

set upon her lips, as well as a chain fastened round her limbs. If the Church is kept dispersed, and no convocation permitted, does she cease to be the public instructor; has she forfeited, or may she dispense herself from, the duty of warning her subjects authoritatively, of condemning heretical or erroneous doctrines, of checking refractory or schismatical conduct? Surely not; the "*Ecclesia dispersa*," even speaking of national or provincial churches. It is not the place in which Bishops meet that gives them their authority; this is inherent in the episcopate; and, if they unite in declaration of doctrine, even without coming together, there is the voice of the Church, authoritative and plenary.

But is it necessary even to have this much in order to secure the authoritative teaching of a church? Those with whom we have principally to deal at least have taught us not. If one bishop of our Church—if St. Alphonsus Ligouri writes certain passages, and the rest of the church makes no opposition, and rejects and condemns them not, we are told we must allow such passages to be considered as the authoritative teaching of our church. Be it so; at least we shall have a precedent not without its value for another case; but we are willing to have something more required. While, therefore, we will not allow that the active suffrages of all the bishops are requisite to give us the decision of a Church, we will be content that some authoritative form should invest such partial declarations as we would stamp with the weight of the entire hierarchy. Let us put a case. We wish to ascertain what the belief of a national church is on a given point. Men's minds are greatly agitated on the subject; the people from many sides press for a decision. Some denounce one view as heretical; some the other. The church is rent in twain, and its teachers proclaim contradictory doctrines. The Bishops, as is the case in France and in Spain at this moment, cannot meet to deliberate and consult: but yet, whenever they have occasion to speak on the important subject, they speak one way. They do not, perhaps, seek occasion to speak; but, when the occasion does come, their feeling, their teaching, their warnings, their denunciations, all go one way. Such, for instance, has been the conduct, during the last year, of the French bishops regarding education; every bishop that had a pastoral to issue, spoke on this subject, and the voices of all were in unison. Such is the conduct of the admirable episcopate of Spain at this moment, with respect to the dreadful measures of Espartero's irreligious government for destroying the authority of the Holy See. Each one raises his voice as best he may: one is, a memorial to the Cortes like the Bishop of Tuy, another cries out from his place of exile; a third, perhaps, from his prison. But they are good shepherds; their sheep know their voice, and they follow them. No one doubts which side the Church of Spain holds in this matter; it is evidently that on which its bishops have declared themselves. The silence of the other bishops does not go against

this decision; because we know that they would speak out and protest if they differed from their colleagues; it would be their duty to do so if they thought they were misleading the nation; and bishops are presumed to know and do their duty.

However, let us not be content with even these demonstrations of sentiment. Let us farther suppose that the Primate of the country comes forward to direct and conduct a public act, necessarily involving certain religious views. We will add two conditions to our statement of the problem. First, it shall be an act in which he officially acts as Primate—as the first bishop in the Episcopate—as its hierarchical chief, representative, and procurator. Secondly, it shall be one in which he alone can act; that is, one in which individual bishops could not all take a part, so that he must here be their organ. Under these circumstances the Primate takes a certain course, which pledges him directly and entirely to a certain side of conflicting ideas. Upon this the rest of the bishops remain silent; not a remonstrance is made, not a caution is entered, not a thought of dissent is insinuated. We say that the body has acquiesced in the decision of its head; the suffragans are with their Primate; the national "*Ecclesia dispersa*" has chosen its side. If not, when can such a choice be verified? But, if this be not enough, let us add more. Let us, then, suppose a justification of these views to be published by that Primate, and by some very leading bishop in the Church, and yet no protest, no censure, no hint of difference of opinion from their episcopal brethren. If all this does not fix upon a church its side, in a controverted case, we fairly give it up, and say that there are no means by which such a conclusion may be reached under ordinary circumstances. In other words, either a Church can have no means of teaching what it holds on a controverted point, when circumstances do not allow its bishops to assemble, or here we have the most obvious and probable meaning.

Let us now come to the application. Our inquiry is, whether the Anglican Church can be considered Catholic or Protestant? First, then, we must see what we are to understand by the two terms. By Catholic, we of course mean that church which is in communion with the Holy and Apostolic see of St. Peter, and acknowledges his successor in it as the Head of the universal Church. But the High-church theology will not admit this definition; but considers the "orthodox" (that is the separated or schismatical) Greek and Russian Churches, as well as the other oriental churches (though in truth all infested with Nestorianism or Eutychianism), as entering, with the Roman communion, into the composition of the Church Catholic. Of this church, they will maintain the Anglican to be a component part; as "essentially one with all other churches of kindred origin, both Greek and Latin." Protestant Churches all agree in considering to be the Lutheran, Calvinist, and other churches on the European continent, not in communion with the Holy See,

nor belonging to the Great rite. Now the question is, even taking the Oxford notion of the Church Catholic, is the Anglican established church to be considered as belonging to it, and not rather to the Protestant family? To this question we wish to apply the tests above given.

