

acknowledges,' say their opponents, 'the authority of the true Church; but for what Church do you claim this power, and where shall we find her teaching?' The Anglican replies that the Church is that of England, and her teaching is to be found in her Liturgy and Articles. But these formularies admit of divers interpretations, and need a living voice to decide between conflicting interpreters. 'Where then,' says the inquirer, 'shall I seek this living voice, which may solve my doubts?' To this it is replied that the accents of the Church are to be heard from the lips of her bishops, and that her presbyters ordained by those bishops are her living oracles to each individual layman in every separate parish. But when asked whether the laity under the charge of Dr. McNeile are to believe a different creed from those under Dr. Pusey, the Anglican is perplexed for an answer; and still more so when he is reminded that the collective voice of the bishops is silent, and that individual bishops differ as much as their presbyters.

But again the inquirer demands satisfaction on a farther point. 'How am I to know,' he says, 'that the English establishment is that true Church which can alone claim authority to teach and guide?' The Anglican theology replies that the true Church possesses unity as well as visibility. Truth is one, therefore the true Church is one. And this one Church has a note whereby she may be known. In each country she is that body of orthodox Christians which is governed by bishops possessing the Apostolical Succession. Hence the Dissenter, who secedes from his parish church, is forsaking the communion of the Apostles. But here again the High Churchman is embarrassed by his Roman antagonist. For a rival Church exists in England, also governed by bishops to whom the Apostolic consecration has been literally transmitted from the very source whence the Anglican bishops derive their own orders. And that Church declares the Anglican doctrine not orthodox but heretical, and her bishops not successors of the Apostles but schismatical usurpers. How are the laity of the Metropolis to decide whether their allegiance be due to the Bishop of London or the Archbishop of Westminster? Their decision can scarcely be determined in favour of the former by the criterion of Unity, Ecclesiastical Authority or Apostolic Succession.

Thus these hierarchical claims of Anglicanism are dangerous weapons; serviceable artillery, perhaps, against the sectarian, but liable to recoil in the discharge. They do not, however, hold a prominent place in the teaching of High Churchmen. They are not the basis of their system, but only secondary and ornamental details. Even against Dissenters they are not rigidly enforced. The hereditary non-conformist is not excluded from Salvation. Foreign Protestants are even owned as brethren, though a mild regret is expressed that they lack the blessing of an authorised Church government. Apostolical succession is not practically made essential to the being of a Church, but rather cherished as a dignified and ancient pedigree, connecting our English episcopats with primitive antiquity, and binding the present to the past by a chain of filial piety. In the same hands, Church authority is reduced to little more than a claim to that deference which is due from the ignorant to the learned, from the taught to the teacher. Meanwhile the maintainers of these views are useful, not only as a counterpoise to the extravagance of the Rocoedites, but for much positive

good achieved by themselves. And, considered as a whole, they form a party which the Church could ill afford to spare.

In the first place, their system gives freer scope to the feelings of reverence, awe, and beauty than that of their opponents. They endeavour, and often successfully, to enlist those feelings in the service of piety. Music, painting, and architecture they consecrate as the handmaids of religion. Thus they attract an order of men found chiefly amongst the most cultivated classes, whose hearts must be reached through their imagination rather than their understanding. It is surely well that such provision has been made for those whose taste (perhaps over refined) has been shocked by the flippant familiarity of superficial religionists. But the influence of these Anglican divines is not confined to the fastidious few. They have a greater reality to the religion of all ranks, by their energetic protest against the hollowness and insincerity of popular piety. Too often a 'professor of religion' was led to think that by the pronunciation of an easy Shibboleth, coupled with an abstinence from balls and theatres, he atoned for a life of covetousness and self-indulgence. The old Evangelical body, it is true, always discountenances such self-deceit. But the Anglican School has checked it more successfully by the prominence which they give to the duties of daily life, and the formation of habits. Moreover their exhortations cannot be turned aside by excuses which often parry the homie-thrusts of other preachers. 'We are waiting for the time of our conversion'—'We hope to receive our effectual calling in due season'—'To such pleas their reply is ready and consistent. You have already received the needful help. You have the power to pray and act. You are now the elect of God; make your election sure, lest you be cast away.' Such addresses administer no palliative to the conscience, and encourage no indolent hope of a compulsory reformation.

