

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

JULY 1900.

No. 3.

## Doctrinal Theology.

### CHRISTOLOGY.

(Concluded.)

#### II. THE OFFICE AND WORK OF CHRIST.

##### Christ the Prophet.

A prophet is an official spokesman of God. Thus said the Lord to Moses, "Aaron shall be *thy spokesman* unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee *instead of a mouth*, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God*."<sup>1)</sup> And in this capacity Aaron was a *prophet*. The Lord said unto Moses, "See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be *thy prophet*."<sup>2)</sup> It was not Aaron who of his own accord stepped in to supply the deficiency of which his brother Moses complained;<sup>3)</sup> but by divine appointment he was made a spokesman of God, and thus was he constituted a prophet. *Prophecy came not by the will of man*.<sup>4)</sup> The prophet does not appear in his own name, but comes with a commission from a superior, whose agent or public officer he is in his capacity of a prophet, a spokesman by divine commission, uttering the thoughts and will and very words of him from whom he has his commission.<sup>5)</sup>

1) Exod. 4, 16.

2) Exod. 7, 1.

3) Exod. 4, 10.

4) 2 Pet. 1, 21.

5) Matt. 1, 22. Acts 1, 16; 3, 18. Amos 3, 1. Jer. 1, 2. al.

## Historical Theology.

---

### THE ROMeward MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

False notions of the Church and the Ministry, tares sown by the arch-enemy in early days of Christianity, were the germs from which, in the course of time, that great Mystery of Iniquity, the Papacy, was developed. That the church of God is the whole number of all believers, an invisible body of which Christ is the invisible and only Head, who rules supreme by his word; that all the powers of the Church are vested in the local congregation of believers; that the holy office established by Christ in and for his church is a ministerial office instituted for the public administration of the means of grace, and conferred upon its incumbents by Christ through the call of the congregation—these simple truths were soon lost sight of. The true concepts of the Church and the Ministry were perverted into those of a visible hierarchy with visible rulers of various limits of jurisdiction and power, inferior and superior bishops, country bishops, and city bishops, and metropolitan bishops, and, by and by, ecumenical bishops, and, finally, a Supreme Pontiff, the Pope, who arrogated to himself the dignity and authority of a visible head and infallible teacher of the Church Universal. As long as these false notions of the Church prevailed, every effort to bring about a Reformation was necessarily futile. The great Doctors of the fifteenth century, who spoke of a Reformation of the Church in Head and Members, by these very words, and by their actions suited to these words, bore witness to their utter ignorance of both the malady and the remedy. For to think of reforming the true Head of the Church is blasphemy, and to think of reforming the false head of the Church is foolishness. Like the sublime fool who with much ostentation ousts a

thief from his treasure house and at once turns it over to another thief, the great "reformatory" synods committed the ineffable folly of enthroning a new tyrant on the anti-christian See which they had pronounced vacant with so much ado, and which ought to have remained vacant till doomsday, and the second half of the century of the great Councils saw some of the greatest scoundrels of all ages on the purported See of St. Peter. It was in the first quarter of the next century, during the Pontificate of a proud Medicean infidel, that God raised up his own Reformer. *Dominus et Magister noster Christus dicendo*, were the opening words of Luther's ninety-five Theses, and the day when these words were given to the world has been fitly called the birthday of the Reformation. It was Luther who taught all those who were willing to learn that the Babylonian Captivity which had endured a thousand years had been, first of all, a captivity of Christ's word and sacraments, and it was not until Luther again taught and millions of Christians again learned the true doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, that the Reformation became an established fact.

Zwingli and Calvin and their followers never grasped the true biblical concept of the means of grace. In fact, the Calvinistic scheme of theology excludes the doctrine of the appropriation of the benefits of Christ's universal redemption to the individual sinner by the word of the gospel and the sacraments. And hence the Calvinistic idea of the Ministry is not and cannot consistently be that of a divine office for the public administration of the means of grace, whereby saving faith is engendered and preserved and the forgiveness of sins is truly and actually and earnestly offered to all who hear the word and partake of the sacraments.

In England, the Lutheran movement, having been held down by a royal political schemer and hard-shell Romanist in spite of his conflict with the Pope, was, about the middle of the century, superseded by a Calvinistic movement which

led to the establishment of a Calvinistic state church with a Calvinistic creed. On the other hand, this Anglican establishment was never thoroughly and entirely purged from certain residues of Romanism. As distinguished from the "Protestant" element there was from the beginning a "Catholic" element in the Anglican Church. Regard for this element was not without influence in shaping the Articles and the Prayer-Book. It was represented by Archbishop Laud and other "High-church" theologians, who laid stress on the Apostolic Succession, Patristic tradition, and what has been termed a sacerdotal view of the sacraments, in point of doctrine, and exhibited ritualistic tendencies in the forms of public worship. In all these points they differed from the "Low-church" party, of which Jewel, Stillingfleet, Hoadley, and Wilberforce, the leader of the Evangelicals, were exponents. But while Low-church theology was more or less pronouncedly Calvinistic and admitted even of the far-gone rationalism of some Broad-church or Latitudinarian teachers, the High-church traditions were by no means Lutheran, but more or less distinctly Romanizing. Thus, for example, the "real presence" in the Eucharist taught by the High-church theologians was not the presence of the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the consecrated elements distributed to and taken by the communicants, but a presence of Christ's body and blood, or of the whole Christ, in the forms of bread and wine on the altar, after the consecration and before the distribution, or "while the elements are unconsumed." Anglican Ritualists did not manifest a leaning toward, but a repugnance to Lutheranism. The High-church party in the Anglican church is not a continuation of the Lutheran movement of the first half of the sixteenth century, but a residuary charge of Romanism, and "Reunion" in the mouth of the Anglican Ritualist means corporate union with the Roman church and, perhaps, with the Greek church, never with the Lutheran church, the true Church of the Reformation.

All this will appear more clearly and in detail, as we shall view the ascendancy of this "Catholic element" of the Anglican Church in the nineteenth century, in a movement which is still going on, not only in Great Britain and the English colonies, but also in the United States of America.

The Tractarian movement has been so called from a series of "Tracts for the Times," which appeared in the course of nine years, from September 9, 1833, to January 25, 1841. By far the greater number of these tracts were short treatises of 4, 6, 7, 8, or 12 pages; some, especially the later, numbers were longer, covering 35, 56, and even 100 and more pages. Among the subjects set forth in these Tracts, some of which were directed *Ad Clerum*, others *Ad Populum*, still others *Ad Scholas*, we find the following: "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission," "The Catholic Church," "Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the safest course," "The Episcopal Church Apostolical," "The visible church," "The Ember Days," "On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church," "Thoughts on the benefits of the system of Fasting enjoined by our Church," "Mortification of the flesh a Scripture duty," "The Scripture view of the Apostolic Commission," "The necessity and advantage of frequent Communion," "The standing Ordinances of Religion," "Primitive Episcopacy," "Rites and customs of the Church," "Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays," "The Antiquity of the existing Liturgies," "Scriptural view of Holy Baptism," "On the Controversy with the Romanists," "On the Roman Breviary as embodying the substance of the devotional Services of the Church Catholic," "On Purgatory," "On Reserve in communicating religious knowledge," "Whether a Clergyman of the Church of England be now bound to have Morning and Evening Prayers daily in his Parish Church," "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." These titles may serve to indicate, in a general way, the trend, not only of the "Tracts for the

Times," but of the entire movement to which they gave rise and impetus. The authors are seen to be of the High-church party; for if they had given voice to interests of Low-church or Evangelicals, their subjects would probably have been such as, "The Suppression of Vice," "Missions and Missionaries," "Bible Societies," "The Slave Trade," "Education Societies," "The advancement of Christianity among infidels in Virginia." The Tract writers were not Calvinists or Liberals, but opposed to both Calvinism and Liberalism. They were of that element in the Anglican Church which was from the very beginning leavened with Romanism as pointed out in our introductory remarks.

