

BX
5095 73

SECOND EDITION

PRO-ROMANISM
AND
The TRACTARIAN
M O V E M E N T

By

CHARLES CHAPMAN GRAFTON, S.T.D.

Bishop of Fond du Lac



MILWAUKEE: THE YOUNG
CHURCHMAN COMPANY
NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHT

The Publishers are authorized to offer this pamphlet to any of the reverend clergy and heads of Religious Houses for free distribution in reasonable quantities, not exceeding one hundred copies to each, on request made prior to November first, and at their own expense for transportation.

Pro-Romanism

AND

The Tractarian Movement

BY
CHARLES CHAPMAN GRAFTON, S.T.D.
Bishop of Fond du Lac

Milwaukee
The Young Churchman Co.

1908

Pro-Romanism

THE CHURCH is now undergoing some trials. It would not be fair or wise to ignore them. The Church's cause may seem to some to have received a check in the desertion of a few to Rome. Towards them we must continue our love, while we condemn their action and repudiate their argument.

In England at one time the like occurred, in greater measure, and yet the Tractarian Movement went triumphantly on. As Dr. Pusey said once to me: "Our checks have been our greatest blessings." Here, in America, we believe, as a consequence, the Church will be stronger. The Pro-Romans, *i.e.*, those who believe the Roman Papacy is of divine right, will probably leave. This will be a more honorable course than to remain and seek to betray their trust. This issue is, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." By the retirement of the Pro-Romans, conservatives will be no longer divided into Pro-Roman and Catholic wings. The "*terminus ad quem*" of the Movement will then be seen by all Churchmen to be—not union with Rome, but the revival of our own Prayer Book Catholicity. It will rally the conservatives of all schools together. There will be a purifying of the



air, a closing up of ranks, a more devoted spirit, a filling up of the places where some have fallen, and the loss of the few will result in the gain of the many. God is with us. The great movement had God for its Author, and He will not let a few men ruin it. The intercessions of the Faithful from hundreds of Altars go up on our behalf, and the great Cause of Catholic teaching and worship and revived devotional life will advance. We must fear nothing; we must hope for everything. We must go forward with invigorated courage and faith.

Reviewing the field and the course of battle, the points gained and lost and the causes thereof, we think one mistake has been an overzeal and desire for the reunion of Christendom. We have centered our hopes upon it, looked upon it as the one thing needful, and we have made it an idol. Persons have so dwelt upon it as to give it a reflexive, suggestive, hypnotic power. The idea so takes possession of them that when exercised in respect of Rome, they are hypnotized by it, and no reason or argument can break the spell. They can for the time see Rome, and nothing but Rome.

The recognition of our common Catholicity and restored Christian fellowship has always been a constant subject in my own prayers from my entry into the Priesthood. In the early sixties I became an active member of the A. P. U. C., when it was first started. We have followed in our

prayers and personal service the advancement of this cause, seeking union with the Latin and Eastern Churches and also with our separated brethren. Pusey and Bishop Forbes did this once in respect of Rome, but Pusey wrote that after the Papal decree of 1870 the aspect had changed.¹

So far as Rome is concerned, it is obvious that during the past half century she has placed more and greater barriers in the way of reunion. She has done this by additions to the faith, and has finally closed the door by a final rejection of our Orders. Good came out of this, as it was a demonstration to us Anglicans that the Pope was not possessed of any special gift of infallibility. For if there is one thing as clear and certain as that there is a God, it is that we are possessed of valid orders and a true priesthood. Defeated in so many of its former manufactured objections, Rome at last retreated to objections to our form; objections that, if valid, would have invalidated their own orders.²

It is clear that the Edwardine form of ordination, the form in dispute, retained the proper Episcopal minister, with laying on of hands, with gift of the Holy Ghost, with determination of the office and the recognition of the *Sacerdotium*. For at the laying on of the hands the Bishop said: "Receive the Holy Ghost," and using our Lord's own

¹ *Preface to Second Edition of Sermon on the Rule of Faith.*

² *Response of the Archbishops of England to the Pope; Treatise on the Bull Apostolicae Curae*, Bishop Creighton, S. P. C. K.; *Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders*, 3rd Edition, Charles Spence Ms, London.

words, made mention of the sacerdotal power of absolution, which belongs exclusively to the Priesthood.

The denial by Rome of our orders was a judgment such as destroyed all confidence in her spiritual conduct. No political judgment has ever been more corrupt. Expert Roman theologians had said our orders were valid,^{*} but English Romans said such a ruling was not politic. As the matter stands, any corporate union with Rome has now passed beyond the scope of human possibility; to look for it, under the conditions of to-day, is as sane as to believe the earth and the moon can be reunited.

Moreover, union with Rome, in her present state, while claiming a temporal sovereignty, and exercising a spiritual one, despotically controlled by the Curia, is spiritually undesirable. Brought about without deep repentance and concessions on both sides, the union of the Churches would not bring a blessing. But we must face the fact that, as things stand, it would be logically impossible for Rome to retreat from her position, and it would be equally impossible for the Anglican Bishops to surrender their recovered Episcopal rights and become again the serfs of the Vatican. The Church in Britain had been founded independently of Rome and for centuries existed apart from her jurisdiction. When the Monk Augustine came,

^{*} *Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders.*

about 597, the seven British Bishops refused to transfer their allegiance from their own Metropolitan to him.*

Subsequently, chiefly by Archbishop Theodore, arriving A. D. 669, the two communions were united. The relation of the Church to Rome was, however, far from what it is claimed by her to-day. For example, at the National Synod of Osterfield, 701, the Synod decreed that "the see of Rome could not interfere with an Anglican Council nor alter its decrees."

The developments of the papal power in England, after the Norman Conquest, by the rise of the feudal system and the influence of the forged decretals, was constantly resisted. As an instance, Fulco, Bishop of London, said to the Papal Legate, in 1255, that "I would certainly bear to have my head cut off before I will consent to such slavery on the part of our Church."

Parliament, in which the Church was represented, checked its extortions, and by its laws forbade appeals to Rome. When at length the oppressions had become intolerable, God delivered the Church, and her Bishops recovered their ancient rights. As it is necessary for the sects, in order to be true to the Gospel, to recover the priesthood, so it is necessary for the Roman Bishops to recover the full rights of the Episcopate. God has

* *Bright's Early English Church; Joyce's Acts of the Church*, p. 19.

† *Acts of the Church*, pp. 56-58.

given us freedom and it would be a base betrayal of our trust to surrender it.

Besides, reunion is evidently not the revealed purpose of divine providence. Our Lord prayed for the unity and the union of His Church, and that prayer was granted. The Church's unity was secured by the sacramental union of her members with Christ. This unity is indestructible. Its "union" was preserved by the Holy Spirit's binding in love the members together in subordination to the decrees of the whole Church. This was the case for nigh 1,000 years. But He did not pray that if, as has happened by man's sin, union was lost, it should ever be restored. On the contrary, the teaching of the Holy Scripture is, that the Church at the second coming of Christ will be found outwardly divided. The outward framework of the Church Militant is to suffer shipwreck. The bones of the mystical Body are to be out of joint. The "*terminus ad quem*" of the spiritual movement in our Communion, therefore, is not reunion with Rome, as she is to-day, but a revival of true Catholic teaching, practice, and worship in our own portion of Christ's Church, secured to us as it is in our Book of Common Prayer.

Again: There has been too much talk about Western Christendom to the ignoring of the East, and a too sentimental regard expressed for the holy or Western Apostolic See.

The foundation of the principle of the An-

glican Church was expressed in its declaration in Convocation in 1534, that “the Pope of Rome has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Holy Scripture, in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign Bishop.”

When the Roman has been beaten on his appeal to Scripture, he falls back on the argument of development. It was first introduced by Newman in the attempt to defend his secession, and he borrowed it, said Carter, from a German source.¹ The great Bishop Andrewes pointed out the innate absurdity of this Roman claim. He said “that the degrees among Bishops—of Archbishops, Primates, Patriarchs—should be *de jure pontio* (or by canon law), but that the Pope should be *de jure divino* (or by divine right)—that in one uniform ascent or scale of four degrees, one degree only should be *de jure divino*, and all the other three *de jure pontio*, deserves rather to be scorned than answered.”

Again, what has hurt us has been a tendency to copy Rome as our standard in ritual or otherwise, as a supposed means of aiding future union. As a matter of practical wisdom, union with Rome, if in any way desirable, would not be forwarded by any such similarity. She is more likely to be attracted and allow of diversity of ritual, than won by any strained applying and copying of her pecu-

¹ *Conc. Mag. Brit.*, iii., 769. *Acts of the Ch.*, 78.

² *The Roman Question*, 49.

liarities. Where our Liturgy differs from the Roman, let us be loyal to our own. It bids us sing the *Gloria in Excelsis*, not at the beginning of the service but as an act of praise and thanksgiving after the communion of the people, and when in veiled presence the Blessed Lord abides in the sacramental mystery yet with us. Let us avoid irritating one another by extremes, but try to bear with all our brother Churchmen, seeing how we may learn from one another, and make union among ourselves of the first importance.

Our true position is that we are Catholics, believing that our Lord formed one holy and apostolic body and that our first allegiance is to that Body regarded as a whole which Christ made, and not to any one of the divisions, Eastern or Western, which the sin of man has made. A true Catholic will not follow the mind of the Western rather than the Eastern Church, for he will love the whole Church and listen to the Spirit that speaks through it. But subordinately and with a more home-like devotion, he will be loyal to his own branch of the Church, "Our Mother," as Pusey called her, "in whom we were new-born to God, in whom we have been fed, in whose bosom we hope to die; beloved and afflicted, and by afflictions purified." Let us cease dwelling on her faults and defects and love her all the more for the blemishes on her face and the stains on her worn garments.