And, first, how have the bishops, on occasion given, declared themselves? Let last year's episcopal charges speak.—Scarcely one, if one, who had occasion to issue such a document, failed to touch, to say no more, on the controversies which divide the Anglican world; and all to a man took the Protestant side. Here is a real case, similar to the one before proposed of the French or Spanish bishops. It is not necessary to quote them individually; we referred to them in our last number; we may content ourselves with the complaint of those on whom their censure fell. Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, analyzes these charges: and, though he does not admit that the bishops have properly understood the doctrines of his school, yet he fully shows that they have all condemned them as far as they did. "Thus I know," he writes, that the mildest charge which was delivered in the past year, and which does in a very kind way recognize services which we have rendered, yet because the bishop goes on to point out at greater length some, though fewer and subordinate, points which he considers erroneous, has appeared to be a condemnation." This alludes to the Bishop of Ripon's charge; and the learned writer then goes on to speak of those issued by the bishops of Chester, Winchester, Gloucester, Durham, and Calcutta. The Bishop of Durham's charge was not published by himself, but was taken down in shorthand; the bishop of Lichfield did not at all publish his; but, if we are rightly informed, he, too, sufficiently declared his Protestant views upon existing controversies. Here, then, we have every bishop who had an opportunity fairly presented him of stating his opinions, taking one side. We could not expect them, if they thought their brethren wrong, to throw the counterpoise of their solemn protest into the other scale, and so prevent Protestantism from preponderating in the councils of the establishment. But not a tongue stirred, not a hand moved; the silent consent of some was added to the expressed sentiments of the rest. Mr. Palmer allows that "the spirit of Protestantism seems undoubtedly to be dominant, both among dignitaries of the establishment and society at large;" and that "people abound who, though in full communion with the church, nay, though priests, or rather ministers, or bishops, or even archbishops, yet publicly disclaim Catholicism, and invite, and even urge their brethren to quit the "Protestant establishment," on the ground that it is absolutely dishonest to hold Catholic principles within its pale." "It is not unnatural, he concludes, "for persons to suppose that a church can scarcely be Catholic whose rulers do not consistently and unequivocally assert to themselves that holy title, and which is viewed as a mere political establishment of Protestantism by the civil government." We think not

indeed. It would rather be hard enough, on the contrary, to find a process of reasoning whereby any one could convince himself that a church, indifferent to the title, would be considered, justly, Catholic, still less a church, in which dignitaries, ministers, bishops, and archbishops; publicly disclaim Catholicism, &c.

"But, (says Mr. Palmer) as long as I can reject Protestantism thus publicly, as I now do, as a member of the Church of England, and profess to be merely and simply a Catholic, so long will I continue to pray that I may have grace to continue steadfast in that way of salvation." (p. 10). In other words, as long as one is allowed to call himself a Catholic, and yet not be rejected by that establishment, yea even at the same time condemning in the strongest terms Protestantism—the church itself may be considered as "intrinsically Catholic." In the sentences immediately preceding the one just quoted, this fervent deacon had written as follows: "Certainly I am for no middle ways, as you will understand when I tell you plainly, that for myself, I utterly reject and anathematize the principle of Protestantism as a heresy, with all its forms, sects or denominations. And if the church of England should ever unhappily profess herself to be a form of Protestantism (which God of His infinite mercy forbid), then I would reject and anathematize the Church of England, and would separate myself from her immediately as from a human sect, without giving Protestants any unnecessary trouble to procure my expulsion." (p. 9). But this reasoning will not do. The standard of a church's orthodoxy must be rated by the minimum, not by the maximum of faith, which she will allow within her confession. The lowest scheme of opinions which she tolerates must determine her character, not the highest. Had, for instance, the body of the French bishops freely permitted any one that pleased to hold and teach Jansenism, had they proclaimed it in all their pastorals,—nay, had they refused ordination to none that professed it, but had to some who rejected it, the Church of France would have been Jansenist, even though individuals had continued to hold the truth and denounce error. It is as with a form of government—it may be democratical, although it allows the noble to descend to the level of the people, and thus exclude them from a share in the state; but a determined aristocracy will not admit the plebeians to sit with princes and rulers. And so, a truly Catholic Church cannot brook the co-existence of Protestantism within its pale: but a Protestant establishment takes all in,—Socinians, like Hoadley, on one side, and Catholicity-inclined minds like Dr. Pusey, on the other. But this very circumstance proves that it cannot be Catholic. Catholicism is homogeneous, Protestantism heterogeneous: the one compact and united, the other vague and loose: the one inflexible, the other pliable and elastic. The one is unvarying in standard of purity, the other admits into its circulation every degree of alloy, yes down to sheer dross. The presence of gold in the base mixture does not redeem its character; this it must draw from the