Who the authors were, was, with a few exceptions, not announced by the Tracts, which were published in London, most of them without the names or initials of the contributors. But they were not of London growth. The first three, and twenty-five of the subsequent tracts, were written by J. H. Newman, a Fellow of Oriel College at Oxford, and, since 1828, incumbent of St. Mary's and chaplain of Littlemore. The author of Tract No. IV, published Sept. 21, 1833, and of seven later numbers of the series of ninety, was John Keble, also a Fellow of Oriel, and, since 1825, curate of Hursley, Hampshire, where he became vicar in 1835 and remained to the end of his life, 1866. He had published, in a first edition of 500 copies, in 1827, his *Christian Year*, two volumes of sacred lyrics, of which, before the copyright expired, 305,500 copies were sold. When he wrote his contributions to the Tracts, he was also connected with Oxford by a lectureship of Poetry. On July 14, 1833, he had preached a sermon at Oxford on *National Apostacy*, occasioned by the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, and Newman, in his day, considered this sermon "the start of the religious Movement of 1833." The subject of Keble's first Tract was "Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the safest course." A third Fellow of Oriel who entered the ranks of the Tract-writers in 1833

was Richard Hurrell Froude, who, together with Newman, had that same year visited Wiseman at Rome, and there found that toward union with the Roman church "not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole."

But the brightest star of Oriel College and of the University in those and many subsequent days was Edward Bouverie Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and before the expiration of 1833, he, too, had published his first contribution to the "Tracts for the Times."

That the leaders of the Movement were Oxford men, was significant in various ways. "Oxford," says Canon Overton, "had reached her nadir in the eighteenth century. Professors who never lectured, tutors who never taught, students who never studied, were the rule rather than the exception." The dawn of the nineteenth century brought better days for the English Universities. But the better part of the change might have seemed to have fallen to Cambridge. While the center of practical activity of the Evangelicals was Clapham, near London, where such men as Wilberforce, Thornton, Macaulay, and Venn, exerted their energies, the intellectual head-quarters of the party were at Cambridge, where Charles Simeon, Isaac Milner, Thomason, Farish, the Jowetts, Scholefield, and others, shaped the minds of the young men who flocked to Queen's or Magdalen College, or were sent there by societies because the religious climate there was considered more salubrious than that of the other University. Oxford was considered the Athens of High-church principles; "but," says a Provost of Oriel, "the leading partisans appear to me only occupied with the thought of converting the property of the Church to their private advantage, leaving the duties of it to be performed how they can." On the other hand, Liberalism had found its friends and promoters at Oxford, also among the Fellows of Oriel, the society which was at that time "the

centre of all the finest ability in Oxford." Under these circumstances, religious fanaticism, or a movement which would create a turmoil throughout the kingdom and stir schools and parishes and courts and the episcopal bench and the Houses of Parliament into violent commotion was probably the last thing to be expected from Oxford. And here came these Tracts like discharges of rapid-firing guns, in volleys or in quick succession, No. I, Sept. 9, No. II, Sept. 9, No. III, Sept. 9, No. IV, Sept. 21, No. V, Oct. 18, No. VI, Oct. 29, No. VII, Oct. 29, No. VIII, Oct. 31, No. IX, Oct. 31, No. X, Nov. 4, No. XI, Nov. 11, No. XII, Dec. 4, No. XIII, Dec. 5, No. XIV, Dec. 12, No. XV, Dec. 13, No. XVI, Dec. 17, No. XVII, Dec. 20, No. XVIII, Dec. 21, No. XIX, Dec. 23, No. XX, Dec. 24, 1833; No. XXI, Jan. 1, No. XXII, Jan. 6, No. XXIII, Jan. 6, etc. etc., giving the readers hardly time enough to get through with one day's delivery and to catch their breath before another charge would come crashing in upon them, *ad Clerum, ad Populum, ad Scholas*. If this was what he had in mind when, on his homeward journey from Rome, he said, "I have a work to do in England," Newman certainly had lost no time in getting down to business and was now at it with a will, and in a way which could not fail to attract attention far and wide. The doctrine of the Tracts was not new in the Anglican Church; but never before had it been so boldly and persistently propounded and advocated as in these leaflets and booklets. Besides, the discussion was not restricted to the Tracts; it "got into the papers." The periodical press opened its pages and columns to contributors *pro* and *contra*, and here, again, the "Tractarians" were not backward in keeping themselves before the public. Then there was the personal contact of the leaders with the young men at Oxford. "They heard," says Newman, "what I said in conversation, and told it to others. Undergraduates in due time took their degree, and became private tutors themselves. Others went down to the country, and became

curates of parishes. Then they had down from London parcels of the Tracts, and other publications. They placed them in the shops of local booksellers, got them into newspapers, introduced them to clerical meetings, and converted more or less their Rectors and their brother curates."

This underhand and underground way of operating was one of the characteristics of the Movement. As early as Aug. 31, shortly before Tract I appeared, Newman wrote to his friend, J. W. Bowden: "We are just setting up here Societies for the defence of the Church. We do not like our names known, but we hope the plan will succeed." To another close friend, F. Rogers, he wrote on the same day: "*Entre nous*, we have set up Societies over the kingdom in defence of the Church. Certainly this is, you will say, a singular confidential communication, being shared by so many; but the *entre nous* relates to *we*. We do not like our names known." Thus, also, in discharging their Tracts, the leaders used smokeless powder. In this secret way, another measure was planned and executed. In January, 1838, Newman wrote to Bowden, the author of Tract No. V: "Your offering towards the *young monks* was just like yourself, and I cannot pay you a better compliment. It will be most welcome. As you may suppose, we have nothing settled, but are feeling our way. We should begin next term; but since, *however secret* one may wish to keep it, things get out, we do not yet wish to commit young men to anything which may hurt their chance of success at any college in standing for a fellowship." A *coenobitium* was subsequently established at Oxford and, later on, moved to Littlemore. One of the members of the little community which Newman gathered about himself there, Lockhart, gives the following description of the life they led at the Monastery: "We had now arrived at the year 1842, when we took up residence with Newman at Littlemore. Father Dalgairns and myself were the first inmates. It was a kind of Monastic life of retirement, prayer, and study.

We had a sincere desire to remain in the Church of England, if we could be satisfied that in doing so we were members of the world-wide visible communion of Christianity which was of Apostolic origin. We spent our time at Littlemore in study, prayer, and fasting. We rose at midnight to recite the Breviary Office, consoling ourselves that we were united in prayer with united Christendom, and were using the very words used by the Saints of all ages. We fasted according to the practice recommended in Holy Scripture, and practiced in the most austere Religious Orders of Eastern and Western Christendom. We never broke our fast, except on Sundays and the Great Festivals, before 12 o'clock, and not until 5 o'clock in the Advent and Lenten seasons." F. C. Bowles, J. B. Dalgairns, Ambrose St. John, Rich. Stanton, Lockhart, Christie, all of whom afterwards seceded to the Roman church, had been inmates of Newman's House at Littlemore, which was abandoned when Newman himself went over to Rome.

The Romeward tendency of the Movement was an innate evil. In November, 1833, Newman wrote to a friend: "I expect to be called a Papist when my opinions are known. But (please God) I shall lead persons on a little way, while they fancy they are only taking the mean, and denounce me as the extreme." And his expectation was not long in being fulfilled, for one month later to the day, Dec. 22, writing to a lady, he said of a friend who called on him: "He . . . did not call me a Papist to my face, as some other persons have." In June, 1834, he complained, "My Tracts were abused as Popish." In 1839, he wrote to Manning: "I am conscious that we are raising longings and tastes which we are not allowed to supply; and till our Bishops and others give scope to the development of Catholicism externally and wisely, we do tend to make impatient minds seek it where it has ever been, in Rome." A few months later, Jan. 12, 1840, he said, in a letter to Bowden: "Things are progressing steadily, but breakers ahead! The danger

of lapse into Romanism, I think, gets stronger daily. I expect to hear of victims." A few weeks later he wrote to the same friend: "Pusey is at present eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy. I feel sure that such institutions are the only means of saving some of our best members from turning Roman Catholics."

A bold stroke intended to justify Romanism within the Anglican Church as a matter of course was the publication of Newman's Tract No. XC, early in 1841. It was a pamphlet of 83 pages and bore the title, "Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." The Articles on which it laid stress were XXII and XXXI. Keble had seen it in proof and recommended it for publication. The object of Tract XC was, as the introduction stated, to show that "while our Prayer-book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed to by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine."