Having love toward all, yet we agree so much

more with the Eastern Orthodox Church than we do with Rome, that we should rather cultivate a revival of Christian fellowship with the East, than with the Papacy. What has severely hurt the development of Church principles in America has been the fear of Rome. Let us hope that the late desertions will tend to the elimination of all pro-Romanism amongst ourselves. It is Catholicity, not Romanism, that should be our common aim.

A PRESENT ISSUE

Our present trial will force on us a certain amount of controversy. For this we must be prepared. The clergy must take up the subject seriously, calmly, dispassionately and with prayer. If rightly used, it may turn out to be of great benefit both to the Roman Communion and to our own. Their priests and people are trained to disbelieve anything a Protestant can say. But a large number of the Roman laity have also been educated in our public schools and have caught the American spirit of freedom, liberty, fair play, and honest investigation. Many of them will be led to examine the Roman question for themselves and not be contented to be the mere empty echoes of what the priest says. They must in time be forced to ask, for instance, why they should be called on to contribute large sums of money to support the Pope? Why should they forever be deluded by the farce that he is the "prisoner of the Vatican"?

Why should they not learn that when the Pope as a temporal sovereign governed the states of Italy, there was never a worse government among civilized nations? Are they to be kept forever in ignorance that there justice was shamefully administered, persons tortured, education neglected, sanitation unprovided for, agriculture stagnant, that poverty and pauperism and begging abounded, that there was no real personal liberty, and patriotism was a crime? Count Cavour said: "Misrule crushed out every generous instinct as sacrilege or high treason." Ricardi, the premier, described the Papal court "as an abominable and rotten system." Gladstone spoke of the Papal system of government as an "outrage upon religion, upon civilization, upon humanity, and upon decency." Ground down by this tyrannous power, the Italians threw off their Papal oppressor. Had they not a right to do so? Can we Americans, who have inherited the spirit of liberty, through our English progenitors, or our American forefathers in their noble struggle for freedom, censure the Italians, crushed under oppressions and wrongs (to which ours were but featherweights), for asserting their rights and casting off the debauched and cruel Papal government?

The Roman Catholic Italians in their struggle for freedom and human rights cast off the Papal government and welcomed their liberator, Victor

¹ See Robertson's *Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, ch. I.

Emmanuel. But did the new government oppress the Pope? On the contrary, it drew up some thirteen Articles of Papal guarantees, making the person of the Pope sacred and inviolable, according to him sovereign honors, giving to him the right to receive ambassadors, securing him in all liberty of action, protecting him in his spiritual administration, and assigning to him an income of 3,225,000 liras or about \$645,000 a year! But claiming, though deposed by the Italians, to be still a king, he says he will not take the money. He poses as a prisoner and tries to act the part of one, though free in all spiritual matters and surrounded by kingly riches and palace and pomp and state. How long are American Roman Catholics to be misled? How long is it to be said that the temporal power is necessary for the exercise of the Pope's spiritual power? How long shall any Christian fail to see that if the old temporal power is necessary to the spiritual as is claimed, then such spiritual power can be no part of the Christian religion? How long shall American Roman Catholics in their devotion uphold the Pope in his unevangelical position as a worldly king? How long will the poor be mulcted to support the Papacy in its claim to a temporal sovereignty which finds no support in the Gospels? The American Roman Catholics are coming to be the strength of the Roman Church. By refusing Peter's pence they could bring the Papacy to terms and make it resign the temporal

sovereignty. It would increase the spiritual power of the Roman Church greatly and remove one barrier toward Christian fellowship and recognition. While this is the duty of Romans, our clear duty is to remain where God's providence has placed us and where we can teach the Catholic faith to those who otherwise would not know it. This is our blessed privilege and we must not, by deserting our posts, lose our reward.

THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY

We turn to another subject:—

It is forced on us to examine the Roman doctrine concerning Purgatory. We learn from Holy Scripture that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." It is lawfully held that there is a state where imperfect souls, who die in a state of grace, but who are not perfected in holiness, are purified and fitted for the Beatific Vision. In this condition they are in joy and felicity and have the consciousness of their acceptance and salvation. Seeing themselves afresh in the sight of God's holiness, they are purified in God's love; but the method of their purification is not revealed to us. Their progress, we may charitably hold, is aided by the prayers of the Faithful.

Rome, however, teaches that while Christ made an atonement and satisfaction for sin on the Cross, this applies only to the guilt of sin, and deliverance

from eternal loss. God's Justice, it is held, demands that a temporal punishment must be inflicted even on forgiven sins, and borne, either in this world or in the next. The nature of this punishment is thus stated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. "There is a *purgatorial fire* in which the souls of the pious are tormented (*cruciatae*) for a certain time, and expiated." The character of the fire is thus stated in a popular book on Purgatory.¹ "There poor souls are buried under waves of fire. It is from the smallest spark of their purgatorial fire that they suffer more intense pains than all the fires of this world put together could produce. In this fire they suffer more than all the most cruel torments undergone by malefactors, or invented by the most barbarous tyrants; they suffer more than all the tortures of the martyrs summed up together. Our terrestrial fire was not created by God to torment men, but rather to benefit them; but the fire in Purgatory was created by God for no other purpose than to be an instrument of His justice; and for this reason it is possessed of a burning quality so intense and penetrating that it is impossible for us to conceive of it even the faintest idea."

"There the souls with heart-rending voices cry

¹ "They suffer the pains of the senses. They are in the fire, in a real corporeal and not only metaphysical fire. The pains are the same as those of hell."—Guillois, *Explication du Catechisme*, vol. I., p. 594, 12th Ed.

² *Charity to the Souls in Purgatory*, 35-46; by M. Muller, C.S.S.R. Published by Donahue.

to us, one after another: Father, Mother, have pity on me, your child! Brother, have pity on me, your sister! Husband, have pity on me, your wife! Wife, have pity on me, your husband! Friend, have pity on me, your friend!" What is asked for is prayers, alms, and money for masses to be paid to the priest.

There are two theological objections to this doctrine. While, when a sin is committed of a public character, as David's was, a punishment may, for warning to others, publicly follow after forgiveness, yet, if no scandal has been given, we cannot imagine a loving Father demanding punishment to satisfy His justice for a forgiven sin. Christ's parable of the Prodigal Son is against it. Neither does God's Justice require it, for His Justice has been fully satisfied by Christ; nor could a created being make any due satisfaction to satisfy God's Justice. The Roman doctrine is thus repugnant to the Gospel's system and a true Catholic would rather die than aid so money-making and unevangelical a doctrine.

The case of Dives, sometimes cited, does not apply, for his is the case of a lost soul. He showed no sense of sin or of repentance. A fixed and impassable gulf separated him from Abraham's bosom. Again, the fire of Christ's presence which burns up at the last day the works of hay, wood, and stubble of Christians, deprives them of their

expected rewards, but is not a purgatorial state of torment.

This doctrine is indeed a source of great financial revenue to Rome, and a fearful oppression to the poor and ignorant. Who can resist an appeal to help those we love out of torment?

Those who believe it cannot do so. It holds in its deadly and horrible grip thousands and thousands of our fellow Christians. Shall we Anglicans help them out of their benighted slavery by enlightening them, or aid this superstition by a cowardly desertion of our post? How terrible must be the weight of sin on those who do this!

* * * * *

DEVOTIONS TO MARY

The devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary is not a question about asking through God a portion in her prayers. The tradition preserved in the Eastern Church is that of those for whom we may pray, their prayers we may ask. They thus commemorate the Blessed Virgin Mary; "Of our exceedingly blessed Lady and ever Virgin Mary, with all the Saints, ourselves and one another, let us commend to Christ the God."

The Anglican Church keeps special feasts in her honor, and in hymns we express our love and call her blessed. She stands pre-eminent in the

* *The Divine Liturgies*, 247; pub., D. Nutt.

Heavenly Court, the highest of all Saints. We can but love her whom Christ so loved, and pray God to give us a portion in her prayers. But this is very different from what Rome teaches. With her, Mary is something more than a saint. As Rome says, Christ is the Head of the Church, Mary is the "Neck" of the mystical Body.* As all grace comes to us from Christ the Head, so it is said to come to us through the Blessed Virgin. Thus it is taught that it is the "Will of God that all graces pass through her." "God has constituted Mary the ordinary Dispensatrix of grace." "It is safer," one wrote, "to go to the Blessed Virgin than to our Lord." "We can only hope to obtain perseverance through her." I have had said to me, "I feel I can go to her, when I cannot go to Him."

Thus in prayer is she addressed:—

"I adore you, O great Queen, I thank you for all the grace you have given me, especially for having liberated me from hell." So in sermons Roman priests are known to have preached, "One can be a bad man and neglect Christ, but if he will only say one prayer daily to Mary, in the Day of Judgment, she will say, 'Son, he forgot you, but he remembered me.'" It is not uncommon thus to represent Mary as the embodiment of Mercy; and Jesus of Justice. "When we betake ourselves to

* Faber's Notes in vol. I, *The Roman Question*, p. 119.

* *Gl. of M.*, ii. 2, p. 62, and vi. 2, p. 171.

* Pusey's *Sermon on Rule of Faith*, 51-59.

prayer to Mary," said Leo XIII., "we betake ourselves to the Mother of Mercy."

How few Anglicans know that in a "Psalter of Mary," published by the Propaganda, in the first verse of every psalm the word Lord is changed to Mary. "Blessed is the man who loves thy name, O Virgin Mary." "O Lady, how are they increased that trouble me." "O my Lady, in thee have I hoped." "Preserve me, O Lady, because I have hoped in thee." "O Lady, thou art my refuge." "Blessed are the hearts of those that love thee, O Virgin Mary; their sins by thee shall be mercifully blotted out." "O come, let us sing unto our Lady, let us rejoice in the Virgin, our Saviour."