In the same spirit, the writers of this party have contributed to the religious literature of the day many admirable works which under the guise of fiction teach the purest Christianity, and exemplify its bearings on every detail of common life. To the training of childhood especially they have rendered most valuable aid, by thus embodying the precepts of the Gospel. But we need not do more than allude to works so universally known and valued as those of Miss Sewell, Mr. Adams and Bishop Wilberforce.*

Again, the revival of the High Church party has affected an important improvement among the clergy. Many of these were prejudiced by hereditary dislike against the doctrines and the persons of the Evangelicals, and by this prejudice were repelled from religion. But under the name of

† About the time of the first appearance of the 'Tracts' half the religious world was going mad after the Irrragies (who spoke in unknown tongues), the Rowites (who worked miracles), and the Plymouth Brethren, who advocated a community of goods.

The Evangelical party has also pursued the line of religious fiction, but generally with less success. Mrs. Sherwood, it is true, had great power of narrative, but her love of the pomps and vanities of the world too often overpowers her sense of religion. One recent Evangelical work of this kind, however, we may notice as possessing great merit.—'The Daughter at Home,' by an anonymous author. As a picture of the power of religion in gradually subduing asperities of a gloomy disposition and morbid temper, this story is unequalled.

orthodoxy and the banner of the High Church, they have willingly received fruit against which, had it come to them another shape, they would have closed their ears and hearts. A better spirit has thus been breathed into hundreds who but for this new movement would have remained, as their fathers were before them, mere Numbuds, Ratrods, or Fishing rods.

We cannot trace to the party of which we are now speaking, such great measures of public morality as are due to the school of Wilberforce and Buxton. But this is no reproach to them; for they did not exist as a distinct party till those national reforms were accomplished. They have, however, originated two public movements of much importance in our own time; that for the establishment of Protestant Sisterhoods of Mercy, and that for the general creation of Colonial Bishoprics.† Some discredit has been thrown upon the former of these objects, by the indiscretion of its more conspicuous promoters. Yet even in the midst of this indiscretion, there has been much to admire, in the self-devotion of body and soul to the relief of misery. And the original sisterhood, instituted under the superintendence of the Bishop of London, to train nurses for the hospitals, has, we believe, furnished no such occasion of stumbling. The movement for establishing Bishoprics in the Colonies has attracted greater public attention, and has met with more unqualified success. In the last thirteen years, fifteen new Bishoprics have been founded, and the complete organization of the Church transferred to as many nascent empires. We need not say that our satisfaction at this result springs not from our attributing any miraculous powers to the episcopal office. We value it not as the source of thaumaturgic influence, but as an instrument of good government; not for its magical but for its moral energy. The superintendence of any central authority can do much by combining and harmonising the isolated efforts of individuals; the superintendence of a zealous and intelligent man can do no more. Nor does he only render more efficient the labours of those amongst whom he comes to preside; his presence attracts more labourers into the vineyard. Those who would have shrunk from the isolation of independent action, now gladly go to work under a chief pastor on whose wisdom they rely, and on whose affectionate sympathy and encouragement they depend.—That is no mere theory is proved by the fact that in thirteen years the number of clergy in those fifteen new episcopates had increased from 274 to 503.*

But, as we have already said, the public measures promoted by an ecclesiastical party are a less certain test of its merits than that afforded by the conduct of its private members, and the efficiency of their parochial ministrations. From this criterion the Anglican party has no need to shrink. The moderate High Churchman (supposing him, of course, to be in earnest) is peculiarly fitted for the management of a

† It is true that the first example in the present century was given by the Evangelical party, the foundation of the Bishopric of Calcutta in 1814 having been entirely due to the exertions of Wilberforce. But no general effort was made in the same cause, till the establishment of the 'Colonial Bishopric Fund.'

* In connexion with these efforts for the benefit of the Colonies we would notice the great impulse given by the High Church party, during the last twenty years, to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and also the foundation of St. Augustine's College at Canterbury, for training Colonial Missionaries.