This audacious attempt to make people in the Anglican Church consider or feel themselves in full accord with Rome on some of the chief points of false doctrine and worship called forth loud protests from various quarters. At Oxford, the University was called into action. In a letter bearing the signatures of "Four Tutors," and dated March 8, 1841, the Tract was denounced in the following terms: "The tract has, in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggestion that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England: for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines,

1. Of Purgatory,
2. Of Pardons,
3. Of the Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics,
4. Of the Invocation of Saints,
5. Of the Mass,

as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. . . . If we are right in our apprehension of the author's meaning, we are at a loss to see what security would remain, were his principles generally recognized, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the University and from the pulpits of our churches." On March 12, after a previous meeting on the 10th, the Heads of Houses were assembled, 21 of the 26 members of the Board being present. By a vote of 19 to 2 it was resolved to censure the Tract, and a manifesto published on the morning of March 16, said "that modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of the errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes." Bishop Bagot of Oxford, too, though he had been remarkable indulgent toward the Tractarians, now saw the time come when he must interfere, and it was ordained that the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" should be discontinued.

One by one the bishops came forth against the Movement, and their words were followed up by corresponding action. Thus the Bishop of Winchester refused ordination to the priesthood to Keble's curate, Peter Young.

All these and other measures, however, could not stem the current which had been allowed too long to have its way. In its issue of March 6, 1841, the *London Times* said: "Their teaching has now sunk deeply into the heart of the Church of England, it has acquired not only a numerical, but a moral power and influence, which must henceforth make it impossible for any statesman to despise and overlook, and highly indiscreet for any political party unnecessarily to alienate, this element in the constitution of

society. The younger clergy are said to be very generally of this school; it has no want of advocates among their seniors; it has penetrated into both Houses of Parliament, and we are confidently informed (we suppose, therefore, on some foundation) that it has met with countenance from Bishops themselves."

As the Movement continued, the waters kept on seeking their level. In 1842 several cases of secession to Rome occurred. On Sept. 4 of that year, Doellinger wrote to Pusey: "From all these writings I retain such an impression that I feel almost inclined to call out: '*Tales cum sitis, jam nostri estis,*' or if you like it better thus: '*Tales cum sitis, jam vestri sumus!*'" In Rome, also, the English developments were hailed with delight. Newman, who had written some hard truths concerning the Papacy, toward the close of the year wrote a "Retractation," which he published early in 1843, and in which he recanted what he said of Rome as "a lost church," of the "cause of Antichrist" to which, he had feared, the Council of Trent had bound the Roman Communion; that Rome was "infested with heresy," that in the seat of St. Peter "the evil spirit had throned himself and ruled." Some days before this recantation was published in London, Newman wrote to a friend: "My conscience goaded me some two months since to an act which comes into effect, I believe, in the *Conservative Journal* next Saturday viz., to eat a few dirty words of mine." In August of that year, a young man who had been with Newman at Littlemore for a year, Lockhart, took his departure for the Church of Rome. On September 1, Newman wrote to Mozley: "The truth is, I am not a good son enough of the church of England to feel that I can in conscience hold preferment under her. I love the Church of Rome too well." He resigned the Vicarage of St. Mary's on September 18 and preached his last sermon at Littlemore on September 25. Soon after, Rev. Seager, who had for four years been Pusey's assistant lecturer in Hebrew, and whom

Pusey had again appointed to lecture in the Hebrew classes, just before the opening of the October term, joined the church of Rome. In December, when Pusey contemplated a translation and publication of the Breviary, Newman, in reply to a letter in which Pusey had asked his opinion on the plan, said:—"I am quite of the opinion that any Breviary, however corrected etc., will tend to prepare minds for the Church of Rome. I fully think that you will be doing so by your publication. . . . Did I wish to promote the cause of the Church of Rome, I should say, Do what you propose to do. . . . My dislike of approximating Rome has diminished with my hope of avoiding her. Now, as before, I am not unwilling that Breviaries should be published—though for different reasons. But as I have tried, while I had a charge in our church to do nothing against her, so now you should have my opinion on the subject."

Even as late as Nov. 14, 1844, Pusey wrote to Prebendary Henderson: "You are quite right in thinking that N. has no feelings drawing him away from us: all his feelings and sympathies have been for our Church." On Feb. 25, 1845, Newman wrote to Pusey:—"My dear Pusey, please do not disguise from yourself, that, as far as such outward matters go, I am as much gone over as if I *were already gone*. It is a matter of time only. I am waiting." And now, at last, Pusey prepared his mind for the blow which Newman's secession would be to him, and his attitude toward the coming event is truly remarkable. It appears from a letter of March 21, 1845, to the Rev. H. A. Woodgate, in which he said: "He has done all he could to keep himself where he is, but his convictions are too strong for him, and so now my only hope is that he may be an instrument to restore the Roman Church, since our church knows not how to employ him. . . . Besides those already unsettled, hundreds will be carried from us, mistrusting themselves to stay when he goes."

On October 3, Newman wrote to Pusey: "I have writ-

ten to the Provost to-day to resign my Fellowship. Anything may happen to me now any day.'"

On October 9, Father Dominic, the Passionist, was at Littlemore, and Newman crossed the line, another renegade to Rome.

When Newman took his leave from the Church of England to go where a Cardinal's hat was in store for him, the head leadership of the Tractarian Movement had long since passed from him to the man who thenceforth for nearly half a century stood at the head of the High-church party in England, Edward Bouverie Pusey. Of his significance as a scholar we must not here endeavor to speak at length. Suffice it to say that also in this respect he stood second to no man at Oxford. He had put the years spent at German Universities to excellent advantage, and with studious habits, great natural talents and an astounding capacity for hard work he continued to lay by stores of knowledge which placed him in the first rank among the scholars of the century. From the time when, at the age of twenty-eight years, he was, in 1828 appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew by the duke of Wellington, to the end of his life, in 1882, there was hardly an important event in the University, in the Church, and in the State, upon which he did not exert a determining influence. From the sermon for which he was, without a hearing, suspended for three years from preaching in the University pulpit, and which, in consequence, was sold in 18,000 copies, each or nearly every University sermon he delivered marked an epoch in the history of the Church of England. The *Library of the Fathers*, of which he was very much what Flacius was to the *Centuriae Magdeburgenses*, and his Commentaries on Daniel and the Minor Prophets, were works which alone would have sufficed to secure for his name a prominent place in the history of Theology. Small wonder that a Movement into which this man entered heart and soul came to be known as the Puseyite Movement throughout the civilized world.

It is not without significance that in the letter of thanks by which he acknowledged his appointment to the Professorship of Hebrew, Pusey, by a slip of the pen which seems to have passed unnoticed at the time, expressed his gratitude for his appointment as Regius Professor of *Divinity*, though that professorship had its incumbent. He looked upon his work in the University as theological work, though at a time he was told that he was a Professor of Language. His writings, the titles of which, in their various editions, cover 50 pages, are, with very few exceptions, theological. And to understand the nature of the Movement of which he became and remained so prominent a leader, we must learn to know Pusey as a theologian.

The cardinal doctrine in Pusey's theology was the doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, and here, also, lay his ruling error. On the one hand, the "Church Catholic" was to him the authoritative teacher in matters of faith, whose definitions are binding upon the conscience of the individual. In a letter to Tholuck, of Nov. 19, 1839, he says: "The main question is a practical one, and one of great moral moment; it is this: Is a person in duty bound to accept what the Church Catholic has pronounced to be a matter of faith or no? Is it e. g. a person's duty to receive the articles of the Nicene Creed, on the authority of the Church, whether *he* can prove them by Scripture or no, or even if he think that Scripture goes rather against any one? Our great divines, and we after them, say, Yes, *Crede ut intelligas.*"

But the Church to which the deposit of the faith was delivered is not, according to Pusey, the Church, the whole number of believers. He says: "The deposit of the faith, and the guardianship of discipline and of ritual, was, you know, delivered by the Apostles to the Bishops, and in their degree to Presbyters. It was not given to laity, because they are sheep, not shepherds, as one Emperor says." When, in 1852, the proposal of admitting laymen to Convocation

was discussed, Pusey wrote to Keble:—"I look with terror to any admission of laity into *Synods*. It at once invests them with an ecclesiastical office, which will develop itself sooner or later, I believe, to the destruction of the Faith." And to Mr. Gladstone: "Such a synod is not of Divine institution, and so, I suppose, we could not look for the Presence of God the Holy Ghost in it. Synods of Bishops are Apostolic. If such a plan were adopted, I believe *actum esset de Ecclesia Anglicana*." And to Dr. Skinner, Lord B. of Aberdeen and Primus of Scotland: "If the Church of the United States has admitted the laity to a voice in deciding on matters of faith, I believe that her Bishops have abandoned a trust committed to them, and, sooner or later, they must suffer by it. . . . I do most entirely think that 'the Constitution' of the American Church is based neither on warrant of Holy Scripture, nor of the Church, down to itself. I believe that it introduced a new principle."