The *Te Deum* has been altered in like manner:

"We praise thee, Maker of God,
We acknowledge thee, Mary the Virgin,
All the earth doth worship thee,
Spouse of the Eternal Father.
To thee all Angels and Archangels
Thrones and Principalities faithfully serve,
To thee the whole angelic creation
With incessant voice proclaim—
Holy, holy, holy Mary!

In this way has the *Anima Christi* been paraphrased:

"Soul of the Virgin, Illuminate me;
"Body of the Virgin, guard me;
"Milk of the Virgin, feed me;
"Passing of the Virgin, strengthen me;
"Make me always to trust in thee;

¹ *The Anglican Claim*, Holden, p. 25.

"From all evil protect me;
 "In the hour of my death assist me;
 "Prepare for me a safe way to thee;
 "That with all the elect I may glorify thee,
 "For ever and ever."

That such teaching is not that of a few devotional writers, but the authorized teaching of the Church, we may quote Pius IX.'s own words: "Mary is the most powerful mediatrix and reconciler of the whole world unto her only begotten Son." "Ye know well, Venerable Brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most Holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all goodness that accordingly we may know, that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her, because such is His Will who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary." Well may we ask with Pusey: "Who of the Fathers taught this?" While devotions may grow based on revealed truth, they cannot be the ground of new revelations. As antiquity was ever the test of truth, and novelty of heresy, Roman Mariolatry is thus convicted of error. Is not this Roman teaching the reason why in Europe we find our Lord's altars comparatively deserted, while Mary's are crowded with worshippers? This increase of sentimental devotions has been, if we may believe some Roman writers, at the expense of the Christian

* *Ep. Encyclical*, A. D. 1849.

character. Surely the excessive devotion to Mary which has so increased must be very painful indeed if known to her. It is a mistake to suppose that these excessive devotions to her help to protect the doctrine of the Incarnation. The result as seen in the Latin nations has been to weaken it. Belief in the facts of the Apostles' Creed is more extensive and stronger in England, among its statesmen, its lawyers, its members of Parliament, its editors and professional and scientific men than it is among like classes in Italy or France. Having known so many priests and laymen far holier than myself, my testimony is, that in the last century the Anglican Church has produced more saints, saintly men and women, than any other one European or Roman Catholic country. The argument sometimes made that Mary was by some of the Fathers spoken of as the second Eve, is a very superficial and unsound one. As Eve listened to the Tempter and disobeyed God, so it is true that Mary listened to the Angel and obeyed him. In this sense she may be called the second Eve, but there is no contrast made between any supposed gift of grace to the first Eve, and any, whatever they were, gifts to the second. Mary was full of grace when the Angel addressed her, but how or when given is not revealed, and to make the Immaculate Conception of Mary a dogma is to depart from Catholicity, which holds to the faith as once delivered, and to fall away into the presumptuous sin of Romanism;

from which may God keep all true and humble-minded Catholic Churchmen.

INDULGENCES

We come now to the system of Indulgences:—

An indulgence in the primitive Church was a relaxation, by the Bishop, of canonical penance upon sufficient evidence of true repentance. This power in the Bishop was recognized in the twelfth canon of Nice and the sixteenth of Chalcedon. Dr. Pusey quotes from a Roman authority that “such were the chief Indulgences for the first thousand years after our Lord.” “It is now conceded,” says Dr. Pusey, “that until the end of the fifteenth century there was scarcely any, or anyhow very rare,¹ use of Indulgences for the departed.” But Pius VI. in 1794 condemned the idea “that Indulgences were to be limited to the relaxation of penance, and not applied to temporal punishment due to divine Justice.”

In the Faculty given by Leo X. to the Indulgence broker John Tetzel, the most ample power was given “of absolving from sins repented of, confessed and forgotten, and even of those not repented of and not confessed; and in the moment of death of bestowing universal remission of all sin, guilt, and penalty to be paid in Purgatory.”

Luther testified that Tetzel preached that “as

¹ *Eirenicon*, p. 252.

² *Romish Indulgences*, Imp. Prot. Fed., London, p. 13.

soon as the money paid for the indulgence clinked in the bottom of the chest, the souls of their deceased friends went up to heaven.” This started the Reformation, and no wonder! Can any gospel Christian conceive of anything more unlike the Christian religion? Nor has the sale of indulgences ceased in the Roman Church. In Spain, a formal announcement is made, by a grand procession, of the arrival of the yearly-dispensing Bulls from Rome. It is sometimes said that the money asked is by way of alms. But as these dispensatory Bulls are to be purchased in religious shops by a fixed sum which is demanded for them, the money paid cannot be called alms! There are three noticeable Bulls sold in Spain—one, dispensing largely from the abstinence of flesh meat during Lent—a plenary indulgence by way of suffrage to that soul in purgatory in whose behalf the Bull is taken out by any one of the faithful; and a curious Bull of “composition” which has relation to property *unjustly* acquired. The person must not be the actual thief. But if he swears he does not know the owner and cannot find him, he may, having procured the Bull, retain the property. Some theologians hold, that if the true owner turns up, the Bull purchaser may still retain the goods.* This dreadful mercantile system is at the basis of much of Rome’s moral teaching. To enforce

* Same.

* *Romish Indulgence*, p. 53.

a high standard of morality, Rome proclaims the awful tortures of a purgatory where every sin must be expiated by penal suffering. But then it undoes it by teaching that by gaining plenary indulgence, and this may be done easily and in a short time, the soul entirely escapes all punishment. This may be done for one's self or for another. What is the result of such a mercantile system? An Indulgence, it is said, is not a purchased permission to sin. No! But it is a purchased deliverance from the punishment of sin. Dr. Hirscher, a Roman Catholic professor at Freiburg, says: "Another deep-rooted yet evil practice is the notion that exists in the popular mind concerning indulgences. Say what you will, the people understand by indulgences the remission of sins. Tell them that the indulgences have nothing to do with *sin*, but only with the *punishment of sin*—but so, it is the punishment and not the guilt of sin which the people consider the most important point; and if you free them from the punishment of sin, you free them from sin itself, or at least from the thing they are most concerned about." Now should not every Anglican rejoice that he is freed from this mercantile system! How filled with joy should the heart of every true Christian be, saved freely and wholly by Christ and in Christ, saved entirely from all guilt and penal punishment by the Precious Blood, a ransomed soul, saved without money and without price. O! precious,

divine, gospel gift of free acceptance and safety, which may all Roman laity come to know, and Anglicans be thankful for and not throw away.

THE SPIRIT OF THE PAPACY

Let us next consider the Spirit of the Papacy.

There is a difference between Catholicity and the Papacy. We have no quarrel with true Catholicity, which is the manifestation of the faith once revealed and borne witness to by the general Christian consciousness. But the Papacy is something different. Is it of man or of God? We can only know by its character and its fruits. There are two most evident signs. The Papacy has not been the principle of unity, but the chief source of the divisions in Christendom. It first broke the Church into the East and the West. It then divided the West into the Latin and the Anglican Communions. It could not hold always together even the Churches of the Latin nations. It was the cause of the great schism in the Middle Ages, when there were three rival Popes. It has split in our day into Old and Roman Catholics, the former a small but learned and increasing body. It has, moreover, been actuated by a worldly-minded, cruel, and political spirit, often masking itself in counterfeited forms of piety. Can we ever forget the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, for which the Pope ordered a medal in its commemoration; or the horrors of the Inquisition, yet defended by the

Jesuits; or the condemnation of Galileo the astronomer;¹ or that Philip II. of Spain, acting in the name of Pope Pius VI., succeeded, according to Grotius, in murdering over 100,000 persons? In our own day, Cavour, after the massacres of Romagna, denounced Pope Pius IX. to Europe as a butcher.

Again: Rome has added dogmas to the Faith, not in the interest of truth, but in the interest of the increase of its own concentration of power. It has summoned Councils, not freely to consult and bear witness to the ancient Faith, but, as the Pope himself said, to do honor to the Papacy and its infallible decrees.

ITS VENALITY

Again: The past history of the Papacy is full of crimes of venality and simony. The Papacy has been bought again and again. It has had to veil its conduct in modern times, but is rotten with the spirit of worldliness. To all wise Christians, it is a terror and a form of Anti-Christ. The Church of Christ was, like the individual Christian, to be noted for its unworldly spirit. The Kingdom the dear Lord founded was not to be like the kingdoms of the world. It was a beautiful kingdom filled with the Holy Ghost and its organization kept one by mutual submission and love.

¹ Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, 230-254.

No monarch, sitting on a splendid throne, surrounded by the pomp of an earthly court, was to be its ruler. It is not necessary for salvation, as Father Puller has shown in his book, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, to be in communion with Rome. The same is well taught in Dr. Bright's book, *The Roman See in the Early Church*.

Alas! How has the Papacy been a hindrance to Christ's Kingdom. Unlike the Eastern Church, which has her ornate ceremonial but to do honor to God, many of the great papal offices are to attract the multitude and to do honor to the Papal king. What a spectacle does St. Peter's present, thronged with its many thousand spectators shouting *Vive le roi*, when the Pope, surrounded by a brilliant cortege of Cardinals and the gay-colored Swiss guard, is borne in state through the Cathedral! What a spectacle does the Pope present, surrounded by the splendor and etiquette of an earthly court! No wonder Christianity does not increase when the world sees the Papacy filled with a spirit like its own.

