most exceedingly unreasonable and arrogant procedure. Rather our course should be, to take for granted that nothing, really held by Saints as part of their spiritual nature, can be contradictory to doctrines which we know for certain to be true; to cherish these latter the more watchfully and carefully, as though to assure ourselves that we really possess them; and to take it on faith, if we do not at once see the proof, that these most precious and holy truths were really valued by the Saints whose sentiments at first sight would seem to contradict them;—valued by them, I say, not only as dearly as by ourselves, but

rather by so much the more dearly, by how much their habits and desires were more heavenly and spiritual than our own. The result of this, the only humble and religious course, will often be—that we shall go on more to find that true in fact which we had believed on principle; and not impossibly, that we shall discover in addition, that those very truths, which we had fancied in peril, had been held by ourselves in a disproportionate and one-sided shape, rather than in their full orb and heavenly completeness.

X. I have already said, that the mere circumstance of there being no producible proof whatever for a tenet which believers have learned to hold, does not imply even the faintest probability that it may not be true; and that for the simple reason, that religious truths are their own evidence. On the other hand, if we consider certain errors of opinion to be really injurious to the spiritual growth, it must be because they interfere, either with the reception, or with the full action, of some important doctrine. For both these reasons, as Mr. Newman has continually remarked, the true way of opposing error, is to place before its victims, by every attainable means, the truth in all its fulness and harmonious beauty. For instance, many excellent persons, whose opinion deserves great respect, consider that the Catholic peasantry, in parts of the continent, are superstitious on the subject of relics or miracles to a very injurious degree. Supposing, for argument's sake, that this be so, the evil of their superstition arises from its contrariety to a certain higher and more truly religious habit of mind. The right course then of those who may desire to benefit them must be, not merely to oppose their particular errors in fact or doctrine, (for were we ever so successful in that, so long as their defective habit of mind remains, similar or worse errors would take their place,) but to implant by *positive*, not *negative* addresses that higher tone of mind which we desire. Let that be done, and these particular errors will at once fall off; as the very objector bears witness: they shock the objector, as being inconsistent with a certain high tone of religious purity; give the peasant

that tone, and they will shock him too. Let me again repeat, I am not at all granting the justice of the accusation: I really have no opinion on the subject: I am only granting it *for argument's sake*, that I may join issue on the principle. And in like manner, if I had to give advice to a person, in whom I fancied myself to perceive too great and exclusive prominence given to the thought of the Blessed Virgin, I should set him to meditate for half-an-hour in every day on the truth—that our Blessed Lord created her; or that He redeemed her; or again, that all blessings whatever flow from God as from their first source; or that our Blessed Lord died for us on the Cross. As to the last particular alone, I can hardly fancy any one following St. Alphonsus's earnest exhortations, and meditating for at least a quarter of an hour in every day on that inconceivable miracle of love, who could be in real danger of eclipsing the constant vision of Him by other objects of regard. In a word, our endeavours should be, in such cases, to *increase* their devotion to the highest Object, not diminish it to the lower; to take care that they honour, not the Saints less, but God more.

XI. The same humility, which leads sensible Christians to understand their complete inability to pass judgment on doctrines foreign to their moral experience, leads them also another step; it leads them (though in a far less degree) to feel, how difficult and complex a question it is, to discriminate,—among religious men whose character is known to them only at second-hand,—who are, and who are not, so fully endowed with the whole circle of Christian graces, so complete in all the constituent parts of a Christian temper, so mortified, so saintly, as fairly to claim at their hands that deference, of which so much has been said. They will be anxious then, where it may be possible, to repose confidence in some external body, which exhibits on its very front a most loving sympathy and reverence for saintliness, and which may shew them other sufficient marks that their confidence will be well-placed; rather than venture by themselves, with-

out necessity, on so hazardous an inquiry. I have said 'among religious men whose character is known to them only at second-hand:' for those of whom we have an habitual and practical knowledge, we may justly and unfailingly appreciate, without reference to an external body; much less, as in the case I am glancing at, to a body whose members very frequently decide on the character of such men, on no ground of personal experience, but on *a priori* considerations. It admits of great question indeed, whether any body whose relations to us are merely external, can exhibit such trustworthy signs of divine Authority, as holy men in whose presence or close proximity we may constantly live.¹ But however this may be decided, there is a circumstance which will weigh far more than any other consideration with religious minds,—viz. that it is under *their* influence, as it were, that God Himself has placed us; an influence which we will *then* neglect, when the said external body shall bring before us, carried out into living and energetic action, a *higher* conception of the Christian character.

XII. This leads to a remark on the word 'private judgment.' The real idea, which has possession of serious men, when they speak of this habit of mind in terms of extreme disparagement, whether or no they are able themselves to disentangle it, is perhaps on the whole such as the following. That religious truth is obtained by humbly obeying God, and following every ascertainable trace of His adorable will. So far as individuals forsake this path and take the matter into *their own* hands instead of leaving it with God—whether by deciding on argumentative questions for which they are incompetent, or by any other mode,—in that degree they act sinfully. Hence a faulty exercise of private judgment may quite as easily take place, in deserting guides placed over us by God for some other authority, as in taking up opinions of our own without reference to *any* authority; though whether, in this or that person, any sinful

¹ This will be estimated differently by different minds. In my own case I should feel this, I think, not merely doubtful, but impossible.

element has been mixed up with his procedure, is a question on which it is our happiness to know that we cannot form the most distant conjecture.

XIII. It is plain, that in proportion as we give ourselves up to an uninterrupted course of religious action, we realise and dwell upon our *positive* doctrines, and forget what may be called our *negative* opinions. •To *hold* negative opinions indeed, except on authority, is unphilosophical and unreasonable; because we cannot form even a guess on the value of a doctrine, until we have morally apprehended either that doctrine or its contradictory. But over and above this it appears also that to *lay any stress* on them, (even though we *do* hold them on authority,) is a sure mark of carnal-mindedness and sluggishness in the spiritual life. There would be apparent exceptions to this statement, in the case of some most admirable men, who may have been taught to lay stress on these negations, and who fancy that they do so; but these are not real exceptions, for it will be found that in proportion as they talk naturally rather than on a theory, they sufficiently shew how little real connection there is, between the language they have learnt and their spiritual nature.

And the converse is equally true: he who resolutely puts from his mind the mere negations of his hereditary creed, and girds himself to the task of carrying forward boldly and unsuspectingly the positive tenets which it contains, is, as one may say, already a Catholic potentially. Thus the very same outward expressions of doctrine may be held by different persons, Catholically or heretically, Christianly or unchristianly, according as they fix their mind on what is *affirmed* or on what is *denied*. A most extremely important consideration this, were there room to pursue it, in judging of our 'high-church' theology, and of its professed agreement with primitive Antiquity. And thus we are led to one most distinguishing note, which has appeared in every age, between Catholic and heretical exercises of the intellect. The Catholic exercises his intellect *philosophically*; he endeavours to con-

vey, as best he may through so inadequate a medium, certain wonderful ideas which fully possess him, on which he is energetically acting at the very time when he is scientifically analysing them. The heretic, on the contrary, exercises his intellect *unphilosophically*; in trying to expose what appear to him unmeaning subtleties and distinctions, in a matter on which he has *no* spiritual experience; like a blind man who should ridicule those who possess the power of seeing, for the unintelligible distinctions they make in trying to *explain* to him what they see. The Arian ridicules the idea of the Eternal Sonship, the Sabellian of a distinction of Persons in One Substance, the Zuinglian of a Real Presence of our Lord's Body. On the other hand, let us suppose the case of a *positive* Arian, if I may use such a term: suppose the case of some one whom Ulfilas should have converted from heathenism to Arianism, and who should have no practical knowledge of genuine Christianity. I conceive that such an one, if religious, would theorize on the idea of 'God' now for the first time purely brought before Him; or on Christian morality; or, it may be, on the doctrines of Grace: it is even conceivable, that by religiously and heartily contemplating the doctrine put before him, he might unconsciously press it forward for himself into orthodoxy. But it is quite certain, that when orthodoxy is fairly and fully brought before him, to criticise it *negatively* would be to contradict the whole habit of his past life; he would see that it is something wholly beyond his spiritual experience, and therefore no subject for his criticism; nay, can we doubt that in a very short time he would heartily embrace it?

XIV. From the truths with which we started, the rule is very readily obtained for deciding—what are those cases in which it is unreasonable consciously to inquire and examine into the grounds of our belief, and what are those in which it is reasonable to do so: for where first principles are concerned, such a process will not lead to truth; but where the matter in hand is to apply them or argue from them, it *will*. The application of this rule indeed may in some cases occasion a good deal of perplexity; but the rule itself

is very plain and simple. It will be better, however, to subjoin a few examples. Mathematical science requires us to concede as a first principle, the trustworthiness of our memory and of our intellectual faculties; physical science, political economy, social investigations, require, as a further first principle, a belief that fixed laws regulate the course of the phenomenal world, whether in the physical or in the mental order. But these principles once granted, free inquiry has its place; and truth is obtained by means of the fullest and most searching investigation, on the part of those intellectually qualified for the task. Again, if the question be raised concerning the genuineness and authenticity of the books of Scripture, it is plain that the spiritual nature has a most important part to play in the decision. But supposing it were ruled, that that text must be considered authentic which was most generally received in the fourth century, the further investigation of the case would wholly appertain to the province of free inquiry. Once more, let us suppose that inspiration were the topic discussed, and that here too it were decided, that the view prevalent in the fourth century is to be considered authoritative: as before, free inquiry will henceforth be our one instrument of discovery. But in this instance, a very important distinction must be observed: the most irreligious men may discuss, with great advantage, mathematical, physical, and many parts of political science; or they may, with perfect success, decide on the authority and date of given Manuscripts; but in such cases as the present, they will be wholly *incompetent* to form a judgment on the matter: not because the inquiry into phenomena is to be less free and unbiassed in this than in the former cases, but because the phenomena cannot be *apprehended* except by religious men; a thinker, who has not carefully cultivated his spiritual nature, will be no more able to understand St. Chrysostom's or St. Jerome's implied views on inspiration, than a tyro, ignorant of Athenian manners and habits and ways of thought, could understand the allusions in a speech of Pericles or of Alcibiades.

We see then how wholly unfounded is the notion, that the

philosophy of faith denies the trustworthiness of the intellectual powers; or involves us in inextricable confusion, as to the occasions when we *may* reason and when we may not. As to the methods of reasoning, indeed, which have given rise to the latter allegation — who considers it any disparagement to the intellect, when we believe, without proof, that a certain tree is green? The philosophy in question asserts, first, that we have a faculty, supplying materials for the intellect to work upon, which are altogether distinct from the mere facts of consciousness or sensation; and, secondly, (which is surely *à priori* far most probable,) that this faculty has an organ of acquisition, wholly different from that by which the intellect performs its functions; that the intellect obtains truth by examination of evidence, but the conscience obtains truth by obedience and belief.

The analogy between the senses and the spiritual nature, in their relation to the understanding, has been used by Mr. Newman with admirable success.^k Let us apply it in another particular. Suppose a person, wholly destitute of musical ear, were obstinately to refuse belief in the existence of such an endowment; it is plain that when we enlarged to him in the most glowing language, on the surpassing beauty, majesty, suggestiveness, of a symphony of Beethoven's, he would consider us the victims of some wild and delusive imagination. Suppose, again, he fell in with a work on the science of music, in which e. g. it were stated, as a matter of theory, how exquisitely in accordance with the most joyous feelings is some given composition; and how, by its mere change into a minor key, it jars irreconcilably with the whole current of our associations; — the expression of this in technical terms, would appear to him the mere refinement, flowing from an over-subtle character of mind. Over-imaginativeness, and over-subtlety! by how many a 'sensible and hard-headed' man has this charge been brought against Catholics, when they enlarge on the surpassing delight of meditation on some (so called) abstract doctrine; — or when they express, in scientific language, the differences between

^k University Sermons, pp. 46, 7.

Catholicism and Nestorianism or Sabellianism, and proceed to characterise those differences as so irreconcilable and so constantly and practically energetic, that the talk of a Christian union between their professors is the wildest and most senseless of theories.

XV. But this bigotted man could hardly fail to observe, that these technical words are used in treatises on music with remarkable skill and precision; and that any contradiction in terms is avoided, as it would seem to him, with an unflinching art, which he would not know whether to admire for its ingenuity, or to sigh over for its perverseness.¹ Here then is a most legitimate office for the intellect;—to express these and other truths, derived from the spiritual nature, in a consistent and scientific shape. To require intellectual *proof* whether for the Personality or the Trinity of God, is absurd;^m but an intellectual *statement* of these doctrines, is among the noblest occupations in which a thinker's faculties can be engaged. And another most fitting employment for them, is to contemplate truths, derived from other quarters, which seem *primâ facie* to conflict with these truths; 'to fix his mind carefully, intently, and habitually, as it were, on both sides of the picture, until they make on it respectively their appropriate impression. If he profess to be a philosopher, the inquirer then proceeds to aim at developing, to his own consciousness by accurate thought, and afterwards to the world by accurate language, that wide and expansive field of truth, which shall embrace both these seeming contradictions.' The first of these functions belongs to the science of dogmatic theology, the last to the 'architectonic philosophy.'ⁿ

¹ A similar observation of Mr. Blanco White's, on the Catholic Theology, has been often enough quoted.

^m There is the fullest proof indeed to the believing mind, that this doctrine is the doctrine of *Scripture*: (see, for the nature of this proof, the 23d Sermon of Mr. Newman's 6th volume :) but intellectual proof implies that we shall prove the foundation; e. g. the Inspiration of Scripture, or, to take a still earlier stage, the Existence of a God from whom a Revelation could proceed.

ⁿ 'The architectonic philosophy, that which assigns to all sciences and to all known things their relative position and value.' ('On Mill's Logic,' p. 359.)

XVI. Hence that truth follows, to which I have before alluded;—viz. that when sceptical thoughts assail us at the period of prayer, or devotional meditation, or rather at any time, (for our life at every moment ought to be a practical prayer,) our only reasonable course is, to put them from us, as suggestions of Satan, by an effort of the will. For on the one hand, it is this very life of prayer, meditation, and religious action, which gives us assurance of spiritual realities; and to capitulate with a sceptical thought, is to intermit that life: so that (resuming our old illustration) thus to act, would be just as if you were to shut your eyes, that you might do full justice to the arguments which are intended to convince you, that a certain tree, within ten yards of you, does not really there exist. If you keep your eyes shut for a sufficiently long time, you might really begin to think that there is great force in the arguments. And as to the sceptical objections themselves,—either they profess to shew that you have no intellectual *proof* for what you believe, or that your opinion is intellectually *inconsistent* with acknowledged truths. The former objections, as I have sufficiently shewn, are simply absurd and unreasonable; but the latter have the fairest claim on your attention: or rather indeed they demand it, if it be your profession, and *if you have sufficient intellectual power, to enter on such inquiries*. Now this allegation of intellectual inconsistency may possibly be *true*, and may arise from the circumstance that your opinion is not the adequate exponent of your *belief*; in that case, obviously the reasonable course is,—not to admit doubt into your mind, but, on the contrary,—to hold your belief all the more stedfastly; while the intellectual difficulty in question may stimulate you, so that you shall perceive the error of your explicit *opinion* earlier than you would otherwise perceive it. Or, secondly, such an allegation may be only plausible; a case which will happen over and over again, in these days wherein we live: here, if we give up firm belief, it is plain that we lose our hold of truth; but if we cleave to it, and cleave also to the truth which appears *at first sight* contradictory, we have that very opportunity, to which I lately adverted, of enlarging the sphere of the ‘architectonic

philosophy.' Lastly, the case is hypothetically conceivable, though it never happened, and in all probability never will,—that the intellectual inconsistency is real. The only philosophical inference from that would be, that our intellectual powers are mendacious; for we have infinitely less evidence for their trustworthiness, than we have for those truths which we spiritually discern.^o In no conceivable case then can it be otherwise than most unreasonable, and most injurious to the progress of truth, that we should give up, from intellectual difficulties, any constituent part of our spiritual belief.

XVII. From all that has been said, it at once follows, that religious persons will invariably present to the world the appearance of acting and of believing on absurdly insufficient grounds. To present this appearance is ever a characteristic note of the Church.

XVIII. In all that has been said about spiritual knowledge and conviction, it must not be forgotten, that the Christian Gift has imparted to this knowledge and conviction a new and supernatural quality.

The first impression of some readers from all this, I cannot deny it, will be that I have advocated a sort of universal Pyrrhonism, a cheerless and desolating scepticism on all moral truth; so many are the opinions, bearing on moral and religious subjects, on which I seem to represent that they are unable to form a judgment; nay, so many are the opinions, erroneous in themselves, which nevertheless, if these views be true, ought in the first instance firmly to be believed. I answer as follows. First, the object of moral and religious truth is religious action, and not

^o 'So certain is this, that we hold it perfectly conceivable (we do not say probable) that, as part of the last fierce contest on earth between the powers of good and evil, when "great signs and wonders" shall be shewn, "insomuch that if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect," Satan may be permitted to bring a cloud over man's intellectual faculties, and represent, as certainly deduced by the reasoning powers, doctrines inconsistent with revealed truth. On such an hypothesis, it will be the evidence and the reward of men practised in piety, that their perception of holiness shall attach them even the more indissolubly to the doctrines and ordinances of the Church, from the unprecedented confederacy of strength which would be ranged in opposition.' ('On Mill's Logic,' pp. 410, 11.)

curious speculation; no temper of mind will have God's blessing with it in its search after such truth, or has any chance of prospering in the search, except that which displays itself in the prayer: 'Lord, I am sinful, blind, ignorant; what is that outward messenger of Thy Truth before which Thou wouldest have me bow?' This is the sentiment, which it has been my very principal object all through to enforce: and such maxims as have been here given, are most amply sufficient to guide the temper of mind I am supposing;—most amply sufficient to determine, what those truths are, which it is our duty at any moment to receive and realise. But, secondly, it would be very far from giving me pain, if a consideration of the true principles on which religious belief is based, should impress deeply on the minds of Englishmen, how miserable a guide is our boasted private judgment; and how fearful a blow was inflicted on the progress of religious knowledge amongst us, by our infatuated rejection of that great Gospel boon, a Living Witness and Home of Christian Truth. The Reformation *has* brought us, I willingly acknowledge, into a state, in many respects analogous to that of heathen; in which we may know enough for our immediate guidance, but have no vantage-ground, as it were, no lofty eminence, from whence to pass judgment on that great expanse of fluctuating opinions, which is beyond the reach of *our own* spiritual ken.