Upon the Episcopate, as by apostolic succession, Pusey also based the validity of the sacraments and the power of the keys. In a letter to a lady, he wrote on March 2, 1846:—"Having the Apostolic Succession, we have the Sacraments, and being neither heretics nor schismatics, we have their grace with the power of the keys." In 1842 he urged as one of the reasons against a union of Anglicans and Lutherans that the former "hold Ordination to be derived from the Apostles," the latter, "that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred may consecrate the Holy Eucharist." How this false assumption of the bearing of apostolic ordination on the validity and efficacy of the means of grace affects the personal faith of the individual Christian, was exemplified in Pusey's own family. During the latter years of her life, his wife was much distressed by doubts as to the validity of her baptism, which had not been performed by an Anglican priest or bishop, but by a dissenter. The question was to

her and Pusey whether, to make sure of the validity of her baptism, it would be well to rebaptize her conditionally, and, after two years of hesitation, she was thus rebaptized by Newman on Easter Eve, April 14, 1838, the sanction of the Bishop having been previously sought and obtained.

Pusey's doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, in its close kinship with the Romanist doctrine, is thus seen to vitiate also, and in the same direction, his doctrine of the means of grace. This further appears when we hear such utterances as these. On December 10, 1836, Pusey wrote to J. F. Russell, Esq.: "Confirmation is not simply taking upon oneself the vows made for one in infancy, but also a channel of grace through the ordinance of God. It, as well as orders, differs from the two great Sacraments in that these directly unite us with Christ, but both it and orders are means of grace to the worthy receiver."

Especially was Pusey's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in various ways unscriptural. His emphatic maintenance of the Real Presence has led many, also Lutherans, who knew Pusey's doctrine either from hearsay or from a superficial survey of his writings, to believe and say that Pusey and the Puseyites, and the Ritualists of to-day, held Lutheran views of the Eucharist. But Pusey's notions of the Sacrament were essentially Roman, as are those of the Ritualists to-day. He looked upon the Eucharist as a sacrifice, by which Christ's body and blood, even the whole Christ, present upon the altar in the form of bread and wine, were offered for the quick and the dead. He taught that in this form Christ must be adored by the church, and, rejecting the Lutheran doctrine of the chief purpose and benefit of the sacrament as a seal of divine grace and the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, made the direct union of the communicant with Christ the distinctive eucharistic blessing. In a letter of April 18, 1852, to the Bishop of Oxford he said: "Having gone fully into this, I thought of not going, with the same fullness, into the doctrine of the Eucharistic

Sacrifice, because it depends upon this. If there were no real Sacramental Presence of our Lord's Blessed Body and Blood, there would be nothing to offer and plead before Almighty God, except the outward symbols of an absent Thing. Since Holy Scripture (as taken most literally, and that meaning confirmed by the Fathers) speaks of a real, actual, Sacramental Presence, then we offer to God on the 'Altar' which Holy Scripture speaks of as belonging to Christians only (Heb.) the 'pure offering' of which the prophet Malachi speaks." In the "Protest" framed by Pusey against the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, and signed by Pusey and seventeen others, in 1856, the appellants say, "that the practice of worshipping Christ then and there especially present, after consecration and before communicating, has been common throughout the Church." Newman, who was thoroughly familiar with Pusey's view of the Lord's supper, wrote to him in 1836: "As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine decree."

Nor was this the only point of agreement between Pusey's theology and that of the Tridentine Canons. On January 1, 1850, Pusey wrote to Archdeacon Manning, who was then getting ready to secede to Romanism and had asked Pusey whether he could accept the Decrees of the Council of Trent: "What I felt before comes out fully to me again, on reading it as a whole, that it is so manifestly not directed against us. Indeed, as you know well historically, it was taken up with the errors of Luther chiefly. There are his very words." And in a letter to the *Weekly Register* dated Dec. 6, 1865, Pusey said: "On comparing my belief with that expressed by the Council of Trent, I thought that its terms, as explained by some individual doctors, yet of authority among you, did not condemn what I believed, and did not require me to believe what I did not believe. I thought that the Council of Trent *so* explained

for the Church of England, might be a basis of union. If I may sum up briefly, I think that not only on the whole range of doctrine, on the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation, but also on Original Sin and Justification, and all the doctrines of grace, there is nothing to be explained; that on the Canon of Scripture, the Holy Eucharist, and the Anointing of the sick, there is what has to be mutually explained; that on what I suppose you will account points of lesser magnitude, as those alluded to in our XXII Article, there will be need not only of explanation, but of limitation, what is to be *de fide*." The reader will note that Pusey, according to these statements, was ready to accept, even without explanation, the teaching of Trent on "Justification and all the doctrines of grace," and that in opposition to "the errors of Luther."

This may be the proper place to add a word or two on Pusey's attitude toward Lutheranism in general. In a letter to Newman of Aug. 9, 1841, he says: "I suppose that until one saw the development of Calvinism and Lutheranism into Rationalism, people would not venture to see them in their true light. . . . Our Reformation has had, amid whatever reverses, a steady tendency to develop itself into Catholicism, and to throw out the impure elements which came into the Church; the foreign Reformation has developed the contrary way into Rationalism and Pantheism; and therefore I think we have a right to infer that there was a difference in their original *ἡθoς*—ours intrinsically Catholic, though with something un-Catholic cleaving to the agents in it, theirs intrinsically un-Catholic, though with some semblance of Catholicism."

In 1841, the first Anglo-Prussian Bishop of Jerusalem, M. S. Alexander, was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London, Rochester, and New Zealand. Against this arrangement, which was indeed objectionable for valid reasons which we need not here specify, the Tractarians entered their protests. Newman objected

to an alliance with the German Protestants because Lutheranism as well as Calvinism had been condemned as heresies both by the East and by the West. Pusey in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, said: "Still less, I own, can I see, even if your Grace were advised, or it were lawful, to free the Bishop from these obligations by which he is at present bound,—how the picture of a United Church could be presented by an English and a Lutheran congregation, of which the one hold 'One Holy Catholic Church, throughout all the world,' knit together by its Bishops, as 'joints and bands,' under its one Head, Christ, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles; the other, an infinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power; of which the one holds Confirmation to be the act of the Bishop, the other deems such unnecessary, but accepts it for its younger members: the one holds Ordination to be derived from the Apostles, the other that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred may consecrate the Holy Eucharist: the one recites the Creed of Nicea, the other has laid it aside: in the one, ancient prayers, the inspired Psalms, and hearing God's Word, are the chief part of their weekly service; in the other, uninspired hymns and preaching, with prayer extempore: the one kneel in prayer, the other not even in the Holy Eucharist: with the one, the Lord's Day is a Holy Day, with the other a holyday: the one receives 'the faith' as 'once for all delivered to the saints;' the other, as susceptible of subsequent correction and development: the one rests her authority and the very titles of her existence on being an Ancient Church, the other boasts itself modern: the one not founded by man, but descended of that founded on the day of Pentecost; the other dating itself from Luther." Many years later, in his work on the "Real Presence," first published in 1857, Pusey openly accused Luther of heresy, and it may be safely said

that he was only consistent in rejecting Lutheranism as a whole and all the distinctive doctrines which separate us from Rome for ever.