ITS ATTITUDE TO FREEDOM

And what has been the attitude of the Papacy in regard to freedom? The Papacy has been opposed to freedom and progress, keeping the people when it had the power, as in Italy and Spain, in subjection, upholding tyranny and tyrants, as in

the case of King John and *Magna Charta*. Mr. McCarthy, a Roman Catholic, in his *Five Years in Ireland*, contrasts the Protestant North of Ireland with the unhappy state of the Roman portion; and Mr. Gladstone said in 1875: "Profligacy, corruption, and ambition continued for ages their destructive work upon the [Italian] country, through the Curia and the Papal Chair; and in doing it they of course have heavily tainted the faith of which that Chair was the guardian." "There was never any more cunning blade devised against the freedom, the virtue, and the happiness of a people than Romanism."

ITS LUST FOR POWER

The Papacy is full of the lust of power and greed for money.¹ Its commercial spirit shocked the moral sense of Europe in the sixteenth century, as it does now. The Papacy is a shop-keeping institution. "It is the antithesis of Christianity." "Its every action, when analyzed, resolves itself into a business transaction." As the Italians say, "It is all a matter of soldi," or, as we say, "of pounds, shillings, and pence." "*Oro non fa odore*," says the priest—"Gold," no matter how got, "has no bad smell." From Froude's *History of England* we learn how persons—clergy and laity—compounded for money to be allowed

¹ *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, by Robertson, ch. V.

to live in the grossest licentiousness. It is well known that in certain countries, like those in South America, the Philippines, in Southern Europe, allowed concubinage exists among the clergy. Mr. Froude tells us that Pope Pius V. offered "remission of sin, with annuities, to any cook, brewer, or baker who would make away with Queen Elizabeth."

ITS SUPERSTITIONS

It is also to be noted that:—

The superstitious spirit Romanism engenders is harmful to character. Rome has good reason for encouraging it, for it is profitable. It helps to fill her treasury. "Preach Purgatory," said a Roman priest, "if you want to get a good collection." To believe everything the priest tells us is as bad as to refuse all belief. What Holy Scripture bears witness to we should accept, but not all the legends and fables which necromancers have compiled. But the Roman Church favors and puts her seal on so many most doubtful stories as to destroy the faith of many. There is the fable that the home of the Blessed Virgin at Nazareth was transported by Angels and now rests at Loretto. At Rome is shown Christ's cradle, His swaddling clothes, the Table of the Last Supper, the towel used at the feet-washing, specimens of the bread and fish miraculously multiplied, the col-

umn to which He was bound, and many like spurious but profitable relics. Should we Anglicans not be thankful we are delivered from a Church that is pervaded with commercialism and injures faith in what is true by its superstitions?

SOME DIFFERENCES OF FAITH

Let us now consider some of the differences in faith and practice between the Anglican and Roman Communions. In the Anglican the faith rests on the testimony of the whole Church expressed in her Creeds, Councils, and general consent of undivided Christendom.

In teaching this faith, which an Anglican clergyman does, he has for his authority the whole Catholic Church. If asked what is his authority, he replies: "It is God's Word in Holy Scripture, testified to by the common consent of undivided Christendom." He stands on an immovable rock, and speaks with a heaven-sent authority.

The Roman gives as a special and independent witness to the Faith the utterances of the Pope of Rome. The Anglican believes what the Church believes; the Roman believes what the Pope believes. Yet the Pope has been condemned by General Councils, as was Pope Honorius, who was condemned by the Sixth Ecumenical and subsequent Councils. Grant, as modern Roman apologists have contended, that he was not heretical; never-

theless, the Church, knowing nothing of his infallibility, declared that he was.

Again: The Anglican holds that Christ is the revelation of God to man. What He was, did and said, is the whole of this revelation. It was given in Christ completely and for all time. The Holy Spirit was given to the Apostles to bring to their remembrance all that Christ was, did, and said. The Apostles, under the Spirit's guidance, said they had declared the whole Counsel of God. St. Paul declared that if an angel from heaven (much less a Pope) should declare any other gospel, they should not receive it. The Faith has, therefore, once and for all been delivered to the Saints.

The Roman theory differs widely from this. It holds that the Holy Spirit, dwelling in the Church, may utter through it new truths which our Fathers of the Church knew not. It thus falls into the heresy of confounding the office of the Holy Spirit with that of Christ; the work of the Holy Ghost being, not to reveal truths, but to guide the Church into the truth, which is Christ. Holding that the Holy Spirit reveals new truths, the Roman Church varies in its doctrines. Once it taught that "the Papal infallibility was a Protestant invention." (See Keenan's *Catechism*, as formerly published, page 305). Now it teaches the doctrine as lately defined. Changing its faith this way on an important subject, one cannot tell what it may do next. In the whole Church we have

certainty, in the Roman Church uncertainty, as to the Faith.

Again: The Anglican Church, like a wise mother, carefully confines her dogmatic teaching to the essentials of the Faith, as embodied in the Creeds and manifested in the Sacraments. She gives to her children the ancient Faith and the means of grace necessary to salvation. Rome, however, condemned Galileo and Copernicus. She dogmatized on politics, and put herself in opposition to the spirit of progress. In theology the Pope Eugenius IV. once decided that the delivery of the Instruments, *i.e.*, the chalice and paten, was the essence of the giving of Holy Orders. She was obliged to reverse her decision, and it was thus as worthless as the judgment on the validity of Anglican Orders. In the decree she did not hurt them, but condemned herself as a politically-governed machine.

The decision of Pope Nicholas I., in his reply to the Bulgarians, upheld the validity of Baptism administered "in the name of Christ." He was not, indeed, addressing the whole Church, but by his error misleading a whole Christian nation.

Again: Our great Anglican Mother, in her sedate and tender wisdom, holds all that is not of the faith to be matters of private opinion. She shows herself in this a teacher like unto her Lord. She is tender with her children. She does not needlessly enforce dogmas upon them. The author-

ity she exercises is one of a loving parental character. She makes us truly love her all the more. Rome, however, teaches with an arbitrary, crushing authority, saying in fact: "Believe what we say, or be damned." She does not tenderly appeal to reason, but would crush it. Instead of holding to the Faith revealed, she changes matters of acknowledged opinion into articles of Faith. Take for instance, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. It was acknowledged to be in the Middle Ages a mere matter of private theological opinion, unlike the belief in the divinity of our Lord, which was always held from the beginning as a dogma of the Faith, and was so pronounced at the Council of Nice. The matter of the Immaculate Conception was, as we have said, a matter of mere private opinion, unprovable in the Scriptures and only made a dogma in the year 1854, by a personal decree of the Pope.

Again: The Anglican Church, in her wise wisdom and deep humility, appealed at the Reformation, and has done so ever since, to antiquity.

The living voice of the Church is the guide to the faithful as to the Faith. But the Church herself, for her own protection and guidance, keeps her eye fixed on the past. She knows what the Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of Truth, has once said must be true, and she knows that the Faith has been delivered once for all. Like a good rower, to keep in the straight path, she keeps her eye fixed

on the shore behind her. Thus the Reformers appealed in all they did to the Fathers and the ancient Church. Thus they kept the Church one with the Church of antiquity. Rome, on the other hand, holds, as Cardinal Manning said, that "the appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy." Speaking to a friend of the writer, he said: "An appeal to history is blasphemy to the Holy Ghost." On the decree of the Pope's infallibility, he is reported to have said, "Thank God, the Church is done with history." But is this the spirit and teaching of the Gospel? An appeal to the past is sanctioned in the Scriptures by St. Paul, who said: "If an angel from heaven should preach unto you any other gospel than that we have preached, let him be anathema."

Again: By the appeal to antiquity, the Anglican Church teaches the same faith as was taught in the early ages. Lord Selborne, as Lord High Chancellor of England, has stated in his work on the *Defence of the Church of England* that the doctrines held in the Church of England to-day are practically the same with those taught at the time when Augustine the monk came over to England; while if an ultramontane Roman Catholic should declare in the pulpits of the early Church the doctrine of modern Rome concerning Mary and the Papal infallibility, people would cry out against him, "Thou art proved a heretic by these additions to the faith."

Again: The Anglican Church, our wise and considerate mother, has preserved in her teachings the common-sense rule of the *via media*. She gives us in the Creeds and Sacraments all that is necessary for us to know and to do for our salvation. She does not seek for herself or her children to answer all the questions that the curiosity of man may ask. She is content to be wise not above that which is fitting. "The Church kept its middle course rigidly combining opposites, and a mixed and balanced erection of dogmatic language arose."

Again: In its methods, while the Anglican Church has appealed to Scripture and the Fathers, Rome, like the sects, has ever appealed to logic, and the logicalness of its special doctrines. "The Arian, the Nestorian, the Apollinarian, the Eutychian, the Monothelite development each began with a great truth and each professed to demand one and only one logical treatment for it." So it has been with the Calvinists, the Anabaptists, the Quaker, the Unitarian, and the Roman. "Logical developments from a few or single texts have been the basis of heresies." And this has been the method of the scholastics and Roman theologians.

Again: The Anglican Church holds that the Holy Ghost is the Vicar of Christ. Now the two great types of Christ in the Old Testament are Moses as Prophet and David as King. The dele-

¹ Mozley's *Development*, pp. 41-43.

gation by Moses to Joshua is recorded in Numbers 27: 15-23; and the action of David is found in I. Kings 1: 32-35. In like manner, we find the promise of the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, and His installation as Christ's Vicar in Acts 2: 1-4.