5. The first application which I shall make of the principle I have been engaged in advocating, shall be to uphold the reverence which it is the duty of all English Christians to pay to the Sacred Volume. This is indeed no task necessarily incumbent on myself; for the view I hold on the authority of the Church enables me, for my own comfort and satisfaction, to assume a far higher position. Still so deeply am I convinced of the opinion lately implied,—viz. that any class of religionists amongst us, if they will only begin to act *bonâ fide* on the *positive* opinions they hold, are at once in the path which most surely leads them to full Catholicity;^p and

^p Lutheranism constitutes no exception to this; let any person, not absolutely depraved, act on it honestly, consistently, unflinchingly, he will speedily abandon it

again, so deeply do I fear that an attack on the full inspiration and authority of the Bible itself, is more nearly impending than most of us fancy,^p that I am anxious to give a few hints, on the arguments by which that attack may be most successfully parried. Moreover, the discussion will give me the opportunity of expressing one or two particulars, which *are* personally important, more clearly than I have yet had an opportunity of doing. It is most truly unfortunate, indeed, however natural, that the Protestant world has agreed in taking as their first principle a *book* rather than a *doctrine*; but still we must deal with facts as we find them. The deepest and surest conviction of which our nature is capable, is that which is entertained by those who have obediently followed a pure Church's training, of that Church's Divine authority.^q Still the belief in definite Christian doctrines, such as the Trinity, or the Incarnation, which is accessible to all serious Christians, is not inferior to this in kind, however much so in degree: it has to fight indeed single-handed against the assaults of sight, imagination, reason; while a pure Church employs sight, imagination, reason, in her own defence, thus using worldly weapons *against* the world: yet the belief itself is not the less superhuman and infallible. But this cannot be said of belief in the whole Bible as it stands; and those therefore who have made this their *locus standi*, have chosen a less impregnable position than might have been desired. True it is indeed that their fathers have been probably more in fault than themselves; and at all events, taking the facts as they are, such Christians may defend their ground with no contemptible advantage, against the poisonous arrows of scepticism and unbelief.

with horror and anathema. It derives its whole influence from those who will *not* act on it consistently, and yet *do* receive it in a great measure.

^p 'Have you seen' S. T. Coleridge's 'Letters on Inspiration?' They are well fitted to break ground in the approaches to that momentous question, which involves in it *so great a shock to existing notions*; the greatest probably that has ever been given, since the discovery of the falsehood of the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility.' Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 358.

^q See pp. 280—2.

To shew more clearly my meaning as to the vantage-ground which Protestants have given up, let us suppose, as an imaginary case, that a priest is beginning to instruct a baptized Christian in the leading facts and doctrines of Christianity. This will represent to us, as in a figure, the respective positions held towards each other, in one respect, by the intellect and the conscience. For it is plain, on the one hand, that the most mortified and conscientious man living could never invent for himself these tidings; they must be taught, through the agency of the intellect, from without. But the doctrines are *apprehended and understood* by the disciple, in proportion to his moral proficiency; and often very far better than by the teacher. That our Saviour is God, that He died for our sins, that the Holy Ghost is God, and purges us from sin, all these statements are by him best understood, who, by means of moral action, is best acquainted with the real idea of God, and best appreciates the real nature of sin. Let us further suppose, that the priest recounts to the disciple, one after the other, the narratives contained in the four Gospels, and impresses them on his memory, imagination, and understanding: these also will be far more fitly apprehended in proportion to moral, than to intellectual, attainments; though the latter will have their place also.

Now if we suppose a sufficient time to have elapsed, and a continual process to have gone on of spiritually appropriating and realising this teaching, certain of these statements will have been so embraced by the learner, as that he has an infallible spiritual knowledge of their truth: they will have gradually awakened into life and energy a responsive chord within him, the deep and full echo of which to doctrines proposed, is the ultimate fact which constitutes *proof*; and the analysis of this fact would complete the analysis of the *process* of proof. This faith is natural under natural religion, and *supernatural* under the Gospel through the Baptismal Gift: so that Gospel faith is indefinitely elevated above natural faith: but in either case this conviction is, beyond any possible comparison, more reasonable and undoubted, than any derivable from intellectual ‘discursus;’ because the trustworthiness

itself of our intellectual powers is only proved *indirectly* by that very test, which proves *these* truths *directly and immediately*. (see pp. 507, 8. ^q)

Now further—which of these statements is it that are really so proved? I conceive such as the following:—that the subject of these various Narratives is one Person, whose attributes are on the whole most faithfully and harmoniously embodied in these narratives;—that that Person is God; is the Son of God; died as an Atonement for our sins; is brought into ineffable proximity to us by the agency of the Holy Ghost;—that the Holy Ghost is God;—and so on with others that might be named.^r But the Scripture nar-

^q “The Almighty, to impart to us the gift of faith penetrates the soul and speaks to her; not by reasoning, but by inspiration. He proposes to the understanding the objects of her belief in so gentle and persuasive a manner, that the will is powerfully inclined to exert her freedom and authority over the understanding, and thereby reduce it to acquiesce unhesitatingly and fully in the truths revealed. Notwithstanding the veils and shadows which obscure the divine light, it no sooner beams in the soul than it exacts obedience; it so completely subdues the mind, that there is no opposition made to the certainty of the object which it proposes to our belief; which certainty is in fact superior to every other species of conviction.” St. Francis de Sales, ‘Love of God,’ English translation, pp. 93, 4.

^r The following passages, from the British Critic, will illustrate the process which will enable those who are intellectually gifted, and have not been nurtured in the bosom of a pure Church, to discern what those doctrines are which they believe with a divine faith.

‘Let the supposition be fairly brought home to any religious person, of a denial, e. g. of God’s existence from everlasting; will he not at once most deeply feel, that the idea of such denial is unspeakably painful and shocking to the imagination? and that, not as being an insult to some formula which he has learned to revere, but rather as threatening to take from him the possession of a real, living, vital truth, which he had rather die than part with. There *is* then such an idea—the *experimentum crucis* proves it—deeply implanted in the religious man’s moral nature, and precious to him beyond words, as God’s eternal pre-existence; and yet, as has been often enough remarked, if we attempt the intellectual apprehension of this truth—if we attempt to conceive, as an external fact, of God *having* lived ages *without end*, and *then* beginning to create—our mind recoils, baffled in its futile attempt. And a similar moral test may be applied to one after another of God’s attributes, notwithstanding the absolute impossibility of any attempt to *reconcile* with each other, in our own minds, the expressions which are universally adopted to signify them.’

‘Are we asked for proof that there *is* a real assembly of truths, answering to the ecclesiastical expressions of Christian doctrine? We offer the very same

ratives themselves, one by one, most certainly are *not* so proved: no ordinary Christian can say, (to make a purely imaginary hypothesis,) that if it became on other grounds probable that some one or more of these were spurious, he could have any spiritual knowledge of his own, which he could oppose confidently to such a supposition; nor yet again, that of those which *are* genuine there may not be some few, which, at first hearing, do not altogether commend themselves, and which he receives on the authority of the rest or of the pro-

which establishes the reality of our idea of God. The more conscientiously and strictly the orthodox believer walks, the more chastened and mortified his life, the more entirely by means of voluntary or involuntary suffering he is thrown on the thought of God for comfort, the more deep and stable has ever become his apprehension of the Christian doctrines, the more intimate and undoubting his conviction of their truth, the more warm and absorbing his love of them, the higher his sense of their inestimable value. Heretics, as they grow more spiritual, grow more dissatisfied and restless, and change from one heresy to another, till they find the truth; the orthodox feel with ever-increasing confidence that they *have* found it. And the proof of the reality of *Christian* ideas might be considered indefinitely stronger than that of merely *Theistical*, (did certainly admit of degrees, and did not the former *include* the latter,) by how much Christians attain more than others to the conscientious, mortified, and contemplative life. And, again, that *each one* of the more prominent dogmatic definitions in use corresponds with a deep reality in the believer's mind; this also we prove by precisely the same test which we adopted in speaking of natural religion. Let the assertion in any way be brought home to the apprehension of the religious Catholic, that our Blessed Lord was before all creatures, but still a creature, and not co-eternal with the Father; or that He is not Very God as truly as the Father; or that there is no distinction in any sense between Him and the Father; or that His divine nature is not derived from the Father; or that there are more Gods than one; or, again, that He had not all the feelings and infirmities of human nature, sin only excepted; or that He had sin; or that the principle of any of His actions in the Flesh was less than divine (in other words, that He had a human personality); and so on with the rest: let this be done, and he will at once feel most acutely that a vital, an absolutely essential, part of the one support of his religious life is attacked; that if he is to enjoy happiness, if he is to advance in holiness, he must be sheltered and protected from the endurance of such blasphemies.' 'On St. Athanasius,' pp. 414, 418, 19.

Again a most powerful support to the faith of all in Christian doctrine is supplied by the deep and supernatural harmony between Scripture and Catholic doctrine, which spiritual believers are ever more fully discerning. Of this a few words presently.

All this is of course equally, or probably much more, true of a religious person who has been nurtured within the bosom of a pure Church; but *he* will have also divine faith *in* that Church: so that this analysis will not to him be so important.

ponent. The case might possibly be different with very heavenly-minded and saintly men; nay, supposing a Christian had been preserved by God's grace free from venial as well as mortal sin, in such a case it is even highly *probable* that there would be that sympathy with our Blessed Lord, which might serve as an infallible touchstone, to distinguish the true recital from the false: but none except the wildest fanatic will attribute any such power to ordinary believers. And what is true of this most sacred part of Scripture, is still more true of the rest. That the volume, as a whole, presents the most undeniable proofs of its awful character, mysterious structure, Divine origin, cannot be questioned; but no one can say, that there are not individual portions of it in which he fails to recognise those marks; or again, that passages might not easily be brought, e. g. from Thomas à Kempis, which he could not by his own discernment distinguish from Scripture.

We may see then the disadvantageous position into which English Protestants have brought themselves, by taking their stand on a *book* instead of on a *doctrine*; and they feel it themselves. For when they hear of the course taken by foreign criticism; when they hear of acute and powerful-minded men, who question the Scripture account of the Creation, or the Fall, or the Flood; who deny Divine authority to integral parts of the New Testament; who threaten, as inquiry proceeds, to leave nothing untouched, nothing sacred; they seem able to utter in their defence little more, than a vague and unreasoning clamour. I am far from denying, that even this clamour is far more reasonable than that sort of dispassionate criticism to which I have been alluding: it arises in part doubtless from the shock received, in the hearing of such sentiment, by their religious and reverential instinct; even though it may arise in part also from indolent and acquiescent conservatism. Still I think that—if any of their number should be attracted by that appearance of depth, honesty, and unprejudiced desire of truth, which is presented by the theory of free inquiry; should he be tempted, not to add to his existing creed, but to take from it; not to

accept an authorized interpreter of his rule of faith, but to question the rule itself;—it is possible to put before him, with perfect calmness and argumentativeness, grounds, which will be sufficiently cogent, to deter even moderately religious and conscientious men from such a course.

I would beg to ask him, in the first place, whether he aims honestly at carrying out into lively and energetic practice those religious truths which he *does* hold; whether he be endeavouring, day by day, that the fear and love of God shall be more undividedly the principle of his thoughts, words, and actions? If otherwise, what can he expect to meet with except error and delusion; what will be his fitting reward except intellectual perverseness and judicial blindness; if, with no practical realisation of the truths of natural religion, he presume to criticise the documents which contain a Revelation? Nay, on the score of that very quality for which he takes credit,—sincere and unprejudiced desire of truth,—there is as little to be said in his defence, as on the score of piety and reverence. For surely critical science will suffer no very serious evil by a delay e. g. of two years: if Christianity has gone on very well without his labours for 1844 years, it may do so for 1846: while *we* say, that those two years, spent in retirement, and prayer, and meditation, would give him views of truth radically different. He professes to believe in our accountableness to God, and in judgment to come; it is the dictate of plain reason to *act* on that belief; there are people who say, that by so acting he would further altogether abandon those speculative views to which he is now attracted;—surely, if under all these circumstances he still resolve to proceed in his free inquiries, he must give up all claim to be considered a real seeker for truth: he must be classed with those most contemptible pretenders, who profess to think of truth, but think rather of their own powers of mind; and whose ardent desire, is not to increase human knowledge, but to gratify their own selfish taste for intellectual speculation; supposing, that is, that their real wish be not still baser, the wish to gain notoriety by the propagation of a so-called philosophical system.

But let a person submit himself to a course of such discipline, as I sketched from life in the sixth and seventh chapters; let him acquire the habit of daily self-examination; frequent prayer; meditation on those truths which he acknowledges, the sinfulness of sin, the peril of sin, death, judgment; let him add to this, if possible, (for such a man will probably have had hitherto little experience of life except on its sunny side,) let him add active personal communication with the poor; and, if his principles do not forbid it, such measure of bodily mortification as may be suitable to his case;—little fear need be entertained, lest he should come forth from the influence of such a course of treatment, with any heart left—to criticise impartially and superciliously the evidence for an alleged revelation, or the documents which contain it. In proportion as he shall have realised his own exceeding sinfulness, blindness, helplessness, and the appalling mass of temporal and spiritual misery which overspreads the world, he may think of devoting his intellectual faculties to a consideration of the means of alleviating this frightful evil;—or to preparing the materials by which others may do so;—or to drawing out, in their full and harmonious proportion, those great truths, which have become his own rest and refuge, and the knowledge of which he eagerly desires to spread:—but when books are placed before him which profess to contain a message from God, I conceive that his language will be very much as follows:

‘I possess a knowledge, infinitely more certain than any intellectual inference, that there is an All-Just, All-Holy God; and that I am a miserable and helpless creature. The consciousness of sin present, the memory of worse sin past, fill my mind with anxious misgivings, in regard to the invisible world; let a book be placed before me which purports to bring me news from thence, my only reasonable course is, eagerly to seize it, in hope that I may therein find an alleviation of these misgivings. The Bible is such a book. In almost every page I discern marks of Divine Authority; I read my own nature, as in a mirror, reflected to myself in its pages; I gather from them most precious and consoling truths; and,

by acting on those truths, I obtain a most certain and infallible conviction of their reality. The evidence to me of the Bible's authority is—my need and its supply. It could be no matter of wonder, if God gave no external evidence for it whatever: for He has given us the means of knowing the truths of natural religion; and he who acts on those truths, will experience the same need, and, if he searches Scripture, the same supply. Nor is it in any way inconsistent with His attributes, but rather accordant with them, that those who do not prize the truths of nature, shall have the fullest scope allowed them, for criticising or rejecting the volume of Revelation. True it is, that I find much in it mysterious and perplexing; but in looking for expositors to help me in a fuller understanding of its contents, I will seek for those—who recognise those truths, which I most undoubtingly know; who sympathize with those feelings in regard to the Sacred Volume, which my conscience tells me are the only just and right ones; who look upon the Scriptures in that light, which I plainly see to be the only reasonable light. The German critics, whatever their intellectual merits, (which I have not even a temptation to deny,) are not such expositors. They shall be no guides to me.'

This surely is the language of common reason and common sense. It is a fact acknowledged on all hands, that, from the moment when Christians were first able to meet together and compare notes down to the present day, the sacred books have been the very same which we now retain; and that they have been regarded in that point of view, which I have been just now endeavouring to recommend as the only reasonable point of view.⁵ The New Testament again bears the same testimony to the Old Testament in its integrity, that the

^r A discussion on the 'Apocrypha' would be here out of place.

^s Thus: to meet an objection that has been sometimes made to this statement,—to say that the first chapter in Genesis is a myth, that each verse of it is not adapted to convey to us truth, or does not deserve the most careful study for the purpose of discovering its meaning,—all this is inconsistent with this point of view. But to say that passages in Scripture have been purposely so worded—as to convey truth, without anticipating scientific discoveries, this is no departure whatever from patristic principles of interpretation.

