

NEW FORMS OF OLD ERRORS.

TRUTH and error are both subject to development. The difference is, that truth is always consistent with itself, whereas error is naturally self-contradictory. For example: Protestant development is only a multiplying of changes, each of which is the negation of some previous one, or destined to be negated by some successor. Since Bossuet wrote his "Variations," there have been more new protestantisms born into the world than there could be pulpits for the fulmination of their oddities. Take the last forty years; think of Great Britain only; trace what may be called the genera of the plant Heresy through their infinitely multiplying, crossing, commingling species; if Bossuet could have compressed them into a last chapter, his work would have been at least twice as wonderful. But not only the species, even the genera of the plant Heresy have multiplied seven fold since Bossuet's day. New principles, new ambitions, new methods of reasoning have come into fashion in the last half century. The later issues of Protestantism have been bewildering to all Christians, from their conflict both with one another and with their own selves. They seem to defy both analysis and correlation. They are like the four winds trying to blow together from the same quarter.

How shall we attempt to state these later issues in correct form? It is useless to write discursively on such novelties; the point is, what have been their principles, their postulates, assuming by courtesy that they could be said to have any? Thus, may it be permissible to say of Ritualism, that it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the combination of authority with private judgment? It may be objected by the Ritualists that this is really to beg the question, whether the *reductio ad absurdum* has been reached. Let us say, then, that the Ritualist principle was to combine two contradictories, while the postulate was that the combination would be practicable; the issue being that experience has proved the fatuity of an experiment, which, at the first, was thought to propose a legitimate compromise. Yet this again will be called a loose statement by the Ritualists. They will reply to us that they did not combine two contradictories; all that they did was to shift authority on to the first few general councils, and to leave each man to adopt his "reading" of their teaching. Let this be so; and we have still to ask them, on whose authority they determine that one council was more authoritative than another council; that the Council of Jerusalem had more authority than that

of Trent, or that of Ephesus than of the very last Vatican Council? Correct form would demand that, on the elementary question of authority, there should be laid down such perfectly definite essentials, that any child, learning his catechism, should be able to see, as the wisest doctor, why this council was infallible, that not. No such accuracy could be gravely attempted by any Ritualist. The most that could be hazarded would be that the Church *was* infallible, but from causes external or internal became fallible; and that therefore the only safe way was to distrust all living authority and to fall back on church authority before it died. We should, of course, have to reply to such an hypothesis: How was it possible that a divine authority could die? Who had power to kill the divine commission to the Church? Or, who possessed that personal, that novel gift of infallibility, which enabled him to affirm that, say, on the 25th day of March, in the year of our Lord 524, at exactly three and a quarter minutes past four in the afternoon, infallibility was suddenly transferred from the Catholic Church to some authority whom it might not be discreet to venture to name, but who, as we all know, in moments of candor, could be none other than each man's own self, the sovereign interpreter of both the Church and the Bible? No: definition is quite impossible to all Protestants. For, as with the Ritualists, so with Dry Churchmen or Slow Churchmen (to adopt the divisions given by Mr. Conybeare in the *Edinburgh Review*), with Low Churchmen or Broad Churchmen, with Anglican or Associationist clergymen, there is the confessed inability to define their positions in such terms as could convey a fixed meaning to all the world. So that when we attempt to write on Protestant development, we have to face the initial difficulty: "How is it possible to define the new forms of old errors?" a task from which we at once shrink in despair, since no Protestant will so much as hear of definition. "General description" is as much as we can safely dare to attempt; and even here, as Cardinal Newman said, "generalities are apt to be unjust to individuals." Still, a few facts as to Protestant development in the last forty years may be enumerated with fair justice to all concerned.