We find no other installation of one who was to be exclusively the Vicar of Christ. But the Roman theory is that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ. Ferraris, in his *Digest of Pontifical Law*, says: "The Pope is of such dignity and exaltedness that he is not a simple man, but as it were God and Vicar of Christ. Whatsoever the Pope doth, seemeth to proceed out of the mouth of God. The Pope is, as it were, God upon earth." To a devout mind, the Pope's enthronization, being seated on the Altar itself, suggests at least the fearful saying of St. Paul, describing the Man of Sin, "that he, as God, sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Again: Anglicans willingly admit that the Bishop of Rome had by canonical authority a primacy of honor and precedence in the Church; but by claiming a supremacy of jurisdiction he has forfeited what were his canonical rights, just as the President would do if he made himself a monarch.

The Roman argument that God gave a special supremacy to Peter is unsound, for if given to Peter it was a personal privilege, and personal privileges are not transferable. The allowed trans-

ference of such a power must be expressly stated in the original grant, and explicit evidence given of its transference. Knowing that Peter was at Rome, or consecrated anyone with Paul to be a Bishop there, is no proof whatever of the transference of any privilege to the Roman Bishop as a Vicar of Christ, if Peter was so.

Again: The Anglican Catholics believe that Christ is the unseen but present Head of the whole Church, the Church in Glory, the Church on earth, and the Church Expectant. Rome believes the Pope to be the visible Head; but as the Church Militant is only a portion of the Church, it does not require a visible Head, and as the Church is a Divine society, it can only have a Divine Head, which is Christ. Rome's defenders have said, that as every family has a head, and every nation has one, so it is necessary there should be a visible head to the Church Militant; but the Anglican replies that while every family and nation must have a head, it does not follow that there be one head over all families or one over all nations.

In the restoration of St. Peter, on his three-fold profession, our Lord said, "Feed My lambs; shepherd and feed My sheep." He was to feed the little lambs of the New Dispensation and guide and feed the sheep of the Old into the New Kingdom, which he did. Rome argues that here authority was given over the shepherds; but this is not stated, but on the other hand clearly

denied; for when Peter asked concerning John, "What shall this man do?" our Lord said, "What is that to thee?" He was to have no control or jurisdiction over the other Apostles.

Again: Our Lord prayed for Peter that his faith should not fail. Our Lord's Prayer must have been granted. We know by the way in which it was granted what He prayed for. He did not pray that Peter should not deny the Faith, which in denying Christ he did, but He prayed that thus falling away, his faith and trust in Christ should not eventually fail; and being thus converted, and forgiven of this great sin, he would be able to strengthen the other brother Apostles, who had not fallen so far away as himself. If our Lord's Prayer here had invoked any gift of infallibility of Peter, St. Paul would not have censured him for falling away from the truth of the Gospel as he did.

Again: The Anglican Church holds with the Eastern that the Rock on which the Church is founded is Christ. Rome, while admitting this, says: "It is also Peter and the Roman See." But our Lord did not say, "Thou art Peter, the Rock, on whom I will build My Church," but, "upon this Rock," which evidently refers to Christ, whom Peter had just confessed to be the Son of God. But if on Peter in any special way, it would not be on his person, but on his work; and in that sense, all who belong to the Church are built on it. Peter is

called by the Fathers, "first," "prince," "chief," "prince of the Apostles"; but if the Bishop of Rome is no more to us than Peter was to the Apostolic College, he is not the source of all jurisdiction.

Though the Anglican recognizes that the keys of the Kingdom were first promised to Peter, yet he does not believe in Peter's supremacy of jurisdiction; for the Apostles must have understood the meaning of our Lord's words, and they, as superior to Peter and John, *sent* them to Samaria, and divided the jurisdiction over Gentile and Jew between St. Paul and St. Peter. The Anglican believes what the action of the Apostles shows them to have believed. They recognized no supremacy of Peter over themselves.

Again: The Anglican believes that it is safer to trust the action of the united Church for 1,200 years in giving the Blessed Sacrament in both kinds, and that it is more loyal to our Lord's words, than with the Roman to depart from Catholic custom and deprive the laity of so receiving the Blessed Sacrament.

The Anglican believes that the Church is indestructibly one through union of its members in Christ, and that the prayer of our Lord for union was answered by the practical union of the Church for the first thousand years.

Rome holds that union can only be obtained by submission to the Papacy, which was built up first by conformity to the organization of the Em-

pire, then by forged decretals, finally by the action of the feudal system, and by the thirst and love of power. It presents a spectacle of worldliness which gives to the world no sign of a divine mission. To the spiritually-minded, indeed, it looks like a clotted mass of worldliness and a manifestation of the spirit of anti-Christ. By turning opinions into dogmas, it is guilty of the sin of heresy. By refusing Communion to those who will not accept dogmas which were unknown to the early Church, it makes itself guilty of schism and is a schismatic Church everywhere.

* * * * *

SECESSION TO ROME

What does it mean and involve?

A secession from Rome to *our* Church involves no denial of the grace of Orders individuals have received. If sectarians go to Rome, or come to us, they gain the advantages of sacraments which they otherwise have not. For an Anglican Catholic to join Rome is to commit a grievous sin. If he becomes a priest in the Roman Church he is obliged, in conformity with the Pope's teaching, to deny the validity of his former Orders, which are as absolutely true as it is true there is a God. The seceders are obliged to receive Confirmation as if they had never before been confirmed. This is to turn against the Holy Ghost and sin against Him by

saying, "I have never received you in Confirmation." Awful, also, is the denial of the reception of sacramental absolution, which if not real in their case, proves the whole sacramental system of the Gospel to be false. It is also to deny the reality of our Lord's Objective Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, and say to our dear Lord, "I have not in that Sacrament received your Very Body and Blood." It is not an excuse to say they hope they have received Him spiritually, for by talking about their First Communion in the Roman Church, they deny He was on our Altars. What is this but to stab the Sacred Heart? What but to take part with those that deny Him? What, but to fall away from the true Faith and run the risk of losing it entirely? It is being urged that the Amendment to the 19th canon in our American Church allows for an open pulpit with sectarians, and consequently we are justified in leaving our Communion. But as a matter of fact, certified by nearly all the Bishops, such is not the meaning of the canon, which was really meant to be a restrictive one, and the line of argument is thus seen to be fallacious. If men can make such obvious mistakes in the interpretation of a document, it is clear that their judgment in matters concerning the Church, is not worthy to be followed.

Surely we must love those who have been led into this great error, and pray that, led by the Holy Spirit, they, as others have done, may make

the only reparation they can to their Lord, by returning to their former Communion.

If there are still any among us who believe that the Pope has by divine right a primacy in Christendom, and is the source of all jurisdiction, he denies the fundamental principle of the Anglican Church. The only logical outcome of such Pro-Romanism is to submit, as some have done, to Rome. It will be a great blessing to our Communion when it is eliminated of the extremists, or those who would alter the Creed on the one side, and say, "I do not believe in the Virgin Birth," and those who would alter it on the other, and say, "I believe in the Roman Catholic Church."

True and faithful to the ancient Faith, loyal to our own Communion, grateful for the blessing secured to us by the Reformation, drawing to a better understanding of one another, devoted to our own Mother Church, let all conservative Churchmen unite in defending the Catholic Faith.

Let us beware of the leaven of the High Church Pharisee who would substitute justification by morality and good works for dependence on the merits of Christ and justification by the righteousness of God through Faith.

Let us beware of the leaven of the Sadducean Broad Churchman who would substitute results of higher criticism for the Word of God and deny the facts of the Christian Creeds.

Let us beware of the Ritualistic Scribe who

would substitute form and ceremony and Rome-aping for reality and vital religion.

Let us beware of the leaven of the Evangelical disciple who would emphasize a subjective religion to the neglect of its objective and institutional form.

Let us beware of the leaven of the Pro-Roman Herodian who, disobeying Christ's injunction, "It shall not be so among you," would introduce a papal kingdom with papal authority, and thus make vain the word of God through the traditions of Western Christianity.

Let us be all the more devoted to our Lord in these latter days, for it may be that His coming draweth nigh. The secessions of a few Pro-Romans will not hurt us any more than the removal of some trifling sore would injure a sound and healthy body. Let us heroically stand at our posts and not desert them for those of our own choosing. The noble old ship is not going down, though faithless men have tried to scuttle her. Let us come to love the "*Ecclesia Anglicana*" with renewed devotion and be more loyal to her and to one another.

May we not paraphrase the words of America's great poet and apply them to our Church?

Sail on; O Church so true and tried,
 Afflicted sore yet purified.
 The world and Satan's hosts unite
 Against thy witness to Christ's life.
 Humanity with all its fears,
 Its doubts yet hopes for future years,

Looks largely to thy heavenly aid.
We know the Master laid the keel,
Reformers wrought thy ribs of steel.
What scaffolds bled, what martyrs died,
In what a forge and pains beside
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Thy compass is God's Holy Word,
Thy freight the ancient faith retold:
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
In spite of Rome and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee!