Church has borne to both; it speaks of Adam as simply and naturally, as of Christ; it speaks of the Fall or the Flood, with no more suspicion of their literal truth, than of that of the Resurrection or the Ascension. Holy men have perused the text of Scripture with a humble and reverent curiosity; and have professed to derive from every text lessons of superhuman wisdom. I do not press any individual inquirer to give *more* weight to the authority of the Church and of holy men, than his existing principles allow; but I earnestly entreat him to give *as much* weight as these principles require. On the other hand, as to those who have originated the existing school of free criticism, it is saying no more than will be acknowledged by their admirers, if we affirm that they have not resorted to Scripture, as men who watch with breathless interest to catch the first accents that may be really from God, but in the very contrary spirit: in that spirit, which, if there be force in the preceding arguments, is utterly unreasonable and unphilosophical, and so likely to lead into every error;—is irreverent and impious, and so likely to entail a special blindness of sight, as God's appointed punishment. I am most anxious to avoid any railing accusation against individuals, while I attack principles: and I readily admit how much is to be said in personal defence or praise of this or that rationalistic inquirer. As to those who constitute the foreign school, they but inherit the teaching of their fathers; and if we can think, with thoughts altogether short of unmixed abhorrence, even of Luther, we can have little temptation to form uncharitable judgments on Paulus or on Strauss. Moreover, both as to critics abroad and those at home who may be tempted to follow in their train, I gladly concede this:—that there is most undoubtedly a real and genuine science of criticism, which has been brought into active life in these later centuries; and that those who, like myself, are ignorant of its very simplest rudiments, are no fair judges of the temptations, which beset the path of those who are proficient in its study. Still let it be remembered, that the votary of this science has an almost boundless field before him, in applying

it to the *carrying out* of those very principles of interpretation, which have been recognised from the first; that a commentary on St. Paul, or on the Gospels, or on the Psalms, or on the Prophetical Books, is in principle precisely such as might have been written by St. Athanasius or St. Augustine or St. Thomas, but adapted to the existing far superior state of exegetical science;—that this is an undertaking, which would be of extreme benefit to the Church. And when such a course as this is open, with the best wishes and congratulations of all, that an individual should, on his own responsibility, overstep this boundary-line, and should desert principles of interpretation, which all, without one exception, have maintained, who have consulted Scripture in the fit temper of mind; this surely is a course, which the boldest could not contemplate without alarm and dismay.

For my own part, when over against the views I hold on the authority of holy men and of the Church, I place such facts as these; viz. the most unreasonably exaggerated importance which undisciplined minds attach to a plausible objection newly brought against some received opinion, and again, the hasty induction, the absurd readiness to theorize, which all seem to acknowledge as the present characteristic of German thought, so that theory succeeds theory as wave succeeds wave (strange and most edifying contrast to the sure and steady march, and unceasing progressiveness of the Church's dogmatic theology!);—when I consider this, I have no doubt at all, that when this exegetical process has been honestly and *bonâ fide* carried out for some sufficient time, the issue will be, not the overthrow, but the firmer reestablishment, of all those old principles of which we have been speaking. But if I cannot make others partakers of this conviction, they must in fairness acknowledge so much as this: 1. that the temper of mind with which the rationalists have studied Scripture, is both unphilosophical and most deeply sinful; 2. that whether or no their researches have brought old principles of interpretation into discredit, they must be from the cause I just mentioned wholly worthless in devising new; 3. that in order to judge rightly of the whole subject, full

justice must be done to such questions as these—what is the worth of that probability arising from the argument I just now used, on the view of things acquired by really acting on the truths of natural religion?—how much weight is due to the experience of holy men, who have acquired so much of heavenly truths from *every part* of Scripture?—how great is the improbability, that God would have suffered all Christendom to be so long misled in a matter so closely concerning the spiritual life?—and others of a similar kind; 4. that on such questions as these, holy men not intellectual men, are alone qualified to form even a distantly probable judgment, and that consequently, especially in so vitally serious a matter as modifying the principles with which good men of all ages have studied the sacred volume, no authority, except one which should be able to collect the testimony of holy men, and which should be supernaturally assisted in its decision, could claim any deference at our hands; 5. that God has placed us in a traditionary system, where this book is put before us as very simply sacred; that in proportion as we live a strict and godly life, and reverently study it, the marks of Divine authority are more plainly traced in it; that we have derived from it doctrines which we now know to be most certainly and infallibly true; that if we desert those principles of interpretation which have been recognised by such august authority, no *positive* principles we can adopt in their place have even the slightest authority that a serious man can feel trustworthy. If in the face of such considerations as these, an individual should presume to leave the beaten track trodden by holy men, and embark on the sea of speculation, with no safer guide than his power of criticism, or the authority of others who have no *claim* to authority except the same power—to speak plainly, he must expect to place his own salvation in the most imminent peril.

It is generally acknowledged, that in originally fixing the Canon, the Church took very prominently into consideration the *doctrine* contained in the various books presented to her notice. This leads to a remark of the utmost importance. A great deal has been said in these latter days by Protestants,

and conceded by advocates of Catholicism, on the very great dissimilarity *on the surface*, in the way of tone and general bearing, which exists between the text of Scripture and the dogmatic formularies of the Church. When by a deep and habitual study of both, religious men come to perceive the deep and wonderful harmony which *really* exists between them, an evidence arises for the Divine authority of the two, than which no external evidence can be conceived more cogent. The proof is the same in kind with that of the ‘*Horæ Paulinæ*’; but far more persuasive and constraining even than that exquisitely ingenious work. Neither of these Divine oracles can be supposed to have been in matter of fact founded on the other; else they would not so differ on the surface: both must come in a peculiar sense from God; else they would not so mysteriously agree, in the accents which they utter to the disciplined and holy soul.

6. The next application I shall make of the Canons which I fancy myself to have established, is one which all will have anticipated throughout the discussion: I mean, the illustration and defence of those maxims, on which the Church Catholic has ever acted in dealing with her children. This is indeed so obvious, that a few hints will suffice. The Church has ever taught her children with *authority*: not imagining the possibility of their questioning her judgment; much less, educating them, as in a duty, in the habit of studying impartially the evidence of her claims; but relying, for proof of her divine mission, on the very lessons which she teaches her children and the grace she dispenses to them. Those who rebel against her authority, after having been educated in her bosom,—so far from considering in the light of inquirers who have come to an erroneous conclusion on a question which depends on argument,—she has treated, as some indulgent yet holy father might treat his children, who during their childhood have refused to submit themselves to his instructions. Catholics again, during the great controversies which have agitated the Church, have habitually and unconsciously regarded heretics not merely as rebels against lawful authority, but as desiring to rob them of definite

doctrines which are part of their spiritual nature itself, and which they would rather die than part with. On the other hand, not only has the Church not *exhorted* or *encouraged* her children to investigate her claims, she has in most cases *forbidden* it under the strongest penalties. The very thought of unbelief has been treated as a sin; like a thought of anger, or pride, or impurity. Her children have been forbidden so much as to *read* what has been advanced on the other side, unless they establish, to the satisfaction of her authorities, that they are so well grounded spiritually in the faith, and so well furnished with intellectual power, that they may benefit the Church without injuring themselves, by making so hazardous an experiment. All this and much else of the same kind, is no doubt utterly unreasonable and fanatical, *if* examination of evidence be our guide to religious truth;† but it all flows as a direct corollary from the principles I have been labouring to illustrate.

† It is very much to be wished (to repeat what I have before said), that those who, in some shape or other, base religious belief on private judgment,—for instance, on an opinion that certain doctrines are consistent with those of the early Church and certain others *inconsistent*,—would remember, how utterly unmeaning, delusive, and wildly extravagant, are their words, unless they inculcate the duty of doing the most careful justice to both sides of the question. ‘Was there ever heard a more preposterous notion, than that free and impartial inquiry are to be our means of interpreting Scripture, [or the Fathers,] and yet that our examination of arguments is to be all on one side? What would be said of a judge, who, having with much point and emphasis and swelling satisfaction proclaimed his absolute impartiality, should proceed however to intimate his intention of listening only to advocates *on one side of the question*; but that they day after day, week after week, month after month, should have ready access to his ear? Mr. Goode advocates the establishment of a body of clergy to enforce on the people arguments for *his* interpretation of Scripture (vol. ii. p. 246); is he prepared in consistency to provide advocates of the *opposite* sentiments, that the noblest privilege of the Protestant, free and unbiassed inquiry, may have at least some chance of legitimate scope? Will he insist upon the controversial works of Channing, Belsham, and Priestley, as no less necessary parts of Christian education than those of Bull or Horsley? Nay, to go further back, will he enforce the necessary Protestant duty of endeavouring to give their full weight to the arguments of Tindal, Chubb, and Collins, or Rousseau and Voltaire? No! most happily for themselves and others, men’s conscience is on the whole more than a match for their Protestantism: they content themselves with recommending free Scriptural inquiry to all who *differ* from themselves; they allow their Protestantism a gentle un-

This will be the fit place to say what little remains to be said, on a subject which Mr. Palmer has noticed with considerable emphasis;—the development of Christian doctrine. All that I can say indeed on the matter has been pretty well implied in what has gone before; and nothing remains to be done here except to notice Mr. Palmer's observations.

‘There are “developments” which are *inferences* from Revelation, and there are also “developments” which are mere *expressions* of Revelation. There is a wide and essential difference between these things. The former . . . may not have been deduced in the primitive ages. . . . The latter have been at all times held substantially by the Church; they are comprised in Scripture, if not literally, yet in its spirit and meaning; they are mere *expressions* of *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus creditum est*; they can only be novel in form; they are in spirit and life identical with “the Faith once delivered to the Saints.”’

I have omitted from my quotation some expressions of Mr. Palmer's, in which he seems to represent that later *inferences* cannot be matters of *faith*; because I do not concur in that opinion: but the general distinction he makes is undoubtedly just and of very considerable importance. It had indeed already been made, quite as clearly in the British Critic.

‘When we speak of the Apostles having taught some principle to the early Church, we mean what we say; not that they gave to their successors an *embodiment* of that principle *carried to its farthest limits*. Every principle, which (as Mr. Carlyle would say) is a reality not a sham, has indefinite results contained within it, of which those who first receive it have not even the faintest suspicion. They may hold it for some length of time in company with other modes of thought, which are virtually inconsistent with it; they may so hold it through a life, through many lives; until

disturbed slumber, in their own case and that of those who agree with them. Was ever a more contemptible spectacle presented to the eyes of the merely argumentative scoffer, than the claims of English Protestants to the especial praise, as distinguished from foreign Catholics, of grounding their belief on *examination*,—taken in connection with the laws of religious libel, and the virtual proscription in all religious society of books which take the opposite side?’
‘On Goode,’ p. 58.

gradually and unconsciously it is matured within and springs forth into full development. Now the reverse of this is commonly assumed by controversialists: they find the Fathers of some later century far more explicit and unanimous than in earlier times, on some great truth; and immediately conclude, that it is the matured fruit of some false principle which has crept into the Church. Most illogically indeed! unless it be *false* principles only, which are carried forward but slowly and by degrees to their full bearing. Whether *in this or that case* it be false, is matter of evidence in the particular instance; but to say that *a priori* it *probably* is so, is really to rule that the Apostles taught no *principle* whatever. Real or living principles differ from mere formulæ, as the works of nature from the works of art; a table or a chair is made once for all, and remains stationary in size and proportions as it came from the maker's hand; but a small seed, small and almost imperceptible, grows and expands without human cognizance, and *ends* not *begins* by banishing all rival claimants from the space it is destined to occupy. It may well be then, as Mr. Goode has pointed out (vol. ii. pp. 202—214), that the fifth century was far more decided and interested than the second in the defence of St. Mary's perpetual Virginity, and yet may have been altogether right in such increased love of the doctrine. Such love may well have been the natural and legitimate development of principles taught by the Apostles (*e.g.* the blessedness of celibacy, the sacramental efficacy of proximity to our Lord, the unspeakable dignity to which human nature is raised by the Incarnation, &c., &c.); and St. Augustine may have been most pious and wisely zealous in denouncing those as *heretics*, (vol. ii. pp. 211, 213,) who did not receive a statement which the *orthodox*, by that time, had discovered to have been ever morally involved in the principles they held *from the first*.

'Again: the Apostles may not only have taught *principles* without their *development*, but *doctrines* without their *analysis*. A very little thought will suffice to shew,' &c. (See quotation in pp. 519, 520.)

Where it will be observed, that the two paragraphs exactly answer respectively to the two different ideas of 'development' mentioned by Mr. Palmer. I am able also fully to follow the latter in his observation, that Mr. Newman's Sermon on the subject is on the whole confined to 'develop-

ments,' in that sense in which Mr. Palmer seems to admit them; though it is a sense in which, so we are told by learned persons, Bp. Bull did *not* admit them. But the British Critic has gone altogether beyond any thing that Mr. Newman has stated in that sermon; and appears to consider it quite possible that doctrines may be ruled by the Church as part of the necessary faith, which were not held even implicitly by the early Fathers; though they *did* hold *premises*, which, by necessary consequence moral or intellectual, *lead* to these doctrines. For myself, I think not only this *may* be so, but that it *is* so. Here shall follow a passage, in which I have stated this distinctly.

' Viewing then the Church collective starting after the Apostles' death on her aggressive course, we find her, as might have been expected, fully possessed of, and energizing in, those doctrines, which are the cardinal points of faith; e. g. the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharistic Presence. Her intimate assurance of the truth of these, results from spiritual action; and also, we may add, from her perception of their wonderful accordance with the dicta of the Sacred Volume, as viewed by holy eyes in all its depth, fulness, and expanse. And her *idea* of them, the *impression* they form on her mind, is infinitely indeed below the original truths themselves, yet is it "the nearest approach to them which our present state allows;" as being received by the *moral* faculty: that faculty, which is more truly heavenly in its origin, and in its nature more akin to heaven, than any other part of man's constitution. On these subjects, then, the task which remains for her is, to bring before her own notice one particular after another of her complex and mysterious consciousness, to regard it steadily and distinctly, to project it, as it were, from the moral on the intellectual faculty, to express in accurate language the result of such projection, and to follow out the result so obtained into those intellectual consequences which necessarily flow from it. Or, to use the words we adopted in the earlier part of our article, the science of these doctrines (and it is a science which has been in fact growing, we may say, almost to the present day, nay, which is still pregnant with an indefinite number of unexplored inferences) will consist entirely of analytical and deducible propositions. Not that these truths are of a nature different from all other religious and

moral truths, so as not to grow upon the spiritual eye by contemplation, nor to germinate in the spiritual mind by approbation; but because, *in point of fact*, they were impressed, in their wholefulness, on the mind of the infant Church, and, like Minerva, were born full grown and complete in all their parts. In the mind of individual Christians, indeed, they do so expand and germinate; and we may as well add, for clearness, that propositions which are but analytical of the collective Church's experience, are synthetical to believers one by one; and that these dogmatic statements are, in many cases, inestimably advantageous, in directing the disciple's mind to a right apprehension of the revealed Objects. In the mean time to speak at length of the gifts, moral and intellectual, called forth by these investigations, or of their inherent dignity, greatness, fruitfulness, would be hardly even becoming while the words remain on record of one, who cannot at least be accused, as others might be, of theorizing on the mere creature of his imagination, or of praising works which he has not studied.^b

' Still, though the foundations of the faith were fully realised from the first, other principles there were no doubt, and very far from unimportant ones, *which were deposited, as it were, in germ within the bosom of the Church*; that her internal action might gradually nurture them, or external circumstances hasten their appearance on the surface. And on these subjects the Church herself does form synthetical judgments, by dint of moral action and meditation. In other doctrines, again, the spiritual experience, which she accumulates from age to age, forms a most important part of the premises to be taken into account;^c here then also part of the

^b See the 14th of Mr. Newman's University Sermons.

^c The following admirable observations of Mr. Mill will illustrate the indispensable importance of ever keeping alive within the Church the vivid memory of her earlier and mediæval period, through the din of present action and controversy; while they also point out the great advantage of her maintaining formulæ and expressions which have come down to her, though the present generation of believers may be far from entering into their real force. (Vol. ii. p. 257.) "There is a perpetual oscillation in spiritual truths, and of spiritual doctrines of any significance, even when not truths. Their meaning is almost always in a process either of being lost or of being recovered: a remark upon which all history is a comment. Whoever has attended to the history of the more serious convictions of mankind, of the opinions by which the general conduct of their lives is, or as they conceive ought to be, regulated, is aware that while recognising verbally the very same doctrines, they attach to them at different periods a greater or less quantity, and even a different kind of meaning. The words in

premises are synthetical. And it should be pointed out distinctly, that when this theory of "development" is maintained, it is not necessary, in order to account for it, to allege, as the cause of such maintenance, the necessities of some immediate object, or undue sympathy with some external system. If developments had not existed in Christianity, *it would have been necessary to suppose that God worked a continued miracle, to separate off Christian from all other religious and moral truth.* It is of the very nature of moral belief, that the same principles shall appear in each successive age, in a new aspect, or a more advanced growth, or more harmonious proportions.'

Here then, as in other cases, Mr. Palmer has rather understated than over-stated the opinions which I, for one, entertain: but I must be allowed at the same time to add, that here, as in other cases, he does not seem to me so successful in answering them as in stating them; indeed it should be said in justice to him, that he only professes to throw out *hints* in the way of answer, as he 'cannot now discuss this very extensive subject.' (p. 61.) Mr. Palmer seems to have been hardly prepared for a plea of 'justification;' and has directed, therefore, his main strength against a plea which I by no means put forward, that of 'not guilty.'