Again, Pusey was only consistent when, in 1865, he wrote to the *Weekly Register*: — “We readily recognize the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that Primacy on other local churches, we believe to be a matter of ecclesiastical, not of Divine law; but neither is there anything in the Supremacy in itself to which we should object.” During his second visit to France to interview Roman Catholic bishops with a view of promoting the reunion, Pusey wrote from Pau, Jan. 10, 1866: “I have had three very happy interviews. I do not like to name names, but one very eminent Theologian ended a discussion of one and a half to two hours in which I spoke freely, with a kiss of peace, owning me as a true brother; and an Archbishop, whom I had not before seen, did the same twice, after my asking him for and having his benediction.” Such, then, according to Pusey’s own account, was his theology, that after hours of discussion it was by an eminent Romanist theologian recognized by a kiss of peace.

And his practice was in many ways in conformity with his doctrine. For Newman’s apostasy, while it certainly gave him much pain, he had not a word of censure. In the published correspondence we find not a line whereby he had attempted to dissuade or warn his friend when he was about to take the final step. In June, 1844, Ward, one of the agitators of the Cause among the young men at Oxford, published his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, in which he said: “Three years have passed, since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine.” The authorities of the University opened procedure against the author; propositions to be placed before the next Convocation were published, and in February, 1845, Ward’s book was condemned by a majority of 391 votes, and by a majority of 58 votes, the author was degraded

from his University degrees. Pusey in both cases voted with the minority. On the other hand, he was prompt in his disapproval of what he considered undue severity against Rome. While Ward's book was giving widespread offense, and Pusey had no word of rebuke, he wrote to Dr. Hook, on Nov. 24, 1844: "I am frightened at your calling Rome Antichrist, or a forerunner of it: I believe Antichrist will be infidel and arise out of what calls itself Protestantism, and then Rome and England will be united in one to oppose it. Protestantism is infidel, or verging towards it as a whole."

To the same correspondent, Pusey had written in 1842: "I suppose the general neglect of *fasting*, until of late, has fostered this want of severity: but Catholic truth will never strike deep root in the Church without it. It is what we still most want." That he was "eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy" has already been quoted, and the time came when he had his sisterhood and heard confession there, and in 1850, Bishop Wilberforce, who had his eye on him, wrote to him: "You seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman Confessor, and not that of an English clergyman." In 1851 he wrote and printed for private circulation his *Hints for a First Confession*, in which he taught that "the forgiveness is conditional upon the completeness of the Confession." He advocated prayers for the dead as early as 1836. When he proposed to build, at his own expense, a new church for Leeds, he made it a first condition that it should bear the inscription, "Ye who enter this holy place pray for the sinner who built it." Before the dedication of the church, which was named St. Saviour's, he ordered altar plate as a gift of his dying daughter Lucy, and looked for some prayer to be engraved on the vessels, one which might be looked upon as the prayer of the individual and which yet others might use. "Any one," he wrote, "who habitually prayed for the departed would repeat such a prayer." He thought

of such a form as, "*Propitius esto, Domine, Luciae Mariae — —*"

The clergy of St. Saviour's, appointed by Pusey, soon gave serious offence, so that Dr. Hook, also of Leeds, bitterly complained of Pusey that he had planted a colony of Papists in the heart of Leeds. A sermon preached on All Saints' Day, 1846, on the "Intercession of the Saints," by one of the curates, caused complaint to be made to the Bishop of Ripon. Before five years had passed, all the clergy of St. Saviour's connected with the church in 1851, with one exception, seceded to the Church of Rome. For their reception Newman, then Superior of Oratorians at Birmingham, came over to Leeds and preached on Gamaliel's counsel, and the renegades, though no longer in St. Saviour's, set up their traps in the parish to make converts to Rome.

In those days the antagonism between High-church and Low-church had been sharpened by two cases which had been contested by the High-church men and decided against them. The first case was that of Dr. Hampden, who was, in 1836, appointed to the vacant chair of Regius Professor of Divinity. Against this appointment, the Tractarians and others had remonstrated, and arguments ran high on both sides. Hampden's opponents impugned his orthodoxy, and, unable to oust him from his professorship, they succeeded in passing a statute by the Convocation depriving the Regius Professor of Divinity of the right of sitting at the Board of Inquiry into Heretical Doctrines and at the Board of Nomination of Select Preachers at the University. But in 1847 Dr. Hampden was, by the Prime Minister, appointed to the vacant Bishopric of Hereford. This was looked upon by both sides as a move of the Low-church against the High-church element, and in spite of the energetic opposition, of which Pusey was considered "the leader and oracle," Hampden was consecrated at Lambeth on March 26, 1848.

While this case was still pending, another affair turned up, known as the "Gorham Case." A certain Mr. Gorham was, in November, 1847, presented to the vicarage of Brampford Speke. Suspicion of unsound doctrine being raised, Gorham was examined and found to deny the regenerating power of Baptism. Thereupon the Bishop of Exeter refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Brampford Speke. An appeal was taken to the Arches Court of Canterbury, and thence, as the Bishop had been sustained by the court, Gorham took his case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the supreme court of appeal in ecclesiastical cases. The court consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and seven lay judges. The main point to be decided was whether the Articles and Formularies of the Anglican Church taught Baptismal regeneration and Mr. Gorham, denying this doctrine, was a heretic. When, on March 8, 1850, the decision of the court came down, it was that the opinions of Mr. Gorham were "not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, and that Mr. Gorham ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admission to the vicarage of Brampford Speke." The Bishop of Exeter tried this way and that to have the judgment of the court annulled, but failed as he expected, and on August 6, 1850, in spite of the Bishop's solemn protest, Mr. Gorham was instituted by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Before and after this act, protests and remonstrances came pouring in thick and fast, from individuals, from private meetings and public meetings, ten petitions to the Crown, twenty to the Archbishop of Canterbury, ten to the Bishop of London, twenty to the Bishop of Exeter, six to the Bishop of Ripon, others to other Bishops, a declaration signed by 45 Fellows and teachers of Oxford, utterances of the London Church Union and the Bristol Church Union, and all to no avail. Beyond the judgment of the Judicial

Committee the propriety of the jurisdiction of that court was attacked; but the judgment stood and the court continued to hold and exercise jurisdiction. The campaign had resulted in a defeat of the party which had, again, fought under the leadership of Prof. Pusey, the adviser of the Bishop of Exeter and numerous clergymen, the framer of Declarations, the speaker in public meetings, the writer of numerous letters, and of a book on the "Royal Supremacy" composed in carriages and railway coaches and amid the labors of his study. And as, where there is war, there will be dead and wounded, the losses of the Anglican Church by secession to Rome were multiplied at this stage of the struggle within the English establishment. Among these seceders there were two prominent signers of a "Declaration on the Royal Supremacy in Matters ecclesiastic," Archdeacon Manning, who was afterwards made a Roman Archbishop and Cardinal, and Archdeacon Wilberforce, who died before he could be re-ordained to Roman Orders, both of whom fell away to Romanism in spite of Pusey's endeavors to hold them.

The Gorham Case marks an epoch in the Catholic Movement. It was followed by what may be fitly called the period of association and organization. During this period a number of societies, largely secret, came into being, having for their common aim the Corporate Union with the Church of Rome.

The Society of the Holy Cross was founded by Joseph N. Smith and five others on February 28, 1855. It is a secret society, and its members are pledged to secrecy. Among the signs of recognition a peculiar cross worn on the watch-chain or on the breast, a form of salutation and certain forms used in opening and closing letters between the members, are known. The synods are secret meetings held in May and September, with doors locked. The following provisions from the Statutes may serve to indicate the character of the society. "Before the holding of any

Synod Mass shall be Celebrated solemnly, with a short Sermon from a Brother, and the *Officium Proprium* shall be said." (Ch. VI, sec. 4.) "When the Synod shall extend over two days, a Mass shall be said for the Departed Brethren on the second day, in a Church selected by the Master" (sec. 5). "The Brethren shall be strictly forbidden to divulge the proceedings of the Synods and Chapters, except so far as the publication is authorized by the Society" (Ch. VI, sec. 24). "There are four progressive degrees of obligation in the Society, termed respectively, the Ordinary, the Green, the Red, and the White Rule. The Ordinary Rule is binding upon all the Brethren and Probationers. The other three are entirely voluntary, but recommended for adoption; the White Rule being restricted to Celibates" (Ch. X, sec. 1). The vow of the Celibates, made in Latin, is, in English: "I, N—, profess and promise to Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to all the Saints, that I will lead a life of Celibacy for . . . [stating the number of years or the rest of his life]. So help me God!" The regulations for the "White Rule" say that the Celibates must say Mass daily, frequent the Sacrament of Penance at least monthly, say daily an office for each of the Hours, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, or Vespers, and Compline, and make a Retreat each year (Ch. XVI). "The Brethren shall devote themselves diligently to the Science of the Care of Souls and shall labor in bringing young and old who are under their influence to value duly the Sacrament of Penance." "Upon the death of a Brother, notice thereof shall be given to the Secretary, as soon as possible, by any Brother cognizant of it, and the Secretary shall, forthwith, inform the Brethren, that they may say Mass for the soul of their Brother, either on the day of the funeral, or as soon after as practicable" (Ch. II, sec. 9).