BOOKS WHICH MAY BE FOUND USEFUL ON THE ROMAN QUESTION

- The Rule of Faith*, by Pusey. Rivingtons.
The Petrine Claims, by Dr. Littledale. S. P. C. K.
Roman Claims, by Bishop Gore.
The Primitive Saints and See of Rome, by Fr. Puller.
The Roman See and the Early Church, by Dr. Bright. Longmans.
The Privilege of Peter, by Canon Jenkins. King & Co, London.
Leadership, not Lordship, by Rev. H. E. Hall. Kegan, Paul & Co.
Eirenicon, by Pusey. Rivingtons.
The Attitude Towards Roman Catholicism, by Galton (former Roman Catholic who returned to our Church). Crothers, New York.
Christian and Catholic, by Bishop Grafton. Longmans, Green & Co.
Catholic Atlas, by Bishop Grafton. Longmans, Green & Co.
The Anglican Brief Against Roman Claims, by Brinckman. Simpkin, Marshall & Co.
Methods of Romanism, by Brinckman. Swan Sonnensche.
Church Historical Lectures (Two Series), by Bishop Creighton and others. Gorham, New York.
Some Features of Modern Romanism. S. P. C. K.
The Roman Question, by an aged priest, supposed to be T. T. Carter.
The Anglican Claim, by Holden. Moring, London.
Authority in the Church of England, by a lawyer, Gordon Crosse. Wells, Gardner.
What is Modern Romanism? by Bishop Seymour. The Young Churchman Co.
Roman Catholic Churches in Italy, by Robertson. Morgan & Scott, London.
Defense of the Church of England, by Lord Chancellor Selborne. Macmillan.
Romish Indulgences of To-day, by Fulano. Marshall Bros., London.
The Apple of Discord, or Temporal Power, by A Roman Catholic (Apple of Discord Co., Buffalo).
The Parochial School, by J. T. Crowley, a Roman Catholic priest. J. T. Crowley, 1113 Schiller Building, Chicago.
Casting the Nets, a Novel, by Baghot, a Roman Catholic.
Rome, a Novel, by Zola. Macmillan.
Lourdes, a Novel, by Zola. Macmillan.

The Tractarian Movement

The Tractarian Movement

[Reprinted from the "Keble Anniversary Number" of *The Living Church*, July 11, 1908.]

The rise and causes of any movement are always interesting. Especially to Churchmen are those of the Catholic Revival, which is known as the Tractarian Movement. It is necessary to recognize them in order wisely to appreciate its work.

It is often overlooked that this spiritual activity arose independently in both England and America. It is a sign of God's leading that the good seed springs up in various places simultaneously, and not, as sin does, by human contact. The wind of God bloweth where it listeth, and thou canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth. The doctrines of the Church, ministry, and sacraments that distinguished the Great Revival were promulgated early in the nineteenth century in the States by Bishops Seabury and Hobart.¹ Hobart said that he cherished next to the inspired Word as the invaluable standard of his principles, the writings of Bishops Andrewes, Taylor, Ken, Nelson, Hall.² We may find here a reason of the

¹ *Sermons of Seabury and Hobart.*

² *Professional Years of Hobart*, p. 61.

difference which has marked the Churchmanship of Connecticut and Virginia. The Church was planted, in the seventeenth century, in Virginia by the London society of colonists. But it was at a time of low and decadent Churchmanship. It is gratifying to read how they established the saying of the Church offices of morning and evening prayer. But the Holy Communion was celebrated rarely. Its position in the Church's system as the one divinely ordained mode of Christian worship was not recognized. In the Acts we read that the Christians were wont to assemble together on the first day of the week for their solemn Eucharistic feast. The Virginians were loyal to the Church as they had received it, and have ever been conservatively opposed to change. There was less of Churchmanship in the North, where the Church was looked upon as both unevangelical and as representative of the British Government. Throughout the whole land, moreover, the Church was without Bishops and in an abnormal condition. It is a marvel that it survived at all, and but for the grace of orders in the priesthood, it could not have done so. The Revolution brought on a change. Many of the clergy in the North, sympathizing with the Crown, left their parishes and the country. This left the North comparatively free after the Revolution to receive the fuller Church teaching; and so, under Seabury, who had received the traditions of the

high Church Non-jurors, and Hobart, we find the Church in Connecticut and New York becoming high Church, and Virginia and Maryland remaining low. The balanced wisdom of Bishop White was thrown on the former side, as was seen in his opposition to the two Methodist superintendents, Coke and Asbury, who offered, if they might be episcopally consecrated as Bishops, to bring the whole of their followers into the Church. Bishop White feared what the effect would be of bringing such a body of uninstructed sectarians into our communion. Beside, the proposed bargain had about it a look of simony; and it was rejected. The letters of Coke and Asbury are in the library of the General Theological Seminary, New York. So the Church went on in peace and harmony without them, and though it may thereby have lost in numbers, it grew in grace as the minds of Churchmen became more open to the great truths of the Church's order, ministry, and the devotional spirit of her liturgy. Small, but faithful, she became dearer to God than if swollen by numbers.

In England, the movement was preceded by a preparatory one. Europe had been stirred by the terrible wars of Napoleon, which had shaken the ancient thrones and threatened the political existence of England. It has been noticed that great financial disasters or special national deliverances are often followed by a religious revival. "In the time of adversity, consider." On deliverance from

the Red Sea, Miriam uttered her great song of triumph. In the early part of the nineteenth century, as a reaction from Voltairian infidelity, there arose in France a deep religious activity, which showed itself, among other ways, in the rise of the wonderful order of the Sacred Heart, under Mother Barat, and that of the Christian Brothers, in the development of the Oratorians, and subsequently in the Dominicans under the great preacher Lacordaire. In England there arose the Evangelical party.

It is worthy of notice that the revival of the faith in England followed the order of the Creed. There was first the revival of belief in "God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth." The unbelief of the Encyclopaedists in France and of Bolingbroke and Hume in England was met in the latter country by Butler and his *Analogy*. It met the attack of the day as did Paley in his book of Evidences. Roman Catholic France suffered most in the contest, and Bishops like Talleyrand and many clergymen gave up the Christian religion. But in England, where the people had, by the wise action of the Reformed Church, a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, the infidel movement was defeated. It is to the great credit of the Anglican position and of its maintenance of the faith that this was so.

Wesley and Whitfield had been pioneers of the revival which came to be called the Evangelical

Movement.' It brought out in its teaching the next article of the Creed, those related to Jesus Christ and His atoning work. Amongst the leaders of this school were Charles Simeon of Cambridge, John Venn of Huddersfield, Toplady of Broadhambury, Newton of Olney, and Rowland Hill, a famous preacher. There were among them men noted for their personal piety, such as Fletcher of Madeley, Cecil, William Cowper, and, later, the Haldanes of Scotland.⁴ The teaching of the Church in the eighteenth century was mostly of a dry and legal character. "In the delivery of the sermon," said Robert Hall, "the preacher must be free from all suspicion of being moved himself, or of intending to produce any emotion in his hearers."⁵ Blackstone gave his experience of the London pulpit: "As to its morality, it did not always rise, in his opinion, to that of Plato or Cicero; and as for religion, it was difficult to say whether the preacher believed in the Koran, Confucius, or the Bible." The condition of the Church's worship was most deplorable. Accounts of it may be found in almost every Church history of the time. A fair account is given in Wake-man's History, also in the *Annals of the Low Church Party*, chapter vii., in Beresford Hope's *Worship of the Church of England*, p. 7, and in my

³ *Story of the Oxford Movement*, 40, pub. Bemrose & Long.

⁴ See *Annals of the Low Church Party*, Vol. I., pub. Hayes.

⁵ *Annals*, p. 94.

book, *Pusey and the Church Revival*. The Evangelicals, by their presentation of the great doctrines of man's lost estate and need of a Saviour and of union with Him by a living faith, revived religion and made it a living power. It is to them we owe the introduction of the Sunday School for the children, the founding of the great Church Missionary Society, the agitation that led, under Wilberforce and Clarkson, to the abolition of slavery, the impulse that led Howard and Elizabeth Fry to mitigate the brutalities of the jail.* They inculcated amongst their followers strictness of life, placed a ban on theatre-going, card-playing, and dancing, and many affected a plainness of dress. They often met in each other's houses for seasons of prayer and to listen to expositions of Scripture. But, as Dean Church says, their system became a one-sided and an unnatural one. It was dwarfed and cramped by its narrowness of view.[†] It presented chiefly a subjective side of religion. It was indeed blest, as it brought to the converted soul the assurance of acceptance and inward peace. But it needed to be supplemented by the other doctrines of the Creed, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and the Holy Catholic Church. Its piety needed to be enriched and completed by gifts of sacramental grace. So we come

* *Oxford Movement*, Dean Church, p. 13.

[†] *The Oxford Movement*, Dean Church, pp. 11-13.

to the genesis of the Oxford or Tractarian Movement in England, which supplemented it.

As in the Gospels we see how the Apostles were incited to the development of the ministry by the needs and trials of the Church, so the low condition into which the Church of England had fallen and its threatened overthrow led to the new activity. The political riots at Bristol seemed to threaten a repetition of the French reign of terror.⁸ Dr. Arnold of Rugby stated in 1832 that "the Church was imperilled amid the crude revolutionary projects of the reform epoch," and that "no human power could save it." He and others urged, like some in our day, that "union should be made with the dissenters as the only refuge against its overthrow!" A bill was introduced by Lord Stanley, suppressing one half of the Irish episcopate, and carried in the House of Lords by a vote of 135 to 81.¹⁰ William Palmer stated in the *Contemporary Review* that it was this Irish Bishops Act that actually brought things to a crisis. It would seem as if the Church's life was in peril and by State oppression its spiritual and Catholic character was to be blotted out. A petition, signed by 7,000 clergy, was presented to the Archbishop in 1834, and a lay petition, signed by 230,000 heads of families.¹¹ Thus by troubles without and needs within,

⁸ *Story of Oxford Movement*, p. 57. Bemrose & Long.

⁹ *Life*. I., 326.

¹⁰ *Story of the Oxford Movement*, p. 60.

¹¹ *Story of the Oxford Movement*, p. 84.

God pricks men to adopt means for their safety. The work then of the Tractarians was to arouse English Churchmen to the Church's sad and threatened condition and to bring out the objective side of the Christian religion.