My difficulty in defending this doctrine of 'development,' arises from my inability to conceive, how any one can have, for a single day, pursued a course of moral and religious action, and yet deny it. Confining our view to natural religion, 'it is by moral action under this visible system, and thus only, that we learn, in varying but continually increasing degrees, the very *meaning* of those qualities which, in their perfection, we attribute to God. From a father perhaps we derive our first notion of justice; from a mother, of loving tenderness; and thus in our gradual progress, every perception of good in others, every growth of it in ourselves;

their original acceptation connoted, and the propositions expressed, a complication of outward facts and inward feelings, to different portions of which the general mind is more particularly alive in different generations of mankind. To common minds, only that portion of the meaning is in each generation suggested, of which that generation possesses the counterpart in its own habitual experience. But the words and propositions lie ready, to suggest to any mind, duly prepared, the remainder of the meaning."

every strengthened and confirmed habit of love, of unselfishness, of diligence, of self-denial, of humility, of obedience, to which this external and social system is, by God's appointment so well calculated to minister; all unite in this one result, of gifting us with a deeper insight into the perfections of the Divine Nature.'^d Nor is it merely that we learn more fully the *meaning* or the *application* of those truths we know (though the distinction Mr. Palmer here draws is not to me obvious); in the strictest sense of the word we acquire *new* truths. To take one or two out of a thousand instances,—we learn that God is just: if we are careless and worldly, the dogma remains barren and unfruitful; but if we habitually realise and contemplate it, we learn to carry on this truth into a further development; that our conduct here will have a decisive influence on our lot hereafter. Or we learn that God is merciful as well as just; we gradually learn that such a belief involves the doctrine of a particular Providence, and is inconsistent with the idea that the course of phenomena is governed by fatal and unbending laws, irrespective of that great end, our moral probation. Now no one would say that it involved any denial of this principle, if an inspired prophet having communicated a Revelation of God's attributes, were to say—here is 'the whole truth'—or here is 'the whole counsel of God,'—or the like. Such declarations could never be naturally taken to imply more, than 'this is all which I tell you in the way of *Revelation*: take it, appropriate it, develop it, for yourselves: but I have no more to tell you than I *have* told you.' Nor, I think, in the parallel case would any one naturally understand those solemn texts cited by Mr. Palmer, (p. 58,) in any different sense. To say indeed that this process of development ceases, as if by some standing miracle, under the Gospel, would be quite natural, if the history of the Church appeared to require such a statement: but when the facts of Church History precisely tally with what our knowledge of human nature and of moral habits would lead us to expect, some better reason surely must be given for our receiving

^d 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' pp. 7, 8.

such a statement, than merely that its denial is absolutely fatal to the pretensions of 'high-church' Anglican theology.

Mr. Palmer indeed compares this doctrine to rationalism; nevertheless it has been the principal object of this chapter to place these two philosophies in marked and pointed contrast. And in truth the question, whether we should begin by *believing* and at once act;—or whether we should begin by *inquiring* and *abstain* from moral action;—does seem sufficiently vital and fundamental. In one point they agree, and only in one; in clashing with the principles of conservatism. But then, how these principles can be placed on any philosophical basis at all, or how they can be so much as stated plainly and consistently, without disclosing features which would repel the most cowardly and the most indolent, I have never been able to learn.^d

Lastly, Mr. Palmer and others say, that at last the principle of development is only a *negative* argument in favour of Roman doctrine. I have never claimed it as being more. The *positive* arguments arise from the authority of the Roman Catholic Church and of holy men;—whatever be the *value* of those arguments, which this is not the place to consider. . But when it appears that there is no one tenet of the Roman Church, which could not *quite conceivably* have arisen from the development and combination of doctrines declared by the Apostles, then this principle of development does establish, that, to speak positively *against* these tenets as false and corrupt, is as weak and shallow intellectually, as I have already argued it to be arrogant and irreverent morally.^e

^d See 'On Mill's Logic,' p. 352 and p. 362.

^e I am much concerned at being obliged to crowd into a note the observations I had promised on St. Alphonsus: but space forbids the enlargement on the subject which I could wish. No one affects me so much as a devotional writer; and I speak therefore with some claim to be heard, when I give an opinion on matters of fact connected with his writings. Though a copious, he is very far from a *various* writer: on the contrary, in all his devotional works there is a continual recurrence of four leading ideas, which seem his habitually prominent subjects of thought. I. The miraculous love of our Blessed Lord in His Passion; II. in giving Himself to us as our sacramental food; III. that union with Him is perfect happiness, and separation from Him the only real misery; IV. that the

7. The very same principles, which have actuated the Church in her dealings with her children, have also governed

Blessed Virgin's intercession is all-powerful with Him. Of course, when one reads the 'Glories of Mary,' one must expect that the chief subject shall be what the title professes; but it is impossible to read his ordinary works with any fairness, and doubt for a moment, (even apart from the feeling which would lead any ordinarily humble mind to take *on faith* that so great a Saint did not err in such a particular, see pp. 427, 8,) that his feeling of 'latria' is exclusively given to God. One illustration I may especially mention: the idea of *union* with our Blessed Lord, to which I lately alluded, is peculiarly the ascription to Him of a Divine attribute: now I will take upon myself to maintain a negative, and deny that any expression will be found throughout his writings in regard to the Blessed Virgin, of a similar nature.

Now take a few extracts from his writings selected almost at random.

'All the holiness, all the perfection, of a soul consists in loving Jesus Christ our God, our Sovereign Lord and our Saviour. 'There are some men,' says St. Francis de Sales, 'who place perfection in austerity of life, others find it in prayer, others in frequenting the Sacraments, others in alms-giving; but all are mistaken. Perfection consists in loving God with our whole heart.' (p. 1.) (Pratique de l'Amour de Jésus Christ.)

'Oh if men would but stop, when they behold a crucifix, to consider the love which Christ bore for each one of them. "With what love," says St. Francis de Sales, "should we not be enkindled at the sight of the flames of love which burn in the bosom of the Redeemer! Oh! what blessedness to burn with the same flame wherewith our God burns! What joy to be united to God by the bonds of love!" St. Bonaventure called the wounds of Jesus Christ wounds which wound the most insensible hearts, set on fire the most icy souls.' (pp. 7, 8.)

'The venerable John Avila: "In what manner, O Thou who didst love me, shall I repay Thy love? Blood should be paid by blood. May I be covered by Thy blood; may I be nailed on that cross. Receive *me*, crown *me* with thorns, set *Thyself* free, that I may expose my head to the thorns. O sacred nails, leave the innocent hands of my Saviour, and pierce this heart of mine with pity and love. My Jesus, St. Paul says that Thou didst die to make *Thyself* Lord of the quick and the dead; not by chastisement, but by love." (p. 9.)

'But to arrive at perfect love of Jesus Christ, we must employ the necessary means. There are four mentioned by St. Thomas Aquinas: 1. to have a continual memory of the benefits of God, as well general as particular; 2. to consider the infinite goodness of God, who is always ready to do us good, and asks in return only our love; 3. to avoid with care the least thing that can possibly displease Him; 4. to renounce all the sensible goods of this earth, riches, honours, pleasures of the senses. Father Tauler adds, that another great means of obtaining perfect love of Jesus Christ is to meditate on His holy Passion.

'Who can deny that *devotion to the passion* of Jesus Christ is [of all] the *most useful, the most tender*; the most pleasing to God, that which consoles sinners most efficaciously, that which enkindles most loving souls? And whence do we derive certainty of pardon, strength against temptations, hope of paradise? whence do we

her proceedings in drawing towards herself the nations of the world. At the first starting of the Gospel, circumstances were

receive so many rays of truth, so many inspirations of love, so many impulses which lead us to change our life, so many desires of giving up ourselves to God, except from the passion of Jesus Christ?

‘*St. Bonaventure says, that there is no devotion more fit to sanctify the soul than meditation on the passion of Jesus Christ. He therefore advises us to meditate every day on this mystery, if we desire to advance in Divine love. . . . St. Augustine says that one tear shed from the memory of His passion has more merit than to fast every week on bread and water. Therefore it is that the Saints have always employed themselves in considering the sufferings of Jesus Christ. St. Francis of Apicium by this means became a seraph. One day he was found weeping and exclaiming loudly. They asked him the cause of his tears. ‘I weep,’ he answered, ‘the sufferings and ignominies of my Saviour; and that which makes me weep the most bitterly is, that men, for whom He has suffered so much, live without thinking of Him.’ . . . Another time, being ill, some one advised him to have some book of devotion read to him: “My book,” he answered, “is Jesus crucified.” For this reason he did nothing else but exhort his brethren always to think of the passion of Jesus Christ.*

‘I see the wrong I have done Thee, O my Jesus; have pity on me. I offer Thee this ungrateful heart: ungrateful, yet repentant. Yes, I repent, and I regard it as the greatest evil that I ever spurned Thee. . . . Yes, my Saviour, my God, I love Thee, I love Thee. Ah! call ever to my mind how much Thou didst suffer for me, that I may never forget to love Thee. O cords which bound Jesus, bind me to Jesus. O thorns which crowned Jesus, wound me with love for Jesus. O nails which pierced Jesus, fix me to the cross of Jesus, *that I may live and die united to Jesus.* O blood of Jesus, intoxicate me with holy love. O death of Jesus, make me die to all earthly affections. O pierced feet of my Saviour, I bind myself to you; save me from the hell which I deserve. O my Jesus, in hell *I should never be able to love Thee, but I wish to love Thee for ever.* O my well-beloved Jesus save me, press me to Thy bosom, and suffer me not ever to lose Thee. O Mary, refuge of sinners, mother of my Saviour, assist a sinner *who desires to love God, and who commends himself to thee.* Help me in the name of that love *which thou bearest to Jesus Christ.*’

I have retained the last sentence, to shew the habitual connection in his mind of the two feelings, love to our Lord and love to His Mother: the very idea of the possibility of their clashing never occurs to his mind. The following, from ‘the Glories of Mary’ may be added.

‘There is no doubt that figures, like hyperboles, cannot be taxed with falsehood, when *by the context of the discourse the exaggeration is evident*; as, for example, when St. Peter Damianus says, that Mary comes to her Son commanding, not beseeching. . . . So then figures are permitted whenever *there cannot be any mistake in consequence.*’ Vol. vi. (French Edition,) p. 324.

Let it be observed also, that the Saints have their wills wholly and absolutely subject to the will of God: theirs then is no arbitrary or capricious interference, but they pray for those objects and in that degree, which is most fitting for carrying out God’s gracious purposes. This throws light on a form of expression

especially so ordered, that the best and highest minds should be retained by no impediment in leaping forward, as it were, to join her at her first summons. For the various forms of heathenism were so essentially mixed up with moral depravity, that all who had so much of moral light as to revolt from the fearful exhibition, were eagerly looking out for some unknown messenger of good; while the Jewish system had from the first been so ordered, that ‘*he* derived most faithfully the lesson intended by it,’ and gave proof that he had most faithfully and heartily observed it, ‘who was most wearied and dissatisfied with’ its bondage, and looked forward most ardently to the future coming in of grace and truth.^f Under these circumstances, of what nature was the Apostles’ preaching? Let Mr. Newman answer this question.

“The Apostles then proceeded thus:—they did not rest their cause on argument; they did not appeal to eloquence, wisdom, or reputation; nay, nor did they make miracles necessary to the enforcement of their claims. They did not resolve faith into sight or reason; they contrasted it with both, and bade their hearers believe, sometimes in spite, sometimes in default, sometimes in aid of sight and reason. They exhorted them to make trial of the Gospel, since they would find their account in so doing. And of their hearers ‘some believed the things which were spoken, some believed not.’ Those believed whose hearts were ‘opened,’ who were ‘ordained to eternal life;’ those did not whose hearts were hardened. This was the awful exhibition of which the Apostles and their

which I acknowledge to be at first hearing very painful. Some most admirable Christians have at times used expressions, as though God the Father desired to punish, but God the Son prevailed on Him to spare: yet what more frightful heresy, than to suppose any real contrariety of will between Two Persons in the Ever-blessed Trinity? Such expressions then, whether well or ill-advised, are never understood by those who use them, as *true*; but as economical representations of Christ’s intercessory office. And in precisely a similar manner, where the like expressions are found concerning our Blessed Lord and St. Mary, it is absolutely unfounded to suppose, that any opinion is implied so blasphemous, as that the Blessed Virgin’s love for us is otherwise than even infinitely less than His who is perfect God.

^f See this stated at greater length, ‘On the Synagogue and the Church,’ pp. 28—30.

fellow-workers were witnesses ; for faith, as a principle of knowledge, cannot be analysed or made intelligible to man, but is the secret, inexplicable, spontaneous movement of the mind, (however arising,) towards the external word,—a movement not to the exclusion of sight and reason, for the miracles appeal to both, nor of experience, for all who venture for Christ receive daily returns of good in confirmation of their choice, but independent of sight or reason before, or of experience after. The Apostles appealed to their hearts, and, according to their hearts, so they answered them. They appealed to their secret belief in a superintending Providence, in their hopes and fears thence resulting ; and they professed to reveal to them the nature, personality, attributes, will, and works of Him ‘whom they ignorantly worshipped.’ They came as commissioned from Him, and declared that mankind was a sinful and outcast race,—that sin was a misery,—that the world was a snare,—that life was a shadow,—that God was everlasting,—that His Law was holy and true, and its sanctions certain and terrible ;—that He also was all-merciful,—that He had appointed a Mediator between Him and them, who had removed all obstacles, and was desirous to restore them, and that He had sent them to explain how. They said that Mediator had come and gone ; but had left behind Him what was to be His representative till the end of all things, His mystical Body, the Church, in joining which lay the salvation of the world. Thus they preached, and thus they prevailed, using persuasives of every kind as they were given them, but resting at bottom on a principle higher than the senses or the reason. They used many arguments, but as outward forms of something beyond argument. They appealed to the miracles they wrought, as sufficient signs of their power, and assuredly divine, in spite of those which other systems could shew or pretended. They expostulated with the better sort on the ground of their instinctive longings and dim visions of something greater than the world. They awed and overcame the wayward, by the secret influence of what remained of heaven in them, and the involuntary homage paid by such to any more complete realising of it in others. They asked the more generous-minded whether it was not worth while to risk something on the chance of augmenting and perfecting those precious elements of good which their hearts still held ; and they could not hide what they cared not to ‘glory in,’ their own disinterested sufferings, their high deeds, and their sanctity of life.

They won over the affectionate and gentle by the beauty of holiness, and the embodied mercies of Christ as seen in their ministrations and ordinances. Thus they spread their nets for disciples, and caught thousands at a cast; thus they roused and inflamed their hearers into enthusiasm, till 'the Kingdom of Heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force.' †

And such as have been the holy maxims which first founded the Catholic Kingdom of Christ, such on the whole have been those which in subsequent ages have enlarged its borders. Kings have submitted to the Gospel, and their people have at once followed their natural guides; not led surely by inquiry and examination of evidence, (who so insane as to suppose it?) or by pondering on the notes of the Church, or by *à priori* presumptions that an infallible authority is required for weak and ignorant man: no; *they* have but followed those whom they had learned to revere; and the Church has received them, that she may take on herself the sacred and responsible office of imparting to them a purer moral discipline, and indoctrinating them with a higher and truer range of religious ideas, and moulding them under Divine grace on a more heavenly model; and that she may afford them the *proof* of her authority *in* so governing them.

Or does the Church send missionaries into some distant country, sunk in ignorance and superstition? The guise in which she takes especial pains to present herself, has ever been such as is described in the following picture.

'Let us imagine Catholic missionaries, carrying with them as far as might be the pure image of a Church. Let us picture to our minds the men themselves, bearing in their very countenances the marks of holy and mortified lives, exposing themselves with eagerness to toil and danger, authoritatively teaching, reproving, exhorting, appealing to men's consciences for warrant of the substantial truth of their doctrines, displaying that full and intimate acquaintance with human nature which the close relation with a flock is so well qualified to give, and bearing with them a majestic ceremonial which shall set forth plainly before men their doctrines, not written on paper, but exemplified, and, as it were, practically

energizing. To which of these [Protestants who *argue* or Catholics who *teach*] will Dr. Whately himself promise success? yet this is the fair issue: has Christ founded a *religion* or a *Church*? are we to appeal to men's *reasoning* powers in behalf of our faith, and so shew them what are its *grounds*, or to their *moral* faculties, and so shew them what it is?'

It would be absolutely insufferable indeed to dream of confining God's grace within the limits of our narrow theories, or of doubting that there have been numbers,—in whose case the Church's presence has at once broken the fetters of sin, which had not hitherto even galled and fretted them; and has awakened high feelings and aspirations, of which they had never before dreamed; and has elicited towards herself sympathies, which no inferior object had drawn forth. But nevertheless in the long run the result of her ministrations in a strange land has been such as follows. If a person has heartily acted on the creed he has originally learned, 'supposing Christian missionaries to appear and put before him a more divine and true revelation, will he not see here the solution of difficulties, the satisfaction of longings, the fulfilment of desires, which have so long oppressed him? Will not that character which the finger of God has been tracing within him, cling and respond to that which is exhibited externally; and will he not by almost a spontaneous movement, feel himself drawn into the vortex of this new attraction? It may be so: how far it is so, will depend on three things; 1. the degree of real and intrinsic superiority in the system which they offer; 2. the clearness with which this is exhibited and brought to his apprehension; 3. the extent of the strictness and conscientiousness of his past life.'^h

That in addition, and in subordination, to such grounds of conviction as those of which I have spoken, other appeals of every kind would be repeatedly urged, according to opportunity and prospect of success, is of course undoubted. Spiritual addresses alone will have little effect on the multitude of men in our fallen world; 'amidst its incessant din

^h 'On Whately's Essays.'

nothing will attract attention but what cries aloud and spares not;’ the whole inert mass of sluggishness and carnal-mindedness cannot be moved, except by a mechanism which shall act at once on *every* part of their compound nature. Thus a gift of miracles has been commonly granted by Christ, as an attendant on His Church’s missions; and, especially in dealing with an uncivilized people, will be a most efficacious instrument of success. The external notes of the Church are often another, most powerful and constraining, topic; whichever of them may happen at the time to shine with greater lustre; whether it be the visible union and brotherly love of Christians throughout the world,—or the calm and majestic progressiveness of her history from Apostolic times,—or the heavenly front and bearing which she displays to the world. Others are attracted, by those addresses to the eye and ear, which have so mysterious an influence over the minds of men. Others will be aroused by the threat of eternal condemnation, solemnly pressed home to their consciences as certainly impending, if when a message comes before them professing to be from God, and bearing with it so many signs of His presence, they, from sluggishness or carnal-mindedness, fail to give it their full and thoughtful attention. Or if there be among the unbelievers intellectual and philosophical gifts, argument will bear a prominent place in the great work: the missionary will labour to shew, that the truths, already attained by these inquirers, are not really inconsistent with the doctrine he is commissioned to teach; or that so far as they *are* inconsistent, they are no true images of any deep moral conviction; or again, that those tenets themselves, known and realised as they are on the most certain grounds of proof, were originally attained on a principle, which should in consistency lead forward those who hold them, into the acceptance of the higher doctrines now proposed. So various are the instruments, which a true and deep spiritual wisdom will apply to the great task of a people’s conversion:^h but in all cases the *idea* of conversion is one and the same. And

^h I apply the word here to a process which will often continue long after their Baptism; nor am I forgetting for a moment the working of the Holy Spirit in all this; though the subject leads me to speak only of the secondary instruments.

that idea has been,—the attracting to the Church that feeling of loyalty and reverence, purified and made more intense, which had previously at best no higher object on which to repose, than a human and most imperfect system; and the carrying the disciples forward, into a region of new and heavenly doctrine,—which shall contain within its sphere, and most fully recognise, those floating fragments of truth which may have been already acquired, disentangling them from the vast congeries of error with which they had been inter-mixed, and elevating and transmuting them into those fully harmonious and absorbing Divine realities, of which they were but the dim and distorted reflection.