Let the inquiry be confined to Great Britain; an ample field for all experiments in Protestantism. To appreciate the novelties we must remember the antiquities, and the course of events which has led up to present thinkings. Broadly, may it be said that the last forty years have been a test-time, and that we are now witnessing the results of the experiments. But how came it that any experiments could be needed? Nearly three hundred years had tested Protestantism, before any one of the (three) new experiments was essayed; first, the experiment of combining Catho-

licity with Protestantism; next, the experiment of ousting Protestantism from the Church of England; and, thirdly, the experiment of ousting both Protestantism and Catholic communion from the idea, though not from the life, of the new religion. That "idea" may perhaps be sketched, historically, in the following way: Puseyism was the beginning, and a profoundly earnest beginning, of what may be called, and with some exactness, "the combination theory." A certain amount of Protestantism, with a certain amount of Catholicity, were to be mixed in very carefully weighed proportions. Dr. Pusey was the great man for holding the scales. But the theory was soon proved to be unworkable, and it was decided that the element, Protestantism, must go. Now came the tussle, how to naturalize Catholicity in an institution which was out of communion with the Roman Church. Protestantism had been abandoned, as a back-bone; Catholicity was found impracticable in any sense that could be more real than that of appropriating a few selected Roman doctrines; the Roman Church, and also the Greek schism, disowned fellowship; what was to be done to keep up the fiction of Catholicity in a church which seemed to have no ancestors and no relations? "We *won't* submit to the Roman Church," said the Ritualists; "we *can't* submit to the Greek Church, which does not want us; we have disowned our Protestant ancestry and the Reformers, as being all in the wrong in a dozen senses, a dozen grooves; here we are, positively alone in our insularity, yet confident of our being the typically right thing. Only one chance remains to us, which is to condemn the Roman Church as being out of communion with the Anglican idea—the only pure idea; and though, in fact, we shall be neither Protestant nor Catholic, still in idea we shall be *the* Catholic Church."

So the Roman Church was once more ostracised from Anglican sympathies, by the very men who had but just ostracised "the Protestant religion;" the school of Dr. Littledale being as Protestant in disposition as was the school of John Knox or Martin Luther. Thus the "idea"—we should never dream of saying the reality, for the majority of Anglicans have been much too earnest to believe in nonsense—of the latest development of extreme High Churchism in Great Britain was to oust both Catholic communion and Protestantism from the now resuscitated "Early Anglican Church"; a delusive theory being thus substituted for a national loss; a fictitious idea being put in the place of historic truth. Happily non-Catholics are always and everywhere inconsistent, so that the new theorists have been in heart quite a different sort of believers to what their text-books would have led outsiders to suppose.

The other two great parties in the Establishment, the Broad-Churchmen and the old fashioned Low-Churchmen, have also been

developing new "ideas." Broad-Churchmen have taken skepticism within their range, not as an evil to be professed, but to be condoned; while many Low-Churchmen have ingrafted religious liberalism upon their old faith, in a sort of kindly, gentlemanly spirit of magnanimity. The points of contact between Broad-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen are, in these days, almost too fine to be discerned. In England, a Broad-Churchman is a man who affects "scientism," and also a calm and speculative estimate of things in general, together with an amiable impression that Christianity is a good religion, provided you care more for its morals than for its dogmas. He is perhaps a free-thinker first, and a Christian afterwards, though education and the national sentiment preserve his "faith." Forty years ago, he was an easy-thinking Christian, who objected only to Roman Catholicism and to skepticism; to-day, he will include both extremes in his forgiveness, provided there be no aggressiveness nor bigotry. In consistency, every Anglican should be a Broad-Churchman, because the principle of private judgment approves breadth. Indeed, forty years ago, most Churchmen were Broad-Churchmen. But the old form of Anglican breadth meant no more than a comprehending of all the Anglican schools of thought in "Christian charity"; the generously believing that the one thing needful was to be a Protestant, though as to the particular groove or leaning, it did not matter. The new form of breadth goes outside Protestantism. Indeed, it would be impossible to limit the range of its cold embrace. And the explanation of the great change is as follows: It must be remembered that the Broad-Churchman of forty years ago was innocent of three experiences of the present time. First, Ritualism, or the principle of Church authority, had not been worked out to its ultimate right or wrong; next, Biblical criticism, with its ally "infidel science" (perhaps a conjunction of words not more inaccurate than "scientific infidelity," which sounds not unlike "rational imbecility," or "divinely assured atheism," or any other odd compound of contradictories), had not been patronized by newspapers, or gently treated by philosophers, who made use of them as a pretext for infidelity; and thirdly, the visible action of the Catholic Church in England was scarcely begun, still less conspicuously dominant throughout the country. These three "experiences" now cause the Broad-Churchman to adopt attitudes which never even so much as occurred to him forty years ago. He sees that Ritualism is but the grave toy of earnest speculators; he sees that the Old Testament, perhaps the New—on which, formerly, he pinned his whole faith—are subjected to criticisms which deeply disturb his old confidence; while, in the exact proportion in which he resists the Catholic claims, he is thrown back upon himself for