In 1862, a society was founded which assumed the name of the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." It is composed of Bishops, priests, laymen and women, and in

1894, no less than 1682 clergymen and 13,444 laymen and women were members of this "daughter of the Society of the Holy Cross." Its objects, according to the *Manual*, are: "1. The Honor due to the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. 2. Mutual and special Intercession at the time of and in union with the Eucharistic Sacrifice. 3. To promote the observance of the Catholic and primitive practice of receiving the Holy Communion fasting." In other words, the aim of this Sodality is the establishment of the Romanist *Mass* in the Church of England. The *Manual* also recommends "to make Offerings for the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist," that is, to pay for Masses. To offer prayers for the dead is made a duty of every member. In the *Suggestions for the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist*, the following prayer is prescribed:—"Receive, O Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, this pure Oblation, which I, Thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, the Living and true God, for my numberless sins, offences and negligences; for all who are here present, as also for all faithful Christians, living and departed, that it may avail to our salvation unto life eternal. Amen." The subjects for which prayer and thanksgiving should be offered are specified in the *Intercession Paper* published monthly for the Confraternity and secretly distributed among its members. The anniversaries of the Society are held on Corpus Christi Day. In a sermon preached at one of these celebrations, Canon Gore said: "Christ is present in the Eucharist indeed externally to us, objectively and really; He is present as the Bread of Life, the Sacrifice for sins, the Object of worship. He is present wherever the consecrated elements are." In a paper read in 1871, the Rev. A. L. Lewington said: "When we say that the Presence of Christ is objective, we understand that It is there without communion as with communion, abiding under the outward and Visible Form in the consecrated Elements, so

long as the consecrated Elements are unconsumed." The preacher at the "Solemn Requiem," Nov. 10, 1890, said: "The souls in Paradise are offering the homage of their spiritual sufferings in the realms of Purgatory, and are helped by our prayers and Eucharistic offerings on their behalf."

A Ritualistic society which even more expressly makes the doctrine of Purgatory and the practice connected therewith its special object is "The Guild of All Souls," which was founded in 1873 and has its branches spread over England and in Scotland, the United States, Canada, Australia, Madras, Prince Edward Island, Barbados, Port Elizabeth. A secret quarterly *Intercession Paper* gives the names of those departed souls for whom intercession is asked and the churches where these Masses for the Dead are to be held, and the *annual Report* of the Guild for 1895 stated that "During November, in addition to those on All Souls' Day, there were 991 Special Requiem Masses in connection with the Guild, and the regular Requiem Masses maintained throughout the year are now, at least, 480 each month." In his sermon preached for the Guild of All Souls on All Souls' Day, 1883, the preacher, H. Lloyd Russell, said: "We believe that the mercy and justice of God in his dealings with their souls are reconciled by their being detained for a certain time in a middle place, there to be punished, and purified, and dealt with, according to His good pleasure, until He sees fit to admit them to the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision." Another preacher to the Guild, in 1889, said: "God, even in the Fire, shall be known to be their Father, burning all the falsehood and revealing the truth. Therefore let us join together now in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass for all departed Souls."

Another secret Ritualistic Society is the "Order of Corporate Reunion," a society admitting both sexes. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, in its issue of April 20, 1878, published a letter from its English correspondent, who wrote: "The

Order of Corporate Reunion actively pursues its labors, and its officers have sent forth a Pastoral Letter containing an exposition of its views and ends. It is known that several Anglican ministers in connection with this Society have induced a Greek Bishop—whose name, however, it has not yet been possible to ascertain—to ordain them under certain conditions, in order that the doubt to which Anglican Orders are subject may not be alleged as a reason for taking exception to the validity of their operations. . . . So soon as a sufficient number of the Anglican Clergy shall have in this way removed the difficulty which arises from their ordination, the Order hopes to be able to present its petition for Corporate Reunion with the Catholic Church, signed by a number of members so imposing as to render it impossible for the Holy See not to recognize the gravity and importance of the movement.” In 1881, Dr. F. G. Lee, Vicar of All Saints’, Lambeth, supposed to be one of the mysterious Bishops of the Order, published an article in which he stated that “Already there are representatives of the O. C. R. in almost every English diocese.” And in 1894, the Roman *Catholic Standard and Ransomer*, a paper edited by a former Anglican Ritualist, said: “We have heard just lately that there are now *eight hundred* clergymen of the Church of England who have been *validly* ordained by Dr. Lee and his co-Bishops of the Order of Corporate Reunion. If so, Dr. Lee’s dream of providing a body with which the Pope could deal seems likely to be realized.” In the Pastoral Letter referred to by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the principles of the Order are defined as follows:—“In thus associating ourselves together we solemnly take as the basis of this Our Order the Catholic Faith as defined by the Seven General Councils acknowledged as such by the whole Church of the East and the West before the great and deplorable schism, and as commonly received in the Apostles’ Creed, and the Creed of Nicaea, and the Creed of St. Athanasius. To all the sublime doctrines so

laid down, We declare our unreserved adhesion, as well as to the principles of Church constitution and discipline, set forth and approved by the said Seven General Councils. Furthermore, until the whole Church shall speak on the subject, We accept all those dogmatic statements set forth in common by the Council of Trent and the Synod of Bethlehem respectively, with regard to the doctrine of the Sacraments." And one of the three Bishops named in this Pastoral, "Laurentius, O. C. R., Provincial of Caerleon," says in behalf of the Order: "It is quite true that we do not assume an attitude of independence toward the Holy See. We frankly acknowledge that, in the Providence of God, the Roman Pontiff is the first Bishop in the Church, and, therefore, its visible Head on earth."

The "Order of the Holy Redeemer" is another secret society of Ritualists "working within the Church of England under Episcopal approval." In the "Declaration" which is required of the Postulants for Admission to this Order the candidates profess their maintenance of the Seven Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, Orders, Matrimony, Penance, and Extreme Unction. They declare "that in the Holy Eucharist a true and propitiatory Sacrifice is offered for the faithful, both living and dead," and that "the position of the Bishop of Rome is that of Archbishop of all the Churches." Within this Confraternity there is an inner circle, called the "Brotherhood of the Holy Cross," the very existence of which, according to its "Manual," is "to be kept in strict secrecy," and one of whose "recommended books" is the *Glories of Mary*, by "St." Alphonsus Liguori. A Rule of this Order requires, "That Brethren shall be faithful members of the Anglican Church."

The "Society of St. Osmund" was established in 1889. In the list of its Vice Presidents printed in 1895 it has the names of the Bishop of Bloemfontein, the Bishop of Pretoria, and the Bishop of Cairo, Ill., who, at its anniversary

of 1894 "offered up" the Holy Eucharist. Its *Ceremonial of the Altar* prescribes the following form: "I confess to God, to Blessed Mary, to all the Saints, and to you, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault. I beg Holy Mary, all the Saints of God, and you to pray for me." The *Mirror of Our Lady* says: "When all other succour faileth, Our Lady's grace helpeth. Compline is the end of the day; and in the end of our life we have most need of our Lady's help, and therefore in all these hours we ought to do her worship and praising;" and: "It is reasonable that seven times each day she be worshipped and praised." Here is, also, a part of the Ritual for the "Adoration of the Holy Cross" from the *Services of Holy Week*:

"Then the Priests, uncovering the Cross by the right of the Altar, shall sing this Antiphon:—

"Behold the Holy Cross, on which the Savior of the world did hang for us. O come and let us worship.