Nothing however is more probable, than that in many cases the urgency of secondary motives may have been unduly applied, in order to attract proselytes to the Church; though I have no particular facts in my mind, when I make the observation. For, on the one hand, most certainly it cannot be maintained that *all* means are lawful, short of gross and overt sin, which promise to effect this object. And in giving one illustration of this, which may serve as a specimen of many others, I beg to say once for all, that nothing is further from my wish than the advocacy of any theoretical and pedantic refinement: if a child, of an age to know right from wrong, were to apply for Baptism, I am not supposing any course so unreal, as that he should be examined on the question, whether he have sufficiently performed his filial duties; the fact of his coming is a strong *primâ facie presumption*, that he is moved by the Holy Ghost; that either his feelings of reverence are now first called forth, or that the reverence, first drawn forth by his parents, has been elevated through them to this higher object. But what if a Christian priest were secretly to entice a child from under his father's roof; and were to keep him, by continued artifice, separate from his father, and gradually teach him the Christian faith? There is no one living surely, who would defend such a proceeding, when fairly stated in its full circumstances; or in other words, there *is* a point, beyond which the application of secondary motives to the effecting of a good end is indefensible.

And yet it would be almost certain (though as I said I really am not thinking of any particular facts) that zealous missionaries,—impressed with a deep sense of the dreadful evils caused by superstition and idolatry, and of the power possessed by Satan beyond the limits of the Christian Church,—that missionaries, I say, impressed with a deep sense of this, and eager to pluck souls from among them as brands out of the fire, should frequently transgress the limits, which conscience, if fairly consulted, would prescribe. Nor is there any subject, on which we could less calculate that the holy instincts of the most saintly men would lead them to act on different maxims; for the very premisses to be considered, (viz. the moral condition and responsibilities, in regard to each other, of those whom he has been habituated to regard merely in the mass as aliens from the faith) are such as would not be *presented* to his conscience, unless by a special and laborious act of the imagination and the understanding.

However, individual errors, if such there have been (as is most probable), in no way interfere with the general principle sanctioned by the Church: and the general principle has been plainly and undeniably such as I have described. Whether learned men, or eloquent men, or acutely disputing men, have accompanied a mission,—has ever been mainly an accident; whether miracles have been worked,—has been in God's hand alone; but these two matters on the contrary, have always been most carefully aimed at,—viz. that there shall be holy and mortified men, and that there shall be presented, to those whom they desire to convert, the fullest practicable exhibition of a Christian Church, in its orderly round of teaching, discipline, and worship. In other words, whether any, or what, *secondary* means shall be applied, has not been a matter of much thought; but that a higher idea of sanctity, and a higher range of doctrine, shall be brought fairly before the consciences of those whom they address, this has been universally and most carefully provided.

8. It appears, then, from what has been said in the present chapter, that our security against real religious error, is not a free and independent enquiry into the doctrines we have

learnt, but the very contrary—a faithful and unsuspecting appropriation of them; and that the temper of mind, which really leads us towards the truth, is that which desires most unreservedly to submit itself with all teachableness and humility to God's guidance,—which anxiously and watchfully aims at the maintenance of all God's doctrines and commandments according to the light vouchsafed,—and which ever presses eagerly forward towards a fuller vision of Him, towards every new glimpse of religious truth which may visit it from any quarter. I illustrated and enforced this principle, first of all, on the surest of all grounds,—that of natural religion and morality; and next I endeavoured to shew, how fully it has been ever recognised by the Catholic Church. On the one hand—the one habitual and highest motive which she proposes, in inviting unbelievers or misbelievers to forsake their hereditary *society*, is that by so doing they will *add to*, in no way really subtract from, their hereditary *creed*; she addresses herself, I say, prominently and primarily to that very temper of mind,—firm in retaining old belief, eager in adding to it new—which I just now characterized. And on the other hand,—in dealing with her own children, so far has she been from encouraging any conscious examination on their part of her high and peremptory claims, that even to doubt them has ever been considered a sin. It is not that she has called on her children to receive her *doctrines*, because they are satisfied of her *authority*: she has never allowed them to *examine* her authority any more than her doctrines. 'Put away from you doubt,' has been her language, 'put away from you doubt, as being sinful; *believe* what you learn and act on it;—you will sufficiently prove to yourselves, both the truth of what I say, and my authority for saying it, by *means* of believing and acting.' Such has been her confident language; and fully has it been in all cases justified by the event. But the principle, implied in that language, cannot by possibility be other, than that principle which I have so frequently laboured to enforce; viz. that *whatever* our hereditary principles, we must begin at once by believing and acting. For her children at the outset have no more *proof* of her divine

authority, than her own word for it; a proof (if so it can be called) which all have in different shapes, at least as regards their parents, under whatever circumstances their birth may have placed them.

The very same principle has been at work throughout, in that remarkable movement within our own Church, of which so much has been said: as indeed it must be, in any moral or religious movement, which is to contain an element of life and growth. When the eyes of certain English Churchmen were opened by God's grace some twelve years ago, to discern the fearful precipice towards which religious opinion was hastening among us, they altogether eschewed the idle and ridiculous child's play of examining between rival doctrines by means of patristic and scholastic studies.¹ Had *such* been their course, our Church might have been finally ruined, while they were sitting at home and making up their mind. No! they saw at once that *authority* was the element which was wanting, and they stepped forward as advocates for authority. There *was* a recognised and standard *principle* of authority in the English Church; to that they appealed,—on that as on a firm basis they took their stand,—on that they planted the lever which, so they hoped, might disturb, overthrow, revolutionise, the system then dominant in the Church. To this, the Anglican, view of doctrine, they at once summoned others; this view they accepted themselves 'with undoubting confidence; well knowing, that the mere carrying it into practical effect would sufficiently ensure its being borne onwards into its full proportions, should it really want consistency; or crumbling from its own rottenness, should

¹ Mr. Palmer however says, "When we associated ten years since in defence of the Church of England, in vindication of her orthodox and primitive principles, *we had already satisfied ourselves* that this Church is justified in holding her course apart from Romish corruptions." Can Mr. Palmer really mean, that all who then combined, or indeed any of them, had fairly weighed the arguments on both sides, that they had taken every pains to disembarass their minds from the influence of early prepossession, and hold the balance impartially between Anglican and Roman reasonings? If he mean this, surely as regards others than himself he must be mistaken as to the fact: if he do not mean this, what *can* be the meaning of the sentence I have quoted?

it be really untenable.’^k True it is that the language of many among them was rather of free inquirers into the Fathers, than of upholders of the principle of faith; but this is only one out of innumerable instances in every age, where serious and holy men act rightly and defend their acts wrongly. And whoever will at the present day carefully peruse Mr. Newman’s work on the ‘Prophetical Office’ (the first attempt, I suppose, to state Anglican principles in a definite and consistent shape) will see that *he* based his adherence to Anglicanism on those principles of faith, which he has so prominently witnessed.

And what has been the result of this most pious and religious procedure? The course of rationalism has been driven backward with triumph and irresistible might; for though it may have disclosed its real features far more unreservedly and undisguisedly than hitherto it had done, this was the very result of its conflict with those high principles, which now crossed its path: again, the emptiness, hollowness, folly, laxity, unreality of English Protestantism has been held up to light, as it never had been before; a frank and uncompromising defiance has been hurled against it; a whole range of ideas, which had appeared to be finally banished from our theology, have returned among us, with a constraining power and persuasiveness, with an intensity and wide reach of influence, which we have never witnessed since the Reformation; event has succeeded event with such breathless rapidity, that the very principal actors have been startled and bewildered at the fruit of their own labours. While on the other hand, the principles, which have been throughout the centre, rallying-point, and spring of the exertions that have been made,—these have so fruitfully expanded and germinated in the mind of many who had embraced them, that we find, oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight! we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen; numbers even of those, who are as yet

^k ‘On Goode,’ p. 83. See all that I have said in the text more fully stated in the few preceding pages of that article.

unconscious how much of truth they hold, and may remain so, unless some sudden crisis call on them to make an election and to take a side. And this work has been done with no help whatever from without:—for the intellectual difficulties that may have from time to time encountered us, *we* have been left to find the intellectual solution; in the moral perplexities which our position may have occasioned, *we* have been left to devise for ourselves guidance and remedy:—the work going on among us was responded to at first with open hostility, at no time with frank and hearty cordiality, from the great body of Catholic Christendom: *it has been done, under God, by the inherent vitality and powers of our own Church.*

Whether at the present time ‘high-church’ doctrines are increasing or diminishing in numerical strength, I am unable even to guess; but that *Roman* sympathies and doctrines are making the most rapid strides among ‘high-churchmen,’ this no one, who has such experience as is accessible to myself, can for a moment doubt. The ‘Christian Remembrancer’ is no admirer of this tendency; and yet let us hear the candid avowal concerning its extent, made in an article, the admirable spirit and temper of which I have already had occasion most respectfully to commemorate.

Tendencies to Rome ‘exist, and deeply do we deplore them. It is no longer possible to conceal them: it is treacherous to attempt to explain them away. We admit that they are increasing: we by no means share in the apologetic tone adopted towards their occurrence in the *Foreign and Colonial Review*. They are very important and very alarming; *they are deeply seated and widely spreading.*’

‘If we would retain some of our most devout and earnest members, who are *by hundreds* “straggling towards Rome”—some of *our most affectionate and warm-hearted, we do not say strongest-headed, children*—it will only be, it can only be, by becoming at once, in fact, what we have ever been on paper.’

‘Could we anticipate one state of things than another more favourable to *the most frightful growth* of the present *hankering after Rome*, it would be at the present moment by adopting a policy

dangerously conciliatory towards those who openly defy and deny Church authority, and laugh at the very notion of Church principles.'¹

That these tendencies may have been slightly and indirectly increased by such circumstances as those to which the Reviewer alludes, or again, as the condemnation of Dr. Pusey, or again, as the peculiar position assumed by those who are regarded as principal witnesses of 'the distinctive doctrines of our Church'—is probable enough: but there have been far deeper causes at work: giving even to these an efficacy, which they never otherwise could have obtained. And while, in such persons e. g. as myself, to my own extreme surprise, barrier after barrier fell, which I had been told was impassable;—or distinctions on which I had heard stress laid, proved themselves nugatory;—or principles were shewn to be necessary in order to defend the 4th century, against which those very persons who urged them had protested when applied to the 18th or the 19th;—as this process went on, our formularies also assumed a new aspect, and it was at last discovered how utterly lax and inoperative our Articles really are. No secret has been made of this conviction. It is now three years since I, a clergyman of the English Church, writing in my own name, published an opinion, 'that the Articles were not directed against those who *retained the old doctrines*, so that they were willing to join in a protest against the shameful corruptions in existence, and also to give up the Pope,' (*Few More Words*, pp. 34—5,) that 'the Articles do not exclude' the opinions which '*had existed*' (at the time of the Reformation) '*in the Church for an indefinite period.*' (Appendix to do. p. 8.) No argument has appeared of any force against these positions; and, what is more to the purpose, no condemnation of them by any authoritative tribunal. Three years have passed, since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine: yet I retain my Fellowship which I hold on the tenure of subscription, and have received no Ecclesiastical censure in any shape. It may be said, indeed, that individual Bishops have spoken against those opinions: but

¹ November, 1843.

where does the Institution of our Church give individual Bishops any power of authoritatively declaring Church-of-England doctrine? The answer is not doubtful: and while so 'extreme' are the opinions which receive the fullest toleration in our Church, the numbers are daily increasing who consciously embrace them: while still more abundant is the stream of those, who, consciously or unconsciously, are ever pressing in the same direction; and pressing, not by means of independent examination and argumentative inquiry, (which would lead them to error as probably as to truth,) but by means of the surest guides towards sympathy with saintly men and with Rome—habitual watchfulness of conscience, frequent prayer, ever increasing humility, a trust, more and more undivided, in the mercy of God and in the merits of His Son.

But a still more wonderful and constraining proof of the signal favour with which our Blessed Lord has visited our Church, than any that has gone before, remains to be mentioned. The extreme tumult and disorder, which at the present time pervades our Church, to myself, I confess, is simply a sign of good; and should be a matter of surprise to those only, who have underrated the depth and wide extent of corruption, contained in that system which has so long oppressed us. As long as peace and tranquillity seemed to prevail, and compliments were being exchanged on both sides between maintainers of the old conservative principle and members of the new anti-Protestant school, (as though there were no very substantial difference between them,) so long doubtless there was much in the external aspect of our Church, to awaken serious misgivings, whether the rising principle might not be stifled, the spreading flame quenched. But now,—when opinion is pursuing its free course, and shews plainly that it will not be stinted,—when both sides are beginning to discover the real points at issue, and the Reformation itself is openly and undisguisedly attacked,—the commotion which agitates the surface might be confidently expected from the mighty influences which are stirring the depths. Principles and habits, which have grown through three

hundred years cannot be uprooted by one gentle and peaceful effort; and Protestantism is a demon, which will 'cruelly rend' the body from which it is preparing to depart.^k I say then, that those various heart-burnings, misunderstandings, perplexities, which surround us on all sides, deeply deplorable as they must appear to all possessed of any thoughtfulness, have never impressed me with any misgiving or distrust in our Church, but the very reverse. Others, however, as is well known, have been deeply shocked, surprised, perplexed, by them; and have felt the most serious questionings and doubts, whether a Society, thus fearfully distracted, could really be a home of Christ. Yet, on the other hand, they had learned to regard our Church's ordinances, and most the highest of all,—the Holy Eucharist, as the very fountains through which they derived their spiritual life: yes; through all the painful and anxious conflicts of which our Church has been the scene, the Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist had been the central figure, as it were, in the picture; the point, from which all peace and comfort had flowed to their soul. Are they to regard these external disorders in our Church as a notice conveyed to them, that they must break from their very highest and holiest associations, and seek His Presence elsewhere? Such is the difficulty in which they were placed; and not a few members of our Church, finding themselves brought into so critical a position, have taken that very course, which would follow from those principles which I have humbly attempted to advocate; a course surely, which must commend itself to all dutiful and serious minds, who are not absolutely bewildered by the technicalities of controversy. They have resolved to load the ordinances of our Church, as it were, with a heavier weight: they have regarded the lowering aspect of things around, as a call from God to aim at still higher and stricter obedience, to open new paths of labour and self-denial; that they may put the matter to a practical issue, whether Christ will still give them strength in our Church for this more saintly life, or will sum-

^k I speak of course of Protestantism in the abstract: Archbishop Whately applies the same image, that I have used in the text, to 'Romanism.'

mon them into a new position, that they may enjoy the fulness of His grace. And the response of all (I believe), without exception, who have made this trial, has been most wonderfully harmonious: the more they have laboured to chasten and deny themselves, the more they have experienced, not a restless and uneasy desire for fuller privileges, but the very reverse; their treasure has been increased of heavenly peace and joy in believing. The result then has been, that such Christians as those I have been describing, have obtained a deeper and more certain assurance than ever had been before in their power;—while we ordinary men have obtained, by means of the more visible and acknowledged austerity of life which has been here and there brought before our view, an *external* note, of a far higher and more heavenly nature, than any which some among us may consider that we have lost. Nor can it be necessary to point out, how that in proportion as any member of our Church may have a deeper conviction of her prostrate, miserable, and corrupt condition, in that very proportion will such remarkable facts as those I have mentioned, appeal to him as peculiar and most constraining indications of God's will.