It was a tremendous task. The English are a long-suffering and practical people and are apt to be content with things as they are. The Church, as it had been formerly a pope-ridden one, oppressed by foreigners, taxes, annates, appeals, superstitions, had become a State-ridden Church. Convocation, its lawful assembly, had been suppressed from early in the seventeenth century, and the Church could pass no canons for her own discipline or to meet the needs of the age. In ignorance, laxity, and moral abasement it had by no means fallen so low as the Italian Church had done under the Borgias or the clergy at Milan at the time of Charles Borromeo. The English clergy had been so long under the Erastian influence of the Georges that the sense of the Church's divine origin and the authority of her Apostolic Ministry had been obscured."

The work to be done was nothing less than saving the Church of England from spiritual destruction. It was, humanly speaking, an impossible task. The Church had become atrophied and unalterably stereotyped. Well might it be asked, as one did, "Can these dead bones live?" The city

¹¹ *Oxford Movement, Dean Church*, p. 9, pub. Macmillan & Co.

lay in ruins. The modern Sanballats, like those of old, ridiculed and scoffed at the efforts of those who would rebuild the fallen walls. Dead as she might seem, the Anglican Church had within her, by the preservation of the Creeds, a valid priesthood, and sacraments, an indestructible life. The breath of the Holy Ghost could revive the Church, and join bone to bone and fill her with a holier life and adorn her as a living Bride, with the jewels and ornaments of her worship, for with God nothing is impossible.

We cannot dwell too much on this fact: that the great revival, which has seemed to some like unto a pentecostal gift, was God's work. It was a token of God's loving and providential care over the Anglican communion. If ever an organization ought to have gone to pieces or withered away as a branch cut off from the parent one, it was the Church of England. But God's blessing has been upon it, protecting it in its reformed Catholic position against the dangers arising within and without. God showed His providential care in taking away the young King Edward VI., called by Stanley that "young Tudor tiger-cub." If he had lived he would, according to his expressed purpose, have irretrievably destroyed the Catholicity of the Church.

It passed safely, though not without great suffering, through one hundred and fifty years of fierce controversy with Rome and Puritanism. It

was no mere intellectual contest. The Papacy, the embodiment of worldly power within the Church, hesitates not to use worldly power to accomplish its ends. She would now, at any time, throw Europe into war, if thereby she could regain her miserable temporal power. She used her unholy influence to crush England and her Church by the Spanish Armada. It was by the hand of God that the great fleet was scattered and England was delivered. Cromwell and the Puritans in their bloody rebellion suppressed the Church, drove out the clergy, sacked and ruined the church buildings, made penal the recitation of the Prayer Book in service. We who complain and are disturbed by our trifles can scarcely realize the trials of those hero Churchmen who were faithful in those dark days. May their faithfulness be an inspiring example to us. God also ruled and over-ruled the mistaken secession of the Nonjurors in the seventeenth century and the disastrous Erastianism of the eighteenth. And so in the nineteenth, when the Church's life was at stake, when the waves were seemingly beating into the ship and about to overwhelm it, Christ marvellously wrought the Church's deliverance. Anglicans can never be too thankful for what God has wrought, or too trustful that the Hand that has protected them will still "lead them on." God is with her and shall help her and that right early. To every heart He says, to-day, "Be still, and know that I am God."

Wherever God desires a work to be done, He raises up special instruments through which to accomplish His purpose. As God raised up Daniel and Ezekiel to prophesy in Babylon of the Restoration, Ezra and Nehemiah to carry out the rebuilding of Jerusalem, so He raised up saintly men to deliver England's Church. They were not ordinary Christians. They were not mere intellectual reformers. They were persons to whom God gave special gifts of grace and who heroically responded to them. England has no formal method of canonization, no more than the ancient Church had, but the marks of sanctity which distinguish the saints are to be found in some of the holy founders of this great movement, which has saved and transformed the Anglican communion.

One cannot doubt that Pusey and Keble and, later, Carter, were of the same high grade of holiness that is to be seen in Francis de Sales, or Carlo Borromeo, or Philip Neri.

Keble was the originator and the mainspring of the movement. It was on the 14th of July, 1833, he preached at Oxford his great sermon on the "National Apostasy." His "powerfully constructed mind," wrote Canon Liddon, "grasped from the beginning the strength of the Anglican position as opposed to Protestantism and Rationalism, as well as to the yet unappreciated power of Romanism." Newman said that Keble was "the true and primary author of the movement." In

reference to Keble, he wrote: "I felt that I was merely developing his, not my, convictions."

Pusey had enormous learning and spiritually-illuminated reason." He could understand the Prophets, because he lived like them. Whatever he did or said was in the spirit of prayer, humility, and love. "I used," said Newman, "to call him the Great! His learning, his immense diligence, his scholar-like mind, his simple devotion to the cause of religion overcame me." His life stands in a way in contrast with that of Cure d'Ars of France. There God raised up an unlearned man, who by his piety drew thousands, already taught in the Faith, yearly to confession. In England God raised up a learned man, who by his sanctity restored to the uninstructed English Church the painful but blessed privilege—the latter result the greater miracle of the two! Along with these were others, conspicuous amongst whom was Newman, whom space prevents us here from more than mentioning, Hugh James Rose, W. Palmer, H. Froude, J. J. Copeland, Isaac Williams, who were among the pioneers; along with them were J. Mason Neale and Charles Marriott, to be followed by such great men as Bishop Forbes, Liddon, and Dean Church. Their object was to revive in the Church a love of ancient principles and practices, to make better known the doctrines of the Apostolic Succession, the priesthood, the gifts of the sacraments, and the

¹³ See *Pusey and the Church Revival*.

continuity of the Church in England as unbroken by the Reformation. "We all concurred," writes W. Palmer, "in the necessity of impressing that the Church was more than a merely human institution, that it had privileges, sacraments, a ministry ordained by Christ; that it was a matter of the highest obligation to remain united to the Church."

It is one of the commonest mistakes to suppose that the Tractarian Movement was intended to favor or spread the doctrine or practices of the Church of Rome. There was nothing Pro-Roman about its leaders' position. They believed in the Catholic Church as a whole, and did not vaunt themselves as belonging merely to Western Christendom. Their *terminus ad quem* was not reunion with Rome, for Rome they believed needed a reformation. The effort was to restore the Church's own heritage, not as some in our own time have thought to unite with Rome. When God had led Israel out of Egypt, He later sent prophets to deliver her from errors but not to lead her back into the slavery of Egypt. He did not deliver the English Church from the Papal bondage to send those who would bring her again under its dominion. He led the Apostles out from their worldly conception of a temporal kingdom, but did not send the Holy Ghost to lead them into the establishment of a kingdom with an earthly head. "It shall not be

¹¹ *Story of the Oxford Movement*, 117.

so," He said, "among you," "My Kingdom is not of" (or like unto the kingdoms of) "this world." Loyal to Catholicity, the Tractarians were opposed, as all good Catholics should be, to the Papacy. For their authority they looked to antiquity and the teaching of the Ecumenical Councils and of undivided Christendom. Moreover, they claimed not to be inventors or introducers in this of new principles in the Church of England. They constantly appealed in proof of their loyalty to England's Church, and to the older Anglican divines, like Bishops Andrewes, Laud, the older Forbes, Bramhall, Montague, Bull, Ken, J. Taylor, to Drs. Jackson, Marshall, Frank, and others.

The mode and matter of controversy had become somewhat changed, but the general principles were the same. Dedicated to God by lives of devotion, they labored, in the full assurance of truth in the Catholicity of England's Church, for her revival. Persecuted and misrepresented and temporarily hurt by defections, yet "the Church gained strength rather than lost it by the departure of men who were untrue to her principles, and she emerged stronger than ever." And as it has been and will ever be, she became consolidated by her trials, being strengthened by God.

To estimate its *work* we must realize, as Dean Church wrote, that the movement took two distinct lines. "It was on the one hand theological, on the other resolutely practical." Theologically, it

brought to the front the fact of the Church's continuity and the result of this important truth. The Church of England was the same Church after the Reformation that it was before. Its name had from early times been *Anglicana Ecclesia*, the Church of England. Founded at an early day in Britain, it was independent of Rome until the Council of Whitby in 664. Under the Feudal System the claims of the Papacy increased, though often resisted. It was never known as the Roman Catholic Church. The present Roman Church in England began when Pope Pius V. in 1570 issued a bull excommunicating and deposing Queen Elizabeth and commanding his followers to withdraw from the Church. A small number did separate from the Church and so began the Roman schism in England, though not until 1854 were Roman Bishops, with diocesan organizations, introduced. Mr. Gladstone testified that he could find no trace of "that opinion common with unthinking persons that the Roman Catholic Church was abolished at the Reformation and a Protestant Church put in its place." The Reformation did not destroy the Church, but repaired and cleansed it. It was the same Catholic Church it had been before, having the same Apostolic Ministry, containing the same three orders, preserving, by removing existing ambiguities in the Ordinal, the *Sacerdotium*, retaining the ancient creeds, the divine office adapted to the laity, the holy mysteries

and means of grace, and the Liturgy in the common tongue. Its reformed discipline was in the interests of the training of the individual conscience, and by allowing clerical marriages preservative of the purity of the clergy. It delivered the Church from the worldly, power-loving, and unscriptural rule of the Papacy. Its good results are seen in the better hold retained of the faith by Englishmen than by those educated in Roman countries. The Reformation was a great, necessary, and glorious work. Whatever defects there may have been, and there could not but be some, the continuity of the Church was preserved. It was the same Church after the Reformation as before. If so, then it follows that just as England was the same nation, with the same laws and customs, after the Revolution of 1688 as formerly, save where explicitly changed, so it was with the Church. She remained the same Church, reformed, but Catholic, preserving all that was not explicitly abrogated. This is the legal principle of construction to be applied to her formularies and Prayer Book.

