

proaching decay. "But Thou has kept the good wine until now." This is the rule of Christ in His Kingdom of souls, a continual progress from good to better, if man will only be faithful to the grace imparted.

"VERTS AND RE-VERTS."

AS we before pointed out, Romanists have but little to chuckle over in the list of 'verts to Vaticanism, as published by the *Whitehall Review*. In the first place these lists contain but few names of any writers eminent in literature or in theology. In fact, if we take away those of Dr. Newman, Archdeacon Wilberforce, and Dr. Ward in England, and of Mr. Brownson on this continent, it will be found that the talent and learning engaged in the production of the "Tracts for the Times"—that same talent and learning which shone out in the school of thought to which those "Tracts"—gave birth, continued then, and still flourishes in the Church of England. However, to prove our case it is only necessary to point to the names of Keble, Williams, Pusey, Hook, Wilberforce, the Bishop of Winchester, the two Wordsworths—Bishops of Lincoln and St. Andrews, Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, the late Mr. Cheyne, of the Scottish Church, Archbishop Trench, Archdeacons Lee, of Dublin, and Denison, of Taunton, Dean Burgon, Canons Liddon, Gregory, and King, of the clergy, and the late Justice Coleridge, with his son Lord Coleridge, Lord Selborne, W. E. Gladstone, and a host of others of the laity, whom to enumerate would take up all our space. There were giants in those times of ours such as Rome has never shown since the days of Thomas of Aquin, such as may worthily be ranked with the Chrysostoms, the Basils, and the Augustines of the early Church. We are aware that the names of such 'verts as Manning, Faber, and Dalgairns, besides those already mentioned as belonging to the Roman Communion, are boasted of as famous by their unwilling and jealous co-religionists, but, with the exception, perhaps, of Dr. Newman and Archdeacon Wilberforce, what has any one of them done to enrich the theology of the Church Catholic? What will live of the works of Cardinal Manning will be his sermons as Archdeacon of Chichester—and this remark applies with nearly equal force to the pre-Roman writings of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Dr. Newman—the latter's "Apologia" and his "Development of Christian Doctrine" alone excepted; while the sermons and treatises of the others, not excluding Dr. Ward's painfully labored, though undoubtedly able defences of Ultramontaniam are only likely to be met with hereafter, as they are met with now in the shelves of the Mariolater, the Transubstantionist, the Papalist, or the sensational and mawkish preachers in the ultra-Ritualist ranks. What is really sound and Catholic in the writings of Dr. Newman, Wilberforce, or Brownson has been either virtually or actually condemned by Rome, while the sickly and womanish trash written in hyper-laudation of the Blessed Virgin, of a dogma raising a man into the place of God, or of a doctrine concerning the Most Holy Sacrament which the Church of Christ has always anathematized and will always anathematize, alone finds favor in the eyes of Infallibility—of itself proof enough either of the deterioration or the prostitution of the talents of those who have deserted their Mother Church for an alien society. So far, therefore, as learning and intellect go, Rome has but little to boast of with

regard to her new adherents. We would say nothing of their zeal, their piety, or their devotion. We would only remind our readers that there is a zeal without knowledge, a piety which is at once the parent and the offspring of superstition, and a devotion to a cause which savors rather of blinded bigotry than of that "constraining love of Christ," whose outcome is the "glorious liberty of the children of God."

A careful analysis of the published lists reveals also the dishonesty of their compilers. To say nothing of the fact that they reckon as "converts" the children of parents who 'verted either when their children were of too tender years to discern between truth and falsehood or before their children were born, these lists persist in retaining the names of many who have re-'verted to their Mother Church, on whom it flashed, perhaps suddenly, often after many terrible years of mental unrest and cruel soul-strivings that they had made a grievous mistake in confounding the shadow with the substance, in yielding to an impulse rather than to reason, or to the deceitful leading—if such a term can be used—of a judicial blindness in preference to the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Such a method of procedure is, of course, tricky dishonesty, but it is quite of a piece with the tactics of those whose first rule is to do evil that "good" may come. For example, why do the lists include such names as Fathers Suffield, Morewood, and Hargrove—all accessions to the Dominican Order from the "Evangelical" ranks in the Church of England? Why is the re-'version of Mr. Capes ignored? Why those of Messrs. Arnold and Roberts? How comes it that the two not uncelebrated Jesuits, Fathers Collins and Palgrave, are still reckoned as Roman Catholics, when they have long since thrown off all allegiance to Rome? Why is it not stated of Messrs. Walford and Sibthorpe that, in common with a few others equally weak-minded with themselves, they 'verted and re-'verted and 'verted again? How of the six Cambridge men—the "Truth-seekers," who 'verted *en bloc*, five of whom are living in avowed and active hostility to Rome, while the sixth on his deathbed refused to receive any other ecclesiastical consolation than that which the Church of England has been divinely appointed to supply. Of these children also so vauntingly enrolled in the number of "converts," why do the *Whitehall* lists—all supplied by Fathers Christie and Coleridge, once Anglican, but now Jesuit priests—not omit the names of the re-'verted Paleys, some of the Wilberforces and the Laws—one of whom, Father Law, the only man of talent, and the only acknowledged earnest and respectable preacher in the London Oratory, as well as the confessor of the ducal house of Norfolk, has just left the Roman Communion? Surely to count as members of the Roman Church those who never were Romanists or who have in many instances long since abandoned Vaticanism, is to make a trade of falsehood and to bolster up a bad cause by lying of the most disgraceful sort.