all his religion. Thus, his "new form" is much worse than his "old form," for while he knows that he cannot be taught safely by the Church of England, and while he is a good deal shaken by the new onslaught on his old evidences, he is driven back upon his own self, by refusing to "hear the Church," which, forty years ago, only spoke to him from foreign countries.

If the Broad-Churchman be broader, is the Protestant churchman more protesting; does he repudiate "Roman corruptions" more assiduously? Now, here we have a difficult question to answer. The "new form" is necessarily quite distinct from the "old form." The old form (with Low-Churchmen) was the protesting against a religion which was grossly travestied by all Protestant authors and clergymen; the new form is the protesting against a religion which has been sufficiently explained by living compatriots and distinguished converts. The old form was the protesting only against "Romanism"—a slang word which did duty for the Catholic religion, for all that was supposed to be either its history or its teaching; the new form is the protesting equally against the new religions *within* the Establishment, and that One Religion which has been unchanged since the day of Pentecost. The old form was based on the assumption that the Bible was delivered, printed and bound, to the clergy and laity of the first century of the Christian Church, but was subsequently locked up in an iron safe by wicked Papists, until Martin Luther got the key and astonished the world; the new form is based on the assumption that, though there could be no such thing as a printed Bible for fifteen centuries, and, consequently, there could be no such thing as "keeping the Bible back from the people," still, the Catholic Church had not the guidance of the Holy Spirit—as every Protestant has had since the blessed Reformation—to rightly interpret the Sacred Manuscripts. Obviously, these three changes of the Protestant attitude must suffice to establish a "new form." The old form was (1) ignorance of Catholic truth; (2) a sort of universality of hatred of Popery by *all* Protestants; and (3) a firm belief that a Bible, which took a man's whole life to copy, *ought* to have been in the possession of every Christian, but was not because Catholic priests would not allow it. The new form, on the contrary (1) has to coexist with an adequate knowledge of Catholic history, tradition, doctrine, devotion; (2) has to co-exist with the "rank Popery" of half its disciples within the citadel of its own stoutest anti-Catholicism; and (3) has to confess that learned converts, scores of clergy, saintly laymen, now interpret the Protestant Bible in the Roman Catholic sense, while the "Protestant" persists in interpreting it for himself.