Such being the singularly gracious manifestations of His Presence with us which our Blessed Lord has vouchsafed, a right-minded and humble Christian will desire some very direct and unmistakeable personal call from God, before the question will even occur to him of ungratefully, if I may so say, turning his back on it. And so the question might fairly be left: but since individual members of our Church, as most persons know, have felt difficulties as to their position, and since Roman Catholics in general are very urgent in taking a different view of it from that here laid down, a few words more may be desirable, though a few will be fully sufficient. If an individual then say, 'I have *had* this direct and unmistakeable call; for whereas I had humbly laboured to carry into action the principles I had learnt, an external exhibition of Christianity has been brought before me from without,—placing before my view a higher conception of Christian sanctity than any of which I had dreamed,—and

also witnessing a new and heavenly scheme of doctrine towards which all my aspirations at once leaped forward;—or, again, ‘I was plunged in a life of carelessness and worldly turmoil, when my spiritual affections were elicited, and my conscience reprov’d, by an external Society, which claims Divine authority and summons me at once to join it;’—if either of these things be honestly and sincerely said, the case does seem parallel to the ordinary cases of conversion to the Church; and we cannot, I think, fairly plead for so much as delay.

Another perhaps will say:—‘I see force in your arguments, and recognize the truth of many of your assertions;—I meet nowhere else with an idea of the Christian character higher in kind than I find in my present position:—I feel in no way inclined to criticise others for staying, if they will not criticise me for going;—but in real fact I cannot myself find that peace of mind, that consciousness of freedom from mortal sin, whereof they speak;—the service of our Church is a burden to me, not a privilege; the Sacrament a dead ordinance; the preaching an unbearable torture;’—in such a case as this, we *have* a right to call earnestly on such a person, to take good heed that he give our system a fair trial. When the external notes which he confesses are so singularly constraining to the humble and religious mind, he must make himself very sure of the personal call; and this is not easy. To distinguish the voice of conscience from that of intellectual inference, or feeling, or imagination, is very easy to those who live in habitual and unceasing *watchfulness* of conscience, but very difficult to all others. The fair and reasonable course then will be, that, if such be not already his practice, he should devote himself, for some sufficient time, to the careful and habitual performance of such exercises as were mentioned in the sixth and seventh chapters; examen of conscience, general and particular; mental prayer; regular confession of sin. Should a member of our Church do all this, and still remain convinced that God would not have him remain among us, I doubt not at all that he may leave us with a safe conscience.

As to those, again, who have at present no difficulty in remaining with us, in what terms they would speak of that duty, it is not easy to determine; nor even, if it were, are we generally fit judges of the *strength* of our conviction, until the occasion arises which calls for action. In speaking then of myself, I speak only of myself: but so confining my words, I do plainly say, (not here to recite again those other notes of life in our Church, to which I lately adverted,) that when I consider the wonderful and most heavenly graces, which distinguish certain members of our Church whom I have the privilege to know; when I find—from those who are incomparably my own superiors in all good living, and who have more intimate knowledge of those to whom I allude,—that a closer and more habitual observation of their character raises it in their eyes in a degree they could not have before imagined; when the freest use of Roman books of practical religion does not give me any higher conception in *kind* of holiness, than I observe to be recognized and exemplified among ourselves;—and when, on the other hand, I remember that it is within the reach of these men that God Himself has placed me; that any notion of attributing my own defects to deficiency in our Church's ordinances, rather than my own past and present habits of sinful neglect, would be contradictory to most certain and definite experience; and that those of my own acquaintance, who have most *tried* those ordinances, most value them;—when I consider all this, I plainly say, that—supposing, under the influence of some apparent force of argument or some active impression on the imagination, I were to dissever myself from these objects of veneration,—I doubt if I should know one moment's peace of mind during the remainder of my life.

When Roman Catholics press me with arguments from Church History, I answer that the whole surface of Church History reads me a very different lesson from that which they inculcate; and puts in the second place those external notes, which *they* desire to put in the first. As far as her *children* are concerned, the Church, in forbidding them to doubt her authority, has even forbidden them from fairly

examining these notes at all. And in addressing those without, while the exhibition of Christian doctrine and sanctity has been her chief care in every age, the external arguments she has used have *varied* in every age. In early times,—Christians ‘lay most stress on the prophecies of the Old Testament, the miracles of Jesus and the Apostles, the rapid spread of its doctrines, and the constancy of its followers.’¹ In Arian times,—preservation of the doctrine delivered them is the orthodox watchword. When heathen persecution and Arian dissension are happily concluded, and now for the first time the wonderful spectacle of a consentient Church in all lands is displayed,—how can we wonder that St. Augustine’s eyes were dazzled with the glorious sight, and ‘*securus judicat orbis terrarum*’ became his fixed idea? While, later still,—the necessity of a living infallible guide, and the endless confusion which must otherwise result, became the leading topics of argument. Now the Church is authoritative in *all* ages, not in one only: those then are likely to be eternal principles which we *find* in all ages, those are quite certainly accidents and peculiarities of a period, which change from age to age. And whereas there is *no one* external argument which has been used in every age, this circumstance itself points to the fact, which all our knowledge of human nature makes sufficiently certain—viz. that the success of such arguments does not arise from their own value, but from their being the means, whereby the internal notes, of which so much has here been said, are definitely and impressively brought before their mind. Nothing is more common, as we all must know, than to fancy ourselves convinced by argument, when on looking back afterwards we see readily that a far more persuasive agency was at work. How many of us were first brought to an acceptance of Catholic doctrine by this argument,—that early ages are better judges than we, as to what the Apostles taught! Have we ever been tempted then to think the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity less probably Apostolic, when we have gradually learned how much less distinctly it was witnessed by Ante-nicene Fathers?

¹ Gieseler’s Ecclesiastical History, Eng. Trans. p. 95.

If not, we shew plainly that our real reason has not been what we thought it was, but something altogether distinct. And so the 'orbis terrarum' would have been but a poor note of truth, for 'Athanasius contra mundum.' Do we suppose that St. Augustine, had he then lived, would have joined the Arian party? or have doubted and hesitated as the majority seemed to incline? or looked upon St. Meletius of Antioch as little better than an Arian? or rather do we not know, that though he and the Saints of the time should have had to fight the battle single-handed, rather would he have died, than renounced that truth which he *knew* and *experienced*, and of which he would perceive that the Arians desired to rob him? In like manner then,—because he used an argument of the most true and impressive bearing, against a rebellious, self-willed, and fanatical sect, whose very bond of union was active enmity to the Church,—what can be more unreasonable than to press his authority, for a condition of circumstances far more unlike those of his own time, than were the circumstances of the Arian conflict? Let us suppose that the Donatists had remained for three hundred years practically separated from, not actively opposing, the great body of the Church; let us suppose that few Catholics comparatively came across their path, and those desirous on the whole rather to conceal than display their characteristic marks, nay, occasionally making common cause with God-denying heretics to oppose the dominant Society;^m let us suppose that, by help of the positive doctrines they retained, a sudden spring of Catholic life gushed forth from the bosom of this Society in itself; that either the whole Society, or a certain concrete mass of it as yet unascertainable in extent, were plainly and avowedly gravitating back in the direction of their Ancient Mother;—have we any right to infer, that under such circumstances as these, St. Augustine, had he lived in such a time, would have summoned individual

^m Some Roman Catholics, 'as a Roman Catholic newspaper mentioned a few weeks since, gave an entertainment to a Socinian teacher, in requital of his services in defending them from the imputations cast upon them by the emissaries of Exeter Hall.' 'On Whately's Essays,' p. 293.

Donatists, one by one, to exercise their private judgment, and come forth from a body now exhibiting such signs of freshness and of life? The plainest common-sense answers—no.

I have mentioned more particularly the case of St. Augustine, because no other perhaps is so frequently urged or with such apparent plausibility: nor should it be forgotten, how much stronger the whole argument becomes, when we advert to what has been so often mentioned,—the inferior *subjectivity* of those times; and by consequence the increased unlikelihood, that they would carefully analyse the real grounds of their belief.

The case of the Donatists leads to a further remark. Heretics and schismatics, in various times, have been conspicuous for habits of austerity and laborious activity, as is well known: but there is one Christian virtue, in which it requires but little discernment to observe their deficiency—the virtue of humility. Now—not to dwell here upon considerations which none but ourselves can appreciate, the singular prominence of this grace in those members of our Church whom we most deeply revere—observe the *position* which they more and more assume; observe the whole language of humility in reference to our own Church, and deep reverence for the great Christian body, which is now becoming so common. Can there be a more signal contrast with the ground taken up by schismatics in various ages of the Church?

The authority of the existing Church may perhaps also be quoted, against the ground that I have taken; and it may be said, that no slight degree of arrogance and self-will is shewn, in not giving at least more *weight* to so widely spread an opinion, than my language and tone have implied. One answer, ready at hand, is the same which has been already given; for those permanent habits of action, which the Roman Catholic Church has inherited from former ages, are beyond any possible comparison more fully authoritative, than the maxims which may happen to be current in the present day; and the former distinctly witness those very principles, which defend us in our present position. Another answer will be, that the opinion of good men is authoritative in proportion

as they have fully acquainted themselves with the circumstances of the case. Now the great majority of Roman Catholics very plainly, as is indeed most natural, have no knowledge at all of the real principles which are stirring in our Church, and the real phenomena which (rightly or wrongly) influence our conduct: nor have I been able to observe, among those, whose knowledge of facts is more accurate, any pains-taking and laborious effort, to impress our circumstances on their imagination, and give us such advice, as shall shew us how deeply they have pondered those circumstances. Rather it is their habit to produce, as final determinations of the matter, the ordinary maxims prevalent among them, and not give any consideration to the very question which we should desire them to consider: viz. whether God has not placed us in circumstances, where maxims, generally true, cease to be available; and where the question must be decided, by going further back, as it were, from maxims which are merely general and admit of exception, to the first principles on which those maxims were founded.

It would not be necessary to mention any other reasons than these; and there are one or two which weigh with myself even more deeply, which I shall *not* mention. But there is one circumstance, to which I deem it most important to direct attention; and which affords a stronger reason than either of those which I have named, for declining to assign any importance to the view, just now general among Roman Catholics, as to our duties. And this circumstance is, a principle popular with them at the present day, whether in an open or implicit form, which, little as it interferes with the healthy relations between Church and flock, often leads to the most deplorable mistakes, both in opinion and action, in their dealings with those external to their own Communion.

I cannot explain this principle more clearly, than by taking a parallel case. Every religious philosopher, who knows what he is saying, lays the utmost stress on the truth, that the principles of right and wrong are eternal, immutable, and wholly independent of God's will; which indeed, as

Bp. Butler tells us, 'is as certainly determined by these principles,' as 'His judgment' is 'necessarily determined' by 'speculative truth.'ⁿ To say otherwise indeed, would be to uphold the fearful tenet, that morality is a matter of positive, not of necessary, obligation. Now this very sentiment, so necessary, so certain, is at first sight almost shocking to the ear of a religious man; for he has long most piously and rightly habituated himself to worship God as the Almighty Author of all that exists, and this assertion seems to impose some limit to His power, seems to imply some derogation from the full circle of His attributes. Such is the natural judgment of a religious man, before he sees what principle is really at issue: nor is it at all necessary or desirable to perplex him on the subject; the real impression on his moral nature is simply true and right, and few only are those who are called on to analyze and systematise that impression.

But now let us suppose a Society of Theists to be brought into the near neighbourhood of some savage tribe, who should have preserved rough ideas of right and wrong, but had never heard of God. This very difference of statement which in their dealings *with each other* was so trifling and inoperative, in dealing *with these people* becomes at once the symbol and spring of a difference of conduct, the most vital, the most unspeakably serious. According to the true principle, they would say to this people, 'cultivate your moral sense diligently; the more you do so, the more readily you will receive, the more intimately you will appropriate, the more satisfactorily you will prove, the doctrine we bring you.' According to the false principle, their language would be, 'How strangely contradictory are your proceedings! you talk of duty:—how can there be duty without God who originates it, or without the promise of a future state which sanctions it? you cannot defend yourselves if you try. *We* are consistent, for we believe in God also; and wish you to do the same:—but if you refuse, pray do not delude yourselves by fancying you are any the better for your self-contradictory witness to a

ⁿ Analogy, part ii. chap. 8.

supposed reality of moral obligation.' If such language as this were indiscriminately held, without reference to the moral preparation of heart in those addressed, whether so much as one would go on to the idea of *God* is doubtful; but it is very *certain* that multitudes would be readily persuaded to give up an idea, so painful to their natural inclinations as that of *moral obligation*, and would plunge into the polluting streams of licentiousness and vice.

Now a principle, frequently implied by Roman Catholics among ourselves, is precisely parallel to this latter: they speak 'as though they considered there were *no intrinsic* difference between true and false doctrine, no more consistency, no more stability, no more real satisfaction to the spiritual mind, in one than in the other: as though it were a mere matter of external evidence, and (if I may so express myself) ecclesiastical etiquette.'^o One can almost fancy that if St. Meletius of Antioch were among us combating against the Arians, instead of honour and posthumous canonization, the only compliment he would receive from Roman Catholics of the present day would be, to be told that he had no sufficient reason to *deny* Arianism, except for the Pope's word: and that out of communion with the Pope, one opinion is much about as good as another. It is really difficult to say, how far this awful language is an exaggeration of sentiments which occasionally come from Roman Catholics; and expressions tending in the same direction are constantly heard. In the parallel case, I have fully admitted, that a *member of their Church* would derive no practically erroneous impression whatever from such words; he has received all his doctrine at her hands, and looks up to her as its dispenser. But when they damp the courage of those whom they think inconsistent, but who are travelling happily and unsuspectingly in the right direction, by using to them language which should be heard only from the lowest and basest utilitarians, when they endeavour to make a 'tabula rasa' of their mind, if by some possible chance the image of Rome may be afterwards there inscribed; then it is that they pursue

^o 'On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 32.

a course which I have ventured already to call indefensible (see p. 289) but would rather characterise as deeply sinful, and in designating this language of theirs as morally sinful, I intend no prejudice to another very strong opinion which I hold, viz. that, in a merely intellectual point of view, it is baseless and unphilosophical in no ordinary degree. The whole course of the work will have shewn, how very unwilling I am to say one word unkind or disrespectful to Roman Catholics; and I speak thus plainly, only in the hope of rousing the attention of some among them to the real nature of a principle, which I doubt not they have received traditionally and unconsciously, but which is fraught with incalculable mischief to the advance of truth.

How different was the course pursued by the Church towards the heathen! How easy a task would it not have been to shew, the absence of all evidence or argumentative consistency in the various forms which religion had assumed, whether in more refined or more ordinary minds!—on the other hand, how well-grounded, simple, and consistent, the Christian scheme! Yet, so far from adopting such a course, Catholics of those days drew the heathen towards the Church, not by ‘unclothing’ them, but ‘clothing upon’ them; not by first *overthrowing* their existing creed, but by seeking parts in it whereon the superstructure might be raised. And even when these recognised the Presence of the Lord, and bowed before the Church, so careful was the latter not unduly to hurry them forward, or incur peril of making a ruin of their moral nature, that only by slow degrees and in proportion as their holy and obedient life made it appear probable that they were able to bear it, did she divulge to them her highest mysteries and most startling truths. She did not rudely call on them to receive her doctrine at once on her authority, but carefully and tenderly disciplined their mind for its reception.^P This is that feature, in Ancient Christianity, to which I can see no parallel in the course now habitually adopted towards mis-believers by the Roman Church. Her officers seem to imagine

^P See Newman's *Arians*, pp. 72—94.

that, on the authority of an external body, deep thinkers can change at once the whole fabric and fashion of their opinions, as they might change the fashion of their dress : that, e. g., a Frenchman,—who has learned ‘ philosophy ’ from his earliest years, and has been reared in the lessons of a school which regards Divine Mysteries with ineffable contempt as the fantastical creations of an effete and imbecile superstition,—that such a man as this may be expected in one moment, when the claims of the Church are fairly put before him, to accept on her word the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Doubtless the exhibition of a pure Church, in this as in every age, performs wonders for those who, if I may so express myself, *have* no speculative opinions ; who have lived a life of mere passion, or unconscious, un-*subjective* action. But few indeed of the educated classes in the present day answer such a description : and it is in addressing—either those whose religious sympathies have been awakened under an imperfect system,—or those whose wickedness has developed itself into consciously unbelieving, or quasi-unbelieving opinions,—it is in addressing these, that such maxims will so deplorably fail. That there may be individual cases in which God’s grace has a marvellous, a miraculous course, I should indeed shrink from denying : but—until Catholic priests, in such a country as France, learn that this is far from the ordinary rule ; until they learn that the first beginning of a really conscientious obedience to the voice of duty, is a step which will infallibly carry men in their direction ; and that the obligation of so acting may be enforced, with some considerable hope of success, on multitudes who could not, without an absolute ruin of the inward harmony of their nature, at once accept the teaching of a Church which holds Transubstantiation ;—until they learn this I fear the present state of things will there continue : a state of things in which from every other class a large and increasing number of converts seem pouring into the Church, but no impression at all (to speak generally) is made on men of high intellectual and philosophical powers.

This current maxim, which appears so generally prevalent,

has, as might have been anticipated, its foundation in the scientific instruction which Roman Catholic priests receive. The account of 'faith,' given by scholastic writers, is most harmonious and edifying, but it did not carry the analysis to its extreme point. That faith is a virtue supernaturally infused,—that it is influenced by the will,—that it rests for assurance, in no degree whatever on the word of man, but wholly on the authority of God, and so is infallible,—these are parts of its definition in which all were agreed; and these parts lead us at once to anticipate something radically different in kind from intellectual conviction:—wholly different in kind, as depending on the will;—approaching with an infinitely greater proximity to the very springs of spiritual truth, as resting on nothing short of the authority of God Himself. Now the ultimate step in the analysis, which was yet wanting, has been supplied by multitudes of modern writers in the strangest way that could have been conceived. Their language has represented the supernatural assurance of faith as consisting in—the *external evidences of the Church's authority*. 'The divine revelation,' says St. Alphonsus, 'is not made manifest to us, except by means of the Church which proposes the revelations: since it is evident from other reasons (*such as prophecies, miracles, the constancy of Martyrs, and the like*), that the Church can neither be deceived nor deceive.' How miserably erroneous an analysis, of the grounds on which the Blessed Saint himself believed the Church's heavenly doctrine!⁹ as though all the prophecies,

⁹ Theologia Moralís, vol. i. p. 285. Even Bellarmine is not free from language of the kind. In Suarez I have never observed any approach to it; though *he* does not carry the analysis of the scholastic doctrine farther than he received it.