"The choir: genuflecting, reply:—

"Antiphon, We venerate Thy Cross, O Lord."

"Then the clerks shall proceed to venerate the Cross, with feet unshod, beginning with the Senior."

"When this is done, the Cross shall be solemnly carried through the midst of the choir by the two aforesaid priests, the Candlebearers preceding them, and shall be set down before some Altar, where it shall be venerated by the people."

On Palm Sunday, flowers and leaves, which have been exorcised with Sprinkling of Holy Water, are distributed, and the Rubric of the *Services* says: "When the Palms are being distributed, a shrine with relics shall be made ready, in which shall hang in a Pyx the Host; and two clerks, not joining the procession to the first station, shall come to meet it at the place of the first station." A service for "Blessing the Fire" is provided for "Easter Eve." "Holy Water" and "Frankincense" are used. After the "Blessing

of the Paschal Candle" the "Litany of the Saints" is sung. Here is a part of it:

"Holy Mary, pray for us.  
 Holy Mother of God, Pray.  
 Holy Michael, Pray.  
 St. Peter, Pray.  
 All ye holy Apostles and  
 Evangelists, Pray.  
 St. Gregory, Pray.  
 St. Sixtus, Pray.  
 St. Dennis with his com-  
 panions, Pray.  
 St. Augustine, Pray.  
 St. Agnes, Pray.  
 All Saints, Pray."

In the *Ceremonial and Offices connected with the Burial of the Dead* printed in the *Transactions of the Society of St. Osmund*, payment for Masses *pro defunctis* is advocated thus:

"One of the most distressing things I know of in the Anglican Church is the difficulty of getting a priest to say Mass for some departed friend or relation, because when asked he will tell you he does not like being paid for Sacraments, etc.; but surely this is a prudish line to take—the 'laborer is worthy of his hire'—and as St. Paul said, 'They which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar.'

"Let priests then awaken to a greater sense of duty in this respect, and the great work of charity they have the power of bestowing, and remember that in accepting an Honorarium for a Mass they are not receiving a fee, but an offering."

It seems that the Society of St. Osmund has been continued in the form of the "Alcuin Club," in 1897, of which, among other prominent men, "the Bishops of Oxford, Salisbury, and Edinburgh," have been announced as members.

Besides these larger societies, there are in existence numerous sodalities of a more local character, "Guilds" of

men, of "boys," of "girls and young women," all of them Romanizing in their ways and means, educating persons of all classes and ages by doctrine and practice in the same direction. Among the "Things to be Remembered" by the boys of the "Guild of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," the list mentions this: "At the Consecration, immediately the Sanctus Bell rings, everybody should bow down and worship Jesus, Who is then present on the Altar, under the Form of Bread and Wine." The *Manual of the Tertiaries of Reparation to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament* contains the Rules of the Order, a "Litany of Reparation," the Office of Benediction, a Litany of Our Lady, a Litany of the Incarnation, and fourteen hymns—half of them addressed to *Our Lady*, and half to the Blessed Sacrament. "Sacramental Confession" is enjoined, medals and crosses are sprinkled with Holy Water; the "Hail Mary" (*Ave Maria*) is prescribed, and the Tertiaries sing:

"Queen of Heaven, Queen of earth,  
Mistress of the Church of Christ,  
Mother of our second birth—  
Pray for us, O Mother dear."

The *Manual of the Church Fraternity* requires the members to profess that "in the Great Eucharistic Sacrifice" we "obtain His Grace for ourselves and the whole world, pardon for all our sins, and that the faithful departed may rest in peace safe in the arms of Jesus," and that "under either kind alone Jesus is received whole and entire" in the Eucharist, thus inculcating also the Roman doctrine of concomitance and the practice of the *communio sub una*. There is even a "Railway Guild of the Holy Cross" intended for railroad men, but including also "Clerical Associates" and "Women Associates," whose names, however, as a rule, are "not for publication."

The reader has, by this time, a fairly approximate notion of what Ritualism is in the Anglican Church. Its

Romeward tendency appears on its face, and it has not taken this direction, so to say, by a turn of the road, but its compass has pointed that way from the beginning. After the secession at Leeds, Manning wrote to Pusey, Jan. 23, 1847:—"You know how long I have to you openly expressed my conviction that a false position has been taken up in the Church of England. The direct and certain tendency, I believe, of what remains of the original Movement is to the Roman Church." In a letter evidently coming from Pusey and Bishop Forbes, though in the latter's name and directed to Dr. De Buck, who had urgently invited the Bishop to attend the Vatican council, we have what might serve as a Ritualist Platform in 1869. And here we find, also, a program for the future course in contemplation. "We acknowledge that the condition of Anglicanism in reference to the great Church of the West is unsatisfactory, and that the prospects of the Church of England, politically, are not encouraging. Soon she will be emancipated alike from the trammels and the support of the State, and then most important changes are likely to occur. Reconciliation on fair terms with the Latin Church would, of course, be best absolutely for her. The Calvinistic element would incorporate itself with the Dissenters, or unite itself to the mass of political Churchmen, while it is to be hoped that God may open the way to the Catholic party, without injury to its convictions, resting under the Chair of St. Peter. It is to this consummation that present efforts must be directed. We may not live to see it; but surely to lay the foundation of such a work as this must be well pleasing to our Gracious Saviour." In his "Historical Notes," Oakley says:—"We endeavored, especially the younger and less occupied members of our Society, to improve our relations with foreign Catholics by occasional visits to the continent. For this purpose Belgium was preferred to France. Whatever our Tractarian friends may have been on this side of the channel, there could be no doubt of their perfect Catholicity on

the other. It was, in fact, of so enthusiastic and demonstrative a character as to astonish the natives themselves. . . . In the churches they were always in a state of prostration, or of ecstasy." In his Charge of Nov. 2, 1850, Bishop Blomfield of London said: "A propitiatory virtue is ascribed to the Eucharist—the mediation of the saints is spoken of as a probable doctrine—prayer for the dead urged as a positive duty—and a superstitious use of the sign of the Cross is recommended as profitable; add to this the secret practice of auricular confession, the use of crucifixes and rosaries, the administration of what is termed the sacrament of penance, and it is manifest that they who are taught to believe that such things are compatible with the principles of the English Church must also believe it to be separated from that of Rome by a faint and almost imperceptible line, and be prepared to pass that line without much fear of incurring the guilt of schism."

To educate the people toward Rome is also the purpose of those minor points of ritual, as vestments, positions, lights, mixing the wine on the altar, genuflexions and prostrations, and other usages not in themselves objectionable, but practiced by English Ritualists with a manner and measure of ostentation calculated to engage the attention of the worshipers and enlist their interest in what is by many looked upon as tokens of Catholicity. Thus Ritualism is, by friends and foes, looked upon as "the Preparatory School for the training of English Catholics," and the Roman Catholic *Ransomer* has said that "as to conversions it is well known that nine out of every dozen are the direct result of Ritualistic training."

If the question is asked, "What prompts the remaining three of the dozen to lapse into Romanism?" it may be answered by such events as the secession of Dr. De Costa subsequent to the reception of a heretic like Dr. Briggs into the Episcopal Church. It is the Broad church doctrine and practice at which many members of the Anglican Church

take offense. When, in 1880, Dean Church had presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury a Memorial claiming toleration in ritual, Pusey wrote on Jan. 14, 1881: "What the Dean of St. Paul asks for is simply that toleration which is accorded to every one else. The toleration granted to the Broad church is so large that it has publicly been said to be an anachronism when a clergyman parted from the Church of England because he disbelieved the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord." In 1870, Dean Stanley invited the members of the Committee for the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible to receive Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey, and a Unitarian member of the Committee was admitted to Communion with the rest. While this "Westminster Scandal," which was in no wise repudiated by the Bishops, was being agitated far and wide, efforts were set on foot to discontinue the use of the Athanasian Creed in the service of the Church, and among the promoters of this scheme the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tait, was prominent. Pusey was foremost among the opponents of this measure, and the fight was hot, until, in May, 1873, the matter was finally adjusted by Convocation. The use of the Creed was retained, and a Synodical Declaration concerning the "condemnations" was adopted.