Naturally this new form has given birth to modes of attack

which, under the old form, would have had no reason of being. We will first speak of the mode of attack by "Associations." Now the chief of these is called "The Church Association," which was founded twenty-six years ago, as "the last bulwark against Rome within the Church of England," and of which the "Prospectus" stated that it was initiated because the Society of the Holy Cross, the English Church Union, and other Ritualistic societies have been working secretly for upwards of twenty years to introduce into our church and country the Romish Mass and auricular confession." This institution (it will be needless to name others of a similar purpose) has been making war on its brother Anglicans for a quarter of a century, and is now, perhaps, more pugnacious than it has ever been. To give an idea of its "work," it boasted only a few weeks ago, that "under the advice of its lawyer, the Council instituted a second suit, in order to bring before the House of Lords the evidence that idolatrous worship had, *in fact*, been publicly paid before the graven images set up in St. Paul's Cathedral." Now, the comicality of accusing the amiable and accomplished clergymen who conduct the services in the metropolitan Cathedral of Anglicanism, of "*in fact* committing idolatry before graven images" is only equalled by the sectarian pique which such an accusation must demonstrate, or by the sense of failure which such Protestant slanders must imply. Here we have a Protestant association, which not only says that the better part of the Anglican clergy have gone back to Catholic belief, Catholic worship, but have receded even into the paganism of the pre-Christian era to the extent of worshipping stocks and stones in place of God. What a plain proof that there must be a new form of Protestantism, which has absolutely nothing in common with the old form! But take the Anglican Associations of the *new* form, and see whether they do not justify the assertion that there are now two exactly opposite Protestantisms within one Church. The "Society of the Holy Cross," a High Church society, is so bent on a return to the old paths, that it would "pray for union with the Roman Church, so as to put an end to the grievous scandal of divisions." The "English Church Union" would work chiefly "for the restoration of the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood." While other High Church associations would make "the reunion of Christendom to be the first prayerful longing for all Catholic souls"; or would regard "the full teaching of Catholic doctrine as the prime requisite." Now, it must be obvious that the aspiration of the High Church societies is much more Christian than is the dull bitterness of their opponents; still, *both* are aspirations of English Churchmen, *both* are permitted to have their way within the Establishment. But the point which we must now insist on as being so instructive as to

“new form,” is, that the Low Church (not the High Church) leagues, unions, associations are meant to be substitutes for the living authority of Church-of-Englandism; they are not put forward as auxiliary to episcopal authority (indeed, the bishops have not formally sanctioned any one of them), but as assuming to teach bishops and priests what pure Anglicanism is or ought to be, and so to enforce their Associationist views on the nation. This “new form” of Protestantism is like civil war. Within the ramparts of the Anglican Communion various regiments are privately formed, whose duty it is to dictate to the commander, the officers, and the entire army how they should act in regard to an enemy and to one another; and who are in open hostility to half the army on every point of military discipline, as much as on the science of attack or of defence. It is, perhaps, the drollest form of church-mutiny yet perpetrated. And to give a broader touch of comedy to such church-mutiny, the Church Association has recently issued a circular to the entire nation, in which it reproached both Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury for appointing too many High Church clergymen to Anglican bishoprics. Mr. Gladstone, it seems, has named fourteen, and Lord Salisbury eleven Ritualists, to be teachers of the painfully divided State Church; whereas the same statesmen have only named seven or eight Low Church clergymen to the equivocal position of spiritually fighting with their compeers. The Church Association therefore calls upon all British electors to return only Low Church representatives to the next Parliament; so that Parliament may control the Ministers, and the Ministers may control the Bishops, and the Bishops may teach in harmony with “The Association.” It is needless to pursue this trifling to its grave issue, yet it was relevant to our inquiry into “new forms” to show that the modern invention of Associations is new in tactics, new in combativeness, new in schism; just as it is a new usurping of the teaching authority of the Church, which was never before supposed to rest exclusively with Associations.

Another new form which is perhaps kindred in principle, though it is much grander and graver in aspiration, is the tendency of all Protestant bodies to extend themselves by “co-operation,” as a sort of homage to the unattainable virtue of “unity.” We take up the newspapers day by day, and are sure to read such captivating headings as “The Church Congress,” “The National Protestant Congress,” “The International Conference”; the Dissenting, like the Anglican, Protestants emulating Catholic unity by such adjectives as œcumenical or universal; and their boast being that their union is Catholic, in the sense that they all happily agree to differ. The last Archbishop of Canterbury may be said to have started this novelty by convoking his Pan-Anglican Synod at Lam-