I have already quoted a passage from St. Francis de Sales, strongly corroborating the general view of faith that has been here taken (see p. 536). In a neighbouring passage, he says; "Were not the Jews witnesses of our Divine Redeemer's miracles? Why then did they not believe? because their will was too vitiated to relish the suavity of faith.—It is in this submission or acquiescence that the act of faith consists; when the mind, having been illuminated with the light of revelation, adheres sweetly and powerfully to the known truth; *not from the evidence of the reasons* which incline it to believe, but from the perfect conviction and perfect certainty it receives from the authority of Revelation." And in like manner Mr. Newman (Prophetic Office, p. 147,) represents it as the common opinion of Roman

and miracles which Satan could devise, or the constancy of numberless fanatics even unto death, would have made him falter for one moment in his allegiance to the Church! To argue at length against this statement, would be merely to repeat the whole second section of this chapter; which the reader will perhaps kindly read over again, in this new connection. Here I will only content myself with asking any Roman Catholic, who may give attention to what I am saying,—on what principle does he consider the very *comparison* of the Church with some other body, as to its prophecies, miracles, martyrs, &c. with the view of forming a decision, *in the highest degree sinful* in a member of his Church?—why does he even forbid, in all ordinary cases, the reading of books on the heretical side, which should occupy themselves in nothing else than *instituting* this comparison?—how can he consider the heretics at any time guilty of any greater sin, than want of candour? a virtue this last, far more intellectual than moral, and by no means either universally or distinctively characteristic of the saintly mind.

Now I will not shrink from avowing my belief, that this ultimate step in the analysis has been supplied, in our own time, by Mr. Newman: and the highest credit I claim for any thing which has preceded in this chapter, is, that, I have made an attempt to systematise and carry out those truths on the subject, which I have learned solely and exclusively from him.^f

Catholics, that Baptism infuses an inward infallible conviction of religious truth. On the other hand, the Dublin Review censures Mr. Newman for “making a certain inward sense (*the seat of private judgment and of every religious delusion*) a surer test of truth than the great evidences and notes of the Church:” implying, as I understand the writer, that the mode of saving our moral ‘sense’ from being ‘the seat of a delusion,’ is—not the endeavour habitually to cultivate and obey it, but—an unbiassed examination of the various, ‘evidences and notes’ presented by existing Societies.

^f Mr. Newman’s first clear *statement* on the matter, will, I think, be found in his fourth Lecture on Justification: p. 306 of the first edition, p. 304 second edition. He has spoken explicitly and at length in his later ‘University Sermons:’ all of which, except the last, I had heard from the pulpit before I wrote in the *British Critic*, and have, on various occasions, endeavoured, *in* the *Critic*, to apply the principles I had derived from them.

Now this circumstance, of so many later theologians having failed distinctly to perceive that the difference between Protestants and Catholics is one of *principle*, not of *fact*,—of *kind* of argument, not of greater or less force in the *same* kind,—has affected the whole mode in which they treat the subject of ‘invincible ignorance’ on matters of faith. In reading the remarks made by their writers on the subject, one is struck, as always in their books, by the extreme considerateness and thoughtfulness of tone, and the great desire to make it plain that no one is formally heretical except by his own fault: still the remedy they, I think invariably propose, is merely a free and unbiassed examination of the miracles, prophecies, visible union, &c., which are the visible notes of the Church: a kind of argument, which has the appearance of extreme cogency and argumentativeness to those who already believe or who are already predisposed to believe, but which to those of a contrary character appears literally deserving of no weight whatever. Here then we see the distinction I lately made, between maxims and principles: the latter are eternal and irreversible; the former are the application of these eternal principles to existing circumstances, and may alter therefore from age to age. Now what I have been saying is, that these maxims, which were substantially true exponents of Catholic principles in converting barbarians or confronting the mediæval heretics, are rather, in their effect, antagonist to those principles, when directed towards religious Protestants or philosophical unbelievers. And the question which I would submit with the deepest deference to the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, is, whether an exposition of invincible ignorance substantially resembling that quoted in pp. 57-60, be not a far truer application of the principles on which the Church has ever acted, than is the exposition ordinarily current among themselves. In many respects, the task now before them resembles rather the Church’s relation to philosophical heathen, than any later event in her history; and whereas the ‘*disciplina arcani*’ is now impracticable, my belief is, that a true definition of

' invincible ignorance ' is the very thing requisite to supply its place.

And so, in dealing with ourselves, surely (if it be not presumptuous in one of ourselves to offer a suggestion) if the Reformation in fact violently dissevered from each other the two constituent and conflicting elements of European character, (pp. 90-1,) and if the re-union of England with the Holy See would be the direct reversal of this evil, it is not to be supposed,—it is not what the history of the Church would ever lead one to expect,—that so wonderful an event would be brought about by those maxims, which yet may have done good service in less extensive and less difficult enterprises. Surely the true wisdom of the Roman Catholic Church would rather be,—to fall back upon first principles; and to see how great a modification of her maxims those principles may require, and her actual system may allow. In humble cooperation with which work I would beg to suggest as follows: I. It has been already ruled, in the case of the constitutional clergy of France, that schismatic priests consecrate the Eucharist validly; II. It is acknowledged that the Body of our Lord, if really present, is received by communicants who are not in mortal sin; III. *It has never been ruled* what is the definition of that *vincible* ignorance which *is* a mortal sin. On the other hand, St. Alphonsus says, (I believe after St. Thomas,)

' Mortal sin is such a horrible monster, that you could not possibly be guilty of it, *and not be aware of it* . . . when a person that fears God is in doubt whether or no he has lost divine grace, *it is certain that he has not lost it.*'^p

Taking these respective considerations into account, and observing what evidence of strict and holy fear of God is presented by various Christians who remain in our Church, surely Roman Catholics are fully at liberty, if they will, without violating any necessary part of their system, to hold

^p Spirit of Liguori, pp. 145, 6.

that those are 'in invincible ignorance' (to use the technical term) and enjoy sacramental grace, who on the one hand are diligent in self-examination and prayer, and on the other hand are allowed by God to retain that peace of mind which St. Alphonsus considers so sure a mark of His favour. Or again—supposing that some Apostle had been carried by the Spirit to America, and there founded a Church: would not that be a truly Christian Church, though it had never heard the name of Rome? or at the first discovery of America, supposing that it was not ripe for an immediate and corporate union, would Roman Catholics have summoned its members summarily and singly to quit its Communion? or would they not rather have allowed every possible time and opportunity, that misunderstandings might be removed, and Christian love perform its full work? The same principles which would allow them, in such a case, to delay rather than precipitate a crisis and formal rupture, might enable them to extend in our case a similar forbearance. And surely the Roman Catholic Church, would far more suitably fulfil the character she claims, by shewing herself full of love and sympathy for holiness of life and orthodoxy of creed wherever found, and exhorting those, in whom she finds those essential characteristics, to persevere in their noble course, than by appearing deficient in all regard for them, until they have developed into their very last stage, into a craving for union with herself, and into what have frequently been considered her distinctive doctrines.

Nor should there be any misgiving, lest such principles as those I have attempted to advocate should tend to justify a permanent state of schism. It should be taken as a first principle by all Catholic-minded men, that the true Catholic character *exists*, is irresistibly attracted towards the image of itself. If then holy living and orthodox faith actively flourish in the Roman Church, (which I have no disposition at all to deny,) it is plain that to implant it in our Church is to take the merest possible means of effecting a real and lasting union; and if a Catholic minded individual is not attracted at once towards Rome, it is because he is retained by an

attraction nearer home; or, in other words, a leaven is working, not in himself only, but in a certain mass of which he is part; a leaven which will assuredly cause it to gravitate speedily, as a whole, in that very direction. And so far from the separated Greek Church being a difficulty in the way of this obvious view, all the facts I am able to gather concerning the existing condition of that Church, seem to me forcibly to *confirm* the view.

In all that I have urged on this subject, nothing has been further from my intention, (as I need hardly say,) than word of censure on members of the Roman Catholic Church. Well can I understand the feelings of reverence which lead them to such a view of things as I have described: a view, which becomes then only practically mischievous when those are dealt with who had no life-long experience of the fostering care of a pure Church.

One final word will here be in place, to those of our members who may be tempted to infer, that—because it seems almost confessed that higher privileges are attainable in the Roman Church than in ours,—it must be the safest course to join that Church. But surely the principle is universally acknowledged, that gifts, which are in themselves blessings, cease to be such when we pursue them in opposition to the indications of God's will. And not to mention various ways in which we can even conceive this coming to pass, (over and above the innumerable methods by which God might effect it *without* our cognizance,)—such, e. g., as that a Christian, trained in the habits and associations of our Church and country, might possibly find much wiser and more intelligent spiritual direction among ourselves than elsewhere, nay might elsewhere be very dangerously misunderstood,—let us consider one very fearful visitation, which he might with the utmost probability expect; that of religious *doubt*. We make it a point of duty violently to reject from our mind the intrusion of doubt, on such principles as were detailed in the early part of this chapter;—that we are weak, blind, ignorant, creatures—that God alone can enlighten us—that we can only expect Him to do so, in proportion as we endeavour to

follow faithfully His guiding hand, and submit our understandings and wills to the external message which, as we have reason to believe, comes to us from Him. It is by means of this habitual submission to external authority, and by the thousand associations of their past life which are connected with reverence to that authority, that members of a pure Church derive that deep and infallible conviction of Divine Truth, of which I have so often spoken. But let a person break loose, as it were, from God's direction, do violence to his early habits of teachableness and reverence, dis sever himself from those holy associations of which I speak;—let him introduce intellectual argument, as arbiter instead of minister, in discussing a point of duty, and reject the claims of faith and conscience to be God's only vice-gerents;—then, on the first disappointment with which he may meet, the first shock to his high and glowing anticipations of rest and peace, the first real trial of his stability, we may expect that intellect, once enfranchised, will endeavour to break again from its chains; that the convert will think of criticising freely the notes of the Roman Church, as he learned to do those of the English;—and, even without anticipating the worst, that frequent recurrences of gloom, perplexity, and mental disorder, will wage a cruel war against all enjoyment of peace, and all progress in holy living.

9. And this discussion, brings naturally to a close the present anxious and laborious inquiry. I have endeavoured throughout to speak respectfully and charitably of individuals, but plainly and distinctly of principles. Of two principles especially, which may be considered the distinguishing characteristics of the Reformation whether here or abroad—I mean the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, and the principle of private judgment—I have argued (pp. 305, 502—4) that, in their abstract nature and necessary tendency, they sink below atheism itself. At the same time I have also endeavoured to make it clear, that my intense abhorrence of the Reformation, (whether it be considered just or exaggerated,) at least has its origin in no fanatical antiquarianism, in no perverse blindness to those benefits which are called, in one

comprehensive word, civilization. Every age has its own good and its own evil; nor have I ever seen grounds to believe, that a refined age is in itself more sinful than a rude age. That religious minds have so often held this opinion, arises in part from that universal tendency of the holiest men, (see p. 134,) whereby the present evil which confronts them appears of a more malignant character than any other of which they know merely at a distance. But, even after taking this into account, I cannot think that the great disgust felt by the best men at modern habits and ways of thinking, will receive any sufficient explanation, until we turn our thoughts to the distracted state of Christendom; until we call to mind that most unhappy fact, which all serious men should daily deplore as the most fearful of God's judgments,—viz. that good men and faithful followers of their Saviour dissipate their energies in contention with each other, instead of uniting them against the social, moral, and religious evils, which flourish in such rank luxuriance. Here must be sought the full reason for that sort of instinct, whereby holy men look at these latter days as especially degraded; and the *remedy* of this evil is the object, to which all who love holiness and peace should direct their combined efforts.

That a sustained and vigorous attack on the principles of the Reformation, is the only course by which this object can be attained, is my deep and certain conviction. But by this I mean, not an eloquent or argumentative denunciation of the evils of that movement, but a far more hopeful procedure, and one in which many may heartily join, who altogether differ in their view of the Reformation as a *fact*:—I mean a humble and religious carrying out of those great principles which the Reformation denied, obedience and faith. Never, within these three centuries, has there been so lively a counter-movement, at least in England, as there is now. This movement has nothing to dread from the opposition of those who fear or dislike it:—many of these doubtless are holy and humble men of heart, whom we may hope to find one day fighting in our own ranks; but however that may be, the opposition raised by adversaries of the truth is, in every age of the Church,

most wonderfully overruled to the advance of that truth which they oppose. But God has imposed on *upholders* of the truth a fearful responsibility; he has allowed them the mysterious power of thwarting, by their sin or perverseness, His own gracious work. This it is alone which the cause of truth among us has at this moment to fear: if any, from the number of those who feel called to act in its defence, should allow themselves to be led away, by plausibility of argument, or by excitement of imagination, from following the plain and certain dictates of their *conscience*.

APPENDIX.

REFERRED TO IN PAGE 82.

From accidental circumstances there are not as many communications here as I expected: but the following may be taken as a sample of what I have from many.

LETTER I.

MY DEAR WARD,

MY foreign travel has been confined to Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and Rhenish Prussia; I visited Italy and Switzerland for the first time eleven years ago, revisited them six years ago, and spent two months in Belgium and Rhenish Prussia two years ago. On first going abroad in 1833, I went with the impressions respecting the Roman Catholics and their system with which I had been brought up, and which were current among those with whom I associated; I expected to find all classes irreligious or indifferent, the poorer classes ignorant, and the priests purposely keeping them so, and I went prepared to look at their religion and their religious services with distaste. At first, I confess, every thing that I saw seemed to confirm the impressions with which I started; if I saw people diverting themselves on Sundays, I concluded that it was a wilful and deliberate desecration of the day; if I saw priests walking amongst them, I concluded they were winking at it; if I saw a poor person by the road-side on his knees before a cross, I concluded he had placed himself there for us to see, and I thought all meanly clad monks were lazy beggars; the very constancy of the people at Church I attributed to formalism, and I thoroughly believed they worshipped images; for I saw them kneeling before them, and I thought that proved it.

The notion that I should find the foreign Catholics indifferent was very soon dispelled; the very manner in which I saw a French steersman at the helm of his vessel take off his cap on passing the large Crucifix on the pier at Dieppe surprised me, and the earnestness and devotion I saw in the churches was something quite new to me; but then I fell back upon the idea that it was all superstition and idolatry; fraud in the priests and ignorance in the people.

Of the higher classes of laity in the countries in which I have

travelled I have seen nothing, but I have seen a good deal of the priests, of the poor, and of the schools for the children of the poor; and the more I saw, the more and more I became convinced how utterly groundless my impressions were. Of the priests (I speak now of Belgium and Prussia where I saw them most) I have a very pleasing recollection; here and there I met with a mere argumentative theologian, but as a body, I was struck by their kindness of manner and simplicity of life, although in the conversations I had with them I might not agree with them, yet the very idea that they were not honest and sincere quite shocks and distresses me; I felt and still feel convinced that they were religious men.

That the poor are ignorant is, I believe, an entire misapprehension; I never talked to any who were so; I should say they are far, very far better instructed in religious knowledge than our own people of the same class, and their attention to their religious duties is, to my mind, quite affecting. I have seen in large manufacturing towns hundreds upon hundreds of work-people, in their working-dress, at mass at 5 o'clock in the morning before going into the factories, with their books, and joining heartily in the service, and I need scarcely say what a contrast this forms to the habits of the same class of persons in this country.

I have visited also many Catholic schools abroad, chiefly those under the superintendence of the Christian Brothers, and my opinion is, that we have nothing to compare with them either as to the regularity and order of the schools, the extent of the secular education, the carefulness with which religious instruction is conveyed, or the number and character of the teachers.

Upon the whole, my last impression, on returning from a foreign country (Belgium) to our own, was, that I was coming out of a religious country into one of indifference; the open Churches of the former, the frequent services, the constant worshippers, the solemn ceremonial, the collected air of the clergy in their ministrations, the indubitable devotion and reverence of the people, their unhesitating confidence in their Church, has nothing approaching to a counterpart with us; I know nothing more disheartening (I speak of the effect produced upon myself) than a return to England after some time spent in Catholic countries; every thing seems so careless, so irreverent, so dead; with all my heart I wish, and especially for my children's sake, that I could see in this country some approximation to the solemnity, reverence, devotion, and earnestness which I have witnessed abroad.

All this may seem harsh towards my own country, and my own Church, but they are nevertheless the impressions which I have derived from what I have seen; I am of course liable to be swayed by prejudice as well as others, but so far as I know myself, my prejudices, both those of education and of family connection, were all the other way, and I feel they have been overcome by facts which were irresistible.

I have now given you what you asked for, my impression of the Church on the Continent, and you are quite at liberty to make what use you please of it.

Believe me, Dear Ward,
Yours faithfully,

LETTER II.