Having thus viewed the chief causes which secretly or openly worked or still work together for evil in the Romeward Movement in England during the nineteenth century, it remains for us also to point out some agencies whereby this current has been in a measure stemmed in its mighty course.

Among those who have in various ways endeavored to put the brakes on the wheels of Ritualism was the chief promoter of the Movement, Dr. Pusey. On Jan. 1, 1851, he wrote to Rev. W. Scott, of Christ Church, Hoxton: "I am grieved to hear of your trouble about your ritual. One most grievous offence seems to be turning your back to the people. I was not Ritualist enough to know, until the other

day, that the act of turning had any special meaning in the Consecration. . . . Dear Newman consecrated to the last of his consecrations at the North end of the altar. . . . I cannot myself think that this, or any other ritual, is of moment enough (if not essential to the Sacrament) that priests who would work in the service of the Church should give up, because the Bishop insists on his interpretation of the rubric." In a speech which he delivered when, on June 14, 1866, at the seventh anniversary meeting of the English Church Union he joined that society, Pusey said: "It is well known that I never was a Ritualist and that I never wrote a single word on ritual until a short time ago, when my opinion had been quoted against it." In the meeting of the same society, on Nov. 20, 1867, Pusey again spoke against ritual changes in opposition to the will of the congregations. "I do wish," he said, "to lay stress upon the point that no individual member of the whole body has a right to make changes by himself. . . . It has been said that we may have to wait a long time before we can introduce any change at all if we are to wait till we can win the parishioners. I believe it would be better to wait almost any time. . . . rather than introduce changes against the will of the communicants."

But in this speech he had the great majority of his hearers against him, as the scraping of feet unmistakably indicated. Again, in a letter to Dr. Bright, of July 1873, Pusey wrote: "I have a thorough mistrust of the Ultra-Ritualist body. I committed myself some years ago to Ritualism, because it was unjustly persecuted, but I do fear that the Ritualists and the old Tractarians differ both in principle and in object. I hear there is a body, called 'the Society of the Faith,' or some such name, which desires that none except Ultra-Ritualists should belong to it." And to Dr. Liddon he wrote, Dec. 31, 1874: "The High Church have entrusted themselves to the extreme Ritualists, who are now their representatives, as the extreme party always is. . . . I was mistaken in them, and I have told Denison

that I cannot fight their battle." When it was known that some of the Ritualist clergymen endeavored to make private confession obligatory, and, in 1878, the question was addressed to Pusey, Liddon, and Canon Carter, Whether a clergyman of the Church of England had a right to *require* Confession before Communion, the three answers, given promptly and independently, clearly and unrestrictedly denied such right.

It was a grievous disappointment to the Ritualists when Pio Nono, in summoning the Vatican Council, issued invitations to the Eastern Bishops, and left the Anglican Bishops to consider themselves covered by a letter of the Pope issued Sept. 13, 1868, "Omnibus Protestantibus aliisque A Catholicis," not inviting them to attend the Council, but urging them to join the one fold. Pusey remarked: "We are lumped in under the general title of 'Protestants,'" and these were, by the "*aliisque*" put down as *A Catholici*. Anglican Orders were simply ignored, as was the Anglican Church. "We," said Pusey in a letter of March 24, 1869, "are satisfied about our Orders; we are exercising our priestly offices; we are satisfied that we are in the Catholic Church: we have nothing to gain. But we wish the broken intercommunion to be, if possible, healthfully restored."

In 1865 and the following years, Pusey entered into a controversy with Newman and wrote his three "*Eirenica*," in which he endeavored to set forth the points of agreement between the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Council of Trent. The third *Eirenicon* was published while the Vatican Council was being set into motion, and Pusey still hoped that the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which he discussed in this work, might be dealt with by the Council in a manner to leave a way open for the reunion of the Churches. It is worthy of note that in all the later editions of his third *Eirenicon* Pusey changed the title from "Is Healthful Reunion impossible?" to "Healthful Reunion, as conceived possible before the Vatican Council," and to Newman he wrote,

Aug. 26, 1870: "I have done what I could, and now have done with controversy and Eirenica." On July 2, 1880, Pusey wrote: "The majority of the Vatican Council crushed me. I have not touched any book of Roman controversy since. Pope Pius IX devised and carried two new articles of faith. . . . I could not, the other day, read some Encyclical of the present Pope because I did not know whether I was to read it as a third or a thirtieth general Epistle of St. Peter."

Pusey never expressed and probably never entertained a doubt as to the "Catholicity" of the Anglican Church, and looked upon secession to Rome as unnecessary and as inconsistent with true Churchmanship. On Oct. 9, 1839, he wrote to Rev. J. F. Russels: "In a word, it seems plainly a part of Christian charity to avoid all peculiarities which may be helped: all to whom the Catholicity of our Church has been brought home have a responsibility laid upon them; on them and their conduct it may depend how far this view of her (which is so calculated to win back those who are now in schism from her and to perfect her) shall be realized: or they may place obstacles to her reception of these very views. But without subdual of self we may be exposed to some grievous fall, from which we have hitherto been preserved, such as the going over of some to Romanism." In a letter of March 2, 1846, Pusey says:—"There are very serious things in the Roman Communion which ought to keep us where we are. I would instance chiefly the system as to the Blessed Virgin as the Mediatrix and Dispenser of all present blessings to mankind. (I think nothing short of a fresh Revelation could justify this.) Then the sale of Masses as applicable to the departed, the system of Indulgences as applied to the departed, the denial of the Cup to the laity." It is also remarkable that certain Ritualist endeavors to bring about a union with the Greeks and the Old Catholics after the Vatican Council found little favor with Pusey. There had been a time when he pondered the idea of union with the East. On Feb. 17, 1840, he wrote:

“What should hinder communion from being restored with the Orthodox Greek Church? Does it seem that we need insist on their receiving the *Filioque*, or that they would not enter into communion with us because we retain it?” But when at the later period mentioned above some of the advocates of union with the Greek Church used language which threatened to endanger the faith in the *Filioque* of the Creed, and he thought the Eastern Church Association was committing itself to this tendency, Pusey wrote to the Secretary of the society, “I think that we are doing mischief to our own people by accustoming them to the idea of abandoning the *Filioque*, and to the Russians by inflating them,” and he severed his connection with the Association. The Bonn Conferences in 1874 and 1875 held between representatives of the Anglican Church, the Old Catholics, and the Greek Church, displeased Pusey by the formula accepted in the latter year, because he held that the position of the Creed had been surrendered. “I do not,” he writes to Liddon, “see any occasion for any formula in which the Greeks and we should agree.” When, shortly after, the Eastern Church Association petitioned Convocation to consider the Bonn Resolution, he published a remonstrance, and when it was said that the Lambeth Conference of 1878 might remove the *Filioque*, he continued the fight.

Of other checks to the Romeward Movement we may mention that in February of that year, the Bishops, in the Convocation of Canterbury, had, in the Preamble of a resolution, denounced Ritualism, saying that it was in danger of favoring errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England. In the following year the Church Association, lately organized for the purpose of combating the Movement, opened its first active campaign against Ritualism. A Royal Commission on Ritual appointed in 1867 was also intended as a check to Ritualistic innovations.

In 1874, the old Court of Arches was, by the Public Worship Regulation Act, supplanted by a new court for

ecclesiastical cases, and a new Final Court of Appeal had been established for the same cases in the previous year. Ritualists were rigorously prosecuted. Tooth, a Vicar of Hatcham, was imprisoned for contempt of court when he refused to acknowledge the validity of the sentence imposed on him for ritualism. Since then, a number of cases were taken into the courts by the Church Association. But neither the Public Worship Regulation Act nor the methods and measures of the Church Association succeeded in rooting out or putting down Ritualism, but had the opposite effect of engaging public opinion in favor of the Movement, and, with all its eddies and whirlpools and a steady and powerful undercurrent the great mass of the High Church Party, if not the entire Anglican establishment, is being hurried onward in its Romeward course. A. G.

---