

every form of Christianity in which men are earnest there must exist an *infallibility* somewhere. By the Episcopalian Protestant, as by the Presbyterian, that infallibility is recognized as resting in the Scriptures; and by the consistent Papist that infallibility is recognized as resting in the Church. But where does the infallibility of the Puseyite rest? Not in the Scriptures; for, repudiating the right of private judgment, he is necessarily ignorant of what the Scriptures truly teach. Not in tradition; for he has no trustworthy guide to show him where tradition is right, or where wrong. Not in his Church; for his Church has no voice; or, what amounts to exactly the same thing, her voice is a conflicting gabble of antagonist sounds. Now one bishop speaks after one fashion,—now another bishop speaks after another,—and anon the queen speaks, through the ecclesiastical courts, in tones differing from them all. Hence the emphatic complaint of Mr. Ward, in the published letter in which he assigns his reasons for entering the communion of Rome:—“He can find,” he says, “no teaching” in the English Church; and repudiating, as he does, the right of private judgment, there is logic in his objection. “If we reverence,” he argues, “the fact of the apostolicity of creeds on the authority of the English Church, so far as we do not believe the English Church to be infallibly directed, exactly so far we do not believe the creeds to be infallibly true.” Consistent Puseyism can find its desiderated infallibility in Rome only.

The rise and progress of this corruption in the Church of England promises to form a curious episode in the ecclesiastical history of the age. It is now rather more than ten years since Whigism, yielding to the pressure of reinvigorated Popery, suppressed the ten Irish bishoprics, and a body of politic churchmen met to deliberate how best, in the future,