beth. And in the present year, 1891, we have had the glorification of the principle of "co-operation" by the speakers at the annual Anglican Church Congress. The Congress was held in Wales in the month of September, in the hope of attracting the Welsh Dissenters to the Church of England; an invitation to "co-operation" being warmly urged, as antecedent to closer ties of corporate unity. It may be useful to study the language of some of the speakers, as showing at least the sentiment, if not the principle, of co-operation. Thus, the late Dean of St. Asaph's told his brother dignitaries at the Congress that "Reunion, at least in the near future, was the vainest of dreams." And he added that "it was useless to talk about the sin of schism. Of course schism was a sin, when a man deliberately, for private and selfish ends, or out of pure arrogance and self-conceit, rent the unity of the Christian Church. Churchmen accepted the voice of the visible Church, as representing in the main the voice of God, but the Nonconformists honestly rejected that view. Still, he did not despair of reunion; but that state of things could not be hastened; and therefore they should turn their attention to co-operation." Such cautious phrasing, if converted into rough English, might mean, "doctrinal unity among Protestants is impossible, whether inside or outside the State Church; still, as it would look better, and it would be more convenient, to work together for material ends, let us see if we cannot co-operate in conventional sense, just as the various cliques in a town or parish meet in a vestry-room to co-operate about coal or blankets for the poor." Another speaker at the Church Congress thought it might be "desirable to invite Dissenters to occupy the pulpits of the Church of England;" but the Archbishop of York considered this plan to be too radical; "though it might be desirable to attract Dissenters by simpler and more cheerful services in the National Church, services more after the pattern of *their own*." The Bishop of Manchester, with characteristic ambiguity, thought that Nonconformists "should remember how on the one hand the Scriptural definiteness of the formularies of the National Church had formed a pillar of strength for Christian truth in critical times, while, on the other hand, the Catholic freedom of their authorized interpretation had availed more than once to hold in touch, and ultimately to call back into Christian communion many who seemed ready to break away into open apostacy."

After this episcopal eulogium on "Catholic freedom," a Welsh clergyman, laughing to scorn all such attempts at coquetting with the four great divisions of the Welsh Dissent, declared honestly that Welsh Dissenters detested the National Church, and would co-operate heartily in any scheme for its destruction; a statement

which seems to have had some truth in it from the admitted fact that most Dissenters like quarrelling; a prominent Baptist, the Rev. Iwan Jenkyn, having read a paper a few weeks ago at a Baptists' Association, in which he said that "the various sections of Nonconformity acted towards each other like dogs fighting over a bone, although they strongly urged each other to fight Episcopalianism."

These few quotations will suffice to show that "co-operation" between Nonconformists, or co-operation between Nonconformists and English Churchmen, is almost as hopeless as is unity. Yet the point is that *some* Protestants desire *some* co-operation; and we may regard this as a new form of an old error; since the old error was that Protestant sectaries should agree to differ, not that they should think it a good thing to strive to combine. As a matter of fact the modern relations of the Church of England and Nonconformity are so different from the old relations as to be quite new; the new Anglicanism being a much wider departure from the old Anglicanism than was Nonconformity from the Anglicanism of, say, John Wesley. So that if Nonconformity is now invited to co-operate with Anglicanism, it may well reply, "with which of the Anglican churches are we to co-operate? We know what we *left* a hundred years ago, but we now see a perfectly new Church of England. Do you invite us to co-operate with the Church of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who told his clergy in a recent pastoral, 'not to make any changes in their conduct of Divine Service, unless they were assured of the practical unanimity of their people in desiring such change'; and that even if they ordinarily held services which implied a belief in Holy Mass, they should sometimes, 'especially on the first Sunday of the month,' have a Low Church form of service, 'which should meet in all ways the desire of their parishioners'; or do you invite us to co-operate with the new Church of the Ritualists, who write to their newspapers about their High Mass and their Low Mass, their Missa Cantata, their Children's Mass, and their Choral Mass, and also pretend to be Roman Catholics in everything but obedience—that one dogma which they protest against as not being primitive?" It certainly seems unreasonable to say to Nonconformists, "co-operate with your Mother Church, the Church of England"; while yet not specifying which of the Churches is referred to; whether the Church of the pliable Archbishop of Canterbury or that of the "persecuted" Bishop of Lincoln. "Co-operate among yourselves" would be a reasonable rejoinder; "and then ask us to co-operate with you." Briefly—for we must leave this point and pass on to others—what co-operation can there be between the Ritualists, who affirm, through their favorite organ

The Church Times, "the Mass should regain the position which it once occupied in the Church of England, and which it still preserves in every other branch of historic Christendom, Latin or oriental"; and (say, for example) the delegates to the International Council of Congregationalists (held last summer), one of whom said at the council, "*our* council, compared with the twenty œcumenical councils of the Roman and the fifty small councils of the Anglican Church, has loftier aims; for, we are met together, *not* to frame theological definitions, but to deal with the great pressing questions of"—housing the poor, equalizing the claims of capital and labor, and making life more moral and more honorable.

A writer in the English *Quarterly* for last October, in the course of an able and just article on "Church Progress and Church Defence," laid stress on the vast practical fruits of Anglican industries, in education, in mission-work, in domestic blessings to the poor, in social harmonies, and in material structures both for worship and for charities. Every one of these boasts was well-founded. The Church of England has done full justice to its capacities, while its lay members have done full justice to the clergy. The liberality of the lay members is sufficiently shown in the fact that within a period of a quarter of a century—1860 to 1884—the voluntary lay contributions have exceeded four hundred million dollars; reckoning only such contributions as have been made public. Energy of will and action have kept pace with the High Church growth, as well as with the collateral spread of latitudinarianism.

But our point is, what is the difference between this new energy and the energy which was almost national for three centuries? The answer is found in the very title of the article which records the luxuriant fruits of modern Anglicism—"Church Progress and Church Defence." Why defence? How many enemies has the National Church to face that it should want defending? Three in chief, which are all new within forty years: (1) The enemy of extreme Ritualism, which is leading the nation to an apprehension of the incompatibility of Anglicanism with Authority; (2) the enemy of Freethinking, which has now shot far beyond Protestant liberty, so that it assumes the liberty of saying, "I do not believe in the supernatural"; and (3) the enemy (so accounted) of Catholicity, which is now housed in almost every part of Great Britain, so that its hierarchy takes equal place with that of Anglicanism. Church defence! To fall back on our old simile, let us suppose a besieged fortress, in which the danger is from one enemy on the outside, and from two enemies who are fighting desperately on the inside. The general in command has to give two-thirds of his consideration to the question of defence against his *inside* enemies;

while, to make matters worse, one of these two enemies is on terms of parley with the "common enemy" who is on the outside of the fortress. And, unhappily, the poor general (say, the Archbishop of Canterbury) has to receive his orders from the home authorities, who are only civilians, and who forbid him to cashier or turn out of the fortress any rebel of either of the sections, who are laughing at him. "Church defence," in such a plight, comes to mean the equally defending the rights of both the belligerents, who are fighting within the fortress; together with the right of the party, Ritualism, to make terms with the common enemy—to even refuse to strike a blow, save in mere pretence. The defence, therefore, is too great a difficulty for the commander. To defend his fortress against an outside enemy would be one thing, but to defend it against two inside enemies is another thing. He must be tempted to wish that the two Anglican parties would consume each other, as the only practical solution of a "Church Defence" in which each party defends itself against the other party.

We know, of course, that church defence means, with the "State and Church party," the preventing the disestablishing of the state church; and here, again, we have a new form of an old error which will want a little formulating to make it clear. The old idea was, that Church and State were united, but only in the sense that the State aided the Church by throwing over her the mantle of its patronage; not in the sense that (1) the State controlled the Church, or that (2) the Church controlled the State by teaching it truth. In the last forty years, two new "views" have sprung up; (1) that the State ought to rule the Church on points of orthodoxy; (2) that the Church should resist enforcement by the State. The first view is maintained by those who rejoice when the Privy Council says *Placet* or *Non-placet* in a doctrinal dispute. The second view is maintained by those who rejoice in "suffering persecution" rather than yield an inch to the "vile Erastianism" of State judgments. Now, both these views have sprung out of the novelties of High Churchism; and both are, curiously enough, both right and wrong. That the State should rule the Church would be obviously wrong in a Catholic sense, because the State knows nothing whatever about orthodoxy, save only that the Catholic Church teaches it; but, as the State was the original parent of the Church of England, it is obvious that it must have parental rights of enforcing homage. So, too, that the Church should resist the ruling of the State would be right, in regard to doctrines, on the part of Catholics; but, on the part of Anglicans, one does not see how they can affect to resist the State, since they admit that Henry VIII., Queen Elizabeth, or their parliaments, played any tricks they liked with Catholic doctrines,

while repudiating Catholic authority altogether. Thus, the novelty of the modern controversy is, that both sides may be said to be right, while both sides may be also said to be wrong; the special conditions of the Church of England being so confusing of fact with theory that Church Defence means really defence of your own ideas.

The slow transition from the old forms to the new forms, would need a volume for careful tracing or elucidation. Let one example suffice, and we can conclude. In a country church in the Isle of Wight, fifty-four years ago, there was such a dominance of the "old form" of Protestant Nothingism that half the east end was given up to a communion table, and the other half to a huge pew for the lord of the manor. As soon as Puseyism came into fashion, the lord of the manor was requested to forego his right to divide the holy of holies with Almighty God; and, after six years of contention he did so. Then came open seats where for generations there had been sheep-pens; and High Church doctrines where for generations there had been Protestantism. Slowly, in the course of years, further development took place, until a new vicar, who was transcendental in his Anglicanism, carried his innovations to such extent that he was sternly rebuked for "lighting candles on the altar." Thus, in half a century, the old form of arid Protestantism—which was equally a mockery of the natural fitness of devotional ideas and of the whole supernatural structure of the Christian Church—was transformed into such an imitation of Catholic function that the son of a clergyman who had been wide-famed for his frantic Protestantism became "a martyr" to his practical experiments of the New Popery.

The question which naturally arises is, can a religion be divine which has every feature of the weakest human instability? We have touched cursorily on only a few of the prominent features, so as rather to suggest than to attempt to demonstrate their human origin. Very briefly let us sum up their value—though but suggestively.

If Protestantism had been divine, would it have expanded itself in the way of contradictories; would it not have demonstrated its divine origin by unities? We may use the plural number, unities, because there is a unity which is structural, there is a unity which is doctrinal, and there is a unity which is (as the Dean of St. Asaph's called it) co-operative. Structural unity is unknown to Protestantism; for, in England alone, the Registrar-General counts 206 sects, while, as to the Church of England, even in Lord Macaulay's time, it was "a hundred sects battling within one Church"; and, as has just been shown, the developments of the great contending divisions are in the direction of such "structural" antagon-

onism, that the visible Ritualist Church, the visible Broad Church, and the visible Low Church are as distinct in their outward features, as in their purposes. As to doctrinal unity, first, the changes have been continuous, and next, their excesses have been concurrent with the continuity. While as to co-operative unity, it is as impracticable within the Establishment as it is unwished-for by the sects which are outside it.

Where, then, shall we find the evidences of a divine origin? The "new forms" give no more sign of it than did the "old forms." We said at the beginning that the Ritualists claim their new form to be the old form, not of Protestantism but of "the purest Catholicity." Let this be so; still, as such old forms would be *not* Protestant, it would be the ingrafting of what was repudiated at the Reformation into the very Church which the Reformers built for its repudiation. Oh, no, say the Ritualists, the Reformers did not build the Church of England; that Church had become terribly ill and invalided ("corrupt" is the popular adjective with all Church parties), and was only almost killed by the Protestant Reformers, in order that it might be resuscitated and rejuvenated by the Ritualists. Whence the Ritualists derived the power to work this miracle has never been stated by their great masters of apology. "New forms of old errors" was perfectly natural; but the "rebirth of old truths" which had been dead for centuries (dead as far as all positive teaching was concerned; dead as to the Holy Mass, as to Confession, as to priestly powers) is not natural in any sense which can be called Catholic. For, even assuming that divine truths could die (which they could not do), a divine authority would be required to re-deliver them; and since the so-called Church of England had proved that it was *not* divine, by tumbling into the grossest heresies and profanations, it must be obvious to common sense that so fictitious an institution could not have the power to teach itself all Catholic truth. If, being divine, it could teach itself scores of heresies, the same divinity must teach divers heresies now; or, indeed, to speak plainly, the very use and purpose of its divinity must be to confuse all truth with all error. This may be "Catholic"; but, if so, the structural, doctrinal, and co-operative unity, which we assumed to be the divine features of a divine church, must give place to their exact opposites in point of fact.

We need not glance again at the "Protestant" vagaries and Babel tongues. Enough has been said to show that *their* origin is human. While, as to Broad-Churchmen, their theory of comprehensiveness is the assertion of the non-divinity of doctrinal belief. What is left? The Salvation Army, which is the most dogmatic of all Protestantisms—for it positively forbids the introduction

of doctrinal controversy, the General pontifically ruling that there shall be no creeds—has possibly hit upon the right solution of the Protestant muddle by saying that all Protestantism must be protested against. This seems to be the only way of getting out of the embarrassment of having to protest against the whole word, past and present. General Booth has not received the intellectual homage which is his due, as being the first man to rule positively that there are *no* Christian doctrines—beyond, of course, the belief in redemption and in redeeming grace—and that therefore heresy consists in affirming that there *are* doctrines. This is an ultimate which should have been foreseen by Martin Luther, so that he might have lessened the chaos which his illogical mind helped to bequeath.

Is there no further issue for all this Protestantism? Must new forms of old errors continue to be the "Christian" development of all the churches which are outside the Catholic Church? Yes, necessarily. There can be only one of two principles in any kind of religious belief; the natural, which must be subject to fallibility; the supernatural, which is essentially infallible. No need to ask whether Protestantism can be supernatural, since it repudiates infallibility while claiming the right of personal dogmatism; in other words, limits infallibility to one's own self. Is it then only natural? Far from it. For, though its principle as to Church authority is that each man should be his own pontiff, its close neighborhood to the Catholic Church keeps it always in living sympathy with an immense deal that is divine or supernatural. As Cardinal Manning has said, most Englishmen are in heresy, but few are heretics; for the majority are only traditionally deceived by fictional history, by association, by education, or by surroundings, so that the deception is, perhaps, more sentimental than intellectual. "Canterbury" keeps up the fiction of Churchism, or Mr. Spurgeon keeps up the fiction of enthusiasm. So that new forms of old errors seem to Protestants to be little more than the changeful toilet of a sound religion which has worked well. That the Catholic Church never changes, save in that sense of divine vitality which enables her to define *old* truths from time to time in order to meet the new forms of old errors, seems to Protestants to be easily explicable, on the ground that the Catholic principle is: "A definition once promulgated is infallible." But the assurance of this Catholic principle is the assurance that the Holy Spirit necessarily guides the Church into all truth. Protestantism has repudiated that divine principle. Hence, new forms of old errors continue to be the poor substitutes for eternal truths, which may be defined, from age to age, but cannot be changed.

A. F. MARSHALL, B. A. (OXON.).