One name we have purposely kept to the last as a name deserving more than a mere passing notice, that of the Rev. Edmund S. Ffoulkes, of Jesus College, Oxford, who, after ably championing the cause of Romanism, summoned up courage enough to read history through other than Vatican spectacles. More especially was this the case when he came to study the history of the Council of Florence and of the great Eastern Schism. An investigation into the true motives of the Papal action of that period, caused him to publish a work condemning the conduct of the Pope and the

Latin Church *in globo*. His treatment of the subject caused his book to be placed on the "Index Expurgatorius" at Rome, and he was called upon by Archbishop Manning to retract, and to withdraw his treatise from circulation. He refused to do either, and, as a consequence, was refused the Sacraments, and so became virtually excommunicated. Resenting this interference with his rights he exposed the whole system of the Syllabus in two scathing pamphlets, directed against the dogma of the Infallibility. These were speedily followed by his return to the Catholic Communion and fellowship, and now, after a few years' retirement, he has once more appeared as a priest of the Church, having recently been appointed Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin in Oxford—that famous church from whose pulpit John Henry Newman in old days preached those marvellous sermons, whose depth and beauty stirred from its lowest depths all the dry bonedness of Oxford, and caused the sacred building to be thronged Sunday after Sunday by mingled crowds of dons and undergraduates who hung upon the lips of the most popular preacher the Church had seen for many a long year. To him has succeeded Edmund S. Ffoulkes, the once Dean, Fellow, and Tutor of Jesus College, then the doughty defender of Rome's claims to supremacy, and now the occupant of what Bishop Coxe has happily styled the "first pulpit in Christendom," the incumbent of the chief church in the first seat of learning in the world, the "University Church" of Oxford. To this position he, though a member of another, and in the eyes of the patrons of the living a somewhat despised foundation, has been preferred by the Fellows of Oriel College, the college of Sir Walter Raleigh, Bishop Butler, White of Selborne, Bishop Copleston, Archbishop Whately, Dr. Arnold, John Keble, John Henry Newman, Richard Hurrell Froude, Bishop Wilberforce and his two brothers—Archdeacon and H. W. Wilberforce, Hartley Coleridge, Matthew Arnold, and a host of others equally renowned. But in the face of this fact, from his name being retained in the list of Rome's gains it would seem either that she no longer considers as an "apostate" him whom she once amathematized, or that she has not honesty enough nor pluck enough openly to confess that her system is not sufficiently Catholic in every or any sense of the word to keep within her fold profoundly learned theologians, or "converts" of twenty years standing. Rome will not admit defeat: the Catholic Church, on the other hand, while she deplures too frequent losses, is always ready to welcome back her wandering sheep, and, if she sees them worthy of such an honour to re-establish them as her protagonists, to bear all the brunt of the fray, or by their prowess to set a good example to their brethren, to add bravery to the brave, to strengthen the weak, and above all, by being themselves the most obedient in a lawless age, to stand as patterns of unshakable faithfulness to the behests of those who have been set over them in the Lord. Thus they redeem the mischief done by their former desertion, and by their very courage and their science in the fight, arrest the erratic course of those, whose ardent cravings after the impossible or whose blind misuse of that private judgment, the end of which is not to be quenched, but to be used as a guide to the truth, would speedily throw them into the hands of an insidious and unscrupulous foe, that hesitates not to appropriate to himself the very facings and uniform, even the very watchword of "Christ's Church Militant here on earth." Rome may well desire to keep the names of such former sons inscribed upon her *fasti*, so as