MY DEAR WARD,

One of the first things that struck me in France, indeed it is obvious to any one—was the behaviour of the people in the Churches. There was something which one saw at once to be quite of another kind from that correct demeanour which a sense of propriety dictates. A general sense of the purpose for which we go to Church, and due consideration for others, will lead to a regulated and attentive conduct when there. But an attitude of active devotion cannot be mistaken for this; and to see, as you never fail to do on entering any Church, large or small, in France, many of the lowest class wrapt in that visible absorption of mind which shews at once that a real communication is going on between the soul and God, is indeed a cheering sight,—a spirit of prayer and supplication is seen to belong as much now as ever to the body of the Christian people. Often the posture of the worshipper is careless, and would little meet the taste of those who dwell with rapture on the forms of middle-age art, or whose ideas of prayer are formed on such representations as in the offensive archæological jargon are called “a St. Francis nimbed”—the regulations of the Churches may be thought irreverential, the system of chairs introduces a continual traffic, and the never-ending circuits of a noisy beadle rattling the money he is collecting sadly breaks up the ideal some are apt to form of the still and solemn ceremonial,—with all this, there is that in the appearance of the people which shews at once that they come there not from curiosity, from habit, or from fashion, but for a definite act to join heart and soul at the great sacrifice in communion with the faithful living and dead. Fashion may carry the French to sermons, but not to mass or to private prayer in the Church. The theory of Catholicism may be fashionable, but submission to its rules in practice is very far from being. It is not many years since a priest could not appear in his habit in the streets of Paris without risk of insult—and the king himself, though suspected of going privately, durst not go publicly to mass, for fear of losing his character for good sense. The increase of

popularity of the clergy, the crowds of intellectual young men, lawyers, and students of the University, who flocked to Notre Dame in Advent last to hear Lacordaire—signs of a change of feeling in the public which the French Catholic press is never tired of proclaiming,—these are the mere ebb and flow on the surface—far more valuable is that genuine old Christian leaven deep in the heart of the country population, which even the Revolution could not root out, quite distinguishable from that fickle patronage which the present generation is disposed to hold out to a visionary middle-age theory. I felt much less satisfaction in seeing a crowded audience in Paris listening to a favourite preacher, than in entering early in the morning a village Church in a distant province, and seeing the country people drop in before going to work for a few minutes of private devotion. This was the genuine product of the religion—the harvest where S. Martin had sown.

The same practical air was visible where I least expected it. I had fancied a procession as merely ornamental; a poetical portion of the ceremonial intended to aid and captivate the imagination. I was struck therefore with the business-like air it wore. Those engaged in it seemed performing a real act of devotion, to which they were given up, the assembly accompanying them with their prayers—the one party not thinking of admiring, the other not aiming at effect.

Every one notices the subdued, regulated manner almost universal in foreign priests. This arises from their habitual consideration of the Divine Presence. It must be a very superficial observer who can think it accounted for by the constraint of the peculiar habit. But it is not any matter of surprise that they should be able to preserve this, when one sees the education they go through for the Priesthood. The Seminary of S. Sulpice is the principal establishment for this purpose. Many persons are offended at continually recurring comparisons between our own institutions, and the corresponding Catholic ones, and attribute such to a fretful, captious spirit. But they should remember that it is only the natural process of the mind to judge of the unknown by the known, of the new by the familiar. Open any book of travels, and whether he is describing the shape of a wheel, or a mode of harnessing a horse, the writer's first impulse is to compare it with the fashion of his own country. It was impossible for me to see S. Sulpice without comparing it with the education we give our clergy. There the world was shut out, not because it was unknown, but because it was understood that the process of hardening by exposure to it is one incompatible with the innocence which is the required foundation for a religious character. Here I understood for the first time what it was to make religion the one business of life—not merely a handmaid, a means towards living well and happily. There was no cant of language, no affectation of dis-carding the customs of common society, but religion reigned

without effort in the whole system. A young man bringing up for the priesthood where the Church is scantily paid by the State, knows that he resigns the common objects of ambition. Hard work and contempt is what he must expect. There is, as might be expected, a strong esprit de corps, which gives great offence to the world, which they vent in the epithet 'narrow-minded.' But even were it so, habits of devotion, and a bracing religious discipline, would be cheaply purchased at a greater sacrifice than this. An occasional religious service introduced into a day the whole of which is given to secular studies, secular conversation, and secular amusements, is an irksome formality. But where the whole day's business is made one religious service, interposed, as it were, between the hours of prayer, the mind must either openly revolt, or be raised to partake of the pervading tone. I was edified to see many of the students taking the brief space allowed to recreation after dinner, for retirement to some shrine or image (with which the grounds were filled) for prayer or recollection. It was not considered necessary to avoid intruding on them—they were taught to form the habit of abstraction from what was going on about them.

The professors (though without any Gallican bias) did not at all share in that eagerness for the visible triumph of the Church which the L'Univers is so anxious for. There was among them no active sympathy with any political party—and that in a country where, much more than with us, every one is a politician.

The Priests are, in general, shy of strangers, of the English in particular. Hence the accounts of travellers of a Protestant bias must be read backwards. If such a person falls in with a Priest more lax than others, who is willing to converse on the topics of the day with him, he entertains a better opinion of him as 'superior to the prejudices of his order,'—but exactly in proportion as he observes earnestness of devotion and exclusiveness, the traveller's anger is roused at the bigotry, intolerance, hypocrisy, &c., of the 'poor creatures.'

Yours very truly,

LETTER III.

MY DEAR WARD,

I will put down indiscriminately, as they occur to me, some points in connection with the Church abroad which made an impression upon me whilst in Normandy in 1842. I saw near Rouen a College intended for young men of all professions, and conducted by priests, and was much struck with the religious character which seemed impressed upon every thing about it. The

chapel was very pleasing and reverent in its arrangements, and bore marks of the interest which the students took in it. On the altar were flowers placed there by them; and over it a beautiful picture, which was given by them. The person who took us into it, and who was much like the porter of a College at Oxford, was very reverent in his behaviour, and spoke with much interest and intelligence of the mode of life in general, and particularly of the religious habits of the students. The grounds in which they generally take their recreation were very nicely laid out in avenues and walks, in which, we were told, they often practised the hymns and other music which they used in Church. There were also little chapels here and there about the grounds, into which they might retire for private devotion. Each has a small private sleeping room. Whilst they are at dinner, one of them reads some book aloud; one which was mentioned to us was Alban Butler's Lives of the Saints; others, however, which were mentioned, were of a purely historical character.

I was also much struck with the hospitals, in which the poor were served with the greatest care by Sisters of some religious Order, many of whom, we were told, had been persons of great wealth and high rank. The wards were named after different Saints, and in each of them there was, I think, an altar, and also religious pictures, and other objects of the same kind, which gave altogether a religious air to the place, whilst the vases of fresh flowers which were placed by them, and the airiness and cleanliness of the rooms, and pleasant view from the windows, gave at the same time in another way an idea of joy and cheerfulness.

At Rouen we were much struck with a person, who shewed us over one of the Churches, and whom we had an opportunity of seeing frequently. He was in a very low rank of life. He gave me one the idea of being a very religious person; and we obtained from him a great deal of information about the practices of the Church, with which he seemed well acquainted, and he spoke of them with the greatest interest. When we were going away, he asked us to remember him in our prayers; and said he would always remember us, and would tell his children to do the same; and the prayers of little children, he said, are very pleasing to Almighty God. What struck me particularly about him was an appearance of reverence and devotion and self-forgetfulness, which one so rarely meets with among persons of the same condition in England.

The appearance and devotion in the people whom we saw in the Churches was in many instances particularly striking; and in general the heartiness and joy with which they joined in the religious services of the Festivals gave me an idea of their regarding religion as something in which they felt their happiness to be really interested.

LETTER IV.

MY DEAR —

I ought to say in the way of deduction from the value of my testimony to the practical operation of the Church abroad, that I have been in two of the foreign Catholic countries only, and in each for a very short time. It is true that I have visited both of these countries more than once; but it is of my latter visits that I wish to speak principally, since it was in these only that I was of age and experience to form any fair idea of the state of things, or that I had sufficient interest in ecclesiastical matters to turn my attention to points of that sort.

The only countries of which I know any thing are France and Belgium; and of France, no part but Normandy, which is generally said to be a favourable specimen. When I first visited Belgium (in 1828) it was under the disadvantages of which I have just spoken; but even then, (though, so far as I had any religious feelings and interests at all, they were decidedly *anti-Roman*,) I remember to have been impressed, almost as it were against my wishes, with the exceedingly religious appearance of the Flemish towns. Of course I thought it all superstition, and so on; but even then, I drew comparisons between the aspect of things abroad and at home, to the great advantage of the former. Churches open and frequented at five or six in the morning (when I happened to be up and about, because I was travelling,) and a decided air of reverence in the people, especially the females; favoured perhaps in a degree by their dress—for every third female one met was habited like a nun. Also, (in another way) the state of the towns late in the evening was strikingly different from those of *any* of our own, greater or smaller. No ill-conditioned people about, (as a general rule,) and yet one could not but feel, (especially after the appearance of the Churches in the morning,) that all this was the fruit of something better than mere police regulations.

To come now to my last visits. I will speak of Normandy first, because I was there first. *Now*, you remember, my eyes are open, and my sympathies Catholic, so you must allow accordingly. Yet I do not think any one could be in Normandy a week without having it forced upon him, that religion has a place in the hearts and affections, more or less, of the people, especially the poor. In England a foreigner might certainly travel on six days in every week and consider himself in a heathen country; but you need not be abroad more than one day, and that *any* day, in order to find that you are among Christians. And this, after all the miserable effects of the first French Revo-

lution, in banishing the external signs of religion—such as processions—from that country. But still there are the crucifixes, to which *manypay* reverence (though fewer, alas! than formerly); still all churches are open from (at least) six till twelve, and again in the evening, with a succession of edifying Services, and an attendance of devout people.

I spent a Sunday at Bayeux, where I was fortunate enough to come in for the Festival of the first Bishop and Patron of the place, St. Exuperius. It is difficult to conceive a more interesting circumstance than that of a whole town engaged in the religious celebration of a holyday. It did one's heart good to hear the glee with which the people joined in the Hymns descriptive of their Saints' Christian achievements. The noble Cathedral was filled both at the First and Second Vespers on the Saturday and Sunday, and on the Mass on the Sunday morning. The Service was magnificent, and most edifying, even to those who could not well follow it, which was our case; the chanting of the Psalms was alternate (as is common in France) between the choir and the congregation; there must have been many hundreds in the nave, who took the alternate verses, and it quite reminded one of the "roar" of voices, which one of the Fathers, I think, speaks of in describing the psalmody of ancient times. I do not mean that there were not points in the Service which some might lament; i. e. a lighter strain of music than was always suitable, and what seemed to us like an occasional interception of the verses and substituting for them a shewy organ accompaniment. I speak but of the general effect upon a stranger, which was doubtless most highly impressive; indeed the delight of being permitted, though but for one hour, to join in this psalmody, with the feeling that one was so far in active communion with the Holy Church throughout all the world, was in the act, and is in the retrospect, of the most inspiring kind—a momentary but absolutely transporting foretaste of that union of hearts and voices for which we all pray, and the hopes of which seem to grow brighter and brighter.

My recollections of Normandy are simply favourable. The French Church suffers a grievous loss in lacking the full Roman Offices; and their Service labours under the farther disadvantage of diocesan varieties. Still, the general features of Catholic worship are preserved; and to a stranger the celebrations are not visibly affected by these peculiarities.

I must not forget a scene at Caen. We witnessed the funeral of a person who was evidently one of the poorest in the town, perhaps a tradesman on the smallest scale, or less. It was most pleasing to see the exceeding care with which the whole ceremony was conducted; both procession and service. The latter occupied nearly two hours, and seemed to consist in the full office for the dead, chanted with the utmost solemnity. The procession was every where received with great marks of reverence; all persons on foot baring their heads as it passed; all vehicles stopping or slackening their pace. It might, no doubt, have been some person who was peculiarly re-

spected ; but it struck us as presenting a remarkable contrast to the funerals of the poor in this country, especially in towns. I should add that it was at a time when some public gaieties were going on in the town.

As to the Clergy, we understood that they were very strict in conduct, and generally respected. They never appear at public places of amusement, and rarely if ever dine out, except with their Bishop. This we heard at Rouen. Of course, in judging of the Service abroad, an Englishman is frequently called upon to make large allowance for the peculiarity of foreign tastes and habits. I am not speaking of the dressed figures, of which however I will say, that in the present state of the popular taste, I think the authorities would be very wrong in discontinuing them ; but of practices, which come quite naturally to Frenchmen, but which are exceedingly, and very properly disgusting to us. Yet it ought to be considered, that since Frenchmen of the rank out of which the Priesthood is very commonly supplied, give in to these practices even in furnished rooms and before all companies, they cannot *intend* any disrespect by them. One ought not to complain if they are *as* decorous in Church as in other places, though one would wish them to be more decent every where. In St. Paul's Cathedral I have seen people wearing their hats. This, the same people would *not* have done in the presence of their betters in ordinary society. We are apt, with our English notions, to expect *gentleman-like* habits in the foreign Catholic Priest, I mean in external points ; forgetting how much the "efficiency" of their ministrations often depends upon their belonging to a rank short of the highest. Not, however, that I would seem to undervalue the temper of mind which the word "gentleman-like" expresses better than any other ; or to deny that this temper, when combined with more obviously Christian qualities, is of very essential use to a Clergyman in mixing with the poor.

Now for Belgium. I thought the appearance of the people on the whole less satisfactory in 1842 than in 1828. The towns are evidently more flourishing in a worldly point of view since the Revolution ; at least there is a great advance in civilization. As they have become more commercial, they have of course so far become less religious, and I believe this is fully acknowledged by Catholics. An infidel spirit has sprung up, which the Church sets herself vigorously to counteract, and I understand with increasing effect. The king, too, professes impartiality in religious matters, which is another trial to the Church. Still it is undoubtingly making immense way. Comparing Belgium and France, the Church gives greater *signs* of power in the former country than in the latter. It had a great hold on the people before the political changes, and this it still retains, with whatever drawbacks from circumstances which it cannot control. The Services are more fully carried out and more splendidly conducted ; the Government does not seem, as in France,

to attempt restrictions as to the number of Festivals, &c.; more priests appear in the streets; and processions are not (as in France) commonly interdicted.

The Clergy of Belgium impress one with the idea of being a most devoted body. The amount of labour which they go through is prodigious. They rise generally at five (the Belgians are universally early risers), and seem to have their days fully occupied with devotional and charitable works. I remained some little time at Mechlin, where I was most kindly treated, and had an opportunity of going over all the principal institutions of the place, in company with a priest. The schools for the poor seem to be admirable; the teachers are, I believe, for the most part members of the society of frères Chrétiens, and the Clergy of the place superintend and occasionally take part in the teaching. One establishment was especially striking; a sort of Sunday school for young maid-servants. The demeanour of these poor girls towards their priest was most pleasing; when he entered, they begged his blessing, which he gave them in the usual form. I must not forget to add, that at one of the boys' schools which I visited, I had an opportunity of examining some of the boys, whom I took quite at random, upon the distinction between *reverence* and *worship*. I may say that they (almost indignantly) repudiated the idea of paying *Divine* honours to the blessed Saints.

The Churches in Belgium are open generally at six, and many persons both assist and *communicate* at the earliest Mass. There cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose that the Mass is used exclusively or generally as a service for contemplation only. Nothing apparently can exceed the devotion of those who so use it; but there is a series of Low Masses from six to ten every day, at which I think there are *always* some communicants, and often many. This is a point in which we thought Belgium superior to France.

At Antwerp, we fell in with one of the boys who officiated at Mass in the Cathedral. Considering that he was a mere chance specimen of his class, I cannot but augur very favourably of the attention paid to young persons in the Belgian Church. I had a great deal of conversation with him on two separate occasions, and was struck and pleased beyond measure by his general tone and demeanour. We learned that he was in the habit of confessing every fortnight. He was between twelve and thirteen. He spoke with delight of his duties in the Church, and of his hope of one day attaining to the dignity of the Priesthood. It was impossible to see that boy even for a few hours and doubt, from his conversation and general deportment, that he had been most carefully and religiously brought up.

I had the good fortune to come in for a Confirmation at Brussels. It was a most beautiful sight, carrying one back in thought to the days of St. Ambrose. The present Primate of Belgium bears the highest character, and sustains his dignity with most especial majesty and sweetness. Every child and young person knelt during the Service, and had his, or her, sponsor standing behind, and the

behaviour of the whole assemblage was reverent and devout. The children were arranged in the nave; the choir was reserved for the service. On entering, the Archbishop proceeded to the centre of the Altar, and the *Veni Creator* was entoned to a simple Gregorian Chant. There was no noise nor confusion of any sort; the children did not move from their places; but the Archbishop and attendant Priests came round, and administered the rite to each. The Archbishop delivered a most affectionate and paternal address.

The Bishops of Belgium meet every year at Mechlin to confer on the affairs of the Church, and remain there one week. They are received and entertained by the Primate; the days are taken up with alternate devotions and business, and the evenings passed in receiving the Clergy at dinner. The Archbishop exercises constant hospitality among his Clergy; he receives them at dinner, but his occupations are so numerous and constant that he is generally obliged to quit his table as soon as dinner is over, or even earlier, leaving his Chaplain to do the honours to his guests.

I cannot think of anything else to tell you, but as you ask for my impressions, I gladly give them, with the grounds of them.

I remain, &c.

THE END.

LONDON :

Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY, WILSON, & FLEY, Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

11





283

9716

283
wa
Th
ian cl

Ward, W. G.

The ideal of a Christian Church