Whatever the private opinions of some of the pioneer reformers in Kings Henry and Edward's reigns may have been, those who had the final revision of the Prayer Book and the settlement of the Reform in 1662 were decidedly Catholic, and to the Prayer Book and its rubrics as expressing the ripened mind of the Anglican Church the Tractarians constantly appealed.

Their work was especially a serious and spiritual one. "Theologically it dealt," wrote Dean Church, "with great questions of religious principle. What is the Church? Is it a reality or a mode of speech? On what grounds does it rest? How may it be known? Is it among us? How is it to be discriminated from its rivals and counterfeits? What is its essential constitution? What does it teach? What are its shortcomings? Does it need reform? But on the other hand the Movement was marked by its deep earnestness on the practical side of genuine Christian life. The Movement above all was a moral one; it was nothing if it was not this."

It was this spirit that led to its fuller appreciation of the doctrine of the Incarnation. God had become man, not only, as the Evangelicals had emphasized, to redeem us by the offering of Himself on Calvary, but to restore and elevate our nature by union with His own. He came not only to give us forgiveness and an assurance of acceptance and peace, but to make us, through union with Himself, sons of God and partakers of the divine nature.

As in Adam, by a natural union, we all die, even so in the new Adam we were by a spiritual but real union to be made alive. The Atoning Blood that flowed before He uttered the *consummatum est* was followed by the water and blood that flowed from His opened side. As Eve was taken from the first Adam, so the Church was to be taken from the sec-

ond. We were to be incorporated into Christ and "Christ in us" was to be our hope of glory. This union with Him was on His part to be given by means of the sacraments, made effective by the Holy Spirit and by reception on our part with a living faith. It was this deeper truth that led to the wonderful development of the spiritual life and reformed the lives of so many of the clergy, led to such heroic missionary efforts, and revived in all its beauty and divine simplicity the consecrated life of the religious.

On its intellectual side, the movement gave a new impulse to theological study. The number of books produced by Pusey alone is something marvellous. The writers, if we include those who sympathize or were affected by it, are to be counted by the hundreds. They have produced most important works on Holy Scripture, on the Fathers, the Anglican divines. There is no department of sacred learning which they have not illustrated and adorned. Ecclesiastical history, liturgics, apologetics, archæology, sociology, architecture, music, manuals concerning canon law, and the whole realm of spiritual theology. The Tractarians have created a vast literature, profound ofttimes in its learning, and ever filled with a devotional spirit. It has enriched not only the Church, but the age.

The work of the movement on its practical side has been of a revolutionary character. It is supernaturally wonderful. It has transformed

the English Church. Consider what was its former condition. Writing in 1874, Gladstone said, "that even no longer than forty or fifty years ago the actual state of things as to worship was bad beyond all parallel known to me in my experience or reading. Taking together the expulsion of the poor and laboring classes, the mutilation and blockages of the fabrics, the baldness of the service, the elaborate horrors of the so-called music, above all the indifference of the lounging and sleepy congregations, our services were probably without parallel for their debasement; as they would have shocked a Brahmin or a Buddhist, so they could hardly have been endured in this country had not the perception of the seemly and unseemly been as dead as the spirit of devotion."

One of the first of practical reforms was that in favor of free sittings in the churches. The chancel often and nave had been filled with the box pews with high sides and curtains and fitted up for the repose of the gentry, while the poor were assigned inferior places or pushed out on rough benches without backs, in the aisles. By the aid of the Tractarians these abominations were swept away, and the House of God became free to all men.

The Cathedrals, whose services had been attended by a few, were made living centres of missionary work, and the great congregations now to be seen in them were the result of the energetic

action of the Tractarian leaders. The churches everywhere took on signs of improvement. The age of deformation and hypocritical whitewash began to pass away. The three-decker arrangement of pulpit, reading, and clerk desk began to be replaced by a more seemly order. The "mean communion table with a moth-eaten red cloth upon it" was replaced by a more costly one, as the altar of the Lord should be. Gradually the rule began to be obeyed that the chancels should remain as in times past before the dark age of puritanism. Then the symbol of redemption began to take its place where the memorial of our redemption was made. Little by little, as prejudices passed, the two lights, symbolical of the double nature of our blessed Lord, who is the Light of the world, appeared. The Church began and is now progressively appreciating the truths of Dr. Bright's great hymn on ritual:

When to Thy beloved on Patmos,
 Through the open door in heaven,
 Visions of the perfect worship,
 Saviour by Thy love were given;
 Surely there was truth and spirit,
 Surely there a pattern shown,
 How Thy Church should do her service
 When she came before the Throne.

'Tis for Thee we bid the frontal
 Its embroidered wealth unfold,
 'Tis for Thee we deck the reredos
 With the colors and the gold;

Thine the floral glow and fragrance,
 Thine the vesture's fair array,
 Thine the starry lights that glitter
 Where Thou dost Thy Light display.

Lord, bring home the glorious lesson
 To their hearts, who strangely deem
 That an unmajestic worship
 Doth Thy Majesty beseem;
 Show them more of Thy dear Presence,
 Let them, let them, come to know
 That our King is throned among us,
 And the Church is Heaven below.

The spiritual development in souls was ever first with the leaders. They set the example of most holy and consecrated lives, living with Christ and filled with the Holy Spirit. The standard of the Episcopate was elevated. The Bishops no longer could live careless lives of ease. Their position seemed to be eminently a social one. The great Bishop Wilberforce set the pace of untiring hard work which others were prone to follow. The clergy, taught by such great parish priests as Upton Richards and subsequently by Butler of Wantage, strictly ordered their own lives and adapted new methods of parish organization and oversight. The preaching of parochial missions began about 1862, when Fathers Lowder and Benson gave one to the coal miners and about the mouths of their shafts. These spread and were so effective that in 1867 the first great London mission was given, organized by the Cowley Fathers,

in which some 145 churches participated and 60,000 persons attended the services daily. The spiritual life of the clergy was further aided by the giving of retreats and quiet days, when they gathered together for earnest self-examination and exhortation and prayer.

The spiritual life that developed showed itself in an enthusiastic spirit for missionary work at home and abroad. The first settlement work was begun by Father Lowder in the east of London, among the dock laborers and sailors and the debauchery of St. Mary Redcliffe highway. Mobbed, insulted, and persecuted, he laid the foundation of a blessed, soul-saving work which has been continued and been followed by many like efforts. The martyr Bishop Patteson, and the hero Bishops Selwyn, Milman, and others who went out to New Zealand, Africa, India, Corea, were the children of the movement.

At home in England we find the revival of Convocation in its deliberative capacity, the establishment of the Church Congress, the gathering of the Anglican Bishops in the Lambeth Conferences, the marvellous increase of the Episcopate, the powerful organization of the English Church Union, with its 40,000 members, the various confraternities, like that of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, with over 2,000 priests, all of which have been in various degrees the outcome of this work of God.

Not least has been the revival of the dedicated Religious Life. Lacordaire said in the pulpit of Notre Dame that "the religious life was the finest fruit of the Catholic Church." Its existence was a proof of the Catholicity of the Church with its priesthood and grace-giving sacraments. Pusey and others devised and prayed for its restoration amongst us, and it came.

There are now many excellent Communities in England and America, both of men and women, who have consecrated their lives to their dear Lord's service and are walking in holiness with Him. It is said there are now more women in the Religious Life than there were at the time of the Reformation. Thus the movement is seen to be the work of God. It has made its mistakes, it has been marred by excesses, it has been injured by some Pro-Romanists, but it is yet far from having spent its force. Men of all schools in the Church are learning from one another and are being drawn more and more together as they see the true spirit of the movement. It has not and cannot be destroyed by individual secessions, for it was not founded on men but on principles and was the work of God. Unlike the Caroline movement, which came from the Bishops, and was pressed on from above, it had its beginning in the lower ranks of the clergy and in the enthusiastic devotion of the laity. Movements like the former are wont to fail, those which arise from the people are stable. It has

found its way into every class, and scientists, philosophers, lawyers, statesmen are saying its teaching best meets the needs of the age. It has not only come to stay, but to grow, and, by a true conservation and loyalty to the Prayer Book, unite the large body of conservative and earnest minded Churchmen.

BOOKS BY THE BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC

CHRISTIAN AND CATHOLIC. Net \$1.50; by mail \$1.65.

A CATHOLIC ATLAS, OR DIGEST OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY.
Net \$2.50; by mail \$2.70.

PUSEY AND THE CHURCH REVIVAL. Net 50 cents; by mail
55 cents.

FOND DU LAC TRACTS

No. I. THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the
Bishop of Fond du Lac. Price 5 cents; per hundred,
net, \$3.50. Express additional.

No. II. THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHA-
RIST. Price 15 cents; per hundred, net, \$7.00. Ex-
press additional.

No. III. CATHOLICITY AND THE VINCENTIAN RULE. Price
15 cents; per hundred, net, \$7.00. Express additional.

No. IV. ABSOLUTION IN GOD'S WORD. Price 15 cents;
fifteen copies for \$1.00. Express additional.

No. V. DIFFICULTIES OF FAITH. Price 10 cents; fifty
copies for \$3.00. Express additional.

OTHER TRACTS

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. A charge delivered to his
clergy. 10 cents; by mail 12 cents.

CONFESSION IN GOD'S WORD AND THE PRAYER BOOK. 3 cts.;
by mail 4 cents.

A CONSECRATION SERMON. The Living Temple of Christ's
Church and the Two Witnesses of the Word Written
and the Sacraments. Preached at the consecration
of the Right Rev. Isaac Lea Nicholson, D.D., Bishop
of Milwaukee. 15 cents.

The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee

